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Program Evaluation and Vision

Explore move to Entry Level OTD

- Examine existing curriculum strengths and challenges utilizing collaboration and authentic dialogue

- Program Evaluation discussions and novel attempts at looking at program led to curriculum mapping literature

- Led to one year formative evaluation study utilizing mapping, faculty interviews and iterative group analysis
Why mapping?

- The guide aint’ the curriculum (English, 1980).

- Mapping process includes:
  - Content actually taught
  - How long taught
  - Match between what is taught and what is assessed
## Curriculum Mapping

*Map an entire curriculum – course to outcome*
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- **I** = Introduced
- **D** = Developed & Practiced with Feedback
- **M** = Demonstrated at the Mastery Level Appropriate for Graduation
- **^** = Denotes where the signature assignment is given
- ***** = Outcome is introduced in a prerequisite course
## Map a course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Content</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Paradigms</strong></td>
<td>Understand the differences between quantitative &amp; qualitative ways of knowing</td>
<td>Discussion and Application of knowledge to framing of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Searching the Literature</strong></td>
<td>Conduct a review of the literature using multiple databases</td>
<td>Provides 20 relevant articles in APA format*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesize literature to identify themes and gaps</td>
<td>Outline of literature review that supports research*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mapping in the Health Sciences (Willett, 2008)

- Survey sent to Canada and UK medical schools
  - 90% of 31 schools are implementing mapping
  - Mapping was useful in
    - Making curriculum transparent
    - Conducting holistic curriculum evaluation

- Challenges
  - Time
  - Funding
  - Human resources
Pharmacy and Nursing
(Britton et al, 2008; Plaza, et al, 2007)
(Landry, 2011)

- Mapping is an expectation in evaluation and assessment of outcomes in pharmaceutical education
  - Utilize electronic systems

- Nursing in two community colleges and a state university developed audit tool to review course syllabi
  - Revealed gaps and redundancies
  - Enabled revisions and collaborations
The Sage Plan

- Foster collaboration
- Discuss content and pedagogy
- Share knowledge about teaching and learning
- Align curriculum
- Authentic dialogue
Crafting Collaborative Dialogue
(Briggs, 2007; Simpson, 2009; Uchiyama & Radin, 2010)

Department as Unit of Social Organization

Commitment to Authenticity
Guiding Theoretical Models

Fourth Generation Evaluation
(Guba and Lincoln, 1989; 2001)

Deliberative Democratic Evaluation
(House and Howe, 1999)

- Individuals have pre-existing constructions about the curricula and these constructions need to be made transparent to the group
- Value is placed on inclusive dialogue that allows for the free expression of differing opinions
- Process of evalulative dialogue aims to develop shared understandings and/or consensus
Mid-term Faculty Retreat: Interview Findings Mapping Analyses Pair and Share (Jan.)

Study Design (June-Aug.)

Faculty Negotiation (Sept.)

Start Curriculum Mapping (Sept.)

Mapping & Check-ins (Oct.-Dec.)

Conduct Individual Interviews (October)

Interview Analysis & Representation (Nov.-Dec.)

Peer Debriefing (Nov.)

Summer through Fall Semester
Spring Semester

1. Repeat Curriculum Mapping (Jan.-April)
2. End of year Faculty Retreat: Mapping Analyses Action Planning (May)
3. End-Report Out
Curricular Context

Foundations & Professional Responsibilities
Evaluation & Intervention in Practice Settings
OT Service Delivery & Research

Supporting Theme I: Person Environment Occupation Relationships
Supporting Theme II: Therapeutic Style & Interactions
Supporting Theme III: Competent Practice

The Sage Colleges Program in Occupational Therapy
Faculty Commitment

- Complete curricular maps in real time
- Participate in semi-structured interviews about program history, delivery and future projections
- Review and analyze maps and data from interview at January retreat
Interviews

- Semi-structured individual meetings
- 45-60 minutes
- Provided questions prior to meeting
- Audio taped and transcribed
- Member checking
Interview Analysis

1. Co-investigators individually coded the data identifying:

   Claims – shared positive assertions about the program

   Concerns – shared unfavorable assertions

   Issues – Areas of disagreement (Guba and Lincoln, 1989)

2. Coded quotations were compared and discussed to establish intercoder agreement (Saldana, 2009).

3. Five emergent categories were co-constructed to subsume Claims, Concerns and Issues.

4. Trustworthiness of the process was maintained by conducting Member Checking and Peer Debriefing (Krefting, 1991).
Interview Findings: Claims and Concerns

- Claims and Concerns coded into 5 categories:
  - **Curriculum** - “Designed to produce strong occupation-centered focused practitioners.” (claim)
    “Need to take more steps to create synchrony in honoring the diversity of teaching methods and assessments strategies.” (concern)
  - **Experiential learning** – “Integrated fieldwork is a strength.” (claim)
    “Value-added activities taking up a lot of time given the other demands of the program.” (concern)
  - **Student life**
  - **Faculty collaboration**
  - **Connection to the college community**
Faculty Collaboration (concern)

“It is challenging to find time for collaborations in the context of over-the-top curriculum.”

“We tend to work in silos and this creates turf issues.”

“We’re not always aware of what everyone else is teaching and when a problem occurs we don’t always collect all the data. We need to be better information gathers before judging”.

“We need to strengthen our ability to talk with one and another.”

“We are all strong within ourselves and there are times when we support each other, but it is not the culture.”

“It feels like competition over collaboration.”
Issues - Faculty perceptions varied when speaking about:

1. Equity across course load
2. Assessment practices
3. Our ability to be student centered, for example:

“We make changes, move deadlines, accommodate, look at scheduling, sometimes bend over backwards...we are very much toward the student and I think that is what we should be doing.”

“We do not hold students to professional development issues and time management issues, it is important to be flexible, but we move the line a lot and that doesn’t do anybody any favors.”

“Sometimes we are not comfortable hearing a student voice and helping them to shape that voice to a point where it can be used professionally....sometimes it is not an equal relationship.”
Pair and Share: Discussion of Issues

✧ Do all three credit courses have to be created equal – how so, how not?

✧ What does a student-centered learning environment look like, sound like, and feel like?

✧ What makes for good assessment?

✧ What does faculty collaboration look like, sound like and feel like?
Ground Rules for Retreats

- Focus on current Masters curriculum
- Only on matters we could change as a team
- Parking lot for other matters
- Listen through lens of Program Director
- Not defend or advocate any particular course
- Past performances or personal beliefs were sidelined
- Negotiate outcomes and action steps by end of each day
## Mapping Process

Course:__________________                  Month: September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Content</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter for session</td>
<td>Desired proficiencies using an action verb to begin the statement</td>
<td>Specific and engaging product and performance providing evidence of student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed succinct, clear references to key concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mapping: Small Group Analysis

- Divided faculty into 2 groups of 5 each
- Each group member reviewed 4-5 maps
- Reviewed as group with discussion
- Two teams rejoined for sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Gaps</th>
<th>Possible Repetitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues with Assessments</td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mapping: Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAPS</th>
<th>REPETITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Bolster some content areas</td>
<td>• Identified redundancies that promote higher level learning and those that detracted from the learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stronger links between certain courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Certain populations need better address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrate emerging practice areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Struggle with moving to student centered and OT focused learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ASSESSMENTS

- Further examine how assessments can be best used as a learner focused tool rather than an outcome instrument
  - Explore how to best use peer feedback and self-assessed learning
- How are we enhancing or detracting from cultivating self-regulated learners in our assessment processes?

### QUESTIONS

- A number of questions across courses focusing on:
  - the sequence of course activities and courses
  - the role and utility of value added topics and assessments
Discussion

Timing is Everything

Conducting the study outside of an impending accreditation visit provided space for reflection.

Acculturating study activities into departmental routines was helpful to buy-in and do-ability.

Completing maps in *real time* created a powerful portrait of the program.
Discussion

**Less is More**

Rather than casting a wide variable net, we opted for depth of dialogue.

Our analysis of gaps, repetitions, and assessments raised larger pedagogical questions and strategies:

- What is a self-regulated learner?
- How can we build stronger curricular bridges?
- Where can peers better provide support to one and other?
Discussion

Strength Lies in Differences

As a department, there are differences among the faculty and like other groups, sometimes those differences get us stuck.

Adhering to conversational guidelines that allowed for authentic dialogue allowed us to step outside of our routine ways of relating.

The study helped us to examine our preparedness for the OTD, catalyzed collaboration and created a foundation for future deliberations.
Limitations

Research in One’s Own Backyard

Program of a Kind -> Transferability
Future Directions

• Building on process for curricular renewal
• Deconstructing and rebuilding for an OTD
• Expand mapping processes to explore interprofessional integration of curriculum
• Continuing authentic dialogue
• Follow up and evolution of action planning
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