

# INTRODUCTION

Online education has been promising. Online courses provide opportunities for those who work full-time to continue their education. Flexibility, variety of technology, and access to a variety of resources encourages universities and colleges to switch to a more online educational system. Like any other type of education, online education requires certain rules and standards in order to enhance the necessary outcomes of learning. Different sets of standards that colleges and universities have defined their online courses. Online course design, content, and activities are different from face-to-face, therefore a rubric can help the design of a better class.

# WHAT IS QM RUBRIC?

QM Rubric includes eight general standards, and guideline to help the educators include the important guidelines, components and activities when they design online courses.

QM Eight General Standards Are:

- ❖ Course Overview and Introduction
- ❖ Learning Objectives
- ❖ Assessment and Measurement
- ❖ Instructional Materials
- ❖ Learner Interaction and Engagement
- ❖ Course Technology
- ❖ Learner Support
- ❖ Accessibility

# STATEMENT OF PROBLEM AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

- ❖ The QM Rubric was designed to guide course development to ensure that students experienced specific learning outcomes.
- ❖ It is unknown if online students experience learning outcomes that align with the essential standards of the Quality Matters Rubric.
- ❖ The Research Question is : Are students experiencing the intended outcomes of the Quality Matters Standards?
- ❖ This study measured the actual experience of students.

# STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ONLINE LEARNING

Knowles and Kalata (2010) studied the impact of Quality Matters standards on student perceptions of online courses. They studied whether students would evaluate a course using quality standards with the same outcomes as the Quality Matters reviewers.

Results of that study showed students' expectations or experiences were not similar to the reviewers. Reviewers believed the courses were not QM qualified, while students scored courses as satisfactory.

# SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

- ❖ There is little or no study which has been published that measures the actual students' experience of the QM required outcomes.
- ❖ A Likert survey was conducted based on the essential QM standards. There are statements that examines the actual experiences of students and students can strongly disagree or agree with that statement, based on their actual experience.

# SURVEY QUESTIONS

## SURVEY QUESTIONS ALLIGNED WITH QM STANDARDS

<b>Questions</b>	<b>QM rubric standard</b>
1. When I first entered the course it was clear to me where to get started and the location of necessary course components.	1.1 Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components
2. The purpose and the structure of this course are clear to me.	1.2 Students are introduced to the purpose and structure of the course.
3. I have access to course objectives and they are measurable to me.	2.1 The course learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable.

# SAMPLE QUESTION

7. I have found the Learning objectives in this course to be appropriately designed for my learning level.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Satisfactory
- Non-Satisfactory
- Strongly Disagree
- Other:

# RESEARCH METHOD

- ❖ 15 out of 18 professors of online classes agreed to participate.
- ❖ Blind study: 100 out of 275 students selected randomly by an external secretary.
- ❖ A survey was created by the researcher aligned with the 21 essential standards from the QM rubric.
- ❖ A single statement was written to align with each standard.
- ❖ Students signified approval for participating in the study by completing the online Google Docs survey.
- ❖ Students were given the opportunity to react to each statement using the Likert scale of 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree).



# SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

- ❖ A secretary contacted each student individually through e-mail sending the link of the survey to them.
- ❖ Students replied to the survey with the understanding that the survey results would be used for a study.
- ❖ Each student received two reminder e-mails. The first reminder email was sent two days after the original email. The second reminder email was sent two days after that.
- ❖ The secretary changed the students' names with pseudonyms.

# SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

- ❖ The secretary sent the results with the pseudonyms to the researcher. 36% of the selected students replied.
- ❖ The secretary changed the students' names with pseudonyms.
- ❖ The secretary sent the results with the pseudonyms to the researcher. 36% of the selected students replied.

# RESULTS

## *Survey Results*

<b>Response</b>	<b>SA+A</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>NS+SD</b>	<b>Other</b>
Average Percentage of Students	83.5%	11.35%	2.85	2.3

SA+A = Strongly Agree + Agree, S= Satisfactory, NS+SD= Non Satisfactory + Strongly Disagree

- ❖ 82% of the students ranked the statements positive.
- ❖ Only 3% of the results showed dissatisfaction.
- ❖ 11% explained their experience satisfactory.
- ❖ 4% selected the category others.

# AN UNEXPECTED RESULT

- ❖ A statement related to how accessible Assistive Technology is for students with special needs was answered by 50% of the selected students.
- ❖ Students had the option to answer “Not Applicable” if they were not special need student.
- ❖ This means that 50% of the students may have felt that they required the technological accommodations. It could also mean that they did not read the question carefully. Either way, this may be the basis for future research.

# DISCUSSION

- ❖ Overall the answer to the research question, “Are online students’ experiencing learning outcomes that align with the essential standards of the Quality Matters Rubric?” relates to student’s tendency to evaluate their experiences of outcomes in a positive manner.
- ❖ This indicates that the courses that were QM certified by the Office of Continuing and Distance Education were indeed achieving the intended QM Rubric outcomes.

# LIMITATIONS

- ❖ The overall number of the QM-approved online courses may not be a good representation of all the online course.
- ❖ Another limitation was a lack of previous studies done in this area.
- ❖ The fact that 50% of students replied positively to question 21 which is about the assistive technology and accommodation, brings to doubt about whether they are people who really need the accommodation or simply misinterpreted the question.

# CONCLUSION

- ❖ QM-certified courses are providing students with the learning outcomes intended by the QM design.
- ❖ Since there are no previous studies of students' actual experience of the outcomes, this can provide the foundation for ongoing research into the effects of Quality Matters Rubrics on course design.
- ❖ Future studies should measure the effects of independent variables (e.g., age, student status, gender, and race) on these outcomes.

## REFERENCES

- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (n.d.). *Mission Statement*. Retrieved from [http://www.educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&id=2328&Itemid=4340](http://www.educateiowa.gov/index.php?option=com_content&id=2328&Itemid=4340)
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011). *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialog*. Retrieved from [http://www.ccsso.org/documents/2011/intasc\\_model\\_core\\_teaching\\_standards\\_2011.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/documents/2011/intasc_model_core_teaching_standards_2011.pdf)
- Driscoll, A., Jicha, K., Hunt, A. N., Tichavsky, L., & Thompson, G. (2012). Can online courses deliver in-class results?: A comparison of student performance and satisfaction in an online versus a face-to-face introductory sociology course. *Teaching Sociology*, 40, 312-331. doi:10.1177/0092055X12446624
- International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL). (2011). *National Standards for Quality Online Courses: Version 2*. International Association For K-12 Online Learning. Retrieved from [www.inacol.org](http://www.inacol.org)
- Knowles, E. E., & Kalata, K. (2010, June). *The impact of QM standards on learning experiences in online courses*. [2009 QM Research Grant]. Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Quality Matters Conference, Oak Brook, IL.
- Quality Matters Program. (2011). *Quality Matters rubric workbook for higher education (2011-2013 ed.)*. Annapolis, MD: Maryland Online.
- Shattuck, K. (2007). Quality matters: Collaborative program planning at a state level. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 10(3). Retrieved from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall103/shattuck103.htm>
- Shattuck, K. (2012). *What we're learning from Quality Matters-focused research: Research, practice, continuous improvement*. Unpublished Manuscript. Quality Matter Program. Annapolis, MD.
- Simunich, B., Robins, D., & Kelly, V. (2012, October). *Does findability matter?: Findability, student motivation and self-efficacy in online courses*. [2011-2012 QM Research Grant]. Paper presented at the 4th Annual Quality Matters Conference, Tucson, AZ.
- Wright, J. (2010, June). *The effect of Quality Matters TM on faculty's online self-efficacy*. Paper presented at the Distance Learning Association Conference, Jekyll Island, GA. Retrieved from <http://bcoe.kennesaw.edu/qm/>