

**Department Meeting**  
**Friday, February 9, 2018 1:00 – 3:00 PM**  
**Thomas Edison Campus, Building U, Room 106**

	Present	Absent	Excused
<b>Administration</b>			
Dr. Thomas Rath, Interim Dean	X		
<b>Department Chairs</b>			
Andrew Blitz	X		
Leroy Bugger	X		
Mary Conwell	X		
Dr. Richard Worch	X		
<b>Faculty</b>			
Jim Barrell			
Vincent Butler	X		
Alisa Callahan	X		
Dennis Fahey			
Matthew Hoffman	X		
Deborah Johnson	X		
George Kodsey	X		
Tim Lucas	X		
Michael Nisson	X		
Cynthia Wilson-Orndoff			
Jennifer Patterson	X		
Anita Rose	X		
William VanGlabek	X		

	Present	Absent	Excused
<b>Staff</b>			
Tom Carr			
Jill De Valk	X		
Lisa Dick	X		
Ivan Guerrero	X		
Steve Kelly			
Mark Morgan	X		
Al Nault	X		
David Sundby			
<b>Other Staff</b>			
<b>Adjunct Faculty</b>			
Dr. Sandi Towers	X		
<b>Guests</b>			
Stella Egan			
Dr. Joseph Van Gaalen			

**Welcome:** Dr. Rath, Interim Dean of the School of Business and Technology welcomed all in attendance. Dr. Rath introduced guest speakers Stella Egan, Manager, Grants Administration and Development and Dr. Joseph Van Gaalen, Director, Assessment and Effectiveness from the Sponsored Programs and Research.

**Office of Sponsored Programs & Research:** Stella explained that a sponsored program is any FSW activity or project supported by an outside organization. These organizations could be state or federal agencies, or private, corporate, or non-profit organizations. The Office of Sponsored Programs can assist with finding funds for research projects. The office is responsible for facilitating the process by submitting the proposal. The FSW Foundation funding is separate. Stella will meet and review any proposals for submission.

Academic Research Council (ARC) grants are sponsored by the Vice President of Academic Affairs office. July 6, 2018 is the next submission deadline. Submissions after the deadline will not be considered. It usually takes 10 business days for the submission process. Dr. Van Gaalen explained that there are four categories of research: Action, Classical, Experiential, and Discovery. Action research supports scholarly projects that will be beneficial to FSW students and the FSW community. These grants involve a new learning process and are completed in

the classroom or within the FSW community. An example would be the purchase of software for a course. Classical research is the traditional research grant with a principal investigator (PI). Experiential research is social research conducted on FSW students or within the FSW community. Research is gained through the use surveys or publications. Discovery research involves the travel to obtain research on archived information examined only onsite. Each research category has an independent rubric where like grants compete with like grants for approval. Each grant approved is approximately \$5000 or less.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) must review and approve research involving human subjects. IRB members serve for three years and are recommended by their School's Dean. Dr. Rath encourages faculty to volunteer to become a member of the board. Dr. Rath thanked Stella and Dr. Van Gaalen for informing the group about their services with sponsored programs and ARC grants available.

#### **FSW Deadlines:**

- Annual and non-evaluated continuing contract faculty, Form 1 is due on Friday, February 23, 2018. This is completed using student success information. Include the following information: "This is what I said that I was going to accomplish and this is what I accomplished."
- Faculty evaluations for faculty not up for continuing contract and 5-Year faculty evaluations are due March 12, 2018 – March 23, 2018.
- Form 2 is due March 30, 2018
- All other documents are due April 6, 2018
- Form 3 is due April 11, 2018

#### **Department Updates and Projects:**

- Dr. Rath and Lisa Dick are working on the summer and fall 2018 schedules.
- Please wrap up the assessment mapping for respective areas with the next two weeks.
- Articulations: Steven is compiling the state gold standard articulations. We will be creating local agreements with other schools to award credits for classes completed. Dr. Rath will be meeting with faculty for review and signature.
- The department needs to start setting the stage for the new dean.
- Chairs talk about Perkins needs for your programs in the breakout sessions.
- Programs of Study (POS) for the 2018-2019 Perkins Grant. Dr. Rath will be meeting with area school districts and technical centers in collaboration for a common POS.
- Using Canvas for grading and attendance for both online and ground courses will soon become ubiquitous. There will be an upcoming discussion of this topic soon.
- Common course assessments through Canvas
- Questions about eLearning please contact Carolyn George, Instructional Design Coordinator. X16779 [Cgeorge2@fsw.edu](mailto:Cgeorge2@fsw.edu)

The faculty adjourned to their individual breakout meetings at 1:25 PM and resumed at 2:00 PM.

**eLearning Updates:** Dr. Rath introduced Dr. Rozalind Jester, Director of eLearning, to the group. Dr. Jester explained that in 2017, Dr. DeLuca, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, challenged the Academic Technology and eLearning Committees to make revisions to procedures, policies, and contracting of course design. In 2016, eLearning spent \$170,000 on course development and redesign. Previous Director Wendy Athens started revising policies by incorporating rubrics into the contract. The Faculty Senate objected about the stipend associated with the rubric because it was weighted against the subject matter expert. A revision that if there are four instructional designers reviewing the course, there will be an average of the four reviews instead of four reviews is reflected in the rubric.

In order to make the process transparent, the eLearning department has proposed that each School or Academic Department will have an eLearning coordinator who will be a liaison between eLearning and their School. This coordinator will be a faculty member approved by the Dean of the School, Director of eLearning, and the Provost/VPAA with final approval.

The revised online course development contract includes a review rubric aligned with the Quality Matters rubric using the University of Florida standards. Every element of a course is expected to be of high quality. In the course map, there needs to be an outline for every module including rubrics. The contract includes the subject matter expert building the course and the review process with a content expert. The design focus is for accessibility and aesthetics.

The review part of the form includes three sections including early stage review Part A, quality review rubric Part B, and final written critique Part C. The Part B rubric includes the following: course framework is worth a maximum of 30%, instructional materials are worth a maximum of 30%, assessments are worth a maximum of 30%, and interaction and communication are worth a maximum of 10% of the course rating.

One of the professors commented that in the past, there was an instructional designer available to assist when there were problems with the Canvas shell. Dr. Jester stated that faculty should contact the Help Desk for problems with eLearning at FSW. They are not on call 24/7 but another professor commented that she has submitted help tickets and her experience is that they have fixed the problems quickly. Many times problems occur because students are not using compatible computers. In the course description tell what computer students may use. Dr. Jester stated that it was ok to contact individual instructional designers who have assisted us in the past, such as Marilyn Goby or Randy Manning.

The new plan will include different levels of course development with stipends corresponding to each level of course design. The stipend will be paid when the course is completed for review (\$1000) and then will be paid after review, determined by course rating (\$1400 x numerical course rating). The maximum amount for a new course development is \$2400.

The online course development contract and the eLearning coordinator position will be proposed to the Faculty Senate on February 23, 2018. The goal with these initiatives is to have a more direct line between the eLearning department and the School. Course revisions and developments will include quality matters components, outcomes, and objectives where the assessments tie to the learning outcomes. If proposals are approved, the forms will be available electronically in March and will be able to be submitted all year long. The budget for course development has been set at \$100,000 for the year.

Dr. Rath thanked Dr. Jester for the eLearning updates and all for participating. The department meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM.

*Meeting minutes interpreted and reported by Jill De Valk*

## **Paralegal Studies Breakout Meeting**

**In Attendance:** Mary Conwell, Matt Hoffman, Sandi Towers, and Jill De Valk

**Westlaw & Paralegal Resources:** Jill has recently surveyed the nine other ABA approved paralegal programs in Florida to see what the other programs are using to fulfill the library resources requirement. Mary will survey other programs when she attends the AAFPE Regional Conference in March.

**Lorenzo de Medici Italian International Institute:** Matt recently submitted his application to teach an international business class at LDM. This is a one-month course that is very beneficial to students. Only FSW full-time faculty and administrators have this opportunity. After the submission of application, FSW approves and then LDM has the final approval of the applicant. Students are enrolled through LDM and the faculty member is paid by LDM.

**AAfPE Regional Conference:** Mary will be travelling to Memphis, Tennessee in March for the AAfPE Conference. Mary has proposed a panel discussion on contingency plans on how educational institutions should handle natural disasters which are becoming more severe and more frequent.

**Perkins Grant:** If the decision is made to stay with Westlaw, the Perkins Grant will remain as funding source.

**Program Name Change:** We will wait for the name change from Paralegal Studies to Legal Studies until the new Dean is in place. Changing to Legal Studies is a trend in other parts of the country to attract students whose goal is to attend law school or study public policy.

**Other Issues:** Matt brought to attention the issue he is having with students where English is their second language. Their writing skills are an issue and their assignments reflect this issue. We need to come up with an approach to this problem. One solution may be to refer the students to the writing centers or Tutor.com.

*Meeting minutes interpreted and reported by Jill De Valk*

## **Technology Programs including Architecture & Civil Engineering Programs**

### **Breakout Meeting**

**In Attendance:** Andrew Blitz, Deborah Johnson, George Kodsey, and Vincent Butler

**Pearson Company:** Discussion about MyLAB™ access being impeded between mid-December to early January 2018 (before Spring 2018 term start) for FSW faculty to their online course materials. All interactions required direct assistance from Pearson® support and incurred increased wait times to be processed.

- What if this error occurred during an active semester?
- What assurances or backup processes do FSW faculty have available?
- Should Technology Programs' review other vendor options for academic materials in future terms?
  - Cengage, McGraw-Hill, and Pearson were identified as the most predominate companies with associated course materials
- Attending faculty largely agreed, as of this meeting, that the Pearson products are working and their support services are addressing individual issues.

**Curriculum:** The following issues were discussed within the breakout meeting.

- Refinement of CGS 2108 - Computer Applications with Flowcharting content relativity to CGS 1100 - Computer Applications for Business
- The potential of instating a prerequisite of CGS 1000 – Computer Literacy for CGS 1100 - Computer Applications for Business course
- Student Plagiarism occurrences and policy

- Why is a “D” a passing letter grade for Technology Programs’ courses

**Textbooks:**

Discussion about the unique concern the Technology Programs’ have when considering textbooks as the subject materials and technology change faster than textbooks are printed.

- Overall how can Technology Programs’ logistically identify relevant textbooks associated with continually evolving subjects, while meeting required FLDOE and FSW’s deadlines for textbook selection?

**Student Attendance:** Discussed the current FSW Attendance Verification process.

- Online courses to continue with Attendance Verification being attached to a week one required student assignment was ***unanimously*** approved by the attending faculty
- Could FSW’s faculty have the option to “Drop a Student” from a course was broadly discussed as it relates to student attendance.

Minutes by Albert Nault

**Business and Accounting Break-Out Meeting Minutes** submitted by Lisa Dick

**Attendees:** Timothy Lucas, Jennifer Patterson, Alisa Callahan, William Van Glabek, Anita Rose, Leroy Bugger

**Proceedings:**

Professor Bugger led the discussion regarding the proposed 2018-19 textbook adoptions. He reviewed the accounting and business course textbooks. The group discussed how changes will affect Canvas shells and course syllabi.

The group discussed, in detail, each textbook adoption that had not been addressed as of February 9.

# Online Course Development Contract

## eLearning Department

8099 College Parkway  
Fort Myers, FL 33919



This contract outlines the agreement between the eLearning Department and subject matter expert(s) hired to develop and/or review course content for use in Florida SouthWestern courses. It defines the course to be developed, target delivery dates, responsibilities of each party, levels of course design and related compensation. Course Development projects must be approved by the Academic Dean and Department Chair (or Program Director/Coordinator).

Submit signed contracts to the Director of eLearning at [eLearning@fsw.edu](mailto:eLearning@fsw.edu).

## 1. Course Information

Course number and name:

Academic School: Choose School

Term and year to be offered: Choose Term

Academic Dean: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair:  
(Or Program Director/Coordinator)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Approval

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## 2. Roles and Responsibilities

Faculty/Content Developers must be qualified Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and are required to have completed the FSW Online Instructor Certification prior to developing an online course. A secondary SME may be contracted when deemed appropriate for the scope of the project. Your Banner ID is required to process payment.

SME	Name:	Name:
	Title:	Title:
	Banner ID: @	Banner ID: @
	Email:	Email:
Quality Reviewer	Phone:	Phone:
	Name:	Name:
	Title:	Title:
	Banner ID: @	Banner ID: @
Secondary SME (if required)	Email:	Email:
	Phone:	Phone:
	Name:	Name:
	Title:	Title:
Instructional Designer	Banner ID: @	Banner ID: @
	Email:	Email:
	Phone:	Phone:
	Name:	Name:

### Responsibilities of the SME(s)<sup>[1]</sup>:

1. Provide clear and organized course and module overviews.
2. Provide original and/or vetted direct instruction.
3. Identify how each course module addresses an outcome provided in the course syllabus.
4. Provide learning activities and assessments that meet the course outcomes provided in the syllabus.
5. Vet all publisher test banks and/or provide original question bank(s).

### Responsibilities of the Instructional Designer<sup>[1]</sup>:

1. Ensure Quality Matters standards throughout the course development.
2. Work collaboratively with the Faculty Developer to present course content in the best modality to meet the outcomes of the course and ensure student engagement.
3. Build original media when necessary and help incorporate vetted media.
4. Ensure usability and accessibility for all users and across multiple device platforms.

<sup>[1]</sup>For a comprehensive list of all responsibilities and deliverables please reference Appendix I the Course Development Quality Review Form.

### 3. Stipend Determination and Payout Schedule

Stipends and payout dates are dependent on the role of the SME, the level of course design as defined in Appendix II, and the final course evaluations as determined by a minimum of three independent quality reviews (Appendix I). A course development project may be granted reassigned time in place of a stipend with the approval of the VPAA's Office.

Role	Course Development Description	Level of Course Design	Estimated Stipend Payout 1	Estimated Stipend Payout 2
Select one		Select one		
Select one		Select one		
Select one		Select one		

### 4. Acknowledgements and Required Signatures

Faculty Developer/SME, please initial each line item to acknowledge review and receipt of the following:

- \_\_\_\_\_ I have completed the FSW online instructor certification. This is not required for Project Piece work.
- \_\_\_\_\_ I understand that the content produced as a result of this course development contract will be used in FSW "Master Courses" and will be distributed to and used by other faculty in accordance with the current CNA.
- \_\_\_\_\_ I received a copy of the Course Development Timeline and agree to Deliverable Due Dates. I understand that in the event that the course development timeline with deliverable due dates set forth in Appendix III have not been met, the Director of eLearning and/or the Academic Dean reserves the right to terminate the Online Course Development contract.
- \_\_\_\_\_ I received a copy of the Course Quality Review Form. I understand that full course developments (new or complete overhauls) will be subject to at least three quality reviews and that the final stipend payment will not be made unless the course receives an "Acceptable" rating or higher.
- \_\_\_\_\_ I understand that final stipend payments are dependent on the Average Course Rating for full course development projects (new or complete overhauls).
- \_\_\_\_\_ I agree to participate in a discussion with the academic department and design team to evaluate student and faculty feedback after the first term of implementation and decide on any further improvements.

As the Subject Matter Expert assigned to the course development project, I agree to develop and deliver the course materials as outlined in this contract. Any course development work pursuant to this agreement shall be Work for Hire and wholly owned by the College, including the right to make derivative use. I understand that my work under this agreement is work done at the request of the College and not at my own initiative.

Subject Matter Expert: \_\_\_\_\_

Subject Matter Expert: \_\_\_\_\_

Director, eLearning: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

Date

Contract Start Date:

Contract End Date:

## 5. Final Course Evaluation

This section is to be completed for full course development projects after all Quality Reviews have been submitted and the course is ready to launch.

Quality Review	Reviewer Internal ID / External SME	Rubric Score	Course Rating
1			Select one
2			Select one
3			Select one
Average Rubric Score	= 0		Select one
Stipend Payout 2	= \$1400 x average rubric score: \$ 0.00		



# Appendix I: Course Quality Review Form

---

The stipend for reviewing this course is \$300 to be paid after the submission of the final review. Submit the completed form (Parts A, B and C) to the eLearning department ([eLearning@fsw.edu](mailto:eLearning@fsw.edu)) by the mutually agreed upon due dates.

Quality Review for Course (Number and Name):

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Due Date Part A: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Banner ID: @ \_\_\_\_\_ Due Date Parts B and C: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Sign upon completion: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for evaluating this online course to ensure its quality prior to delivery to students. To fulfill the obligations of the course reviewer eLearning requests that you:

1. Provide a written critique of the course "map" in the early stages of development (Part A: Early Stage Review), and a thorough review after the course has been submitted (Part B: Complete Quality Review Rubric and Part C: Final Written Critique).
2. Evaluate how effectively this course meets the quality standards outlined in the rubric below. Do this by selecting the appropriate score from the dropdown menu for each group of standards.

We urge you to put the course through its paces by playing the role of the student - take all quizzes, tests, submit mock assignments, open links and files, etc. Your thorough efforts provide valuable feedback to the learning experience for the student and improve course quality.

Thank you for your service,  
FSW eLearning

## Part A: Early Stage Review

---

To be completed 4-5 weeks after course development is initiated. Review the completed Course Mapping Worksheet provided by the Design Team and answer the following questions.

Will this course cover everything that you would expect it to cover given its place in the program? Explain your answer:

Please comment on the planned mix of learning activities, content pacing, and student-student interactions.

Please comment on the intended allocation of assessment weights, paying particular attention to the summative/authentic assessments.

## Part B: Complete Quality Review Rubric

To be completed at the end of the project. Please review the course carefully and select a "Quality Score" rating from the drop-down list that reflects how well the course meets each group of quality standards. Use the following definitions as a guide for determining your rating for each category (Course Framework, Instructional Materials, Assessments, and Interaction and Communication):

**Exemplary** = there is *strong* evidence that each criterion has been met

**Accomplished** = there is *strong* evidence that the majority of criteria have been met (e.g. all but 1-2)

**Acceptable** = there is *some* evidence that the majority of criteria have been met

**Needs Improvement** = there is *weak* evidence that the criteria have been met

Online Course Standards	Quality Score
<p><b>Course Framework</b> This category accounts for 30% of the Overall Quality Score.</p>	<p>Rating: Select One Score (max 30): 0</p>
1.1 The course layout is logical, consistent, and efficient. <sup>[QM8]</sup>	
1.2 A recorded and/or written course overview describes the purpose and structure of the course. It includes course-level outcomes, prerequisites, grading policies and other relevant course policies. <sup>[QM1][OSCQR1]</sup>	
1.3 Clear how-to-get-started instructions are present. <sup>[QM1]</sup> They describe how to navigate through the course, and include sign-up instructions for any required integrated resources. <sup>[OSCQR1, OSCQR2][UFMOE4]</sup>	
1.4 Attendance verification activities promote engagement and student understanding of course requirements. <sup>[QM1]</sup>	
1.5 An example syllabus contains the following: assignment weights, recommended course schedule, and required materials (including ISBN numbers). The distinction between required and optional materials is explained. <sup>[QM3, QM4]</sup>	
1.6 Each module has clearly stated learning objectives written from the student perspective; they are measurable and consistent with course learning outcomes. <sup>[QM2]</sup>	
1.7 Recorded and/or written module overviews describe the big picture, relate to prior learning, align with learning outcomes, and state student responsibilities. <sup>[UFMOE]</sup>	
1.8 Thorough instructor notes are written to inform faculty of all pertinent details about the course, e.g. course set up, integrated content, alternate assignments, group projects, key assessments, etc.	
1.9 Course is ADA compliant. Alt-text is present for images, descriptive headings present on tables, transcripts and/or CC present on videos. <sup>[QM8][UFMOE]</sup>	
<p><b>Instructional Materials</b> This category accounts for 30% of the Overall Quality Score.</p>	<p>Rating: Select One Score (max 30): 0</p>
2.1 All materials are clearly written, free of grammatical errors, and links are functional.	
2.2 Materials are organized and chunked per module to balance student workload.	
2.3 Instructional materials and course activities clearly state the relationship to, and promote the achievement of, course learning objectives. <sup>[QM4, QM5]</sup>	
2.4 Both the purpose of instructional materials and how they are to be used for learning activities are clearly explained. <sup>[QM4]</sup>	
2.5 Direct instruction is present in the course (e.g. recorded lectures, demonstrations). <sup>[UFMOE1]</sup>	
2.6 Course tools promote learner engagement and active learning. <sup>[QM6]</sup>	

Online Course Standards	Quality Score
2.7 Activities require higher level thinking (e.g. connections to prior learning, brainstorming, portfolios, simulations, concept maps, case studies, research, and writing).	
2.8 Supplemental resources and/or open source textbooks are selected to provide variety and support learning objectives.	
2.9 All instructional materials are appropriately cited. <sup>[QM4]</sup>	
<b>Assessments</b> This category accounts for 30% of the Overall Quality Score.	Rating: Select One Score (max 30): 0
3.1 All major assessments have specific and descriptive rubrics that describe the grading criteria used to evaluate the learners' work. <sup>[QM3][UFMOE2]</sup>	
3.2 The assessments measure the course learning outcomes and stated learning objectives in each module. <sup>[QM3]</sup>	
3.3 The assessments selected are sequenced, varied, and suited to the learner work being assessed. <sup>[QM3]</sup>	
3.4 The course provides learners with multiple opportunities to track their learning progress. <sup>[QM3]</sup>	
3.5 Authentic assessments are developed to provide real-world connections to learning outcomes.	
3.6 Publisher quiz banks are validated and edited as necessary to align with learning objectives, and/or original question banks are created. Assessments draw from question pools and should support three years of use.	
3.7 Summative and common assessments are secured, and students are allotted adequate time for completion.	
<b>Interaction &amp; Communication</b> This category accounts for 10% of the Overall Quality Score.	Rating: Select One Score (max 10): 0
4.1 Activities that build community are included.	
4.2 Course offers opportunities for student-to-student interaction through peer reviews, group work, interactive games, and/or other planned activities. <sup>[QM5][OSQR5]</sup>	
4.3 Course offers opportunities for student-to-instructor interactions through synchronous sessions, required conferences, project feedback and/or other planned activities. <sup>[QM5][OSQR5]</sup>	
4.4 Requirements for student-to-student, and/or student-to-instructor, interactions are clearly stated in directions and rubrics. <sup>[QM5]</sup>	
<sup>[QM]</sup> References a Quality Matters™ Rubric Standard, 5 <sup>th</sup> edition (2014) <sup>[UFMOE]</sup> References University of Florida Standards and Markers of Excellence (2015) <sup>[OSQR]</sup> References Online Learning Consortium Course Design Review Quality Scorecard	Course Rating 0 OF 100
Rev. 5/16, 1/18	

Assign the course a final rating based on the Quality Review Rubric total score (check the box):

<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Accomplished	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommended for Redesign
≥ 90	80-89	70-79	60-69	< 60
This course exceeds expectations and provides a rich learning environment. Students will appreciate the thoughtfully crafted learning experiences and assessments. The course structure supports engagement with peers and instructor. This course meets all program and course level outcomes.	Rather than a repetitive read-discuss-quiz sequence, this course intersperses engaging learning activities and supports students in their synthesis of concepts. This course meets all program and course level outcomes.	This is the minimum score needed for the course to be released to students. This course provides a complete and error-free learning platform. It is logically organized and intuitive. The course is of the appropriate academic rigor and meets all program and course level outcomes.	After several corrections, the course could be released. This course is missing critical components. It may contain errors, require only lower-order thinking, and/or not meet program outcomes.	This course does not meet program outcomes and/or is too problematic for release.

Part C: Final Written Critique

Please comment on the following aspects of the course.

**Course Framework:** Overall structure of course, support for students and instructors teaching the course, ease of navigation, organization of modules. Please explain:

**Instructional Materials:** Lecture equivalent content is present, effective use of publisher content including e-resources, selection of supplemental resources, use of multimedia, visual appeal. Please explain:

**Assessments:** Formative assessments build skills in preparation for summative assessments, authenticity of assessments, alignment with learning outcomes, rubrics for feedback. Please explain:

**Interactivity - Engagement with Content:** Study materials are provided, a variety of learning methods are employed, students can express themselves in multiple ways, and activities require higher order thinking. Please explain:

**Interactivity - Engagement with Peers:** Collaborative opportunities are present (peer review, discussions, group work, case studies, debates). Please explain:

**Interactivity - Engagement with Instructor:** Synchronous sessions and/or other means for building community, providing individual student feedback, and answering student questions are planned. Please explain:

**Academic Rigor:** Rate the appropriateness of the academic rigor and pacing of the course. Please explain:

---

## Error Tracking

Did you find any errors in the course? Please identify them so they can be fixed:

---

## Final Comments and Course Rating

Would you enjoy being a student in this course? Please comment:

Did the Quality Review rubric accurately represent the quality of the course in your opinion? Please comment:

## Appendix II: Level of Course Development

The workload associated with course development projects may vary depending on the type and/or volume of content that needs to be created. Compensation varies by the Level of Design (LOD).

Level of Course Design (LOD)	Description	Stipend
New Course Development	Course that has never been taught online using a master course designed by eLearning.	Up to \$2400*
Course Overhaul	Course that has been taught online, but content, structure, and/or lack of usability is cause for a "New Course Development".	Up to \$2400*
Textbook Change	<p>A new textbook OR textbook edition has been adopted for an existing online course. The change requires new direct instruction and/or assessments, vetting and/or writing of test banks, or new course/module overviews.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Large-scale:</b> Majority of the course content must be updated (&gt;50%).</li> <li>○ <b>Small-scale:</b> Majority of the course content is still usable and only minor updates are needed (&lt;50%).</li> </ul>	\$500 to \$1000
Project Piece	SME** is contracted to provide a specific piece, or unit, of course content: e.g. test bank development, lecture recordings, course/module overviews, supplemental instruction, or assignments.	Up to \$500
Quality Review	A qualified SME** agrees to provide an evaluation of the course development project by completing a Course Quality Review form. They agree to provide feedback on the Course Mapping Worksheet at the start of the project, and a full in-depth review at the end of the course build.	\$300

\* Stipend is paid in two installments. First payout upon course delivery for review (\$1000); Second payout is determined by final course score (\$1400 x numerical course rating).

\*\* SME may be excused from the online teaching certification requirement. Quality Reviewers should be proficient in navigating Canvas and toggling between student view and instructor view.

## Appendix III: Course Development Timeline

The dates for delivering course content are negotiable. Faculty Developers may opt to deliver weekly module content OR focus on types of content for biweekly or monthly due dates. At least 4 milestones

Week	Activity	Deliverables	Deliver By
1	<p>Project Launch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of any existing instructional materials</li> <li>Discuss and complete course intake sheet expected enrollment, course profile, LMS, etc.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ID deliverables:</b> Intake and kickoff paperwork</p> <p><b>Faculty deliverables:</b> Completed course intake sheet</p>	
2 - 3	<p>Outline Course Framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brainstorm with ID and discuss options for course layout</li> <li>Identify the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) in the syllabus and determine how they will fit into the weekly Module Learning Objectives (MLOs)</li> <li>Complete list of learning assessments and grade weights for the course.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ID deliverables:</b> Blank Course Mapping Template Course Document Templates if needed Brainstorming and advice</p> <p><b>Faculty deliverables:</b> Completed Course Map Course schedule Grade breakdown Create module template in course shell</p>	
4 - 16	<p>Course Build:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During this stage, the bulk of the course content will be created in collaboration with the ID's.</li> <li>Faculty Developers decide on deliverable dates. There should be at least 4 major check points</li> <li>Dates for deadlines should be set at the project launch meeting.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ID deliverables:</b> Design delivered content for usability and accessibility standards Assist with development and editing of media content</p> <p><b>Faculty deliverables:</b> Overviews (written and/or recorded) Presentations Learning activities Assessments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> </ol>
17	<p>Review Stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All course content should be completed by this point and ready to distribute for Quality Reviews</li> </ul>	<p><b>ID deliverables:</b> Detailed review to assess for Quality Matters standards</p> <p><b>Faculty deliverables:</b> Final completed course Instructor Notes Example Syllabus</p>	
20	<p>Pilot Launch:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The course is now complete and all revisions are final.</li> <li>The course is ready to be distributed for faculty to customize for use in the upcoming semester</li> <li>Courses should be delivered to faculty teaching the course a minimum of 4-6 weeks prior to the start of the semester</li> </ul>	<p><b>ID deliverables:</b> Fully built and revised course Surveys distributed</p> <p><b>Faculty deliverables:</b> Request live course copied from Master Course</p>	

The eLearning coordinator acts as the direct liaison between the eLearning department and their designated School or Academic Department. The purpose of this role is to provide faculty with oversight and management of the Canvas Sub-Account associated with their school and/or department. The eLearning Coordinator will receive Canvas admin training through eLearning and have access to all the courses, development shells, course masters, and assessment tools in their respective Sub-Accounts. The eLearning Coordinator position will require availability throughout the Academic Year (Fall, Spring and Summer). Workload will vary based on semester trends (e.g. assisting with semester start procedures, or stage of course development cycle).

## Knowledge, Skills and Abilities

---

**Knowledge of:** FSW Online and eLearning policies and procedures; Proficient in using Canvas for course development and instruction; Quality Matters and/or other metrics for online course development and best practices in teaching online.

**Ability to:** advocate for support of distance education; facilitate communication between eLearning and faculty; adapt to new technology quickly; learn and maintain updated knowledge of Canvas; learn and maintain updated knowledge of policies, procedures and current practices and trends in online learning; work independently while recognizing situations that require the supervisor's attention; maintain confidentiality; communicate effectively orally and in writing; establish cooperative working relationships with persons contacted in the course of performing assigned duties.

## Specific Duties

---

- Provides academic departments with eLearning and Canvas updates prior to each department meeting.
- Assists eLearning in communicating and training faculty on eLearning procedures and available support services.
- Collaborates with eLearning on evaluating and prioritizing course development requests for academic departments and/or schools.
- Participate in Quality Matters training (eLearning support for becoming "QM Certified").
- Participate in the online external course review process.
- Provides eLearning with updates on known textbook changes, or other curriculum changes, that will impact the current online master course.
- Assist eLearning in the documentation and identification of courses in respective Sub-Accounts.
- Assess the current state of online master courses by applying Quality Standards Rubric.
- Work with departmental faculty and eLearning to identify professional development needs/opportunities for online and campus-based instructors.
- Act as Canvas Commons manager for respective academic department and/or school groups.
- Collaborate with the respective Learning Assessment Coordinator(s) and Office of Institutional Research to facilitate common assessments administered in Canvas.
- Serve as the Department's representative to the Academic Technology Committee.
- Facilitates course copies of online course masters into Canvas shells for full-time and adjunct faculty prior to semester start.
- Assists eLearning with day-to-day operations related to academic department or school (e.g. add/remove people, create/delete "sandboxes" for faculty as needed, ProctorU faculty support).



## Selection Process

---

Faculty may nominate themselves for this role and is subject to a departmental vote. The selected candidate is then recommended to respective Dean and the Director of eLearning. The Provost/VPAA has final appointment authority.

## Positions available:

---

One or two eLearning Coordinators per School by approval of the Dean.

## Compensation

---

The eLearning Coordinator compensation is dependent on the average online course load of the given department/school. Coordinators will receive a minimum of one-class (3 hours) reassignment each for fall, spring and summer semesters, and up to two-class (6 hours) reassignment with a \$1500 stipend for larger loads. Appointment may be renewed annually at the discretion of the Dean and Provost/VPAA.

Figure 1: EOL Sections Offered Fall 2015, Fall 2016, Fall 2017

