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Course-Level Curriculum Map Pilot Program

Abstract

Objective: To pilot a newly developed course level curriculum map that documents course learning outcomes, corresponding teaching activities, assessments, student achievement on assessments, and evidence-based changes made subsequently at the course level.

Method: The newly developed course level curriculum map was piloted in twelve courses involving nine faculty members. Faculty either retroactively recorded data or utilized the map during the semester. At the conclusion of the pilot period, a focus group was conducted during which seven of the faculty members shared experiences and recommendations. Focus group comments were recorded by three people. Recorders’ notes were compared for accuracy and completeness. Notes were analyzed using ATLAS.ti, a qualitative research program.

Results: Qualitative analysis of focus group notes yielded four principal comment codes: learning outcomes, changing activities, documenting changes, and changing assessments. These four main codes document that faculty believe work is needed on writing better course learning outcomes, creating more appropriately matched course activities, better documenting data-driven changes that occur at the course level, and developing appropriate assessments.

Implications: Faculty comments support school-wide adoption of course level curriculum mapping. They also suggest a need to provide faculty development on writing precise learning outcomes and mapping them to specific classroom activities to support outcomes achievement. Additionally, curricular changes made at the course level need to be carefully documented and linked to appropriate evidence derived from assessments. The value of the map for inclusion in the dossier for promotion and tenure was also noted.
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The purpose of this program was to pilot a newly developed course-level curriculum map that assists faculty in documenting:

- learning outcomes
- program level curricular mapping
- teaching activities
- assessments
- student achievement
- evidence-based changes made to the courses

The course-level map helps faculty complete the cycle of student learning assessment as outlined in Middle States Standard 14:

1. Develop clearly articulated written statements of key learning outcomes
2. Design experiences that provide opportunities for students to achieve outcomes
3. Assess student achievement of outcomes
4. Use results of assessment to improve teaching and learning

Faculty piloted the course level map in twelve courses involving nine faculty members.

Faculty recorded data either retroactively or during the semester.

A focus group was conducted.

Comments were coded and analyzed using ATLAS.ti.

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE**

**METHODS**

**RESULTS**

- Qualitative analysis of focus group data yielded four distinct comment areas:
  1. Drafting learning outcomes
  2. Changing course activities
  3. Documenting changes
  4. Changing assessments

**CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS**

- Faculty comments support school-wide adoption of course level curriculum mapping.
- Faculty development is needed on writing precise learning outcomes.
- Curricular changes documented at the course level should be evidence-based.
- Completed course-level maps will assist in programmatic curriculum review.
- The course level mapping can be valuable for inclusion in promotion and tenure dossier.