A Preliminary Study: Application of Quality Matters Standard 5 (Course Activities and Learner Interaction) to Development of an Online Business Management Course

James G. Ward Ed.D.
*Fort Hays State University, jgward@fhsu.edu*

Yaprak Dalat Ward Ed.D.
*Fort Hays State University, y_dalatward@fhsu.edu*

Linda A
*Fort Hays State University, g_a@fhsu.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.fhsu.edu/appliedbusiness_facpubs](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/appliedbusiness_facpubs)

Part of the Business Commons, and the Higher Education Commons

Recommended Citation
[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/appliedbusiness_facpubs/1](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/appliedbusiness_facpubs/1)

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Applied Business Studies at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Applied Business Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.
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Abstract

This preliminary study of developing a sample course model aimed to answer the following question: What are the potential issues designers may encounter regarding developing Course Activities and Learner Interaction in the application of the QM High Education Rubric? The following questions were supported by annotations within the QM High Education Rubric. The course was designed to address each of the following four questions:

- Question 1: Are activities aligned to promote the achievement of stated learning objectives or competencies? All learning activities in the course were aligned to the course objectives.
- Question 2: Do the learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning? Active learning includes learner-leader, learner-instructor, and learner-content (QM Higher Education Rubric, 2014). Active learning requires learners to act-discover, process, apply, for example, learner-Learner activities might be group discussions, or team projects. A conversation with the instructor is a learner-instructor interaction. Finally, a learner-content interaction is assigning readings, or podcasts, or videos for viewing.
- Question 3: Is the instructor’s plan for response time and feedback on assignments clearly stated? Frequent feedback was required for learning to occur. This provides clear information about when learners will receive feedback from the instructor and the course。（QM Higher Education Rubric, 2014, p. 23） If response time needs to be altered, it had to be clearly stated. This information was included in the syllabus.
- Question 4: Are the requirements for learner interaction clearly stated? This information is provided in the syllabus that cleared understanding of course requirements and assisted learners to plan and manage their own class participation.

Introduction

Prior to applying the QM Rubric to an online business course, the researcher had to be qualified through a five-day face-to-face training session in the first four QM certifications: 1) Applying the QM Rubric; 2) Improving Your Online Course; 3) Designing Your Online Course; 4) Using Instructional Materials. Technology to Promote Learner Engagement. The final culminating certificate was awarded after completing an approximately 50-hour online course and then certified as a QM Peer Reviewer in the spring of 2017. The faculty researcher was also assisted by an instructional designer from the same university in the development of the course.

The purpose of this preliminary study was to develop a sample model course demonstrating the use of QM General Standard 5, Course Activities and Learner Interaction.

Findings

The faculty researcher completed a reflection on the process of developing these Quality Matters activities based on the business philosophy of Koch Industries. The instructor followed the rubric and additionally, focused on the annotations provided by QM Higher Education Rubric (2014).

Conclusions

QM Higher Education Rubric (2014) serves as a guide for standardization of best practices and no doubt can be extremely beneficial for novice as well as experienced faculty as part of a course improvement plan since learner characteristics continuously change due to technological developments and generational differences.

Recommendations for Further Study

2. A preliminary study exploring the application of other seven QM Higher Education Rubric standards.
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QM Specific Review Standards of General Standard 5: Course Activities and Learner Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>QM Specific Review Standards of General Standard 5: Course Activities and Learner Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are activities aligned to promote the achievement of stated learning objectives or competencies?</td>
<td>The achievement of stated learning objectives or competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do the learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning?</td>
<td>This example demonstrates that the learning activity provides interaction that support active learning as indicated below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the requirements for learner interaction clearly stated?</td>
<td>This example demonstrates that the learning activity provides interaction that support active learning as indicated below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are the requirements for learner interaction clearly stated?</td>
<td>This example demonstrates that the learning activity provides interaction that support active learning as indicated below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application of QM Specific Review Standards of General Standard 5 to the course: Decision Rights and Solution Process - The course design was aligned to the course objectives as described in the QM Higher Education Rubric. The course was designed to address each of the following four questions: Question 1: Are activities aligned to promote the achievement of stated learning objectives or competencies? All learning activities in the course were aligned to the course objectives. Question 2: Do the learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning? Active learning includes learner-leader, learner-instructor, and learner-content (QM Higher Education Rubric, 2014). Active learning requires learners to act-discover, process, apply, for example, learner-Learner activities might be group discussions, or team projects. A conversation with the instructor is a learner-instructor interaction. Finally, a learner-content interaction is assigning readings, or podcasts, or videos for viewing. Question 3: Is the instructor’s plan for response time and feedback on assignments clearly stated? Frequent feedback was required for learning to occur. This provides clear information about when learners will receive feedback from the instructor. In the course, the instructor made clear responses would be clearly stated. Question 4: Are the requirements for learner interaction clearly stated? This information is provided in the syllabus that cleared understanding of course requirements and assisted learners to plan and manage their own class participation.
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