

## **Faculty Development and Instructional Design Through a Quality Matters Tool for Online and Hybrid Course Assessment**

**Dr. Alyson Grace Eggleston, The Citadel**

Alyson G. Eggleston is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English, Fine Arts, and Communications at The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina, where she teaches STEM-focused technical writing and communication, writing-intensive courses for international students, and linguistics. She received her PhD from Purdue University in Linguistics, and she has a BA and MA in English with concentrations in TESOL and writing pedagogy from Youngstown State University. Her research and teaching interests are in technical and scientific writing pedagogy and the interaction of language and cognition. She is a member of Sigma Xi and ASEE.

**Dr. Robert J. Rabb P.E., The Citadel**

Robert Rabb is a professor and the Mechanical Engineering Program Director at The Citadel. He previously taught mechanical engineering at the United States Military Academy at West Point. He received his B.S. in Mechanical Engineering from the United States Military Academy and his M.S.E. and PhD in Mechanical Engineering from the University of Texas at Austin. His research and teaching interests are in mechatronics, regenerative power, and multidisciplinary engineering.

# **WIP: Faculty Development and Instructional Design Through a Quality Matters Tool for Online and Hybrid Course Assessment**

## **Abstract**

Institutional assessment has become increasingly important for quality assurance as course delivery methods hybridize and instructors leverage diverse online tools within Learning Management Systems (LMSs). Educators face multiple challenges while teaching variations of delivery methods in their courses. Some of the challenges are course content design, learning new technologies and LMSs, and effective communication. However, instructors, particularly junior faculty, are rarely included in detailed individual-level course assessment practices, as these evaluations are traditionally completed by program leadership. Exacerbating this, as institutional assessment cycles run every five to ten years, the time gap between assessment reports creates ripe opportunity for courses and programs to become misaligned concerning learning objectives, activities, and assessment methods. This paper reports on an institution-specific assessment tool, based on Quality Matters-informed criteria, created to ensure course-level quality assurance for online, in-person, synchronous, and asynchronous course delivery styles. This formative tool functions as a dashboard and is currently being used in the School of Engineering as well across other schools at The Citadel. Results of the reported self-study point to several benefits to using the formative dashboard tool, such as training junior faculty in-course assessment, development, and expectations, maintaining programmatic alignment in learning objectives, and maintaining quality and equivalence within the native institution LMS regardless of online or in-person teaching modality. Junior faculty employed this tool to improve course design and became habituated to developing measurable learning outcomes, while external evaluators and program leadership used the same tool as a summative metric of course standardization. Program leadership could easily determine differences when courses were taught by different instructors and suggest best practices for course improvement. Leadership could also see where new faculty needed assistance in developing and structuring their courses.

This formative dashboard tool also facilitates total course data capture within the native institutional LMS, ensuring that student grades, course activities, video recordings, and course engagement behavior can be analyzed and acted upon. Encouraging faculty to use the native LMS along institutional guidelines also benefits students, who quickly acclimate to standardized course structures. Student privacy is also protected when course content and interactions are housed within the LMS, an important federal criterion to meet as online courses proliferate.

Prioritizing standardization with regard to instructional design and student experience will become more important as course modalities hybridize and proliferate. This paper would appeal to new and experienced instructors, program assessors and coordinators, administration, and in general, curriculum developers.

## **Background and Rationale**

COVID-19 radically altered the landscape of higher education, which for many institutions, resulted in the adoption of a hybrid-flexible (Hyflex) lecture model. In traditional, pre-pandemic implementations of Hyflex, the mode is defined as “class sessions that allow students to choose

whether to attend classes face-to-face or online, synchronously or asynchronously,” creating a truly blended learning environment [1]. On-the-ground implementation of Hyflex at The Citadel and other US institutions has been more nuanced and complex. At The Citadel, accommodated faculty and faculty teaching classes of 20 or more students taught purely online and partially online classes, respectively. Synchronous delivery was the institutional standard for online, Hyflex, and in-person delivery modes. While disruptive, the emerging Hyflex teaching model also created new opportunities for faculty development and course evaluation.

Faculty who were teaching purely online classes were assigned a mentor with whom to work to ensure quality online course delivery. Due to the quick pivot to online learning for many instructors, this auxiliary support was mostly welcome. To facilitate objective evaluations, feedback, and improvement, a dashboard tool was created at The Citadel to track online course improvement and metric capture over the course of a 15-week semester. Using an institution-specific application of the 43 criteria of Quality Matters [2]—a rubric-based system of ensuring continuous improvement in the online delivery of courses—a dashboard tool was created.

The goals of this QM dashboard tool were to capture: (1) the frequency of instructor-student interactions; (2) the quality and objectivity of learning outcomes, assessments, and course content; (3) the alignment of course learning outcomes, lesson learning outcomes, assessments, and student feedback; (4) course expectations, privacy and accessibility policies and resources. In capturing this information for quality assurance purposes, there were obvious faculty development opportunities that also motivated this study. Swivl robot-facilitated classes, as well as continuous improvement checks, have been well documented in the literature as a means to support and promote instructor reflection and development. Initially designed to capture presentations, the Swivl is a robotic mount for a smart device and remote controlled with a device called a marker. The Swivl tracks and records the person holding the marker [3].

What follows are guiding self-study questions that ultimately facilitate an institutional continuous improvement plan, leveraged with the same formative motivations as the Quality Matters framework.

- (1) Can course quality be most effectively impacted through a full QM, 43-criterion review or can a subset of QM criteria be used to effect similar change?
- (2) How can faculty responses to Swivl-based lecture capture be optimized?
- (3) What best practices emerge from a QM-based dashboard tool coupled with Swivl-capture technology?

Prior to the pandemic, a need for QM-based capture tool was already forming. As The Citadel was moving some courses and graduate programs online, even before the pandemic, program directors and institutional audits noted a disparity in online course delivery. A large number of students taking certain online classes during the summer were failing or withdrawing. In many of these courses, the instructor had very little online presence, was communicating solely by email with the students and vice-versa, and providing no or very little feedback to the students. Many of the students taking the summer courses were trying to get back on track for graduation or

needed the summer courses to make up enough credits to return in the fall semester. Even though many online instructors were doing well, some instructors had never gone through any formal training to establish an online course. Some had taught online with other institutions where they did not receive scrutiny and had preconceived notions of what constituted a good online course. Still, others developed an ineffective online presence and a mindset that they already knew how to teach remotely. Administration in conjunction with program directors knew an external audit could jeopardize much for the school, and a system to ensure quality online course delivery needed to be in place. An online teaching committee was formed with representation from all the schools. As policy was being developed, committee members elevated concerns from faculty in the schools and kept them informed of evolving information. Findings from the online teaching committee supported quality assurance and continuous improvement strategies for both online-only and Hyflex teaching modalities.

## **1. Hyflex Courses and Swivl-based Lecture Capture**

Before Hyflex classrooms at The Citadel and elsewhere proliferated as a result of the COVID pandemic, Hyflex models were widely praised in pedagogical research as a new normal that offers distinct advantages over traditional teacher-centered classrooms [4]. Characterized by phased learning, Hyflex teaching requires extensive organization to facilitate before class, during class, and after class learning [4, 5]. Organizing a course in this way allows for collaboration, multiple forms of communication, and high- and low-stakes grading opportunities—all of which have been found to be aligned with best teaching practices. Some definitions of Hyflex emphasize the phased approach to student learning given in [4-5], while others focus on a student's relative choice of learning modes [6].

Phased learning requires intensive organization and time commitment from instructors, researchers acknowledge [4, 7]. In a study of best Hyflex practices as a result of the pandemic-induced change to biochemistry course offerings, researchers have also characterized Hyflex as a “flipped, micro-MOOC environment,” emphasizing the active nature of students' necessary classroom engagement in terms of their speaking, listening, and writing [5]. Researchers recommend more frequent student assessments to encourage this active engagement, acknowledging that Hyflex teaching models require instructors to adjust and adapt course content for an online delivery environment [5]. Additionally, providing students with links, slides, pre-lecture material, and lecture videos 24 hours in advance was identified as a significantly predictive factor of successful student learning [5]. Singh and Arya value the before-class learning phase as key to eventual content mastery.

Swivl-based lecture capture has been explored as a teaching development tool for several years prior to the pandemic. Swivl-based lecture capture has been used to study teacher discourse in the classroom [7]; to facilitate instructor preparation through repeated observations [8-9]); and to improve instructor reflection during pedagogical training [10]. Additionally, because Swivl robots pivot to capture movement, body language, gesture, and facial expression are well captured, which can provide valuable feedback for behavioral analysis, which other disciplines have recently studied as a means of better understanding client interaction and response [11]. Taken in sum, Swivl-based lecture capture was identified as being most effective at facilitating instructor reflection and development through watching successive lecture recordings as a

practice [10-11], while other researchers recommend Swivl-based lecture capture as an alternative means of supervisor evaluations of teaching [8-9].

Swivl-based lecture capture has also been reported to have challenges. Some instructors balk at recording themselves or sharing video recordings [10], while other instructors reported concerns with privacy and a distrust of being observed remotely [12]. Wifi connectivity and cloud-based sharing of recordings were documented as persistent issues [8, 10, 13].

## **2. Quality Matters assessment framework can assist Hyflex and online learning**

The administration at The Citadel, which is residential, was confronted with the following competing constraints that had to be resolved prior to bringing students and faculty back to campus for the Fall 2020 semester: (1) maintain and enforce social distancing and smaller class sizes; (2) accommodate faculty who may need to teach remotely for the foreseeable future; (3) accommodate students who may need to learn remotely due to health reasons; (4) identify and maintain best practices for online instruction and facilitate faculty buy-in to a shared vision for online teaching.

Quality Matters (QM) was adopted by the administration as a lens through which to capture key metrics demonstrating educational excellence for The Citadel's regional accrediting body. QM is also an established protocol for supporting online instructional design excellence in STEM, as well as supporting program assessment and faculty development [14]. Studies note online QM reviews are important preparation experiences for faculty [15], with increased QM training among course developing faculty identified as a key factor that is predictive of increasing course quality, as measured by external stakeholders. QM training has also been studied as a professional development tool [16, 17], with researchers noting that faculty who are trained in QM create a "community of inquiry" that facilitates rapid and continuing acquisition of technological skills and enhanced online interactions with students [18].

Students also perceive QM-approved courses as more educationally enriched, owing to QM courses' careful instructional design criteria [19, 20], however detailed instructional design does not always correlate with higher teacher evaluations, particularly on the first run of an online course [16]. QM review scores have been found to correlate with students' final exam scores and overall course averages, and this has been taken as further evidence that STEM faculty would benefit from QM training [21].

Another benefit of QM is that the framework offers concrete targets for measuring the degree to which an online course has effectively removed barriers to online learning. QM aims to provide a Universal Design for Learning that encourages success among diverse student demographics. Some best practices that emerge from employing the QM framework include [17]:

1. Providing step-by-step instructions for accessing the course and all course materials, including an "orientation" or "getting started" module that helps students navigate with the Learning Management System (LMS).
2. Offering multiple formats of materials, including Word and PDF documents in order to meet accessibility guidelines.

3. Providing transcripts and closed captioning for all lectures, talks, synchronous or asynchronous.
4. Providing a means for regular interaction with students.
5. Using Sans Serif fonts (Arial, Calibri, among others) to increase visibility and accessibility. Font size for documents should be no less than 12 point and with presentations no less than 24 points.
6. Using bold to display emphasis rather than color in order to accommodate students with color blindness.
7. Maintaining ongoing one-on-one and group communication with students; establishing positive relationships with students and offering accessible opportunities for interaction.

The longitudinal effects of QM training for faculty appear to be long-term, with participants who were tracked over three years found to demonstrate increased teaching efficacy across face-to-face, online, and Hyflex modalities [21]. A major reported impact from these studies was faculty members' increased attention to the alignment of course learning objectives, module-level learning objectives, and assignments and activities [21, 22]. Studies also show that QM training and certification improves course learning outcomes and ABET-alignment about QM redesign of existing courses [23]. Student performance increased significantly as a result of QM-redesigned courses when measured against specific learning outcomes [23].

### **3. QM Dashboard Tool**

The Center for Excellence and Innovation in Teaching, Learning, and Distance Education (CEITL&DE) at The Citadel rapidly created a series of QM online trainings for accommodated faculty who would teach remotely during the pandemic, as well as faculty who would be teaching in-person. For faculty teaching remotely, these trainings were obligatory, and training completion was supported at all levels of the academic hierarchy, with department heads and deans reinforcing the need for training completion.

Faculty who taught remotely were assigned QM-trained mentors whose assigned roles included regular Zoom meetings, answering instructional design questions, providing online resources as instructional design exemplars, and overall guidance during the online review process. Due to the need for both frequent progress-check meetings and meeting concrete QM criteria to ensure instructional excellence, a visual QM dashboard was created.

The QM dashboard completed two iterations before evolving into its current form. In its initial deployment for Fall 2020, all 43 QM criteria were listed, as well as a brief 5-item capture that was driven by institutional needs and not specific to QM. The 5-item capture identified course content fundamentals: syllabus; announcements; assignments; Zoom video recordings; modules; discussion boards. These 5 items were areas of emphasis for the school administration and were included on the dashboard. For instance, The Citadel adopted standard language that all syllabi must contain for the fall. Some of the requirements outlined specific equipment such as a webcam, reliable WiFi if off campus, scanning (possibly with a smartphone), and masks on campus. Syllabi also contained expectations of students to include webcam on if in class, appropriately dressed, awake, etc. Organized by each week in the semester, the mentors identified whether or not each of the 43 QM criteria had been met on a weekly basis. While

mentors could not view grades, the QM dashboard was also used by select department heads who could view grade postings. Regular grade posting was just one indicator of overall online course management on the part of the instructor.

Motivated by scale and time constraints, CEITL&DE and their collaborators revised the QM dashboard to just 16 criteria while retaining the 5-item fundamentals. The sheer number of course reviews required for Fall 2020, as well as mentoring challenges, drove changes for the QM dashboard, resulting in a distilled capture of course engagement, course alignment, planned activities, assignments, and assessments, as well as key accessibility and privacy checks. Appendix A contains a sample second iteration dashboard employed during Spring 2021. The revised QM dashboard tool was motivated in part by the finding that a minority of faculty were not able to meet or exceed 86% of the QM criteria by the mid-semester of Fall 2020, as was hoped. For Spring 2021 semester, the revised QM dashboard retained the 5-item capture but reduced the QM criteria to the following 16 criteria [2]:

- 1.1 Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.
- 2.1 The course learning objectives, or course/program competencies, describe outcomes that are measurable.
- 2.2 The module/unit-level learning objectives or competencies describe outcomes that are measurable and consistent with the course-level objectives or competencies.
- 3.1 The assessments measure the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.
- 3.2 The course grading policy is stated clearly at the beginning of the course.
- 3.3 Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of learners' work, and their connection to the course grading policy is clearly explained.
- 4.1 The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.
- 4.2 The relationship between the use of instructional materials in the course and completing learning activities is clearly explained.
- 5.1 The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.
- 5.4 The requirements for learner interaction are clearly stated.
- 6.5 Links are provided to privacy policies for all external tools required in the course.
- 7.1 The course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered and how to obtain it.
- 7.2 (Disability Statement) Course instructions articulate or link to the institution's accessibility policies and services.
- 8.1 Course navigation facilitates ease of use.
- 8.2 The course design facilitates readability.
- 8.6 Vendor accessibility statements are provided for all technologies required in the course.

Reducing the QM criteria to these 16 items was driven by a need to conserve mentor and mentee time and energy, as well as institutional agreement that these selected criteria were of most import to our institutional context. Retaining the 5-item capture that included items like syllabus, announcements was retained because administrators and department heads were interested in knowing when these items were posted in the course. The institution adopted specific

information and requirements to be included in all syllabi. New information included equipment necessary for remote instruction while some requirements were that students will keep their cameras on.

#### **4. Near-term Impacts**

Both mentors and mentees were surveyed in their usage of the QM dashboard, and survey analysis is ongoing. Mentors who underwent QM training agree that the QM dashboard is useful, and they will use it to guide their own online course design efforts. Mentors and mentees alike appreciated that the tool was visual and allows for immediate recognition of met and still in-progress QM criteria. Some mentees were initially alienated by the use of MS Excel to capture this data; however, Excel facilitated mentors' accelerated efforts to complete course reviews on a weekly basis. The dashboard also was used as a helpful and objective visual that could be used to have more in-depth discussions with mentees on the importance of particular QM criteria and the kinds of instructional design impacts that would be a best-fit for their class. Mentees appreciated the abbreviated format of the 16-criteria version of the QM tool and appreciated how they were able to connect their LMS instructional design training with the CEITL&DE.

All mentors appreciated that the revised QM criteria used in Spring 2021 included 2/3 fewer Quality Matters criteria to evaluate, while some indicated that "[the visual checklist] does not need to be documented each week." As the mentoring process is further standardized at The Citadel, a manual of best practices will be produced that accounts for mentors' feedback regarding this tool, as well as observed best practices to ensure teaching effectiveness as new faculty are hired or shift into hybrid/Hyflex classroom delivery roles. Mentors also valued the QM tool and the training that supported it as a means of continuing their own faculty development.

The QM dashboard is socialized beyond the mentor-mentee relationship to include department heads and deans when particular instructors have fallen behind or done particularly well in their courses. Some department heads are using this tool to standardize and grow new online courses within their programs and mentor new faculty. Some programs have even decentralized this process of using the QM dashboard to allow junior faculty to self-assess their instructional design.

#### **5. Discussion**

While survey analysis is ongoing, both mentees and mentors report that use of the dashboard made the online review process easier and both groups intended to use the tool for instructional design purposes in the future. Consistent with the literature [22], however, mentees reported that QM-informed instructional design resulted in a great deal of additional labor and some of the criteria seemed more like minutia than crucial elements of instructional design, especially with regard to the first dashboard tool used, which included 43 criteria. One mentee suggested that her background in pedagogy should have been sufficient and additional training was unnecessary: "My pedagogical background in my opinion was sufficient to ensure a good class without doing so much busy super precise extra unpaid work." This sentiment is not unexpected in the wake of the pandemic and points to a broader need to educate all faculty on the merits and differences



between online and face-to-face instruction. It is well established that online course management and instructional design require a great deal more additional hours and lesson planning than many instructors anticipate.

Returning to the self-study questions guiding this research:

- (1) Can course quality be most effectively impacted through a full QM, 43-criterion review or can a subset of QM criteria be used to effect similar change?

It is clear that both mentees and mentors appreciate and prefer a more abbreviated QM-inspired assessment tool. Some mentors expressed that it was not necessary to assess mentees' courses every week; however, incoming feedback from department heads and administrators indicates that a weekly capture is useful for tracking progress. At least one department head and one dean liked the weekly checks, knowing that "if something doesn't get checked, it is more likely to be out of compliance."

- (2) How can faculty responses to Swivl-based lecture capture be optimized?

Optimization requires familiarization. As more faculty are trained in the use of Swivl-based lecture capture and its integration with the institution's LMS, more faculty will become comfortable with the presence of a Swivl in the classroom, as it allows for students to revisit lecture material and consolidate what they have learned.

- (3) What best practices emerge from a QM-based dashboard tool coupled with Swivl-capture technology?

As with all hybrid and hybrid-inspired instruction, instructional design and planning are key. Students need to be acclimated to faculty expectations both on and offline in order to maximize use of the Swivl-based lecture capture tool. Additionally, the developmental training and continued use of these tools post-pandemic affords opportunities in consolidating student learning, facilitating junior faculty development, and supports greater attention to instructional design.

Going forward, the QM dashboard will be used each semester at The Citadel to identify any areas of needed improvement, as perceived by faculty. There are also plans to transition the dashboard to face-to-face courses as a means of encouraging standardization regarding course navigation within the LMS. Course standardization, as employed at The Citadel, targets best practices in instructional design, not pedagogical theory or course work products, which remain the purview of a faculty member's department. The dashboard may also be used to track quality and consistency of online instructional design over time at The Citadel as more faculty are trained and onboarded in the use of instructional design. It is expected that faculty who do a lot of online teaching will likely produce fully compliant online courses more quickly over time. Initial dashboard performance results and surveys indicate that once a faculty member or mentee reaches a criterion in one course it is rapidly acquired in the other courses he or she teaches.

It is anticipated that the QM dashboard tool can be used beyond The Citadel, as many of the criteria selected would be useful for any institution to capture. While the dashboard is not the equivalent of a full online QM review, it can function as a quick snapshot of a course, and if completed weekly, can function as the proverbial ‘canary in a coalmine’ if there are issues that need to be addressed. Finally, though the dashboard facilitates QM captures and discussions at The Citadel, its fundamental purpose is to create an online environment that positions students and instructors for success. Student success is our driving motivation for all instructional innovation and though modest, the dashboard tool provides an objective visual snapshot of how we can best serve our students during the semester, while there still remains time to make the changes they need.

Our findings showed that the second, truncated version of the QM dashboard was most useful, and in response to self-study question (1) was less overwhelming for the mentees. While the QM criteria selected for the second iteration of the dashboard are critical for The Citadel’s online teaching context, it is likely this dashboard could be employed at other institutions. Additionally, some QM criteria are weighted more than others during a full QM review, therefore, logically, those are among the criteria most useful for a snapshot like the dashboard produces.

Faculty responses to online teaching and training have also been impacted by the exigent stresses of the pandemic in their personal lives. With regard to self-study question (2), faculty responses can be optimized through trust-building relationships between administration and faculty, as is modeled by the CEITL&DE mentors and mentees at The Citadel. While anxiety over lecture capture and video accessibility remains a flashpoint among faculty, use of this technology is well supported in the pre-pandemic literature, and is known to support student success more than traditional unrecorded teacher-centered classrooms do. Junior faculty have the most to gain from rewatching lectures, but established faculty can also continuously improve by engaging in pedagogical self-reflection.

One of the best practices reinforced by the QM dashboard and pedagogical research is staged learning: before class learning; during class learning; and after class learning. Regarding self-study question (3), training faculty in aligning course learning outcomes, lesson learning outcomes, activities, and assessments so as to facilitate the staged learning effect is a time-intensive process. Not unexpectedly, faculty noted the time requirements for this instructional design process. As this work continues, institution-specific best practices for meeting the selected QM criteria will emerge and reduce faculty onboarding time in the creation of online classes. While the literature reports reduced satisfaction on the part of faculty offering QM-informed online courses for the first time, it is expected that this initial negative effect will diminish as the process and goal posts become more concrete, standardized, and well-understood across the institution.

## **6. Conclusion and Future Work**

The dashboard instrument is an evolving tool to improve online instruction and resulted from a need to standardize minimum course content and instructor requirements. Temporary remote instruction does require that a course meet all 43 QM checks, but a subset of 16 was used to measure some degree of effective teaching. Preparation at all levels from instructor up to the

institution facilitates alternate instructional delivery in imperfect conditions. Remote instruction can be difficult, especially for instructors who are experiencing it for the first time. Higher education may never look like it did before COVID, and some of these changes have been opportunities for growth. Opportunities to improve education became apparent during the pandemic, and instructors and institutions should employ these best practices when possible. Future work will include analysis of mentor and mentee survey responses and identification of best practices.

## References

- [1] B. J. Beatty, *Hybrid-Flexible Course Design*. EdTech Books, 2019.  
<https://edtechbooks.org/Hyflex/>.
- [2] “Standards from the Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric,” Sixth Edition. *Quality Matters*. Retrieved from [Specific Review Standards from the QM Higher Education Rubric, Sixth Edition](#).
- [3] “7 Things about Swivl,” Grand Valley State University Information Technology. Retrieved from [https://www.gvsu.edu/cms4/asset/7E70FBB5-0BBC-EF4C-A56CBB9121AECA7F/7\\_things\\_swivl.pdf](https://www.gvsu.edu/cms4/asset/7E70FBB5-0BBC-EF4C-A56CBB9121AECA7F/7_things_swivl.pdf).
- [4] C. Li, “Hybrid Teaching of College English Under the Background of Big Data,” *Data Processing Techniques and Applications for Cyber-Physical Systems (DPTA 2019)*, 445-450, 2020.
- [5] S. Singh & A. Arya, “A hybrid flipped-classroom approach for online teaching of biochemistry in developing countries during COVID-19 crisis,” *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education: a Bimonthly Publication of the International Union of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, 2020.
- [6] T. Usova, “Optimizing our teaching: Hybrid mode of instruction,” *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, 6(2), 2011.H. Yuying, “Implementation Strategy of College English Online Blended Teaching Model,” In *2020 5th International Conference on Humanities Science and Society Development (ICHSSD 2020)* (pp. 279-282). Atlantis Press, July 2020.
- [7] P. Kranzfelder, J. L. Bankers-Fulbright, M. E. García-Ojeda, M. Melloy, S. Mohammed & A. R. M. Warfa, “The Classroom Discourse Observation Protocol (CDOP): A quantitative method for characterizing teacher discourse moves in undergraduate STEM learning environments,” *PloS one*, 14(7), e0219019, 2019.
- [8] R. K. Franklin, J. O. N. Mitchell, K. S. Walters, B. Livingston, M. B. Lineberger, C. Putman, & L. Karges-Bone, “Using Swivl robotic technology in teacher education preparation: A pilot study.” *TechTrends*, 62(2), 184-189, 2018.
- [9] S. McCoy, A. Lynam, & M. Kelly. “A case for using Swivl for digital observation in an online or blended learning environment,” *International Journal on Innovations in Online Education*, 2(2), 2018.
- [10] D. S. Allen, L. Goodson, & D. Hinrichs. “Improving Reflection during Student Teaching with Technology,” *The Advocate*, 23(2), 9, 2016.
- [11] K. A. Zoder-Martell, A. M. Markelz, M. T. Floress, H. A. Skriba, & L. E. Sayyah, “Technology to Facilitate Telehealth in Applied Behavior Analysis,” *Behavior analysis in practice*, 13(3), 596-603, 2020.

- [12] A. Kanekar & B. Prince, "Application of best practices in blended and online learning in a public health course," *International Journal of Sports, Health and Physical Education*, 1(2), 13-16, 2019.
- [13] D., Adair, K. Shattuck, B. Burch, & W. Zimmerman, "If We Knew Then What We Know Now: 15 Years of Data on Improving Online Learning Design," In *Proceedings from the 28<sup>th</sup> ICDE World Conference on Online Learning*, November 2019. <https://wcol2019>.
- [14] S. Conklin, Z. Morgan, G. Easow, & E. Hanson, "Impact of QM Professional Development on Course Design and Student Evaluations," *Journal of Educators Online*, 17(2), n2, 2020.
- [15] A. S. Haynes, "Identifying and removing barriers: How campus partners cultivate diverse online learning environments," *Library Technology Reports*, 54(4), 32-44, 2018.
- [16] K. Koepke & A. O'Brien, "Advancing pedagogy: Evidence for the role of online instructor training in improved pedagogical practices," *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 16(2), 73-83, 2012. doi:10.24059/olj.v16i2.259.
- [17] C. N. Allan, J. Crough, D. Green, & G. Brent, "Designing Rich, Evidence-Based Learning Experiences in STEM Higher Education," *Blended Learning Designs in STEM Higher Education*, 339-363, 2019.
- [18] V. S. Brown, M. Toussaint, & D. Lewis, "Students' Perceptions of Quality across Four Course Development Models," *Online Learning*, 22(2), 173-195, 2018.
- [19] G. P. Hollowell, R. M. Brooks, & Y. B. Anderson, "Course design, quality matters training, and student outcomes," *American Journal of Distance Education*, 31(3), 207-216, 2017.
- [20] L. R. Kearns & R. Mancilla, "The Impact of Quality Matters professional development on teaching across delivery formats," *American Journal of Distance Education*, 31(3), 185-197, 2017.
- [21] L. Posey & C. Pintz, "Transitioning a bachelor of science in nursing program to blended learning: Successes, challenges & outcomes," *Nurse education in practice*, 26, 126-133, 2017.
- [22] H. Wang, "Improving online STEM courses through Quality Matters Certification," *Journal of Online Engineering Education*, 10(2), 2019.
- [23] L. L. Hsu, "Qualitative assessment of a blended learning intervention in an undergraduate nursing course," *Journal of Nursing Research*, 20(4), 291-299, 2012.

## Appendix A: Revised Dashboard

Hybrid Standards	Jan 20-22	Jan 25-29	Feb 1-5	Feb 8-12	Feb 15-19	Feb 22-26	Mar 1-5	Mar 8-12	Mar 15-19	Mar 22-26	Mar 29 - Apr 2	Apr 5-9	Apr 12-16	Apr 19-23	
Syllabus	m	m	m	m	m	m	m								m = met
Announcements	n	n	m	m	n	n	n								n = needs revision
Assignments	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	np = no progress
Grades	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	g = goal
Video Recording	n	n	n	n	n	n	n								
Modules / Lessons	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
Discussion	m	m	m	n	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
Synch OL Compliance (met %)	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Synch OL Compliance (not met %)	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Synch OL Compliance (working %)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Synchronous OL Std	QM														
Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.	1.1	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
The course learning objectives, or course/program competencies, describe outcomes that are measurable.	2.1	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
The module/unit-level learning objectives or competencies describe outcomes that are measurable and consistent with the course-level objectives or competencies.	2.2	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n			
The assessments measure the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.	3.1	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
The course grading policy is stated clearly at the beginning of the course.	3.2	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of learners' work, and their connection to the course grading policy is clearly explained.	3.3	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n			
The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.	4.1	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
The relationship between the use of instructional materials in the course and completing learning activities is clearly explained.	4.2	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.	5.1	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
The requirements for learner interaction are clearly stated.	5.4	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
Links are provided to privacy policies for all external tools required in the course.	6.5	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n			
The course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered and how to obtain it.	7.1	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
(Disability Statement) Course instructions articulate or link to the institution's accessibility policies and services.	7.2	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
Course navigation facilitates ease of use.	8.1	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
The course design facilitates readability.	8.2	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			
Vendor accessibility statements are provided for all technologies required in the course.	8.6	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n			