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Brief Overview of Quality Matters

1. Rubric
   a. 8 General Standards & 43 Specific Review Standards
2. Review Process
3. Professional Development
Introduction – Purpose of study

Why did we do this?

Data Drive Program Revision: Need to make decisions based on the data we have

- What’s going on with these courses?
- How can we provide more support to faculty?
- How can we create design processes that help faculty build better courses?
### Literature – what we know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅ Positive student/teacher perspective (Kearns &amp; Mancilla, 2017; Mozelius, et al., 2018; Little, 2009; Roehrs, et al., 2013; Young, 2014)</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### What we know about course reviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials, course technology &amp; course activities that promote active engagement and achievement of learning goals (Kwon, 2017; Shattuck, 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to navigate through the course/course orientation (Kwon, 2017; Little, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear explanation of the course materials (Kwon, 2017; Little, 2009; McMahon, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Kwon, 2017; Shattuck, 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research questions

Question 1: What are the trends in the QM Internal Review scores from 2015-2019?
• 1.1 How have scores changed over time?
• 1.2 Which standards are met most/least overall?
• 1.3 Is there any correlation between standards that are met/not met together? (e.g., groups of standards)

Question 2: What role does institutional context play in these trends?
• 2.1 How did QM training impact the internal review scores?
• 2.2 How did institutional processes impact the review scores?
Methods

Data Collection

1. Collect course review data (n=70)
   • Course name
   • Year review was completed
   • Overall score: Met/Not Met
   • Score for each Specific Review Standard

2. Collect qualitative data
   • Interview with QM coordinator
   • Institutional records

Data analysis RQ1

RQ 1.1: Score changes over time
   • ANOVA, to determine relationship between year and score for General Standards
   • Chi square to determine relationship between year and score for Specific Review Standards

RQ 1.2: Standards met most/least
   • Frequency analysis (percentage met scores for each SRS)

RQ 1.3: Correlation between standards
   • Spearman Rho correlation analysis

RQ 1.4: What role does institutional context play in these trends?
   • Grounded theory analysis of interviews and institutional records; themes to explain trends
Question 1.1: How did scores change over time?

• **General Standards**: Only 2015 scores statistically impacted by year (likely due to low sample size).
  • But...

• 2 General trends were discovered.
**Trend 1:** After rising from 2015 to 2016, scores *decreased* in 2017.

Scores dropped 2016-2017 for:
- Standard 2: Learning Objectives
- Standard 3: Assessment & Measurement
- Standard 4: Instructional Materials
- Standard 5: Learning Activities & Learner Interaction
- Standard 8: Accessibility & Usability
Except for General Standards 1, 6, and 7, which increased in 2017.

Standard 6: Course Technology (SRS 6.1 & 6.2)

Standard 1: Course Overview & Introduction (SRS 1.1 – 1.9)

Standard 7: Learner Support (SRS 7.1 & 7.2)
**Trend 2:** All General Standard scores (except 3 and 8) peaked in 2018
Wildcat Design Set

Start Here

Add dates and restrictions...

This module contains important information that will help you be successful in this course. Please read each section thoroughly as there will be a Syllabus Quiz covering this information.
These General Standards *Did Not* Peak in 2018

Standard 3: Assessment & Measurement

Standard 8: Accessibility & Usability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Review Standards at least 80% met (78%, n=21)</th>
<th>Specific Review Standards under 80% met (22%, n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 1.8</td>
<td>2.4 The relationship between <strong>learning objectives or competencies and learning activities</strong> is clearly stated. (62% Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1, 2.3, 2.5</td>
<td>1.6 <strong>Computer skills and digital information literacy skills</strong> expected of the learner are clearly stated. (66% Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1, 3.2</td>
<td>8.2 The course design facilitates <strong>readability</strong>. (68% Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1, 4.2</td>
<td>3.3 Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the <strong>evaluation of learners’ work, and their connection to the course grading policy</strong> is clearly explained. (71% Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1, 5.2, 5.3</td>
<td>2.2 The <strong>module/unit-level learning objectives</strong> describe outcomes that are measurable &amp; consistent with course-level objectives or competencies. (73% Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1, 6.2</td>
<td>8.3 The course provides <strong>accessible text and images</strong> in files, documents, LMS pages, and web pages to meet the needs of diverse learners. (74% Met)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1, 7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Template</td>
<td>Institutional Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SRS 1.6</strong> Computer skills and digital information literacy skill</td>
<td><strong>SRS 2.2</strong> The module/unit-level learning objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SRS 2.4</strong> relationship between learning objectives or competencies and learning activities</td>
<td><strong>SRS 3.3</strong> Specific and descriptive criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SRS 8.2</strong> Readability</td>
<td><strong>SRS 8.3</strong> Accessible text and images</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 1.3: Is there any correlation between standards that are met/not met together?

Three clusters (positive correlations) found:

- Clear Communication Cluster
- Learning Objectives Cluster
- Policy Cluster
Clear Communication Cluster

• 1.3 Communication expectations for online discussions, email, and other forms of interaction are clearly stated.
• 1.4 Course and institutional policies with which the learner is expected to comply are clearly stated within the course, or a link to current policies is provided.
• 1.8 The self-introduction by the instructor is professional and is available online.
General Standard 2: Correlation Cluster

Learning Objectives Cluster

• 2.2 The module/unit-level learning objectives or competencies describe outcomes that are measurable and consistent with the course-level objectives or competencies.

• 2.4 The relationship between learning objectives or competencies and learning activities is clearly stated.

• 2.5 The learning objectives or competencies are suited to the level of the course.

• 2.3 Learning objectives or competencies are stated clearly, are written from the learner’s perspective, and are prominently located in the course.
General Standard 7: Correlation Cluster

Policy Cluster

• 7.1 The course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered and how to obtain it.

• 7.2 Course instructions articulate or link to the institution’s accessibility policies and services.
Summary: Role of Context

Institution
UArizona
1) Policies differ across colleges and programs
2) Intra-office collaboration (DL + DRC + OIA + Faculty)

Ingredients for our Success

1. Systematic process
2. Design templates
3. Scaffolded and targeted training

Department
Digital Learning Office team collaboration (CI + ID + InTech + Creative)

National - QM Rubric
Rubric revisions
Conclusion

Advocate for change and support at the institutional level (enterprise licenses, training)

Design with rubric in mind

Inclusive across campus; bring all stakeholders in
Reflection and Q&A

What trends do you see in your institutional course reviews?

What next steps might you take given your institutional context?
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