A FACULTY OBSERVATION MODEL FOR ONLINE INSTRUCTORS: OBSERVING FACULTY MEMBERS IN THE ONLINE CLASSROOM

Michael T. Eskey, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice Administration
Park University
Parkville , Missouri
meskey@park.edu

Henry Roehrich, Ph.D.
School of Business
Park University
Parkville, Missouri
Henry.roehrich@park.edu

Abstract

Maintaining academic standards, retention of quality faculty, and establishing a measure for promotion can be achieved through faculty evaluation. As Park University entered the online marker, the market, the growing course offerings would involve an increasing number of adjunct faculty members. In order to insure that these faculty members use best practices and maintain high standards of teaching that are important to student satisfaction, Park University developed an evaluation process for online adjunct faculty similar to in-class observation of full-time faculty, but focused on unique factors of online course facilitation. The focus of this analysis is on the Faculty Online Observation (FOO) method which is an advanced model for evaluation developed from utilizing the original evaluation system used in annual observations for online adjunct faculty. The FOO process that is used by a team of evaluators ensures that Best Practices in online teaching are addressed continuously in the online delivery program. The focus on Best Practices and specific institutional policies of online teaching will play a significant role in the growth of online degree programs and the success of Park University. Finally, the analysis discusses the applicability of the FOO to other institutions with online programs.

Introduction

The rapid and continued growth of distance learning has established an important role in educational programs worldwide. Distance education has a long and storied history with the first distance education offerings emerging over one hundred years ago in the form of correspondence courses and low-tech media (Holmberg, 1977; Matthews, 1999). While not online or steeped in technology, early distance education sought to provide opportunities for diverse and dispersed populations. Over the past decade, most colleges and universities in the United States have experienced a dramatic increase in the growth and popularity of online degree programs.

According to research conducted by the Sloan Consortium, distance learning is growing rapidly, with 83% of higher education institutions offering some form of distance-learning (Allen and Seaman, 2008). Likewise, community colleges reported an 11.3 percent increase for distance education enrollments, substantially ahead of overall national campus enrollments, which averaged less than two percent (Lokken, 2009). Further, in 2008 there was an overall 17 percent growth in online learning in higher education, far outdistancing a growth of 1.2 percent of traditional classes in the same period (pg. 5).

The 2010 Sloan Survey of Online Learning reports that enrollment in online programs rose by almost one million students from the prior year. Sloan surveyed more than 2,500 colleges and universities nationwide and found approximately 5.6 million students were enrolled in at least one online course in fall 2009 (Allen & Seaman, 2010). As the online learning process there are continued improvements in the linkage of pedagogy, technology, and learner needs in an effort to satisfy the growing demands of varied students in the online classroom (Kim, Bonk and Zeng, 2005). Distance-learning programs at colleges and universities are often compared to their counterparts at other institutions, and their counter-part in-class courses at their own institution. Many institutions offer a full range of online degree programs with full organizational, infrastructure, design and technical support for distance learners and their instructors.

The growth of online learning has brought the challenge of the need to develop appropriate evaluation methods that are relevant, specifically, to the online environment. This focus has included the evaluation of pedagogy, course content, and facilitation. Unique distance learning course requirements require a periodic assessment of faculty, students, courses, and institutional needs to meet the unique demands and expectations of modern online learning (Mandernach, et al, 2005).

Institutional Context

Park University was founded as a small, private liberal-arts college in 1875. Park University began offering Internet courses in 1996, to better meet the needs of undergraduate degree completion students being served at military bases around the U.S. Today, Park serves 42 nation-wide campus centers, to include 37 military bases in 21 states. From the beginning, the focus of the Park initiative was student service – making all services that would be available face-to-face also available online. To date, over 120,000 students have been enrolled in online courses at Park University through offerings of over 250 online degree credit courses, 12 online bachelor's degree completion programs (http://www.park.edu/online/degrees.aspx) and six complete graduate programs (http://www.park.edu/grad/degreesonline.aspx). Like similar online institutions in the United States, Park University has created and has fostered a thriving online learning program (Eskey and Schulte, 2010). As a best practice, Park has focused on quality of instruction by requiring faculty teaching online to go through a six-week training program in which they are the student in the course they will be teaching, thus understanding the student perspective (Abel, 2005).

To meet the demand of students within its established campus center system, Park University relied heavily on an adjunct faculty pool. As the online course offerings grew, many of these adjuncts taught online courses as needed. Recognizing a need to properly assess the facilitation of online instructors, the Park University College for Distance Learning created a proprietary instrument called the Online Instructor Evaluation System (OIES). The OIES developed out of a comprehensive review of the literature on benchmarks and best practices of online pedagogy (for

more detailed information on these standards, see; Berg, 2001, Graham et al., 2000; Finch & Montambeau, 2000; [7]; Reeves, 1997; and Tobin, 2004).

The Faculty Online Observation model (FOO) was developed as a follow-on to the Online Instructor Evaluation Model (OIES) for online faculty at Park University. The FOO was created to meet the needs of the evolving online program, as well as provide an annual requirement for online adjunct faculty to meet the similar in-class observation of full-time faculty.

Rationale for Online Faculty Evaluation System

An initial online faculty evaluation system was first developed in 2001 at Park University. This was determined to be the evaluation system was initially based upon face-to-face classroom instructors and not the unique characteristics and functioning of online instruction. As such, the original evaluation system did not encompass directed evaluation of learning outcomes, classroom management, facilitation, faculty presence, response rate, student accessibility, and course-related administrative tasks. To address the unique concerns associated with a growing number of online courses and online adjunct instructors, Park University College for Distance Learning developed a formalized online instructor evaluation system (OIES), consisting of three formative reviews and a summative review for evaluating online adjunct faculty [7].

The OIES was first piloted in Fall, 2004. The OIES was utilized as the sole online adjunct instructor evaluation mechanism at the institution from 2004 through 2008. The OIES strengths were its robust evaluation/mentoring process which paired an online evaluator with an online adjunct for an entire term. It became evident that although it was very complete and functional, the OIES was very labor- and manpower- intensive. Not having limitless resources and personnel, Park University's College for Distance Learning sought a more streamlined process

which still adhered to institutional needs and research guidelines [8]. The OIES more closely aligned faculty observation with specific and unique characteristics of online courses.

Additionally, the original evaluation system consisted of an end-of-term review based on a single classroom visit and single exchange between the evaluator and the instructor. This was satisfactory in the face-to-face classroom, but, this format did not meaningfully encompass the evaluation needs of the online classroom. Additionally, most of the university's online adjunct faculty members were relatively new to distance learning, a factor not effectively accounted for with the legacy evaluation system that was based on traditional face-to-face courses [7].

Theoretical and Institutional Foundations

The OIES was not founded solely on the related literature and research findings. Instead, the development of the OIES included the adaptation of best practices in online- education in ways that reflected Park University's institutional history, current context, and future goals, as synthesized in the University's "Online Course Standards and Principles" (Park University, 2009). Initially, newly-hired online instructors were trained by utilizing a self-paced, individualized format. This mandatory training has been formalized to include an orientation process, and an emphasis on course facilitation of Park -developed, online courses. In order to be scheduled to teach an online course at Park University, faculty members must be screened for required professional credentials, approved by the individual academic department, and complete the Park University online instructional training course (PDL750). The OIES was a direct result of the implementation of institutional dynamics, current online pedagogy, a foundation of generally-accepted practices tailored to the needs of Park University. It is important to note that utilizing this model at other institutions would require similar institutional-tailoring.

The OIES was established to provide both evaluation and mentoring of online faculty. Through the pre-term review, three formative and a summative evaluation, the online observer interacted on a number of occasions and provided the instructor with a number of helpful and constructive points through e-mail, telephone, and digital evaluations. The OIES utilized by Park University from 2005 through 2008 was found to be a very complete and functional, albeit tedious, and time-consuming method of evaluating online adjunct instructors. It became evident that it was very labor and manpower intensive [7]. The university required and, indeed, North Central Association accreditations required us to observe our adjunct faculty on an annual basis (NACS, 2010).

Beginning in Fall I, 2007 Park University instituted a formal adjunct faculty mentoring program. Upon completion of the Park Online Instructor Qualification Seminars CDL 750 or 758, all new online instructors are assigned to the Park Distance Learning's new Online Instructor Mentoring Program (OIMP) for one-on-one mentoring throughout their first term teaching for Park's PDL-Online program. There is one full-time mentor and a number of experienced online adjunct faculty mentors that generally are assigned up to five "mentees" per term. The goal is to provide one-on-one guidance to all instructors as they begin to teach online at Park University; and to offer continued, specialized support from peer mentors throughout their career. The mentoring program served a secondary function of allowing course evaluators more time to concentrate on course facilitation and a reduction of individual mentoring of instructors. This was an important functional separation. While mentoring is very important, especially for new instructors, the mentoring function was somewhat counterproductive to the function of evaluators. As such, a mentoring program was established to separate the functions of mentoring and evaluation.

Implementation of the Faculty Online Observation (FOO)

The Faculty Online Observation model (FOO) was developed as a follow-on to the Online Instructor Evaluation Model (OIES) for online adjunct faculty at Park University. The FOO was created to meet the needs of the evolving online program, as well as provide an annual requirement for online adjunct faculty to meet the similar in-class observation of full-time faculty. The Faculty Online Observation (FOO) was developed to provide both an observation that closely emulated the observation of full-time faculty in the classroom; and, an observation that would allow for each online adjunct faculty member of receive an annual observation with the personnel resource of five full-time faculty members on half –time release dedicated to the observation/evaluation of online adjunct faculty.

 To accomplish this, a team of faculty members developed an observation form, driven by university observations, university policies (Park University, 2008), Best Practices (Boettcher and Conrad, 2004; [10]; Chickering et al, 1996; [13]), Quality Matters (UMUC, 2008), and effective training concepts [13]; Weiss, et al, 2001; Burnett, et al, 2007; [14]). Further, the observations below are based upon the Park Distance Learning (PDL – formerly the College for Distance Learning) - Online Policies and Procedures, Online Course Standards, and PDL Online Instructor Participation.

The Faculty Online Observation serves a number of purposes: ensure the finest quality education experience for our online students, provide pragmatic instructional support for our online instructors, and gauges the needs and strengths of our online instruction delivery methods. All online adjunct faculty members have completed training in the Park online facilitation policies. In addition, they have access to the Park online resource page. Those hired after September,

2007, have been assigned and worked with a faculty mentor to guide them through their first online course following training, as well as continued support while teaching for Park University. The FOO allows for an online observation of course facilitation by trained course observers and course content evaluation by program coordinators.

Overview of the Faculty Online Observation System

The Faculty Online Observation was developed out of concerns for the academic success of our students. The benefit and impacts of the FOO are demonstrated through: expected instructor performance; enhanced student satisfaction; strengthened scholarship of teaching; and clarification of learning and professional development strengths and weaknesses. The adjunct instructors have been through the Park University online training- oriented on theory/pedagogy, technology, and policies & procedures related to specifically teaching for Park University in the eCollege platform. Each instructor has complete access to all Park University website training and resources.

For the FOO, instructors, as well as their college dean, receive notification of the observation process and names and courses-taught of instructors in their college. The instructor is provided a copy of the observation form, an explanation of the observation, a number of informative documents related to the online teaching and observation process, access to the Park University online resource website, and access to communicate freely with the observer for any questions or concerns on the FOO process. Each of the online course observers are full-time, tenure-track faculty members at Park University, on half-time release to the College for Distance Learning. Each observer has a minimum of five years of online teaching experience, has an earned terminal

degree from a regionally-accredited University, and has developed courses online for Park University or other institutions.

During the eight-week term scheduled for the instructor's formal observation, the instructor is observed over a specified two-week period and observed over five course facilitation related areas, to include: course organization and facilitation; building community in the online classroom, discussion facilitation and instruction; assessment, grading, and feedback; and course climate and online classroom environment [8]. These observation topics are in accordance with guiding principles outlined in the best practices for online education, the *School of Online Learning* (SOL) *Principles and Standards and the College for Distance Learning* (CDL) *Online Instructor Participation Policy.* The criteria divisions are as follows:

- Course Organization and Facilitation – It is important that instructors are in compliance with online course policies and Park University CDL-online police and procedures and online course standards. Instructors are further observed for any augmentations they might add to course discussions in a manner that complements the course objectives both relevantly and constructively. Instructors are encouraged to utilize several of the online platform organizational features available, including doc sharing, additional lectures, announcements, discussion threads, and/or webliography to enhance the course delivery and online learning experience

- Building Community in the Online Classroom – Park University utilizes a course development staff to aid the development of online courses taught by certified instructors. It is the responsibility of the instructor to create and open and inviting climate for communication. The instructor must set the tone for interactions via course tools, such as the Instructors Office, Introductions, Announcements, discussion threads, and grade book comments. *B*oth instructor discussion facilitation and feedback is important; and, consistent instructor interaction is an ongoing essential of effective online learning [7]. It is, for example, a Park online Participation policy that online instructors post in the instructor office with 48 hours after students post a question.

- Discussion Facilitation and Instruction – The discussion board is the focal point of the online course, the classroom. At a minimum instructors need to substantively interact in the course discussion thread four (4) days, minimum, per week as recommended by Best Practices and as directed by the Park CDL Online Instructor Participation Policy. Instructor discussion postings must be professional, clear, precise, and supportive of

student learning. Further, instructors should use discussion posting to augment course content and provide examples to facilitate the understanding and application of course concepts. Finally, instructs are observed for perceived encouragement of student's' continued interaction and critical thinking through both questions and comments.

- Assessment, Grading, and Feedback – Online course terms at Park University are eight weeks. With this accelerated format, it is very important that instructors establish and meet deadlines for grading and feedback so that students can make timely adjustments and improvements. While the content of the basic assessments is determined by the course developer, effective learning occurs through students and instructor active engagement with course material [7]. It is necessary for instructors to utilize course assignments' grading rubrics and apply these to grading. It is equally important that instructors provide helpful, individualized, constructive feedback on all syllabus-identified component assessments to highlight student strengths and provide suggestions for improvement, as applicable.

- Course Climate and Online classroom Environment – This section focuses on the atmosphere that that instructor maintains in the online course. Both Best Practices and Quality Matters serve as a valuable professional development resource and address instructor behavior related to professionalism, grammar, respect, and fairness.

The Faculty Online Observation is an effective and efficient means of providing an annual faculty evaluation that meets departmental requirements for course facilitation. A university-wide Distance Learning Advisory Committee (DLAC) was formed to coordinate and approve the policies and functions of the FOO. The FOO resembles the annual observation of face-to-face full-time and adjunct faculty in that it provides a comprehensive evaluation of selected course facilitation characteristics over specific, facilitated portions of the course.

Implementation

The Faculty Online Observation is implemented by designated instructor observers. The instructor observers are assigned approximately 20 instructors per eight-week term. Each online observer is a full-time faculty member (tenured / tenure track) on half-time release with Park Distance Learning (PDL). As a faculty member, they, too, are teaching online courses, participating in curriculum and other university committees, and fulfilling institutional requirements for scholarship, teaching, and service. All online evaluators possess a terminal

degree. Utilizing full-time faculty allows the addition of a faculty member to the individual departments who contribute to the teaching load and unique department needs. Additionally, these individuals also serve as valuable assets, contributing to the academic oversight of the online program and course development. Since the inception of the OIES and transition to the FOO, the faculty/evaluator role has provided a stronger relationship between the academic departments and the online learning program.

It is important to note that the focus of the FOO is facilitation. That is, the FOO focuses on the facilitation of the course, not the course content, not a specific discipline. The academic department program coordinator is responsible for evaluating the course content of online courses. At Park University, online course content is created by a content-expert with the support of a course development specialist and with the approval of the academic department. The online instructor evaluator then utilizes the FOO to observe instructors for online teaching facilitation in adherence to best practices and unique institutional distance learning policies. The FOO observation and program coordinator evaluation fulfill the instructor annual observation requirement.

Since the implementation of the FOO in Fall I, 2008, 1,368 instructors have been evaluated. The FOO online instructor evaluators are in constant communication, to include a weekly conference call to address observer/observed concerns, programmatic needs, and considerations for needed revisions, interpretations, and any needed modifications. The FOO completions by term are as follows: (Table 1):

Table 1

Number of Faculty Observed by Term

Term	Number of Faculty Observed	Rationale
Fall I 08	71	
Fall II 08	93	
Spring I 09	104	
Spring II 09	61	
Summer 09	47	IRR pilot – 5 instructors
Fall I 09	84	IRR – 5 instructors
Fall II 09	85	IRR – 5 instructors
Spring I 10	117	IRR – 5 instructors
Spring II 10	85	IRR – 5 instructors
Summer 10	45	IRR – 5 instructors
Fall I 10	78	
Fall II 10	72	
Spring I 11	95	
Spring II 11	74	
Summer 11	55	

At the conclusion of the first term of the FOO pilot (Summer 2009), the team of observers reflected on the form. Extensive reflection on the observation form and reactions by instructors and university personnel resulted in revisions of the form and additional information provided to instructors. As part of the review process, the instructor observer number remained at five to meet the demands of the University's pool of approximately 450 active online instructors and to ensure sound and attainable, observation loads. Based on pilot analysis, it was determined that five instructor observers could accommodate the observations of approximately 20 faculty members per eight-week term, five terms each academic year. This load would allow each instructor evaluator to complete approximately 100 FOO observations in one academic year, resulting in a total of 400 evaluations completed for online adjunct instructors annually. Note:

during this second year of observations there were a number of cross-listed inter-rater-reliability observations performed to gauge the reliability of observations between observers. There are always budgetary concerns when faculty members are not utilized strictly in the role of teaching, scholarship, and service. The release time afforded the FOO team from faculty duties has resulted in a valuable observation tool, accepted by the regional accreditors, accepted by both faculty and administration, and credited with the retention of qualified online instructors.

Interrater Reliability Comparison

In order to validate the consistency of observations among the observers they were compared directly by observing identical adjunct faculty each term over the course of eight terms. That is, each observer was assigned the observation of four identical instructors each term for eight terms. Only one of the observations counted as the official observation. The observation results were compared to ensure that the overall observations were consistent in the observation rating. 80 percent of the observations were the same. In the small number of inconsistencies in the observations, the rationale was discussed and in all cases the soundness of the decision and rationale for any discrepancy was agree-upon. While official changes in instructor did not result; the rationale and consistency of the observations were solidified. This is important in the determination that all instructors will be fairly and consistently observed by any of the observers to whom they are assigned.

Inter-rater reliability is the extent to which two or more individuals (coders or raters) agree. The interrater reliability addressed the consistency of the implementation of the FOO. A test of interrater reliability followed a process: Five observers observed online adjunct faculty teaching eight-week online courses. The instructors are teaching a class following Park University

policies, Best Practices, and Quality Matters. The researchers have a sliding rating scale (0 denotes "Needs Improvement", 1 denotes "Meets Expectations", and 2 denotes "Exceeds Expectations") with which they are rated in the faculty course facilitation on 17 separate factors within four major categories: Interrater reliability assessed the consistency of how the rating system was implemented. For example, if one researcher gives a "0" to a student response, while another researcher gives a "2," obviously the interrater reliability would be inconsistent. Interrater reliability was dependent upon the ability of two or more individuals to be consistent. Training, education, monitoring skills can enhance interrater reliability (Marques & McCall, 2005).

Results and Reflections

Like all effective evaluation systems, to include the Park University Online Instructor Evaluation System (OIES) that preceded the Faculty Online Observations, the FOO is continually monitored and adjusted to adapt to the dynamic nature of higher-education, instructor needs, student needs, and the emergent quality of online education in particular. This is accomplished via constant communication between the observer team, departmental colleagues, administrative staff, and student-related support personnel. The FOO was developed as a result of the capitalization of the strengths and weaknesses noted in the OIES. A dedicated online instructor evaluator team working in conjunction with academic departments, the university administration, and distance learning support staff have created and implemented a successful observation tool, as well as an instrument conforming to accreditation demands. A review of the initial concerns, coupled with experience with the more resource-consuming OIES, and a review of initial results has enabled continued refinement of the observation instrument and process. All proposed and implemented changes have gone through a thorough review by the observation team in concert with quality

matters, best-practiced, and Park University Distance Learning policy. Further, all changes are finalized through the approval of the Distance Learning Advisory Committee (DLAC). The results of the observations allow for more refined and focused future professional development and training of online adjunct instructors.

Instructor feedback to the FOO has revealed interesting results that somewhat have resembled those found with the initial findings from the OIES. That is, the similarities between the perceptions and reactions of experienced, "seasoned" online faculty have revealed initial contrasts between relatively new online instructors. These are tracked and more-thoroughly analyzed in an upcoming study of adjunct instructors' reactions to the FOO. While most new instructors (those with less than one-year of teaching) were very receptive- to and appreciative of the information provided, observation process, and access provided to additional resources, there were noted differences between experienced (more seasoned) faculty members, who were more resistant to any indicators of "needs improvement", or not receiving "exceeding expectations" for the courses observed

As with the OIES, new instructors indicated an appreciation for the completeness of the observation process in the measurement of their performance as facilitators of learning online. Representative of this category of feedback, one new instructor commented, "Thank you for your comments. I am taking a course in a week on improving discussion board participation and expect this will greatly improve my participation as I will have more tools " Furthermore, new instructors considered the evaluation to be a collaborative process between themselves and the evaluator. One respondent noted, "Thank you, for your commitment of time and experience toward maintaining high standards of education. I appreciate your interest and your remarks."

The majority of new instructors valued the suggestions for improvements offered through the evaluation process. As one first time instructor noted, "Thank you for your comments. I am taking a course in a week on improving discussion board participation and expect this will greatly improve my participation as I will have more tools.

Most important, the observation process yielded opportunities for instructor reflection and subsequent revision and improvement of teaching practice. At the various levels, examples of instructor comments include: "Thank you very much! I will continue to work in the classroom at this level in order to provide a positive, supportive and interesting learning environment for my students. I appreciate your feedback and encouraging comments. Similarly, I appreciate the constructive comments. The evaluation will help me stay on track in future terms." While not all instructor comments are positive, they are helpful to focus on areas of concern. The comments are also helpful for focusing on future professional development needs. Additionally, results are sent to department program coordinators who may use the results in future course scheduling decisions.

In addition to feedback from instructors, the observers' reflections on the administrative aspects of the observation process provided valuable insight for continual enhancements of the FOO. A marked improvement over issues related to the OIES used previously includes extensive time savings by replacing one observation period of two weeks covering many of the topics covered over the entire eight-week period utilizing three formative and one summative report. This allows for providing an annul observations of all online adjunct faculty members that are actively teaching for Park University. Further the inter-rater reliability observations will provide a higher rate of consistency in the observation of specific areas and the end - commentary provided by

observers to explain the criteria rankings. Current faculty observers have transitioned from faculty evaluators allowing a consistency in the interpretation of the observation criteria and the explanation and interpretation of the criteria utilized in the observation categories. The evaluators worked together to create a standardized approach to ensure consistency in criteria interpretation and, more importantly, to allow more time for adding custom, instructor-specific commentary.

Summary and Conclusions

Like many other colleges and universities, Park University has an online program that experienced a rapid growth in online students and courses with limited administrative resources and models. The challenges of meeting the demands of students and offering quality online courses required that an efficient and effective system be implemented. The development and implementation of such a system demanded that benefits outweigh the costs, which can be a concern during challenging budget scenarios. Park University has supported the efforts in creating an evaluation system for faculty teaching in an online environment. Based on this growth, the main objective of the faculty online observation process was to provide students with a quality learning experience in online delivery while assisting faculty in their professional development as online instructors.

Initially, the College for Distance Learning mirrored the established processes and paradigms for faculty evaluation at the University's traditional campuses of in-class students. The Online Instructor Evaluation System was the initial evaluation system implemented at Park University to address the evaluation and mentoring process. The labor intensive effort needed to implement the OIES system was instrumental in looking at alternatives and options in the areas of evaluation

and mentoring of adjunct online faculty. As a result of the concerns for effectiveness, the mentoring process was refined and a process that resulted in specialized support was implemented. This type of evaluation online faculty at Park University was of limited relevance to the online environment, both in content and in implementation. Strategic planning and advancing technology and online focus led to identification of program goals and key competencies for online instructors, which were subsequently woven into the recruiting, training, extensive evaluation (OIES), reduced and focused evaluation (FOO), and faculty development components of the online program. The FOO has reduced the exchange and interaction between the evaluator and the instructor; instead, there is more of a concerted effort in the entire process that includes the trainer, mentors, course developers, instructional designers, program coordinators (focused on course content), and evaluators (focused on course facilitation).

The Faculty Online Observation has the adaptable potential to other institutions contemplating the addition of a formal online faculty evaluation that bridges the gap often found between online and resident instructors, directors, and administrators. The FOO does not stand alone, but is built based on the face-to-face evaluation model, Park online policies, online best practices, a team of evaluators, a team of faculty mentors, instructional designers, course developers, a distance learning advisory committee (DLAC), departmental buy-in, and support from the University administration. At times this coordination is as confusing as determining the placement of the chicken and the egg. Each entity plays an important part and allows for sound decisions for establishing and maintaining an effective online pedagogy. The coordinated effort is reflective of best practices and program expectations, resulting in the reinforcement of the academic quality goals of Park University's online learning program.

References

Abel, R. (2005) Achieving Success in Internet-Supported Learning in higher Education: Case Studies Illuminate Success Factors, Challenges, and Future Directions, Alliance for Higher Education Competitiveness.

Allen, E.I. and Seaman J. (2008) Staying the Course: Online Education in the United States, the Sloan consortium.

Allen, E.I. and Seaman J. (2010) Class Differences – Online Education in the United States, the Sloan Consortium,

Berg, G. (2011) Distance learning best practices debate. WebNet Journal. (April-June, 5-6, 2001), 17.

Boettcher, J. V. and Conrad, R. M. (2004) Faculty guide for moving teaching and learning to the web. 2nd Edition. Phoenix, AZ, League for Innovation, 247.

Burnett, K., Bonnici, L. J., Miksa, S. D., and Joonmin, K. (2007) Frequency, intensity and topicality in online learning: An exploration of the interaction dimensions that contribute to student satisfaction in online learning. Journal of Education for Library & Information Science, 48(1) (Winter, 2007), 21-35.

Chickering, A. and Ehrmann, S. (1996) Implementing the seven principles: Technology as lever. American Association for Higher Education Bulletin, 49 (2) (October, 1996): 3-6.

Eskey, M.T. and M. Schulte (2010) What Online College Students Say About Online Instructors and   What Do Online Faculty Members Say About Online Instruction: A Comparison of Attitudes, *Journal of Online Education*, August, 2010

Finch, J., and Montambeau, E. (2000) Beyond Bells and Whistles: Affecting Student Learning Through Technology.

Graham, C., K. Cagiltay, B. Lim, J. Craner, and Duffy, T.M. (2000). Seven Principles of Effective Teaching: A Practical Lens for Evaluating Online Courses.

Holmberg, B. *Distance education: A survey and bibliography*. (1977) London: Kogan Page; New York: Nichols Publishing Company.

Kim, K., Bonk, C. and Zeng, T. (2005) Surveying the Future of Workplace E-Learning: the Rise of   Blending, Interactivity, and Authentic Learning, *E-Learn Magazine* (June, 2005).

Lokken, F. 2009 Distance Education Survey Results: Tracking the Impact of eLearning at Community Colleges, Instructional Technical Council, Washington, DC (2009).

Mandernach, B. J., Donnelli, E., Dailey, A., and Schulte, M. (2005) A Faculty Evaluation Model for Online Instructors: Mentoring and Evaluation in the Online Classroom. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8 (3)

Marques, J.F. and C. McCall (2005) The Application of Interrater Reliability as a Solidification Instrument in a Phenomenological Study, *The Qualitative Report*, 10, No. 3, September, 2005.

Maryland Online, Inc. (2008). Quality Matters Rubric Standards 2008 – 2010 edition with assigned point values.

Matthews, D. (1999) The Origins of Distance Education and its Use in the United States. *The Journal*. (September, 1999)

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (2010).

Park University (2009) Online Course Principles and Standards

Park University. (2008). SOL Principles and Standards. Park University School for Online Learning Website:

Reeves, T. Evaluating What Really Matters in Computer-Based Education (1997).

Tobin, T. (2004). Best Practices for Administrative Evaluation of Online Faculty. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 7 (2).

Weiss, R.,E., Knowlton, D.S., & Speck, B. W. (Eds.) (2004). *Principles of Effective Teaching in the Online Classroom*. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass.