Review of CRR Review Process 2015SP:

Discussed results from 2015SP both in terms of completion numbers and instructor feedback. Recap docs included at the end of the minutes)

- Barb suggested keeping the goal of 95% Decision – verbal consensus (perhaps) from the group but no vote – we can do at next meeting based on the review of the minutes
- Discussed the course schedule
  - Decision - Committee decided that instructors must include a schedule, but allow for flexibility in the definition (Schedules don't have to outline every single item but can be a general guide of what will be covered and what students can expect, for folks who prefer not to reveal content – hidden folders continue to be an option)
- Discussed Syllabus Inconsistencies
  - Decision - E-Learning will approach ISSA / Professional Development group to update Faculty Handbook to allow for:
    - Inclusion of syllabus information in a Bb/online site
    - Re-crafting the attendance statement in the faculty handbook to include online courses
    - In addition, once policy is reworked, e-learning to provide examples of statements in the CRR Training Resources course
- Discussed learning objectives in capstone and exam review courses
  - Decision - Committee suggests that these must be put in
    - E-Learning will work with instructors
    - Hybrid classification of courses is also an option
- Discussed learning objectives in 3rd party tools
  - Cyndi asked how other schools are doing this
    - Discussion of different review standards at different schools – will survey the DL Admins to see what we can discover
  - Decision - E-Learning will approach that
  - Cut and paste was given as an option – Barb and others had concerns about versioning and keeping two sites up to date
  - Discussion of Program Coordinator / chair level approval – reliability came into question (busy folks with many other things to juggle – we may need a second set of eyes)
  - Do we want to ask instructors to provide screenshots?
    - Instructor would have to show us screenshots or come by to show me their objectives in the 3rd party tool
    - Is this the best way to spend instructor's time?
  - Decision – Deferred - It was suggested to convene an expert panel including program chairs from across campus who rely on these types of tools - Bethany to organize
- Discussed Technology tools
  - Committee suggests that tech tools should be exemplary but not in the basic review
  - Decision - Clarify the requirement to include exams as an interactive tool (to stay in line with what we require for face-to-face courses)
- Discussed the challenge for adjuncts
  - Discussed possibilities for giving shells - what about "starter templates" that we would hold on the server
    - E-learning will need to develop a better list from deans of the templates that they have
    - Work to insure that the system works for Program Coordinators (and they know what will be given to whom and when)
    - Discussed that similar requirements are in place for face to face instruction.
    - Discussed how the requirements are being conveyed to the adjuncts – is it suggested that they are paid hourly or for the course including some preparation time
  - Decision – All adjuncts will complete the CRR
• Committee consensus that there will be times that flexibility is required as far as the deadline with adjuncts, and that flexibility will contribute to the 5% of non-completers (which is reasonable and acceptable)

Open Discussion – Exemplary Course Program

 o Initial query of members (vote-ish)
   o Bethany and Erin and Mitch = QM
   o Barb & Cyndi & Danell = Bb
   o Abstentions (or not a clear vote recorded – Carolyn, Amy)
 o Danell mentioned that she remains committed to the Bb Exemplary – mentioned her concerns that it is more rigorous and effective than it is in the training.
 o We will need to make adjustments to the rubric (whichever is chosen) to make it 3 levels
   o Suggested - Ready, Commendable or Accomplished, Exemplary
   o It appears both rubrics could accommodate this
     ▪ A certain number of points (not all required for exemplary) from QM could be "middle of the road"
     ▪ Bb is currently a three tiered system
 o Bethany discussed challenges in implementing the Bb rubric
   o Not sure what the overall score means – we would need to define that – what is required to be exemplary?
   o Some components / standards are confusing based on multiple types of information include – could be a beginner, intermediate and advanced based on what is included
   o Desire to eliminate the ability for the rubric to seem influenced (ie that some developers would be favored)
 o Barb brings up that Bb is more achievable for how the contracting works (Course Development Contract)
   o Bethany mentions that at a recent policy revision – the standard was changed from meeting exemplary status to meeting expectations outlined by the E-Learning Committee
   o Cyndi suggested QM Level 2 could be the new standard
 o Danell said that she teaches a lot of courses, training would be rigorous, maybe too much to expect faculty to do. The QM rubric is intimidating for instructors.
   o Agreement expressed by Carolyn
   o Discussion of reformatting into 3 tier process many make this manageable
   o Overall consensus that no matter which we use this will need to be a major focus
 o Second query of members (vote-ish)
   o Although constructive dissent continued, the decision was made to move forward with the QM Rubric and develop a training and certification standard to be reviewed by faculty
     ▪ Begin by running a few more courses through the rubric to see how close exemplary courses are currently
     ▪ Break apart the QM rubric into three levels
     ▪ Develop a few potential training / development paths to consider for 2015FA-2016SP development
       ▪ Amy suggested using her course, Carolyn’s already in process, Cyndi open to one of hers – not CIS-110

Next Steps:

 o E-Learning to:
   o Approach ISSA about changes to wording in the faculty handbook to make CRR requirements consistent
   o Discuss with affected instructors the need to include course and module level objectives in Capstone and Exam Review courses
   o Convene a panel of 3rd party tool users, and bring a suggested review standard to next meeting (Schedules willing)
   o Review a number of courses using the QM rubric
   o Begin initial planning of a development training process to bring for discussion at the next meeting