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Agenda

• Introductions
• Program background
• Review process
• Report critique
• Discussion
• Q/A
Session Objectives

• Identify the focus, criteria and data necessary to support your quality assurance effort.
• Apply the steps of a QM-based program review to your institution.
• Analyze the design, delivery, and impact of a program review and report.
Program vs. Course Review

• What are the differences between program and course-level reviews?
# Program vs. Course Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strives for continuous improvement</td>
<td>Involves single/multiple courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves specific review criteria</td>
<td>Involves single/multiple stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires trained reviewer</td>
<td>Focuses on achievement of course/broad program outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves considerable time commitment</td>
<td>Considers only course-related data/multiple data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizes a third-party reviewer</td>
<td>Utilizes a short/long-term timeline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QM Program Certification

• 4 certifications
• Online program design
  – Aligned with QM rubric
  – Minimum 3 years of data
  – Measurable program objectives
  – Curriculum alignment map
  – QM certified designers or faculty
  – Evidence of meeting QM standards
    – At least 3 courses
Online Design Unit

• Pitt Online:
  – >10 years old
  – Graduate-level programs and certificates
  – 18 programs across 6 schools
  – Asynchronous and fully online courses
  – Centralized design and support unit
  – 1-1 faculty and instructional design collaboration
  – Early program assessment attempts abandoned
Review Process

1. Assessed internal resources
2. Established criteria for program inclusion
3. Developed instrument to gather course data
4. Completed and summarized course reviews
5. Drafted report for design team feedback
Timeline of Events

QM Program Review Course
- July 2017
- Department Approval

Course Review Instrument Design
- Aug 2017
- Round 1 Course Reviews

Round 2 Course Reviews
- Sep 2017
- Dec 2017 – Jan 2018
- Report Template Created

Report Drafted
- Oct 2017 – Nov 2017
- Feb 2018
- April 2018

Report Finalized and Distributed
- May 2018
Data Sources

- Course review data
  - Learning objectives
  - Instructional alignment
  - Teaching and learning materials
  - Assessment techniques
  - Course activities and learner interaction
- Faculty experience survey
- Student experience survey
- Program demographics/enrollment
Faculty Survey Example

Pitt online provided an equivalent or better experience for my students than my face-to-face courses.

Agree: 72%
Neither agree nor disagree: 24%
Disagree: 4%
Student Survey Example

Ease of Use and Enjoyment

- I would recommend the Pitt Online experience to others.
- My courses used technologies and media that supported my learning.
- Instructions explained how to use technologies when appropriate.
- My Pitt Online experience has contributed to my personal goals.
- I have enjoyed my interactions with classmates in my courses.
- I have enjoyed the learning experiences and activities in my courses.
- My Pitt Online experience has contributed to my professional goals.
- I understood what was expected of me in my courses.

Legend: 
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
Data Sources Discussion

• What data sources are readily available to you?
• What data sources would be ideal for conducting a program review at your institution?
Report Format

• QM headings
• Program overview
• Visualizations
• Strengths
• Recommendations for improvement
• Exemplary practices across program
• Summary of faculty and student experience
• Conclusion and next steps
• Glossary for online program directors
Critique and Discussion

• Impressions and recommendations

• How might these program review results be used by:
  – Faculty members?
  – Program administrators?
  – Online design units?

• How can centralized design units provide feedback that may reflect negatively on their services to departments?

• Questions?
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