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The Need

• Three new online business programs (45+ courses to bring online)
• No existing centralized administration of design
• No formal quality standards
The Approach

1. Establish a qualified personnel structure
2. Establish Quality Management
3. Construct Courses
4. Establish Continuous Quality Improvement
The Approach

Step 1

Establish a qualified personnel structure
Establish Instructional Technology and Instructional Design Department

- Associate VP of Instructional Technology and Online Education
- One FT Instructional Technologist
- One FT Instructional Designer
- One or more PT Instructional Designers
Train and qualify subject matter experts

- Two required online training courses
  - Education Technology for Instructors
  - Succeeding as an Online Instructor
- Mandatory Course Builder Workshop
- Development contracts with a firm development schedule (~115 days)
- Pair SME with a dedicated Instructional Designer
The Approach

Step 2

Establish Quality Management
Quality Management

- Quality Matters?
  www.qualitymatters.org

- Online Learning Consortium Quality Scorecard?
  http://onlinelearningconsortium.org/consult/quality-scorecard/

- eCampus Alberta Quality eToolkit?
  http://quality.ecampusalberta.ca/
Quality Management
Selection Considerations

• Time to Implement
• Cost (little or no budget)
• Credentialing Reviewers
Choice: Quality eToolkit

• Comprehensive Scorecard
• No required credentialing of reviewers
• Favorable WCET review
  https://wcetfrontiers.org/2015/03/18/ecaqualityrubric/
• No cost (Creative Commons licensing)

The content of this website (http://quality.ecampusalberta.ca) is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License except where otherwise noted.
Features:

• Checklist approach

• Three levels of quality
  1. Essentials
  2. Excellent
  3. Exemplary
Features:

Seven major quality standards categories

• Web Design
• Course Information
• Writing
• Resources
• Organization
• Pedagogy
• Technology
## Features:

### Quality eToolkit

- **Detailed assessment rubrics** – 27 pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Standards</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VV</th>
<th>VVV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marking Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Learners are provided clear details of the marking criteria that will be used for all graded activities.</td>
<td>□ Clearly stated, detailed scoring rubrics or equivalents describe the important performance criteria expected of the learners.</td>
<td>□ Marking criteria is located with each graded activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ This is provided to learners prior to beginning the activity.</td>
<td>□ Learners are encouraged to review the criteria prior to beginning the activity and again after completing the activity as a self-assessment.</td>
<td>□ These models are similar enough to the graded activities to demonstrate what high performance looks like, but do not provide answers to the graded activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ The performance criteria align with the learning outcomes/objectives, and with activity requirements that are stated in the activity directions.</td>
<td>□ Where peer-review is encouraged, learners are informed about how to provide peer feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Learners are told which activities are graded and which are not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Interactivity** | Interactive activities are incorporated into the course, all of which facilitate deeper understanding of the content. | □ Types of interactivity include learner-learner (or learner-peer), learner-instructor, and learner-content. | □ Guidelines for interactivity are provided. | □ The course fosters a learning community by actively engaging learners with their peers and the instructor throughout the course. |
|                  | □ In cohort-based courses, learners interact with each other through directed asynchronous or synchronous discussions (e.g., chats, webinars) and/or other types of interactive group activities. | □ Collaboration with other learners or others (e.g., fellow employee at place of employment) along with peer feedback is utilized in at least one graded learning activity. | □ Learners share their perceptions and experiences gained through reflection and critical thinking with their peers. |
|                  | □ In individual study courses, learners may interact with each other or with peers or others (e.g., experts, practitioners). | | □ Networking, teamwork, cooperation, negotiation, and consensus-building skills are built throughout the course. |
|                  | | | □ Guest speakers (e.g., professionals in the field, community leaders, practitioners) are included in the course. |
The Approach

Construct courses
Schedule Courses Development

• Order by expected first offering dates
• Goal: Courses fully developed at least 30 days before first offering date
• Capacity: ~10 courses per 115-day cycle
• Review at completion:
  ✓ Required components
  ✓ Credit-hour compliance
  ✓ Quality rubric
The Approach

Establish Continuous Quality Improvement
Quality Monitoring – initial

• Course must meet all “Essentials” in rubric before first offering
• SME teaches course, course improvement journal is updated in real time
• SME and Instructional Designer make improvements after review of journal, student evaluations and other feedback
• Revised course must meet all “Excellent” rubric items
• 20% of SMEs contract compensation is reserved until after successful completion of first cycle of needed improvements
Quality Monitoring – ongoing

• Each subsequent offering is replicated from the stored, approved version of the course
• Courses reviewed at least every two years
• Goal is to meet all Essentials, Excellent, and Exemplary quality standards
• SMEs may request improvements and other changes as needed
### Continuous Quality Improvement Process

**Essential Quality Standards 2.0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Standards</th>
<th>ESSENTIAL</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marking Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners are provided clear details of the marking criteria that will be used for all graded activities.</td>
<td>□ Clearly stated, detailed scoring rubrics or equivalents describe the important performance criteria expected of the learners.</td>
<td>□ Marking criteria is located with each graded activity.</td>
<td>□ Models of “good work” are provided, along with clear marking criteria and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ This is provided to learners prior to beginning the activity.</td>
<td>□ Learners are encouraged to review the criteria prior to beginning the activity and again after completing the activity as a self-assessment.</td>
<td>□ These models are similar enough to the graded activities to demonstrate what high performance looks like, but do not provide answers to the graded activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ The performance criteria align with the learning outcomes/objectives, and with activity requirements that are stated in the activity directions.</td>
<td>□ Where peer-review is encouraged, learners are informed about how to provide peer feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Learners are told which activities are graded and which are not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive activities are incorporated into the course, all of which facilitate deeper understanding of the content.</td>
<td>□ Types of interactivity include learner-learner (or learner-peer), learner-instructor, and learner-content.</td>
<td>□ Guidelines for interactivity are provided.</td>
<td>□ The course fosters a learning community by actively engaging learners with their peers and the instructor throughout the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ In cohort-based courses, learners interact with each other through directed asynchronous or synchronous discussions (e.g., chats, webinars) and/or other types of interactive group activities.</td>
<td>□ Collaboration with other learners or other peers (e.g., fellow employee at place of employment) along with peer feedback is utilized in at least one graded learning activity.</td>
<td>□ Learners share their perceptions and experiences gained through reflection and critical thinking with their peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In individual study courses, learners may interact with each other or with peers or others (e.g., experts, practitioners).</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Networking, teamwork, cooperation, negotiation, and consensus-building skills are built throughout the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Guest speakers (e.g., professionals in the field, community leaders, practitioners) are included in the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuous Quality Improvement Process

Step 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Standards</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXEMPLARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current status as of August, 2017

• 40+ courses have been completed in 3 development cycles
• 3 courses remaining, currently in process
• More programs and courses are in the planning and approval stages
Discussion?
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