

**SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Committee on Academic and Student Affairs**

**AGENDA ITEM: I – D**

**DATE: June 10-11, 2015**

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUBJECT: Quality Assurance Rubric Review**

At the [February 2015](#) meeting, AAC approved moving forward with a statewide Quality Assurance (QA) Review process of courses eligible for the dual-credit program. Attached to the original agenda were a series of QA rubrics currently used by each of the institutions. While the institutions have largely adhered to the original rubric developed for the system, there are quite a number of variances. Also, the system rubric has not been reviewed since 2010. For these reasons, a necessary first step in conducting the statewide QA review process will be to standardize the system rubric. A subcommittee, which will also review changes incorporated by institutions into their rubrics, has been asked to facilitate this process and then develop a revised system QA rubric that will be used in the statewide QA review process.

Eric Mosterd, Regents Fellow for e-Education Initiatives, has been assigned to lead the subcommittee and a request went out to AAC members on May 4 seeking institutional representatives with the following background:

- **an instructor:** preferably one that regularly teaches online, and who has been through the institution’s QA review process a number of times
- **an instructional designer (ID):** preferably one who facilitates the institution’s QA reviews; ideally, this would be the person in charge of the institution’s QA process, or the one most familiar with it

This review process will take place during the 2015SU term, and will be ready for implementation in 2015FA. For the sake of consistency, institutions will also be encouraged to adopt this revised rubric for their institutional review processes. Once the rubric has been developed and approved, the review will occur. A proposal for course selection and the review process is outlined in Attachment I consisting of the following:

- The ID representatives from the subcommittee will serve as statewide QA reviewers, due to their familiarity with the system QA rubric.

(Continued)

\*\*\*\*\*

**RECOMMENDED ACTION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Information only.

## QA Rubric Review

June 10-11, 2015

Page 2 of 2

- They will be divided into three review teams—roughly organized by geography—with a larger institution paired with a smaller institution.
- Each team will review four courses—two from each institution—pulled from the six highest-enrolled, dual-credit-eligible, online courses.
- The ID from the institution offering the course will serve as a consultant during the review of the instruction's course, providing information to the reviewers about the institution's support services, requirements, etc. This is similar to the process developed by QualityMatters, off of which the system process is based.

Once the courses have been reviewed, a summary of the process will be shared.

# Statewide QA Review Process Proposal

## Introduction

At their February 2015 meeting, AAC approved moving forward with a statewide QA review of online courses that qualify for dual credit, with the goal of assuring that the online course experience of these high school students is a positive one. Below is a proposal of how these would be facilitated, as well as who will facilitate them.

## Scope

These statewide reviews would focus on the six courses with highest dual-credit enrollment. These will vary by semester, but as an example, for 2015SP, they were:

Course	BHSU	DSU	NSU	SDSMT	SDSU	USD	Total
<b>Fundamentals of Speech</b>	8	25	30	0	87	139	289
<b>General Psychology</b>	39		6	6	60	116	227
<b>College Algebra</b>	35	35	18	3	30	53	174
<b>Composition I</b>	28	9	18	4	24	61	144
<b>Introduction to Sociology</b>	19	0	28	0	37	35	119
<b>American Government</b>	28	6	1	0	0	46	81

## Statewide QA Review Subcommittee

The Statewide QA Review Subcommittee will be made up of one reviewer from each SDBOR institution, for a total of six reviewers. Ideally, these reviewers would be either responsible for the QA review process, or the primary conductor of QA reviews at their institutions.

## Review Process

The subcommittee would be further broken down into three review teams, with one of the larger institutions paired with one of the smaller institutions. These would be divided roughly by geography:

Team One	Team Two	Team Three
Black Hills State University	Northern State University	Dakota State University
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	South Dakota State University	University of South Dakota

The teams would be responsible for reviewing one course from each of the other institutions—with each team reviewing four courses—for a grand total of twelve (12) courses:

Team	Courses to Review			
<b>BHSU/SDSMT</b>	DSU	NSU	SDSU	USD
<b>NSU/SDSU</b>	BHSU	DSU	SDSMT	USD
<b>DSU/USD</b>	BHSU	NSU	SDSMT	SDSU

Six courses will be selected for review based on their dual-credit enrollment after the census date for the fall and spring terms. The institution with the highest enrollment would have its course reviewed, followed by the course with the next highest enrollment, etc. Once a course has been selected twice for a review, or an institution has two courses identified for review, it would then be removed from the selection process. Should an institution not teach a course remaining on the list, then they can be swapped as makes sense. In this way, the courses with the highest impact on dual credit students would always be reviewed.

For example, 2015SP dual-credit enrollments broke down as follows:

Course	BHSU	DSU	NSU	SDSMT	SDSU	USD	Total
<b>Fundamentals of Speech</b>	8	25	30	0	87	139	289
<b>General Psychology</b>	39		6	6	60	116	227
<b>College Algebra</b>	35	35	18	3	30	53	174
<b>Composition I</b>	28	9	18	4	24	61	144
<b>Introduction to Sociology</b>	19	0	28	0	37	35	119
<b>American Government</b>	28	6	1	0	0	46	81

Using the process outlined above, the following courses would be identified for review from each institution:

1. **Fundamentals of Speech (USD) [enrollment: 139]**
2. **General Psychology (USD) [enrollment: 116]**  
NOTE: USD is now removed from future selection as two of its courses have been selected already
3. **Fundamentals of Speech (SDSU) [enrollment: 87]**  
NOTE: Fundamentals of Speech is now removed from future selection as it has been twice selected for review
4. **General Psychology (SDSU) [enrollment: 60]**  
NOTE: USD's Composition I course would technically be fourth, but it already has two courses assigned for review
5. **College Algebra (DSU) [enrollment: 35]**  
NOTE: BHSU has the same enrollment, but offers Sociology, so the tie in enrollment went to DSU, which does not offer Sociology

6. **American Government (BHSU) [enrollment: 28]**  
NOTE: This is tied with Composition I; however, that has been assigned to NSU (see below)
7. **Introduction to Sociology (NSU) [enrollment: 28]**
8. **Introduction to Sociology (BHSU) [enrollment: 19]**
9. **Composition I (NSU) [enrollment: 18]**
10. **American Government (DSU) [enrollment: 6]**
11. **Composition I (SDSMT) [enrollment 4]**
12. **College Algebra (SDSMT) [enrollment 3]**

Once assigned, institutions would be encouraged to review their courses in preparation for the statewide review. This would be optional, especially in cases where the course had been recently reviewed by the institution. Regardless, the last review of the course—either the last scheduled review or the one done in preparation for the statewide review—should be sent to the review team to assist with the statewide review process.

While the two-member teams—outlined above—would perform the reviews, the reviewer from the course’s home institution would act as a consultant to guide the reviewers about the institutions practices, support services, etc.

Reviewers should focus on the design standards from the QA rubric, and defer more content-related standards (e.g. II.2, III.1, IV.1, V.1) to the institutional review. They should also utilize the institutional QA review for guidance. Should any other questions or concerns arise, the review team should consult with the institution’s reviewer prior to any final documentation of issues.

## **Quality Assurance Rubric**

The statewide review process will utilize the SDBOR-approved QA rubric:

<http://sdbor.edu/services/academics/AAC/documents/System-WideQualityAssuranceRubric.pdf>

The subcommittee will periodically review the rubric to make sure it is updated to the changing needs of the SDBOR. Any suggestions for revisions will be presented to AAC for approval.