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Publication & presentation – provost support
Peer Review

Faculty to Faculty
Research: Levels of Course Review & Levels of Training

Self review

Informal review

Full QM certified review
Research Problem

How to provide efficient and effective ways to implement the QM program at UNC?

Issues –

– formal or informal review
– number of QM faculty peer/staff experts
– instructional design resources
– time for faculty
– experience teaching online
Research questions address:

Experiences of participants learning the QM model and employing the rubric

Differences in course self-review scores versus different levels of QM training

Incorporating recommended changes into their courses without additional assistance with instructional design
Methodology

Mixed methods

Descriptive and Qualitative design -- to gather information about the faculty experience with:

- QM training
- Course review & UNC peer feedback
- Updating their courses
- QM formal review feedback
Methodology

Participants: 6 faculty (9 anticipated) from Nursing, Art, & Theatre
2 or more years teaching online
course available not based on QM standards

3 levels of training:
   self training – QM materials given
   short training – 3 hours, some practice
   long training – 3 hours plus 3 hours practice
Methodology: Procedures

1. **Learn** to use QM rubric for course
2. **Review** one course (UNC peer review also)
3. Receive **feedback** (self and informal review)
4. **Update** the course
5. **Formal** QM review of updated course
6. Receive **feedback** from official review

- No help from instructional designer until study over; if desired, got help until course passed official review & was certified
## Results: Scores on Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant / UNC reviewer agreement</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Possible influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62.25%</td>
<td>Self training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>Short training</td>
<td>Most experienced online instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Long training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the rubric

- Majority of participants were able to assess their courses with 60–70% accuracy.

- Majority of participants were able to make needed changes sufficient to reach or approach level required by QM course certification.
Experiences of participants

1. After QM training
2. After self-review of courses
3. After receiving UNC peer feedback
4. After updating their courses
5. After receiving QM official feedback
6. At the end of study
Experiences of participants

The rubric was very helpful since it “assisted the review process by identifying specific criteria expected within the course.”

The QM system is geared toward the typical 3 credit didactic course that is online. There should be some other approach for courses that are quite different in nature.
Experiences of participants

After updating their courses, none sought help from instructional designers, but two asked colleagues and two asked students about certain aspects as part of course planning for the future.

“I found it difficult to find time to do this until the end of the semester as I prepare for the next semester.”
Lessons Learned

Time
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