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Continuous Quality Improvement of Adult Education

Access, Prior Learning, Study Progress, e-Tool Use and Drop-out

Implications for Policy and Organization
Continuous Quality Improvement

ADULT EDUCATION

- **CQI** ‘helps people to set goals, identify resources and strategies, and measure progress towards the institution’s ideal vision of its distinctive purpose’ (Moore, 2005: 3)

- **Blended learning**
  - face-to-face
  - online (co-operative) learning
  - guided selfstudy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Principles</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>The quality of learning online is demonstrated to be at least as good as the institutional norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness and Institutional Commitment</strong></td>
<td>The institution continuously improves services while reducing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td>All learners who wish to learn online can access learning in a wide array of programs and courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Faculty are pleased with teaching online, citing appreciating and happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Students are pleased with their experiences in learning online, including interaction with instructors and peers, learning outcomes that match expectations, services, and orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: The Sloan Consortium Quality Framework and The Five Pillars (partim from Moore, 2005)*
Practice-based Research

QUESTIONS AND WORK FLOW

• Who participates, under which conditions?
• What works - do they learn?
• Are they satisfied about their learning/teaching experiences?

Intended learning outcomes

PSDA Cycle

Continuous feedback
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterium</th>
<th>Practice-Based Research</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Students / Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Learning</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Students / Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Progress and drop-out</td>
<td>Secondary data</td>
<td>Students / Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview / Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Tool Use</td>
<td>Secondary data</td>
<td>Students / Faculty / Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner satisfaction</td>
<td>Interview / Focus group</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty satisfaction</td>
<td>Interview / Focus group</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 CQI Framework for Adult Education at Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel
Access

INDICATORS

- enrollment numbers
- motivation and expectations
- socio-demographics
- travel time
- job conditions
- study background
- technology ownership, knowledge and attitudes
- learning strategies

Figure 1 Intake Questionnaire for Adult Students
Recognition of Prior Learning

**Assessment**

1. no secondary education qualification
2. competences already acquired

**INDICATORS ADMISSION ASSESSMENT**

- receptive reading ability (test)
- motivation, persistence, study skills, sources for support (interview)
- extra: intelligence or language

**INDICATORS EVC**

- knowledge, skills and attitudes
- tests: case, essay, overall, simulation, portfolio with interview, practice- or knowledge-oriented
Example findings:
Study efficiency of all students admitted without qualification during their first year of study (since 2005)
Learning effectiveness and learner satisfaction

**INDICATORS**

- **performance**
  - exams: participation and success
  - success rate

- **study progress**
  - study efficiency short-term
  - cumulative study efficiency
  - rate of formal drop-out (a)
  - rate of informal drop-out (b)
  - reasons for (a) and (b)

- **aptitude of the programme**
- **course evaluation**
- **assessment of teaching**
Implications

- Facts and figures
- Counterbalance limitations of legal framework
- Changes in (blended) teaching approach
- Adaptations in study and learning path counseling
- Improved support and in-service training
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