



Where's the Beef?

Analyzing Aggregated QM Reviewer Feedback for Continuous Improvement

Carol Parenteau Manager of Academic Quality April 2014

Purpose of Presentation

To show results of analysis of QM reviewer feedback, and discuss how it is used for continuous improvement after courses have been certified.



Learning Objectives

- Describe criteria used to analyze feedback from peer reviewers
- Identify patterns and trends that emerged from analyzing peer reviewers' recommendations
- Evaluate the benefits of analyzing qualitative data from QM peer reviews



Mission Statement and Values

University of the Rockies provides high-quality, accessible learning opportunities globally for diverse groups of individuals seeking preparation for life goals, professional practice, service, and distinguished leadership.

Integrity, Service, Excellence and Diversity





Our Numbers

9 Programs
3 Schools
300 + Faculty
2,000 Students

Assessment, Instructional Design, & Academic Quality



Quality Matters Training at Rockies

Quality Matters						
QM Certified Courses	156 courses,64.14% 39 in 2013					
QM Peer Reviewers	79 or 23% of faculty members (347) 12 staff					
Applying the QM Rubric	98 faculty and staff 28 %					
Master Reviewer Training	11 faculty					
Improving your Online Course	2 staff					

Deliverable 1: Purpose and Structure Statement, Course Learning Outcomes and Required Resources

Purpose and Structure Statement

Standard 1.2

The purpose of this survey course in the PhD of Education program is to familiarize students with terminology and concepts specific to the profession of education. The course provides an historical, theoretical, academic, and practical foundation for individuals interested in working in post-secondary adult education and higher education settings. Specifically, this course focuses on preparing the learner to develop the skills and knowledge necessary to plan, develop, deliver, and evaluate curriculum design, theories of learning, learning communities, and models of instruction. Students will examine and evaluate current literature, research, and trends

Deliverable	2: Course	Map / Weekly	y Outcomes
-------------	-----------	--------------	------------

Complete and return entire document to I.D. when you've completed the Course Map.

Standard 2

÷				
	WEEK & OUTCOMES	ALIGNS	CLO reference list	
	WEEK TOUTCOMES	WITH CLO#		
	 Identify the significant historical events in adult education. 	4, 5	 Explain the concepts and terminology related to education 	1 .
ſ	Discover educational concepts.	1	Compare and contrast the theories of learning.	
ſ	Identify and define education terminology.	1	Analyze models of instruction.	
Ī	Review historical perspectives on adult education.	2,5	Identify elements of curriculum design.	
L	•••	-	Evaluate perspectives on learning communities.	



e. *All of the above.

+	Activities Standard 2								
	Activity	Activity	% of	Day	Instructions (Narrative)	Credit	WLOs	CLOs	Reference
	Туре	Title	Total	Due		Hours to	aligned	aligned	Resource
		(Topic)	Grade			Complete	to	to	UID
[Introduction	Introduction	1	1	Basic Intro + Include a brief description of why you		n/a	n/a	n/a
	Discussion	Discussion			are pursuing a PhD in Education.				
_ r	Discussion 1	Time allies a	2	2	V		1 4	2 4 5	10 11 11

QM Rankings for 2013

Top QM Institutions for 2013					
Name of Institution No. of Courses					
1 Ashford University	119				
2 Capella University	64				
3 Florida International University	63				
4 University of the Rockies	39				
5 Regent University (VA)	36				
6 Tidewater Community College (VA)	36				
7 Prince George's Community College (MD)	20				
8 Frederick Community College (MD)	17				
9 Nashville State Community College	17				

(Source: http://www.qmprogram.org/qmresources/courses/grouped_by_inst.cfm?year=2012&program=0)

Our Process



Continuous Improvement



Analysis of QM Reviewer Feedback

- After Certification Instructional designers were focused on courses that did NOT meet standards
- Reports on courses that met standards the first time were not fully evaluated



QM Criteria for Reviews

- Constructive
- Specific
- Measurable
- Balanced
- Sensitive



The majority of QM reviewers adhered to these criteria when furnishing critiques of our courses. Exceptions were in the areas of specificity and measurability.

Methodology

- Analyzed all comments by peer reviewers for 2013
- Identified patterns and color-coded those as they relate to QM standards
- Determined number of occurrences

Methodology

Course	QM Standard	Comments	
HUM 5100	2.2	WLO in Week 4: change verb "hypothesize"	
	8.2	Video transcripts not readily available	
HUM 8519	2.1	WLOs 1, 3 and 5 require verb changes to ensure measurability	
		CLO 2 is needlessly complex and hard to understand	
	8.4	many of the hyperlinks do not use descriptive labels	
		Objectives beginning with "understand" and "recognize" may	
ORG 6346	2.2	not be measurable	
ORG 6354		None	
		WLOs 1 and 4 use "support" when a more measurable verb	
ORG 7321	2.2	might be substituted	
ORG 7340		None	
		Reviewers had several recommendations on varying the	
ORG 7525	3.4	types of assignments	
	3.5	more self-checks are recommended	
	4.4	sources are outdated: non-working link	

Methodology

QM Standard	Comments					
1.1	Put a hyperlink behind the Start Here button	4				
1.1	Can "Start Here" button be an active link?					
1.1	some key info is buried (Instructor Response Time, student guide)		Nun	nber of Comments per Stan	dard	
	One reviewer recommended that "expectations" be removed from the "start here" tab; he					
	notes: A student may feel , having encountered this page first, that they are being confronted					
	with a litany of "dos/do nots as oppose to positives about the journey they are about the embark					
1.1	upon"			Standard	Comments	%
		-				-
1.2	Multiple instructors should be mentioned; purpose and structure should be made more explicit	/		1 Overall Design	27	20
1.2	Syllabus should be more comprehensive			2 Learning Objectives	28	21
1.2	Purpose/structure statement does not exist in the course (outside the CG)			3 Assessment Strategies	32	24
1.2	Purpose/structure statement does not exist in the course (outside the CG)			4 Instructional Materials	17	13
1.2	Syllabus should be more comprehensive			5 Forms of Interactions	8	6
1.2	Syllabus should be more comprehensive			6 Navigation & Technology	10	7.5
1.2	Syllabus should be more comprehensive			7 Access to Support Serv.	1	0.7
1.3	Netiquette rules are buried	10		8 Commitment to Accessib	8	6
1.3	Move Academic Policies section to the top				131	98
1.3	Netiquette rules are buried					

Results

Percentage of Comments per Standard



Assessment Strategies

Standard 3 (24%)

- Not enough variety (3.4)
- More opportunities for self-checks (3.5)

Improvement

- We have already seen an improvement in this area after adding this as a requirement for developers
- We are planning to expand our variety of tools.
 Collaborating with sister institution (webinars for faculty)
 - Google quizzes
 - Respondus
 - Big Think and Ted Talks
 - Flash card machine
 - Leverage e-books "Check Your Knowledge" and e-books analytics



Learning Outcomes & Alignment Standard 2 (21%)

- Measurability (2.1)
- CLOs not aligned with types of assignments or with WLOs (2.2)
- Clarity of directions and or how WLOs help meet CLOs (2.3, 2.4)
- Appropriate for the level of the course (2.5)



Improvement

- Leveraging research to expand our knowledge of learning outcomes beyond Bloom's taxonomy
- Providing guidelines for developers to consider rigor of the course
- Improving the course builder template to ensure alignment throughout the process

Activities

Activity Type	Activity Title	% of Total	Day Due	Instructions (Narrative)	Credit Hours to	WLOs aligned	CLOs aligned	Reference Resource
Introduction Discussion	(Topic) Introduction Discussion	Grade 1	1	Basic Intro + Include a brief description of why you are pursuing a PhD in Education.	Complete	to n/a	to n/a	UID n/a
D:1	T	2	2	Versenill Le Annalassia en educational dimetine dela		1.4	245	10 01 00

Overall Design

Standard 1 (21%)

- Getting Started, more comprehensive syllabus (1.1)
- No purpose statement (1.2)
- Netiquette (1.3)
- Academic Policies (1.4)
- Prerequisites not identified (1.5)

Improvement

- Discussed needs with LMS vendor-- Plans to implement horizontal navigation bar at the top of the page for non-content items
- Items such as the course guide, About Discussions, and Instructor Policies will be placed in this bar for ease of access

Instructional Materials Standard 4 (13%)

- Out of date (4.4)
- All resources should be listed in APA format (4.3)

Improvement

- Undergoing program review, Deans, faculty will review content and make recommendations
- Vendor provided comprehensive list of resources that will be going out of print

Commitment to Accessibility

Standard 8 (6%)

- Equivalent alternatives to auditory and visual content (8.2)
- Descriptive links (8.4)

Improvement

- Accessibility Taskforce
 - Instructional Design team
 - Academic Quality
 - Student Services
 - Admissions
- Collaboration with sister institution
 - Creation of 12 personas
 - Resources for faculty
 - Webinar for training faculty

Other Areas of Opportunity

- Forms of interactions (10)
- Navigation and technology (6)
- Access to Student support (1)

Results

Percentage of Comments per Standard





