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Introduction
Former Provost, Larry Gould

How to Succeed in 21st Century Distance Education Learning:
Quality Assurance, Differentiation and Innovation

“The online revolution offers intriguing opportunities for broadening access to education. But so far, the evidence shows that poorly designed courses can seriously shortchange the most vulnerable students.”


The Historical Context

When I wrote the first introduction to the university’s distance education course development resource manual in the Fall of 2007, Fort Hays State University (FHSU) had just surpassed its all-time summer session student credit hour (SCH) record enrollment. This achievement followed a long-term trend of record-setting regular semester enrollments with Virtual College (VC) course delivery headcount (HCT) surpassing on-campus enrollment in 2007 for the first time in the institution’s history. FHSU annual VC growth averaged approximately 12% during the period 2008-2012. This excellent local growth trajectory coincided with an Eduventures (2006) report that predicted online course enrollments nationwide would grow by approximately 20 percent each year during the same time period. The Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C) issued a statement that same year announcing that almost two-thirds of all colleges and universities that delivered face-to-face (F2F) instruction were now offering distance education courses. Stated succinctly, this was an era of high growth, minimal competition, loose regulation and seemingly endless optimism about the future of online education.

The FHSU version of this era of promise and prosperity in off-campus learning was built on its own history and experience in professional development education dating back to 1977 and the operations in the newly established Office of Continuing Education. The 25 year history of this office served as the predecessor for the launch of a new phase where technology was destined to play a crucial role in the design and delivery of new learning experiences.

In the early to mid-1990s, FHSU witnessed its First Wave in off-campus course development. During that period, the university encouraged faculty to develop and offer increasingly more off-campus courses to satisfy the growing demand for distance-driven learning experiences. First Wave course development generally ignored the need to deliver academic programs that were entirely available off-campus. In a sense, it was the opening of a new frontier in learning that generally was unregulated and advanced at FHSU with internal direction built on the 1977-1990 Office of Continuing Education experience.
The Second Wave of FHSU off-campus course development in the mid-nineties found its origins in emerging and expanding information technologies and the increasing call by students for courses that would lead to off-campus completion of full academic programs. Again, the FHSU emphasis during this phase continued to emphasize the quantity of courses that could be developed but with the added aim of producing comprehensive off-campus programs for degree completion. Still, too often, faculty and academic support staff assigned to help facilitate course development minimized the special context of off-campus, or soon to be called virtual learning environments. There was a tendency to rely heavily on the pedagogy, the management tools, and the technology of the traditional on-campus teaching environment and text-based learning. There was little if any recognition that simply moving a course from the on- to the off-campus environment might not produce comparable high quality learning experiences. Still, FHSU did find itself with many new courses and increasing numbers of fully accessible online programs as it moved through the early years of the new millennium. Second Wave text-based coursework in many cases, however, was not the result of a careful and systematic mix of educational quality work processes incorporating information technology skills, foundational concepts about how particular technologies and approaches were more appropriate for a course than others, and intellectual thinking about how to manipulate the media to produce the best outcome in a virtual learning environment (Moore, 2007). Rather, as noted earlier, the coursework was often a product of developing and re-purposing on-campus courses for the distance learning environment without consideration that the virtual learning environment might call for new participatory approaches, tools and technologies.

The Third Wave in developing FHSU distance learning experiences began around the same time Eduventures issued its report predicting unbridled growth for years to come. In 2006, the online education world was still a wide-open market where demand for courses outstripped the supply of available learners. Price and quality were important, but not absolutely essential as ways of differentiating the FHSU learning experience. Online marketing and the increasing supply of courses and programs provided by for-profit providers, however, was beginning to change the marketplace for learning. Just being online with courses and full programs was no longer enough. Affordability and quality of off-campus courses and programs were beginning to make a difference for both retention goals and branding an institution’s distance education offerings. Too many providers chasing the same learners had begun to change the name of the game. Let’s be clear. Quality has always been important, but during the first two waves of course development, an institution could introduce new courses without a well-defined quality assurance requirement because of an abundance of learners. In 2007, FHSU was making its first attempt with a new course development approach at positioning itself
for the new competition—and a growing world of higher education institutions that were contending to lead the distance learning world on the basis of their brand.

The Current Context

In 2013, the higher education online landscape has changed in several substantive ways. In a report published last year, Eduventures (2012) declared that the current context is marked by four dynamics:

1. A general decline in higher education enrollment;
2. A level of “maturity” in online higher education that makes it too large to avoid broader trends that are causing the decline;
3. A threat from disruptive innovation like massive online open courses (MOOCs) that are posing a serious challenge to the access and affordability of “traditional” online higher education; and
4. A world in which “supply risks overwhelming demand.” Institutions of all types, but especially more conventional non-profits, have begun to enter the marketplace to use distance education as a strategic asset for achieving all sorts of outcomes including revenue enhancement. New or revitalized strategies like hybrid pedagogies, competency-based education, and higher quality learning experiences have become imperative for remaining competitive and moving into an age where “brand reputation” is the essential element in distance education.

What does all of this mean? It means that FHSU will have to ramp up its quality course initiative and better differentiate itself from other providers of distance education. You could call the impact of these changes as shepherding in the profile of a Fourth Wave of course development. We’re not there yet, but we can begin to see the faint features of a new landscape. This is likely to become an era in which growth remains an important consideration, but expansion will depend as much, if not more, on the quality of the courses being produced and the compelling nature of the learning experience. Learners simply have more choices than ever before to seek the best courses and programs. As the Eduventures’ report makes clear, “online education is no longer the latest, greatest, fastest growing game in town….online enrollments are not predestined to grow forever. As hundreds of schools rush into the online market to compensate for a sagging traditional-age student market, there is a risk of online supply overwhelming demand….but there is] the opportunity for a few online pioneers and ambitious newcomers to show the benefits of scale and consolidation in terms of higher education
fundamentals—quality, outcomes and value for money” (2012, pg. 23). A more compelling student experience will be the inflection point for someone choosing among a limited number of brand suppliers. The implementation of quality course development processes will be the driver of success. Americans continue to value college but question its quality (Sander, 2013). When it comes to online education, the academic integrity of coursework is even more in question. Employers and the public in general have joined in this consensus. To continue its successful virtual learning initiative, FHSU must do everything it can to reduce this skepticism and embrace a "culture of learning" that does not differentiate between traditional and virtual learning environments. Learning is learning--no matter the venue. Student surveys regarding quality coursework continue to emphasize this critical differentiator along with other factors like interface design, course layout, flexible learning software, engagement strategies and communities of interaction.

In course development, quality assurance refers to a process for the systematic monitoring and evaluation of the various aspects of designing a new learning experience in accord with defined standards of production. This can be a real challenge for faculty used to designing courses on their own without external standards of review. The newly, revitalized FHSU course development process that is the focus of this introduction was created precisely to meet this challenge. Peter Drucker, the founder of modern management theory once said, “Most companies have good people. The companies that win over the long-term have the best processes” (as cited in Ghiselli, 2013, pg. 3).

Equally important, these processes are focused. At FHSU, quality assurance is about design, not delivery or faculty performance. If the design is effective, successful learning is more likely to follow. As Diana Oblinger, the Educause CEO, has suggested, “Design, rather than disruption, will help us ensure technology lives up to its promise” (2013, pg. 4-6). Again, this is why implementation and adherence to the new FHSU course development process is so critical in terms of positioning the university for a future driven by the core competency of quality.

The Future Context: Course Development and Innovations in Learning

David Ward, the former chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, argues that a shifting resource base in higher education requires that we develop “sustainable and strategic paths to educational innovation” that will allow us to reform, restructure, and re-imagine what we do in a way that will not only maintain excellence but go beyond the current standards to new and creative measures of quality (2013). The concept of “sustainable and strategic pathways for innovation” is crucial. There needs to be in place structures and processes that will encourage faculty collaboration, creativity and incentive to re-imagine and improve learning experiences at FHSU. As Randy Bass (2012) has said, “we need to be able to disrupt ourselves” (pg. 24).
At FHSU, the future of high quality learning depends on **two sustainable and strategic paths to educational innovation**. One is the Red Balloon Project. This project empowers faculty and staff to collaborate, share and initiate conversations about quality learning and technological trends. I’ve likened the Red Balloon web site (http://rbfhsu.org) to the proverbial “water cooler” where the inherent creativity of our faculty will be shared and nurtured to help catalyze new and better learning experiences for our students. The second sustainable and strategic path is the **new approach to course development**. This pathway is a set of documents and ancillary materials that serves to create the expectations and obligations for developing new courses, re-purposing existing courses and helping with the quality assurance of on-campus and imported courses. Along with this set of documents is a generic course site that will serve as the repository for allowing our students and others to review a course at any time. A **new electronic course syllabus** has been created to support and facilitate the work of faculty and create consistency that will help students find course information and explore possible future course selections. Finally, a **structure has been created** to allow CTELT staff and administrators to check the status and progress of any course in the development queue including those earmarked for quality review only.

Taken together, these three structures and set of processes will provide the university, faculty and staff with a comprehensive, sustainable and strategic pathway for developing exciting new learning experiences for our students whether they are in China, California or Colby. Forward thinking institutions count on quality, differentiation and innovation to showcase the future of the online learning experience. Applied with care and commitment, the FHSU course development process can produce a compelling learning experience that will drive all three branding elements in higher education’s “age of brands.”

**Key Stipulations for Policy Implementation**

1. All courses offered through the Virtual College must go through one of the three quality assurance pathways in the course development process. No courses can be developed or re-developed without the services of CTELT.

2. It is strongly encouraged that all prospective course developers read though the “frequently asked questions” listing in Appendix 6 of this set of policies and procedures.

3. A previously existing course must be three years old or 50% of the content has changed as determined by CTELT staff and the developer before a full re-purposing can be approved. Adjustments and replacement of existing content can occur at any time. CTELT staff can consult with developers on these minor changes that do not require a contract.

4. No new or re-purposed CTELT course development can be initiated until the instructions in Document 1 have been read by the developer and Documents 2, 3.
and 7 have been negotiated and signed by the appropriate parties. These documents will require approval by the department chair, dean and processed by CTELT’s Senior Director.

5. No campus or online adjuncts can develop courses without a faculty mentor. Programs are strongly encouraged to create one syllabus for all comparable sections of a course (e.g. Personal Wellness, introductory accounting, introduction to Computing Systems, College Algebra, Macroeconomics, Elements of Statistics, etc.) to ensure consistency, quality, per-requisites are met, a good foundation for the next course in line is established and adjuncts are not teaching their own content unapproved by the full-time faculty in a department.

6. A course from another institution, a pre-packaged course or a F2F campus or blended course may be evaluated though Pathway III at any time, but requires a negotiated contract with CTELT.

7. Faculty are strongly encouraged to use the new online course syllabus developed by the university. This is available for online, blended or F2F campus coursework. A bonus of $300 is paid for faculty who process their existing courses through Pathway III and adopt the new course syllabus. This is a one-time bonus with the expectation the syllabus will be used for all courses offered by that instructor.

8. A maximum of 24 weeks is allowed for course development. The first 16 weeks are conducted by CTELT and the developer. Upon completion of that time period, the chair in concert with program faculty will be required to carry out a course check for technical quality issues, assessment techniques and assurance of learning. A set of quality standards and questions have been devised for this evaluation. Departments are required to establish faculty committees to conduct this evaluation. A maximum of eight weeks are allowed for this quality assurance check. Any modifications need to be returned to the CTELT instructional designer. Once the program director/chair and the CTELT Senior Director have issued final approval, the CTELT and department quality seals are attached to the course site.

9. Payment for the course as defined in the negotiated contract is made in two payments. One payment is issued at the end of the CTELT development period (16 weeks) and the second payment is made at the end of the department quality check (8 weeks).
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**Instructions for Course Development**

**Distance Education Course Development Process, Expectations and Obligations**

*(New and Redeveloped Courses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Required Document/Action</th>
<th>Initiator Form/Meeting</th>
<th>Facilitator/Approver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I: Course Development Agreement and Understanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Course Developer meets with Department Chair to explore the possibility of developing a new course, re-developing an existing course or acquiring a quality assurance approval for a non-FHSU produced course or previously developed FHSU course that needs validation.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Course Developer</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Department Chair negotiates approval with College Dean to verify course is needed and to assure salary funds are available to pay faculty member for course delivery.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>College Dean and Graduate Dean (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Once approval is granted from the College Dean, the Course Developer submits a <em>Course Development Agreement and Understanding</em> form to Department Chair.</td>
<td>Course Development Agreement and Understanding</td>
<td>Course Developer</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Department Chair approves form and forwards to College Dean and Graduate Dean (if applicable). The College Dean or Graduate Dean forwards to CTELT Director.</td>
<td>Course Development Agreement and Understanding</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>College Dean and Graduate Dean (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CTELT Director approves Agreement and Understanding to indicate that the course proposal is now in the development queue. NOTE: Delay of approval of the Course Development Agreement and Understanding form by CTELT may be based on several factor, such as insufficient course development funds, CTELT time and personnel constraints, or insufficient information.</td>
<td>Course Development Agreement and Understanding</td>
<td>College Dean and Graduate Dean (if applicable)</td>
<td>CTELT Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase II: Preliminary Course Planning Meeting**
### Phase III: Course Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Course Developer and Instructional Designer hold initial development meeting; Course Developer signs course development contract (Work-for-Hire).</td>
<td>Work-for-Hire Contract signed, Course Developer, Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Regularly-scheduled meetings (typically once every two weeks or more frequently) will be held face-to-face for on-campus/adjunct faculty. For adjunct faculty located outside of Hays meetings will be held via a web conferencing tool.</td>
<td>n/a, Course Developer, Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>From the starting date the <strong>Course Developer has a maximum of 16 weeks to complete the process of course development.</strong> Course Developers have an obligation to meet the timeline or request exceptions five business days prior to any deadline or the contract may become null and void.</td>
<td>Initial Completion, Course Developer, Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Instructional Designer requests first half of payment to Course Developer upon initial completion (prior to CTELT Quality Assurance Review).</td>
<td>Payment Form, Instructional Designer, Administrative Specialist, CTELT Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Questions? Contact TigerTech at 785-628-3478. FACULTY ONLY email bbsupport@fhsu.edu.
# Phase IV: CTELT Quality Assurance Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructional Designer not assigned to this course development and CTELT Director conduct the CTELT Quality Assurance Review.</th>
<th>CTELT Quality Assurance Review</th>
<th>Instructional Designer, CTELT Director</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Notes and recommendations are provided to the assigned Instructional Designer after the review is completed. Changes are discussed with the Course Developer and may (depending on the significance of the improvements suggested) be negotiable.</td>
<td>Notes/Recommendations</td>
<td>Instructional Designer, Course Developer</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructional Designer notifies CTELT Director when course recommendations have been addressed. At this point, the course is assumed to be ready for Departmental Review.</td>
<td>E-mail alert</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase V: Department/Program Quality Assurance Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructional Designer sends Department Quality Assurance Review form to department chair for review and evaluation by chair and Course Developer. The department has a maximum of 8 weeks using the approved institutional quality criteria standards to complete the review.</th>
<th>Department Quality Assurance Review</th>
<th>Instructional Designer</th>
<th>Department Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Department Chair returns the Quality Assurance Review to the Instructional Designer. Negotiations may be necessary with the Instructional Designer and/or CTELT Director to rectify any problems in quality of presentation, materials or related issues.</td>
<td>Department Quality Assurance Review</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase VI: Course Added to Schedule, Syllabus in Online Repository, Final Payment
### Instructional Design Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Corresponding Resource</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Instructional Designer notifies Virtual College Faculty Services Coordinator when the Department Quality Assurance Review is completed and course is ready to be added to the VC schedule.</td>
<td>E-mail alert</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
<td>Virtual College Faculty Services Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Instructional Designer posts the generic syllabus to fhsu.edu/syllabus.</td>
<td>Generic Syllabus</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CTELT Director requests second-half payment for Course Developer.</td>
<td>Payment Form</td>
<td>Administrative Specialist</td>
<td>CTELT Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Phase I**

**Distance Education Course Development Agreement and Understanding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Developer(s):</th>
<th>____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Course No./Title:</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Semester for Initial Offering:</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway:</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I understand this process is not to be formally initiated until approvals are received from the Department Chair, College Dean and CTELT Senior Director.

I understand I must meet with the CTELT Senior Director and assigned Instructional Designer to sign the Work-for-Hire Contract **before** I can start working on any type of course development.

I understand the course cannot be scheduled for delivery (not added to the class schedule) until final endorsement of completion and quality assurance is issued by CTELT and my department/program. This applies to **all** types of course development.

I understand if the course development is not completed within 16 weeks as required for any type of course development, the Work-for-Hire Contract will become null and void. This does not include the additional 8 weeks for Department and CTELT Quality Assurance reviews. Course Developers have an obligation to meet the timeline or request exceptions **five** business days prior to any deadline. This is to expedite CTELT's workload and University scheduling.

I understand my program faculty and Department Chair have ultimate responsibility to review the quality of this course, the appropriateness of instructional materials, and its consistency with **all** other sections of the same course taught in our program.

I agree to use the official FHSU digital syllabus. A generic version of the syllabus will be created by removing current data (dates, instructor's name, etc.). This latter version will be added to the FHSU generic syllabus website for student use.

I understand that any exceptions to the Course Development process must be approved by the CTELT Senior Director, College Dean and Office of the Provost.

**Approved by:**

Department Chair  
College Dean  
CTELT Senior Director

---

**THIS IS NOT A CONTRACT**

This form does not guarantee approval for course development. Work-for-Hire Contract must be signed before starting course development.
### Phase II

**Preliminary Planning of the Course**

(To be filled out collaboratively by the Course Developer and Instructional Designer)

**NOTE:** This form is not a contract.

### SECTION I: Course Developer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course Developer</th>
<th>__________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Course Co-Developer(s)</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you planning to teach this course?  □ Yes  □ No  If no, instructor of record _______________

Will an adjunct be developing this course?  □ Yes  □ No  If yes, name of adjunct _______________

All adjuncts must have a mentor to develop or re-develop a course. Name of mentor _______________

Have you previously developed an online and/or blended course?  □ Yes  □ No

Have you taught an online course and/or blended course?  □ Yes  □ No

Intended course length:  □ 12 weeks  □ 16 weeks  □ 8 weeks  □ Other ___________

### SECTION II: Course Development

1. Type of Course Development:

   - **Pathway I:** □ New Development
   - **Pathway II:** □ Redevelopment of Existing FHSU Course
   - **Pathway III:** □ Non-FHSU Produced Course or Existing Previously Developed FHSU Course

   **New Development:** A course that has not been previously developed for online/blended delivery.

   **Redevelopment of an Existing Course:** Redevelopment of an existing course (e.g. delivery method changed, modifying current course content and/or adding new lectures). A course must be 3 years or older or 50% of the content has changed to be eligible for redevelopment.

   **Non-FHSU or Previously Developed:** Any course not developed at FHSU or a previously developed FHSU course that needs validation. The course must be submitted for quality assurance and any exceptions must be approved by the Office of the Provost.
2. Dept/Course Number: _____________
3. Credit Hours: ___________
4. Course Title: __________________________________________________________
5. Course Level: ☐ Undergraduate ☐ Graduate ☐ Other, specify _____________
6. Proposed semester for initial offering of course after development:
   ☐ Spring ☐ Summer ☐ Fall ☐ Fall Year _____
   Reminder: All courses must go through a Quality Assurance Review before scheduling
7. Will this course require the university to secure copyright or Creative Commons licensing for any resources?* ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, please note the specific resources likely to be needed.______________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________________
   *Are you familiar with the implications of Creative Commons licensing? If not, you may find information at: http://creativecommons.org/licenses
8. What program will the course support? (check all that apply)
   ☐ Certificate Program
   ☐ Degree Program
   ☐ General Education Program
   ☐ Short Course/Workshop
   ☐ Other ________________________________
9. If the development process is for a general education course, has the course been approved by the general education committee?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

**SECTION II: Course Development (cont’d)**

10. What are the approved learning objectives/outcomes for this course? (Please provide affinity diagram for program in which course is found.).
11. If the course is for redevelopment (Pathway II), how are you going to improve this course (e.g., new delivery methods, new course content, better teaching techniques, etc.)?

12. Who is most likely to take this course? (check all that apply)

- [ ] High School Seniors
- [ ] Freshmen
- [ ] Sophomores
- [ ] Juniors
- [ ] Seniors
- [ ] Graduate Students
- [ ] International Partnership Students
- [ ] On-Campus International Students
- [ ] Non-traditional Students/Adult Learners
- [ ] Other, please specify: ________________________________

13. Do you need video production from CTELT for this course?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Uncertain

14. Do you plan to use guest lecturers?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

15. Will you need DVDs for this class?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

### SECTION III: Menu of Considerations/Elements for Developing the Course Proposal

**Audio and Podcasting:**
- [ ] Audacity
- [ ] iTunes
- [ ] SoundCloud
- [ ] Spreaker
- [ ] VoiceThread
- [ ] Other, specify____________________

**Experiential Learning:** Experiential learning opportunities are concrete learning experiences to aid student in the application of knowledge in real-world settings.

- [ ] Clinicals
- [ ] Internships
- [ ] Preceptorships
- [ ] Service Learning
- [ ] Other, specify____________________

**Cultivating Communities of Interaction/**
Focus on Course Interactivity: A community of interaction is cultivated by utilizing collaboration in order to enhance student success and facilitate course management. These are examples of approaches to cultivating communities in distance and web learning experiences.

- Discussion Boards/Chat Rooms
- Frequently Asked Questions Page
- Gaming/Simulations
- Journals
- Peer-Review of Assignments/Projects
- Problem Solving/Problem-based Learning
- Service Learning/Civic Engagement Projects
- Wikis
- Other, specify____________________

Institutional Strategic Themes and Goals:

- Civic Engagement
- Diversity
- Entrepreneurship/Forward Thinking
- Internationalization/World Ready
- Leadership
- Service Learning
- STEM
- Technological/Digital Literacy
- Undergraduate Research
- Other, specify____________________
SECTION III: Menu of Considerations/Elements for Developing the Course Proposal

Pedagogies: Pedagogical strategies are used to engage students and address learning styles with the help of technological resources to improve student learning. Strategies can be blended to address different needs or parts of a learning experience (e.g. modules).

- Adult Learning/Andragogy
- Bloom’s Taxonomy
- Collaborative Learning
- Concierge Learning
- Connectivism
- Constructivism
- Curatorial Learning
- Flipped Classroom
- Guided Instruction
- Network Administrator
- Problem-Based Learning
- Other, specify_______________________

Approved by:

CTELT Senior Director

Presentation Tools/Technologies:

- Powerpoint
- Prezi
- Screencast-O-Matic
- SlideShare
- VoiceThread
- Other, specify_______________________

Social Media/WEB 2.0/Immersive Technologies:

- Blogging and Microblogging (e.g. WordPress, Twitter)
- Instant Messaging
- Social Bookmarking
- Social Networking/Collaborative Learning and Knowledge Creation (e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn)
- Other, specify_______________________

Video Streaming/Video/Image Sharing:

- Flickr
- Khan Academy
- Skype
- TeacherTube
- TED Talks
- YouTube
- Other, specify_______________________
Phase III

The Course Proposal: Where Planning Meets Spontaneity
(The Proposal will be developed as a collaborative effort between CTELT and the Course Developer)

Date: ______________________

Course title and number: ________________________________
Course developer: _______________________________________
Target date for CTELT course completion: __________________
Target date for FULL course completion: ____________________
Intended semester to offer: ________________________________
Lead FHSU Instructional Designer: __________________________

Introduction

The following are major design/delivery/content considerations that can serve as checkpoints in the course development process. Each checkpoint is identified with a Roman numeral. You will use your previously completed “Preliminary Planning of the Course” form in discussion with a CTELT instructional designer, and any other CTELT staff required, to develop this “Final Proposal”. The complete proposal will require additional planning items to be attached to this document as the development of the course is discussed between the developer and the CTELT Team. Finally, keep in mind that FHSU encourages “real-time” planning. The plan is a tool to provide compass-like direction. It is not a precise road map. During the execution or quality assurance phases in the process, you may have a spontaneous idea or brainstorm that will improve your course/learning experience as you design and develop it. Feel free to work with the instructional design team to incorporate innovations and differentiators into the final product.

Keep in mind the Red Balloon Project/Next Generation faculty initiative encourages the adoption of hybrid/blended learning approaches and open educational resources. CTELT has a variety of web links and resources to help better acquaint you with blended learning/hybrid approaches. See the section Menu of Considerations/Elements for Developing the Course Proposal at the end of the “Preliminary Planning of the Course” form (Document 3).
In 1987, the AAHE Bulletin first published “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education,” followed by a book, “Applying the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" by Chickering and Gamson (1991). Recently, an updated set of evidence-based principles have emerged (Ambrose, et. al., 2010) that, in some cases, clarify and expand upon Chickering and Gamson’s principles. The guidelines in this document have been evaluated against these principles, and include many specific strategies that align with each of them. The following seven research-based principles focus on best practices of teaching (adapted from the originals, which focus on the learner’s perspective):

1. Recognize that learners’ prior knowledge can help or hinder learning.
2. Structure course content in ways that help learners organize knowledge, which influences how they learn and helps them apply what they know.
3. Stimulate learners’ motivation to generate, direct, and sustain what they do to learn.
4. For learners to develop mastery (expertise) in a subject, they need opportunities to acquire, practice, integrate, and apply the skills they have learned.
5. Provide goal-directed practice coupled with targeted feedback to enhance the quality of student learning.
6. Recognize that learners’ current level of development interacts with the social, emotional, and intellectual climate to impact learning.

To become self-directed, instructors must help learners develop the skills to monitor and adjust their approaches to learning. Specifically, students must learn to:

- Assess the demands of the task
- Evaluate their own knowledge and skills
- Plan their approach
- Monitor their progress
- Adjust their strategies as needed
Course Delivery/Design/Content Checklist

I. Mode of Delivery:

A. Face-to-face, fully online, or blended/hybrid course? The latter type has reduced face-to-face classroom time balanced with online activities in varying proportions.

B. On-campus Delivery: How will your course use online tools and resources to augment classroom instruction?

C. On- or Off-campus Delivery: Will this be a special course of some type, such as directed readings, laboratory, internship, workshop, etc.?

II. Learning Goals and Outcomes

A. All course goals and unit-level learning outcomes should be observable and measurable. They are intended to answer the question, “What will the learner be able to do as a result of this course/unit?” Unit-level outcomes are more specific and incrementally move students toward accomplishing the broader course goals.

B. Aim for learning outcomes that require cognitive skills beyond memorization and comprehension; deep learning is more likely to occur when students engage in application, analysis, problem-solving, and creative endeavors, for example.

C. Outcomes should also address real-world skills such as communication, teamwork, and reasoning ability that will transfer to environments beyond the course.

D. Examine the desired learning outcomes for alignment with goals of the Academic Program, College, and Institution.

E. Identify how learning outcomes address FHSU Strategic Themes:
   - Civic Engagement
   - Diversity
   - Entrepreneurship/Forward Thinking
   - Internationalization/World Ready
   - Leadership
   - Service Learning
   - STEM
   - Technological/Digital Literacy
   - Undergraduate Research

back to Table of Contents
III. Pedagogical Approaches: Enabling Students to Achieve Learning Outcomes

Pedagogy refers to the body of instructional strategies utilized to facilitate learning, including (but not limited to) content delivery, individual student activities, interaction and collaboration with peers, feedback mechanisms, assessments, and the underlying theories supporting and guiding how these events are designed.

Learning occurs when students do something meaningful with course content, so an important part of the course design process will be to identify what students should be doing that will help them achieve the established course/unit/lesson outcomes: These tasks can be broken down as follows:

A. Identifying appropriate content resources:
   - Textbooks and Publisher-produced Content: This category may include hardcopy/print materials, e-books, slideshow files, quiz or test item pools, and/or video materials (streamed or on DVD); please consider the cost of such materials in regard to their instructional value;
   - Open Educational Resources (OER’s): Open resources are free or low-cost materials available online with licenses that facilitate their use for instructional or non-commercial purposes; these may include e-books or book chapters, articles, videos, games, or simulations; work with CTELT and/or Forsyth Library staff to identify OER’s of high quality that align with desired learning outcomes;
   - Library Materials: The Forsyth Library licenses a wide variety of online resources (texts, videos, etc.) that are easily accessed via the LMS (Bb or other) interface;
   - Commercially-produced Videos: These may be available on DVD or via streaming from a third-party vendor; work with CTELT or Forsyth Library staff to ensure these materials are accessible for students;

B. Providing guidance for the use of content (e.g., chapter/study outlines, prompts to facilitate reading for comprehension, advance organizers, etc.)

C. Developing engaging, relevant activities that lead students to achieve unit-level outcomes; this is the “What are students doing to learn?” part of the design process

D. Determining how feedback that results from instructional activities will be provided to help students monitor their progress
IV. Instructional Technologies

Online courses and those designed in blended formats may require the use of technologies to deliver content, engage learners in practicing newly-acquired skills, provide feedback, facilitate communication and collaboration, track learning engagement, and assess progress. During the course development process, technologies will be selected based on several criteria:

A. Capabilities for active student engagement, useful practice, and meaningful feedback
B. Ease of use and intuitive interface design
C. Accommodations for students requiring adaptive assistance
D. Cost to the students or to FHSU relative to software quality or amount of use
E. Security of student information, including names, grades, course enrollments, etc.
F. Technical compatibility with existing course delivery software
G. Technical support available for FHSU staff and/or student users

Technologies and how they are to be used will be described in the course plan that is presented to the course developer’s department after the successful completion of both CTELT and Departmental Quality Assurance reviews.
V. Content Structure and Course Organization

In this section, content materials and learning activities are organized into modules, lessons, or units. Each module may be designed to fit into a one-week timeframe for the sake of convenience, but it is more important that the course topics be arranged in a way that makes sense for the discipline being studied, while still balanced to not overwhelm students with too much information at once.

A. Estimate the time needed for students to achieve the overall course learning outcomes identified in Step II, taking into account any activities with complicated logistical requirements (special labs, for example), and decide on course length.

B. Divide the course into modules/units based on the incremental, unit-level learning outcomes, with each module containing the following elements:

- Introduction to the topic (including how this module fits with the others, its relevance to the overall course, and – of course – the outcomes)
- Task list of instructional activities (sequenced, if appropriate)
- Full descriptions of each activity, including special directions, an estimate of how long it should take, type of feedback that will be provided, whether the activity is to be done individually or with others, how it will be scored, and links to the online tools or resources required, for example
- Module summary statement and transition to upcoming tasks, modules, or assessments

C. Develop a course calendar/timeline identifying important benchmarks within the course such as major assignments, tests, or projects.

An outline of the modules will form the basis of the course plan to be presented to the course developer’s department after the successful completion of both CTELT and Departmental Quality Assurance reviews. The plan will describe how students will navigate the modules to arrive at the end of the course, able to achieve the established goals and outcomes.
VI. Communication and Collaboration

Online coursework requires the use of interaction and collaboration to help build what is typically referred to as the learning group. The formation of this group, and a student’s identity as a participant in the group, provide a sense of community that facilitates motivation, benchmarking, and social relevance, while strengthening necessary workplace skills like communication, problem-solving, negotiation, and teamwork.

Regularly scheduled, frequent interactions between the instructor and students are expected, along with student-to-student communication about course content and activities. When developing an online or blended course, it is important to take into account the following considerations related to communication and collaboration:

A. Instructional activities that rely on student-to-student communication must be designed to facilitate achievement of course/unit outcomes. Discussions or other interactions that are perceived as busy-work not only waste student time but ultimately inhibit motivation.

B. Discussions should be driven by prompts, questions, or challenges that require reflection and higher order thinking, while real-time communication activities (videoconferencing, for example) on the other hand, can take advantage of the immediacy of the group to encourage quick thinking about content that should be part of foundational knowledge.

C. Group collaboration and peer-to-peer activities are well-suited for problem-based learning, major projects, and/or coursework that rewards interdependence and team-building.

D. Interaction protocols (i.e., the rules for class communication) should be provided by the instructor or they can be developed collaboratively among the students in the course.

E. Expectations regarding the frequency, quality, and quantity of interactions should be made clear and explained in the course syllabus.

F. Options for asynchronous communication include (but are not limited to):
   - Discussion boards
   - e-Mail
   - Journals
   - Blogs
   - Wikis

G. Options for synchronous communication include (but are not limited to):
   - Telephone
   - Instant messaging
   - Videoconferencing
   - Audioconferencing
VII. Designing Assessments of Learning Progress

As regulatory and governmental bodies grow increasingly interested in how well universities are fulfilling their missions, the role of assessment takes on even greater importance. Providing evidence of student learning not only helps FHSU address questions regarding accreditation and funding, but directs attention to the transferability of learned skills and knowledge beyond a single course or program to the wider world. All assessment activities must be aligned to one or more course/unit outcomes to ensure validity of the resulting scores or grades.

A. Assessments fulfill several other (even more important) purposes in online, blended, or face-to-face coursework:
   - Reinforcing key concepts and skills
   - Providing feedback about progress to the learner and to the instructor
   - Signaling to the student the relative importance of specific activities
   - Identifying misconceptions and gaps in knowledge or skills that may interfere with subsequent learning
   - Motivating students to read, study, and engage in learning activities
   - Grading and other forms of required reporting

B. Formative assessments are designed to provide feedback during the learning process and can be integrated into unit modules as homework, communication activities, or low-stakes quizzes to enhance motivation and reinforce learning;

C. Summative assessments are used at the end of a course (or major unit of instruction) primarily for grading, placement, or external reporting;

D. Assessment activities require detailed, specific instructions and should include criteria upon which scoring or grading will be based;

E. Multiple types of assessments, requiring different types of skills, should be integrated into the course with opportunities to practice with the technologies to be used for assessment prior to a high-stakes event;

F. Some high-stakes assessments may require the use of a proctor, biometric authentication, or lock-down browser (or a combination of all three).

A description and explanation of formative and summative assessment activities will be included in the plan to be presented to the course developer’s department after the successful completion of both CTELT and Departmental Quality Assurance reviews.
VIII. Student Support Mechanisms

Learner support is to be built seamlessly into online, blended, and face-to-face courses whenever possible. Supporting mechanisms should include the following:

A. Comprehensive syllabus with detailed, specific information that fulfills the requirements of the FHSU digital syllabus template (or departmental equivalent)

B. Information about and links to important policies regarding academic integrity

C. Information about and links to resources and assistance with library usage, accessibility and accommodations, technology support, academic support services, student support services, and other relevant offices

D. Instructor contact information and expectations for response times to voice messages or e-mail

E. An orientation to the LMS interface, including how to find tutorials or get real-time assistance, when needed

F. An orientation to the course itself that describes the content, how to get started, and overall expectations

G. Links to any software or resources that are not already embedded in the LMS interface

H. Information relevant to the development of strong study habits, time management practices, and other self-regulating behaviors predictive of success in postsecondary education

IX. Additional Tools, Policies, and Supplemental Information

A. Regents Policies
B. FHSU Policies
C. Creative Commons Policies
### Document 5

**Phase IV:** CTELT Quality Assurance Content Review Process for New Courses/Redeveloped Courses/Non-FHSU Courses  
(Process Led by Instructional Designer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Developer(s):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Course Number/Course Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed By:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of Course Development:**

- **Pathway I:**  
  - New Development
- **Pathway II:**  
  - Redevelopment of Existing FHSU Course
- **Pathway III:**  
  - Non-FHSU Produced Course or Existing Previously Developed FHSU Course

**New Development:** A course that has not been previously developed for online/blended delivery.

**Redevelopment of an Existing Course:** Redevelopment of an existing course (e.g. delivery method changed, modifying current course content and/or adding new lectures). A course must be 3 years or older or 50% of the content has changed to be eligible for redevelopment.

**Non-FHSU or Existing Course Previously Developed:** Any course not developed at FHSU or a previously developed FHSU course that needs validation. The course must be submitted for quality assurance and any exceptions must be approved by the Office of the Provost.

Complete all items in the following section. Add comments to explain box checked “Needs Work” in the “Reviewer Comments” space provided.

### CTELT Quality Assurance Review

**I: Course Design**

**Goals and Objectives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Are easy to find and clearly written</th>
<th>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reflect measurable learning outcomes</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions? Contact TigerTech at 785-628-3478. FACULTY ONLY email bbsupport@fhsu.edu.
### Reviewer Comments:

3. Include expectations for higher order thinking (e.g., problem-solving, analysis, etc.)
   - Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □

### Reviewer Comments:

4. Are provided at the course level and for units/modules within the course
   - Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □

---

### Course Organization includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>An introduction to the course and structural overview</th>
<th>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>Skill/Knowledge prerequisites (and/or any atypical technical skills)</th>
<th>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>A schedule/timeline/calendar to facilitate student time management</th>
<th>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Content is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Presented in manageable segments</th>
<th>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>Free of typos and other types of errors</th>
<th>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>Easily navigated; progression within units/modules is intuitive or obvious</th>
<th>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Presented using a variety of media (e.g., text, visual, audio) as appropriate to the audience, learning goals, etc. | Works  | Needs Work  | N/A  \\
|Reviewer Comments: | |

5. Presented with its source information (including copyright permissions info, as needed) | Works  | Needs Work  | N/A  \\
<p>|Reviewer Comments: | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Activities:</th>
<th>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are aligned with course goals and objectives</td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Include clear guidance on how to use course content to achieve stated learning outcomes</td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide opportunities for practice and feedback</td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Require meaningful learner engagement with content and interaction among peers</td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| II: Interaction & Collaboration                                                               |
| Communication Strategies:                                                                   |
| 1. All communication activities are aligned with course goals and objectives                  | Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □  |
| Reviewer Comments:                                                                          |                             |
| 2. Asynchronous (discussions, blogs, wikis, etc.) and synchronous (chat, videoconferencing, etc.) activities are available, as appropriate | Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □  |
| Reviewer Comments:                                                                          |                             |
| 3. Asynchronous communication activities provide students with opportunities for reflection, analysis, problem-solving, and/or other higher order thinking | Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □  |
| Reviewer Comments                                                                            |                             |
| 4. Synchronous communication activities benefit from the real-time presence of instructor and/or peers allowing for interactions of a “rapid response” nature regarding content | Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □  |
### CTELT Quality Assurance Review (cont’d)

#### Development of a Learning Community:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Communication activities are used to further student learning and/or build a sense of community among learners</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Collaborative activities, if included, are designed not only to help students learn course content but to practice/improve upon their teamwork skills</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Students have an opportunity to meet their classmates informally using online communication tools</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Student-to-student interaction is encouraged and/or required</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Student-to-instructor interaction is encouraged and/or required</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Interaction Logistics:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Levels of participation required by students are explained clearly, as are communication protocols (e.g., netiquette, policies, or what constitutes a “good” versus “poor” discussion posting)</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Students are provided with a rubric or other guidelines indicating how course participation and interaction contribute to their final grade</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions? Contact TigerTech at 785-628-3478. FACULTY ONLY email bbsupport@fhsu.edu.
## CTELT Quality Assurance Review (cont’d)

### III: Assessment

**Expectations:**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Assignments and assessments are aligned with goals and objectives</td>
<td>Works ☑ Needs Work ☑ N/A ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Rubrics or descriptive criterion measures are provided to make expectations clear</td>
<td>Works ☑ Needs Work ☑ N/A ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Instructions offer sufficient detail to ensure learner understanding</td>
<td>Works ☑ Needs Work ☑ N/A ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Grading policies are explained clearly</td>
<td>Works ☑ Needs Work ☑ N/A ☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment Design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessments measure the skills and knowledge students have acquired</th>
<th>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Multiple assessment opportunities are included to provide a record/baseline of performance over time</td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Multiple types of assessments are provided</td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Students have an opportunity to practice with online tools in a low-stakes environment prior to formal assessments</td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Assessments are designed to reduce cheating/plagiarism</td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CTELT Quality Assurance Review (cont’d)

#### Self-assessment:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Multiple opportunities for self-assessment are provided</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Needs Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Self-assessments provide feedback that helps students to improve</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Needs Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IV: Learner Support

### Supportive Software (Plug-ins):

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Links to necessary software plug-ins and instructions are provided</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Needs Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Instructions for downloading, installing, and using plug-ins are provided</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Needs Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Learner Resources:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Instructions for using online tools are included</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Needs Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Information/contacts for technical support are provided</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Needs Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Reviewer Comments:**

---

[back to Table of Contents]
### CTELT Quality Assurance Review (cont’d)

#### Learner Resources (cont’d):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>Links to the following are provided</th>
<th>Works ☐</th>
<th>Needs Work ☐</th>
<th>N/A ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Student support services information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Academic support services information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Institutional/departmental policies information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Accessibility options and accommodations information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewer Comments:

#### Instructor Role and Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Instructor introduction is included, with photo(s), video, and/or audio</th>
<th>Works ☐</th>
<th>Needs Work ☐</th>
<th>N/A ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reviewer Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>Contact information is provided to reach the instructor</th>
<th>Works ☐</th>
<th>Needs Work ☐</th>
<th>N/A ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reviewer Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>The instructor’s role and expected response times are clearly explained</th>
<th>Works ☐</th>
<th>Needs Work ☐</th>
<th>N/A ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reviewer Comments:
### Technical Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Needs Work</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>File formats/software that students are expected to use are listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reviewer Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Assessments, assignments, and other activities are designed to alleviate technical difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reviewer Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Standard file formats are used to present content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reviewer Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Content can be viewed/downloaded without technical problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reviewer Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Materials or tools external to the course environment include support for their use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reviewer Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTELT Quality Assurance Review (cont’d)
### Accommodations for Disabilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Visuals are helpful and appropriate (e.g., colors, text sizes, white space)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2. Text is presented in formats compatible with screen reader software.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3. Images use alt-tags.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4. Audio and/or video elements include transcripts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluative Feedback is Requested from Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. During the course</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2. After the course</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V: Non-Blackboard (or “non-template”) Courses Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. A link is included in Blackboard to connect students to the off-campus course site</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2. FERPA-protected student information is not transmitted via non-secure means nor stored on servers not maintained by FHSU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works □ Needs Work □ N/A □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions? Contact TigerTech at 785-628-3478. FACULTY ONLY email bbsupport@fhsu.edu.
Phase V:
Department Quality Assurance Content Review Process
for New Courses/Redeveloped Courses/Non-FHSU Courses
(Process Led by Department/Program Chair and Faculty)

Jon Wergin claims in his classic study Departments that Work (2003) that “true academic quality stems from authentic engagement of faculty and students with the subject matter and with each other and of the department as a whole….” (p.11). Why is this collegial engagement with a newly repurposed course so important? First, the review is more likely to produce this “true academic quality” that Wergin finds so critical. Second, and equally important, the tendency to evaluate quality from the “outside-in” using external standards is diminished and redirected to an “inside-out” approach implemented by those who have the largest stake in the academic integrity and success of the reengineered course.

You are being required, therefore, to respond to the twelve institutionally-derived questions in this content review process to check elements of course design that are NOT the responsibility of CTELT—pedagogy, course management methods, content selection and curricular coherence. The twelve questions in this review document should be considered a minimal set of standards that align with institutional goals, themes and quality. You have the opportunity to add any additional considerations that you or your colleagues feel are important to your particular department or program. This secondary assurance of quality review could focus on course netiquette, special instructions to students, social presence of the instructor in an online environment and other variables in your own department’s listing of essential “good practices.”

The ultimate goal is to manage the institution’s brand by scheduling and delivering only the highest quality courses and programs possible. Your cooperation in this effort to ensure curricular excellence is greatly appreciated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Developer(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Course Number/Course Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Designer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date (return to Instructional Designer within eight (8) weeks):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Course Development:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway I:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway II:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway III:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Development:** A course that has not been previously developed for online/blended delivery.

**Redevelopment of an Existing Course:** Redevelopment of an existing course (e.g. delivery method changed, modifying current course content and/or adding new lectures). A course must be 3 years or older or 50% of the content changed to be eligible for redevelopment.

**Non-FHSU or Existing Course Previously Developed:** Any course not developed at FHSU or a previously developed FHSU course that needs validation. The course must be submitted for quality assurance and any exceptions must be approved by the Office of the Provost.
**Instructions for Obtaining Course Access:**

- Log in to your Blackboard home page.
- Course to be reviewed should be listed in the **My Courses** area. If you cannot find the course, please contact the Instructional Designer at 4194 for assistance.
- Click on the course title to gain instructor access to the course.

**Note:** Once you’ve submitted the review to CTELT, the course title will no longer appear in your My Courses list.

Please complete all items in the following section. Add comments to explain box checked “Needs Work” in the “Reviewer Comments” space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Quality Assurance Review Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Do course outcomes/learning objectives align with the officially approved department/program learning outcomes and objectives (e.g. state, national, professional standards where applicable)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Does the course use comparable content materials similar to other sections of the same course? In other words, was the course developed with curriculur coherence in mind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> If there are graduate and undergraduate versions of this course, are there qualitative differences between the two levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Have specific considerations related to program accreditation (or related approvals) been addressed in the development of this course? (American Psychological Association, Music, CSWE, KSE, CAEP, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Are course policies (identified in the syllabus) compatible with departmental and institutional policies—for example, those related to student misconduct, dishonesty or proctored examinations? Are hyperlinks available to access policies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Department Quality Assurance Review Criteria (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Does the technical production/presentation of the course (e.g. ADA compliance, spelling, captions, media quality, background in video materials, branding, directory information for contacting department/chair, etc.) meet department/program expectations?</th>
<th>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Are grading policies and assessment approaches consistent with department/program expectations?</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Do course tools, approaches and media enhance student interactivity; collaborative learning and help the student become a more active learner consistent with department/program expectations?</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Does the course provide information that accommodates the many forms of student/faculty contact (e.g. welcome letter, netiquette guidelines, faculty obligations for timely response, clear expectations for contact, etc.)?</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Have appropriate tools for student feedback been incorporated into the course structure?</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Does the course articulate or provide appropriate directions about technical and academic support tools (e.g. Smarthinking.com) and how to access these services?</td>
<td>Works ☐ Needs Work ☐ N/A ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Agreement is entered into this __________ day of _____________, 20 ____, by Fort Hays State University (“FHSU”) and ______________________ (“Course Developer”), __________________________ (“Co-Developer/Mentor”). For good and valuable consideration, the sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, both parties hereby agree as follows:

A. All Material created under this Agreement will collectively be called “the Product.” All Material produced under this Agreement may be used alone or as supplement to existing commercially produced material and offered as a course of study to be called the “Course”.

The Course Developer agrees that the Product is created by the Course Developer within the scope of developing a course entitled ____________________________ for ______________________ semester.

All material created pursuant to this Agreement is at the direction of FHSU. Course Developer is being compensated to create this material by and for FHSU. As such, this is to be considered a work-for-hire arrangement. Pursuant to governing law, and policy of the Kansas Board of Regents, FHSU owns all material created pursuant to this Agreement subject to the rights granted to Course Developer herein.

B. FHSU desires the flexibility to use the Product in a variety of different contexts, whether through distance learning or in face-to-face classroom education, for purposes of educating students.

C. The Course Developer desires to produce such Product to repurpose a course or supplement to a course and to make it available to students in a variety of different formats, including DVDs, CD-ROMs, iTunes U, world wide web or other media, and so that FHSU may utilize the Product in many different contexts and through many different arrangements, including but not limited to...
D. FHSU and the Course Developer agree that the material created pursuant to this Agreement will be subject to the Department and CTELT Quality Assurance reviews specified in policy of FHSU. FHSU, through the Department and CTELT, will make any recommendations for changes it feels are necessary to bring the Course up to the level of quality expected of courses offered by FHSU. FHSU will act in good faith in making this determination. Absent exceptional circumstances, the Course Developer agrees to implement the changes suggested by the Department and/or CTELT in order for the Course to be offered by FHSU. CTELT may refuse to offer the course if, in its judgment upon the exercise of good faith, FHSU determines that the course is for whatever reason not suitable to be offered to its students.

E. The Course Developer agrees that the Product is created by the Course Developer for compensation provided by FHSU, and with the substantial use of FHSU resources.

Additional Terms of this Agreement:

1. Production of Work

   1.1. Description and Purpose. The Course Developer shall produce all original or supplemental materials (the “Product”), appropriate for teaching the Course, as described in Document 4.

   1.2. Funding and Other Support. FHSU shall provide appropriate and affordable financial, equipment, and staff support to assist the Course Developer in preparation of the Product as described in Document 4.

   1.3. Deadline. The Course Developer shall deliver to FHSU the Product in a completed state, suitable for immediate classroom or distance learning use, and as outlined in Document 4.

      The Product will be completed within 16 weeks as per procedures on or before the following deadline date ________________ .

   1.4. If the Product is not completed within 16 weeks as required for any type of course development, the Work-for-Hire Contract will be declared null and void. This does not include the additional 8 weeks for Department and CTELT Quality Assurance reviews.

2. Rights of Use of the Product

   2.1. University Rights of Use. Subject to the restrictions set forth in this Agreement, FHSU shall have the right to use the Product as a course or as supplement to a course in perpetuity and to transform the Product to another medium. FHSU’s rights include the right to, or to authorize others to, reproduce, market, distribute, perform and transmit the Product and to prepare derivative works based on the Product in furtherance of FHSU’s allowed uses. FHSU shall have the right to determine when and under what conditions the Product is used in courses offered to its students, including the right to determine who will deliver such courses.
2.1.1 **Scheduled Courses.** The Product, or parts thereof, shall be used in connection with scheduled courses (whether credit or non-credit) with enrolled students or in connection with independent study by enrolled students.

2.2. **Publication and Sales of Fixed Media.** FHSU shall have the right to publish, sell, or authorize others to sell or make other distributions of the Product for instructional purposes.

2.3. **Archival Collection.** FHSU may retain copies of the Product for archival purposes. FHSU may also make archival copies of the Product available to any persons who have access to Forsyth Library or other facility at FHSU where such copies will be retained. FHSU has no obligations to restrict access to such archival materials.

2.3.1. **Use for Faculty training.** FHSU has the right to use the Product in an archival collection as a resource for FHSU faculty to use in other course preparation and in faculty development.

2.4. **Course Developer's Rights of Use.** Throughout the term of this Agreement, FHSU grants the Course Developer the right to use the substantive content of the Product, without further consent or approval from FHSU, in any scholarly or creative works that do not compete with FHSU’s actual or planned use of the Product, subject to laws of the State of Kansas, policies of the Kansas Board of Regents, and the policies of FHSU. In particular, the Course Developer will have the right to use the content with no expense to FHSU in textbooks, journal articles, conference presentations, consulting projects, and other scholarly works or professional activities. The Course Developer may also allow or arrange for the reproduction, packaging, and distribution of all or part of the Product for use in connection with a textbook or other teaching materials developed by the Course Developer for the general education market.

2.4.1. **Use Upon the Course Developer Leaving FHSU.** The Course Developer agrees that if the Course Developer leaves FHSU, the Product may be taken with the Course Developer, subject to the conditions below:

2.4.2. **Restriction on the Course Developer’s Use of the Product for Teaching Elsewhere.** The Course Developer agrees that the Course Developer will not use the Product to compete with FHSU in Kansas for a period of three (3) years following severance of employment with FHSU. The Course Developer also agrees the Product will not be used outside of Kansas without the express written approval of FHSU.

3. **Rights of Control and Credit**

3.1. **Quality, Clarity, Currency.** The Course Developer shall have full control of the substantive and intellectual content of the Product, subject to approval of the Product using FHSU's Quality Assurance Procedures.
Forward thinking. World ready.

3.1.1. **Supplemental Revisions and Updates.** The Course Developer shall produce any revised or supplemental materials or updates, as suggested by the reviewing parties in order to reflect developments or insights that come to the Course Developer’s attention following completion of the Product.

3.2. **Named Credit.** The Course Developer agrees to acknowledge the support of FHSU in developing and publishing the Product for the Course. All materials created for the Product must include the statement: “Developed for Fort Hays State University by ___________________________ ________________”

(course developer) (month/year)

3.2.1 **Appropriate use of Material in Creating Product.** The Course Developer shall not include in the content of the Product any material which the Course Developer knows to constitute libel, invasion of privacy, infringement of copyright or other literary rights, or otherwise violate the legal rights of any persons not a party to this Agreement. Any responsibility or liability for such violations shall be treated in a manner consistent with the customary treatment of similar violations as they may occur in the context of traditional teaching at FHSU. Should the University conclude that any of the content of the Product may violate such rights of third parties, the Course Developer will be required to make revisions to the Product to correct the violations for no compensation. Pending such revisions, FHSU shall have the right to remove the portions of the Product that create the potential violations before making any further use of the Product pursuant to this Agreement.
4. **Copyright Ownership**

4.1. **FHSU Ownership.** FHSU shall retain copyright ownership of the Product, subject to the rights granted to the Course Developer pursuant to this Agreement.

4.2. **Copyright Registration.** Application for Copyright may be applied for by FHSU with the Office of Patents and Copyright.

4.3. **Creative Commons.** Notwithstanding the foregoing, the parties acknowledge and agree that any open course materials utilized in or created for the Product may be licensed by FHSU through the Creative Commons.

5. **Miscellaneous Items**

5.1 **Default.** In the event that either party defaults in its material obligations under this Agreement and shall fail to remedy said default in thirty (30) days after receipt of written notice thereof, this Agreement shall terminate upon expiration of the thirty- (30) day period.

5.2 Compensation for creation of the Product will be ______________________(Pre Tax).

5.3 **Severability.** The invalidity of any provision in this Agreement shall not invalidate any other provision of this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Developer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CTELT Senior Director</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Course Developer/Mentor</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cc: Course Developer  
CTELT Senior Director  
Department Chair  
College Dean  
Instructional Designer
This Agreement is entered into this ______ day of ____________ , 20___ by
Fort Hays State University (“FHSU”) and ___________________________ , (“Course
Developer”), ___________________________ (“Co-Developer/Mentor”) is for the purpose
of setting forth the terms of the parties' agreement regarding the redesign of a course entitled
_______________________________ for ________________ semester.

For good and valuable consideration, the sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, both parties
hereby agree as follows:

1. Any Agreement the parties entered into prior to the development of the course
 _____________________________________________ (prior agreement) is incorporated into this Agreement as
if fully set forth herein. The terms of the prior agreement regarding ownership, royalties,
rights to use and other related topics shall remain in full force and effect and govern the
redesigned course.

2. In exchange for a payment of ______________(Pre Tax) by FHSU, the Course Developer
will perform the following updates, upgrades, deletions or other modifications to the course.
   • Substantial improvements to course. Possibly including but not limited to new content,
pedagogical approaches, instructional activities, etc. to improve quality and the value
of the learning experience).
   • Deliverables will be identified and priced by the CTELT Senior Director.
   • Notwithstanding the foregoing, the parties acknowledge and agree that any open course
materials utilized in or created for the Product may be licensed by FHSU through the
Creative Commons.

3. Deliverables will be identified and priced by the CTELT Senior Director.

4. FHSU and the Course Developer agree that the material created pursuant to this
Agreement will be subject to the Department and CTELT Quality Assurance reviews
specified in policy of FHSU. FHSU, through the Department and CTELT, will make any
recommendations for changes it feels are necessary to bring the Course up to the level of
quality expected of courses offered by FHSU. FHSU will act in good faith in making this
determination. Absent exceptional circumstances, the Course Developer agrees to
implement the changes suggested by the Department and/or CTELT in order for the
Course to be offered by FHSU. CTELT may refuse to offer the course if, in its judgment
5. **Deadline.** The Course Developer shall deliver to FHSU the Product in a completed state, suitable for immediate classroom or distance learning use, and as outlined in Document 3. The Product will be completed within 16 weeks as per procedures on or before the following deadline date: ________________.

If the Product is not completed within 16 weeks as required for any type of course development, the Work-for-Hire Contract will be declared null and void. This does not include the additional 8 weeks for Department and CTELT Quality Assurance reviews.

6. Should any term of this Agreement be determined to be invalid by any Court, hearing officer, or any other finder of fact or tribunal, the remaining provisions of the Agreement will continue in full force and effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Developer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CTELT Senior Director</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Course Developer/Mentor</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cc: Course Developer  
CTELT Senior Director  
Department Chair  
College Dean  
Instructional Designer
Fort Hays State University
Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning Technologies

Work-for-Hire Contract
PATHWAY III: Non-FHSU Produced or Existing Course Previously Developed

This Agreement is entered into this ______ day of ____________ , 20___, by Fort Hays State University (“FHSU”) and ______________________ (“Course Developer”), ______________________ (“Co-Developer/Mentor”) is for the purpose of submitting a course entitled ______________________ for ______________ semester developed by Course Developer, to FHSU’s Quality Assurance program. For good and valuable consideration, the sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, both parties hereby agree as follows:

1. Course Developer agrees to submit the Course to the Department and CTELT Quality Assurance reviews developed by FHSU and implemented through its Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning Technologies (CTELT). FHSU, through the Department and CTELT, will make any recommendations for changes it feels are necessary to bring the Course up to the level of quality expected of courses offered by FHSU. FHSU will act in good faith in making this determination. Absent exceptional circumstances, the Course Developer agrees to implement the changes suggested by the Department and/or CTELT in order for the Course to be offered by FHSU. CTELT may refuse to offer the course if, in its judgment upon the exercise of good faith, FHSU determines that the course is for whatever reason not suitable to be offered to its students. Any exceptions must be made by the Division of Academic Affairs, Office of the Provost.

2. Deadline. The Course Developer shall deliver to FHSU the Product in a completed state, suitable for immediate classroom or distance learning use, and as outlined in Document 4. The Product will be completed within 16 weeks as per procedures on or before the following deadline date: __________________ .

If the Product is not completed within 16 weeks as required for any type of course development, the Work-for-Hire Contract will be declared null and void. This does not include the additional 8 weeks for Department and CTELT Quality Assurance reviews.

3. FHSU will make payment to Course Developer of __________ (Pre Tax) in exchange for Course Developer entering into this Agreement.

4. Ownership of the course and of any intellectual property rights relating thereto is beyond the scope of this Agreement and nothing contained herein should be construed as in any way altering any previous agreements or any applicable provisions of law relating to ownership of or intellectual property rights relating to the Course.
5. FHSU has no rights to the Course other than those granted by this Agreement to insure the quality is adequate for use in instructing FHSU students.

6. By signing this Agreement, Course Developer hereby represents and warrants that all materials utilized in creating the Course were either the sole property of the Course Developer or Course Developer has received permission from the owner of such material prior to the use thereof.

7. Should any term of this Agreement be determined to be invalid by any Court, hearing officer, or any other finder of fact or tribunal, the remaining provisions of the Agreement will continue in full force and effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Developer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CTELT Senior Director</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Course Developer/Mentor</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cc: Course Developer
    CTELT Senior Director
    Department Chair
    College Dean
    Instructional Designer
Appendix 1

Distance Education Course Development
Request for Exception of Timeline
(Form Initiated by Instructional Developer)

Request for exceptions to the timeline must be made five business days prior to any deadline or the contract will become null and void. Any delay in completing the course development on time may delay the scheduling of the desired first offering of the course (not added to the course schedule).

Date Submitted: ____________________________________________________________
Pathway: __________________________________________________________________
Course Developer: __________________________________________________________
Department/Course Title: ____________________________________________________
Intended Semester to Offer: _________________________________________________
Instructional Designer: ______________________________________________________

The Course Developer is requesting an exception to extend the deadline for course development from _________________ to _________________.

Comments: ____________________________________________________________________________________________

Approved by:
CTELT Senior Director
Department Chair
College Dean
Provost
Appendix 2

CTELT Quality Assured Seal
Appendix 3

Department Quality Assured Seal
Generic/Online Course Syllabus (Faculty Senate Approved)

(Generic Course Syllabus: remove due dates, semester, instructor’s name, etc.)

- Log in to Tiger Central
- Under the “Teaching” tab, choose Generic Syllabus
- Click (upper right)
- Choose the Year and Semester, Status (Active or Inactive), and the Course for which you’d like to create a syllabus.
- Under Syllabus Type, select Create a Syllabus, Link to a Syllabus URL, or Attach a Syllabus

- For: Link to a Syllabus URL or Attach a Syllabus, follow the prompts to provide a URL or upload a file from your computer.
- For: Create a Generic Syllabus, proceed as follows:
  1) Enter the appropriate information in the fields for each section of the syllabus template. Sections are presented in a collapsed “accordion-style” structure; click on the section title (Course Materials, for example) and the section will expand.
  2) Required fields are marked with a red vertical bar
  3) Sections that include required fields have a red triangular symbol on the title bar.
4) Once you’ve finished entering information in the various fields, click the Update/Add button at the bottom of the page (or Cancel to leave the syllabus creation page).

5) You don’t have to complete the syllabus in one visit. Feel free to start the document, then mark it as “Inactive” before saving it with Update/Add. This will save your work but not make it viewable until you change the status to Active.

Once you’ve created a syllabus, you will see it listed on the main page of the Generic Syllabus area (under My Online Syllabi).

Here you’ll have the option to:

- Change syllabus status from Active to Inactive (and vice versa)
- View and/or Print your syllabus
- Edit your syllabus
- Cross-post your syllabus for multiple sections of the same course
- Archive your syllabus (i.e., remove it from the system)

After you’ve completed the syllabus and set the status to Active, it will be viewable in the Syllabus Search site.

Note: If any of the pre-populated information in the form (e.g., course name, credit hours, etc.) is incorrect, please contact your departmental administrative assistant to make the appropriate updates in CICS.

*If you have suggestions for improving the usability of the system or for assistance, please contact CTELT at 785-628-4194 or ctelt@fhsu.edu.*
Appendix 5

Distance Education Course Development
Frequently Asked Questions

1. How do I get started?

The Course Developer meets with the Department Chair to explore the possibility of developing a new course (Pathway I), redeveloping an existing course (Pathway II), or acquiring a quality assurance approval for a non-FHSU produced course or previously developed FHSU course that needs validation (Pathway III).

Once approval is granted from the Chair or College Dean, the Course Developer submits the form Agreement and Understanding (Phase I; Document 2) to start the process. This form is used for all three Pathways.

After you receive notification from CTELT that the Agreement and Understanding form has been approved you then submit the form for Preliminary Planning of the Course (Phase II; Document 3) **DO NOT** submit this form until the Agreement and Understanding form has been approved by CTELT.

2. How do I find and submit the required forms to request course development (Document 2 and 3)?

**Finding Forms:**
- From the Lotus Notes toolbar, Click on File, Application, and Open
- Change Server to LNapps/FHSU
- Scroll to file folder titled “apps”. Click Open
- Scroll to Course Development. Click Open
- Select the Document needed. Complete form.

**Submitting Document:**
- Once the form is completed click on “Edit Approver List” button.
- The order of the approver list can be found under each Document section in the course development manual.
- If you need to add an approver, click to highlight “Entered when submitted” line. Click OK.
- Click “Submit for Approval” button.

Contact CTELT at 785-628-4194 for any difficulties in submitting the form.

3. What course development options are available?

There are three “pathways” designated for contracted (Work-for-Hire) course development.

**Pathway I** is associated with the design and development of a course that has not been previously developed for online/blended delivery.

**Pathway II** is utilized for the re-development of an existing course (e.g. delivery method changed, modifying current course content and/or adding new lectures). To be eligible for re-development, a course must be at least 3 years old or 50% of the content has changed.

**Pathway III** is used for any course not developed at FHSU or a previously developed FHSU course that needs validation. The course must be submitted for quality assurance and any exceptions must be approved.
4. **When should a course be redeveloped?**

   After each offering, a course should be reviewed for quality and effectiveness. Generally, re-development occurs about every third year or if the course needs to be modified by more than 50%.

5. **May I offer a distance education course that I developed from another institution (Pathway III)?**

   Yes. However, all non-FHSU produced courses must go through a Department/CTELT quality assurance review before being placed in the course schedule (Pathway III). There will be a small compensation for this process.

   If a course requires major revision after the quality assurance review, the compensation for Pathway III will be replaced with the compensation for redeveloping the course. The amount of payment for redevelop depends on the work/time that is necessary to align the course with established FHSU standards.

6. **When may I begin my course development?**

   Course development cannot start until a Work-for-Hire contract has been signed.

7. **Is there a limit on how many courses I can submit for course development at one time?**

   Yes. By definition (24 weeks per course), a faculty member is limited to two courses per year.

8. **May I access a Blackboard shell to build content before the course development process begins?**

   No, a Blackboard shell will not be created until a Work-for-Hire contract is signed.

9. **Why is utilizing the master template shell pivotal in course development?**

   The master template is used as a model for best practices in developing online courses or for using Blackboard to support classroom and blended instruction. The purpose of the master template is to provide a clear starting point for your course development while simultaneously encouraging consistency.

10. **May I develop or redevelop a course without using the services of CTELT?**

    No. All distance education course development or redevelopment (Pathways I and II) is required to be coordinated with CTELT.
11. **How can the instructional designer assist with course development?**

The instructional designer is responsible for coordinating and executing an array of tasks in the design process. The instructional designer can assist you with (1) creating clear and succinct objectives that can be understood and mastered by the target learners; (2) creating learning objectives based on the target learners, the instructional or training topics, and the available resources; (3) designing activities that facilitate learning; (4) designing assessment that aligns with the learning objectives; (5) finding resources to facilitate and enhance instruction; (6) integrating technology into teaching practices; and (7) taking advantage of current research findings on instructional technology and design.

12. **Why is instructional design important?**

Some consider instructional design the “science” of instruction because it follows a set of theories and methods. Others view instructional design as an “art” because it directly relates to the creativity and talent of the designers. In colloquial terminology, instructional design is the process by which instruction is improved through the analysis of learning needs and the development of learning materials. Instructional designers often use technology and multimedia tools to enhance instruction. The goal of instructional design is to facilitate the learning process to ensure student success.

13. **What are the timelines for developing a distance education course?**

The Course Developer has a maximum of 16 weeks to complete the process. The Department and CTELT will have an additional 8 weeks for Quality Assurance reviews. The accumulative developmental time period is typically 24 weeks. Time is a critical variable in designing and developing high quality courses. Less time may be used, but the outcomes do not change: INNOVATION and QUALITY!

Course Developers have an obligation to meet the deadlines as set in Document 3 or request extensions five business days prior to any deadline.

14. **What if I miss the course development deadline?**

The Course Developer has an obligation to meet the deadline or request extensions five business days prior to any deadline or the contract will become null and void. Any delay in completing the course development on time may delay the scheduling of the desired first offering of the course.

15. **Where do I find the new syllabus template?**

You must log into Tiger Tracks and look under the “teaching” tab. The syllabus creation site is at [https://webapps.fhsu.edu/OnlineSyllabus/](https://webapps.fhsu.edu/OnlineSyllabus/).
16. **Does my course development have to go through the Quality Assurance reviews?**

All courses in the Virtual College class schedule **must** go through the Department and CTELT quality checks **before** being placed in the course schedule no matter which Pathway is used. This process has been developed by the Provost's Council and will be implemented by FHSU. CTELT personnel will determine whether the design and technology utilized in developing the course satisfies the established evaluation criteria. No course content will be mandated by the Instructional Designer, but may make recommendations to enhance the quality and use of course technology or content.

No course will be offered for distance education by FHSU unless it has been subjected to and complies with recommendations made as a result of the Quality Assurance Process. This stipulation is a part of the University’s Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) in partnership with the Higher Learning Commission (HLC).

17. **Do I have to use the new syllabus template?**

If you are completing a “work-for-hire” distance education contract, you are required to use the new online syllabus at [https://webapps.fhsu.edu/OnlineSyllabus/](https://webapps.fhsu.edu/OnlineSyllabus/). Usage is optional with Pathway III.

18. **Will I receive payment for developing or redeveloping a course?**

Compensation may be applicable if the course is developed on an overload basis and not part of base contract expectations. The amount of compensation depends on the work/time that is associated with course development requirements.

19. **When will I receive payment for completing a developed or redeveloped course?**

The Course Developer receives half of the contracted amount when the course development is completed. Final payment will be made upon completion of the Department/CTELT Quality Assurance Review.

20. **Will I get paid if I have one of my current classes go through a Department and CTELT review (Pathway III)?**

There is a small compensation for this process. After review, if the Department and CTELT determine that major revisions are needed, the compensation for Pathway III will be replaced with the compensation for
redeveloping the course. The amount of payment depends on the work/time that is necessary to bring the course up to established FHSU standards.

21. Do I have to submit a Generic Syllabus?

No, but you are strongly encouraged to submit “clean” syllabi for all courses, especially at the end of the semester when a course will not be taught again the subsequent semester. This will allow all interested parties to review a course they find in the catalog or elsewhere and better help our students to make wise choices about programs and scheduling. Your course devoid of dates, page numbers, etc. will be archived for viewing at https://webapps.fhsu.edu/OnlineSyllabus/ with the help of CTELT staff.

22. May an adjunct develop a course?

Yes. However all adjuncts must have a mentor to develop or re-develop a course. The mentor is required to attend the initial meeting and monitor the progress of the course development.

23. How can I get help with the Learning Management System (currently Blackboard)?

Blackboard assistance is available through CTELT, which is located in the second floor of Hammond Hall, by calling (785) 628-4194, or via email at bbsupport@fhsu.edu.

Adjunct faculty can meet with CTELT staff in real time using a web conferring tool.

Support materials and information can also be accessed on the Blackboard Faculty Tutorials website at https://www.fhsu.edu/ctelt/BlackboardFacultyTutorialGettingStarted/.