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Goals for this Session

Via short presentations from three statewide systems:

• Identify similarities and differences among systems that might influence inputs, outputs, and outcomes
• Discuss common QM data points and sources, and how data can be used towards improvement of online learning
• Describe challenges in data collection for statewide systems, as well as opportunities and initiatives moving forward
Plan for Session

• Panel experts share their experience

• Q&A
  • Post on conference app or Twitter #QMConnect
  • Write on note card

• Wrap up
QA @ CSU

- 23 campuses, 479,000 students, 26,000 faculty
- Campuses opt-in to our QA program; 22 involved with 13-15 annually as QM Campus Affiliates.
- 1,400+ QM training completions in the last 5 years
  - 140 certified peer-reviewers; ~100 certified courses
- We track data on: PD completions; Certified peer-reviewers; Course certifications; Grades; Course completion rates; Student survey ratings
Inputs > Outputs > Outcomes

• To improve online learning we strive to go beyond tracking outputs and into analyzing outcomes.
  • Where can you find patterns of best/worst course design?
  • What connections can be made to student experience and performance?
  • How does that inform local professional development efforts and resources?
Accessing & Tracking the Data

- We deal with a variety of data sources:
  - QM subscriber database; CSU Quality Assurance; Campus IR Offices
- How do you gain access to the data?
  - Most complex is navigating relationships with campus IR Office/Director
- How do you track the data?
  - Student Quality Assurance Impact Research (SQuAIR) for system-campus
- How used to improve online learning?
  - Target 10 Critical Elements; Student Survey; Work with IDs
# Coding, Sorting, Weighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Professional Development Topic</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>1 = lower level</th>
<th>5 = higher level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>Independent Applying the QM Rubric (APPQMR)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>Designing Your Online Course (DYOC)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>Addressing Accessibility and Usability (ST8)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>Improving Your Online Course (IYOC)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>Creating Presence in Your Online Course (CPOC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>Designing Your Blended Course (DYBC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewer Course (PRC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Facilitator Certification (FFC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Facilitator Certification (OFC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Reviewer Certification (MRC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving on Informal Review Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving on Formal Review Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving as Master Reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Level Review Certified Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM Course Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other QM workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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tiny.cc/csqa-coding
Student Feedback Invaluable

### CSU Quality Assurance Course Survey

#### Part II – Course Experience

**Course Overview and Introduction**

1. The instructor provided clear and detailed instructions for how to begin accessing all course components, such as syllabus, course calendar, and assignments:
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Somewhat Agree
   - Somewhat Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Not Applicable/No Opinion

2. Detailed information about the instructor was available and included multiple ways to contact him/her, times s/he was available, a brief biography, etc.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Somewhat Agree
   - Somewhat Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Not Applicable/No Opinion

---

25-item survey aligned with QM standards plus CSU delivery elements

[ tiny.cc/csu-student-survey ]
Challenges Overcome

1. Raising awareness, creating a culture
2. Establishing respect for online formats
3. Shifting focus from outputs to outcomes
   • Moving from number trained to exemplars to impact data via SQuAIR
Best Advice for Creating a Plan

1. Learn, adopt, adapt from others

2. Take time to build culture and capacity
   a) Push campuses toward self-sustainability
      1) See CSU QA PLC @ tiny.cc/csuaqa-plc
      2) See CSU QA ePortfolios @ tiny.cc/csuaqa-eports

3. Look for ways to progressively build evidence
   a) squair.csuprojects.org & quarry.calstate.edu
Minnesota Online Quality Initiative
Promoting Quality Course Design Through Statewide Collaboration

Home
On the Calendar...
STAR Symposium – Call for Proposals is Open
The STAR Symposium (virtual conference) will be held on February 10, 2017. Call for Proposals is open.
Official MOQI-Managed QM Course Reviews
Next application deadline: October 31  More Info

Professional Development Opportunities
- Peer Reviewer/ Master Reviewer Mini-Retreat – October 7
- CTOC Workshop (Rochester Community & Technical College) – October 14

MOQI promotes quality course design through professional development, statewide collaboration and shared expertise.

Learn More about MOQI @
http://minnesota.qualitymatters.org
About Our QM Subscription

- Statewide Subscription through Minnesota Learning Commons since 2008
- Public Higher Education
  - Colleges and Universities of Minnesota State (37 institutions)
  - University of Minnesota (5 campuses)
- Department of Education (K-12)
MOQI Goals

For Learners
- Improved learning experience
- Increased satisfaction & success

For Institutions
- Faculty well-trained to deliver high quality learning experiences
- Improved faculty satisfaction
- Improved student success

For System/s
- High quality online and blended courses
- Improved collaboration across system
- Improved Student success
Inputs

- Financial Support
- Co-coordinators
- Reduced cost or free professional development
- QM Subscription subsidy
- Course review subsidy
- Support for QMCs & Reviewers

Outputs

- Numbers (affiliates, reviewers, certified courses, etc.)
- Data/QM Reports
- Survey Data
By the Numbers....

- 40 QM subscribers
- 28 two year institutions
- 7 state universities
- UMN
- 1892 individuals trained
- 109 Peer Reviewers
- 43 Master Reviewers
- 467 certified courses
“Every review that I participate in has a positive impact on my own courses. I see something that doesn't work as well as I would like from a student's perspective or I see something wonderful I think I could modify for my class or I simply get a new idea from the course or from the suggestions of the other reviewers.”

~ Minnesota Peer Reviewer
Challenges

- Expected Outcomes not yet well-defined
- Approaches to quality assurance and/or QM implementation unique to each institution
- Administrative or institutional support
- Budgetary constraints
- Voluntary nature of participation
Minnesota Outcomes

Salehi, N. (2016). Impact of Training and Course Reviews on Faculty and Student Satisfaction

1. What is the impact of faculty training and development on online/hybrid course design?
2. What is the impact of training and development on faculty satisfaction?
3. What is the impact of faculty development and enhanced course design on student satisfaction?
Minnesota Outcomes

McMahon, E. (2016). Impact of Involvement in Quality Matters Course Reviews

1. What are faculty reported impacts of involvement on course design, teaching strategies, student learning and course completion?

2. What methods were used to improve teaching practice across ALL course formats?

3. What changes were made f2f, online and blended courses as a result of expertise gained due to participation with official course review process?

McMahon, E. (2016). Impact of Involvement in Quality Matters Course Reviews
About Our Statewide System

- Formed in academic year 2012-2013
- Largest in the U.S. - 60+ members
- Governed by Executive Committee
- Hosts Annual Member Meeting
- Unique benefits:
  - Reduced institution dues
  - Free & discounted Professional Development
  - Bartering credits system for official QM reviews
  - Member institution mentoring
  - Monthly QMC Webinars
By the Numbers

INCENTIVIZING REVIEWERS & CERTIFICATION
In order to incentivize members to become peer/master reviewers and facilitators, the consortium will pay for the training fees in exchange for their service to the consortium.

▶ APPQMR FACILITATOR
The consortium pays the $500 training fee. In exchange, the facilitator must conduct at least 4 face-to-face APPQMR workshops at institutions other than their home institution within 2 years.

▶ IYOC FACILITATOR
The consortium pays the $200 training fee. In exchange, the facilitator must conduct at least 2 face-to-face IYOC workshops at institutions other than their home institution within 2 years.

▶ PEER REVIEWER CERTIFICATION
The consortium pays the $200 training fee. In exchange, the reviewer must serve on at least 1 QM review in the bartering system within one year.

▶ MASTER REVIEWER CERTIFICATION
The consortium pays the $300 ($50 for recert) training fee. In exchange, the reviewer must chair at least 1 QM review in the bartering system within one year.

THE BARTERING SYSTEM
- Paying annual dues gives your institution 8 bartering credits
- Institutions can decide how many credits they would like to spend
- 8 credits would cover two completely external QM review teams

2 CREDITS = TEAM CHAIR / MASTER REVIEWER
1 CREDIT = SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT (SME)
1 CREDIT = REVIEWER / EXTERNAL REVIEWER

48/60
Institutions actively participate in bartering review credits

120+ Reviews completed in 4 years
OVER $120,000 SAVED
QM Reviews: Current 2017 Numbers

- QM-Managed Reviews, 69, 10%
- QM Ohio Subscriber-Managed, 114, 17%
- QM Ohio Subscriber-Managed with CRM, 99, 15%
- Internal Reviews, 72, 14%
QM Ohio Goals

For Learners
- Promote the importance of QM-Certified courses and why it matters
- Improve the quality of online and hybrid courses throughout the entire State of Ohio

For Faculty & Staff
- Free and reduced-cost professional development
- Continue the support of individual and program QM certifications
- Help provide best practices, examples, tools and strategies for successful online course rollout / development

For Institutions
- Cost savings on subscription fee, professional development, and QM reviews
- Collaboration, community, and mentoring
- Establish QM certification as a rigorous endeavor, which should be recognized in the promotion and tenure process
Challenges and Opportunities

Data Coordination Challenges
❖ Institutional definitions & data collection
❖ Impact of QM Stages of Implementation
❖ Administrative/institutional support

New Initiatives
❖ Institutional/QMC mentoring
❖ Feedback surveys for institutions, workshops, and subscriber-managed review
❖ Working with the Chancellor’s office in the State of Ohio to recognize QM courses
Contact Information

- Brett Christie - bchristie@calstate.edu
- Ashley Skylar - askylar@calstate.edu
- Stephen Kaufman - skaufman@uakron.edu
- Bethany Simunich - bsimunic@kent.edu
- Beth McMahon - Elizabeth.McMahon@northlandcollege.edu
- Kay Shattuck & Barbra Burch - research@qualitymatters.org
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