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By Show of Hands...

- Familiar with the Quality Matters (QM) Peer Review process?
- Trained QM Peer Reviewers?
- Had your online course QM reviewed?
- Participated in a QM course review?
- Using QM at your institution?
Distance Learning Program Overview
History of Quality Matters (QM) @ PGCC
QM Peer Review Process
QM@PGCC Independent Review Process
Challenges
Results
Lessons Learned
# Online Courses: 212
# Online Instructors: 112
Avg Sections Per semester: ~ 257
Avg Enrollment per semester: ~ 3,700
History of QM@PGCC

2003 – Fiscal Agent and Co-Director for Quality Matters (QM) FIPSE Grant

2005 – Proposal to Implement QM (handout)
Piloted internal QM review process

2005 – QM endorsed by VP, Academic Affairs

2006 – Adopted QM as internal evaluation process for all online courses
Quality Matters™
Course Peer Review Process

Course

Peer Course Review

Course Meets Quality Expectations

Feedback

Course Revision

Course Did not Meet Quality Expectations
QM@PGCC
Independent Review Process
Our Experience

CoursesReviewed @ PGCC

- FY08: 25
- FY07: 19
- FY06: 7
- FY05: 7
- FY04 (Grant): 2

Total Courses Reviewed: 60
Our QM “Staff”

General Admin Support
“Control Center”
- Paperwork
- Answer Questions
- Files & Data Collection
- Reviewer Communication

Faculty Support
“Cat Herder”
- Faculty Contact
- Course Review Setup
- Review Tracking

Program Oversight
“QM Advocate”
- QM Orientation
- ID Support
- Solicit supporters

All QM Staff are “Part time”
Our Process
QM@PGCC: Course Peer Review Process

Course Meets Quality Expectations

- Notify Faculty Member, Dean, VP
- Notify QM of “Met” Courses
- Post on PGCC QM Website

Course Did Not Meet QM

- Review Report with Faculty
- Process Reviewer Payment

Course Revision

- Provide Instructional Design Support (5 hours)
- Review Revisions with Faculty
- Assist with Course Amendment Form
- Monitor Team Chair Revision Review

Feedback

- Gather Review Results
- Monitor Review Progress & Completion
- Process Reviewer Support

Peer Course Review

- Submit Review Planning Sheet to QM
- Peer Review Team Paperwork
- Organize Peer Review Team
- Conduct Faculty Orientation
- Select Courses to be reviewed

Notify QM of “Met” Courses

Notify Faculty of Course Review

Conduct Faculty Orientation

Select Courses to be reviewed
Our Challenges
Challenges

Solutions:

- Categorize Paperwork and Files
  - General QM Information
  - Courses Reviewed
  - Reviewers
  - Budget
- Create spreadsheets and reminder schedules
- “Getting Started” Letter (handout)
- Regular communication with reviewers
- Make friends with Accounting department
- Dedicated e-mail account: [QMPGCC@pgcc.edu](mailto:QMPGCC@pgcc.edu)

- Managing High Volume of Paperwork and files
- Tracking multiple aspects of each review
- Collecting information from Reviewers
- Timely processing of reviewer payment
- Complex Review Process
Challenges

- Complex Review Process
- Lack of trained PGCC Reviewers
- Tracking down “MIA” Reviewers
- Getting Faculty participation in the process
- Tracking review from start to finish

Solutions:

- Use core group of reliable reviewers
- Allow faculty *some* flexibility in review schedule
- Centralize review communication and files
- “Review Team Grid” (handout)
- Meet regularly with Admin Coordinator & Project Director
- Regularly “check-in” with reviewers
- Leverage faculty relationships
Challenges

Solutions:

- “Grassroots” campaign for supporters
- Created Faculty Orientation
- Implemented resources to help faculty prepare (handouts)
- Created Website for QM@PGCC
- Regular communication w/QM and MOL
- “Formally” approved internal QM Procedure Statement (handout)
- Standard reporting requirements to track status of reviews

Project Director

- Complex QM Process
- Institutional Politics
- Buy-in from faculty, dept chairs, deans
- Changing QM organization
- Frustration of faculty, dept chairs & reviewers
- Keeping the momentum
- Convincing faculty this is not a formal “evaluation”
Our Results
Results

Met QM after Course Revisions

Met QM upon initial review

Met QM after Course Revisions

16

Did Not Meet QM

10

Faculty “refused” Course Revisions

2

Awaiting Team Chair Approval

4

Faculty Procrastinating

7

Faculty working on Course Revisions

11

Met QM (26)

Did Not Meet QM (24)

Total Reviews

Completed: 50

Updated as of 2/16/2008
## Cost of Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Courses Reviewed</th>
<th>Review Cost</th>
<th>Faculty Liaison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY04 (Grant)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 ECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05 (Grant)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 ECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05 (Internal)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>6 ECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3,850</td>
<td>6 ECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>8 ECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>8 ECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,750</strong></td>
<td>~$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned
Lessons Learned

Process
• QM Process is VERY Complex – too many steps!
• Difficult to get buy-in from faculty once it becomes “mandatory”
• Faculty apprehensive – “Peer” process doesn’t make it easier
• Confidentiality is critical
• Need “training” specifically for faculty being reviewed
• QM does not manage full cycle course reviews…not a valuable resource – need QM User Group!
• Limited scalability due to cumbersome process
• QM process needs “tweaking” for successful internal use

Resources
• “Dedicated” staff resources needed to manage full scale QM project
• Hard to hold reviewers to timeline – must constantly “check in”
• Difficult to get faculty to become trained reviewers
• Formal/public recognition needed
• Resources needed for reviewer support
Next Steps...

- Determine value of “QM Recognition”
  - Internal vs Independent Review
- Fully implement formal QM Procedure
  - Hold faculty, dept chairs accountable
- Determine cost effectiveness of QM program
- Consider faculty developer incentive
- Identify formal/public recognition process
Are YOU ready to implement QM?
Feel free to contact us for more information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Spells Fentry</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>301-583-5253</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rspells@pgcc.edu">rspells@pgcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Ives</td>
<td>Admin Coordinator</td>
<td>301-583-5219</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nives@pgcc.edu">nives@pgcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Habermacher</td>
<td>Faculty Liaison</td>
<td>301-322-0548</td>
<td><a href="mailto:habermax@pgcc.edu">habermax@pgcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>