

The Online Journal of Quality in Higher Education

*Volume 1 Issue 1
January 2014*

Editor-in-Chief
Prof. Dr. Muzaffer ELMAS

Editors
Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali YALÇIN, Sakarya University, Turkey
Prof. Dr. Aytekin İŞMAN, Sakarya Univeriy, Turkey
Prof. Dr. Colleen SEXTON, Governors State University, USA
Prof. Dr. Deborah BORDELON, Governors State University, USA
Prof. Dr. Teresa Franklin Ohio University, USA
Prof. Dr. Douglas Franklin Ohio University, USA

Associate Editors
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet ESKİCUMALU, Sakarya Univeriy, Turkey
Assoc. Prof. Mübin KIYICI, Sakarya University, Turkey



With the increased use of online environments which are inherently based in technology and its use, the TPACK framework offers several possibilities for research in the examination of faculty professional development and faculty's use of technology as well as options for examining the complex phenomenon of technology integration not only by instructors of online courses but students within those courses as creators of content (Peruski & Mishra, 2004). The use of technology tools for analysis within LMS environments may provide researchers with opportunities to focus on the ecological integration of technology by faculty and student in virtual learning environments. How do these three core knowledge bases, pedagogy, content and technology play out within the context of anywhere, anytime learning? Does the solutions lie in the ability of an instructor to "flexibly navigate the spaces defined by the three elements of content, pedagogy, and technology and the complex interactions among these elements in specific contexts?" (Koehler, M. & Mishra, 2009, p. 68).

The Quality Matters Process

Faculty development is a critical component for any robust online program. The Quality Matters Program (QM) is an international organization of broad institutional sharing and collaboration in an effort to understand online course quality. QM is a quality "assurance process that has been developed to improve and certify the design of online and blended courses" (Quality Matters Program, 2013, para. 1). The membership with QM is by institutional subscription although there is opportunity for individual subscription at a much higher cost. These membership institutions work together to provide trained peer reviewer and support other institutions as they implement the QM process (Quality Matters Program, 2013). The QM Program is a not-for-profit subscription service that provides the tools and training to support a quality assurance process in online course design and comes from the work of the University of Maryland's participation in a FIPSE grant. All areas of the QM process are focused on student learning.

The QM process recognizes that the faculty member is an integral part of both course design and course delivery. To this end, QM provides intense professional development to member institutional faculty. The QM process provides on-site, online, and Web-based professional development opportunities to instructional designers, faculty, administrators, and adjunct instructors (Quality Matters Program, 2013).

Quality Matters promotes a peer review process in which QM Peer Reviewers are selected from a database of trained professionals to review a course per an institution or faculty request. Any subscribing institution may conduct internal or informal reviews or contract with Quality Matters to conduct an official review. Courses that successfully meet the QM rubric standards in an official course review are eligible for QM recognition. QM is

dedicated to the continuous improvement of online course design.

The QM process is composed of four distinct characteristics and the process is:

1. Continuous
 - a. The process is designed to ensure that all reviewed courses will eventually meet expectations.
 - b. The process is a rubric-based review integral to a continuous quality improvement process.
2. Centered
 - a. The development of the rubric is based on national standards of best practice, the research literature, and instructional design principles.
3. Collegial
 - a. The review is part of a faculty-driven, peer review process.
 - b. The review process is intended to be diagnostic and collegial, not evaluative and judgmental.
4. Collaborative
 - a. The review is based on collaboratively identified evidence found in the course rather than the personal preference of an individual reviewer.
 - b. The review is flexible and not prescriptive (many ways to meet each standard).
 - c. The review team consists of three experienced online instructors, as reviewers along with the course faculty developer.

The QM process is about course design, which is seen as the forethought, and planning a faculty member puts into the development of a course. Course delivery is about the actual teaching and implementation of the course design. QM is about design not delivery or faculty performance and should be seen by administrators seeking to improve online quality at an institution as a first step in securing faculty quality in online teaching and learning in the institution.

The QM Rubric. There are many factors that influence course quality. These factors include: (1) course design, (2) course delivery, (3) course content, (4) institutional infrastructure, (5) learning management system, (6) faculty readiness and (7) student readiness. While there are many factors, the QM Rubric only examines course design. The Quality Matters Rubric contains 8 general standards and 41 specific standards to evaluate the design of online and blended courses. "The Rubric is complete with annotations that explain the application of the standards and the relationship among them. A scoring system and set of online tools facilitate the evaluation by a team of reviewers" (Higher Ed Program > Rubric, 2013, para. 1). The rubric is divided into the eight critical course standards below:

1. Course Overview and Introduction
2. Learning Objectives (Competencies)
3. Assessment and Measurement
4. Instructional Materials

5. Learner Interaction and Engagement
6. Course Technology
7. Learner Support
8. Accessibility

Each of these standards is further divided to help the reviewer and faculty member identify the elements of the standard within each course component. Each element is given a point value of 1 to 3 that is used in the scoring of the course standard. An instructional designer or faculty member developing a course can use the rubric not only as a peer review of their course but to guide them in the development process. Institutions and faculty benefit from the peer review process through improved consistency and rigor of course design, professionalism and commitment to online learning and useful and constructive feedback. It is important to note that less than 50% of courses in a QM-managed review meet the rubric standards upon initial review; however, all meet the requirements after amendment of the site to meet the deficiencies identified in the review.

The Quality Matters Rubric can be found at <https://www.qualitymatters.org/rubric>. The rubric is copyrighted so the use of the rubric as an individual for one time use is allowed; however, use within an institution would require a subscription to the Quality Matters Program which at the Basic level is \$1650.00 per year at the time of the writing of this paper. In the end, the goal of the Quality Matters Process is to improve online instruction to facilitate student learning and ensure institutional quality in the delivery of online content.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The use of the Quality Matters Rubric provides a foundation in which the content, pedagogy and technology of the TPACK framework can be used to examine course design. While the characteristics provided in the discussion on redesign are clearly identified as needed, the Quality Matters Rubric takes the redesign to a new level. Just a quick examination of the list of critical course standards suggests that the use of the TPACK framework could easily support the theoretical research of a faculty member in course design. TPACK can be seen in the design of course objects (content); instructional materials (content); learner interaction and engagement (pedagogy); accessibility (pedagogy) and course technology and learner support (technology) of the QM rubric.

The QM Rubric places a means of self-reflection on a faculty member's course design that can allow for a continuous improvement model that not only informs the faculty member but also informs the university of course design quality. Universities can use this information to begin to develop professional development that embraces the QM Rubric and builds a set of standards for the institutions faculty to meet as they design their online courses. This is of particular importance in that most faculty work alone in the design of their course without an instructional designer, media specialist or pedagogical coach. Through self-reflection on the

interchange of technology, content and pedagogy and how it aligns within the QM Rubric for design of a course, the faculty member may find new and engaging ways to reach students and to engage in active learning in an online environment to improve student learning in their courses.

REFERENCES

- Curtis, D. D. & Lawson, M. J. (2001). Exploring collaborative online learning. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 5(1), 21-26.
- Moore, J. L., Dickson-Deane, C., Galyen, K. (2011). e-Learning, online learning, and distance learning environments: Are they the same? *Internet and Higher Education*, 14, Pp. 129-135.
- Moore, M. G. (1993). 2 Theory of transactional distance. *Theoretical Principles of Distance Education*, 22.
- Twigg, C.A. (September/October 2003). New Models for Online Learning. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 28-38.
- DeMari, R., & Bongiovanni, T. (2010). The 10 biggest myths about synchronous online teaching. *EDUCAUSE Review*. Retrieved November 10, 2013, from <http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/10-biggest-myths-about-synchronous-online-teaching>
- Higher Ed Program>Rubric. (2013). Retrieved from December 8, 2013, <https://www.qualitymatters.org/rubric>
- Koehler, M. & Mishra, P. (2009). What is Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK)?. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 60-70. AACE. Retrieved December 7, 2013 from <http://www.editlib.org/p/29544>
- Peruski, L., & Mishra, P. (2004). Webs of activity in online course design and teaching. *ALT-J: Research in Learning Technology*, 12(1), 37-49.
- Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Quality Matters Program (2013). Quality Matters: A national benchmark for online course design. Retrieved on December 1, 2013, <https://www.qualitymatters.org/>