



California  
Community  
Colleges

California  
Virtual Campus

# Peer Online Course Review Landscape Report

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	2
Introduction	2
Executive Summary	2
POCR and the CVC Exchange	3
POCR Aligned Courses as of November 2023	4
Staff Support for POCR	5
Network of Support	5
Goals and Benefits of POCR	5
Local POCR Processes and Practices	6
CCC POCR Research	6
The Rubric	7
Influences and Comparisons to Other Systems	8
Other Systems	11
Peer Online Course Review Survey	13
Survey Administration	14
Background of Respondents, N=126	14
Purposes and Contributions of POCR, N=113	14
College Implementation of POCR	15
Compensation and Funding	15
Benefits to both faculty and students	16
Faculty Benefits – Community, Support for teaching all Courses:	16
Student Benefits - Improved course Accessibility, Navigation, and Engagement:	16
Ideas for POCR improvement	17
General Findings	18
Recommendations for CVC@ONE	20
Recommendations for the California Community College Chancellor’s Office	20
Bibliography	21

## Acknowledgement

This report was prepared with the support of several California Virtual Campus (CVC) and Online Network of Educators (@ONE) team members, in addition to Peer Online Course Review (POCR) Leads and Reviewers throughout the California Community College (CCC) system, with the goal of providing a snapshot in time of the POCR process, mostly focusing on data available by fall 2023.

The report is in fulfillment of the Chancellor's Office request for a landscape analysis of the Peer Online Course Review process under the professional development contract awarded to the Foothill-De Anza (FHDA) Community College District to support systemwide professional development.

## Introduction

California Virtual Campus' Online Network of Educators (CVC@ONE) is a community of educators, dedicated to improving and enhancing teaching and learning. Having served the California Community Colleges with quality professional development for more than two decades, CVC@ONE is supported by the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) through a grant to the FHDA Community College District, and receives leadership through the CVC. In addition to providing high-quality professional development and inclusive instructional resources, CVC@ONE also provides training and support for the Peer Online Course Review process, a quality assurance program for creating, improving and growing quality online courses.

## Executive Summary

The CVC@ONE Peer Online Course Review (POCR) framework is a comprehensive process for assessing, remediating and improving course design for fully online asynchronous courses. POCR, which uses a quality rubric, norming sessions, peer guidance and review, and professional development as its core strategies, has been designed in consultation and collaboration with systemwide leadership and the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges (ASCCC) to certify online courses that meet the highest quality standards. The POCR process has involved thousands of faculty and impacted hundreds of thousands of students state-wide, and is highly-regarded by participants as working well and adding significant value to both faculty and students. User feedback strongly indicates that the positive impact of the

quality alignments is felt well beyond the aligned section, and that POCR positively impacts teaching for students in both online and on-campus courses.

The current POCR process involves a significant investment in staff and faculty time, since successful course design for online teaching requires the learning and adoption of new technology, the learning and incorporation of instructional design practices, the learning and implementation of accessibility/universal design practices, and the effort needed to reach quality standards goes beyond the minimum qualifications required by most colleges to teach online. Colleges typically provide incentives in the form of stipends or release time or designation on the class schedule to promote enrollment, however the application of these incentives varies greatly, and is locally determined and negotiated. Increasing the percentage of badged courses offered to our students will require more creative solutions, systemwide resources and additional, streamlined pathways for badging. Similar to accreditation, POCR serves several purposes which are based on the signaling of quality to various constituents.

### [POCR and the CVC Exchange](#)

POCR is the process by which a faculty member demonstrates their online course meets the quality standards outlined in the [CVC Course Design Rubric](#). This includes peer review of the online course materials, using the rubric to guide feedback. When the standards have been met to the satisfaction of the peer review team, the course is considered “aligned” and receives a Quality Reviewed badge in the CVC Exchange. The process can take several months and can require considerable time and effort for all those involved.

[The CVC Exchange](#) is a statewide course-sharing platform that allows students to seamlessly register for online classes at other CCCs without requiring a new application, wait time, or provisioning. One of the many tools available to students on the CVC Exchange during their search for online courses is the “Quality Reviewed” badge that some courses carry, indicating that they are aligned with the rubric and have undergone a thorough review and remediation process. Furthermore, courses that have this quality badge are prioritized in the search results through an associated algorithm.

Based on data pulled from the CVC Exchange, in fall 2023 there were more than 33,000 enrollments state-wide in Quality Reviewed courses (i.e. courses that are POCR aligned). Of those 33,000 enrollments, nearly 1,100 were in Quality Reviewed sections. About 75% of the QR enrollments were in 3 credit classes with English, social sciences (psychology, history, anthropology, sociology), business (accounting, business,

economics), communications, and nutrition classes with the largest enrollments overall. Although this report mostly focuses on the snapshot taken during fall, 2023, at the time of publication of this report in June, 2024, there are 79 Local POCR certified colleges, and more than 2,011 courses are aligned, with 322 of them aligned during the 23-24 fiscal year.

Whereas colleges used to send every single aligned course to the CVC@ONE team for a final review, beginning in 2021, the CVC@ONE moved from a centralized POCR review process to “Local POCR,” where colleges were supported by the CVC@ONE team to review and badge their own courses. Although these Local POCR processes must be reviewed and certified by CVC@ONE team to ensure each college has systems in place to certify that courses meet the rubric standards, once certified, the colleges are entrusted to review and badge their own courses. Each college team must participate in training and attend quarterly state-wide norming sessions to ensure a common understanding and use of the rubric.

There were about 150 attendees at each norming session in fall 2023, including about 245 individuals attending one of two norming sessions so far that year, with the balance (about 50) attending both sessions. Feedback was positive with 92% of respondents rating it a 4 or 5 out 5 on a feedback form during the December 2023 meeting.

With the adoption of local POCR processes by more and more colleges, the number of aligned courses is projected to grow significantly in the coming years. More than 1,000 faculty have obtained certification. Including POCR Leads and Reviewers, the number of faculty involved in POCR over the last few years is likely in the thousands. Each Local POCR college typically has several additional faculty, including POCR Leads and Reviewers involved in the process. These faculty often are represented on college distance education committees where they may report on POCR activities.

**POCR Aligned Courses as of November 2023**

Table 1: Select data points for POCR aligned courses, as of November 2023

Data	Findings
Colleges with the Most Aligned courses	Saddleback College Santa Ana College Sacramento City College
Subject with the Most Aligned Courses	English

Top 10 Subjects with Aligned Courses	ENGL, HIST, PSYC, SOC , MATH, COMM, BUS, ECON, ANTH, PHIL
--------------------------------------	---

### Staff Support for POCR

In recent years many colleges have hired instructional designers and accessibility specialists to assist faculty with online courses, including those submitting for POCR alignment. In other cases, instructional technologists, support staff or faculty themselves have this expertise and were able to provide this support. As of last year, 24% of colleges reported on their Local POCR Certification Application that they have no additional staff support for POCR, with another 30% indicating the support was part-time. Less than half of applicants noted full-time staff support in the form of an accessibility specialist and or an instructional designer trained in accessibility. In most cases, colleges report that they do not have specially dedicated team members to POCR activities, but rather that existing staff for online education and accessibility also support POCR.

### Network of Support

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has been a partner with the CVC since its inception. In 2018 ASCCC passed a resolution in support of local adoption of the rubric, formally creating a strong faculty backing for the process. Furthermore, dozens of local senates from individual colleges have also passed resolutions in support of starting and sustaining POCR at their institutions. Moreover, POCR remains a consistent topic of collaboration amongst faculty and staff, and is well represented in the programs for the past several years of the annual [Online Teaching Conference](#), a popular conference for the CCCs. There are also other local and national conferences and panels, such as the 2022 [WCET Member Summit](#) where the CVC@ONE Executive Director, alongside representatives from SUNY and Quality Matters, were invited to speak about course quality rubrics and processes.

### Goals and Benefits of POCR

Those involved with POCR highlight the primary goal of the process is student success, but many indicate the process benefits both faculty and students. For faculty, participation provides a community that can support their professional development over the long term. It provides them with the tools to be better instructors in all of their classes, regardless of modality. Nearly all faculty report high levels of satisfaction with the process and that they are proud of their work on behalf of students. They are

appreciative of the assistance provided through training, the peer feedback, and generally feel supported. For students, the aligned courses provide instruction that is easy to navigate, allowing them to focus more on learning the material while reducing the cognitive load of course navigation. An aligned course also provides multiple forms of engagement, allowing students to feel connected and supported in the online environment.

### Local POCR Processes and Practices

Local POCR processes vary by college and are impacted by funding, contractual agreements, and the degree of support from local academic senates. Funding also impacts whether and how much stipends and or release time were given to leads, reviewers, and participants. Some colleges require a rigorous review of course shells as part of distance education committee approval which is separate from POCR. Some colleges use a cohort approach to the POCR process and connect it to an online professional development course, some colleges use a self-paced approach, and some colleges do both. Some colleges have used technology to help organize peer suggestions that allow participants to track progress on their edits. Other colleges have different levels of review with the peer reviewers taking a first look at certain elements followed by a review by the POCR leads. Most colleges talk about celebrating the achievement of getting a course badged and have collected faculty testimonials to inspire other faculty. However, many do not highlight the badging in the local schedule of classes for students.

### CCC POCR Research

There is some local research around the impact of POCR on student outcomes. In a 2017 study conducted by the RP Group, there was an encouraging finding that students taking POCR-aligned courses had a 4.9% higher success rate than the statewide average for online courses. While promising, there were questions about the methodology of this work, and questions as to whether these faculty were already strong teachers by virtue of their interest and willingness in the POCR promise as a form of professional development. Meaning, were these already highly effective instructors who sought out this process or did the process itself improve the outcomes of their students in the POCR aligned sections? To build on this research, some institutional research offices have examined the outcomes from POCR alignment. Below are two examples.

[The Chaffey College Institutional Research Office](#) examined course success rates pre and post POCR alignment. This means that they examined the same faculty member's

courses before and after the alignment, thus appearing to address the concern around faculty self-selection in the student outcomes from the RP Group survey. The sample included five faculty and 27 aligned courses. They found that “there was a 12% increase overall in online course success rates after POOCR alignment. Furthermore, regardless of ethnicity, gender, or age, success rates in online courses were higher for all student groups post-POOCR alignment in comparison to pre- POOCR alignment, with one exception (students aged 35 to 39).”

In 2024 Los Angeles Pierce College, [Office of Institutional Effectiveness](#) also examined course success rates pre and post POOCR alignment. They found an overall 5% increase, and significant increases of 8% seen for Asian students, 8% for Black students and 10% increase for Hispanic students. There were also gains of up to 6-10% seen for various age groups.

### The Rubric

The current Course Design Rubric was last revised in April 2020 and originally developed in 2014 by the CVC (then OEI) Professional Development Work Group to ensure that all courses offered as part of the initiative promote student success and meet existing regulatory and accreditation requirements. It has undergone revisions and updates since then in response to changes in available instructional technology and feedback from both instructors and reviewers. The rubric was based on a review of other rubrics available at the time (Baldwin, 2017).

Table 2: Summary of the CVC@ONE Course Design Rubric’s four sections.

Rubric Section	Description
Section A: Content Presentation	The 14 elements for quality course design in this section address how content is organized and accessed in the course management system. Key elements include course navigation, learning objectives, and access to student support information.
Section B: Interaction	The six elements in this section address instructor-initiated and student-initiated communication. Key elements of quality



	course design covered in this section include regular effective contact, both between and among instructors and students.
Section C: Assessment	The eight elements in this section address the variety and effectiveness of assessments within the course. Key elements include the alignment of objectives and assessments, the clarity of instructions for completing activities, and evidence of timely and regular feedback.
Section D: Accessibility	The 16 elements in this section are reviewed to determine if a student using assistive technologies will be able to access the instructor’s course content as required by Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (also known as “508 Compliance”). The accessibility elements in Section D focus on instructor-generated content that is primarily under the control of faculty when developing a course.

Following a review by a team of trained faculty peer reviewers, each element in Sections A-C is marked in one of three ways:

- Incomplete: The element is missing or present to a degree that does not adequately support student success in online learning.
- Aligned: The element is present and effectively designed to support student success in online learning.
- Additional Exemplary Elements: This designation recognizes design choices that are aligned *and* go even further to enhance the student experience in the online learning environment.

Since Section D addresses elements that are required to be present, the elements in this section, when applicable, are only marked as Incomplete or Exchange Ready.

### Influences and Comparisons to Other Systems

The CVC@ONE rubric was influenced by the Quality Matters (QM) Rubric and is similar in many respects to what is provided by this national organization. Since the Quality Matters (QM) rubric is widely used in colleges across the country, what follows below is a selected comparison and analysis of the rubric elements between CVC@ONE and QM.

Table 3: A comparison between CVC Quality Course Design Rubric and Quality Matters Rubric

Standard	CVC Quality Course Design Rubric	Quality Matters Rubric	Conclusion
Accessibility	<p>D7: Images- All images have appropriate alternative text, either explaining instructional value or indicating the image is decorative. Alternative text does not contain "image of", "picture of" or file extension (e.g., ".jpg").</p> <p>D12: Video- All videos must have accurate captions.</p>	<p>8.4 The course provides alternative means of access to multimedia content in formats that meet the needs of diverse learners.</p>	<p>CVC@ONE rubric is more specific regarding Accessibility</p>
Accessibility	<p>The 16 elements in this section are reviewed to determine if a student using assistive technologies will be able to access the instructor's course content as required by Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (also known as "508 Compliance"). The accessibility elements in Section D focus on instructor-generated content that is primarily under the control of faculty when developing a course.</p>	<p>QM Note on Accessibility                      * Meeting QM Specific Review Standards regarding accessibility does not guarantee or imply that the specific accessibility regulations of any country are met. Consult with an accessibility specialist to ensure that accessibility regulations are met.</p>	<p>The CVC@ONE rubric appears to be more rigorous in its review of accessibility than QM.</p>

<p>Student Engagement</p>	<p>Regular Effective Contact (CVC)</p> <p>The course design includes regular instructor-initiated contact with students using CM S communication tools and a clear explanation for students of when and how communication will happen.</p>	<p>Learner Interaction (QM)</p> <p>5.2 Learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning.</p> <p>5.3 The instructor’s plan for interacting with learners during the course is clearly stated.</p> <p>5.4 The requirements for learner interaction are clearly stated.</p>	<p>Varying language is used for student engagement.</p>
<p>Costs</p>	<p>The support, ongoing norming sessions and mentoring provided by CVC@ONE comes at no additional charge to colleges; however colleges still determine their local compensation practices.</p>	<p>There is a significant cost to QM training, ranging in the hundreds of dollars for individuals, and in the many thousands of dollars for groups. There are also membership fees for institutions who seek to receive ongoing support and recertification.</p>	<p>CVC provides better overall value.</p>

Technology	<p>6.1 The tools used in the course support the learning objectives or competencies.</p> <p>6.2 Course tools promote learner engagement and active learning.</p> <p>6.3 A variety of technology is used in the course.</p> <p>6.4 The course provides learners with information on protecting their data and privacy.</p>	<p>A7: Effective Use of Course Management (CMS) Tools - CMS tools are used to provide integrated and innovative learning materials and activities for students.</p> <p>A8: Effective Use of Multimedia-Multimedia is used creatively throughout the course to facilitate student-centered learning.</p> <p>A14: Technology Support-Links to technology support and trouble-shooting tips are provided where they may be needed throughout the course.</p>	<p>For Technology the QM Rubric is more general, with the exception of privacy.</p>
------------	---	---	---

Other Systems

What follows is a select list of systems (both in-state and out of the state) who have active online programs, along with a brief summary of how they address peer review, if at all, for course design.

[The University of California, UC Online](#) provides support for online instruction system wide. Each campus has developed its own online framework. For example, the University of California San Diego has developed a [Quality Checklist and an approval process through the Academic Senate](#). The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Working Group of the UC Instructional Design Faculty Support (IDFS) Community of Practice has developed a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Course Design Rubric.

[California State University](#) does not appear to have a systemwide program for peer review, but individual CSUs have developed an online course quality rubric modeled on the work done by [CSU Chico](#), which uses the Quality Learning and Teaching (QLT) rubric.

“Since 2014, CSU, Chico has used the CSU Chancellor's Office instrument called Quality Learning and Teaching (QLT, pronounced "colt") to evaluate the quality of online and hybrid courses. The QLT instrument can be applied to any course with online elements, from fully online to hybrid or blended. Although the rubric is used as an evaluation tool it is best used as a developmental process for online course design. Originally, the QLT rubric was constructed to promote course assessment based on CSU-wide expectations, to guide course redesign using instructional design principles, and to recognize instructors who have developed expertise in online instruction.”

[Oregon State University Ecampus](#) has 14,000 fully online students, 30,000 enrollments, in 100 online programs. The course review process has been in place for 20 years with faculty senate support. Each new online course goes through several levels of review but staff that have trained in Quality Matters rubric and have quality matters peer review certification. Ecampus staffing includes 20 full-time instructional designers, and 20 Media Specialists such as videographers and animation experts. The media specialists work with faculty to develop course materials based on learning outcomes for the course. The Media Specialists also act as project managers to get the course completed, which takes about 6 months. Ecampus provides funding to the colleges for online course development and some of the colleges pay faculty for their time over the six months. Redevelopment of online courses is recommended every 3-5 years, although this is a recommendation.

[The University of Maryland Global Campus](#) (UMGC) is a fully online institution of higher education. [According to its “Facts at a Glance” web page](#), the university enrolled more than 300,000 students in 2022, offering 125 undergraduate programs with almost 1,000 online courses. UMGC provides instructional design support for the development of online courses using the quality matters rubric. They do not use an internal peer review process. Instructional designers lead the development of online materials used by faculty.

[SUNY Online](#) offers 900 online programs across the 64 State University of New York campuses, with half the campuses offering a fully online program. SUNY Online supports the campuses in developing and promoting online courses. Since 2015, SUNY Online has used the Online SUNY Course Quality Review Rubric ([OSCQR](#)) to develop quality online courses. OSCQR is an open resource available to meet individual campus needs. The rubric incorporates aspects of the QM rubric. SUNY Online assists the campuses in course design. They do not badge or highlight courses in the schedule of classes but do give preferential treatment in their Navigator tool for quality reviewed

programs. In addition to course review, they have a program level quality review process. A course review refresh is recommended every three - five years. SUNY Online provides help desk support with 12 fulltime analysts that campuses can opt in for a fee, which provides support for its learning management system.

### Examples of Differences

A summary of some key differences between the CVC@ONE model and other systems is below:

- Full service instructional design model in other systems: Instructional designer builds the course for the faculty member.
- Media specialist staff in other systems help with the creation of teaching materials.
- Other systems often require review before a faculty member is allowed to teach online.
- Other systems often include a review cycle.
- Other rubrics include information on how long it takes to fix the issue – e.g. 30-minute revision.
- Most systems do not highlight badged courses on the course schedule.
- Some have funding for faculty, not all.
- Standards elsewhere are focused on quality course design not online teaching.

### Peer Online Course Review Survey

An online survey was administered to individuals across California Community Colleges (CCC) involved with the Peer Online Course Review Process (POCR). POCR is now a locally administered process using the CVC@ONE rubric and state-wide norming sessions that involves professional development and peer review with feedback. Overall, Survey responses indicate wide support for the value and benefit to faculty and students of a local process that uses a standardized rubric. Respondents noted that quality online courses lead to equity in student outcomes. Many respondents suggested that the CCCCO could help support campus POCR efforts through consistent funding.

### Survey Administration

- An online survey was conducted from January 17 to January 29, 2024.

- There were 126 responses, 81 self-identified as POCR Leads and 45 self-identified as Reviewers or other participants.
- There are 118 POCR Leads (or Co-Leads) resulting in a response rate for POCR Leads of 69%.
- Responses were received from 83 colleges.
- All responses were included in the analysis.

#### Background of Respondents, N=126

- 83% of respondents identified as faculty, from a range of disciplines.
- 63% of respondents had been involved with the POCR process for 3 or more years.
- 71% of respondents were from certified Local POCR colleges.

#### Purposes and Contributions of POCR, N=113

Table 4: Most common responses from respondents around the purposes and contributions of POCR at their campuses.

Purposes	Contributes to Online Quality
Promotes individual faculty member improvement (93%)	It expands the expertise of peers at the college that support all online faculty (89%)
Promotes institutional improvement (84%)	It increases the professional development opportunities for all online faculty (76%)
Certifies value and legitimacy of student online learning (83%)	It provides examples to students and faculty of quality online courses (83%)
Assures online course quality to students and taxpayers (79%)	
Improves the online learning experience for all students (96%)	

#### College Implementation of POCR

- 83% of 120 respondents reported having between 0-10% online course sections offered in fall 2023 that were POCR-aligned courses.
- 54% of 114 respondents indicated that their local POCR process includes discussion of student equity (e.g. outlines strategies for creating inclusive and culturally responsive online courses). Some respondents noted that a focus on equity was inherent in the CVC@ONE rubric, if not explicit. Several respondents reported using the “Peralta Equity Rubric.”

- 86% of 114 respondents indicated either they believe the POOCR process was extremely or very effective in ensuring high quality online courses are offered to students.
- 15% of 112 respondents indicated their college identifies Quality Reviewed badged courses in its schedule of classes.
- 8% of 114 respondents reported that their college conducted research or had other evidence that Quality Review badged courses lead to better outcomes (success, persistence, etc.) for all student groups.

### Compensation and Funding

- 59% of 113 respondents indicated that implementing accessibility improvements takes the most time for a faculty member to get a course badged, with 28% indicating applying new design elements to the course shell.
- Estimates for the time it takes to align a course included:
  - For experienced faculty: 100 responses ranging from 5 hours to 300 hours. More than half of the responses were 70 hours or more. The average was about 161 hours. The average was about 83 hours to align a second course.
  - Reported time to alignment for a new online faculty member averaged 256 hours.
- 29% of 110 respondents indicated that their college used General Funds to support the POOCR process, with 6% using Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) funding and 5% Student Equity and Achievement (SEA) funding. A few colleges reported using COVID, Guided Pathways or IEPT/PRT funds.
- 41% of 111 respondents indicated that the POOCR Leads were provided a stipend as compensation with 19% indicating reassigned time. 29% reported no compensation.
- 59% of 110 respondents indicated that faculty aligning their courses were provided a stipend as compensation with less than 1% indicating reassigned time. 27% reported no compensation.

### Benefits to Faculty and Students

The pattern of comments strongly point to feelings of respondents that POOCR benefits faculty and students alike. The quotes from qualitative comments are selected representative of the types of comments received overall:



## Faculty Benefits: Community, Support for teaching all Courses

- “Improved morale and confidence in faculty with aligned courses.”
- “Helps to establish/maintain the culture of Teaching Excellence on our campus.”
- “POCR has helped create a more supportive teaching community among our faculty.”
- “POCR helps faculty develop course design strategies to support student success. The skills they develop through aligning one class can carry over into other classes, both in person and online. Faculty have told me POCR is the best professional development they've ever experienced.”
- “POCR helps faculty develop course design strategies to support student success. The skills they develop through aligning one class can carry over into other classes, both in person and online.”
- “The professional development is incredibly helpful for faculty to not only assess and build out one course but helps them to teach their other courses, even face-to-face, with a more equitable and accessible approach.”

## Student Benefits: Improved course Accessibility, Navigation, and Engagement

- “It creates clarity in navigation & expectations. Students can access the materials they need to in order to be successful. They know how to reach their instructor, where to receive feedback, and are given opportunities to interact with their classmates, for example. These community-building and interactive practices help our students to perform because they have the support they need, aren't confused with clutter, and have a caring instructor that believes in them.”
- “Aligned courses provide consistency, guidance, and accessibility to students. After the extensive work aligning a course, instructors can concentrate on the content/material and interactions with students. Students have a much better chance to be successful in an aligned course because of its organization and flow.”
- “Better course design helps with equitable student outcomes. There are plenty of students that would not be able to attend in person classes due to work schedules and other life obligations. My own students tell me this in the introduction assignment I administer in my own classes. I ask them why they are taking an online course and most of the time it is because their other life obligations prevent them from taking in person courses.”
- “Even though we haven't conducted any research at our local college, professors who have participated in the POCR review process, have reported that students provided very positive feedback about their courses. I agree that a quality design

course promotes equitable access improves course completion/student success and student retention.”

- “Most of the benefits are to students and include clear guidelines, effective communication, well organized courses, reduction of barriers, as well as others. The biggest benefit is a more equitable and supportive online environment.”
- “Aligning online courses to the CVC-OEI rubric ensures quality of courses, accessibility and engagement with students.”

#### Ideas for POOCR Improvement

- 34% of 107 responding thought that POOCR feedback from reviewers should include an estimate for how long it might take to fix an issue.
- 60% of 107 responding thought that aligned courses should be required to go through POOCR again after some number of years (e.g. a 5 year cycle of review)
- 56% of 109 responding thought that POOCR should be required for all online courses
- A reoccurring suggestion for encouraging more STEM faculty to submit courses for review was to provide more support for accessibility efforts.

*“Provide support for accessibility. Getting videos captioned, making PDFs accessible, and ensuring that lab simulations are accessible are the biggest limitations to my STEM folks. They can get aligned in everything, but PDFs or videos are the blockades.”*

- A reoccurring suggestion for what it would take to double the number of badged sections offered at your college by fall 2025 was additional funding.

*“Securing funding for POOCR Lead, POOCR reviewers and our team. We have to submit annually as at this time, this is not part of program 100 funds.”*

- A reoccurring suggestion for how the CCCCO can best support colleges as they seek to improve online course quality through POOCR was additional and consistent funding. The graph below is the result of categorizing the comments provided by respondents. A sample of comments is also listed below.
  - “First, POOCR program funding is needed. It is not reasonable or feasible to expect colleges to pick up the entire tab. Second, if the CO really values POOCR, it needs to regularly communicate this to college presidents and

vice presidents. They do not hear about the value of and need for POOCR very often—from the CO or even from the CVC.”

- o “Give our faculty support. ADA accessibility is the job of an ADA expert, not a faculty discipline expert. If we rely on our faculty for ADA alignment, we will fail. We need more support, similar to how the Chancellor's office gave an Alternate Media Specialist funding to each DSPS department. “
- o “Provide free support to instructors to address their accessibility issues. Free pdf remediation, support for complex accessibility issues in STEM, free captioning...”
- o “Funding! Supporting colleges to hire accessibility technologists who can support faculty with course materials.”
- o “Provide sustainable funding. Provide shared support (IDs and accessibility experts) for all CCCs. Provide prebuilt and aligned shells for faculty in all disciplines as a starting base.”
- o “Direct communication with our college's administration so they know this is something that is worth investing in; and regular check-ins with those admins to ensure continued support.”
- o “Offer POOCR grants to colleges.”
- o “Provide greater funding so that we're able to get more courses through the POOCR process as well as aggregate and disaggregate data regarding the benefits and success of POOCR-aligned courses over non-POOCR-aligned courses.”

## General Findings

- The feedback on the POOCR process is highly positive with most respondents indicating multiple institutional and student benefits beyond those from the class that is badged. Responses indicate that the local POOCR process, using the CVC@ONE rubric, is very effective in improving quality.
- A significant amount of the work to get a course badged is around accessibility. Most colleges do not have staff accessibility support for faculty. This has a particularly strong impact in STEM.
- There are indications that it may be challenging to significantly expand the number of badged courses because many campuses and the CCCCO do not see it as a priority. This can be seen from the patchwork of funding and types of compensation given. The fact that most colleges do not include the badging in their own schedule of classes is also an indication of lower priority.

- Responses to questions about equity indicate that it is often part of the discussion, but it is not currently included as an explicit part of the rubric. This might suggest the need to revise the rubric to include equity components more explicitly.
- Several comments suggest that the process has a positive impact on students beyond the courses aligned to the rubric in that the process supports engaged teaching in all the courses taught by the faculty going through the process, as well as the faculty more generally as it supports a culture of quality teaching across the college.
- Responses to the questions about the time required to align a course varied greatly. As respondents noted, each faculty member works at their own speed depending on previous experience and individual ability, making an estimate difficult. However, the variation between colleges might suggest the need to implement the local POCR recertification process and continue with norming sessions.
- There is a high degree of satisfaction with the current model amongst faculty and staff at the CCCs: Local POCR supported by CVC@ONE training and state-wide norming sessions provides participants support to adapt the process to local needs while adhering to a statewide standard.
- Local funding to support the POCR process (leads, reviewers, instructional designers, accessibility specialists, etc.) and faculty submissions is uneven across colleges.
- There is a need to update the rubric, especially to include an equity focus.
- ICA Independent Course Alignment (ICA) may offer a way to expand the number of aligned courses.
- The process has a wider impact on college culture and discussions beyond the courses achieving alignment. Professional development appears to benefit all the courses taught by a faculty member whether online or in person.

### Recommendations for CVC@ONE

- a) Update the CVC@ONE rubric to align with the new Title 5 language on Regular Substantive Interaction, to include support more explicitly for diverse learners, and to consider the use of AI and privacy of student information.

- b) Examine the establishment of a cycle of review in the alignment process for existing Local POQR certified colleges.
- c) Research the impact of Quality Review Courses information on student selection during registration to better understand the impact of the Quality Reviewed badge on the CVC Exchange.
- d) Develop a CVC Exchange data warehouse to provide ongoing analysis of key metrics related to POQR.

#### Recommendations for the California Community College Chancellor's Office

- a) Provide POQR grants of up to \$50,000 per college for the establishment of Local POQR, and for scaling of POQR programs.
- b) Consider an alignment between the use of the CVC@ONE rubric for the creation of OER materials funded through ZTC pathways grants.
- c) Include POQR aligned courses as an MIS data element.
- d) Advocate for the inclusion of the Quality Reviewed badge in colleges' schedule of classes, like the requirement for ZTC courses, to signal quality courses to students.
- e) Promote the use of Student Equity and Achievement funds to support faculty development of quality online courses, including adding funding for accessibility specialists, as an approved expense for Student Equity and Achievement funds.
- f) Include the role of quality online course review in discussions as the system implements Vision 2030 Strategic Direction 12b regarding "the impact of generative AI technology and its potential implications for teaching and learning."
- g) Support more research to compare students enrolled in QR sections demographically to students in other sections of the same course and examine whether students persist to census, persist through the class, and persist to next term as compared to similarly situated students not in QRC sections. This research should examine the reasons for the differences in terms of the student experience and engagement within the online course.

## Bibliography

Andrade, Maureen Snow, et al. "Online Learning in Schools of Business: The Impact of Strategy on Course Enrollments." *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, vol. 19, no. 5, 2019, pp. 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v19i5.2280>.

Baldwin, Sally, Yu-Hui Ching, and Yu-Chang Hsu. "Online Course Design in Higher Education: A Review of National and Statewide Evaluation Instruments." *TechTrends*, vol. 62, 2018, pp. 46–57.

Barshay, Jill. "Most College Kids Are Taking at Least One Class Online, Even Long after Campuses Reopened." *Hechinger Report*, 29 Jan. 2024.

Admire, Amanda. "Did You Know." *Chaffey Institutional Research*, vol. 110, Fall 2022.

Driscoll, L. L. *Quality Matters Implementation in Florida Colleges: Using The Behavior Engineering Model To Explore Effective Environmental Supports*. Florida State University, 2023.

Hobson, C. *Improving Online Teaching Skills of Community College Faculty Through Experiential Training at a California Community College*. Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University, 2022.

Lynch, Susan, and Teresa Gaston. "Quality Matters Impact on Student Outcomes in an Online Program." *Journal of Educators Online*, vol. 17, no. 2, July 2020.

Los Angeles Pierce College. *Peer Online Course Review (POCR) Course Success Rates*. Office of Institutional Effectiveness, 17 July 2023.

McCorkle, S. "A Development-Focused Approach to the Peer Review of Online Teaching: Using OSCQR with Genuine Peers." *OAKTrust Digital Repository*, Texas A&M University, 2022.

Nguyen, Alyssa. *The Online Education Initiative: Access and Quality of Online Education in California's Community Colleges, 2015-2016*. The RP Group, 2017.

Nguyen, Alyssa, and Daniel Berumen. *January 2019 California Community Colleges Online Education Landscape Report*. The RP Group, 2019.

*Online Learning Consortium*. Website. 2024.

Pedro, N.S., and S. Kumar. "Institutional Support for Online Teaching in Quality Assurance Frameworks." *Online Learning*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2020, pp. 50-66.  
<https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i3.2309>.

Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC). *Successful Online Courses in California's Community Colleges*. Hans Johnson, Marisol Cuellar Mejia, and Kevin Cook, 2015.

Weissman, Sara. "Online Enrollments Spike at Community Colleges." *Inside Higher Education*, 20 Nov. 2023.

Williams, Janet. "Leveraging Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Data to Achieve Equity in Success, Assess, and Support for California Community College Students." *Instructional and Performance Technology*, University of West Florida, Aug. 2023.

Zimmerman, W., et al. "Evaluating Online Course Quality: A Study on Implementation of Course Quality Standards." *Online Learning*, vol. 24, no. 4, 2020, pp. 147-163.

### **Interviews and Correspondence**

Email correspondence, Deborah Adair, Ph.D., CEO, Quality Matters, 18 Dec. 2023.

Interview, Sally Baldwin, Foothill College, 15 Feb. 2024.

Interview, MJ Bishop, Vice President of Integrated Learning Design, University of Maryland Global Campus, 4 Dec. 2023.

Interview, Dan Feinberg, Interim Director SUNY Online, and Kim Scalzo, Interim Senior Associate Provost for Digital Innovation and Academic Services, SUNY System Administration, 12 Dec. 2023.

Email correspondence, Carol Hobson, POCR Lead, Hartnell College, 10 Feb. 2024.

Interview, Heather Kokorowski, POCR Lead, Los Angeles Pierce College, 18 Dec. 2023.

Interview, Mandy Kronbeck, POCR Lead, East Los Angeles College, 5 Jan. 2024.

Interview, Shannon Riggs, Associate Vice Provost of Educational Programs and Learning Innovation, Oregon State University, 8 Dec. 2023.

Interview, Xochi Tirado, POCR Lead, Imperial Valley College, 30 Nov. 2023.