Two Studies Reveal Impact of QM Across Delivery Formats
Two Parts to Today’s Presentation

• Part 1: Analysis of review exit survey data:
  
  Melissa Poole

• Part 2: Impact of QM professional development on face-to-face teaching:

  Kay Shattuck
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Plan for Our Session

- What the review exit surveys suggested (Melissa)
- What, why, and how we dug deeper (Kay)
- What we learned (Kay)
- How you can use this to improve student learning and persistence to degree or certification (All)
Show of Hands

- I’ve done official QM reviews (had my course reviewed or served as a peer reviewer)
- I’ve completed at least one QM course or workshop
- I’m fairly new to QM

8th QM Annual Conference – October/November 2016 – Portland, OR
The QM toolset and process:

A faculty-drive, peer review process that is . . .

• Collaborative
• Collegial
• Continuous
• Centered – in research literature – around student learning
For official Higher Education QM reviews, Review Teams consist of:

- **3 QM-Certified Peer Reviewers**
  Prerequisite: Current for-credit online teaching experience and professional development

- **Master Reviewer as team chair**
  Peer Reviewer with additional experience and professional development

- **One reviewer must be a subject matter expert**

- **At least one reviewer must be external to the institution sponsoring the course**

**AND**

- Faculty developer/instructor
- Access to Rubric prior to review
- Involved in pre-review discussions
- Consulted during review
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QM Peer Reviews

- 3,500 Peer Reviewers
- 670 Master Reviewers
- 5,890 Courses QM Certified
- 5,700 Internal Reviews
- Over 12,000 Courses Reviewed using QM Tools
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Course Review Exit Survey

• Reviews using QM Rubric, 5th edition

• Survey ALL team members
  (Course Rep, Reviewers, QMC)


• Approx. 1750 reviews

• 62% response rate
Student Impact: Instructor’s Courses
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Quality Matters – A national benchmark for online course design.
Themes Identified

- Learn from others
- Leadership
- Collegiality
- Recognition
- Learning Experience
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Value of Participation in Reviews

- Reviewer service is faculty professional development
  - learn from other reviewers and the process
  - gain valuable leadership experience
  - are recognized by peers for their individual contributions
- Promotes continuous quality improvement
  - Reviewers improve their OWN courses

IDEA SHOPPING
PARALLEL REVIEW
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An example from QM’s Higher Education Course Review Exit Survey Data
- February 2015 – October 2016
- All roles, N=8750
- Self-reported data about behavior and intended behavior
Impact for Online Courses

As a result of your participation as a _______ in QM course reviews, have you or do you intend to make changes in your online courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes (N)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QMC</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3563</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Impact for F2F Courses

As a result of your participation as a _______ in QM course reviews, have you or do you intend to make changes in your F2F courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes (N)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QMC</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer Review at Your Institution

Benefits of peer review include:

• Carryover effects to non-reviewed courses, including F2F courses

• Increased technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge (TPACK)

• Promotion of a culture of teaching and learning across campus
What Works for You?

• What peer-to-peer activities work at your institution?
  • Peer review?
  • Peer collaboration or sharing?
  • Mentoring programs?

• What would you like to see implemented?