

Curriculum and Instruction Committee
March 9, 2016

Present

Jane Fitzgibbon	Douglas Barnett	Meghan Courtney
Jennifer Hart	Peter Hook	Patricia Jarosz
Mahendra Kavdia	Fayette Keys	Qin Lai
Diane Levine	Leah Lowenberg	Aaron Martin
Joseph Rankin	Marsha Richmond	Preethy Samuel
Naida Simon	Mark VanBerkum	Barrett Watten

Absent with Notice None

- 1) Notes from February 10, 2016 meeting were approved with no changes.
- 2) The purpose of the meeting was to develop a response to the Policy Committee's request on how the administration can ensure that On-line courses are of high quality.

The committee felt that that this is a noble goal but the university must not create a separate set of evaluation tools to assess On-line and Hybrid classes. Evaluation must be the same as those for traditional classes at all levels.

1. With the upcoming accreditation, from Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, all colleges and departments are in the process of or have developed specific learning objectives, outcomes and evaluation criteria for all classes. The rubrics that are being developed are specific to each discipline. The committee acknowledges that these may be varied. They also acknowledge that within the various colleges and departments the criteria between lower and upper level may be different. This does not mean that there is disconnect between pedagogy and how the evaluations are conducted but that they are different while striving for excellence.
2. The committee felt that the Office for Teaching and Learning (OTL) has been a beacon of support for all forms of teaching. In the last year, they have provide assistance to faculty on course design and assessment, diversity, evidence-based learning strategies, and instructional technologies. They have made a specific emphasis to assist in Hybrid and On-line course development. It cannot be mandated that all Hybrid or On-line courses be certified by the OTL, it would be a value that colleges and departments adopt evidence-based strategies in their learning outcomes for evaluation.
3. Another avenue that the university might wish to pursue would be to have some of the multi-section Hybrid/On-line courses certified via the Quality Matters process. <https://www.qualitymatters.org/>

The following is an overview from the higher education segment on their website.

Quality Matters Program Certifications are offered at four levels. They are designed for mature programs able to provide a minimum of three consecutive years of relevant data. Criteria for the Online Program Design Certification specify that the Program has been designed by QM-trained faculty or QM-trained instructional design staff in accordance with the relevant QM Rubric. This certification is, thus, for QM subscribers. Institutions with approved Implementation Plans are particularly good candidates for Program Certification, but others that have followed their own implementation path are also eligible.

Even though Wayne State has membership status, certification for all of the university's Hybrid/On-Line classes might be expensive. As the university is under economic pressure, this might not be a realistic solution at this time.

4. Finally, it might be possible to use Peer Evaluations as a means of ensuring quality. However, while researching what other institutions are doing a word of caution was offered from colleagues at University of Wisconsin – Whitewater and Indiana University East... While it could offer an opportunity for innovation, there needs to be guidance and caution on how the evaluations are applied.

Based on the above the CIC suggests that the university use the evaluation process that is being used for HLC accreditation. In addition, this could be supplemented with metrics from the registrar's office cross-related to student course evaluations on delivery mode, average grade etc.

JEF
April 22, 2016