

Curriculum & Instruction Committee 2013-2014 Focus

Below is the summary of the CIC meetings and activities for the 2013-14 academic year.

- 1) Evaluation of online courses
 - a) The committee met with Laura Woodward and Hamid Siddiqui on April 30.
 - b) They presented responses to questions on the SET process & metrics. These included
 - i) When are the notifications sent to students for evaluations for online classes.
 - (1) These are typically sent three weeks before study day unless a professor/instructor has requested a specific time window. (Classes shorter than 15 weeks they use a compressed time format)
 - (2) Prior to the sending of emails with the link to the evaluation they perform an integration of Banner to ensure that the link is sent only to current students.
 - (3) Based on responses they are able to identify the three elements
 - (a) On-line courses with evaluations
 - (b) Traditional courses with online evaluations
 - (c) Traditional courses with traditional evaluations
 - ii) What are current response rates?
 - (1) Online SET (for both A & B above) are 28.7%
 - (2) This is a poor response rate based on the 69.61% response for traditional courses.
 - (3) They have comprehensive response rate by type of student with lowest in the lower level classes (below 3000) at 19.9%. For 5000 and above classes the response rate is 43%.
 - iii) At this time, they do not have the mechanics to identify the response rate to instructor.
 - iv) They will provide the committee with a comparative rate for 2012-2013.
 - c) COMMENTS AND CONCERNS
 - i) The current set of questions are the same as those for a traditional course. Though they are in the process of revising the questions, the committee suggested that they need to develop an instrument that focuses the evaluation on online teaching.
 - ii) As many of the colleges and schools are using the overall evaluations as a benchmark during the salary review process, concern was expressed that this might be an issue if there were a high number of courses that have poor response rates.
 - iii) The committee discussed that some institutions delay students from seeing their grade until the evaluation has taken place. It was noted that this might be considered a punitive measure and students might react adversely to this.
- 2) APEX program
 - a) The committee met with Monica Brockmeyer & Monica Davie
 - i) The program focused on student skill sets.
 - ii) Students in the program continue with evaluations. For the winter term, students are expected to meet eight times with the APEX team.
 - iii) The program seeks to focus on retention.
- 3) Effect of new admission policies
 - a) The committee met with Monica Brockmeyer and Cheryl Kollin
 - i) New advisors that will deal exclusively with the transfer of students.
 - ii) The lack of advisors who had an understanding of transfer students' course work had created problems in the past.

- iii) "Transfer Student Success Center (TSSC)"
 - iv) All new students need to be registered for a program.
 - b) Concern was expressed that there appears to be a gap in student knowledge on prerequisites, knowledge of course work and the differences between attending a community college and a R1 University.
- 4) Report on new intervention drop policy (SMART)
 - a) Corinne Webb presented the initial results of the SMART initiative.
 - i) The program was developed to ensure that students who are receiving financial aid understand the impact of withdrawing from a class. Based on Title 4 Aid the university must fully reimburse the government for students not completing classes.
 - ii) For Fall 2012, approx 500 (both undergraduate and graduate) students, who did not return, are in arrears for owed tuition to the university, which is estimated at over \$3 million.
 - a. They are predicting similar amounts for W 2013.
 - iii) During Fall 2013, 1488 students came to the student center for a SMART check.
 - b) The committee applauded these efforts.
- 7) State Hall renovation
 - a) Joint meeting held with Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee (Joseph Artiss, chair).
 - b) Apart from the 4th floor renovation a number of issues still exist
 - c) Intended to have a meeting with Rick Nork but due to budget limitations this was cancelled.
- 8) Rejuvenated curriculum
 - a) Item referred to the Policy Committee.
- 9) Macomb Campus
 - a) Ahmad Ezzeddine provided the committee with an overview of the plans for the new WSU Technical Center. It is located adjacent to the Macomb Community College Center campus and is scheduled to open in the Fall of 2014. The choice of this location was in part driven by the fact that Macomb County has no four year degree granting institution.
 - b) Target students are 18 – 24 FTIAC's. (MCC has a student body of approx. 24,000 students)
 - c) Concerns
 - i) The committee noted that there are issues with transfer students who can complete the degree requirements but cannot complete the additional classes to graduate. In these cases, students have no choice but to travel to Main or other campuses to take electives.
 - ii) Another area for concern is that initial transfer students appear to have been unaware that though they have the MACRAO Stamp that does not waive the prerequisite of certain class or college requirements.
 - iii) Lack of promotion at Macomb Community College & other community colleges. Committee would like to see an aggressive program to capture potential students.
- 10) The Assessment Process for HLC Accreditation
 - a) Joseph Rankin provided the committee with a review of the process in early October.
 - b) Noted that the office of the provost had set up a number of training sessions to provide assistance university wide.

Recommendations or Suggestions for the 2014-15 Academic Year

1. SET Evaluations – Meet with the 2-N committee to review and discuss progress
 - a. The University needs to develop a marketing program that includes a website to promote the SET Process for both faculty and students.
 - b. Based on anecdotal feedback from students they have a low understanding of what they are and what they do.
 - c. That the revised SET questions should differentiate between the different types of evaluations.
2. The committee would like to receive regular progress reports on the Accreditation process.
3. State Hall Renovation that a survey be conducted of both faculty and students who have taught or had classes to obtain fresh a look at the issues.
4. How is the success of programs at the new Macomb & Schoolcraft College centers going to be measured? As noted above the committee has concerns on how we attract students in to the various programs being offered. This should include retention of transfer students.
5. How the SMART check program is functioning.
6. Election of a major for both new and transfer students. Are current guidelines working.
7. Results of University Ambassador program.

JEF

May 5, 2014