The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, February 9, 2018, at 2:10pm in the State Room (1957 E Street NW).

AGENDA

1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on January 12, 2017

3. RESOLUTION 18/3 (revised): To Amend Article X. A., Rights, Privileges, and Resolution of Disputes under the Faculty Code (Jeff Gutman, Chair, Committee on Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom)

4. RESOLUTION 18/4: To Amend the Faculty Code to Clarify Faculty Eligible for Reduced Service Status (Jeff Gutman, Chair, Committee on Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom)

5. REPORT: Global Women’s Institute Strategies/Directions (Mary Ellsberg, Director)

6. UPDATE: Status of Faculty Survey Process for Dean Evaluations (Chris Bracey, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs)

7. UPDATE: Provost Response to Joint Task Force of the Faculty Senate Committees on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom and Educational Policy to Investigate Online, Hybrid, and Off-Campus Degree Programs at GW (Forrest Maltzman, Provost)

8. Introduction of Resolutions

9. GENERAL BUSINESS
   a) Nominations for election of new members to Senate standing committees
      a. Appointments, Salary, & Promotion Policies: Richard Owens (staff) and Jelena Berberovic (staff)
      b. Libraries: Professor Elizabeth Crunk (GSEHD)
      c. Research: Katrin Schultheiss (CCAS) & Jamie Cohen-Cole (CCAS)
   b) Election of Faculty Senate Executive Committee Nominating Committee
   c) Reports of Standing Committees
   d) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters, Chair
   e) Provost’s Remarks
   f) Chair’s Remarks

9. Brief Statements and Questions

10. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson, Secretary
Resolution 18/3 (revised)

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND ARTICLE X. A., RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, AND RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES UNDER THIS CODE

WHEREAS: Article X.A., Rights and Privileges Under this Code, provides:
“The rights, privileges, and responsibilities of a faculty member, as conferred by this Code, shall be carefully safeguarded in accordance with the highest accepted principles, practices, and procedures of the academic community. An alleged infringement of such rights or privileges or an alleged violation of such responsibilities shall first be considered by the faculty member or members concerned, or by appropriate representatives of the faculty, in cooperation with the responsible administrative officers. If such consideration does not lead to an adjustment satisfactory to the parties involved, the procedures for the implementation of this Article shall be fully utilized.”; and

WHEREAS: The third sentence of Article X.A., Rights and Privileges Under this Code provides: If such consideration does not lead to an adjustment satisfactory to the parties involved, the procedures for the implementation of this Article shall be fully utilized.” (emphasis added); and

WHEREAS: Common use of shall is as a mandatory action, or an expression of an instruction or command; and

WHEREAS: The case of Kyriakopoulos v. George Washington Univ., 657 F. Supp. 1525 (D.D.C. 1987) decided by the federal district court for the District of Columbia adjudicated issues regarding GWU’s grievance procedure, and the Code provisions regarding the grievance procedure interpreted in that case used language identical to the language used now; and

WHEREAS: The federal district court held that use of the grievance procedure was not mandatory; and

WHEREAS: The possible confusion between common use of “shall” and the judicial determination of the meaning of “shall” might mislead grievants or cause them to misunderstand their rights at law versus their rights under the Code; and

WHEREAS: Clarity is essential to an orderly and fair process for aggrieved faculty members; and
WHEREAS: It is prudent to follow judicial guidance for internal processes in resolving disputes at GWU; and

WHEREAS: Code language should make it clear that undertaking the grievance process is voluntary, not mandatory and is initiated by the grievant;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the third sentence of Article X.A. is amended as follows:

“If such consideration does not lead to an adjustment satisfactory to the parties involved, the procedures for the implementation of this Article shall may be fully utilized by the grievant.”

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
January 12, 2018

Recommitted by the Faculty Senate to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
January 12, 2018

Revision returned to the Faculty Senate by the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
February 9, 2018
Resolution 18/4
A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO CLARIFY FACULTY ELIGIBLE FOR REDUCED SERVICE STATUS

WHEREAS: Article VII(D) of the Faculty Code provides:

“Subject to programmatic needs, full-time tenured members of the faculty with ten years of continuous full-time service who are above 60 years of age may elect to continue for a mutually agreed period on a half-time or two-thirds-time regular basis. Benefits and conditions of this reduced service will be as specified in the Faculty Handbook at the time the election is made to retire partially.”

WHEREAS: Article I(B) of the Faculty Code provides:

“Regular Faculty are full-time faculty members with the title of university professor, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor who are tenured or tenure-track, and non-tenure-track full-time faculty members who are on a renewable contract, do not hold either a regular or tenured appointment at another university, have a nine- or twelve-month appointment and who have contractual responsibilities for all of the following: research, teaching, and service. However, the proportion of regular faculty serving in non-tenure track appointments shall not exceed 25 percent in any school, nor shall any department have fewer than 50 percent of its regular faculty appointments either tenured or tenure-track. The foregoing shall not apply to the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the School of Nursing, the Milken Institute School of Public Health, and the College of Professional Studies.”

WHEREAS: Certain tenured faculty members with ten years of continuous full-time service who are older than 60 may wish to retire partially and continue to make contributions to the University;

WHEREAS: It is not clear whether regular faculty who were on a previously agreed temporary part-time status are subject to Article VII(D) and

WHEREAS: Additional clarity and flexibility are warranted to ensure that such faculty are permitted to elect to continue on reduced service and remain members of the regular faculty under Article I(B) of the Faculty Code;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
That Article VII(D) of the Faculty Code is amended by deleting the term “full-time” and “regular” (shown in bold above) and adding new text in bold so that it reads:

“Subject to programmatic needs, tenured members of the faculty with ten years of continuous full-time service who are above 60 years of age may elect to continue for a mutually agreed period on a half-time or two-thirds-time basis and shall be considered Regular Faculty for the purposes of Article I(B). Benefits and conditions of this reduced service will be as specified in the Faculty Handbook at the time the election is made to retire partially.”

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
January 23, 2018
Provost Response\(^1\) to Joint Task Force of the Faculty Senate Committees on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom and Educational Policy to Investigate Online, Hybrid, and Off-campus Degree Programs at GW

February 2, 2018

Background

In April 2017, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate established a task force to investigate the quality of online and off-campus degree programs. This stemmed from recognition that remotely offered courses were rapidly expanding; a strong conviction that all of our programs need to be of high quality; and a realization that there had not been a systematic review of the quality of all online programs, including a comparison between the same programs that were offered in both face-to-face and online modalities.

In October 2017, the chair of the task force presented a preliminary report to the Faculty Senate. The report suggested that: (a) there was no master list of online, hybrid, or off-campus degree programs; and (b) it could not be determined if online courses/programs were equivalent in quality and content to what was offered in a traditional, face-to-face settings. The report also raised a number of issues concerning whether our online programs were attracting students who might otherwise be interested in our face-to-face programs.

The report came up with a number of suggestions. Most importantly, the report made the case that in light of the fact that online courses and programs are currently overseen by the different GW schools (as are face-to-face courses), the preliminary report called for increased central administrative oversight of the burgeoning online program offerings.

Subsequently, there were a number of national news stories following the circulation of the report. Likewise, a number of students and faculty felt unfairly denigrated and expressed concern about the aspersions about the quality of the online courses, the students in them, and the faculty that taught them of courses in the report.

This memo is a response to the report and will: (a) provide an overview of GW’s online and distance offerings and the students enrolled in them; (b) discuss the quality of the programs relative to our face-to-face offerings; (c) articulate standards all online and distance education programs are expected to follow; and (d) suggest different monitoring mechanisms to employ. The bottom line is that by all indicators those teaching our online offerings are providing an excellent education and those taking

---

\(^1\) Special thanks to Cheryl Beil, PB Garrett, Geneva Henry, Terry Murphy, and the Online Committee for their input.
advantage of our online offerings are receiving an excellent education. Nevertheless, it is important that there is more transparency about the role of remote educational offerings and that both clear standards and better monitoring mechanism should be in place.

**Overview of Online and Distance Offerings and Students**

GW has extensive distance / online courses. Some formats of distance education courses tend to be offered with a 100% of the courses in synchronous format. Effectively, students participate in a class from different locations remote from the instructor and have the opportunity to ask questions throughout the class. Recent growth in synchronous distance offerings is associated with a decline in face-to-face off-campus courses (but not on-campus) offerings. Much of what is now offered as online/distance courses replaced those that previously took place on the campuses of various corporations across the country. This memo will refer to this type of class as “distance education.”

In contrast, the primary growth in online courses have both an asynchronous and synchronous component. During the synchronous component all students must be present at the same time; the class is offered on a scheduled basis. The asynchronous part can be completed on a student’s own schedule. Typically, it includes a significant number of videos that frequently (but not exclusively) include presentations by GW faculty. The asynchronous portion of the course is usually developed in conjunction with an instructional designer to make it more engaging and interactive. This memo will refer to this type of class as “online.”

Whereas the School of Engineering and Applied Science (SEAS) offers distance education [synchronous] courses for credit, the School of Nursing (SON), Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD), School of Business (GWSB), School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS), Milken Institute School of Public Health (MISPH), College of Professional Studies (CPS), and Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS) students routinely enroll in online courses for credit that offer both synchronous and asynchronous components. I anticipate additional online programs offered in the future from ESIA and Law. All courses that are offered online or distance are coded using a unique campus code in our Banner system and are coded as “online” in our schedule of classes. Academic programs where a student can earn the degree remotely can be easily identified in GW’s program finder by selecting “online” for the campus location.

Over the past few years, GW and other institutions have experienced increasing demand for courses offered remotely. In 2016-17, 9,945 students took 91,992 credits in a non-face-to-face format. Seventy-three percent of these credits were offered at the master’s level, 15% at the bachelor’s level, and 5% at the doctoral level. The vast majority of the doctoral students are receiving a professional doctoral degree, and, for all practical purposes, none are pursuing their doctorate as a path to an academic career. There
were also non-degree and certificate students. Forty-one percent of the students who took one or more courses in either a distance or online format also took one or more courses in a face-to-face format. Distance and online courses accounted for approximately, $110M of our gross tuition revenue. Undergraduate revenue was approximately 10% of this.

Fifty-nine percent of students who took an online course did not take any courses face-to-face. The vast majority of these students are in one of our online/distance programs. Currently GW offers 164 online/distance programs: 69 are undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, or post-master’s certificates, and 95 are degree-granting programs.

It is also clear that students who took a course remotely are different from face-to-face students. A significantly higher proportion of our online/distance students are from under represented populations (25% compared to 18% of our overall students; and 26% compared to 20% when limited to graduate students), and they are significantly less likely to be international (7% compared to 15%). They also tend to be eight years older than face-to-face students. Even when one limits one’s comparison to graduate students, face-to-face students are four years younger and are much more likely to have enrolled in a graduate program directly out of college.

While we do not have the data systematically across the university, the MISPH compared its online and face-to-face graduate students and discovered that the online students were much more likely to be the first in their family to pursue an advanced degree (47% versus 15%), and had similar grades in college and GRE scores compared to face-to-face students. Whereas the college GPA for MISPH online students was 3.2, it was 3.4 for the face-to-face students. Online students scored at the 65th percentile on their verbal GRE and at the 46th percentile on their quantitative GRE compared to face-to-face students who scored at the 63rd percentile on the verbal GRE and at the 47th percentile on the quantitative GRE.

There is no fact-based evidence that the academic ability of online/distance students is any different from those of face-to-face students. What is clear is that our online/distance students are a critical component of GW’s mission and our efforts to provide access to a broad group of students.

**Academic Strength of Our Online/Distance Offerings**

While assessing academic merit is never an easy task, it is increasingly clear that there is no evidence to support the claim that our online/distance offerings are inferior to our face-to-face offerings.

First, most of our online courses are developed in conjunction with instructional designers and refreshed on a regular basis. Second, student course evaluations completed between spring 2015 and spring 2017 indicate that the quality of online
instruction is either comparable or slightly higher compared to the instruction in face-to-face settings (see Appendix 1 for comparisons between online/distance and face-to-face teaching evaluations). Likewise, evaluations that make direct comparisons between face-to-face and online programs for GSEHD, GWSB, MISPH, and SEAS uniformly have very modest differences. Although the face-to-face and online/distance courses tend to be evaluated above 4.0 on a 5.0 scale, it is important to note that there are occasionally outliers; not every course, regardless of modality in which it is taught, is at the standard I would like.

Second, national rankings routinely rank our online programs at or above their face-to-face counterparts. In the 2018 *U.S. News* online rankings, GW programs were ranked as follows:

- Online Bachelor’s (SMHS): 23 out of 231 ranked schools
- Online Graduate MBA: 54 out of 204 ranked schools
- Online Graduate Business: 19 out of 119 ranked schools
- Online Master of Science in Information Systems (GWSB): 19 out of 39 ranked schools
- Online Graduate Education: 31 out of 223 ranked schools
- Online Graduate Engineering: 26 out of 68 ranked schools
- Online Graduate Nursing: 5 out of 117 ranked schools

Admittedly, *U.S. News* is not a perfect vehicle for finite comparisons. It is for this reason that the rankings are considered crude indicators of the quality of a program. Moreover, the relative weight that *U.S. News* uses for the underlying variables (graduation rate; course size; accessibility; faculty quality; etc.) are somewhat arbitrary. However, the variables that make up the ranking do provide an overall indicator of a program’s relative strength, and none of these scores suggests to me that GW online programs are inferior in some critical dimension. Indeed, what is apparent is that our remote offerings are frequently considered some of the best in the country. This is a sentiment that many members of our faculty involved in these programs have articulated to me over the past few months.

Third, scholars from other institutions have complimented these remote programs during either academic program reviews or accreditation visits. For example, following a recently completed review of the online Health Care management program, the visiting team from the Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education (CAHME) highlighted that one of the strengths of the MISPH program was the support that 2U provided.

Teaching evaluations, national rankings, and comments from outside reviewers all point in one direction—GW’s academic programs, regardless of modality, easily pass a quality threshold. There is no doubt that within the market our remote programs are viewed as holding their own. It is not surprising that these programs are growing and that much of the growth is occurring as corporations either commit to funding scholarships to
students that they will eventually want to hire (SON) or fund and encourage their employees to enhance their training by enrolling in a GW Online program (SEAS).

**Setting Standards**

At every university, there is a tension between letting individual faculty design and offer courses with their own specifications, allowing schools to impose their own criteria, or having the university impose standards. At the university level, we require that every school have their programs either go through an academic program review every five years or a professional accreditation review. These reviews provide me with an additional opportunity to assess what is happening at the programmatic level.

Having said this it is clear that every course and program has the ability to affect the reputation of the university as a whole. The Faculty Senate has expressed concern that courses and programs that are approved in a face-to-face setting do not have to go through a second approval process to be offered online, which raises questions about how can we ensure the rigor and integrity of our online offerings. Inevitably, this concern reflects the fact that asynchronous education creates additional opportunities for courses to become stale.

Building on discussions within the university committee on online education, we will be asking all online programs to meet Quality Matters standards as a minimum. Likewise, all instructional designers who work on course development should be trained and certified in the Quality Matters standards. Finally, the university will offer Quality Matters seminars and training to faculty who are interested in having a firsthand understanding of the standards and their importance, without having to rely upon their instructional designer.

Quality Matters is a non-profit national organization that is considered by many to be the gold standard for quality in online education. Indeed, many of the requirements mandated to be a member of National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (NC-SARA) follow the expectations of Quality Matters.

Quality Matters has a set of eight general standards and 43 specific review standards used to evaluate online courses. The eight general standards of this rubric pertain to: course overview and introduction, learning objectives (competencies), assessment and measurement, instructional materials, course activities and learner interaction, course technology, learner support, accessibility and usability.

---

2 GW’s membership in SARA ensures that its online programs meet the requirements for all participating states. Moreover, SARA standards are the same as those recommended by all regional accrediting agencies, including Middle States.
In addition to meeting the Quality Matters standards, the Provost office will update its recommended syllabus template and suggest that faculty teaching online synchronous or asynchronous courses include in their syllabi the items listed in Appendix 3.

While we recognize that there are additional standards that one may impose (e.g. advising ratios; material adoption; specific feedback requirements for the student), these are not unique to online. We expect schools and their units to take the lead in setting their own expectations.

**Monitoring and Enforcement**

To date, there has been no indication that our online/distance courses are less rigorous than our face-to-face courses. Nevertheless, we do not want GW to be at risk because it was unaware of what is being offered across all modalities. Therefore, we plan to take four steps.

First, we will send a reminder to all academic leaders that they are responsible for the academic integrity of all the programs that fall under them.

Second, we will clarify that academic program reviews need to include separate analyses for online/distance programs, even if the programs are the same. Appendix 4 provides a redlined and marked up version of the newly released academic program review guidelines that incorporate these changes.

Third, we propose that courses offered in a distance format should electronically-capture and retain for at least one semester the faculty lectures to assist their schools in the reviews of teaching performance and educational efficacy.

Finally, all online courses should use the electronic course feedback tool, SmartEvals, as its end-of-semester course evaluation tool. The recommended survey for online courses includes questions specific to online venues. Additional questions can be added to the form to meet the needs of the instructor and department. While we will work with the Online Committee to identify the specific questions, Appendix 5 provides the sort of questions that might be asked exclusively of online students.

**Conclusion**

Remote education has become critical to our capacity to perform our mission. And, our remote educational programs are frequently teaching students in a way that is as good as our first-rate face-to-face programs. Likewise, the students in our online program have academic qualifications comparable to face-to-face students. The evidence is clear. GW is drawing top quality students into both its remote and face-to-face programs, and equally clearly, students are reflecting high levels of satisfaction with the quality of their GW education, regardless of the delivery modality.
Nevertheless, we also recognize that remote education is significantly more complicated to offer compared to face-to-face offerings and that many of the techniques faculty learned in a face-to-face setting may not work online. Therefore, it is important that there is a set of standards utilized university wide, that mechanisms are instituted to ensure that monitoring is routinely done at the school level, and to make sure that online programs receive the same scrutiny that face-to-face programs receive in academic program reviews.

Appendices

1. Course evaluations comparisons between courses offered face-to-face and online
   - Graduate programs
   - Undergraduate programs
   - Engineering Management and Systems Engineering
   - GSEHD programs
   - GWSB programs
   - Public Health programs

2. Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric, Fifth Edition

3. Syllabus Template suggested updates

4. Academic Program Review revised guidelines (Redlined with online inclusion)

5. Course evaluation suggested additions
Appendix 1

Course evaluations comparisons between courses offered face-to-face and online

- Graduate programs
- Undergraduate programs
- Engineering Management and Systems Engineering
- GSEHD programs
- GWSB programs
- Public Health programs
### Student Feedback by Course Delivery Method
#### Spring 2015 - Spring 2017

**Instructor enthusiastic about the topic/subject**
- **Grad 6000 & 7000**
  - Not Online: Avg = 4.7 (N = 48,987)
  - Online: Avg = 4.6 (N = 42,365)
- **Grad 5000**
  - Not Online: Avg = 4.5 (N = 46,677)
  - Online: Avg = 4.6 (N = 39,170)

**Instructor designed/used fair grading procedures**
- **Grad 6000 & 7000**
  - Not Online: Avg = 4.4 (N = 50,559)
  - Online: Avg = 4.4 (N = 48,103)
- **Grad 5000**
  - Not Online: Avg = 4.8 (N = 49,070)
  - Online: Avg = 4.8 (N = 42,801)

**Overall rating of instructor**
- **Grad 6000 & 7000**
  - Not Online: Avg = 4.5 (N = 47,185)
  - Online: Avg = 4.4 (N = 38,682)
- **Grad 5000**
  - Not Online: Avg = 4.4 (N = 35,882)
  - Online: Avg = 4.4 (N = 32,496)

**Instructor knowledgeable about topic/subject**
- **Grad 6000 & 7000**
  - Not Online: Avg = 4.4 (N = 43,224)
  - Online: Avg = 3.9 (N = 31,719)
- **Grad 5000**
  - Not Online: Avg = 4.6 (N = 35,882)
  - Online: Avg = 4.2 (N = 27,029)

**Other feedback metrics**
- **Did best possible work.**
  - **Grad 6000 & 7000**
    - Not Online: Avg = 4.5 (N = 35,361)
    - Online: Avg = 4.7 (N = 27,671)
- **Course covered all stated objectives**
  - **Grad 6000 & 7000**
    - Not Online: Avg = 4.3 (N = 42,944)
    - Online: Avg = 4.7 (N = 32,496)
- **Instructor provided adequate and timely feedback.**
  - **Grad 6000 & 7000**
    - Not Online: Avg = 4.7 (N = 49,070)
    - Online: Avg = 4.8 (N = 42,801)
- **Instructor treats me with respect.**
  - **Grad 6000 & 7000**
    - Not Online: Avg = 4.4 (N = 43,224)
    - Online: Avg = 4.2 (N = 31,719)

**Course Level**
- 4000 and under
- Grad 5000
- Grad 6000 & 7000
- Grad 8000

**School/College**
- CCAS
- CPS
- ESIA
- GSEHD
- GWSPH
- No College
- SEAS
- SMHS
- SON
- Student Feedback

---

*N* is the number of enrollments, not students. A student can answer multiple times if they are enrolled in more than one class.
### Student Feedback by Course Delivery Method  
**Spring 2015 - Spring 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor enthusiastic about the topic/subject</th>
<th>Instructor designed/used fair grading procedures</th>
<th>Overall rating of instructor</th>
<th>Instructor knowledgeable about topic/subject</th>
<th>Instructor provided adequate and timely feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4000 and under</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg = 4.6</td>
<td>Avg = 4.6</td>
<td>Avg = 4.7</td>
<td>Avg = 4.5</td>
<td>Avg = 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 137,807</td>
<td>N = 10,099</td>
<td>N = 10,295</td>
<td>N = 10,718</td>
<td>N = 10,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of intellectual challenge in the course</th>
<th>How much you learned in the course.</th>
<th>Did best possible work.</th>
<th>Instructor treats me with respect.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4000 and under</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Not Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg = 3.9</td>
<td>Avg = 4.2</td>
<td>Avg = 4.4</td>
<td>Avg = 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 96,546</td>
<td>N = 10,067</td>
<td>N = 10,379</td>
<td>N = 9,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 98,708</td>
<td>N = 84,347</td>
<td>N = 100,723</td>
<td>N = 10,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 114,493</td>
<td>N = 5,935</td>
<td>N = 110,723</td>
<td>N = 9,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N** is the number of enrollments, not students. A student can answer multiple times if they are enrolled in more than one class.
### Student Feedback Results: Spring 2015-Summer 2017
**Not online vs. online courses, GWSB questions vs. standard questions**

**Instructor's grading standards are fair (1: Not all all, 5: Very fair)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Campus</th>
<th>GWSB Questions</th>
<th>Not Online</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>N = 12,170</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels to display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000s and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I learned a lot from this course (1: Not at all, 5: A great deal)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Campus</th>
<th>GWSB Questions</th>
<th>Not Online</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>N = 10,951</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels to display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000s and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor stimulates student interest (1: Not at all, 5: A great deal)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Campus</th>
<th>GWSB Questions</th>
<th>Not Online</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>N = 12,617</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels to display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000s and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall quality of instructor (1: Poor, 5: Excellent)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Campus</th>
<th>GWSB Questions</th>
<th>Not Online</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>N = 12,493</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels to display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000s and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall quality of the course (1: Poor, 5: Excellent)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Campus</th>
<th>GWSB Questions</th>
<th>Not Online</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>N = 11,031</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels to display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000s and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Designed and used fair grading procedures.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Campus</th>
<th>GWSB Questions</th>
<th>Not Online</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>N = 46,697</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels to display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000s and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rate how much you learned in the course.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Campus</th>
<th>GWSB Questions</th>
<th>Not Online</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>N = 43,245</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels to display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000s and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Was enthusiastic about the topic or subject**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Campus</th>
<th>GWSB Questions</th>
<th>Not Online</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>N = 49,098</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels to display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000s and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What is your overall rating of the instructor?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Campus</th>
<th>GWSB Questions</th>
<th>Not Online</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>N = 50,592</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels to display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000s and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The course covered all its stated objectives.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Campus</th>
<th>GWSB Questions</th>
<th>Not Online</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>N = 35,896</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels to display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000s and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000s and 7000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Campus**

- Not Online
- Online

**Select a School**

- (standard questions only)
- All

Note: Ns include multiple responses from the same students when they are enrolled in multiple classes across multiple semesters.
## EMSE Fall 2017 Student Feedback Results by Course Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>On Campus (N = 133)</th>
<th>Online (N = 303)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed and used fair grading procedures.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put a lot of effort into doing the best work possible in this class.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate your level of intellectual challenge in the</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided adequate and timely feedback on exams/papers/performance</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate how much you learned in the course.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course covered all its stated objectives.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor treats all students with respect.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was enthusiastic about the topic or subject</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was knowledgeable about the subject and course material.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your overall rating of the instructor?</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Feedback by Course Delivery Method

**Spring 2015 - Spring 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor enthusiastic about the topic/subject</th>
<th>Instructor designed/used fair grading procedures</th>
<th>Overall rating of instructor</th>
<th>Instructor knowledgeable about topic/subject</th>
<th>Instructor provided adequate and timely feedback.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grad 6000 &amp; 7000</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N= 5,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 5,388</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 5,889</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 5,585</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grad 8000</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N= 978</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 928</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 987</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 981</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of intellectual challenge in the course</th>
<th>How much you learned in the course.</th>
<th>Course covered all stated objectives</th>
<th>Did best possible work.</th>
<th>Instructor treats me with respect.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grad 6000 &amp; 7000</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N= 5,171</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 5,272</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 4,295</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 5,233</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grad 8000</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avg = 4.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N= 950</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 989</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 987</strong></td>
<td><strong>N= 974</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N** is the number of enrollments, not students. A student can answer multiple times if they are enrolled in more than one class.
PUBH Online vs. On Campus Feedback Results
Fall 2015 - Fall 2017 | Only courses offered both on campus and online are included

5-point scale questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>On Campus (N)</th>
<th>Online (N)</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was knowledgeable about the subject and course material.</td>
<td>(N = 4,816)</td>
<td>(N = 10,716)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor treats all students with respect.</td>
<td>(N = 3,836)</td>
<td>(N = 7,371)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course covered all its stated objectives.</td>
<td>(N = 3,218)</td>
<td>(N = 7,056)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was enthusiastic about the topic or subject</td>
<td>(N = 4,818)</td>
<td>(N = 10,293)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed and used fair grading procedures.</td>
<td>(N = 4,647)</td>
<td>(N = 9,129)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your overall rating of the instructor?</td>
<td>(N = 5,108)</td>
<td>(N = 11,398)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased conceptual understanding and/or critical thinking.</td>
<td>(N = 16)</td>
<td>(N = 525)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of discussion, lab, or recitation into the course structure.</td>
<td>(N = 17)</td>
<td>(N = 537)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put a lot of effort into doing the best work possible in this class.</td>
<td>(N = 4,073)</td>
<td>(N = 8,718)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided adequate and timely feedback on exams/papers/performance</td>
<td>(N = 4,635)</td>
<td>(N = 8,830)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate how much you learned in the course.</td>
<td>(N = 4,112)</td>
<td>(N = 8,788)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate your level of intellectual challenge in the course?</td>
<td>(N = 4,011)</td>
<td>(N = 8,503)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10-point scale questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>On Campus (N)</th>
<th>Online (N)</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend this section’s live synchronous sessions to fellow students. (Skip question if it does not apply)</td>
<td>(N = 1,268)</td>
<td>(N = 8,202)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend the asynchronous material for this course (course materials in 2GW/Blackboard that you used to prepare)</td>
<td>(N = 1,633)</td>
<td>(N = 8,340)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric, Fifth Edition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Overview</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Learners are introduced to the purpose and structure of the course.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Etiquette expectations (sometimes called “netiquette”) for online discussions, email, and other forms of communication are clearly stated.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Course and/or institutional policies with which the learner is expected to comply are clearly stated, or a link to current policies is provided.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Minimum technology requirements are clearly stated and instructions for use provided.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Prerequisite knowledge in the discipline and/or any required competencies are clearly stated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Minimum technical skills expected of the learner are clearly stated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 The self-introduction by the instructor is appropriate and is available online.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Learners are asked to introduce themselves to the class.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Competencies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 The course learning objectives, or course/program competencies, describe outcomes that are measurable.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The module/unit learning objectives or competencies describe outcomes that are measurable and consistent with the course-level objectives or competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 All learning objectives or competencies are stated clearly and written from the learner’s perspective.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 The relationship between learning objectives or competencies and course activities is clearly stated.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 The learning objectives or competencies are suited to the level of the course.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment and Measurement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The assessments measure the stated learning objectives or competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 The course grading policy is stated clearly.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of learners’ work and are tied to the course grading policy.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 The assessment instruments selected are sequenced, varied, and suited to the learner work being assessed.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 The course provides learners with multiple opportunities to track their learning progress.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated course and module/unit learning objectives or competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Both the purpose of instructional materials and how the materials are to be used for learning activities are clearly explained.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 All instructional materials used in the course are appropriately cited.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 The instructional materials are current.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 A variety of instructional materials is used in the course.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 The distinction between required and optional materials is clearly explained.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Activities and Learner Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 The instructor’s plan for classroom response time and feedback on assignments is clearly stated.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 The requirements for learner interaction are clearly stated.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 The tools used in the course support the learning objectives and competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Course tools promote learner engagement and active learning.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Technologies required in the course are readily obtainable.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 The course technologies are current.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Links are provided to privacy policies for all external tools required in the course.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learner Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 The course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered and how to obtain it.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Course instructions articulate or link to the institution’s accessibility policies and services.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution’s academic support services and resources can help learners succeed in the course and how learners can obtain them.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution’s student services and resources can help learners succeed and how learners can obtain them.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility and Usability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Meeting QM’s accessibility Standards does not guarantee or imply that specific country/federal/state/local accessibility regulations are met. Consult with an accessibility specialist to ensure that accessibility regulations are met.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Course navigation facilitates ease of use.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Information is provided about the accessibility of all technologies required in the course.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 The course provides alternative means of access to course materials in formats that meet the needs of diverse learners.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 The course design facilitates readability.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Course multimedia facilitate ease of use.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Syllabus Template suggested updates
APPENDIX 3.
SUGGESTED ITEMS TO ADD TO SYLLABUS TEMPLATE

Suggested items to add to template:
1) Instructions on how to get started and where to find various course components
2) Minimum technology requirements for participation in the course
3) Link to student support (e.g., technical requirements and support, student services, obtaining a GWorld card, state contact information) https://online.gwu.edu/student-support
4) Information about the accessibility of all technologies required in the course
5) Instructor contact information (for ALL types of courses)
6) Requirements for accessing and participating in the course (e.g., requisite skills for using technology tools and software apps; computer equipment requirements such as webcam, microphone, software)

Recommended Syllabus Template

[Modeled after CCAS syllabus template]

Syllabus Requirements

In accordance with the regulations laid out in the GW Faculty Handbook, updated April 2015, Section 2.7.3.4, the syllabus for all proposed courses should include the following:

1. Bulletin course descriptions
2. Course prerequisites, if any.
3. Learning outcomes that state descriptions of behaviors or skills that students will be able to demonstrate at the end of the class or unit, (see: assessment.gwu.edu/course-assessment).
4. Average minimum amount of out-of-class or independent learning expected per week, (see provost.gwu.edu/files/downloads/Resources/Assignment-Credit-Hours-7-2016.pdf).
5. Required textbooks, materials and recommended readings.
6. Week-by-week schedule of topics to be presented.
7. Description of assignments and other course assessments that delineate how student performance will be evaluated.
8. Statement on University policy on observance of religious holidays (see text, below).
9. Statement regarding accommodations for student with disabilities (see text, below).
10. Reference to the GW Academic Integrity Code (see suggested text, below).
11. Reference to the Security and Safety Policy (see suggested text, below).

For the GW Faculty Handbook see:
https://provost.gwu.edu/sites/provost.gwu.edu/files/downloads/Resources/Faculty_Handbook-Approved_20150410.pdf
Recommended Syllabus Template

Course and Contact Information:

Course: [department, course title, number, section]
Semester: [semester, year]
Meeting time: [day, time: from-to]
Location: [building, room]

Instructor:

Name:
Campus Address:
Phone:
E-mail: [Please use GW address]
Office hours:
Bulletin course description:

[The course description should be brief (1-2 sentences), written in the present tense, and include only the primary themes/topics to be covered. Please avoid using jargon. Approved courses can use the GW Bulletin description.]

Course prerequisites, if any:

[List all prerequisite courses using departmental code and course number. Also list specific skills, knowledge, credits completed, and the like, if appropriate.]

Learning outcomes that state descriptions of behaviors or skills that students will be able to demonstrate at the end of the class or unit:

[Please ensure that the learning outcomes are appropriate to the level at which the course is designed. Avoid verbs like “understand” or “know;” instead, use verbs such as analyze, synthesize, apply, and evaluate.]

“As a result of completing this course, students will be able to:

1.
2.
3. [etc.]”

[Note: For guidance on writing learning outcomes, see: assessment.gwu.edu/course-assessment]

Required textbooks, materials, and recommended readings:

[List all required textbooks, workbooks, websites, etc.
List all recommended or supplemental course learning materials
Clearly identify which materials are required, recommended, or supplemental]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Average minimum amount of out-of-class or independent learning expected per week:

[In a 15-week semester, including exam week, students are expected to spend a minimum of 100 minutes of out-of-class work for every 50 minutes of direct instruction, for a minimum total of 2.5 hours a week. A 3-credit course should include 2.5 hours of direct instruction and a minimum of 5 hours of independent learning, totaling a minimum of 7.5 hours per week. More information about GW’s credit hour policy can be found at: provost.gwu.edu/policies-forms (webpage); or provost.gwu.edu/files/downloads/Resources/Assignment-Credit-Hours-7-2016.pdf (form).]
Week-by-week schedule of topics to be presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic(s) and readings</th>
<th>Assignment(s) Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[The following statement should be included at the end of the class schedule]:

NOTE: In accordance with university policy, the final exam will be given during the final exam period and not the last week of the semester. For details and complete policy, see: provost.gwu.edu/administration-final-examinations-during-examination-period

Assignments

[A detailed breakdown of course assignments and due dates by lesson module. Including assignment descriptions, method of assessment/evaluation, and point value is recommended.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Possible Points

Grading

List what will be counted and percentages. [For example:

- midterm exam (__%)
- paper (__%)
- final exam (__%)
- class participation/attendance ( __%)

University policies:

University policy on observance of religious holidays

In accordance with University policy, students should notify faculty during the first week of the semester of their intention to be absent from class on their day(s) of religious observance. For details and policy, see: students.gwu.edu/accommodations-religious-holidays.
Academic integrity code

Academic dishonesty is defined as cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one’s own work, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information. For details and complete code, see: studentconduct.gwu.edu/code-academic-integrity

Safety and security

In the case of an emergency, if at all possible, the class should shelter in place. If the building that the class is in is affected, follow the evacuation procedures for the building. After evacuation, seek shelter at a predetermined rendezvous location.

Support for students outside the classroom

Disability Support Services (DSS)

Any student who may need an accommodation based on the potential impact of a disability should contact the Disability Support Services office at 202-994-8250 in the Rome Hall, Suite 102, to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. For additional information see: disabilitysupport.gwu.edu/

Mental Health Services 202-994-5300

The University's Mental Health Services offers 24/7 assistance and referral to address students' personal, social, career, and study skills problems. Services for students include: crisis and emergency mental health consultations confidential assessment, counseling services (individual and small group), and referrals. For additional information see: counselingcenter.gwu.edu/
Appendix 4

Academic Program Review revised guidelines (Redlined with online inclusion)
The self-study is the vital initial element of the Academic Program Review (APR) process. It is intended to give departments and programs (“units” below) an opportunity to conduct a critical evaluation of their current status and activities, across all programs, certificates, and courses offered by the unit, regardless of modality or location of offering. These guidelines were developed in order to establish a consistent framework for providing necessary information across the university. This will facilitate planning not only at the unit level, but at the school and university-wide levels as well.

The first two sections (I) Analysis of Strengths and Areas for Improvement and (II) Five-Year Strategic Plan are by far the most important. They provide the analytic information that will inform external and internal review teams, deans, and the Office of the Provost regarding those issues the unit considers of greatest importance or concern and how it intends to address them. But (perhaps counter-intuitively) these first two sections are actually completed at the end of the self-study process as their content is based on information generated in sections III-VII that follow. Sections I and II also allow for an assessment of how well the unit contributes to the goals of 2021 Vision: The Strategic Plan for the Third Century of the George Washington University.

GW has leased a data management software tool, TaskStream, to collect, manage, and store much of the information required in the self-study and for yearly program and general education assessments. Questions regarding these guidelines may be directed to the appropriate dean’s office or to the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Assessment, Cheryl Beil, at 4-6712, or cbeil@gwu.edu. Questions regarding TaskStream, including information on how to access your individual work areas, should be directed to Alex Feldman, at 4-0933, or alexmf@gwu.edu. (More information about TaskStream can be found at http://academicplanning.gwu.edu/taskstream.)

How units conduct their self-study is left largely to the discretion of deans and unit faculty. In preparing their final self-study report, however, all units should follow these guidelines, using the main headings provided below. Upon completion, the self-study report should be submitted, via TaskStream, to both your dean and to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Assessment.

Self-Study Main Sections

I. Analysis of Strengths and Areas for Improvement
II. Five-Year Strategic Plan
III. Mission Statement
IV. Faculty
V. Curriculum and Assessment
VI. Enrollment Trends
VII. Scholarly/Creative Productivity
VIII. Supporting Materials:
   - Facilities
   - University and school service
   - Other pertinent information
Guidelines for Conducting an APR Self-Study

I. ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

This section, one of the two most important in the unit’s self-study, should include highlights of the evaluation of all goals for student learning, faculty scholarly/creative productivity, and service to the discipline, the University and the community as applicable. Discuss specific strengths, immediate and future opportunities and challenges, and areas for potential improvement. The evaluation should consider any trends in the data and factors that may account for those trends. Most important, it should be honest.

II. FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN

This other very important section should lay out the unit’s plans for the next five years for developing its strengths, meeting challenges and opportunities, and addressing the areas identified for improvement. It should include a prioritized list of issues/problems to be addressed. These plans should correspond to the university’s strategic initiatives whenever possible. (A copy of the strategic plan and related goals may be found at: https://provost.gwu.edu/strategic-plan.) For each issue/problem identified for improvement, please provide the following:

- Specific goals and objectives;
- Actions to be taken in order to achieve the stated goals;
- A schedule for implementation of the actions; and
- Measures of effectiveness for each of the actions.

III. MISSION STATEMENT

Provide the unit’s mission statement. The self-study is a good time to reconsider (or develop, if necessary) mission statements.

Questions to consider for a mission statement:

- **Unit’s purpose:** a statement of purpose and how departmental activities align with its mission.
- **Relationship to your school’s mission:** a statement of the unit’s contributions to the mission of your school(s). How does the unit contribute to school goals and advance its strategic plan?
- **Relationship to the University’s strategic plan:** how does the program contribute to GW’s strategic plan?
- **Doctoral Programs:** Provide a well-defined mission and focus.

IV. FACULTY

A. Full-Time Faculty Profile

- List all full-time faculty by rank and tenure status, including those on contract. Indicate which of the faculty were hired in the past five years.
- Describe your experience in retaining existing faculty and recruiting new faculty.
- What anticipated faculty changes and hoped-for new hires are projected over the next five years?
• Describe the unit’s goal for achieving faculty gender, racial, and ethnic diversity

B. Part-Time Faculty Profile
• Discuss your unit’s reliance on part-time and/or contract (as opposed to tenured or tenure-track) faculty.
• What percentage of your face-to-face and online courses are taught by full-time and part-time faculty each semester (including summers)?
• If part-time faculty are teaching doctoral-level courses, what are their qualifications?

C. Faculty Productivity
When relevant, attach data from unit annual reports to provide the following data (some of this will be in available from unit annual reports, TaskStream, or Literati). A five-year faculty workload report can be found as an attachment in Section IV in TaskStream.
• List publications and creative works for past five years (see also VII).
• List external funding sought and received for past five years.
• List professional activities for past five years.

V. CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING
In this section, review all undergraduate majors, master, certificate, and doctoral degree programs for which your unit is responsible. If a program is offered in more than one location or using different modalities, evaluate each location and modality of that program separately, as specifics of the curriculum and indicators of quality may differ across locations and modalities.

A. List of Programs
First, list ALL programs currently offered by the unit (e.g., undergraduate majors and minors, double majors, interdisciplinary majors and minors; combined bachelor/master degree programs or other dual or joint programs; and master, doctoral, certificate program, and other degree programs). Indicate whether the program is offered predominantly in a face-to-face or online format. For undergraduate offerings, include any special academic programs supported by the unit (e.g., academic/residential programs, summer institutes, study abroad). For doctoral programs, include and define concentrations, and list faculty associated with each.

B. Curriculum Development and Relevance
Questions to consider:
• As your discipline, the external environment, and unit resources have changed during the past five years, how has the unit responded to new challenges and new opportunities?
• What changes, such as offering programs off-campus or online, have been put in place?
• (For online courses) Describe the technical support system available for the creation of online courses. What review process is in place (or used) to determine if the course meets the department’s academic standards?
• Does the curriculum reflect best practices in your discipline and adequately prepare students to succeed at the next career or educational step?
• During the past five years, what significant curriculum changes have been planned and implemented to stay abreast of the discipline?
• What changes are planned or underway to support the university’s strategic initiatives?
• What changes have occurred in degree requirements, courses offered, internships, or other elements that define the learning expectations and experiences of students in each program?
• What career path expectations does the doctoral program have for its graduates upon earning their degrees?
• How have you used measures such as student surveys, course evaluations, alumni placement, alumni satisfaction, alumni gifts, employer ratings, intern supervisor ratings, and student research and conference presentations to review and inform the curriculum?

(Three years of survey data from the undergraduate and graduate student graduation surveys can be found in TaskStream in Appendix D.)

C. Assessment of Student Learning
Assessment of student learning is an essential tool for advancing GW’s commitment to achieve academic excellence in teaching and to provide outstanding learning experiences for its students. How well students have mastered the knowledge, analytic skills, and tools set forth in each degree program’s learning outcomes serves as the key measure of how successfully the degree program contributes to these overall university goals. Moreover, a large component of GW’s reaccreditation by Middle States is based on implementation of a “comprehensive, organized, and sustained process for the assessment of student learning outcomes, including evidence that assessment results are used for improvement.”

Assess student learning
Units should use their past five years of annual assessments of student learning as the foundation for this section. Separate assessments should be included for those programs offered in a face-to-face setting and those offered online.

• Provide a list of each degree program’s major learning goals or outcomes. Note any changes in learning outcomes that have been made over the past five years.
• Summarize and review how well students have achieved the learning goals, outcomes, objectives and/or competencies defined by each degree program on its own or in accordance with its professional accreditation group and any changes made in response to each year’s findings. (The number of learning outcomes may range from as few as three to as many as 12-15 depending on accrediting agency requirements.) Is student achievement (measured by the assessment of learning outcomes) consistent across modalities?
• Reflect on the past five years’ annual reviews of student learning and the changes made in the curriculum and teaching to evaluate how well your program is achieving its mission and providing quality academic programs and opportunities for its students. Are there consistently high-quality learning experiences across courses and across modalities?
• Cite the three most important changes made in each degree program in response to the annual assessments.
• What is your overall evaluation of the improvements of the past five years in each degree program?
• What is currently the most important aspect of each program where the students could be doing better, and how is the faculty planning to improve student learning?

1 From GW’s 2008 Statement of Accreditation by Middle States Commission on Higher Education.
Yearly assessment reports for each degree program should be included in Appendix A.

D. Map the curriculum
Individual courses and curricula should be developed within the context of the unit’s goals and should reflect a coherent plan of study. Curriculum mapping provides an efficient means to display the relationship between student learning and the curriculum. Its value is that it enables the faculty to display visually where central information, concepts, or skills are introduced, developed, and mastered. A curriculum map must be developed for each major and degree program. Separate curriculum maps should be included for online and face-to-face programs if they are different. If the unit has not already produced curriculum map(s), it is strongly encouraged that there is broad unit involvement in the development of the map, especially from those faculty teaching key courses in the program. That way, faculty member can better understand how their course(s) contribute to the overall learning outcomes for the program. (Use the curriculum mapping feature in TaskStream, Section V.D., or online to map the curriculum for each program. For examples of completed curriculum maps, see: http://assessment.gwu.edu/curriculum-mapping.)

Questions to consider:

- Is there coherence in the sequencing and increasing complexity of courses?
- Are the linkages between and among program components evident?
- Do students have sufficient learning opportunities to develop and achieve program outcomes?

E. Instructor Development
As faculty are the heart of any institution (serving as teachers, mentors, and scholars, shaping the curriculum, and creating a climate for learning), the self-study needs to explore how they contribute to the learning process.

Full- and Part-Time Faculty
Questions to consider:

- Given the variety of people responsible for student instruction and learning, how has the unit worked with regular active status (and possible limited service) faculty and part-time faculty to encourage high quality teaching?
- How do each of these different groups gain knowledge and understanding of the programmatic and course learning outcomes pertinent to their teaching?
- Regardless of course modality, are faculty given adequate time to prepare course materials and to become sufficiently familiar with any technologies involved in instruction prior to the delivery of the course?
- How are data from student surveys and course evaluations used to help teaching staff improve their effectiveness in supporting student learning? What processes are in place, either formally or informally, to address substandard teaching from active status, limited service, and part-time faculty?
- How do course evaluations, departmental syllabus review, class observation, or other techniques enable the program to monitor consistency, not uniformity, across sections?
- How do course evaluations for those teaching face-to-face courses compare with those teaching online courses?
- How do course evaluations for face-to-face courses compare with those offered online?
• (For doctoral programs) Are faculty resources adequate for carrying out the doctoral program at a level of high quality? Is the ratio of doctoral students to faculty adequate to provide quality advising and mentoring?

Include a copy of the department’s course evaluation form in appendix B.

F. GTAs (if applicable)

Questions to consider:
• How does your unit prepare GTAs to be effective instructors in face-to-face and/or online courses? Describe the criteria used to determine a GTA’s readiness to perform specific instructional activities. Describe the training and supervision/feedback provided for GTAs, including any workshops or tutorials provided specifically for GTAs.
• Describe the methods (e.g., separate course evaluations, observation by faculty) used by your unit to evaluate the performance of your GTAs and to give them feedback.
• Describe the methods used to assess the reliability of grading (particularly more subjective grading such as grading of essay questions or papers) done by GTAs. Include examples of unit rubrics used for grading essay questions or papers.

G. Placement of Undergraduate and Master’s Students

Using data from the undergraduate and graduate student graduation surveys (available from TaskStream in section V.A., or online https://careerservices.gwu.edu/undergraduate-employment-education-outcomes), describe the types and levels of positions obtained by your graduates.

Questions to consider:
• How well is the curriculum preparing students for employment?
• Describe the employment market for students who have completed their master’s degree.

H. Placement of Doctoral Students (if relevant)

• Is there a viable employment market for new Ph.D.s in the discipline? What has been the placement of graduates in the program, including the mix between academic institutions, government, industry, and independent employment? Include placement data for graduates over the past five years.
• For those pursuing an academic path, provide samples of the institutions, academic titles, and types of positions graduates attain.

VI. ENROLLMENT TRENDS

A. Enrollment

The following data will be provided and can be found in TaskStream, Section VI:
• Five year undergraduate and graduate course enrollments
• Five year trend of number of majors and minors as of fall census

Other information that will be needed may be found in the chair’s annual report or in DataMart:
• Five year certificate program enrollments
• Graduate programs five-year admissions information and time to degree

B. Trends
Describe, separately, any increases or decreases that are apparent in your five-year enrollment figures for undergraduate and graduate programs, separating out growth in face-to-face and online courses. Note factors (e.g., addition or deletion of courses, faculty sabbatical leaves or retirements, changing demand for the program, preference for particular modality) that may account for variations in the enrollments. Units offering programs in both online and face-to-face modalities should discuss trends for each modality.

- Is the unit comfortable with what the data say about enrollments?
- What plans are underway to address enrollment growth or decline?
- What is the average time-to-degree for doctoral students?
- What is the retention rate for masters’ and doctoral students over the past five years? If programs are offered in different modalities, compute retention rates separately.
- Describe any changes in the overall quality of master’s or doctoral students by modality. To what do you attribute these changes?
- If there are declines in the quality of master’s or doctoral students, what has the unit done or what plans are underway to address this issue?

VII. SCHOLARLY AND/OR CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY

As the university serves as a center for intellectual inquiry, including both research, and creative endeavors, describe how your unit is advancing knowledge in your discipline and contributing to improving local/national/global conditions.

A. Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

Questions to consider:

- Discuss the overall range and development of the active status faculty’s primary scholarly and/or creative activities (refer to IV-B). Is the unit becoming more focused or diverse in its interests?
- Describe any collaborations among faculty within the unit, with other GW departments or schools, and with individuals or groups outside GW.
- Does the unit have any existing affiliations with organizations outside GW such as research/creative entities or governmental agencies?
- Are there additional agencies or entities with which the unit might develop collaborative partnerships?

B. Research Foci and Strengths

Questions to consider:

- What are the unit’s primary research strengths? How do they support the unit’s mission and the university’s strategic plan? How do they correspond to current trends in the field or discipline?
- What cross-disciplinary research is either underway or being considered?
- Is any applied, translational, and policy research underway or being considered?

C. Research and Graduate Education

Questions to consider:

- How is faculty research integrated into the graduate curriculum?
- Which faculty direct graduate student research, and in what disciplinary areas? (Provide a copy of any unit guidelines for faculty directing graduate student research.)
• Cite examples of outstanding graduate student research (especially publications)—and why they are important.
• List doctoral dissertations and their faculty advisors for the past five years in Appendix C (if applicable).

D. Research and Undergraduate Education

Questions to consider:
• How has faculty research been integrated into your undergraduate curriculum?
• Which faculty are directing undergraduate student research and in what subject areas? Cite examples of outstanding undergraduate research.
• Have your undergraduates been involved in school, university-wide, or external initiatives to support undergraduate research (e.g., Gamow, Luther Rice, NSF’s REU program). If so, in what subject areas?

E. National (Ph.D.) Rankings (if applicable)

Questions to consider:
• Cite any external evidence that describes or ranks the quality of the unit’s doctoral program(s) with respect to national standards of excellence in your discipline. Evidence that is as objective as possible, and not totally subjective, should be noted (e.g., NRC data, other rankings, citation index data).
• Describe aspects of the unit’s Ph.D. program that may not be available at competing institutions. What makes your program stand out?

VIII. SUPPORTING DATA AND ANALYSIS

A. Staff
Provide the number and levels (e.g., executive aide, senior secretary) of all clerical staff assigned to the unit.

B. Facilities
• **Space:** Assess unit facilities in relation to programmatic goals, considering the amount, types, and overall adequacy of space.
• **Equipment:** Describe specialized equipment used by the unit for instructional and/or research purposes.

C. University and School Service
Provide a summary listing of full-time faculty service to (1) the university (e.g., Faculty Senate, IRB) and (2) to your school (e.g., freshman advising, teaching initiatives, committees) over the past three years.

D. Other Pertinent Information
Include any additional information that you feel may prove useful in conducting the academic program review.
APPENDICES

Appendix A: Copies of annual academic assessment reports for each of the unit's degree program for the past five years

Appendix B: Copy of the unit’s course evaluation form(s)

Appendix C: (if applicable) List of doctoral dissertations and their faculty advisors for the past five years

Appendix D: Undergraduate and graduate student graduation survey data
Appendix 5

Course evaluation suggested additions
APPENDIX 5.
SUGGESTED ADDITIONS TO COURSE EVALUATIONS

Suggested questions to add to feedback survey:
1) Rate the quality of technical support for this course.
2) Rate the organization of course materials in Blackboard or other course management system)
3) Rate the use of multimedia (e.g., videos, audios, Blackboard Collaborate sessions) enhanced my learning in this course.
4) Add teaching methods and approaches that are not included in current list that are appropriate for and used in online courses.
   Current question on survey: Which teaching methods and approaches used by the instructor contributed significantly to your learning? (Select all that apply)
   • Lectures (including online lectures)
   • Class discussions (including online discussion boards)
   • In-class clickers or other quick-response methods
   • In-class learning activities (other than discussion)
   • Out-of-class homework, readings
   • Labs
   • Projects or portfolios
   • Teamwork or group activities
   • Student presentations
   • Guest lecturers
   • Fieldwork/field trips
   • Writing
   • Other
5) Rate the instructor’s adeptness with using the technology required for the course (for all courses regardless of modality)
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Nominating Committee (FSECNC) Slate

The FSECNC will convene to nominate the 2018-2019 Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

CCAS: Harald Griesshammer
ESIA: Ed McCord
GSEHD: Natalie Millman
GWSB: Ernie Englander
GWSPH: Karen McDonnell
LAW: Art Wilmarth
SEAS: Charles Garris
SMHS: ***tbd***
SON: Joyce Pulcini