Quality Process for KanTRAIN Deliverables

# Introduction

KanTRAIN is a consortium of four institutions of Higher Education in Kansas: [Flint Hill Technical College (FHTC);](https://fhtc.edu/web/site/main) [Garden City Community College](https://www.gcccks.edu/) (GCCC); [Wichita Area Technical College](https://wsutech.edu/) now [Wichita State University Campus of Applied Sciences and Technology](https://wsutech.edu/) (WSU Tech); and, [Washburn University Institute of Technology](http://www.washburntech.edu) (WUIT). The consortium is led by [Washburn University of Topeka](http://www.wasburn.edu). Each institution in the consortium is committed to providing deliverables that contribute to the body of knowledge housed in the Skills Commons Open Educational Resources (OER) depository for TAACCCT grant deliverables. Washburn developed a review process to ensure that each deliverable was reviewed according to the guidelines provided in the [SGA](http://www.doleta.gov/grants/pdf/SGA-DFA-PY-13-10.pdf) (p.35). The process outlined below builds on the individual consortium college processes that are already established as noted below.

# Quality Processes within the Consortium Institutions:

Each institution in the consortium is accredited by the [Higher Learning Commission](https://www.hlcommission.org/) (HLC). The HLC processes assure that each accredited institution meets the [Criteria for Accreditation](https://www.hlcommission.org/Policies/criteria-and-core-components.html) that includes:

* Criterion 3. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support: the institution provides high quality education, [wherever and however its offerings are delivered](https://www.hlcommission.org/Policies/glossary-new-criteria-for-accreditation.html).
* Each consortium institution has an internal process that ensure that the curricula developed at that institution meets the quality standards and supports Criterion 3 referenced above. This process typically consists of a curriculum committee that meets to review and approve new curriculum.
* Each college also submits new programs to the curriculum review process developed by the [Kansas Board of Regents](http://www.Kansasregents.org) for approval before the curriculum is eligible for Federal Financial Aid and offered to the students.

# KanTRAIN Quality Process

To supplement the internal processes of the colleges and to meet the guidelines in the SGA, KanTRAIN developed the following Quality Assurance process for deliverables.

1. Writing and Submitting the Deliverable
	* Each consortium institution site coordinator was responsible for gathering or writing the deliverable on behalf of their institution. He/she ensured that a Deliverable Entry Form[[1]](#footnote-1) was filled out for each deliverable and submitted the deliverable for grant management review.
2. Review of the Deliverable
	* The grant management team reviewed the deliverable and any needed changes were communicated to the site coordinator. Modifications were submitted back to grant management. The review processes included ensuring that the correct US Department of Labor disclaimers were included and that the document had the appropriate CCBY license. The document was also checked for accessibility using the MSOffice Suite Accessibility Checking process. Necessary corrections were made to ensure no accessibility errors were found. Progress was tracked on a shared Tracking Sheet.
	* Deliverables were categorized by the sites into Program Support Materials or Learning Resource Deliverables. The different process for each set of documents in outlined below.

## Program Support Materials

* + Program Support Materials were uploaded to Skills Commons with no further review using the information provided on the Deliverable Entry Form.
	+ Once confirmation was received from [Skills Commons](http://www.skillscommons.org) that the upload was successful, the sites were asked to review the upload and provide any necessary edits or corrections to grant management for correction.

## Learning Resource Deliverables

* + Learning Resource Deliverables were further reviewed according to the [SGA](http://www.doleta.gov/grants/pdf/SGA-DFA-PY-13-10.pdf) (p.35)
1. Subject Mater Expert Review
	* KanTRAIN contracted with subject matter experts in curriculum (SMEs) to review all curriculum related deliverables. The SMEs were individuals with demonstrated experience in developing and/or implementing similar deliverables. They included qualified individuals from Washburn faculty and staff as well as from a community college in Kansas that was not part of the consortium. Each reviewer had expertise in curriculum development and assessment of student learning.
	* The Learning Resource deliverables were posted to a shared folder that could be accessed by the SMEs and they were provided with appropriate rubrics for their evaluations[[2]](#footnote-2). Once the review had been completed, they posted their reviews back into the shared folder. The names of the reviewers were redacted, and the reviews were shared with the site that had developed the deliverable. The sites had the option to revise the deliverable or not. About 50% of the deliverables were reviewed by a second reviewer to ensure interrater reliability.
2. Accessibility Review
	* KanTRAIN entered into a contract with RTI to review documents for ADA compliance that were to be submitted to the repository. This provided an external, third-party review for validation of accessibility compliance.
	* If several documents used the same template, a sample document was submitted to RTI to identify any accessibility issues and then either consortium staff or the KT liaison fixed the issues identified in all the documents that used that template.
	* RTI remediated documents and provided a checklist that noted any compliance issues for each document submitted.
	* All learning resource documents were reviewed by RTI and the results reported during the upload process through Skills Commons.
3. Grant Management Review
	* When the deliverable had been through a third-party subject matter expert review, the deliverable was brought to grant management for final review and approval. If any modifications were needed, grant management consulted with the site coordinator to make needed modifications.
4. Submission to DOL
	* All deliverables that have met final approval by grant management were stored in a shared folder on a secure server and submitted to Skills Commons along with the related Subject Matter Expert reviews.
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## Appendix 1

Quality Rubric for Curriculum Materials

# Reviewer’s Name Date:

# Instructions:

Review the document(s) assigned to you. Evaluate the curriculum materials collectively, as appropriate, and use this document to assess the quality by selecting the applicable rating for each category. For example: all simulation scenarios for a course or program could be reviewed together. However, if individual documents are not of similar quality, they must be reviewed separately.

## List documents included in this review:

| **Criteria** | **3 – Superior** | **2 – Strong** | **1 – Limited** | **0 – Weak**  | **N/A** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Learning Objectives/Outcomes** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The material relates directly to one or more of the course objectives stated in the course syllabus. | The learning objectives of the scenario are clearly stated and are designed to assist the student to achieve mastery of one or more course outcomes or objectives.  | The learning objectives of the scenario are clearly stated and are designed to assist the student to learn the one or more course outcomes or objectives.  | The learning objectives are unclear, not stated or only indirectly relate to any of the course objectives.  | There is little relationship between the material and any of the course objectives or outcomes stated in the course syllabus.  | This does not apply. |  |
| **2. Use of Information** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The information provided in the material covers the subject matter and is specific to the subject matter.  | Demonstrates sound use of scholarly information about the subject matter. Elements of the subject matter are covered thoroughly. | Demonstrates moderate use of scholarly information about the subject matter, and addresses some elements are covered with excellent clarity and thoroughness while others could be improved. | Minimal use of scholarly information. Subject matter elements are addressed, but material lacks thoroughness and clarity. | Little to no use of information | This does not apply. |  |

| **Criteria** | **3 – Superior** | **2 – Strong** | **1 – Limited** | **0 – Weak**  | **N/A** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Quality of Explanation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The subject matter in the material is explained thoroughly and in a clear and concise manner.  | Provides comprehensive information so effectively that the target audience[[3]](#footnote-3) should be able to understand the subject matter and connect important associated concepts. The main ideas of the subject matter are clearly identified. | Subject matter is presented in a way that makes skills, procedures, concepts, and/or information understandable. It does not make connections among important associated concepts within the subject matter. | Subject matter is explained correctly but in a limited way. The explanations are not thorough and would likely serve as a review for most learners. | Information is presented in a way that makes it confusing or it contains errors. There is little likelihood that this object will contribute to understanding | This does not apply. |  |
| **4. Organization of content** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Format of the material is presented in such a manner that the information presented is easy to follow.  | The object shows a continuous progression of ideas and tells a complete, easily followed story. Well organized. Excellent, well thought out explanation shows superior effort. | The object is fairly well organized. Format is easy to follow. Good explanation but not excellent. | Portions may be poorly organized. Hard to follow the progressions of the presentation.  | Not organized. Difficult to follow. Poor quality. | This does not apply. |  |
| **5. Usefulness** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is the subject matter relevant to the target audience[[4]](#footnote-4)? | The information presented is relevant to the target audience and promotes further discussion and/or understanding of the topic. | The information presented is relevant but does not provide useful information to promote further discussion and/or understanding of the topic. | The information is relevant but limited.  | The object’s usefulness for target audience is in question. Does not inform and does not stay focused on the topic. | This does not apply. |  |
| **6. Assessment** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessment of student learning is included and is aligned to the content and performance expectations stated or implied.  | The assessment is included and relates directly to the learning objectives. The assessment requires students to create, evaluate or analyze what has been learned.  | The assessment is included and relates directly to the learning objectives. The assessment requires students to apply, understand or remember what has been learned | The assessment is included but does not relate directly to the learning objectives.  | No assessment is provided, or the assessment contains significant errors | This does not apply. |  |

## Please provide Feedback for the criteria above.

### Learning Objectives/Outcomes

### Use of Information

### Quality of Explanation

### Organization of content

###  Usefulness

## Overall Feedback

## To Be completed BY Grant Management

| **6. Accessibility/Disclaimers/CCBY** | **Yes\No\NA** |
| --- | --- |
| Each document has no errors according to the MS word accessibility check. |  |
| Each document passes the RTI accessibility check |  |
| Each document contains the US Department of Labor disclaimers |  |
| Each document includes the CCBY license |  |
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1. This form mirrors the criteria required for the Skills Commons upload process. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The QOCI rubric was used for all syllabi. Other material was reviewed using the rubric attached as Appendix 1 that was adapted from rubrics posted on Skill Commons. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Target audience refers to student(s) enrolled for the program for which the material was created. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)