Program Review Report

Iowa Community College Online Consortium
Program Review

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is first, to summarize the findings of a program review conducted for the Iowa Community College Online Consortium by the Training and Consulting Services Group at eCollege and secondly, to present an implementation plan to begin to address the findings. The Program Review included Program Intelligence Manager (PIM) assessment of course data and course reviews conducted by eCollege Instructional Design consultants.

The report findings include:
Students:
1. Student activity in the first week of a course has an impact on course completion rates
2. Excess student activity in email is correlated to low course completion rates

Faculty:
3. Faculty activity in Discussions and Gradebook has a positive impact on course completion rates

Courses:
Course completion rates appear to be positively impacted by:
1. Discussions contained in 75% of course units
2. Active instructor facilitation of Discussions
3. Use of Course Tools
4. Use of an Assessment mix
5. Instructor provision of feedback through the Gradebook

The findings at the campus and departmental levels led to recommendations concerning:
- Course content design
- Instructional strategies
- Instructor development opportunities

These campus and departmental recommendations align with the previously stated Program Review Goals to:
- Increase course completion rates
- Increase student retention rates
- Increase course quality
- Increase student and faculty satisfaction
- Realize efficiencies

The implementation plan outlined in this report sets the stage for addressing the recommendations contained in the report.

PROGRAM REVIEW and METHODOLOGY

The Iowa Community College Online Consortium (Iowacconline) Program Review was a collaborative analytical and qualitative assessment of an online educational program. The review process was intended to:
- Determine historical performance, baselines, best practices and variance
- Identify drivers of performance and desired thresholds
- Prioritize areas of focus for program enhancement
- Provide recommendations and an implementation plan to realize the identified program enhancement benefits

Program Review Goals were identified as the development of an Action Plan outlining steps Iowacconline could take to:
- Increase course completion rates
- Increase student retention rates
- Increase course quality
- Increase student and faculty satisfaction
- Realize efficiencies
- Develop targets and activity thresholds
- Prioritize opportunities

Program Review parameters and limitations should be noted.
- Courses were reviewed with a course start to course finish timeframe. This timeframe poses an issue as many students add/drop courses during this period. An option for further analysis would be to also review courses from course census to course finish.
- Courses were reviewed with reference to course completion rates. An option for further analysis would be to also review courses with reference to student satisfaction surveys and/or student grades as a measure of success.
- Courses were reviewed based on high and low completion rates by students. An option for further analysis would be to incorporate review/reporting categories based on whether or not courses are: (1) general education or optional courses, (2) required in a major, (3) student "weedout" or "elimination" courses whether in general terms or in a department or major, and (4) lower or higher level courses within a department or major.
- Courses were reviewed based on a sample of courses with high and low completion rates by students across departments. An option for further analysis would be to review:
  - a larger number of courses overall
  - a number of courses with average as well as high and low completion rates
  - a larger number of courses within departments with comparison by departments

The review was implemented based on a three-phase approach designed by Training and Consulting Services, eCollege* in conjunction with Iowacconline online program administrators.

Phase 1: PIM Assessment and Course Identification
The goal of the project's first phase was to identify Iowacconline courses to be targeted for course review by the Instructional Design Consulting (IDC) team. Courses were identified by applying the Program Intelligence Manager (PIM) tool to Iowacconline data using three measures:
- Enrollment growth
  - Historical (2004, 2005, 2006)
  - Detailed 12 month growth composition

- School, Term, Course type
- Assessment at overall Department/School level
- Faculty and Student activity
  - Historical (2004, 2005, 2006)
  - Detailed 12 month analysis
  - Activity/section
  - Successful Faculty and Student profiles
  - Assessment at overall Department/School level
- Completion rates
  - Historical (2004, 2005, 2006)
  - Detailed 12 month analysis
  - School, Term, Course type
  - Class size
  - Quantified opportunities
  - Top/Bottom performers
  - Assessment at overall Department/School level

* See Appendix A for project staff.

Phase 2: Course Level Review

Based on PIM-driven assessment of course data, fifty (50) courses were chosen for review by the eCollege Instructional Design Consultants (IDCs). The review pool included courses from the Iowacconline departments of:

Accounting	History
Art	Humanities
Biology	Mathematics
Business	Music
Computer Science	Philosophy
Early Childhood Education	Political Science
Economics	Psychology
English	Science
Film and Theatre	Speech
Geography	Social Science
Health Information Technology	Sociology
Health Sciences	

The Instructional Design Consultants used a modified version of the form* commonly used by the IDCs for detailed course reviews for Educational Partners. The modified form reviewed key course components, including:

- Course Homepage
- Course Home Elements
- Unit Structure
- Unit Homepages
- Unit Content Items
- Use of Course Tools
- Use of Evaluation Instruments/Techniques
- Instructor Interaction
- Template Use

* See Appendix B for the Iowa Assessment Form

Phase 3: Recommendations and Implementation Plan
Based on (1) the assessment of PIM data and (2) the assessment of Iowacconline courses a series of recommendations were developed to address the program review goals.

The initial findings of the program review were presented, via a PowerPoint presentation and discussion, at the eCollege CiTE Conference in March, 2007. The presentation of the Program Review was conducted by:

- Gretchen Bartelson, ICCOC
- Andrew Bergad, eCollege
- Jeff Borden, eCollege
- Steve Rheinschmidt, ICCOC

This report presents the findings of the program review in a more complete form designed for presentation to the Iowa Community College Online Consortium.

GENERAL FINDINGS

Based on the PIM-driven ICCOC data assessment and the course assessments outlined in the Program Review and Methodology section of this report, general findings are:

Data Assessment Findings*

Students:
1. Student activity in the first week of a course has an impact on course completion rates

Faculty:
1. Faculty activity in Discussions, Gradebook and other interactive elements has a positive impact on course completion rates
2. Excess faculty activity in email is correlated to low course completion rates

Course Level Assessment Findings*

Course completion rates overall appear to be positively impacted by:
1. Discussions contained in 75% of course units
2. Active instructor facilitation of Discussions
3. Use of Course Tools and Assessment items
4. Use of assessment mix
5. Instructor provision of feedback through the Gradebook

More specific findings and recommendations are presented in the following two sections of the report: General Recommendations and Departmental Recommendations.

*Findings differ by Department.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS

Note: Slide numbers refer to the ICCOC Program Review PowerPoint slide - Appendix C.
All data are for 2006.

Completion Rates by Institution
- For 2006, the average course completion rate for all schools is 77%. (Slide 7)
- However, the average course completion rate varies slightly by school. School E has the highest course completion rate, 79%, while School G has the lowest course completion rate, 75%. (Slide 8)
- There is also variation between schools when overall school averages for course completion rates are compared against average department completion rates. School E shows the highest departmental average completion rates (2.6% above average), while School G has lower average departmental completion rates (1.1% below average). (Slide 8)
- This variation between schools is something that could be explored further by ICCOC. Perhaps School G offers more classes in departments that have low completion rates (see below), while School E offers more courses in departments with high completion rates. Or perhaps there are other differences between Schools E and G that can be identified through further investigation.

Completion Rates by Department, Enrollment and Courses
- As mentioned above, the average course completion rate is 77%.
- Sixty six percent of course sections had completion rates greater than average (i.e., greater than 77%), and 14% of course sections had completion rates greater than 90%. Business, Psychology and Criminal Justice courses generally showed high course completion rates of over 90%. (Slide 9)
- Forty four percent of sections show lower than average course completion rates. Mathematics, English and Health Sciences generally have very low course completion rates, with some in the 50-60% course completion range, and some with less than 50% completion rates. (Slide 9)
- Important trends are noted when comparing completion rates and student enrollments. While some departments have high enrollment and high completion rates (such as Sociology, Psychology, and Business), others departments show high enrollments but low completion rates (including English, Mathematics, Health Sciences, Computer Science, Science, and Biology). (Slide 10)
- The high enrollment/low completion departments present areas of opportunity for the school. Slide 11 illustrates the enrollment increase that could be gained by getting departments with low course completion rates up to the average 77% completion rate, as well as enrollments that could be gained by improving above the average completion rate. For example, if the Mathematics department improved to the average 77% course completion rate, they could have 204 additional enrollments at term end (a gain of 24% over current enrollment at term end). (Slide 11)
- Beyond examining departments as a whole, comparisons of completion rates and student enrollments can be carried out for individual courses. This identifies courses that have high enrollments and low completion rates. These courses are: CSC110, ENG106, ENG104, ENG 105, MAT 121, and BIO105. Improving the completion rates in these courses presents specific areas of opportunity for the schools. (Slide 12)

Student Activity and Completion Rates
- In 2006, for students who completed the courses, the average course activity per section is 45.5 hours (for a 16 week term). (Slide 14)
- However, there is departmental variation in this average figure. In the Science department, the average course activity for completed students is 56.6 hours (for a 16 week term); Computer Science shows the lowest average course activity for completed students, with 35.6 hours (for a 16 week term). (Note: When trying to compare these departmental rates, it is important to remember that these numbers only reflect activity within the course shell, and do not reflect work or study time outside the course shell.) (Slide 14)
- Student activity during Week 1 can also be examined, and compared between students who ultimately complete the course and students who drop the course. Students who completed the course averaged 3.1 hours during Week 1, while dropped students averaged 1.3 hours in Week 1. This shows the importance of Week 1 activity, and is possibly a way to identify at-risk students. (Slide 15)
- There is departmental variation in the comparison of Week 1 activity for completed versus dropped students. For example, in the Science department, students who completed the course put in 4.0 hours during Week 1, while those that dropped the course only put in 1.2 hours. In Health Sciences the average student who completes the course put in 2.5 hours in Week 1, while students that dropped the course only put in 1.3 hours. Note that these figures for student activity during Week 1 don't seem to correlate with the overall low/high departmental completion rates. For example, departments with high completion rates, Sociology (3.0/1.5 hours), Psychology (3.3/1.2 hours) and Business (2.9/1.4 hours), show similar hours of Week 1 activity rates for completed/dropped students as do departments with low completion rates, including Mathematics (2.8/1.2 hours), Science (4.0/1.2 hours) English (3.8/1.9 hours), Computer Science (3.3/1.3 hours), and Health Sciences (2.5/1.3 hours) (Slide 15)
- The number of days students log in during Week 1 can also be examined and compared between students who ultimately complete the course and students who drop the course. Students who completed the course logged in, on average, 3.1 days during Week 1, while dropped students logged in on average 1.7 days during Week 1. This measure also shows the importance of Week 1 activity and is a potential measure of students success in the course. (Slide 16)
- There is departmental variation in comparisons of days logged in during Week 1 for completed versus dropped students. For example, in the Science department, students who complete the course log in 3.6 days on average, while those who drop the course log in 1.9 days (higher than the average rate for dropped students, but still 1.7 days behind the students who complete the course). In the Health Sciences department, students who complete the course log in 2.7 days on average (below the average rate for all departments), and those who drop the course log in 1.7 days on average (a 1.0 day difference between those who drop and complete the course). (Slide 16)

Faculty Activity
- In 2006, the average faculty member spent 46 hours in the course (for a 16 week term). (Slide 18)
- There is a wide range of departmental variation in how much time faculty members spend in their courses. For example, the average faculty member in the Science department spends 70 hours in the course, while the average faculty in Health Sciences is in the course for 35 hours. (Slide 18)

- Interestingly, there is a negative correlation between the average faculty activity per section and the departmental course completion rate. Departments with high completion rates all show below average faculty activity (Sociology: 37 hours, Psychology: 39 hours, and Business: 44 hours), while most departments with low completion rates have the highest faculty activity (Mathematics: 59 hours, Computer Science: 53 hours, English: 52 hours, and Sciences: 70 hours), except for Health Sciences which shows the lowest faculty activity (35 hours). (Slide 18)
- Although the average faculty member spent 46 hours in the course, there is a wide range in the number of hours faculty spend in the courses. While every department has some faculty members that are in the course sections over 100 hours, and some faculty members that are in the course sections less than 20 hours, there are certainly some departments where faculty spend more time inside classes than others. In the Science department, 33% of the faculty are in the shell over 100 hours in a 16 week term. Interestingly, Math and English (other low completion departments) are also slightly higher than other departments, with 13% and 10% of faculty spending over 100 hours in the courses. On the low end of the scale, some departments have many instructors spending less than 20 hours in the courses. In Sociology, 46% of instructors spend less than 20 hours in the courses, while Health sciences and Psychology have 37% and 30%, respectively, of instructors in the course less than 20 hours. (Slide 19)
- Looking more in-depth, we can compare faculty activity by department in the different eCollege system tools. Interestingly, higher faculty activity in threads and lower faculty activity in email generally correlate with higher course completion rates, while results are mixed for the gradebook and drop box.
  - *Threads:* Faculty activity in threaded discussions is highest in Psychology (33%), Business (27%), and Sociology (24%); interestingly, all of these are departments with high course completion rates. Faculty activity in threads is lowest in Math (12%), Computer Science (13%), and Science (14%), all of which are departments with low course completion rates.
  - *Gradebook :* Faculty activity in the gradebook is highest in Mathematics (64%), Health Sciences (53%), Science (47%) and Sociology (47%), most of which are low completion rate courses. Faculty activity in the gradebook is lowest in Computer Science (34%), English (37%), and Business (38%), which are a mix of high and low completion rate departments.
  - *Email:* Faculty activity in email is highest in Computer Science (17%), Mathematics (13%), Health Sciences (10%), and Science (10%), which are all low completion rate departments. Faculty activity in email is lowest in Psychology (5%), Business (6%), English (6%), and Sociology (8%), which, except for English, are all high completion rate departments.
  - *Drop Box:* Faculty activity in the drop box is highest in English (32%), Business (23%), Computer Science (22%) and Science (22%), most of which are low completion rate departments. Faculty activity in the drop box is lowest in Mathematics (3%) and Health Sciences (10%), which are also both low completion rate departments. (Slide 21)

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on (1) the results of PIM-driven data assessment, (2) course reviews/assessments, and (3) best practices as identified by eCollege staff. The recommendations are made with the intent to assist ICCOC and member institutions in enhancing course design and delivery.

These general recommendations align with the previously stated Program Review Goals to:
- Increase course completion rates
- Increase student retention
- Increase course quality
- Increase student and faculty satisfaction
- Realize efficiencies

General Recommendations
There are a number of recommendations that can be made based on the practices observed at other institutions with whom eCollege Instructional Design Consultants interact, commonly accepted "best practices," and the results of the course reviews and PIM data analysis conducted for this project. As noted below, these recommendations rely, in large part, on effective collaboration and communication among staff (instructors and administrative staff) at ICCOC and member institutions. We note that some of the following recommendations may be duplicative of activities currently being carried out by ICCOC or member institutions.

Faculty Assessment should be conducted based on a specific assessment rubric shared with faculty. The results of such an ongoing assessment should be shared with faculty, Deans, Department Heads and other relevant institutional administrators. The goal of the assessment should be to (1) acknowledge good performance and (2) identify below standard performance that could be improved through additional mentoring or training. The assessment rubric should outline specific measures of faculty performance, the number of times a faculty member is active in facilitating a discussion plus the quality of the intervention, the number and frequency of announcements posted, the presence of an online office, the assessment mix used in a course, the quality of feedback given on assignments and/or in the gradebook.

Student Evaluations should be correlated with faculty assessments and the results shared with faculty, Deans, Department Heads and other relevant institutional administrators. The goal of the student evaluation should be to (1) acknowledge good course design and good instruction and (2) identify areas of course design or instructional strategies and implementation that could be improved. The evaluation rubric should be specific. It is important that the results be provided to those responsible for course design and presentation as well as course facilitation and instruction; though that person may be the same in many instances. Questions that could add to the utility of the student evaluations might include: What is your major? Is this course required?

Course Reviews which are conducted by ICCOC or eCollege staff should be shared with the relevant instructors, Deans, Department Heads, ICCOC staff, and other relevant institutional administrators such as quality assurance staff. The goal of the course reviews should be to (1) acknowledge good course design and good instruction and (2) identify areas of course design or instructional strategies and implementation that could be improved. It should be noted that Schools or Departments could consolidate the findings of individual course reviews to identify best practices for all online instructors within a school or department to follow.

ICCOC Program Review should be shared with the relevant ICCOC staff, Deans, Department Heads and other relevant institutional administrators such as quality assurance staff. The goal of this program review is to foster additional investigation and activities designed to meet the previously stated Program Review Goals.

Faculty Development should be encouraged through a variety of means which undoubtedly parallel many current activities at ICCOC member institutions.

- New faculty, and faculty identified as less than proficient through faculty assessments and course reviews, should be provided training opportunities to address online instructional strategies as well as "best practices" in course design and facilitation.
- The concept of "Lead Faculty" in the online environment could be explored on a departmental basis. The lead faculty could have a number of assignments including course reviews and mentoring.
- The annual and other periodic conferences could provide specific time for collaboration across schools in general and by departments (such as math or science) across schools. Facilitated workshops with specific goals, activities and guided discussions would provide a rich environment for collaboration and sharing of best practices.

Course Design and Instructional Strategies

There are a number of recommendations that can be made concerning course design and the instructional strategies employed to teach the courses. The recommendations below are based on generally accepted "best practices" in online education and the results of the course reviews conducted for this project.

It is a best practice to encourage instructor presence:

- Provide instructor biographical information, photograph and contact information, commonly in the Syllabus
- Post timely, relevant Announcements throughout the course
- Provide a virtual Office where students can post course-related questions
- Provide active, consistent facilitation in Discussions
- Provide timely, constructive feedback on assignments and in the Gradebook

It is a best practice to encourage an online learning community:

- Provide an "introductions" discussion area
- Provide ongoing discussions in course units
- Provide group / team assignments, as appropriate given instructional objectives

It is a best practice to structure a course for consistency, visual appeal and relevance to student needs:

- Present Course and Unit Homepages with titles, overview/introductory paragraphs, relevant graphics, and navigational guidance.
- Design content items with a consistent naming convention and a consistent order throughout units. Commonly there should be four or more content items per unit.
- Provide a course schedule (assignments, due dates, etc.) in the Syllabus; it is recommended also to present it in an Announcement or content item.
- Provide discussions in most (75% or more) of the units in a course.
- Include a mix of authentic assessment items, such as quizzes and exams, written assignments, participation in discussions, team assignments, etc.
- Use an appropriate mix of the course management tools to provide a rich learning environment and to facilitate communication

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

During the review process, it became clear that it was not possible to simply compare all courses across the board, as this was not comparing "apples to apples." For example, comparing teacher practices in a Mathematics course and a Psychology course did not yield any relevant, constructive strategies. There were few results that were cross-departmental in nature.

As a result, low completion rate programs were chosen for further analysis, as these programs represent areas of opportunity for the school. The lowest completion courses were grouped by department and compared to higher completion courses within that same department (note: in most cases, these are not the "high" completion rate courses identified by PIM, but instead are courses that were not identified as "high" or "low" completion, suggesting they are somewhere in the middle). Whenever possible, multiple sections of the same course were compared to one another to determine potential teacher practices that might explain differences in completion rates. The findings are discussed here for four programs: Science, Mathematics, Health Sciences, and Computer Sciences. These four program areas represent courses with the highest enrollments as well as the lowest course completion rates within the ICCOC. It should be noted that some of these low completion courses are taught only by one or two instructors, which might skew the findings. Therefore, these findings should be regarded contextually by the departments who offer these courses.

Science
Using Environmental Science and Biology as the basis for this mini-review, several teaching and curriculum elements seemed to differ between low and higher completion rate courses.

- Use of Unit Homepages seemed to differ greatly between low and high completion courses. Preview material and contextual materials should be shown to the students on these pages for optimal affect.
- Course tools (Webliography, Doc Sharing, etc) were used more extensively in the higher completion courses, suggesting use of other Internet resources as well.
- Course Homepage information seemed more thorough in the higher completion courses.
- Low completion rate courses did not have any threaded discussions, while the courses with higher course completion rates did expect student participation. However, there was no instructor participation in these threaded discussions (which is not a best practice).
- Feedback through the gradebook was not overly present in any science course. A best practice is to encourage instructors in all disciplines to give quick, constructive feedback to all students through the gradebook comments areas and within papers themselves.

Mathematics
Six Mathematics course sections were among the 50 courses with the lowest completion rates. These courses were compared with higher completion rate sections of the same course (note that these are courses assumed to have higher completion rates, and are not the true high completion rate courses that were identified through PIM). The courses compared were MAT 102, MAT 121, and MAT 132 for Spring and Fall 2006 terms.

- Most Mathematics courses contain few or no threaded discussions, except for MAT 132 (Math for Liberal Arts) which had threaded discussions in every unit. In all courses except for one (see next), even if there were threaded discussions present, there was no instructor participation in any of the discussions.

- All sections of MAT 121 (College Algebra) were on our low course completion list for Fall and Spring 2006 terms, except for one. The one section that had a higher completion rate had a threaded discussion in every unit, with a high degree of instructor participation. Otherwise the courses appeared similar.
- Most Mathematics courses use few course tools and do not use a variety of assessment types (i.e., most courses are almost exclusively focused on exams and homework with no other interaction). MAT 132 (Math for Liberal Arts) is an exception to this, and generally utilizes a wider variety of course tools and assessment types.
- It is interesting to note that in MAT 132 (Math for Liberal Arts), there are no apparent differences between low and higher course completion rate sections in terms of course set up (generally good) or instructor interaction (generally poor). However, MAT 132 is a self-paced course, which might contribute to it having lower completion rates. It is possible that a self-paced course, with limited instructor interaction, is not appropriate for this type of course.
- Instructor feedback in the Gradebook was generally not found.

Health Sciences Courses
Seven health sciences courses were reviewed, three in the high course completion rate category and four in the low course completion rate category (note, in this case, these are true high completion rate courses as identified by PIM). The course findings may be summarized as:

- Instructor feedback in the Gradebook was found more consistently in high completion rate courses than in the low completion rate courses.
- The use of multiple course tools and multiple assessment items were found more consistently in high completion rate courses than in the low completion rate courses.
- Threaded discussions were not present in both high and low completion rate courses.

Summary

Overall, there are some consistent trends within these four departments. The deficiencies found in many of the low completion rate courses lead to the following recommendations.
We recommend:
- Providing threaded discussions in over 75% of the course units
- Including a high degree of instructor participation and interaction (particularly important in these difficult subject areas). Prime areas for this participation are through the threaded discussion, feedback in the gradebook, and virtual office.
- Using a variety of course tools and course assessments.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Implementation Plan aligns with the Program Review Goals and leads to steps ICCOC and member schools could take to:
- Increase course completion rates
- Increase student retention rates
- Increase course quality
- Increase student and faculty satisfaction
- Realize efficiencies
- Develop targets and activity thresholds
- Prioritize opportunities

Step 1: ICCOC Project Review Report
The first step is clearly for interested parties to review the ICCOC Project Review Report.

Step 2: Implementation Stakeholders
The second step would be to identify the relevant stakeholders, at ICCOC and at member schools, who will of necessity be involved in deciding how to proceed concerning the findings and recommendations in the report.

Step 3: Mapping an Approach and Strategy
The next step would be for stakeholders to identify an approach to making decisions about the report's findings and recommendations. A strategy for implementing any recommendations also needs to be identified and agreed upon among the interested stakeholders. Included in any strategy would be identifying which recommendations to address, in what order to address them, and who at ICCOC and the schools/departments will be responsible for carrying out implementing activities.

Step 4: Benchmarks
An early implementation activity would be to set relevant benchmarks. For example, how many courses / instructors to initially target for change activity? What timeframe should be established to accomplish the desired change activities?

Step 5: Progress Review
It would seem imperative that a progress review be conducted on an annual basis by the relevant stakeholders at ICCOC and the member schools. A review should identify progress made and note future actions to be taken.

Step 6: Further Review and Assessment
As a result of the progress review, it is recommended that steps to conduct further review and assessment be identified. For example, should future reviews take into consideration a different timeframe, such as course census to course end? Should student satisfaction, or faculty satisfaction, surveys be utilized in future reviews? Should the quality, as well as the quantity, of instructor facilitation in discussions and feedback on assignments and in the gradebook be investigated?

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Iowa Community College Online Consortium program review developed a number of findings leading to both general and departmental-specific recommendations. The recommendations, in both categories, deal with:
- Course content design
- Instructional strategies
- Instructor development opportunities

The report also discussed, in broad terms, categories to consider in designing and carrying out an implementation plan to take action on the recommendations accepted by the Administrators of the Iowa Community College Online Consortium.

This report provides insight into the "best practices" followed by ICCOC and member schools, and also identifies some areas where proactive steps could be taken by ICCOC and its members to enhance courses and course delivery with the intent of increasing overall course completion rates by students, student retention and student satisfaction. Finally, this report suggests areas, including data collection, for further investigation and action.

APPENDIX

Appendix A – Project Staff

Andrew Bergad, Vice President, EP Operations

Jeff Borden, Director, Training and Consulting

Vicki Harsh, Senior Instructional Design Consultant
Gail Krovitz, Senior Instructional Design Consultant
Ken Switzer, Senior Instructional Design Consultant

Jenyce Rallo, Program Intelligence Manager, Trainer & Consultant

Appendix B – Iowa Assessment Form

Iowa Assessment Form

Course Homepage

Course preview is presented on the homepage	0	1	2	3
Preview statement – Graphic – Directional Text	0 / 3	1/3	2/3	3/3
Use of Announcements	0 None	1 -1/week	2 1/week	3 +1/week

Course Home Elements

Virtual Office (existence of)	Yes / No			
Introductions Thread (existence of, could also be in first Unit)	Yes / No			
Instructor information (Beyond email)	0	1	2	3
Contact Info – Bio – Picture	None	1/3	2/3	3/3

Unit Structure

Consistent Presentation of Content Items	0	1	2	3
Name – Order within a unit – CI Type within a unit (generally)	None	1/3	2/3	3/3
Discussion in 75% or more of units	Yes / No			
Tasks & Deliverables Stated (In Syllabus, Unit, Announcement, Schedule, Tasks, etc.)	Yes / No			

Unit Homepages

Unit preview is presented on the homepage Title – Text – Graphics	0 0 / 3	1 1/3	2 2/3	3 3/3

Unit Content Item Pages

More than 3 CI's per unit (for most units) We can readdress this if not applicable	Yes / No			
Presentation of content follows best practice elements Sans-serif fonts, font size, double coding, images, margins, scrolling, chunking, color, audio, video, etc.	0 0 elements	1 1-2	2 3-4	3 5+

Use of Course Tools

Use of Course Tools Email, Chat, ClassLive, Doc Sharing, Journal, Dropbox, Webliography	0 0 tools	1 1 tool	2 2 tools	3 3+ tools
Gradebook is completely filled out, as appropriate, with grades for students to view	Yes / No			

Use of Evaluation Instruments/Techniques

A variety of assessments are used. Exams, quizzes, discussions, written assignments, team assignments, chats, presentations, etc.	0 0	1 1 Type	2 2 Types	3 3+ Types

Self-assessments and Pre-tests (or other ungraded self-check assessments) are used.	Yes / No

Instructor Interaction	
Instructor provides feedback through the gradebook.	Yes / No
Instructor Response to each student in Introductory Discussion (*do we need N/A?)	Yes / No
Instructor actively participates in unit discussions	0 1 2 3 0 Few / 1 Day Some / 2 Days Lots / 3+ Days

Template Use	
Instructor uses pre-made, Iowa template throughout the course	0 1 2 3 0 Used 1/3 CI Used 2/3 CI Used all CI
Instructor fills in the pre-made, Iowa template (where used)	0 1 2 3 0 / Not filled in / Partially /Completely filled

Appendix C – Assessment Form Summary

Appendix D – ICCOC Program Review PowerPoint Presentation