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# Summary

In the process of developing an evaluation checklist for use by chairs to ascertain the quality of a course, many areas of quality had to be reviewed. Also many examples of evaluations were reviewed.

The first recommendation is to have *quality* defined to suit the needs at ISU. Schindler et al. (2015) state that there are three challenges to defining quality. The first is that “quality is an elusive term” (p. 4). The second is that “quality is a multidimensional concept” (p. 4), whereas the third is that “quality is not a static but rather a dynamic, ever-changing pursuit of excellence that must be considered in the context of the larger educational, economic, political, and social landscape” (p. 4).

Based on Schindler et al’s (2015) perspective, quality at ISU needs to reflect the different classroom environments that may be encountered while teaching at ISU. In this instance, quality should include specific indicators that address instruction. It should also be purposeful in addressing the mission and vision of ISU as a whole and include direction to our institutional goals. It should be accountable to the obtaining of recourses, student preparedness for employment, and focus on continuous improvement It should be transformative, in that it should focus on learn-centered approaches, competent lectures, clear outcomes, engaging students with content and development of critical thinking

Posey and Egerton (2016) argue that when designing an evaluation, one should include the following design considerations:

1. “Adopting established set of quality standards up front, and providing faculty with templates and guidance to aid them in integrating the standards into their course designs, fostering an efficient redesign process…” (p. 14).
2. “…integration of common syllabi components, orientation materials, and links and information about accessing academic, technical and other student support that helped to ensure that expectations were clearly set and diverse student needs were met in all courses” (p. 14).
3. “…reviewing courses with a fresh eye towards alignment among objectives, activities, and assessments fostered positive curricular change” (p. 14).
4. “…holistic approach to quality assurance should consider supplemental review tools and process that focus on how the instructor facilitates learning and interacts with students during course delivery, whether online or face to face” (p. 14).

The authors also found in their review of courses that the following components were of importance to the design of a course: “…greeting students with warm and professional welcome; ensuring alignment among objectives, activities and assessments; establishing a context for instructional units; guiding student use of learning materials; promoting active learning; and providing specific, detailed criteria and grading rubrics for assessments.” (p. 14).

# Areas of Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course Design** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Contains SMART goals and objectives |  |  |  |
| Content is well organized in presentation |  |  |  |
| Content demonstrates learner engagement |  |  |  |
| Alignment between goals, objectives, and assessments |  |  |  |
| Ability to use features of an LMS (upload docs, load multimedia, create tests, create assignments, etc.) |  |  |  |
| Course is well organized and easy to navigate |  |  |  |
| Content aligns with course objectives and learning outcomes |  |  |  |
| All links are accessible and working |  |  |  |
| Colors and textures used in course design are easy to read and use |  |  |  |
| Font type is easy to read |  |  |  |
| Images have alt tags, captions, or text that explains them attached to them |  |  |  |
| Some of the following tools are used to communicate with students*: announcements, discussion board participation, email, group projects, synchronous meetings using Collaborate, virtual meetings.* |  |  |  |
| **Course Information** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Syllabus is available and printable |  |  |  |
| Required syllabus language is in syllabus |  |  |  |
| Course schedule is available  |  |  |  |
| Instructor contact information is available |  |  |  |
| Instructor office hours are available |  |  |  |
| Course objectives (learning objectives) are available |  |  |  |
| Student outcomes are available |  |  |  |
| **Interaction/Collaboration/Active Learning**  | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Communication strategies are present and defined |  |  |  |
| Content is designed to develop a learning community |  |  |  |
| Content is designed to encourage interactions |  |  |  |
| Ability to facilitate, monitor, and establishing interactions is demonstrated |  |  |  |
| Ability to facilitate developing an engaging and welcoming community among students is evident |  |  |  |
| Student participation expectations are clear and available |  |  |  |
| ISU DE Guidelines are applied where and when appropriate |  |  |  |
| **Assessment/Evaluation** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Assessments align with goals and objectives |  |  |  |
| Assessments measure performance as stated |  |  |  |
| Opportunities for self-assessment are provided |  |  |  |
| Ability to select the right assessment for content |  |  |  |
| Ability to assess using multiple strategies to help maintain academic integrity |  |  |  |
| Authentic Assessment is used in course |  |  |  |
| Course has both formative and summative assessments |  |  |  |
| Ability to use self-reflection on teaching or assessment of teaching effectiveness |  |  |  |
| Assessments are detailed and easy to follow and understand |  |  |  |
| **Learner Support** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Course has orientation to course and LMS |  |  |  |
| Information on what technologies are required is provided  |  |  |  |
| Contact information for Technology Support is available |  |  |  |
| Instructor role and contact information is provided |  |  |  |
| Information on course/institutional policies and where to get support is provided |  |  |  |
| Course materials use standard formats for accessibility  |  |  |  |
| Course is designed with accessibility in mind |  |  |  |
| Contact information for Disability Services is provided |  |  |  |
| Learners have an opportunity to give feedback on course design and content.  |  |  |  |
| Videos have closed captions or transcripts to accompany them |  |  |  |
| **Effective Technology Use** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Ability to use appropriate technology for the course |  |  |  |
| Knowledge of who to call when need troubleshooting help |  |  |  |
| Demonstrates the importance of interaction through the technology |  |  |  |
| More than text is used in the course.  |  |  |  |
| **Feedback** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Communicates with the students frequently or regularly |  |  |  |
| Communicates to support engagement using feedback |  |  |  |
| Sets up expectations of students |  |  |  |
| Sets up expectations of professor |  |  |  |
| Feedback is regular and timely |  |  |  |
| **Safe Environment/Ethical Behavior** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Use and implementation of Digital Citizenship |  |  |  |
| Knowledge of Acceptable Use Policies |  |  |  |
| Comprehension of possibilities of academic dishonesty and use of technology |  |  |  |
| Knowledge of privacy standards |  |  |  |
| **Respect Diversity** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Knowledge of and design for disability requirements |  |  |  |
| Ability to make accommodations in technology to meet student needs |  |  |  |
| Knowledge of adaptive or assistive technologies or whom to call on for help. |  |  |  |
| Open to multiple methods of teaching  |  |  |  |
| Ability to respect and integrate those from diverse backgrounds.  |  |  |  |
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