Curriculum & Instruction Committee
Year End Report to the Academic Senate
2015-16 Academic Year

Committee Members

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

Guests and Contributors for 2015-16
Monica Brockmeyer, Thomas Fischer, Mathew Ouellett (Online Courses), Kurt A. Kruschinska and Mark A, Byrd (Data relating to classes).

During the academic year, the CIC addressed four general areas.
1. General Education Revisions
2. On-line Class quality
3. Retention and graduation rates
4. New scheduling matrix

General Education Revisions
1) Early in the academic year, Dr. Brockmeyer and Dr. Fischer were asked to provide an update on the progress that the committee has made over the Summer and Fall.
   a) The committee conducted approx. 20 Focus Groups with Students, Faculty and Administrative staffs.
      i) The goal of the focus groups in broad terms was to solicit feedback and suggestions on what are ideal Gen. Ed. Requirements.
      ii) The process resulted in a very comprehensive set of data on what the overall feelings from the three major groups as to what is the real and perceived value of Gen. Ed.
      iii) From the data collected, they were able to develop a comprehensive set of Guiding Principles for Gen. Ed. Reform.
      iv) In addition, Dr. Fischer suggested that we might want to look at the raw responses from the three groups that can be found at the following web page. http://wayne.edu/engaging-gened/data/focusgroups/
   b) The data collected has allowed the committee to develop a SWOT analysis of the current Gen. Ed. This also allowed the committee to highlight a number of issues tied into Gen. Ed. Dr. Fischer provided a draft of the analysis.
   c) During the discussion, Dr. Fischer noted that once the committee had finalized the guidelines for a revision to the Gen. Ed. Requirements a different committee would be appointed to develop the implementation plan.
   d) The group also discussed how the current MTA does not totally match the current Gen. Ed. Requirements. In addition, depending on the degree, a transfer student may find that the MTA does not fully meet the requirements of a degree as some colleges have specific lower level courses as prerequisites.

Since the meeting, the committee has suggested to Dr. Brockmeyer and Dr. Fischer that when they appoint the implementation committee that they invite a member of the CIC to be an attending member.

On-line Class Quality

1) 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.

    a) 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 courses 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.

    b) 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 provided 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 classes be certified by the OTL, but it would be a value that colleges and departments adopt evidence-based strategies in their learning outcomes for evaluation.

    c) 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. Another possibility is to have OTL staff members gain QM training so they could

help with certification. As the university is under economic pressure this might not be a realistic solution at this time.

d) 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 grades, etc.

Retention and Graduation Rates

1) Monica Brockmeyer provided an update of Advising and Retention. This included data on WSU FTIAC performance. For 2015, first year retention year is now at 77%. National data for the same period was not available at the time of the meeting.
    i) For last data set (2013) WSU is still slightly under peer and Mich. Public Universities.
2) Retention after second year has shown a marked improvement since 2010.
    a) For 2016, the target for 5-year graduation rate is 38%. Currently rate is 34%.
    b) Dr. Brockmeyer noted that there is still a great concern on why students drop. On the wide level, there are many reasons. These include financial, academic progress and there are some that appear to just disappear. The current data set and report does not allow specific identification.
    c) Impact of GPA at the end of first year. During the discussion Dr. Brockmeyer indicated that there are approx. 1063 students from the 2008 cohort that were not registered for Winter 2016.
3) The committee wanted to know if it would it be possible to identify those courses by college that have high failing grades.
4) In addition to the discussion on the above, Dr. Brockmeyer shared the vision on Timely Graduation. One of the approaches that they are looking to implement are 4, 5 & 6 year degree templates.
    a) She also indicated that the Gen. Ed. Reform Committee's recommendations will be a factor in helping students navigate degree requirements.

New Course Scheduling Matrix

The committee worked with Dr. Joseph H. Rankin, Associate Provost and Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Affairs, on the implementation targeted for January 2017.