

Franklin University

## FUSE (Franklin University Scholarly Exchange)

---

Scholars Showcase 2018: Innovations in Leadership and Learning

---

10-5-2018

### Influences of Evidence-Based Online Course Design Using Quality Matters Comparing Certified & Non-Certified Courses

Jami Nininger  
*Mount Carmel*

Dale Hilty  
*Mount Carmel*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://fuse.franklin.edu/ss2018>



Part of the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Nininger, Jami and Hilty, Dale, "Influences of Evidence-Based Online Course Design Using Quality Matters Comparing Certified & Non-Certified Courses" (2018). *Scholars Showcase 2018: Innovations in Leadership and Learning*. 59.

<https://fuse.franklin.edu/ss2018/59>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by FUSE (Franklin University Scholarly Exchange). It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholars Showcase 2018: Innovations in Leadership and Learning by an authorized administrator of FUSE (Franklin University Scholarly Exchange). For more information, please contact [karen.caputo@franklin.edu](mailto:karen.caputo@franklin.edu).





# Influences of Evidence-Based Online Course Design Using Quality Matters Comparing Certified & Non-Certified Courses



Jami Nininger, MSN, RN ~ Dale Hilty, PhD

## Literature Review

### Why Quality Matters?

The literature validates that continuous quality improvement (CQI) processes and quality assurance processes pursue and promote targeted outcomes. Quality assurance and CQI processes facilitate the achievement of outcomes through the creation and refinement of relevant procedures and structures informed by the assessment and analysis of outcome measures associated with the desired outcomes (Brown & Marshall, 2008; Holder, 2007; Shattuck et al., 2014). Quality Matters is a internationally recognized organization whose vision is to lead the promotion and improvement of quality online education and student learning through quality assurance and quality improvement processes (MarylandOnline, 2017). The Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric outlines evidence-based course design standards that when coupled with the intended continuous quality improvement (CQI) process, guide faculty in course design that promotes effective delivery (MarylandOnline, 2018). Research literature and best practices inform the QM rubric design standards and CQI processes (MarylandOnline, 2018; Shattuck et al., 2014; Sun & de la Rosa, 2015).

Course design and implementation are elements of the online learning environment known to promote student success and satisfaction (Kuo et al., 2013; Sun & de la Rosa, 2015). Course design guided by the QM Higher Education Rubric addresses courses structures that facilitate clarity in conveying expectations to learners, create ease in course navigation and establish course structures that align to facilitate learner achievement of identified course outcomes (MarylandOnline, 2018). Therefore, the implementation of evidence-based online course development and design and supporting continuous quality improvement processes are aimed at promoting student satisfaction and success (Kuo et al., 2013; Shattuck et al., 2014; Sun & de la Rosa, 2015).

### Outcome Measures of Quality

The identification of quality indicators for distance education is necessary for stakeholders to make sound decisions and ensure continuous program quality improvement processes aim toward the achievement of desired student outcomes (Matsudaira, 2016). Quality performance indicators are elements of the interpretations and perceptions of the major stakeholder groups such as students and public entities (Cleary, 2001). In today's competitive market, it is essential that outcome measures include those that are learner-centered therefore, represent student measures of success. Student satisfaction and achievement represent key performance indicators representative of the stakeholder perspective (Cleary, 2001). Although there is much debate about learner satisfaction as a quality measure in higher education and online learning, student satisfaction is recognized as an indicator of learning effectiveness and is a variable known to influence learner success (Allen & Seaman, 2008; Ke & Xie, 2009; Yukselturk & Yildirim, 2008).

Student satisfaction. Student satisfaction has been validated as a variable in determining the failure or success of online learners (Lee & Choi, 2010; Levy, 2007; Street, 2010). Variables known to influence student satisfaction include teaching methodologies including faculty response times and quality of feedback (Crews, Wilkinson, & Neill, 2015; Barbera, 2004; Garrison & Cleveland-Innes, 2010), course design (Al-Asfour & Lakota, 2012; Shattuck et al., 2014) and learner perceptions of engagement and interaction (Garrison & Cleveland-Innes, 2010; Kuo et al., 2013). In higher education, learner satisfaction is considered one of the major elements for determining the quality of online courses and programs (Moore, 2005; Yukselturk & Yildirim, 2008).

## Literature Review (Cont'd)

### Grade point average and course grades.

Learner course grades are identified measures of student success (Harrell & Bower, 2011; Kauffman, 2015). Course grades and overall GPA are used in higher education as a measure of student outcomes, and achievement given students are awarded a numeric grade by faculty based on their performance in association with assignment criteria, their performance on testing or other forms of evaluation presumed to be representative of course objectives or outcomes (Matsudaira, 2016). Despite the variety of influences that can impact student grades and GPA, many studies include grades or GPA as an indicator of student achievement. End-of-course grades and GPA are, therefore, acknowledged as accepted measures of students' accomplishment of desired learning and have demonstrated influence on student progression (Harrell & Bower, 2011; Kauffman, 2015; Sun & de la Rosa, 2015). Given the empirical support of student satisfaction and GPAs as acceptable quality indicators for higher education and online education, overall course grade and student satisfaction ratings are used as outcome measures for this project.

### Faculty Influences

Faculty professional development and training in evidenced-based course design and online pedagogical practices are essential to the assurance of quality in online education (Hart, 2012; Kuo et al., 2013; Ralston-Berg, 2014, Shattuck et al., 2014). The faculty holds responsibility for utilizing leading practices in online course design and instruction to promote student satisfaction, learning effectiveness and learning achievement (Kuo et al., 2013; Shattuck et al., 2014; Sun & de la Rosa, 2015). Professional development activities targeting the use of evidence-based design standards and implementation strategies are necessary to promote faculty contribution to quality assurance processes (Little, 2009). However, despite this premise, Palloff and Pratt (2011) contend that faculty training for online instruction has not kept stride with the call for excellence in the online classroom. The promotion of excellence in the online classroom extends beyond course design alone. Quality distance education also requires a change in pedagogical practices guided by the use of student assessment data (Garrison & Cleveland-Innes, 2010; Shattuck, Dubins, & Zilberman, 2011). The faculty role in utilizing outcome data to inform the refinement of courses employing evidence-based design structures and instructional methodologies then underpins quality online experiences that promote learning satisfaction and success (Beudoin, 2005; Cole et al., 2014; Garrison & Cleveland-Innes, 2010; Shattuck et al., 2011).

## Methods & Results

The statistical analysis is based on the RN-to-BSN online course evaluations which consist of 33 questions. Quantitative Likert 5-point ratings (i.e., strongly agree to strongly disagree) are available for questions 1-8, 10-21, 25-33. The data analysis will include three scales: (1) Sentiment (questions 8, 21), (2) Subscale (questions 1-5, 7, 25, 26, 31, 32), and (3) Full Scale (questions 1-8, 10-21, 25-33). Null Hypothesis 1: There will be no difference between the QM Certified and non-Certified courses for the Sentiment Scale, Subscale, and Full Scale. Null Hypothesis 2: The alpha coefficient reliability estimates will be less than .80 for each scale. The Null Hypothesis 3: The exploratory principal axis factor analysis (EPAFA) will find a one-dimensional common factor solution for the Full Scale questions.

Hypothesis 1: Using SPSS 25, the independent t-test found no significant differences ( $p > .05$ ) between the QM Certified and non-Certified courses on all three scales. Hypothesis 2: the null hypothesis is rejected since the alpha reliability estimates were greater than .80 (Sentiment, .873; Subscale, .95; Full Scale, .985). Hypothesis 3: The EPAFA with a direct oblimin rotation found one common factor accounting for 74.2% of the variance (eigenvalue 21.5). Fail to reject the null hypothesis for the first and third hypotheses.

## References

- Al-Asfour, A., & Lakota, O. (2012). Examining student satisfaction of online statics course. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 9(1), 33-38.
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2008). *Staying the course: Online education in the United States, 2008*. Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group, LLC. Retrieved from <http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/staying-the-course.pdf>
- Beaudoin, M. (2005). *Reflections on research, faculty and leadership in distance education*. Oldenburg, Germany: Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universität Oldenburg
- Brown, J. F., & Marshall, B. L. (2008). Continuous quality improvement: An effective strategy for improvement of program outcomes in a higher education setting. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 29(4), 205-211.
- Chickering, A. W., & Ehrmann, S. C. (1996). Implementation of the seven principles: Technology as a lever. *AAHE Bulletin*. Retrieved from [https://case.edu/ucite/media/caseedu/ucite/documents/seven\\_principles.pdf](https://case.edu/ucite/media/caseedu/ucite/documents/seven_principles.pdf)
- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED282491.pdf>
- Cleary, T. S. (2001). Indicators of quality. *Planning for Higher Education*, 29(3), 19-28.
- Cole, M. T., Shelley, D. J., & Swartz, L. B. (2014). Online instruction, e-learning, and student satisfaction: A three year study. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 15(6), 111-131.
- Crews, T. B., Wilkinson, K., & Neill, J. (2015). Principles for good practice in undergraduate education: Effective online course design to assist students' success. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 11(1), 87-103. Retrieved from [http://jolt.merlot.org/vol11no1/Crews\\_0315.pdf](http://jolt.merlot.org/vol11no1/Crews_0315.pdf)
- Garrison, D. R., & Cleveland-Innes, M. F. (2010). Conclusion. In M. F. Cleveland-Innes & D. R. Garrison (Eds.), *An introduction to distance education: Understanding teaching and learning in a new era* (pp. 248-266). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harrell, I. L., & Bower, B. L. (2011). Student characteristics that predict persistence in community college online courses. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 25(3), 178-191.
- Hart, C. (2012). Factors associated with student persistence in an online program of study: A review of the literature. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 11(1), 19-42. Retrieved from <http://www.ncolr.org/jiol/issues/pdf/11.1.2.pdf>
- Holder, B. (2007). An investigation of hope, academics, environment, and motivation as predictors of persistence in higher education online programs. *Internet and Higher Education*, 10, 245-260. Doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2007.08.002
- Kauffman, H. (2015). A review of predictive factors of student success in and satisfaction with online learning. *Research in Technology*, 23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/rt.v23.26507>
- Ke, R., & Xie, K. (2009). Toward deep learning for adult students in online courses. *Internet and Higher Education*, 12(3/4), 136-145. Doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2009.08.001
- Kuo, Y. C., Walker, A. E., Belland, B. R., & Schroder, K. E. (2013). A predictive study of student satisfaction in online education. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Education*, 14(1), 16-39. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1008076.pdf>
- Lee, Y., & Choi, J. (2011). A review of online course dropout research: Implications for practice and future research. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 59, 593-618. Doi: 10.1007/s11423-010-9177-y
- Levy, Y. (2007). Comparing dropouts and persistence in e-learning courses. *Computers & Education*, 48, 185-204. Doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2004.12.004
- Little, B. B. (2009). Quality assurance for online nursing courses. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 48(7), 381-387. doi:10.3928/01484834-20090615-05
- MarylandOnline, Inc. (2018). *Quality matters higher education rubric* (6th ed.). Annapolis, MD: Author.
- MarylandOnline, Inc. (2017). Why Quality Matters™? Retrieved from <https://www.qualitymatters.org/why-quality-matters>
- Matsudaira, J. (2016, February). Defining and measuring institutional quality in higher education. Cornell University Retrieved from [http://sites.nationalacademies.org/cs/groups/pgasite/documents/webpage/pga\\_170937.pdf](http://sites.nationalacademies.org/cs/groups/pgasite/documents/webpage/pga_170937.pdf)
- Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2011). *The excellent online instructor: Strategies for professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ralston-Berg, P. (2014). Surveying student perspectives of quality: Value of QM rubric items. *Internet Learning*, 3(1). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.apus.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1036&context=internetlearning>
- Shattuck, K., Dubins, B., & Zilberman, D. (2011). MarylandOnline's institutional project to training higher education adjunct faculty to teach online. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 12(2), 41-61. Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/933/1669>
- Shattuck, K., Zimmerman, W. A., & Adair, D. (2014). Continuous improvement of the QM rubric and review processes: Scholarship of integration and application. *Internet Learning*, 3(1), 25-34. Retrieved from <http://www.ipsonet.org/publications/open-access/internet-learning/volume-3-number-1-spring-2014>
- Street, H. (2010). Factors influencing a learner's decision to drop-out or persist in higher education distance learning. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 1(4). Retrieved from <http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdl/winter134/street134.html>
- Sun, J., & de la Rosa, R. (2015). Faculty training and student perceptions: Does Quality Matter? *Internet Learning*, 4(1), 56-71. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.apus.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1048&context=internetlearning>
- Yukselturk, E., & Yildirim, Z. (2008). Investigation of interaction, online support, course structure and flexibility as the contributing factors of students' satisfaction in an online certificate program. *Educational Technology & Society*, 11(4), 51-65. Retrieved from [http://www.ifets.info/journals/11\\_4/5.pdf](http://www.ifets.info/journals/11_4/5.pdf)