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Presentation Agenda

• Faculty development workshops
• Quality Matters reviews
• Goals of Research Project
• Survey Data and Focus Group Results
• Impact and Course Design Changes
School of Nursing Graduate Program

- 516 Graduate Students
- 85 Full time faculty
- 348 Doctor of Nursing Practice
- 127 Master of Nursing
- 41 PhD
- 435 Undergrad
Faculty Development Support

• Office of eLearning, CEI
  – Counseling, Grant funding, Workshop design
  – Larry Coyle, Bob Rubinyi, Sue Englemann

• Academic Technology Support Services
  – Media production, Feedback and Counseling
  – Susan Tade, Lauren Marsh, Sarah Schoen
Faculty Development Workshops

- Monthly 1 hour Moodle workshops
- Best Practices in Online Course Design
  - 1 month, 13 hour commitment, course project
- Applying the Quality Matters Rubric
  - 2 week online, 24 hour commitment
BP & QM Workshops Goals

• Learning objectives alignment
• Greater faculty satisfaction
• Greater student satisfaction
• Quality certification of courses
Quality Matters Reviews

• QM = Nationally recognized course design review rubric
• Examines course design
• Does NOT review teaching strategies
• Goal of 10 Core DNP course reviews
QM Informal/Formal Reviews

• Faculty & Instructional Designer
  – Initial revisions

• QM informal review - internal (2)
  – Course revisions

• QM formal review (3)
  – Course revisions
## Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Internal Review</th>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>External Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N5115</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6102</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6110</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6502</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7200</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7400</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7600</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5222</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6501</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7202</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7300</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5226</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5229</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7900</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5200</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5228</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Team

- Center for Educational Innovation
  - Larry Coyle, JD Walker, Bob Rubinyi
- School of Nursing
  - Chris Mueller, Jehad Adwan, Madeline Kerr, Nima Salehi
Research Questions

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?
Data

Students from 2 Graduate Nursing courses

- Student surveys - pre and post QM review
  - Pre-survey - 18 students
  - Post - After QM review - 11 students

Faculty who completed BP & QM workshops

- Faculty survey - 14/25 participants
- Faculty focus group - 9 participants
Student Satisfaction

OLC Quality Framework Indicators (5 Pillars)

Student Satisfaction

clarity
1. instructions are clear and course navigation facilitates ease of use

alignment
2. seeing alignment among objectives, activities, and assessments
3. activities and assignments are used for improving learning
4. adequate and fair systems assess course learning objectives

engagement
5. seeing opportunities for engagement with instructor
6. seeing opportunities for engagement with peers.
Student Data - Limitations

• Small sample size in both courses where data was used
• Courses were already well designed and aligned
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of instructions &amp; course navigation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment among objectives, activities, and assessments</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities and assignments improve learning</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and fair assessment of learning objectives</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with instructor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with peers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Learning Tools: Helpful/Easy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Helpful/Easy to Use</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forums</td>
<td>Helped achieve learning objectives</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to use and access</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Docs</td>
<td>Helped achieve learning objectives</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to use and access</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media content</td>
<td>Helped achieve learning objectives</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to use and access</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Thread</td>
<td>Helped achieve learning objectives</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to use and access</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preference for Course Delivery:

Classroom Only

Rate your preference for the type of course delivery (slide the marker to indicate your response) - Classroom

Mean = 46.3
Std. Dev. = 28.767
N = 27
Preference for Course Delivery:

Online Only

Rate your preference for the type of course delivery (slide the marker to indicate your response) - Online only

Mean = 52.59
Std. Dev. = 31.937
N = 27
Preference for Course Delivery:

Classroom and Online Combo

Rate your preference for the type of course delivery (slide the marker to indicate your response): Classroom combined with online

Mean = 77.5
Std. Dev. = 24.774
N = 28
Takeaways

• Students satisfied with current design and with QM improvements
• Effect of QM implementation statistically insignificant
• Students find current technology learning tools to be helpful and easy to use.
• Students show a preference for hybrid course designs
Student Comments

“The course learning objectives were well addressed and met. I do appreciate the way the course was set up in Moodle and how each module was laid out the same way – that made accessing documents and what to work on clear!”
Faculty Satisfaction

OLC Quality Framework Indicators

• knowledge about quality standards for course design
• confidence in their ability to apply quality standards
• ability to align objectives and learning activities
• perceived value of quality standards and best practices workshops
Faculty Survey

How **knowledgeable** are you about how to achieve this standard in your online course? 5 = very knowledgeable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners are asked to introduce themselves to the class.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The self-introduction by the instructor is appropriate and is available online.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiquette expectations (sometimes called “netiquette”) for online discussions, email, and other forms of communication are clearly stated.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners are introduced to the purpose and structure of the course.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and/or institutional policies with which the learner is expected to comply are clearly stated, or a link to current policies is provided.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Survey

How confident are you about how to achieve this standard in your online course? 5 = very confident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners are asked to introduce themselves to the class.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The self-introduction by the instructor is appropriate and is available online.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiquette expectations (sometimes called “netiquette”) for online discussions, email, and other forms of communication are clearly stated.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners are introduced to the purpose and structure of the course.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and/or institutional policies with which the learner is expected to comply are clearly stated, or a link to current policies is provided.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Survey

Comments: What was most rewarding aspects of Quality Matters or Best Practices workshop?

• Learning what the standards are
• Alignment of course objectives and activities to promote student learning
• Discussion and mentoring with peers
• Seeing what other faculty did
• Time and focus on improving a course with some concrete steps
Pros of workshops

• QM – the concept of alignment, and the opportunity to bring the elements of a course into alignment.
• Getting the sense for what it’s like to take a course as a student
• BP - the application of course design principles to particular cases, like example courses, having one-on-one consultations
• The two workshops elevated the teaching mission of the School appropriately.
Faculty Focus Group

Cons of workshops

• Time commitment; not having enough time for the work
• QM website was itself difficult to use, navigate, etc.
• Workshops dealt only with the structure of courses and not with delivery
• Posting X times per day, week, etc was perceived by some (not all) as rote busy work
Focus Group Ideas

Ideas for future: What could SoN do?

• Learning from peers: have peers give feedback on a course
• Share techniques and approaches at the end of a term
• Be embedded in a course to observe another’s teaching
• A repository of resources and contacts, so faculty know who has worked with what technologies, techniques, etc.
• Feedback on whether your course is aligned
• Set aside a group of courses each semester for review (proactive, rather than reactive to the squeaky wheel)
• Have an office to promote scholarly teaching (similar to the research office)
• Give faculty dedicated time off to improve their teaching
Impacts

- QM reviews enhanced clarity and ADA compliance in courses
- Greater faculty understanding of course alignment
- Changes to School of Nursing templates/course standards
  - Student resource links and privacy policies included
  - Greater copyright compliance of media images
  - More standard format across courses
- Faculty showcases share course development projects
- Developed a workshop “Online Teaching Strategies”
Research Questions

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?
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