

Review of Online, Hybrid, and TN eCampus Courses at Walters State

Approved by Teaching and Learning Technologies Committee on April 1, 2015

Approved by Academic Administrators on April 15, 2015

Approved by Academic Affairs on April 28, 2015

**Revisions approved by Teaching and Learning Technologies Committee on
October 18, 2019**

Revisions approved by Faculty Senate on December 3, 2019

Revisions approved by Academic Administrators on December 18, 2019

**Revisions approved by Teaching and Learning Technologies Committee on
September 23, 2024**

Revisions approved by IDEAS Advisory Board on October 2, 2024

Revisions approved by Faculty Senate on November 19, 2024

Revisions approved by Academic Administrators on January 7, 2025

Revisions approved by Academic Affairs on February 25, 2025

Walters State Community College (WSCC) was one of the early entrants into online education in the state of Tennessee. The present document continues the innovations WSCC faculty members are known for in the use of technology for teaching and learning, including online education.

Background

In the fall of 1998, Andrea Sanders, former English department faculty, offered the first online course at the institution, English 1010. At that time, because of the newness of this mode of delivery and no learning management system (LMS), the first online courses required students to come for a beginning-of-the-course orientation, a middle-of-the course check-in, and an end-of-course wrap-up. These face-to-face requirements were soon dropped as faculty and students became more comfortable with the technologies and processes of online education. In the early 2000's, TBR created the TN eCampus (formerly ROCC) program and purchased an LMS, which WSCC faculty soon adopted for their online courses and for other purposes.

In 2005, Distance Education began a process of reviewing the technical and content aspects of online courses. Based on some early Quality Matters (QM) training, faculty developed documents for a technical review completed by faculty knowledgeable in the

LMS and for a content review completed by a faculty member familiar with both online and the discipline/area of the course.

The Niswonger Project (2011-2014) was an i3 grant received by the college to develop online courses in specific disciplines for dual enrollment students. This project delivered 32 courses entirely online with dual enrollment students as the specified target audience. The Niswonger Project allowed the college to further invest in Quality Matters professional development for interested faculty and served as a model process for creating, reviewing, improving and ensuring robust online courses.

Online and Hybrid Courses

Online courses at WSCC are those that require no face-to-face meetings to carry out instruction and are indicated by “WEB” in Self Service Banner (SSB); hybrid courses include much instruction online but require one or more face-to-face meetings between faculty and students and are indicated by “HYB” in SSB.

Online and hybrid courses at WSCC will be reviewed based on the following criteria:

- Every five years in rotation with a division
- When major revisions in curriculum take place, as deemed necessary by deans or department chairs
- When textbooks change (but not necessarily editions of textbooks)
- During pilots for online course changes
- As deemed necessary by academic administrators

Faculty creating and teaching online and hybrid courses benefit from continued and specialized professional development, including the following Quality Matters courses:

- the faculty member is a developer— either lead developer or otherwise— of an online or hybrid course: APPQMR (Applying the Quality Matters Rubric) and DYOC (Developing Your Online Course)
- the faculty member is a reviewer of an online or hybrid course: APPQMR and PRC (Peer Review Course)
- the faculty member may be both a developer and reviewer of an online and/or hybrid course: APPQMR, DYOC, and PRC
- the faculty member teaches a course developed by another faculty member: TOL (Teaching Online)
- the faculty member is appointed by a dean to review for content only (no QM courses required)

The following rotation recognizes that when divisions concentrate on online and hybrid courses in their departments and divisions, faculty in that department and/or division attention on this particular mode of delivery and any issues that may be unique to online and/or hybrid learning in the discipline. Noting that the next SACSCOC report is due in 2027, WSCC divisions will review online and hybrid courses in the following rotation:

- Fall 2025-Summer 2026: Health Professional and Natural Science
- Fall 2026-Summer 2027: Humanities
- Fall 2027-Summer 2028: Behavioral and Social Science
- Fall 2028-Summer 2029: Business and Technical Education
- Fall 2029-Summer 2030: Math and Public Safety

At any time, academic deans may request that particular online and hybrid courses in their division undergo review in addition to the above rotation.

Academic Year Rotation

In the spring preceding the division review cycle, the Instructional Department for Educator Advancement and Success (IDEAS) will create a list of online and hybrid courses and faculty teaching those courses (fall, spring, and summer) for the indicated divisions to represent different departments. This list will be sent to the dean of the division by April 15. Then, the QM Coordinator and Instructional Design Executive Director will meet with the division dean to finalize the list of courses to be reviewed. The final choices are determined by the division dean and/or department chairs working in conjunction with the division dean. Substitutions may be made by the division dean or the department chairs during the division review cycle based on course enrollment and/or faculty needs.

Online and Hybrid Course Copies

The division dean will choose a faculty member to represent the selected course for review. The dean in conjunction with the faculty member will determine the course, section, and semester of the course to copy. Most reviews are copies of current sections. We recommend the course developer/instructor of the section should have previously completed the APPQMR (Applying the QM Rubric) course which details the standards being reviewed and expectations. Faculty are also encouraged to attend the 3-day IDEAS summer training where they can work on preparing their courses. The eLearn course materials including detailed annotations, faculty examples, and resources for each standard can be accessed at any time during and after the training. In addition, the QM Coordinator will send a copy of the current faculty peer review rubric with detailed annotations and notes, so faculty will know how they will be assessed before the review. This document is emailed in the spring after the division list is

submitted by the dean and again prior to the faculty's scheduled semester review. The QM Coordinator will notify faculty when the course should be ready to copy; this is usually during the third week of the new college semester. This gives both the faculty whose courses are being reviewed and the faculty peer reviewers time to settle into the new semester. The course developer will submit a Course Info document (see Addendum 1) that indicates the course, section, semester, year, CRN, read date, any third party material access info, other details about the course, and percentages for student-instructor, student-student, and student-material engagement. This document along with a PDF copy of the syllabus are returned to the QM Coordinator who provides these docs to the faculty peer reviewers prior to their independent reviews of the course.

TN eCampus Courses

In addition to online courses housed within the college, WS-owned TN eCampus courses will also be included in the QM review process. These courses are developed by faculty from the department and/or division, use the same (or similar) syllabi to the course on campus, and are overseen by the dean and department chair.

TN eCampus Master Courses are maintained by our college faculty. TN eCampus copies these courses and creates sections. The review will focus on a copy of a master course. The QM Coordinator will work with TN eCampus staff to obtain access to a Master Course for reviewers.

Reviewers

Three qualified faculty peer reviewers representing different divisions and/or departments will be selected to review each course. Reviewers are faculty members who have successfully completed training for APPQMR (Applying the QM Rubric) and PRC (Peer Review Course). Where possible, a content area expert from the same department as the course being reviewed will be part of the review team. The QM Coordinator will oversee this process and rotate reviewers to offer diversity and expertise.

Review and Improvement Process

Three reviewers are independently assigned to review each course such that

- The QM Coordinator will contact each reviewer separately, so they can work independently.
- The QM Coordinator will send each reviewer both the current QM Standards rubric review document, the Course Info document, and a PDF of the syllabus.

- Reviewers will provide comments, explanations, discussion points, and any applicable recommendations for improvement for each standard.
- Reviewers will have 3-4 weeks to complete each review during fall, spring, or summer semester.
- Reviewers will not be asked to review more than one course at a time.
- Reviewers will send their completed course review document to the QM Coordinator on or before the due date. The QM Coordinator will compile the three independent reviews into one document for each course.
- After the results are compiled, a Course Reviewers' meeting will be scheduled by the QM Coordinator. This meeting will be led by the QM Coordinator with assistance of the Executive Director of IDEAS. This is the first time the three faculty peer reviews are contacted as a team.
- When the Course Reviewers' meeting schedule is finalized, the QM Coordinator will send the combined course review document with each "not met" item highlighted. Faculty will review the combined course review document prior to the meeting.
- In the Course Reviewers' meeting, each "not met" standard will be discussed. Faculty peer reviewers may adjust their initial independent assessments during the discussion, comparison of the three different perspectives, and by re-examining the course copy, the Course Info document, and/or the syllabus. They will approve the final combined document and score.
- The QM Coordinator will contact the course developer/instructor to arrange a meeting with the QM Coordinator and IDEAS Executive Director to discuss and review the final combined review document with faculty peer reviewer names removed.
- After the meeting, the course developer/instructor will be emailed the combined final review document and a Course Improvement Action Plan (see Addendum 2). This plan briefly discusses how the faculty plans to make improvements on the unmet standards and which semester they plan to complete.
- The Course Improvement Action Plans for all courses are sent to the division dean after the division review cycle is complete. Deans do not see the original reviews, but faculty are welcome to share and also include in their promotion or tenure materials.
- If a course developer does not pass the review with the minimum of 85/101, they can request a re-review and rescore when their improvements have been made in a new semester and section. The QM Coordinator will work with one of the original reviewers to re-review an improved new section for just the unmet standards.

Reviewers' Meeting

As noted in the steps above, prior to scheduling a meeting with reviewers, the QM Coordinator will compile the three independent reviews into one document and prepare a review results document for a meeting with the course reviewers and IDEAS Executive Director. The reviewers will be emailed the combined review to preview prior to the team meeting.

In that meeting, the following points will be addressed:

- Confidentiality of the review and professionalism needed in the review process.
- Appreciation of the reviewers for their work
- Discussion of each standard marked “not met” by all three reviewers
- Consultation of the course copy, Course Info document, and/or syllabus
- Discuss any other concerns or clarification that may be needed for the developer/instructor
- Discuss positive things the reviewers would like the developer to know

From the Course Review Meeting and oral input from the reviewers, the QM Coordinator will finalize the combined review document with the faculty peer review team's final approval during the meeting.

IDEAS retains copies of the completed independent and combined review documents. Reviewers will be compensated after the Course Reviewers' meeting. The QM Coordinator will notify the designated IDEAS staff that the reviews have been completed and for faculty to be compensated.

Developer/Instructor Meeting

When the review results document has been finalized, the QM Coordinator will schedule a meeting with the developer/instructor and the IDEAS Executive Director to share and discuss the review documents.

In that meeting, the following points will be addressed:

- Confidentiality of the review and professionalism of the review process
- Process of the QM review, especially each reviewer working independently
- Provide review results document and Course Improvement Action Plan to developer/instructor
- Discuss all “not met” QM standards where the majority of the faculty peer reviewers agree
- Discuss any other standards, as desired by the developer/instructor
- Discuss any other concerns of the developer/instructor

- Distribute the final combined review document (with faculty peer reviewer names omitted) and Course Improvement Action plan to the developer/instructor
- Discuss any assistance in making changes to the course that the developer/instructor feels they need.

Course Improvement Action Plan

At the end of the Course Developer/Instructor meeting, the Course Improvement Action Plan will be discussed with the developer/instructor along with possible improvement actions. Within three weeks of the meeting, the form is due to the QM Coordinator.

Addendum 1

COURSE INFO



Developer/Instructor Name:

Course:

Section:

CRN:

Semester and year of course:

How You Were Selected for Review

IDEAS meets with the division dean to discuss possible courses for the division review to represent high enrollment online courses or courses that represent each department within the division.

- The division dean consults department heads.
- Your division chooses the online (or hybrid) course and developer/instructor.
- You choose the specific online (or hybrid) section.

Please let Kay know if there has been a change in your planned course.

Home Page Banner/Course Info

To help us ensure we are copying the correct course for the review, please provide a screenshot or snip of your home page banner here (replace sample with your course).

The screenshot shows the home page of an eLEARN course titled "English 2410-W01 Early European Literature". At the top, there is a navigation bar with links for Course Home, Course Information, Communication, Assessments, Course Tools, Resources, Student Help, and More. Below the navigation bar is a large banner image featuring a historical painting of people in a room. The banner text reads "English 2410-W01 Early European Literature". To the left of the banner, there are two status boxes: "2 Quizzes Not Attempted" and "5 New Emails". To the right of the banner, there are two dropdown menus: "Course Syllabus" and "Course Syllabus". Below the banner, there is a "News" section with a "Start Here" link and a "Welcome Back!" message. The "Welcome Back!" message is accompanied by a graphic of a lightbulb, a book, and a pencil. Below the "Welcome Back!" message, there is a section titled "Basics about Our Online Class" with a brief introduction from the instructor, Associate Professor Kay Heck, and a statement that the class is designed to engage students with the material and each other.

Also, take a screenshot or snip of your course info (replace sample with your course) or type in the information. This helps provide exact information for copying your course in eLearn.

English Composition II - ENGL-1020-161 - 10588.202310	✚
English Composition II - ENGL-1020-162 - 10589.202310	✚
ENGL 1020 OER Course Copy Spring 2023 - ENGL_1020_OER_COURSE_COPY_SPRING_2023	✚
Early European Literature - ENGL-2410-W01 - 11207.202110	✚

Ready Date

Please identify a date when your course will be ready for the QM review on or before _____.

Course ready date:

Please be aware that once your course is copied, this is what the reviewers see, not your live course. They will see your class exactly as it is at the time of being copied.

Simple Syllabus

Please download a PDF copy of your published Simple Syllabus for this section of the course and attach it to the email when you return this document to Kay.

This PDF doc helps reviewers easily locate your syllabus. It is a key part of the review, so it is beneficial to have it readily available throughout the review process.

Please note that reviewers will be looking for both syllabus objectives and module/unit/or chapter objectives. See Standard 2 section on the copy of the QM peer reviewer rubric document. (If you reference module objectives in a print textbook or PowerPoint, a copy of these should be included in the course modules, in the Course Info Doc, or an attachment for reviewers since we do not have access to print textbooks.)

Third-Party or External Material

Does the course use a companion website such as Pearson, Cengage, etc.?

If yes, please provide a specific username and password or instructor access code, so reviewers may access and review companion website. If you do not have this info, please contact the company rep for guidelines at your earliest convenience. We often have issues accessing third-party course materials which delays the process, so if you could provide as much info as possible, we would appreciate it. Some developers provide a separate, step-by-step guide with visuals to help with the access.

Reviewers: If you cannot access 3rd-party materials, let Kay know ASAP since the course materials affect many standards.

SLO's

Are the course level Student Learning Outcomes (syllabus outcomes) departmentally mandated?

Division/Department Policy Awareness

Are there any division-/department-wide policies carried out in this course that the reviewers should be aware of (Service Learning Requirements, Oral Components, Field Experience, Credentialing, etc.)?

Course Design

Which of the following best reflects your course design origin? Highlight your response.

- Fully designed by you
- Copy of colleague's course that you are teaching "as is"
- Copy of colleague's course that you have added to
- Master course designed by someone else in your department that you and/or others have added material to
- Master course designed by someone else in your department that you must teach "as is"
- 3rd Party Vendor course materials
- OER textbook that you are teaching "as is"
- Other (please explain)

Beyond-Online Component

Will your online (or hybrid) course meet face-to-face for any classes like for proctored exams, library orientation, or on-campus meetings?

If yes, please state the Student Learning Outcomes that will be addressed during face-to-face sessions that may not be addressed in the online learning environment.

Course Breakdown

For this section, you will estimate the breakdown of course engagement in 3 key categories.

National instructional design experts, best practices in online education, and current research are used by QM to determine the rubric standards and engagement expectations. The percentages should total 100%.

- _____ %

Student-material is how much of the course is the students engaging with course materials such as content items, your created material and/or content videos, readings,

quizzes, exams, writing assignments, projects, games, etc. . . .

- _____ %

Student-instructor is how much of the course is you engaging with the students via individual feedback, home page news items with explanations, video home page news posts with explanations, emails, etc. . . . This is more direct, real-time engagement with students during each week rather than course materials including content you have created or recorded. This is also a requirement of the Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) federal guidelines for online classes. Distance education like our online classes has more expectations for engagement than an online correspondence course that is mostly student-material.

- _____ %

Student-student is how much of the course is students engaging with one another such as in discussion board posts and replies to classmates. It can also include working with fellow classmate(s) on a project, virtual class breakout rooms, etc. . . . Student-student engagement increases learning, motivation, and retention. QM emphasizes building a sense of community and belonging wherever possible in the course.

Additional Info

Please provide any additional information you feel would be helpful for the faculty peer reviewers.

Once you return this completed document and your Simple Syllabus PDF for this section of the course to Kay, your part to start the process is complete. I will contact you later in the semester to schedule a meeting with Candace and me to discuss the final review and Course Improvement Action Plan.



COURSE IMPROVEMENT ACTION PLAN

Faculty:

Course:

Date of Developer/Instructor Meeting:

Date to complete and return to Kay:

IDEAS has shared the results of my QM course review conducted by 3 trained faculty peer reviewers from different divisions of the college. I have read the results, understand them, and have discussed them with the IDEAS Executive Director and QM Coordinator.

The following is an action plan in response to the QM review results. I will prioritize improving the not-met standards from the review listed below and on the final review document with details about the standards, peer reviewer comments, and tips/resources from IDEAS. I may also consider further improvements in student engagement with content, between students, and with me as I consider overall improvements to my course and student experience.

Email Kay if any questions or if you need assistance at kay.heck@ws.edu.

QM Standard	Improvement Actions	Semester to be Completed