

Course Evaluation for the
Teaching Online Certification Training Course
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Prepared by:

Dymphna Canales

Evangelina Guillen

Laura Hayward

Paul Pérez-Jiménez

EDTC-8373

April 2016

Executive Summary

The Teaching Online Certification Training (TOL) was administered to professors (trainees) at the University of Pan American from June 24, 2015 – August 17, 2015, Summer Session II. The TOL course served as an orientation to using Blackboard Learn, the Learning Management System platform adopted by the University. The TOL provided an opportunity for the trainees to learn more about teaching online, using specific Blackboard Learning Management tools, provided an overview of the differences between online and traditional classrooms, online development processes, writing measurable learning objectives, and developing a variety of learning activities that align with course learning objectives. The ultimate goal of the TOL was to aid the trainees in creating and facilitating their own online courses.

Kirkpatrick's evaluation model was applied to the Teaching Online Certification Training (TOL). Data evaluated and analyzed included: the TOL course design, TOL course assignments, End of Course survey and facilitator input. Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Evaluation was selected as the evaluation model. It is important to note that the team had mixed feelings about going through all of the four steps in such a quick manner. Some of these objections included going through several steps at once instead of consecutively or "sequentially", while others pointed out that much as Lopez-Guerra noted in *Performance Evaluation*, the first level, Reaction, measured how the trainees that participated in the certification course reacted to the training and the team was limited to access via a smile sheet. Did the trainees find value in the certification course? Was the instructor that delivered the certification course knowledgeable? Were the trainees able to implement what they learned? Why were some participants unsuccessful at completing the certification course? The second level, Learning, measured self-reflective data in response to a self-assessment on preparing for online teaching which was collected from the trainees during

week one of the TOL course. The focus at this point was on “increase” either “knowledge, skills or desired attitudes” (Lopez-Guerra 2008). In line with Kirkpatrick’s philosophy, the “increase” or learning was assumed “attributable” to the TOL instruction and analyzed at the end of course based off of trainee responses at the end of course survey and trainee’s presence in creating online courses. It is also worthwhile to note that a conversation was held regarding the assumption of this attribute for as one member noted if demonstration of knowledge is attributable then so is ignorance (Lopez-Guerra 2008) while another team member emphasized that the team was not privy to attributes. It was concluded that even though the evaluation team was limited by not only data but resources as well; trainee assessments and feedback would be analyzed or at least commented on. The third level, Behavior, measured how far the trainees have changed their behavior, based on the certification course. In order for this step to be effective, the trainees must apply the knowledge they have gained from the certification course. The task was beyond this team’s capacity and any reference was noted as possibly speculative. The fourth level, Results, analyzed the results of the course evaluation, which included strengths and weaknesses of the certification course so that the University can take action to improve course quality. Evaluation team members pointed out that the team had focused on an indirect “nontraining solution” in the proposal and deemed it important as a “societal impact” which was referred to as online social presence and accepted this much like Kaufman and Keller’s (1994) 5th level. Online social presence was noted as an attribute to the TOL that could not be verified given the time and team constraints.

The evaluation of the TOL course provided the following information for stakeholders:

1. Explanation of the TOL course design and modules that were assigned to the trainees;

2. identification of TOL course strengths and weaknesses;
3. recommendations to improve TOL course quality; and
4. recommendations for improved TOL course completion rates.

Introduction

“The creation of online platforms that establish new learning environments has led to the proliferation of institutions offering online learning programs. However, the use of technologies for teaching and learning requires sound content specialization, as well as grounding in pedagogy” (Mbatia & Minnaar, 2015, p. 272). The University of Texas at Brownsville and The University of Texas-Pan American were fully accredited universities and are the legacy institutions that merged to become what is now known as The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV). UTRGV is a fully accredited institution by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges and with this distinction UTRGV has high expectations for online course quality (The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, 2015).

The continued increase of online course and program offerings at UTRGV are on the rise as the increase in student population and the launching of the medical school brings more applicants from all over the country. It is anticipated that an additional ten new online programs will be offered by Fall 2016. The capacity for the institution to manage these programs requires an increase of 10-15% more faculty achieve the teaching online certification. Maintaining a rigorous curriculum will support the institution’s goal of becoming a Tier I university. In order to maintain high standards, it is essential for UTRGV to provide a quality training to professors on how to create and deliver a course prior to allowing them to teach any course that has an online component. Creating online courses and helping people with learning online is not only an effective strategy but is also a booming business.

Kirkpatrick's evaluation model was applied to the Teaching Online Certification Training (TOL). The TOL that will be evaluated was administered to professors (trainees) at the University of Pan American from June 24, 2015 – August 17, 2015, Summer Session II.

Program Description

The TOL course served as an orientation to using Blackboard Learn, the Learning Management System platform adopted by the University. The TOL provided an opportunity for the trainees to learn more about teaching online, using specific Blackboard Learning Management tools, and provided an overview of the differences between online and traditional classrooms, online development processes, writing measurable learning objectives, and developing a variety of learning activities that align with course learning objectives. The ultimate goal of the TOL was to aid the trainee in creating and facilitating their own online courses for UTRGV.

While the course was designed following the Quality Matters rubric, which has an exhaustive built in evaluation process and goals, the current evaluation team chose Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Evaluation, a more straightforward evaluation model, based on its simplicity in using a categorical outline that "provides basic training success indicators" as well as specific "training interventions"(Guerra-Lopez pg 55). This evaluation team further honed in on, as was discussed in the introduction This outline, as "levels," was then used not only to establish team objectives (see table 1.1) but also utilized to categorize each of the smile sheet's sixteen questions. (see table 1.3.) In essence, Kirkpatrick's Evaluation levels became the basis for a Gantt Chart that along with video-conferencing tracked the team's objectives, efforts, and accomplishments towards finalizing the evaluation. Thus, the purpose of evaluating the TOL stemmed and was made relevant through the chart better known as Table 1.1.

Table 1.1

Reaction Objectives Level 1		
Action Item	Team Member Lead	Impedance/Status
a) Evaluation team formed	DJ, LH, EG, PjP (All)	Non/complete
b) Review the course	All	Time/ongoing
c) Describe the overall design and navigation	DJ	Non/complete
d) Understand the QM rubric in relation to the Evaluation Team goals	All	TOL Facilitator Feedback via interview/Ongoing
e) Include and describe the questionnaire used at the end of course	LH	Complete: see Recommendations and Findings
f) Trainees opinions	LH	Complete
g) Interview facilitator	DJ	Non/complete
h) Success indicators	All	Pending
i) Training Interventions	All	Post mortem suggestions/ongoing

Learning Objectives Level 2		
Action Item	Lead	Impedance/Status
a) Review how the trainees were informed of certification course opportunities	DJ	Limited to one of the TOL Facilitator's recollection/complete
b) Identify trainee support services currently in place	All	Pending
c) Define standards relative to social presence	PjP	complete
d) Analyze end of course data	All	Pending Level 1
e) Success Indicators	all	Pending L1 completion/partial
f) Training Interventions	All	Post mortem suggestions/

Behavior Objectives Level 3		
Action Item	Lead	Impedance/Status
a) Data deduced from summative evaluations	All	Pending L2, L2/ongoing
b) Links to trainees changes in workplace performance	DJ	Pending L1,L2/ongoing

Results Objectives Level 4		
Action items	Lead	Impedance/Status
a) Evidence of online social presence achieved/impacted	All	Pending L1,L2,L3/ongoing
b) Evidence of presence achieved/impacted	All	Pending L1,L2,L3/ongoing

The stakeholders, holding various roles and benefiting in a variety of ways from this evaluation include UTRGV faculty members (trainees), UTRGV administration, the UTRGV online teaching department and the university students enrolled at UTRGV. The categories, interests, and perspective for each stakeholder are detailed in the table below:

Table 1.2 Stakeholder Assessment and Engagement Plan

Stakeholder Name	Stakeholder Category	Interest or Perspective
UTRGV Faculty Members (Trainees)	Primary	Admin
UTRGV Administration	Primary	Delivery
UTRGV Online Teaching Department	Primary	Application
UTRGV University Students	Secondary	Outcomes

General and Specific Evaluation Questions

General and specific evaluation questions aligned to Kirkpatrick's evaluation model include:

Table 1.3

Level 1: Reaction

- To what degree do trainees react favorably to the TOL? This original question measured participant satisfaction with the training and the facilitator.

- To what degree did the trainees feel about the quality of the course and its overall design?
- ~~The degree to which the trainees will have the opportunity to use or apply what they learned in training on the job.~~
- Rate the level of your involvement in the activities of this training.
- The course readings support course objectives?
- What overall rating would you give the training?
- What overall rating would you give the facilitator?

Level 2: Learning

- ~~To what degree do the trainees feel that the TOL objectives were clear and met?~~
- ~~To what degree to which the trainees are actively involved in and contributing to the learning experience?~~
- To what degree do the trainees acquire the intended knowledge, skills, attitudes, confidence and commitment in the TOL?
- What activities most enhanced your learning in this training?
- How much practical knowledge have you gained from this training?
- ~~The training objectives were clear?~~
- ~~The amount of reading you were asked to do was appropriate.~~
- ~~What activities were least helpful to your learning in this training?~~

Level 3: Behavior

- To what degree were the trainees involved in the TOL assignments?

- To what degree do the trainees apply what they learned during the TOL to their job?
- To what degree did the trainees feel supported throughout the TOL course?
- On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this training?
- Could you get clear answers to your questions from the training facilitator?
- Was the facilitator considerate to you?
- What did you think of the quality and helpfulness of instructor feedback?

Level 4: Results

- To what degree do targeted outcomes occur as a result of the training event?
- To what degree would the trainees recommend the TOL to other faculty?
- Would you recommend this training to other faculty?
- Do you feel you have gained the skills and knowledge needed to teach online?

Evaluation Data and Analyses

The evaluation framework that was used was the Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Evaluation. The central evaluation questions are categorized into each of the four levels listed above in Table 1.3. The central stakeholder needs were:

- Provide a quality certification course in order for the professors to be able to teach online courses,
- Provide adequate notice of the training so that trainees would be able to participate and finish the course
- Provide appropriate/relevant course content so that the trainees would be able to apply what they learned in their own online classes.

Data analyzed includes:

- 1) The survey completed by the trainees after the TOL refer to (Appendix A),
 - Nine trainees signed up for TOL course
 - Five trainees were certified through the completion of TOL course
 - Four trainees did not complete the course due to class closing, moving out of the institution, or not answering notifications.

- 2) The TOL content:

Module 1: Introduction to Quality Matters Standard 2: Learning Objectives

Unit 1: Discussion on how the online environment differs from traditional classroom,

Unit 2: Examines instructional strategies that are most effective for accomplishing a particular educational objective

Unit 3: Provides a few definitions, importance and benefits of writing measurable learning objectives

Module 2: QM Standard 3: Assessment & Measure & QM Standard 5: Activities

Unit 1: Define and build engaging activities and assessment

Unit 2: Developing effective online assessment

Unit 3: Importance of clear grading criteria

Module 3: QM Standard 1: Course Overview & QM Standard 5: Course Activities

Unit 1: Effective online communication

Unit 2: Promoting different learning through constructive feedback

Unit 3: Facilitating an online course

Module 4: QM Standard 1: Course Overview & QM 8: Accessibility & Usability

Unit 1: Effective course structure and online navigation

Unit 2: Using navigation and structure to clarify expectations and requirements

Unit 3: Adding content to your online course

Module 5: QM Standard3: Assessment, QM Standard5: Activities, QM6

Technology

Unit 1: Best practices for administering online assignments

Unit 2: Blackboard rubrics assessment tool

Unit 3: Best practices for administering online assessments

Module 6: QM Standard 6: Course Technology

Unit 1: Building content with asynchronous/synchronous tools

Module 7: QM Standard 6: Course Technology

Unit 1: Grade Center

Module 8: QM Standard 6: Course Technology

Unit 1: Retention Center

3) Trainee assignments that were submitted:

Module 1: Unit 1,2,3 Self Checks/Quizzes; Create objectives for 1 week lesson

Module 2: Unit 1,2,3 Self Checks/Quizzes; Create an activity, assessment, rubric

Module 3: Unit 1,2,3 Self Checks/Quizzes; Create discussion activity, post on board

Module 4: Unit 1,2,3 Self Checks/Quizzes; Create item & folder contents, post

Module 5: Unit 1,2,3 Self Checks/Quizzes; Create assignment, test, & rubric

Module 6: Unit 1 Self Checks/Quizzes; Create a discussion forum & link to

Blackboard learn, post on discussion board

Module 7: Unit 1 Self Checks/Quizzes; Create a grade column, grade an assignment utilizing inline grading, clear student's attempt on quiz/test on Blackboard Learn

Module 8: Unit 1 Self Checks/Quizzes; Create two customized rules and notify a student at risk utilizing the Retention Center in Blackboard Learn, post on discussion board.

4) TOL facilitator input: There will be periodic benchmarks to ensure the training materials are utilized and followed as the coordinator intended. This will be achieved through feedback meetings each week where the facilitators are able to offer opinions upon strengths, weaknesses and any suggestions to improve the process with the participants and the instructors.

Findings and Recommendations

The findings and recommendations of this evaluation are based on performance objectives detailed previously in this document and associated with trainee completion rates. Using Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Evaluation, the findings and recommendations will be associated with each of the four levels.

Trainee Reaction

Overall, trainees found the online course helpful in building practical knowledge and skills to create an online class, the pacing of the class was appropriate and trainees reported they received help from the training facilitator when needed. Despite the overall positive reaction, the reaction feedback for particular parts of the training module offer insights into end user areas that support learning and those areas which can be enhanced or modified to best serve the end user which might support increased completion rates. When end users react positively to online learning and the expectation for the trainee is to create online learning modules, the training module should model positive, robust, and purposeful presence.

Trainees responded that activities and readings combined as a reaction question were appropriate. Dividing the question into two separate questions, two thirds of the trainees responded the readings were relevant. In an online course one should expect a larger percentage

in this area and the response outcome might have been different with a correction in the question. Activities contributing to learning included trainees creating assignments, tests, rubrics, and course mapping. All of these activities can be labeled “hands on activities”. Broken links and spelling errors contributed to trainee frustrations. Section headings, clarification of tasks and lack of precision in directions of where to place trainee deliverables caused confusion. Deliverables from previous trainee’s course were still available to trainees making navigation cumbersome to current trainees. Half of the reactions specified discussion questions as being least helpful in the training. Four responses identified the platform as enhancing learning. The platforms included the training lab, retention center, Blackboard and videos as well as talking to the instructor in person. Ideas from trainees to improve the training included a broader scope of the training and pedagogy that was not useful.

Supporting data:

100 % of trainees responded they gained either some or a great deal of practical knowledge.

90% responded the course readings and activities supported the course objectives.

90% would recommend the training to other faculty.

90% responded the objectives of the training were clear.

70% responded the readings were appropriate (see comment above).

50% responded the discussion board was least helpful

Spelling errors, distracting content, broken links and uncertainty where to place deliverables

were specific responses by four different trainees.

Recommendations:

1. The current framework and platform is sustainable and navigation is mostly clear to the trainees. Recommend keeping both.
2. Retain hands on activities and deliverables for the trainees. They found these helpful to increase their skill and knowledge. The activities also serve as a model for building online social presence.
2. Limit the readings or include just the part of the reading that correlates directly to the deliverable. Offer additional readings as links to those who feel they might need additional information. Giving end users quick access helps focus on the quality of the task.
3. Ensure clarity of the navigation to include correct grammar, active links, headings and multiple entry points to link deliverables to the correct location by the trainees. For example, an icon with a chain link is a visual cue of an active link. If the link is not active, remove or activate the icon. Providing more than one entry point for uploading a deliverable allows the trainee to become aware that creation of multiple entry points is possible. What seems probable and logical to one trainee may not be so evident to another. Headings should be a different font size so it is evident to the trainees. All documents should be edited for correct grammar, spelling and punctuation.
4. Remove all deliverables from previous trainings unless those documents are used as examples. If so, they should be clearly identified as examples.
5. Limit discussion board or use the discussion board for a variety of reasons. Modeling a variety of ways to use the discussion board gives trainees multiple opportunities to use the discussion board. For example, an assignment to locate a video or multiple videos about a topic

versus continually asking trainees to write or reflect on a particular question models they can do the same with their students.

Trainee Learning

“Level II evaluations are used to measure whether ‘learning’ has truly occurred. The most common type of Level II evaluations include pre and post tests” (U.S. Department of Transportation, 2004, p. 2), however at the time that the TOL course was delivered pre and post tests were not administered to the trainees. In order to evaluate the learning of the trainees, the trainees’ discussion board posts on their self-reflection after they completed the Self-Assessment on Preparing for Online Teaching (Appendix B), end of training survey and determining if the trainees that completed online training courses are now teaching hybrid or fully online courses for UTRGV.

The Self-Assessment: Preparing for Online Teaching was developed by Penn State University, had 30 questions, was divided into three categories: Technical competencies, Administrative competencies, and Pedagogical competencies and was an assignment to be completed during week one of the TOL. All of the trainees that participated in the self-assessment and posted their responses shared that they were surprised at all of the elements that were required for successful online course delivery. Trainees that had little to no experience with teaching online courses reported that they felt little confidence with creating an online course, teaching an online course and were accustomed to studying alone with little collaboration amongst students at the university level. Trainees with previous experience in delivering online courses initially believed that the self-assessment would be a waste of time since they already had experience with online teaching, but reported that they were surprised at their self-assessment results. Areas in need of improvement for the experienced trainees included utilizing

Blackboard to its fullest capacity, such as using the group assignments and chat tools features, and seeking support not just from technical support, but from fellow colleagues who were also teaching online courses.

According to the End of Course TOL Trainee Survey, the majority of the trainees felt that the lab portion of the TOL course in which the trainees were required to create assignments, develop rubrics, develop course mappings, create assessments and grade assignments were the activities that most enhanced their learning in this training. The trainees felt that the hands on learning was the most beneficial as they were required to practice and apply the theory that they were learning. In addition, 70% of the trainees reported that they learned a great deal while 30% reported that they learned some practical knowledge from the TOL course. Lastly, according to the End of Course survey, 100% of the trainees reported that they felt that they had gained the skills and knowledge needed to teach online.

Immediately after course completion, trainees successfully completing the course can begin teaching hybrid or online courses for UTRGV. The trainees' opportunity to teach hybrid and online courses are directed and guided by course university course schedules. Of the trainees completing the TOL course, more than half have begun to teach on online course or are a teacher's assistant for an online course.

Recommendation:

Create and administer both a pre-test and post –test for the overall TOL course to each trainee.

Trainee Behavior

Application of knowledge and skills learned in this training are measured by periodic benchmarks designed to ensure training materials are utilized and followed as the TOL facilitator intended. Weekly feedback meetings using

Key Appendices/Exhibits

Appendix A

End of TOL Course Trainee Survey: Summer II 2015

1. Rate the level of your involvement in the activities of this training.
 - Very uninvolved
 - Somewhat involved
 - Enthusiastically involved
2. How much practical knowledge have you gained from this training?
 - A great deal
 - Some practical knowledge
 - None
3. Would you recommend this training to other faculty?
 - Yes
 - No

4. On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this training? Include time spent working online, doing readings, reviewing discussions, and other training related work.
- ☐ 0-5
 - ☐ 6-10
 - ☐ 11-15
 - ☐ 16-20
 - ☐ 21-25
 - ☐ 26-30
 - ☐ More than 31
5. The training objectives were clear?
- ☐ Strongly Agree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Neutral
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Strongly Disagree
6. The course readings support course objectives?
- ☐ Strongly Agree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Neutral
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Strongly Disagree
7. The amount of reading you were asked to do was appropriate.

- ☐ Strongly disagree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Neutral
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Strongly Disagree
8. What overall rating would you give the training?
- ☐ Excellent
 - ☐ Good
 - ☐ Average
 - ☐ Poor
9. What activities most enhanced your learning in this training? (Essay)
10. What activities were least helpful to your learning in this training? (Essay)
11. Do you feel you have gained the skills and knowledge needed to teach online?
- ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
12. Could you get clear answers to your questions from the training facilitator?
- ☐ Never
 - ☐ Sometimes
 - ☐ Usually
 - ☐ Most of the time
 - ☐ Always
13. Was the facilitator considerate to you?
- ☐ Never

- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Usually
- ☐ Most of the time
- ☐ Always

14. Quality and helpfulness of instructor feedback was

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Poor

15. What overall rating would you give the facilitator?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Poor

16. Please provide any additional suggestions, comments, or ideas you have for improving this training.

Appendix B

Faculty Self-Assessment: Preparing for Online Teaching
Developed by Penn State University

Category 1: Technical Competencies				
Complete basic computer operations I can complete basic computer operations, including creating and manipulating documents, managing files and folders, and working with multiple windows	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Log into LMS and access class I can log into the Learning Management System (LMS) and access the class.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Navigate course space I can navigate the course space in the Learning Management System (LMS) to use basic course components, tools/features such as the syllabus, lessons, gradebook, course mail, or other features.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Set up gradebook and manage grades I can set up the class gradebook and manage student grades in the LMS, such as set a grading scale, use points/percentages, and submit final grades.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Use course communication systems I can use course communication systems in the LMS such as email, chat, web conferencing, discussion forums, or announcements.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Manage course roster I can manage the course roster in the LMS to set up and manage teams/groups, and add instructors, teaching assistants, or outside guests with appropriate passwords and rights.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Manage student submissions I can manage student submissions in the LMS using tools such as a dropbox.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Create and manage course files and folders I can create and manage course files and folders within the LMS.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.

Category 2: Administrative Competencies				
Use communication tools I actively participate in the course through a variety of communication tools.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Communicate grading per assignment I communicate to students when assignments and exams will be graded and returned per assignment/quiz/exam.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Provide comprehensive syllabus I can provide a comprehensive syllabus that adheres to my institution's policies. The syllabus includes a course examination policy, a basis for grades, an academic integrity policy, and a disability access statement.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Mediate course conflicts I can mediate course-related student conflicts in accordance with my institution's policies.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Adhere to FERPA policies I can adhere to the institutional policies regarding the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Revise course content As needed, I can revise course content and instructional materials based on student feedback.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Obtain technical assistance I can obtain technical assistance and support for either myself or my students at the appropriate time.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Communicate student behavior expectations I can communicate my expectations about student behavior in my course (i.e., netiquete).	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Communicate and monitor academic integrity policies I can communicate and monitor compliance regarding institutional academic integrity policies.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Report grades securely I can securely report grades to students and input final grades into the	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and

University's grading system as required. [WAS: I can securely report grades to students and input record grades into the University's grading system as required]				can teach others.
Notify students of your availability I can notify students through a variety of communication tools when I am unavailable to participate in course-related activities.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Category 3: Pedagogical Competencies				
Attend to unique challenges of asynchronous learning I can attend to the unique challenges of distance learning where learners are separated by time and geographic proximity, and interactions are primarily asynchronous in nature.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Provide appropriate educational experience for diverse learners I am familiar with the unique learning needs and situations of both traditional age and adult learners, providing an education experience that is appropriate for both.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Achieve master of teaching and learning environment I can achieve mastery of the teaching and learning environment by becoming familiar with all course materials, as well as the structure and organization of the course environment.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Respond to student inquiries I can respond to student inquiries within 12-24 hours to guide students towards a positive learning outcome.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Provide detailed feedback I can provide detailed feedback on assignments and exams through facilitation, guidance, directed learning, and progress assessment.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Communicate course progress and changes I can communicate as needed with students about course progress and changes via email, course announcements, etc.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.

Promote a safe, inviting, mutually respectful learning environment I can promote and encourage a safe, inviting, and mutually respectful learning environment by communicating with students in a positive tone and by following and promoting Netiquete guidelines.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Monitor and manage student progress I can continuously monitor and manage student progress by using course statistics or reports to identify students who are not accessing course materials, participating in learning activities, etc., and reach out to encourage engagement.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Communicate course goals and outcomes I can communicate course goals and outcomes using the syllabus and course announcements at the beginning of the course.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Establish my presence in the course I can establish my presence in the course on a regular basis via course announcements, assignments, emails, online office hours, and various other methods.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.
Demonstrate sensitivity to disabilities and diversities I can provide a departmental-accepted statement of accessibility in the course syllabus and, throughout the course, demonstrate sensitivity to disabilities and diversities, including aspects of cultural, cognitive, emotional and physical differences.	I have never done this.	I have done this and had mixed success.	I have done this successfully.	I have done this successfully and can teach others.

References

- Mbati, L., & Minnaar, A. (2015, April). Guidelines Towards the Facilitation of Interactive Online Learning Programmes in Higher Education. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 16(2), 272-287.
- The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. (2015). *The Valley's New Leader in Online Education*. Retrieved April 5, 2016, from The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley:
http://getonline.utrgv.edu/online/programs/?school_id=61&campaign_id=1435&acq_id=1176&CID=1435&grad=show&lsid=Google&lssid=UTRGV_ALL_ALL_M_SR_APP&utm_source=google&utm_medium=&utm_term=%2Buniversity%20of%20%2Btexas%20%2Brio%20%2Bgrande%20%2Bvalley%20%2Bon
- U.S. Department of Transportation. (2004). *Level II Evaluation*. Retrieved April 9, 2016, from
<https://www.nhi.fhwa.dot.gov/resources/docs/Level%20II%20Evaluation%20Document.pdf>