



Crossroads Consulting Group
 206 Lagunaria Lane
 Alameda, CA 94502
 510-769-1340 rpalloff@mindspring.com
 URL: www.xroadsgroup.com

Course Evaluation

Your feedback is important to us! Thank you for completing this survey!

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. The course is well organized					
2. Course readings are relevant to course objectives					
3. Course assignments are relevant to course objectives.					
4. In this course, different instructional approaches are used.					

Please rate the elements below:

	Not Applicable	Needs Improvement	Average	Above Average	Excellent
5. Quality of online feedback by colleagues					
6. Quality of interaction with instructor(s)					
7. Quality of instructor responsiveness					

8. Do you have any additional comments on Items 2 through 7?

9. How did the course add value to your professional and/or personal learning goals?

10. What most helped me to take responsibility for my learning in this class was:

11. What most prevented me from taking responsibility for my learning in this class was:

12. The area of my development as a learner that I most need to work on as a result of taking this class is:

13. Overall, the moments in the course when I was the most engaged, excited, and involved as a learner were when:
14. Overall, the moments in the course when I was the most distanced, disengaged, and uninvolved as a learner were when:
15. What would you most like to say about your experiences as a learner in this course?
16. What piece of advice would you most like to give the instructor(s) on how to facilitate this course in the future or to future learners who take this course?
17. Please share any other comments you may have.

(Source: Palloff & Pratt, 2008)



Crossroads Consulting Group
 206 Lagunaria Lane
 Alameda, CA 94502
 510-769-1340 rpalloff@mindspring.com
 URL: www.xroadsgroup.com

Assessment of the effectiveness of a course and faculty performance:

Scale	Development of Social Presence	Instructional Design for Interaction	Evidence of Learner Engagement	Evidence of Instructor Engagement
Low (1)	No attempts made – no intros, bios, use of collaboration. No presence of a café area in the course.	Students communicate only with instructor via e-mail. Content presented in “lecture” format through text and graphics. No use of discussion board and no required interaction between learners.	Learners respond to instructor as required but do not respond to one another.	Instructor responds to learner assignments but does not promote additional discussion.
Minimum (2)	Intros and bios are required.	Minimal use of discussion board but discussion is required – students are asked to choose discussion questions to respond to or discussion assignments occur at intervals rather than weekly.	Learners respond to discussion questions and, as required, to other learners. There is little evidence of voluntary discussion outside of assignments.	Instructor posts an expectation of timely feedback to learners, responds to learner assignments and is present on the discussion board. Instructor may respond to every post, limiting student-to-student engagement.
Average (3)	Intros and bios are required. An ice-breaker activity is included at the start of a course.	Discussion is a regular part of the course. Students are required to respond to discussion questions and to at least one or two peers weekly. Discussion may or may not be assessed.	Learners respond to discussion questions and provide minimum required feedback to peers that demonstrates application of course concepts. Some voluntary discussion beyond assignments is present with indicators that a learning community has formed.	Instructor posts an expectation of timely feedback to learners, responds to learner assignments and demonstrates some ability to promote learner-to-learner discussion through strategic response that summarizes or links student posts to extend discussion. Instructor shows some ability to develop a learning community.
Above Average (4)	Intros and bios are required. Instructor responds to intros and bios	Discussion is a regular part of the course. Students are required to	Learners respond to discussion questions and to their peers and	Instructor posts clear expectations of response to learner e-mails and

	as a model for students. An ice-breaker activity is included at the start of a course and a café area is included in the course.	respond to discussion questions and at least two of their peers weekly. Dyad or small group assignments are included in the course design. Discussion is part of the assessment scheme for the course.	initiate discussion that goes beyond the assignments. Learner postings are substantive, show application of course concepts, and indicate engagement with course material and one another. There are indicators that a learning community has formed.	assignments within a designated timeframe, demonstrates good ability to promote learner-to-learner discussion through strategic response to discussions, and offers additional materials for consideration. Instructor shows ability to develop and maintain a learning community.
High (5)	Intros and bios are required. Instructor responds to intros and bios as a model for students and may use audio or video as part of the instructor intro. An ice-breaker activity is included at the start of a course. A café area is included in the course and students are encouraged to engage with one another and the instructor in the café through informal discussion.	Discussion is a regular part of the course and is assessed. Students are required to respond to discussion questions and at least two of their peers weekly. Dyad or small group assignments are included in the course design. The use of synchronous discussion media may be included.	Learners respond to discussion questions and to their peers and initiate discussion that goes beyond the assignments. Learner postings are substantive, show application and evaluation of course concepts, and indicate engagement with course material and one another. Learners engage in informal communications through the café area of the course and show strong connection to one another and the presence of a learning community.	Instructor posts clear expectations of response to learner e-mails and assignments, responds to learner e-mails within 24 to 48 hours and to assignments within 7 days, demonstrates good ability to promote learner-to-learner discussion through strategic response to discussions, and offers additional materials for consideration. Instructor shows good ability to develop and maintain a learning community.

Points to determine level of interactivity:

Low – 1 to 8

Average – 9 to 15

High – 16 to 20



Crossroads Consulting Group
206 Lagunaria Lane
Alameda, CA 94502
510-769-1340 rpalloff@mindspring.com
URL: www.xroadsgroup.com

Program Evaluation

Just as with course and faculty evaluation, program evaluation should be outcome and competency based. Competency-mapping is an important technique to accomplish this task. In a larger competency mapping project, the goal is to graphically illustrate how the competencies developed for the program are addressed in every course in the program. The development of competencies is accomplished through a consensus-building process wherein numerous mechanisms are tapped for input. These can include:

- Faculty input
- Student surveys
- Standardized tests
- Employer surveys
- Required professional competencies for practice
- Alumni surveys
- Student assessments and analysis of final projects required for the program
- Portfolio analyses
- Job placement tracking

Once the competencies are agreed-upon and established, then a process to evaluate how well they are being accomplished is put in place. Often, the mechanism used is a final integrative project, thesis, or capstone course that involves the demonstrated application of the competencies. The results can then be analyzed to determine areas of the curriculum that are working well, need improvement, or might be missing. The process, then, is as follows:

- Establish competencies that address desired goals of the program and are responsive to the marketplace into which students will eventually be hired.
- Develop a set of competency-curriculum maps that link each competency to a course or course unit.
- Develop feedback mechanisms designed to measure the achievement of outcomes.
- Analyze the results of the feedback mechanisms to identify areas of the curriculum in need of attention.
- Modify the curriculum in the areas of need.
- Begin the cycle again.

The use of this process helps to ensure that regular program reviews occur, keeps the focus on outcomes and competency development, and keeps the process learner-focused. Learner-focused instruction begs for learner-focused assessment and evaluation. Keeping the learner as the center of attention creates a comprehensive means by which courses and programs can be evaluated on an ongoing basis and helps to align assessment activities within courses to faculty evaluation to course evaluation and finally to program evaluation. As Dunn, Morgan, O'Reilly, and Parry (2004) note, the development of competencies, outcomes, objectives, and assessments begins

with the organizational mission and asks the questions, “What do we want our graduates to be when they leave us? What do we want them to represent?” These questions should guide any of the assessment and evaluation processes in which we engage.

References

- Angelo, T. and Cross, K.P. (1993), *Classroom assessment techniques*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Arbaugh, J.B. (2000), How classroom environment and student engagement affect learning in internet-based MBA courses, *Business Communication Quarterly*, 63(4), pp 9-26.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1995), *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dunn, L., Morgan, C., O’Reilly, M., & Parry, S. (2004), *The student assessment handbook: New directions in traditional & online assessment*. London: RoutledgeFarmer.
- Palloff, R.M. & Pratt, K. (2008), *Assessing the online learner: Resources and strategies for faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (in publication).
- Roberts, T.G., Irani, T.A., Telg, R.W., & Lundy, L.K. (2005), The development of an instrument to evaluate distance education courses using student attitudes, *American Journal of Distance Education*, 19(1), pp 55-64.
- Torbin, T. (2004), Best practices for administrative evaluation of online faculty, *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, Vol VII(II), State University of West Georgia Distance Education Center. Retrieved from [<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer72/tobin72.html>].
- Williams, P.E. (2003), Roles and competencies for distance education programs in higher education institutions, *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 17(1), pp 45-57.