

**Present:** Stacy Anderson, Marilyn Bejma, Cheryl Cluchey, Elise Gramza, Jacklyn Hughes, Leonard Johnson, David Nicol, Robbie Teahen, Deb Thalner, Spencer Tower and John Urbanick

**Call to Order:** 10:35 am

Robbie reported that the topic of revising our charge will be addressed at our next meeting.

### **ONLINE STUDENTS COURSE EVALUATION SURVEY – FALL 2011**

Our faculty received less criticism than in earlier evaluations, and this hopefully is a sign of all the hard work we have been doing.

The majority of student complaints would be taken care of by faculty being more responsive. Teaching an online class is voluntary, and higher expectations should be set for responsiveness.

John noted that the technology category received 80+ and 90+, which is significantly higher than previous surveys; but he'd like to see some trending.

Could maintenance downtime possibly be changed to accommodate students' requests? IT has communicated maintenance schedules through multiple channels and asked faculty to include this in their syllabi. All needed maintenance is done during the scheduled window. The first goal was to try to do as few as possible during the school year, then once a month or as needed. Downtimes may seem more frequent because there are both hosting and maintenance downtimes. Suggestions were made to try to take small steps to reduce downtimes or do a constant small check rather than a regularly scheduled downtime.

Deb asked if it would be helpful to have the survey answers categorized. The majority felt it would, and Robbie will ask a student to code the questions and categorize the responses.

A request was made to add an executive summary and/or other summaries of the results.

Jackie felt that trends could be more valuable if they could be tied into Banner.

John commented that Communications people worked with an instructor who was getting low grades and negative comments, and he has improved.

Stacy reported that, as an online student there, she will receive a survey form from CMU soon. The policy is that if she wants her grade immediately, she must complete the survey. This could be a policy to look into, as now only a minority of our students completes an evaluation form. The number of responses would definitely improve, and they would include students who do not have any complaints (who tend not to complete evaluations now).

Students who are online tend to submit a question to the instructor when they think of it, as opposed to waiting until after class in a face-to-face course. The downside to this is that some online instructors may not want to check three or four times a day for questions.

## BLACKBOARD TRAINING

Jackie will try to get some information to give us on the spring schedule.

Spence suggested, in order to get the word out to more faculty, holding meetings devoted to one particular college with the location of the meeting at that college. We could cite precedence to convince other colleges on responsiveness.

Feedback indicates that online faculty wants some sort of communication possible with other faculty who are teaching the same course.

Stacy suggested that there should be some sort of orientation for adjunct faculty. She travels to talk to off-campus students, and sees a need to do something similar with off-campus faculty.

John felt we missed an opportunity in early training sessions to ask for survey responses; later sessions have been providing feedback.

Jackie reported that 239 out of over 400 faculty have been trained to date.

## STUDENT READINESS ASSESSMENT

Deb reported that the subcommittee met and are narrowing in on what we think is a solution, but there are still many questions on how narrow- or broad-based they should be. We are still looking at SmarterMeasure, working on the teaching and then assessing models.

John asked if the group is also working on assessing student technology skills. Things like dial-up have not been a part of the study.

We had a rough start with Blackboard, but it got better, so trending would be interesting to see.

We can measure whether the students can accomplish the tasks necessary, or we can go back to SmarterMeasure and pick and choose.

We need to teach students concepts and tools for online learning.

We should have an expected level of readiness; and at the finish of the assessment indicate in which areas the student is weak, and recommend taking or not taking a course. We should also have recommended resources for improvement come up.

As it stands now, there is no discussion saying a student needs a minimum score to take a course. Our wording is, "If you can complete the assessment, you can take an online course." Perhaps in the future, we should state, "If you can achieve at this level, you can take this course." Once a student successfully takes the assessment, he is eligible to take all online courses.

Stacy suggested checks be done and captured, then putting this data into a Blackboard shell where it can be interpreted in Banner. Any concerns could be highlighted and referred to the student's advisor. We could work through SmarterMeasure, as it allows anyone to look in and see the assessment results.

Deb commented that the next step is to consider budget for this tool. SmarterMeasure and Captivate would cost, but using Atomic Learning would be at no additional charge. Stacy reported that Emily has the capability of designing something but would need release time to do it. Strategic Planning may support some of the funding.

Deb asked if we are on track to test student Blackboard skills or just general skills. Jackie asked if we could have a month to gather information for discussion at a future meeting.

John asked the group what capabilities a student has to have when taking an online course. The group responded that students should know how:

- To use their browser
- To log in to the university systems (MyFSU or self-servers, their e-mail, and FerrisConnect)
- To attach a document to an e-mail

Then, it would be nice for our students to have some type of basic interface with whichever learning management system we choose and receive BlackBoard training.

We are considering both readiness and training. We will look at portions of SmarterMeasure and Atomic Learning or Captivate. Jackie felt we could put together a customized BlackBoard training session.

Deb will gather information on costs, and Stacy will look to see if there is a free program that does the same thing as SmarterMeasure.

## **ROUNDTABLE**

Stacy received an e-mail from a faculty member who tried to get a new shell but was told he cannot until his mentor approves it.

Jackie reported that early adopters' training did not include Quality Matters, so these people were assigned mentors to see if they are on track. Mary Holmes will send Robbie a list of those who are teaching online who are not certified.

Stacy will forward the faculty member's letter to Robbie and felt that she received it because she sits on the Policy and Standards committee.

On December 16 and 19, mentors and all their mentees will come in and have their sheets checked off and have courses built. If for some reason, a faculty member has not received mentor approval in time, they will be able to teach in their old format; but a time will come when this will not be possible.

## **NEXT MEETING**

Thursday, December 15, 2011 10:30 am to 12:00 pm CSS-302

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Bejma