

Guidelines for Institutional Review of Course Readiness for Distance Delivery
 South Dakota Electronic University Consortium

Summary of Current University Processes for Certifying Course Readiness

UNIV	Conducted by	Completed by	Faculty Training in Technology Req'd?
BHSU	Faculty member teaching course completes checklist and sends to Dean for review and signature	Begins 2 months prior to offering	Not stated; faculty asked to review good practice materials prior to review
DSU	Faculty member teaching course completes checklist; if the course was developed as part of a distance education / alternative delivery summer grant, faculty must present summary of efforts	Before course is delivered	Yes; faculty member is also asked to review good practice materials
NSU	Faculty member teaching course completes course certification document; Coordinator of Instructional Technology verifies technical readiness information provided by faculty member and completes readiness form; Dean makes final certification	Before course is delivered	Yes; faculty member is also asked to review good practice materials
SDSMT	Faculty member teaching course completes checklist and sends to Dean; if Internet, the Director of Academic Initiatives also signs checklist; Dean or dept chair and Director of Academic Initiatives arranges meeting with faculty member to discuss any questions about the readiness of the course; Dean certifies that course is ready	Before course is delivered	Not stated; Faculty Development Coordinator holds sessions that orient and assist faculty meet readiness criteria
SDSU	Department head or Dean meets with faculty member teaching the course; faculty member presents course components and materials; department head completes review checklist and forwards review to College of General Studies; Distance Education Coordinator evaluates reviews	Before course is delivered	Not stated; faculty are to receive copy of principles and guidelines for distance education course and delivery prior to course development
USD	Faculty member teaching course completes checklist and forwards checklist and provides access to website (if online course) to dept. chair; dept chair forwards information to an institutional review team consisting of a faculty peer and a technology specialist; review team reviews materials and forwards recommendation to Dean; Dean makes final approval	Before course is delivered.	Yes; faculty also provided curriculum readiness materials

Proposed Guidelines

I. Purpose of Review

All new courses, regardless of delivery method, are subject to institutional and system curriculum reviews prior to scheduling. In addition, courses offered through the South Dakota Electronic University Consortium are also subject to an institutional review of course readiness for distance delivery as well as a system-level quality review after the course has been offered (see *Guidelines for System Review of Distance Delivered Courses*). The purpose of the institutional review of course readiness for distance delivery is to insure the quality of distance education courses. According to the EUC Guidelines, “courses offered by distance go through an additional institutional readiness review process to insure that the course adheres to best practices for distance delivered courses.”

II. Scope of Review

The institutional review of course readiness includes a review of instructor training, course design, course syllabus, and available course materials. Distance delivered courses are subject to the guidelines outlined in this document based on the following criteria:

- A. The course is being offered through the EUC for the first time.
- B. A previously reviewed course will be delivered using a delivery method other than the method for which the course originally received approval.
- C. The instructor responsible for delivering the course is other than the instructor who was responsible for delivering the course when it originally received approval.
- D. There has been a substantial change in course design, content, or audience.
- E. The department head/dean requests a review of a previously reviewed course.
- F. The faculty member requests a review of a previously reviewed course.

III. Responsibility for the Review

The Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) is responsible for ensuring adherence by their university’s faculty and staff to the guidelines set forth in this document. The VPAA, or designee, is responsible for making the final determination of whether a course has met the requirements associated with the institutional review and for reporting the final results of that review to the Senior Administrator for the Board of Regents. Further, the VPAA, or designee, is responsible for ensuring that any formative recommendations are addressed either before or during the delivery of the course, as appropriate.

IV. Review Deadline

The institutional review of course readiness for distance delivery shall be completed no less than 4 weeks prior to the beginning of the term in which the course has been scheduled for delivery. While it would be preferable that such a review is completed prior to the establishment of course schedules, it is recognized that faculty workload requirement preclude the establishment of such a deadline.

Scheduled distance education courses that have not successfully completed the institutional review prior to this deadline shall be cancelled, or, in the case of a course being delivered by both distance and non-distance delivery methods, those sections associated with distance delivery shall be cancelled. In order to allow Regental universities necessary flexibility to respond to requests that may arise with short notice, the VPAA may approve an exception to this requirement as long as the institutional review is completed prior to beginning of the term in which the course will be offered.

V. Relationship to Faculty Evaluation

The institutional review of course readiness for distance delivery is a quality assurance requirement established by the EUC. It is considered to be a formative part of the curriculum review process and, therefore, results of the review shall not be used as part of the faculty member's evaluation for determining advancements in salary and/or rank and tenure. *(Dr. Shekleton should review)*

VI. Review Components

A. Training

In accordance with EUC Guidelines, all faculty members who deliver courses through the EUC are required to participate in distance delivery training relevant to the delivery method they will use to provide instruction. All faculty members developing distance education courses should also be provided an orientation to the EUC Guidelines and their appendices. This document should serve as a guide for faculty as they develop their distance education courses and syllabi. Additional materials on principles and guidelines for internet- and video-based courses can also be accessed through the EUC website. Faculty are strongly encouraged to collaborate with faculty and/or staff with instructional design and technology expertise.

B. Self-Assessment

Approximately two months before the beginning of the term the course has been scheduled to be offered, the faculty member delivering the course should conduct a self-assessment and complete the Distance Education Course Readiness Review instrument. The faculty member then forwards the completed instrument to their department chair/Dean or designee

In addition to the completed self-assessment, the instructor shall also provide (paper copies or electronically) the following materials:

1. Summary of training and experience in using the distance delivery method by which the course will be delivered;
2. Description of factors that influenced the approach taken in designing the course;
3. Course syllabus;
4. Sample course materials (as available)

C. Chair/Dean Approval

Once all of the necessary materials have been received, the chair/Dean will determine whether the course should be forwarded for institutional review. If so, the chair/Dean then forwards the materials to an institutional review team appointed by the VPAA.

D. Institutional Peer Review

An institutional peer review team, either ad hoc or standing, shall be responsible for determining the extent to which the materials supplied by the faculty member documents achievement of criteria set forth in the Distance Education Course Readiness Review instrument. The peer review team shall include at least one faculty member with prior experience in delivering courses using the same delivery method as the course under review, and one faculty/staff member with instructional design and technology expertise. If deemed necessary, the peer review team shall meet with the faculty member who will be delivering the course.

Upon conclusion of their review, the institutional peer review team shall completed provide the faculty member with formative feedback. The peer review team shall provide a written summary of the results of their review to the VPAA and make one of the following recommendations:

1. The course should be approved for distance delivery.
2. The course should only be approved for distance delivery if recommended changes are made.
3. The course should not be approved for distance delivery.

If the review team recommends to the VPAA that the course should only be approved if recommended changes are made, the review team must also supply the VPAA with a summary of which changes should be considered essential.

E. Final Determination and Reporting

The VPAA, or designee, is responsible for making the final determination of whether a course has met the requirements associated with the institutional review and for reporting the final results of that review to the Senior Administrator for the Board of Regents. If the peer review team recommends changes, the VPAA, or designee, shall make the final determination of which changes are essential. Further, the VPAA , or designee, is responsible for ensuring that any essential changes are addressed either before or during the delivery of the course, as appropriate.

VII. Distance Education Course Readiness Review Instrument (attached)

Distance Education Course Readiness Review Instrument

Directions: this instrument should be used when reviewing the readiness of distance education courses as set forth in the Guidelines for Institutional Review of Course Readiness for Distance Delivery. In addition to being used by an institutional peer review team, it may also be used by the course instructor as a self-assessment device.

Course: _____ Course Title: _____

Instructor: _____ University: _____

Primary Delivery Method: _____ Term to be offered: _____

Reviewed by: _____ Date reviewed: _____

Evaluation Criteria	Criteria Met? (0=No, 1=partially, 2=yes)		
<p>1. <i>The instructor has received technology training appropriate for the delivery method(s) that will be used to deliver this course.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p>	0	1	2
<p>2. <i>The instructor is familiar with the EUC Guidelines and the Best Practices for Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p>	0	1	2
<p>3. <i>A complete course syllabus, in the format as prescribed in the EUC Guidelines, has been provided for the readiness review and is available for review by prospective students.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p>	0	1	2
<p>4. <i>The syllabus includes a clear description of the course in a manner that should be understandable to students.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p>	0	1	2
<p>5. <i>The syllabus clearly defines instructor expectations in regard to student performance and participation.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p>	0	1	2
<p>6. <i>The means and expectations for instructor-student and student-student interactions are clearly defined in the syllabus.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p>	0	1	2
<p>7. <i>Student learning objectives/outcomes are stated appropriately within the syllabus.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p>	0	1	2
<p>8. <i>Clear descriptions of course assignments and course assessments, with relative importance of and weights, and the course grading scheme are provided within the syllabus.</i></p> <p>Comments:</p>	0	1	2

Evaluation Criteria	Criteria Met? (0=No,1=partially,2=yes)		
9. <i>There is a clear link between the student learning objectives/outcomes and the course assignments and assessments.</i> Comments:	0	1	2
10. <i>The methods in which students will receive feedback on their assignments are clearly stated, particularly the posting of grades.</i> Comments:	0	1	2
11. <i>The syllabus includes an appropriate ADA statement.</i> Comments:	0	1	2
12. <i>The syllabus provides relevant academic policy information (drop/add, withdrawal, incompletes, academic honesty, etc).</i> Comments:	0	1	2
13. <i>The syllabus provides appropriate information on how to contact the instructor and other contact persons (technical support, etc) related to course delivery.</i> Comments:	0	1	2
14. <i>Course material (text books, lab supplies, etc) and technology requirements (hardware, software, etc), including prerequisite technology skills, are clearly described.</i> Comments:	0	1	2
15. <i>A complete course schedule (dates, activities, assignments, deadlines, etc) is provided.</i> Comments:	0	1	2
16. <i>The syllabus provides clear information on how to obtain library and other services necessary for course completion.</i> Comments:	0	1	2
17. <i>An explanation of how course delivery technology will be used along with a description of the back-up plan in case of technical problems is clearly described within the syllabus.</i> Comments:	0	1	2
18. <i>The overall design of the course is appropriate given the stated student learning objectives/outcomes and delivery method(s) to be used.</i> Comments:	0	1	2
19. <i>The instructor has taken appropriate steps to insure that the course and course materials will be ADA compliant.</i> Comments:	0	1	2

Recommend: ___ Approval ___ Approval with changes ___ Approval be withheld
Recommended changes (if any):

Reviewers' signatures Date