

# **SELF-STUDY GUIDELINES FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

Sam Houston State University  
The Office of Graduate Studies

Updated June 2017

# Overview

## **Preface**

This manual outlines the procedure for graduate program performance review as mandated by Title 19, Part 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Rule 5.25 of the Texas Administrative Code. Such a self-study is but one tool to guide programs in their continuous improvement efforts in meeting the challenge of serving the needs of students, the university, and external stakeholders. The self-studies produced through use of this manual will provide an overview of the programs with detailed information about curricula, graduate faculty, program resources, assessment, student success, recruitment and marketing.

## **The Self-Study Process**

The self-study process incorporates three-stages: (1) the creation of the self-study, (2) an external review, and (3) the development and initiation of an action plan for improvement. The faculty and the support staff will conduct a thorough program review and produce a report with support documentation. Master's programs in the same six-digit classification of instructional programs code as doctoral programs must undergo review simultaneously with their related doctoral programs. A team of external reviewers will read the report, visit the campus, and provide an evaluation of the program to include program strengths and recommendations for improvement. University leaders will develop an action plan in response to the results of the self-study and external review. The process should be as transparent and inclusive as possible. At the conclusion of the review, the Office of Graduate Studies will submit the self-study, the external reviewers' report, and the response to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board no later than 90 days after the reviewers have submitted their findings to the institution.

## **The Program Committee**

The department under review shall create a committee for purposes of compiling and writing the self-study. The chair of the self-study committee should be the director of the graduate program within the respective department. Based on recommendations by the departmental chair, the academic dean will select the remaining members of the committee. The committee should be fully or primarily comprised of core faculty and may contain at least one outside member from one of the University's other graduate programs. In consultation with the department chair, the academic dean will determine the ultimate size of the committee. No committee should have less than three members.

## **The Outside Reviewers**

A team of outside reviewers (minimum of one for MA/MS and minimum of two for PhD/EdD) will (1) review the self-study, (2) perform an onsite review of the program, and (3) provide a written report containing a response to the self-study, a summary of observations during the onsite visit and recommendations (strengths and concerns). Both reviewers for doctoral programs must come from outside the state of Texas. At least one reviewer for masters programs must come from outside Texas. Appendix A contains guidelines and directions for the reviewers.

In consultation with the academic dean, the chair of the self-study committee will submit to the Office of Graduate Studies a list of at least eight names of faculty who are active in a graduate program of the same discipline. Potential reviewers should be part of a program nationally recognized for excellence in the discipline. The academic dean must approve the list of potential outside reviewers prior to submission to the Office of Graduate Studies. The chair of the committee will then receive a final list of reviewers. The chair of the self-study committee will arrange the itinerary as suggested in the sample in Appendix B. Programs reviewed as part of an accreditation/reaffirmation review may follow the accrediting agency's guidelines for selecting reviewers. External reviewers must affirm that they have no conflict of interest related to the program under review.

### **CHECK LIST FOR REVIEWER SELECTION PROCESS**

1. Program director coordinator selects not more than eight (8) prospective reviewers, ranked in order of preference.
2. Doctoral programs must utilize a minimum of two (2) reviewers. Masters programs may utilize one.
3. The academic dean approves the list and forwards it to OGS. The graduate dean approves and/or makes recommendations to complete the final list.
4. OGS supplies a range of possible visit dates.
5. The department contacts the preferred review team to arrange travel dates for a visit. It is possible that either the academic dean or the graduate dean will have to supply a proxy in the event of unavoidable scheduling conflicts.
6. OGS will transfer money for reviewer travel and stipends to the affected departments. Those departments will handle the details of necessary paperwork. OGS staff will gladly consult and offer assistance with applicable university procedures.
7. Departmental staff and OGS staff will coordinate to make sure all visit dates/events are on the calendars of the academic dean and the graduate dean.

## **Program Review Calendar Timeline**

Target dates to adjust to nearest university business day

**Summer 20XX** - Colleges/Departments receive initial alert to upcoming review process. Participants are encouraged to start preliminary planning and research. This period is ideal for compilation of program history, current student polling, faculty vitae/resumes, faculty interviews, and relevant university documents such as policies and catalogue information.

**August 1, 20XX** – Colleges/Departments receive formal notice, the Office of Graduate Studies schedules meetings with the presiding academic dean and/or the college review team

**Month of August, 20XX** – Departments receive data; program review committee seated

**October 1-15, 20XX** – Reviewer list and on-site visit dates due to Office of Graduate Studies

**November 1, 20XX**—Draft of program review self-study due to presiding academic dean

**November 1, 20XX – December 15, 20XX** – Period available to consult with the Office of Graduate Studies about any aspects of the on-site visit

**December 1, 20XX** – Self-study report final draft and confirmation of finalized on-site visit agenda due to Office of Graduate Studies

**January 1-15, 20XX+1** – Departments send reports and agendas out to external reviewers and provide confirmation to OGS

**February 1, 20XX+1 – April 30, 20XX+1** – Period available for on-site visit for all programs

**Upon Receipt**—Copy of reviewer reports furnished to presiding academic dean

Once reviewers return the written report, the department will prepare a response. The department and college will meet with the Office of Graduate Studies to finalize the response and identify program needs.

**July 1, 20XX+1** – All final reports due to the Office of Graduate Studies

**July 15, 20XX+1** – Graduate Studies uploads reports to THECB, in any case to be completed within 90 days of receipt of reviewer reports.

**May-June 20XX+2** - 1-year check to see progress of implementation of recommendations

## **Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty/Administrators**

### **Chair of Self-Study Committee**

- Make recommendations to the departmental chair and academic dean concerning committee membership.
- Assign responsibilities to self-study committee members and coordinate the creation of the self-study document.
- In conjunction with the self-study committee, identify program-specific issues to address in the self-study.
- In conjunction with the self-study committee, department chair and academic dean, provide the Office of Graduate Studies a list of candidates to serve as external reviewers.
- Where applicable, make arrangements with SHSU Online for quality review of on-line course offerings
- Provide the final version of the self-study, to the academic dean, and to the Office of Graduate Studies. Ensure delivery of reports to visiting reviewers.
- Create the itinerary for the onsite review and arrange time for key personnel to meet with the onsite reviewers.
- Coordinate the arrangements associated with the onsite review (e.g., lodging, travel, transportation, etc.).
- Schedule meeting rooms and meals connected with the onsite visit. **All programs undergoing review should consult to avoid simultaneous scheduling of events.**
- Coordinate the creation of the Action Plan. Present to the provost, academic dean, graduate dean, and department chair.

### **Department Chair**

- Be available to meet with the self-study committee during the creation of the self-study.
- Review draft versions of the self-study and make recommendations for amendment prior to submission to the academic dean.
- Be available to meet with the external reviewers during the onsite visit.
- Attend the exit summary oral report.
- Assist in the creation of the Action Plan prepared in response to the self-study and reviewers' written report.

### **Academic Dean**

- Provide feedback and make final decisions concerning members of the self-study committee.
- Recommend outside reviewers.
- Meet periodically (or appoint a deputy to meet) with the self-study committee during the creation of the self-study.
- Review draft versions of the self-study and make recommendations for amendment prior to submission of the final version to the Office of Graduate Studies.

- Approve final version of the self-study.
- Meet with the external reviewers during the onsite visit.
- Attend the exit summary oral report.
- Provide feedback to the chair and the self-study committee on the Action Plan prepared in response to the self-study and reviewers' written report.
- Schedule and monitor the implementation of the Action Plan.

### **Graduate Dean**

- Identify and notify programs slated for review.
- Consult on final list of on-site reviewers from the list provided by the chair of the self-study committee.
- Be available to meet with the external reviewers during the onsite visit.
- Attend the exit summary oral report.
- Provide funding for
  - the external reviewers, to include travel and, when appropriate, an honorarium,
  - production and distribution of the self-study,
- Be available to consult with self-study committee in creating the Action Plan.
- Submit final report to the Coordinating Board.
- With the academic dean, conduct a visit with reviewed programs after one year to monitor progress in implementing the Action Plan.

# Outline of the Self-Study

This study will cover data from the six previous academic years.

Sources of data/information will likely include but are not limited to: university data supplied by Institutional Effectiveness; the graduate catalogue; departmental records; college records; the program and department websites; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; faculty interviews; student interviews and polling; and accreditation standards where applicable.

All self-studies will adhere to the following outline:

- I. Program Profile** (for this section, members will review the university strategic planning statement, annual program assessment reporting, Institutional Effectiveness data, and graduate faculty interviews)
  - A. Mission of program
    1. Briefly describe the unit's mission, vision, goals and objectives.
    2. How does this align with the university's Strategic Plan?
    3. What unique role does your unit play or special contributions does it make to the university, state, and/or region?
  - B. History of program
  - C. Program demographics (e.g., number of students/class, number of degrees conferred annually, number of core faculty, etc.)
  - D. Faculty/Student ratio for each of the academic semesters under review
  - E. Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes
    1. How does the program align with the program goals and the university goals?
    2. In the next several years, what factors will affect the demand for what you do?
    3. How can you position the unit to respond to changes in demand?
  - F. All doctoral programs must include the 18 Characteristics Report (See Appendix C)

**II. Program Administration** (For this section, committee authors will need to discuss and clarify the differences between procedures/processes and university policies)

- A. Administrative processes including admission processes, etc.
  - 1. Evaluate the effectiveness of the procedures noting strengths to retain.
  - 2. Describe any planned changes.
- B. Administrative policies
  - 1. What are the academic and administrative policies affecting your unit?
  - 2. What, if any, university infrastructural barriers impede your operations?
  - 3. What specific policy changes would the department propose to remedy/overcome those barriers?
- C. Mentoring and Academic Advising
  - 1. Who designates and assigns advisors?
  - 2. Who monitors the student academic progress?

**III. Curriculum** (For this section, members will consult the most recently published University Graduate Catalogue, SHSU Online where applicable, the public records of comparable programs/institutions, and the published standards of appropriate accrediting bodies. Please see Appendix F for the online class evaluation rubric.)

- A. Description of curriculum (e.g. program length, degree plan, specializations, etc.)
  - 1. Describe major curriculum changes in the last several years.
  - 2. Discuss proposed changes to the curriculum. What evidence indicates the need for changes?
- B. Appropriateness of curriculum
  - 1. Degree plan/s
  - 2. Content by course description. List all courses with their university catalogue descriptions.
  - 3. Compare Items B1 and B2 to any applicable accreditation standards.
  - 4. Compare Items B1 and B2 with similar programs of at least three (3) peer or near-peer aspirational institutions. At least one of these must be outside of Texas.
- C. Description of comprehensive exams and dissertation/thesis processes
- D. Cite and give brief descriptions of any/all accreditations
- E. Quality of Instruction
  - 1. Create a table IDEA scores for courses offered during the period under review
  - 2. Other evidence of quality of instruction
- F. Quality of Online Course Offerings
  - 1. SHSU Online will supply a summary of the findings based upon the rubric in Appendix F.



**IV. Faculty** (For this section, members will review vitae/resumes and conduct interviews of all graduate faculty in the program/department. A short vita/resume for each faculty member should appear in Appendix D, “Faculty Resumes”)

A. Credentials

1. Appropriateness of faculty degrees
  - a. Core program faculty
  - b. Faculty supporting program through teaching or service
2. A tabular summary of peer-reviewed publications for the period under review
  - a. book/book length (editorial participation included)
  - b. articles
  - c. abstracts/scientific notices
3. External grants submissions noting those funded/not funded
4. Academic conference presentations
5. Artistic endeavors
6. Awards/recognitions
7. Service to the profession at the state, regional, or national level
8. Professional experience

B. Teaching load

1. Provide a table showing the usual teaching load for each member. Cite/explain any notable deviations having occurred in the period under review.

C. Diversity

D. Faculty program responsibilities (e.g., dissertation/thesis committees; comprehensive exam administration, etc.)

1. What is the dissertation/thesis supervision count per faculty member during the period under review?

- V. Students** (For this section, members will review: university admissions policies, published program guidelines/the program website, Institutional Effectiveness data, and conduct a poll of students currently active in the program. The polling document should appear in Appendix E, “Current Student Poll”. Please see Appendix E for suggested polling items.)
- A. Admission Criteria
  - B. Number of applicants for each year under review
    - 1. Demographics (to include ethnicity and gender)
  - C. Profile of admitted students
    - 1. Demographics
    - 2. Full-time/part-time
  - D. Student funding
    - 1. Percentage of full-time students with financial support
    - 2. Average support per full-time student
    - 3. Number of assistantships and description of duties/responsibilities
  - E. Program Performance Statistics
    - 1. Graduation rate for each of the academic years under review
    - 2. Average time to completion for each graduating cohort
    - 3. Student retention rates
    - 4. Graduate licensure rates (if applicable)
    - 5. Employment profile upon graduation (i.e. employment or further education/training)
    - 6. Student publication and awards (quantitative performance)
    - 7. Student participation in funded grants

**VI. Resources and Finances** (for this section, members will review departmental and program budgets and interviews with the department chair and academic dean)

- A. Travel funds annually available
  - 1. For faculty
  - 2. For students
- B. Assistantships
- C. Scholarships
- D. Overall Program Budget
- E. Clerical/administrative support
- F. External funding other than awarded grants

**VII. Facilities and Equipment**

- A. Facilities
- B. Technology and Technology Costs
  - 1. Does this program require technology/tech support over and above the normal operations of the university? No discussion of basic faculty computing support is necessary here
  - 2. Other Special Equipment Needs

**VIII. Assessment Efforts** (For this section, members will consult the annual department and program assessment reporting for the years under review; various applicable data as described)

- A. Annual program assessment reporting results
  - 1. Student Learning Outcomes
  - 2. Dissertation/thesis quality reviews
- B. Alumni surveys
- C. Employer surveys
- D. Clinical supervisor surveys, if appropriate
- E. Student publications/grants/presentations (qualitative assessment)
- F. Program Recognition/awards
- G. Internships, if appropriate
- H. Other

**IX. Recruitment and Marketing Efforts** (For this section, members will consult among other sources with Enrollment Management, SHSU Online, University Marketing and Communications, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, publications of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, University Advancement)

- A. Demand for graduates, including specific market trends and indicators for the program
- B. Geographical location from which students come
- C. Marketing and recruitment efforts and their effectiveness
- D. Current markets
- E. Potential new markets
- F. Enrollment plan for the next 5 years
- G. Alumni and donor relations

**X. Outreach**

- A. Service learning or community engaged learning
- B. Internships
- C. Professional outreach (providing professional services, such as consulting, etc.)

**XI. Program specific issues**

- A. Please list any issues such as licensure, specific accreditation requirements, or other issues uniquely relevant to the program under review.

**XII. Summary** (cited responses for this section should result from a general meeting of the relevant graduate faculty after having read a preliminary draft of the report—this section can become the core of the final response document)

- A. Strengths and Good Practices to Retain
- B. Items/areas of Concern
  - 1. For each listed item, identify the proposed solution/s

## **Appendices**

## **Appendix A: Reviewer Guidelines**

Reviewers not governed by external bodies should:

- A. Review the self-study prior to onsite visit.
- B. Conduct the onsite visit – one of the external reviewers will serve as chair of the team. The Graduate Dean will ask one external reviewer to serve as chair.
  - 1. The onsite visit must include inspection of the department/program website and sample course pages for online offerings, where appropriate.
- C. Conduct an exit interview as the last component of the onsite visit.
- D. Write an evaluation of the graduate program to include program strengths and recommendations for improvement. The evaluation should address each chapter of the self-study but need not be in identical format. Reviewers will submit the evaluation electronically to the Office of Graduate Studies ([graduate@shsu.edu](mailto:graduate@shsu.edu)) no later than four weeks after the completion of the onsite visit.

## **Appendix B: Sample Onsite Visit Itinerary**

Understanding that each visit may be unique, the following may serve as a template for the onsite visit. The chair of the self-study committee will create the itinerary for the onsite review to include coordinating with individuals involved with the onsite visit. Additionally, the chair will coordinate the arrangements associated with the onsite review (e.g., lodging, travel, transportation, etc.).

### **Day 1**

- Arrive at SHSU. Check into hotel.
- Dinner with the chair of the self-study committee (optional)

### **Day 2**

- 7:30 – 8:30 Breakfast with chair of self-study committee
- 8:30 – 9:15 Meet with self-study committee
- 9:15 – 10:15 Meet with faculty members
- 10:15 - 10:30 Break
- 10:30 – 11:00 Meet with department chair
- 11:00- 11:30 Meet with academic dean
- 11:45 – 1:00 Lunch with self-study committee
- 1:15 – 2:30 Time in document room/additional individual interviews
- 2:30 – 3:00 Tour of campus and facilities
- 3:00 – 3:30 Meet with provost and graduate dean
- 3:30 – 3:45 Break
- 3:45 – 5:00 Meet with students
- 5:00 – 5:30 Wrap-up with chair of self-study
- 6:00 – 7:00 Dinner, review team members only
- 7:00 - Time to work on report and prepare for exit interview

### **Day 3**

- 7:30 – 8:30 Breakfast, review team only.
- 8:30 – 11:00 Time to prepare for exit interview
- 11:00 – 12:00 Conduct exit interview (academic dean, graduate dean, department chair, chair of the self-study committee)
- Lunch, if travel schedule permits
- External reviewers depart

## Appendix C: 18 Characteristics of Texas Public Doctoral Programs

### Characteristics of Texas Public Doctoral Programs<sup>1</sup>

Measure	Operational Definition	Reporting Source
Number of Degrees Per Year	Rolling three-year average of the number of degrees awarded per academic year	Coordinating Board
Graduation Rates	Rolling three-year average of the percent of first-year doctoral students <sup>2</sup> who graduated within ten years	Coordinating Board
Average Time to Degree	Rolling three-year average of the registered time to degree <sup>3</sup> of first-year doctoral students within a ten year period	Coordinating Board
Employment Profile (in field within one year of graduation)	Percentage of the last three years of graduates employed in academia, post-doctorates, industry/professional, government, and those still seeking employment (in Texas and outside Texas)	Institution
Admissions Criteria	Description of admission factors	Institution
Percentage Full-time Students (FTS) with Financial Support	In the prior year, the percentage of FTS ( $\geq 18$ SCH) with support/the number of FTS	Institution
Average Financial Support Provided	For those receiving financial support, the average financial support provided per full-time graduate student (including tuition rebate) for the prior year, including research assistantships, teaching assistantships, fellowships, tuition, benefits, etc. that is “out-of-pocket”	Institution
Student-Core Faculty <sup>4</sup> Ratio	Rolling three-year average of full-time student equivalent (FTSE) /rolling three-	Institution

<sup>1</sup> Programs included only if in existence 3 or more years. Program defined at the 8-digit CIP code level.

<sup>2</sup> First-year doctoral students: Students coded as doctoral students by the institution have completed either a master’s program or at least 30 SCH towards a graduate degree.

<sup>3</sup> Registered time to degree: The number of semesters enrolled starting when a student first appears as a doctoral student until she completes a degree, excluding any time taken off during graduate study. Obtain the number of years by dividing the number of semesters by three.



Measure	Operational Definition	Reporting Source
	year average of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core faculty	
Core Faculty Publications	Rolling three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, notices of discoveries filed/patents issued, and books per year per core faculty member.	Institution
Core Faculty External Grants	Rolling three-year average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, average external grant \$ per faculty, and total external grant \$ per program per academic year <sup>5</sup>	Institution
Percentage Full-Time Students	Rolling three-year average of the FTS ( $\geq 9$ SCH)/number students enrolled (headcount) for last three fall semesters	Coordinating Board
Number of Core Faculty	Number of core faculty in the prior year	Institution
Faculty Teaching Load	Total number of semester credit hours in organized teaching courses taught per academic year by core faculty divided by the number of core faculty in the prior year	Institution
Faculty Diversity	Core faculty by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender, updated when changed	Institution
Student Diversity	Enrollment headcount by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender in program in the prior year	Coordinating Board
Date of Last External Review	Date of last formal external review, updated when changed	Institution
External Program Accreditation	Name of body and date of last program accreditation review, if applicable, updated when changed	Institution
Student Publications/Presentations	Rolling three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year per student	Institution

NOTE: Institutions may wish to add a “comments” field to explain any anomalies.

---

<sup>4</sup> Core Faculty: Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who teach 50 percent or more in the doctoral program or other individuals integral to the doctoral program who can direct dissertation research.

<sup>5</sup> All external funds received from any source including research grants, training grants, gifts from foundations, etc.

## **Appendix D: Faculty Vitae/Resumes**

Please include short resumes of all participating faculty.

## **Appendix E: Current Student Poll**

Suggested Items for the Current Student Poll:

1. Overall satisfaction with the program.
2. Likert scale ranking of specific program components such as instruction, class availability, administrative support, degree planning, advising, and financial support availability.
3. Likert scale rankings of specific SHSU components like admissions, enrollment, financial aid, and the registrar.

These dozen items should be included but are not exhaustive of the possibilities. Programs will likely have specific questions for which they would like student responses.

Programs should ensure student anonymity in the survey process.

A sample of the survey instrument should appear in this appendix along with summary of results.

**Appendix F: Online Class Evaluation Rubric (Double click image to open)**





# SHSU ONLINE

## Rubric for Online Course Design


2017

The SHSU Online Course Design Rubric is used to guide and inform the course development process, as well as evaluate the design of any course, which contains online components. It can be used whether the course is fully or partially online, flipped or web-assisted face-to-face.

The Rubric was developed on nationally recognized, research-based quality assurance standards related to the essential components of online course design. These include...

- General course information
- Presentation of course content
- Collaboration & Communication
- Assessment Strategies
- Course Technology
- Learner Support, and
- Accessibility

The SHSU Online Rubric for Course Design has also been vetted by faculty who are actively involved in online teaching for SHSU.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

COURSE INFORMATION .....	3
COURSE PRESENTATION.....	5
COLLABORATION AND COMMUNICATION .....	7
ASSIGNMENTS AND ASSESSMENTS .....	8
NAVIGATION.....	9
CREDITS .....	14

---

# Course Information Page 1 of 2

Course information addresses the basic overview and organization of the course. It includes such elements as the structure and organization of the course, its learning objectives, description and whether or not the courses identifies and addresses the needs of its audience.

COURSE INFORMATION	INCOMPLETE (0-1)	SATISFACTORY (2-3)	EXEMPLARY (4-5)	FEEDBACK
<p>Course Organization</p> <p>Score: (X2)</p> <p>Score X2:</p>	<p>The course design is confusing and not based on the syllabus or course schedule.</p> <p>Left menu navigation links are unclear or not present for course items.</p>	<p>The course design is derived and flows from the course syllabus and schedule.</p> <p>Terms and names used throughout the course are mostly consistent.</p> <p>Some left menu navigation links are present.</p>	<p>The course design is derived and clearly flows from the course syllabus and schedule.</p> <p>Terms and names are consistent throughout the course and its documents.</p> <p>Includes left menu navigation links to syllabus, welcome page, notifications, units, and other frequently used course tools and information.</p>	
<p>Objectives</p> <p>Score: (X2)</p> <p>Score X2:</p>	<p>Learning objectives are:</p> <p>a. not written as measurable learning outcomes from the students' perspective;</p> <p>b. do not include course level and unit level outcomes; and</p> <p>c. not located within the course.</p>	<p>Learning objectives are:</p> <p>a. mostly written as measurable outcomes from the students' perspective;</p> <p>b. include some course level and unit level outcomes; and</p> <p>c. difficult to locate within the course, for example, listed only in the syllabus.</p>	<p>Learning objectives:</p> <p>a. are written as measurable learning outcomes from the students' perspective;</p> <p>b. include course level and unit level outcomes; and</p> <p>c. are located in the course introduction and unit introductions.</p>	

COURSE INFORMATION	INCOMPLETE (0-1)	SATISFACTORY (2-3)	EXEMPLARY (4-5)	FEEDBACK
Description  Score:	No description of the course is present.	A description of the course from the catalog is provided.	Instructor develops a more expansive description of the course than provided in the course catalog.	



In terms of this rubric, course presentation speaks to the quality and appropriateness of any multimedia content in the course, including instructions and opportunities for students to test out the tools before they are used. It also addresses the visual consistency, including its adherence to established ADA protocols.

COURSE PRESENTATION	INCOMPLETE (0-1)	SATISFACTORY (2-3)	EXEMPLARY (4-5)	FEEDBACK
<b>Multimedia Content</b>  <b>Score: (X2)</b> <b>Score X2:</b>	<p>Multimedia content is not relevant to the course or is not loaded into a media server (i.e. Kaltura).</p> <p>Multimedia content is not mobile friendly and not stored in the most ideal format for online delivery.</p> <p>Multimedia content is not properly sourced and cited.</p> <p>Repetitive use of multimedia from sources not qualifying for fair use.</p> <p>No instructions or incomplete instructions are provided for third party tools used in course.</p>	<p>Multimedia content (visual or streaming) is used appropriately. Consideration is given to file sizes.</p> <p>Most multimedia content is mobile friendly and stored in the most ideal format for online delivery.</p> <p>Multimedia content is properly sourced and cited.</p> <p>Instructions are provided for third party tools used in course.</p>	<p>Multimedia content (visual or streaming) is used appropriately.</p> <p>Multimedia content is mobile friendly and stored in the most ideal format for online delivery.</p> <p>Multimedia content is optimized (size, quality ratio), properly sourced and cited, and relevant to the course content.</p> <p>For complete adherence to SHSU policies regarding use of multimedia and other copyrighted materials, review <a href="#">SHSU Copyright and Fair Use Guide</a>.</p> <p>Instructions are provided for third party tools used in course.</p> <p>Opportunities for practice and exploration of tools are available before their use in the course.</p> <p>Instructor demonstrates tools for students.</p>	

COURSE PRESENTATION	INCOMPLETE (0-1)	SATISFACTORY (2-3)	EXEMPLARY (4-5)	FEEDBACK
Visual Consistency  Score: (X2) Score X2:	<p><b>ADA compliance</b> - images do not contain alternate text, documents posted as scanned images.</p> <p><b>Font usage</b> - fonts used randomly, multiple font types in display areas.</p> <p><b>Color usage</b> - color used as only method of emphasis, no shade considerations for colorblind users, clashing colors used within a visual area.</p> <p>Use of typesetting conventions are not evident, such as double spacing after a period.</p>	<p><b>ADA compliance</b> - all images must have an alternate text display, documents posted in text format, other barriers to access are identified and addressed.</p> <p>Modern typesetting conventions are employed, such as using a single space after a period.</p>	<p>Complete adherence to ADA rules</p> <p>For complete adherence to ADA rules, please refer to the following pages as guides:</p> <p>ADA compliance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Federal ADA Info</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">Tech Republic ADA Info</a></li> </ul> <p>Font usage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Fonts for the Web</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">MIT list of Web Fonts</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">Font.com Tips for Fonts</a></li> </ul> <p>Color usage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Emphasizing text without color</a></li> <li>- <a href="#">Text Emphasis</a></li> </ul> <p>Modern typesetting conventions are employed, such as using a single space after a period.</p>	

Communication and collaboration can take many forms. The SHSU online rubric places emphasis on both instructor to student communication and the opportunities students have to communicate and collaborate with each other within an online environment.

COLLABORATION/ COMMUNICATION	INCOMPLETE (0-1)	SATISFACTORY (2-3)	EXEMPLARY (4-5)	FEEDBACK
<p>Instructor to Student Communication</p> <p>Score: (X2)</p> <p>Score X2:</p>	<p>Instructor provides no expectation of communication response times or grading turnaround.</p>	<p>Instructor will utilize announcements surrounding major grades and significant course events.</p> <p>Instructor provides expectations for response times to student inquiries, and allows use of both Virtual Office, email and/or equivalent for student queries.</p>	<p>Instructor will communicate with students via announcements, streaming media, discussion board responses, and/or email multiple times a week.</p> <p>Instructor provides students with expectations for grading turn around and how quickly the instructor will respond to inquiries sent by email or through the "Virtual Office".</p> <p>Instructor also provides scheduled times of availability for office hours.</p>	
<p>Student-to-Student Communication</p> <p>Score: 5</p>	<p>Students are provided no opportunities to communicate with peers.</p>	<p>Students are provided limited opportunities to interact with each other within the course.</p>	<p>Students are provided opportunities to communicate and interact with peers and are encouraged to do so using tools such as discussions, blogs, wikis, or similar technologies.</p>	

# Assignments and Assessments Page 1 of 1

Assessment focuses on instructional activities designed to measure progress towards learning outcomes, provide feedback to students and instructor, and/or enable grade assignments. This section addresses both the quality and type of student assessments within the course.

ASSIGNMENTS/ ASSESSMENTS	INCOMPLETE (0-1)	SATISFACTORY (2-3)	EXEMPLARY (4-5)	FEEDBACK
<p>Assessments Employed</p> <p>Score: (X2)</p> <p>Score X2:</p>	<p>Only *high stakes assessments employed.</p> <p>*An assessment worth 30% of the grade would count as a high stakes assessment, because the student would have to score 100% on all other assignments to achieve a low C in a course.</p>	<p>Course contains a quiz or assignment for each lesson and periodic exams or major projects with minimal additional assessment methods.</p>	<p>A variety of assessment methods are employed, including pre-tests, written assignments, student created multimedia, graded collaborative projects, and exams.</p> <p>Students are regularly expected to engage in collaborative assignments.</p>	
<p>Academic Integrity Mechanisms</p> <p>Score:</p>	<p>No plagiarism detection methods used for major writing assignments.</p> <p>Exams and quizzes are an identical question set for every student across multiple terms with no security methods employed.</p>	<p>Plagiarism detection tools such as SafeAssign or Turnitin are used, when relevant, for most major writing assignments.</p> <p>Exams and quizzes use some protection methods.</p>	<p>Plagiarism detection tools such as SafeAssign or Turnitin are used, when relevant, for major writing assignments.</p> <p>Exams and quizzes are secured with video proctoring or usage restricted browsers, when appropriate.</p> <p>Exams and quizzes are drawn from pools of a significant size and refreshed on a rotating basis.</p>	

This section of the rubric addresses the efficiency and consistency of the navigation within the course. Navigation includes the logical flow, and organization of the information as well as how intuitive, quick and simple it is to find any component of the course. Navigation between course units as well as within units is considered.

NAVIGATION	INCOMPLETE (0-1)	SATISFACTORY (2-3)	EXEMPLARY (4-5)	FEEDBACK
Unit to Unit Navigation  Score: (X2) Score X2:	<p>Course content is not chunked*.</p> <p>Content does not flow in a logical progression.</p> <p>Navigation is not intuitive.</p> <p>*"Chunking refers to the strategy of breaking down information into bite-sized pieces so the brain can more easily digest new information."</p> <p><a href="#">The eLearning Coach Chunking Guide</a></p>	<p>Course content is chunked into manageable segments (i.e., presented in distinct learning units or modules). Chunking allows for the grouping of material into modules or units of study that contain everything within the unit the learner needs to progress through to completion.</p> <p>A course outline is provided that divides the content into topical units, or weekly lessons.</p> <p>Content flows in a logical progression</p> <p>Navigation is intuitive from Unit to Unit.</p>	<p>Course content is chunked into manageable segments (i.e., presented in distinct learning units or modules). Chunking allows for the grouping of material into modules or units of study that contain everything within the unit the learner needs to progress through to completion.</p> <p>A course outline is provided that divides the content into topical units, or weekly lessons.</p> <p>Course organization deploys and designs symmetrical units throughout.</p> <p>Content flows in a logical progression / scaffolding of concepts is met.</p> <p>Navigation is intuitive from Unit to Unit.</p>	

NAVIGATION	INCOMPLETE (0-1)	SATISFACTORY (2-3)	EXEMPLARY (4-5)	FEEDBACK
<p>Intra unit Navigation</p> <p>Score: (X2)</p> <p>Score X2:</p>	<p>Units do not have any introductory materials;</p> <p>Content is not organized sequentially and does not follow a lesson plan; and</p> <p>No recap or conclusion for the units is provided</p>	<p>Units include a lesson plan / outline / introduction;</p> <p>Content is organized sequentially and follows the lesson plan; and</p> <p>A recap and conclusion of the unit is provided</p>	<p>Units include a lesson plan / outline / introduction; the introduction is a video walkthrough of the unit materials;</p> <p>Content is organized sequentially (by start date) and follows the lesson plan; and</p> <p>A recap and conclusion of the unit, including where students should go next in the course is provided</p>	

NAVIGATION	INCOMPLETE (0-1)	SATISFACTORY (2-3)	EXEMPLARY (4-5)	FEEDBACK
<p>Efficiency and efficacy of Navigation</p> <p>Score: (X2)</p> <p>Score X2:</p>	<p>Course navigation is inefficient and inconsistent.</p> <p>Excessive clicking and/or scrolling is required to access content.</p> <p>Folders do not contain content.</p>	<p>Course navigation is efficient and consistent.</p> <p>The amount of clicks and scrolling to access content is minimal.</p>	<p>Course navigation is efficient and consistent.</p> <p>The amount of clicks and scrolling to access content is minimal.</p> <p>A flat navigation is employed when there are fewer than 8 items on a page.</p> <p>A tiered navigation is employed when there are more than 8 items on a page.</p> <p>Commonly used tools have their own links from the course navigation menu as appropriate.</p>	

## Rubric References

---

- Arvan, L. (2004, February 17). *Dialogic learning objects: Inviting the student into the instructional process*. Retrieved from <https://campustechnology.com/articles/2004/02/dialogic-learning-objects-inviting-the-student-into-the-instructional-process.aspx>
- Blackboard, Inc. (2015). *Blackboard exemplary course program rubric*. Retrieved from [http://www.blackboard.com/resources/catalyst-awards/bbexemplarycourserubric\\_rebrand\\_july2015.pdf](http://www.blackboard.com/resources/catalyst-awards/bbexemplarycourserubric_rebrand_july2015.pdf)
- California State University, Chico (2009). *Rubric for online instruction*. Retrieved from <http://www.csuchico.edu/eoi/documents/rubricpdf>
- Christe, B. (2003) *Designing online courses to discourage dishonesty*. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, 26 (4), 54-58. Retrieved from <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/eqm0348.pdf>
- Dell, C. A., Dell, T. F., & Blackwell, T. L. (2015). *Applying universal design for learning in online courses: Pedagogical and practical considerations*. *Journal of Educators Online*, 12(2), 166-192.
- International Association for K-12 Online, L. (2011). *National standards for quality online courses: Version 2*. International Association for K-12 Online Learning.
- Institutional Eligibility under the Higher Education Act of 1965, 34 C.F.R. § 600.2 (2014). Retrieved from <http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?rgn=div8&node=34:3.1.3.1.1.1.23.2>
- Kearns, L. R., Frey, B. A., & McMorland, G. (2013). *Designing online courses for screen reader users*. *Journal Of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 17(3), 73-85.
- MarylandOnline, Inc. (2011). *Quality Matters rubric standards 2011 – 2013 edition with assigned point values*.
- Pittman, C. N., & Heiselt, A. K. (2014). *Increasing accessibility: Using universal design principles to address disability impairments in the online learning environment*. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 17(3).
- Rao, K., Edelen-Smith, P., & Wailehua, C. (2015). *Universal design for online courses: applying principles to pedagogy*. *Open Learning*, 30(1), 35-52. doi:10.1080/02680513.2014.991300
- Rose, R., & International Association for K-12 Online, L. (2014). *Access and equity for all learners in blended and online education*. International Association for K-12 Online Learning.



## Rubric References, cont.

Terry Anderson, C. E. (2003). *Getting the mix right again: An updated and theoretical rationale for interaction*. International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, Vol 4, Iss 2 (2003), (2).

Stavredes, T. (2011). *Effective online teaching: foundations and strategies for student success*. San Francisco, CA : Jossey-Bass, c2011.

## CREDITS

---

### Rubric Development Team

JAY WILSON

[jwilson@shsu.edu](mailto:jwilson@shsu.edu)

RAY SCHEEL

[ray.scheel@shsu.edu](mailto:ray.scheel@shsu.edu)

THOMAS SOSEBEE

[tsosebee@shsu.edu](mailto:tsosebee@shsu.edu)

---

### SHSU Online Leadership Team

---

Ruth Chisum  
Executive Director  
SHSU Online Operations  
[ruthcubas@shsu.edu](mailto:ruthcubas@shsu.edu)

Jacob Spradlin  
Associate Director, Instructional Technology  
Support Services  
[ucs\\_jws@shsu.edu](mailto:ucs_jws@shsu.edu)

Kendall Tew  
Director of Special Projects  
[kct006@shsu.edu](mailto:kct006@shsu.edu)

Ray Scheel  
Assistant Director for Course Development  
[ray.scheel@shsu.edu](mailto:ray.scheel@shsu.edu)

Thomas Sosebee  
Assistant Director for Course Development  
[tsosebee@shsu.edu](mailto:tsosebee@shsu.edu)

Marisa Padilla  
Assistant Director for Course Development  
[marisa@shsu.edu](mailto:marisa@shsu.edu)

Ricki Lee Hodges  
Blackboard Administrator  
[rickilee@shsu.edu](mailto:rickilee@shsu.edu)

Daniel Walker  
Support Desk Manager  
[dww008@shsu.edu](mailto:dww008@shsu.edu)

Eric Odom  
Lead Web and Graphic Designer  
[eodom@shsu.edu](mailto:eodom@shsu.edu)