

QM General Standards: Recommended References

There are more than 1,600 references in the [QM Research Library](#). To start, here are a few recommended references for each of the 8 QM Rubric General Standards. To read the abstracts and notes for these references, see the [QM Research Library](#).

General Standard 1: Course Overview and Introduction

The overall design of the course is made clear to the learner at the beginning of the course.

1. Hixon, E., Buckenmeyer, J., & Barczyk, C. (2015). Closing the feedback loop: Hearing the student voice in course quality. *Quality Approaches in Higher Education*, 6(1). Retrieved from <http://asq.org/edu/2015/03/best-practices/closing-the-feedback-loop-hearing-the-student-voice-in-course-quality.pdf>
2. Fetzner, M. (2013). What do unsuccessful online students want us to know? *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 17(1). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1011376.pdf>
3. Simunich, B., Robins, D. B., & Kelly, V. (2012, October). The impact of findability on student motivations, self-efficacy, and perceptions of online course quality. [2012 QM Research Grant]. Presentation at the 4th Annual Quality Matters Conference, Tucson, AZ. Retrieved from <https://www.qualitymatters.org/files/webform/Quality%20Matters%202012%20Findability.pdf>

General Standard 2: Learning Objectives (Competencies)

Learning objectives or competencies describe what learners will be able to do upon completion of the course.

1. Jiang, L., & Elen, J. (2011). Why do learning goals (not) work: A reexamination of the hypothesized effectiveness of learning goals based on students' behavior and cognitive processes. *Education Technology Research & Development*. 59, 553-573. doi: 10.1007/s11423-011-9200-y

2. Rice, M. F. (2018). Supporting literacy with accessibility: Virtual school course designers' planning for students with disabilities. *Online Learning*, 22(4), 161-179. doi:10.24059/olj.v22i4.1508 Retrieved from <https://olj.onlinelearningconsortium.org/index.php/olj/article/view/1508/434>
3. Dziuban, C., Graham, C. R., Moskal, P. A., Norberg, A., & Sicilia, N. (2018). Blended learning: the new normal and emerging technologies. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 15(3). DOI 10.1186/s41239-017-0087-5 Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/35930836/Blended_learning_the_new_normal_and_emerging_technologies
4. Swan, K., Matthews, D., Bogle, L., Boles, E., & Day, S. (2012). Linking online course design and implementation to learning outcomes: A design experiment. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 15(2), 81-88. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.07.002>

General Standard 3: Assessment and Measurement

Assessments are integral to the learning process and are designed to evaluate learner progress in achieving the stated learning objectives or mastering the competencies.

1. Hwang, W-Y., Hsu, J-L., Shadiey, R., Chang, C-L., & Huang, Y-M. (2015). Employing self-assessment, journaling, and peer sharing to enhance learning from an online course. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 27(2), 114-133. doi: 10.1007/s12528-015-9096-3
2. Watson, F. F., & Ferdinand-James, D. (2018). Unpacking the influence of online students' perceived course satisfaction/dissatisfaction on their performance. Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com/scholar_url?url=https://works.bepress.com/firmfaith-watson/9/download/&hl=en&sa=X&scisig=AAGBfm0zETzdTgeLggkIY02bDo1J23FNuw&nossl=1&oi=scholaralrt

General Standard 4: Instructional Materials

Instructional materials enable learners to achieve stated learning objectives or competencies.

1. Choo, J., Scagnoli, N. I., & Tian, J. (2019). Students' insights on the use of video lectures in online classes. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(1), 399-414. doi:10.1111/bjet.12572
2. Kumar, S., Martin, F., Budhrani, K., & Ritzhaupt, A. (2019). Award-winning faculty online teaching practices: Elements of award-winning courses. *Online Learning*, 23(4), 160-180. doi:10.24059/olj.v23i4.2077
3. Murray, M., Pérez, J., Geist, D., Hedrick, A., & Steinbach, T. (2012). Student Interaction with Online Course Content: Build It and They Might Come. *Journal Of Information Technology Education*, 11; 125-140.

General Standard 5: Learning Activities and Learner Interaction

Learning activities facilitate and support learner interaction and engagement.

1. Bickle, M.C., Rucker, R. D., & Burnsed, K. A. (2019). Online learning: examination of attributes that promote student satisfaction. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 22(1). Retrieved from https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring221/bickle_rucker_burnsed221.html
2. Oh, E. Y., Rice, M., & Song, D. (2019). Participation in online courses and interaction with a virtual agent. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 20(1), 43-62.
3. Martin, J. (2019). Building relationships and increasing engagement in the virtual classroom: Practical tools for the online instructor. *Journal of Educators Online*, 16(1).
4. Cohen, A. , & Soffer, T. (2019). Students' engagement characteristics predict success and completion of online courses. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 35(3), 378-389. doi:10.1111/jcal.12340
5. Sadaf, A., Martin, F., & Ahlgrim-Delzell, L. (2019). Student perceptions of the impact of quality matters-certified online courses on their learning and engagement. *Online Learning*, 23(4), 214-233. doi:10.24059/olj.v23i4.2009
6. Thomas, R. M. (2017). Student Perceptions of Quality in Fully Online Courses: A Mixed Methods Study (Doctoral dissertation, Frostburg State University).
7. Oyarzun, B., Stefaniak, J., Bol, L., & Morrison, G. R. (2018). Effects of learner-to-learner interactions on social presence, achievement and satisfaction. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 30(1), 154-175. doi:10.1007/s12528-017-9157-x
8. Borup, J. A. (2013). Types, Subjects, and Purposes of K-12 Online Learning Interaction. All Theses and Dissertations. Paper 3711. <http://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/3711>
9. Darabi, A., Liang, X, Suryavanski, R., & Yurekli, H. (2013). Effectiveness of online discussion strategies: A meta-analysis. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 27, 228-241. doi: 10.1080/08923647.2013.837651

General Standard 6: Course Technology

Course technologies support learners' achievement of course objectives or competencies.

1. Spichtig, A. N., Gehsmann, K. M., Pascoe, J. P., & Ferrara, J. D. (2019). The Impact of Adaptive, Web-Based Scaffolded Silent Reading Instruction on the Reading Achievement of Students in Grades 4 and 5. *Elementary School Journal*, 119(3), 443-467. Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1208260>

2. Chapman, J. R., & Rich, P. J. (2018). Does educational gamification improve students' motivation? If so, which game elements work best? *Journal of Education for Business*, 93(7), 314-321.
3. Bellard, B. (2018). Achieving complex learning outcomes through adoption of a pedagogical perspective: A model for computer technology delivered instruction. *Journal of Educational Multimedia & Hypermedia*, 27(1), 5-23.
4. Ellis, R. A., & Han, F. (2018). Reasons why some university students avoid the online learning environment in blended courses. *Journal of Educational Multimedia & Hypermedia*, 27(2), 137-152.

General Standard 7: Learner Support

The course facilitates learner access to institutional support services essential to learner success.

1. Stone, C., & O'Shea, S. (2019). Older, online and first: Recommendations for retention and success. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 35(1). Retrieved from <https://ajet.org.au/index.php/AJET/article/view/3913/1519>
2. Moore, K., Schmidt-Crawford, D., & Valai, A. (2019). Quality indicators for distance learning: A literature review in learners' perceptions of quality. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 18(1), 103-124.
3. St. Rose, M., & Moore, A. (2019). Student retention in online courses: university role. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 22(3). Retrieved from https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall223/strose_moore223.html
4. Hart, T. L. (2017). The Relationship between Online Students' Use of Services and Their Feelings of Mattering (Doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico)
5. Geringer, S. K. (2018). Impact of an online orientation course on academic success of online students. (78), ProQuest Information & Learning, US. Retrieved from <http://0-search.ebscohost.com.carlson.utoledo.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psych&AN=2017-43827-124&site=ehost-live> Available from EBSCOhost psych database.
6. Duarte, J. M., & Krull, G. (2018). Meeting the needs of digital learners: Learner support patterns and strategies. Proceedings of the International Conference on e-Learning, 212-219.

General Standard 8: Accessibility and Usability

The course design reflects a commitment to accessibility and usability for all learners.

1. Ortiz, K., Rice, M., McKeown, T. & Tonks, D. (2020). Special Issue: Inclusion in Online Learning Environments. *Journal of Online Learning Research*, 6(3), 171-176. Waynesville, NC USA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved December 29, 2020 from <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/218374/>
2. Coleman, M., & Berge, Z. L. (2018). A review of accessibility in online higher education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 21(1), 1-7.
3. Rice, M.F. (2018). Supporting literacy with accessibility: Virtual school course designers' planning for students with disabilities. *Online Learning*, 22(4), 161-179. doi:10.24059/olj.v22i4.1508 Retrieved from <https://olj.onlinelearningconsortium.org/index.php/olj/article/view/1508/434>
4. Myers, J. H. (2015). Usability in online course design: Comparative perspectives on ease-of-use, satisfaction, motivation, and teacher presence. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Buffalo, Buffalo, NY.
5. Simunich, B., Robins, D. B., & Kelly, V. (2015). The impact of findability on student motivation, self-efficacy, and perceptions of online course quality. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 29(3), 174-185. doi:10.1080/08923647.2015.1058604