

D.E.C. MEETING AGENDA-

April 17, 2018

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m., **LIB 352 3rd floor stacks conference room or TBA**

I. Call to order/ Introductions

II. Approval of minutes

III. New Business

A. Course Approvals- Last week's online evaluations (MGMT & MKTG courses)

B. New Course Approvals (Please review before meeting):

**Lynch/Luseno choose 3 SED 5304**

**SED 5477**

**SED 5481**

**SED 5484**

**SED 5492**

**Nazon choose 2**

**Psych 4306/5306**

**Psych 4302/5302**

**Psych 4300**

**King**

**Geog 4520/5520**

**Geog 4500/5500**

VII. Old Business

A. Approve shortened course proposal evaluation rubric

B. Approve minor edits of DEC contract language

C. DEC thoughts on course attendance/participation policy & Fee structure

"Distance Learning Tuition and Fees

The tuition for distance learning students is the same as off-campus tuition with the addition of

a \$50.00 distance learning fee per course that covers telecommunication costs. For more

information call 773/995-2960 or visit our website at [www.csu.edu/CTRE](http://www.csu.edu/CTRE)" From: p. 61 Graduate and Professional Academic Catalogue, 2014-2016

VIII. Final Remarks

**Next meeting: May 15**

VII . Adjournment

## D.E.C. MEETING MINUTES

February 20, 2018

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m., LIB 352

- The meeting was called to order at 12:38 p.m.
- We do not have a quorum, yet. We have 2 voting members present: Drs. Jacobs and Jackson.

Members and Guests In Attendance: Karel Jacobs, Joni Jackson, Mike Sukowski, Nancy Grim, Rochelle Johnson, A. Dimah

- The agenda for today has been revised. Dr. Syzman is unable to attend, thus his presentation is postponed.
- The computer in Room 352 is no longer functional.
- Approval of minutes of previous meetings. Dr. Jackson made a motion to approve the minutes, as revised. Tabled until we reach quorum. We cannot yet vote, as we do not have a quorum.

Dr. Jacobs opened our discussion on the use of the evaluation rubric. Let's discuss the evaluation rubric. We began a brief discussion of Dr. Syzman's course.

- Mike Sukowski suggested that Dr. Syzman meet with an instructional designer to "tweak" the course. Most of the elements of the syllabus were "developing."
- Dr. Jacobs asked should we approve the course, recommending the changes under "developing." However, we did not vote on whether Dr. Syzman's course was approved or not.

Dr. Jacobs identified a number of challenges:

- One challenge we have is with the lack of resources.
- The committee may need training on the rubric.
- We don't want a complicated rubric because that might discourage faculty from creating an online/hybrid course. Thus, we need to identify and use some minimal level criteria met. We want to use the rubric as a tool to encourage development.
- Mike Sukowski: We could provide the Design Document to faculty, which describes what happens in OTC training. (The Design Document is on the OIT website.)
- Rochelle Johnson noted that the rubric may be daunting for faculty to use, (suggesting we need to simplify the checklist).
- We need to identify elements that are non-negotiable, per Dr. Grim. Then we might define a course as "provisionally" approved.
- Dr. Jackson shared some questions and comments from the College of Business (COB). If someone is already approved to teach a course online, why must they present to the DEC? It is part of the process and procedure.
- Mike Sukowski referred us to SARA guidelines. The DEC has to approve online courses, in accordance with standard processes used in the college or the university.
- If a course is just changing the delivery mode (online or hybrid for the first time), faculty must come before the DEC. Can we have an expedited format for a new online course to be offered by a faculty member who has completed OCT and currently teaches online?
- Some colleges require faculty to go through their College Curriculum Committee (although the procedures differ and not all colleges have a procedure).
- The first time a course is being developed, a new course, it must be presented before the Curriculum Committee and the DEC.
- We have an expedited form if an existing course is being changed to an online or hybrid format.
  - The idea behind the expedited form was to submit modules for 2 weeks, rather than modules for all 16 weeks.

- Mike shared what other institutions are doing. At NIU, you have to present an online course each time, and go through online training.
- Brand new courses are included on signature routing form.
- Dr. Satsha Green has a committee that will be discussing the routing procedures.
- We will keep expedited form for existing courses, where we are changing an existing course to online or hybrid.
- Is this different for hybrid? A good point – are all the criteria the same, for hybrid and online? Mike noted that most institutions do not differentiate between hybrid and online (for the approval process?). No reason to have a separate evaluation rubric.
- Dr. Jacobs: Can we have a checklist for the items that must be included (the idea of minimum requirements to receive approval).

Dr. Grim asked: What are the needs of this committee and faculty in delivering and developing online courses. We need to identify and define our needs.

Dr. Jacobs: Can we make a recommendation to the CTRE that we prioritize development of a space to allow faculty to develop and improve delivery of online and hybrid courses.

Dr. Jacobs: What about 3 CUES? Part of the process that faculty go through in the process of developing the modules and seeking approval from committee is course development and maintenance. There are CUES for development (3 CUES) and maintenance (1 CUE).

There was a discussion about the meaning of the items on the shortened rubric.

- What is “layout” – consistency and coherence

Dr. Jacobs noted some of the minimally required items that would include:

- Orientation module
- Uniform design layout
- Activities and strategies that engage students and include collaboration
- Communication with professor that is regular and engaging

There was a question from the College of Business regarding the number of DEC committee members who have completed OTC (online) training. Nine of the 19 committee members have completed OTC training.

Meeting adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

The next meeting will be on Tuesday March 27, (4th Tuesday)

Minutes Respectfully Submitted,

Joni Jackson

**Extended Rubric for Evaluating Online and Hybrid Courses**  
**(This is the proposed rubric for evaluating online or hybrid courses discussed at Feb. mtg.)**

This document is prepared by Chicago State University's Distance Education Committee and Office of Online Instruction and Instructional Technology for approving online and hybrid courses for delivery. The form can be printed and used manually, or comments can be added to each section directly inside the digital document.

- **Non-Existent** - Not present, but should be, based on course design and content, or present, but not appropriate for this course.
- **Developing** - Some evidence of this criterion, but it needs to be presented more clearly or better developed.
- **Meets** - Evidence of this criterion is clear and is appropriate for this course. More could possibly be added.
- **Exceeds** - Evidence of this criterion is clear, appropriate for this course, and demonstrates best practices in a manner that models its use.
- **N/A** - Not applicable based on course design and content.

	<b>Non-Existent</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Instructional Design</b>					
Structure					
Learning Goals/Objectives/Outcomes					
Course Information/Instructor Contact Information					
Instructional Strategies					
University Academic Integrity Statement					
University ADA/Accessibility Statement					
Use of Multimedia					
<b>Communication, Interaction, Engagement &amp; Collaboration</b>					
Activities & Opportunities					
Organization & Management					
Group Work					
<b>Student Evaluation &amp; Assessment</b>					
Goals & Objectives					
Strategies					
Grades					
Feedback					
<b>Learner Support &amp; Resources</b>					
University/Program Support & Resources					
Academic Support & Resources (Library, Learning Assistance Center/Tutoring)					

<b>Design</b>					
Layout					
Use of media					
Use of images					
Links/navigation					
Accessibility					
<b>Additional Comments:</b>					

*The above form is derived from the Illinois Online Network (ION) – Quality Online Course Initiative Rubric (QOCIR). The State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) is an agreement among member states, districts and territories that establishes comparable national standards for interstate offering of postsecondary distance education courses and programs. Use of a rubric will support the nation in its efforts to increase the quality and integrity issues that have arisen in some online/distance education offerings.*

<b>Module 1: Title of the Module</b>					
<b>Purpose of the Module:</b>					
Objectives (Intended outcome of the module (Performance objectives and measures)	Readings/ Content Presentation (Textbook chapters, videos, PowerPoint, or other readings) Also include estimated time.	Assignments/ Activities/ Assessments (Exercises/quizzes/exams/assessments) Also include estimated time.	Discussions (collaboration in the course) Also include estimated time.	Application of content learned (The student knows and fully understands the concepts that he/she learned. The students will collaborate with other classmates and the instructor to problem-solve situations in the classroom, in a class project, and eventually in the real world. The students should use what they have learned in class and apply it to their everyday life.) Also include estimated time.	Media/ Technology Ideas Also include estimated time.

*The above form was discussed as a tool for faculty to use for expedited approval. It provides guidelines for completing the two modules required for changing an existing course to a hybrid or online course. THIS HAS NOT BEEN APPROVED.*

