

# **Guide for Evaluating Online Instruction at Santa Rosa Junior College**

Approved by DTREC May 2011 (Revised June 2012, December 2016)

**Part I: Guidelines for Performing the Evaluation** (paperwork, accessing the class, etc.)

**Part II: Guidelines for Evaluating Online Instruction** (Rubric)

**Part III: Resources**

## **Part I: Guidelines for Performing the Evaluation**

The following information may be used as a guide for evaluating online instruction. While the instructional methods may be different in approach and delivery, the goal is to apply comparable standards to both online teaching and face-to-face teaching (see *SRJC Guidelines for Peer Observation of Classroom [Face-to-Face] Teaching*). The categories in these guidelines mirror the categories on the peer evaluation observation forms. Evaluators are charged with observing only one class session; therefore, the evaluator may not observe all items listed. The great diversity in the design and delivery of courses may require the evaluator to infer the intent of some of the guidelines, rather than use them as a literal interpretation. Questions about how to interpret any of the following material should be directed to the Department Chair, Supervising Administrator, or DTREC.

The online evaluation process follows the same steps as for face-to-face classes. However, the online environment does require some special considerations. In an online class the instructor will provide online learning units containing reading assignments (on the Web, in textbooks, or both), explanatory "lecture notes," discussion, answers to questions, and an online exercise or quiz.

Refer to the AFA contract for Evaluation responsibilities and timeline.

- Article 14A for Regular Faculty evaluations
- Article 14B for Adjunct Faculty evaluations
- Article 30 for Tenure Review

### **Access to the Class:**

Contact (email, phone, in person) the evaluatee to obtain the information needed to access the course. The information you will need is:

- Course Name
- Course Section Number
- Semester/Year
- Instructor Name (evaluatee)
- Evaluator Name
- Evaluator Email Address (official SRJC only)
- Evaluator SID (9-digit Portal Login #)
- Data Compiler Name (Department Admin, Dean, or Chair)
- Data Compiler Email Address (official SRJC only)
- Data Compiler SID (9-digit Portal Login #)

### **Paperwork & Forms:**

You may access the peer observation forms on the AFA website at <http://www.afa-srjc.org/forms.shtml> and the HR website at <https://hr.santarosa.edu/forms>.

### **Official Student Evaluation Form:**

The Student Evaluation Form for Online Classes was approved by DTREC November 2016.

The form, as well as links to instructions for how to complete the evaluation, can be found on the SRJC Distance Education Website: "Online Instructor Evaluation": <https://de.santarosa.edu/form/online-instructor-evaluation>

**What to View:**

Consider how much time you would spend in a 1-3 hour in person class visit and the types of information you would have access to. That is the amount of time and access you want to achieve in the online class environment. Your observation and questions should be kept within the scope and time frame you would spend for a face-to-face class.

- Getting started or orientation page
  - Many instructors provide students with instructions for how to navigate the course. They may be found on the syllabus or as a separate Getting Started/Orientation page.
  - If you need orientation-type instructions and do not see them, ask the instructor. Important note: Those instructions would not be part of your evaluation unless you are evaluating that learning unit.
- Course materials
  - These materials are in learning management system.
  - Review the syllabus and follow one lesson, activity, or learning unit from start to finish. Components to view:
    - ✓ Section (Syllabus)
    - ✓ Schedule
    - ✓ Module/Lecture/Week/Presentation Pages
    - ✓ Message List, Forum, Blog, Chat, drop box, and/or email (evaluee forward as needed?)
    - ✓ Assignments for the week
  - You cannot view the Gradebook or any other week's materials. Pending: what about instructor comments from Gradebook? For some online classes that may be a large component of student interaction.

## Part II. Guidelines for Evaluating Online Instruction

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p> <p><b>Organization:</b></p> <p>Effectively organized instructional period with regard to pace, level of difficulty, and focus on course content.</p>	<p>Instructor's expectations, navigation, and structure of content are all clearly labeled, logical, and intuitive. For example, the instructor organized the course so that a student new to an online class is able to easily navigate through the course.</p>	<p>Instructor's expectations, navigation, activity flow, and structure of content are logical. For example, the student is able to navigate through the course; however, class navigation and structure contain very few choices.</p>	<p>Instructor's expectations, navigation, activity flow, and structure of content are not clear and/or are insufficiently logical. There is no structured means of organizing the course, and students can easily get lost. For example, assignment deadlines not are clearly defined.</p>
	<p>Instructor organized the pace and division of learning units and activities so that students are able to keep up with course requirements.</p>	<p>Instructor organized the pace and division of learning units and activities; however, workload may not be well adequately balanced or manageable.</p>	<p>Instructor organized the pace and division of learning units and activities in a way that is not obvious or not clearly connected. There may be significant flaws and/or workload is hard for students to manage.</p>
	<p>The observed portion of class content was delivered with a theme that augments the previous lesson and the Course Outline at an acceptable level of rigor.</p>	<p>The observed portion of class content was delivered with a loose theme that had little relationship to the previous lesson. It supports the Course Outline; however, some areas, such as tests and assignments, may not be representative of an acceptable level of rigor.</p>	<p>The observed portion of class activities has a limited or inadequate theme or relationship to the previous lesson or does not support the Course Outline and/or is not conveyed at an acceptable level of rigor and difficulty.</p>
	<p>The learning unit contained appropriate, sequenced reading assignments, explanatory/lecture text, discussion forum, and/or activities/exercises. All needed links are clear and logical.</p>	<p>The learning unit did not always contain a reasonable progression of basic reading assignments, explanatory/lecture text, discussion forum, and/or activities/exercises. Some of the links may not be easy to follow.</p>	<p>The learning unit did not contain an appropriate progression of reading assignments, explanatory/lecture text, discussion forum, and/or activities/exercises. Links may not be evident or may be confusing.</p>

Other Factors to Consider:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course navigation and structure contain multiple well-designed techniques and/or tools to engage and/or involve students. For example, clear instructions are provided for accessing media.</li> <li>• Instructor organized the pace of activities exceptionally well and course workload is manageable.</li> <li>• The observed portion of content was delivered with a comprehensive theme that enhances and builds upon the previous lesson to support the Course Outline at a <i>challenging</i> level of rigor.</li> <li>• The content is divided into engaging learning units and all needed links are presented in a very clear, logical and intuitive manner. For example, the session includes a balance of all of the following: reading, interaction, collaborative activities (if appropriate), discussion, tests and assignments.</li> </ul>
----------------------------	--

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p> <p><b>Preparation:</b></p> <p>Prepared for lecture, lab, activity presentation, or demonstration.</p>	<p>Instructor provided course materials on time and they are complete, correct and easy to follow.</p> <p>For example, menus, paths and prompts are instinctive, and students are easily able to follow and connect with them. All links are active and up-to-date.</p>	<p>Instructor provided most course materials on time; however, materials may not be complete, may have minor errors, or may have portions that are not easy to follow.</p> <p>For example, menus, paths, and prompts may not be easy to follow. Most links are active and up-to-date.</p>	<p>Instructor did not provide course materials on time, or materials are not complete, may have errors, or are not easy to follow.</p> <p>For example, menus, paths and prompts are not obvious. Some links are inactive and/or not up-to-date.</p>
	<p>The instructor supplemented publisher-prepared materials with additional resources and/or cited references to help explain ideas, concepts, theories, etc.</p>	<p>The instructor provided limited supplemental teaching materials and/or citations to references to help explain ideas, concepts, theories, etc.</p>	<p>The instructor provided only publisher- prepared materials without any enhancement and did not cite references to help explain ideas, concepts, theories, etc.</p>
	<p>Instructor's teaching materials and methods, i.e., lectures, textbooks, media, quizzes, exams, video, audio, Web sources, interactive activities, etc., were well thought out, varied, and enhanced the online learning experience.</p>	<p>Some teaching materials and methods may have lacked sufficient variety or appropriateness to the learning unit and thus did not always enhance the online learning experience.</p>	<p>Teaching materials lacked variety, were not well thought out, and did little to enhance the online learning experience.</p>
Other Factors to Consider:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The learning unit provided an impressive variety of supplemental instructional resources that were very well thought out and enhanced publisher-prepared materials.</li> <li>• Technology was effectively used.</li> </ul>		

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>Content Communicated:</b></p> <p>Communicated course content clearly.</p>	<p>The observed portion of the content was communicated well and addresses some higher level learning and understanding at an appropriate level for the class.</p> <p>For example, content was delivered with a connected theme that built on what students had already learned.</p>	<p>Most of the observed portion of content was communicated at a sufficient level of learning and understanding for the course but there are suggestions for improving the presentation.</p> <p>For example, content was delivered with a vague theme and/or did not build on what students had already learned.</p>	<p>The observed portion of content was inadequately communicated and/or does not address a level of learning and understanding appropriate for the course.</p>
	<p>The observed portion of the content was of competent quality and addressed stated learning objectives.</p>	<p>Most of the observed portion of content was of minimal quality and addressed most of the stated learning objectives.</p>	<p>The observed portion of content was of low quality and inadequately addressed stated learning objectives.</p>
	<p>The instructor used clear and varied methods for delivering content and employed some appropriate online tools and resources.</p>	<p>The instructor used sufficient methods for delivering content; however, there was minimal use of appropriate online tools and resources.</p>	<p>The instructor used an inadequate variety of methods for delivering content. Few online tools or resources were used.</p>
Other Factors to Consider:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The observed portion of the content was communicated clearly and effectively and advances higher-level learning and understanding at an appropriate level for the class. For example, content was presented with a clear theme and built new material on what students had already learned.</li> <li>• The observed portion of the content was of high quality and addressed all stated learning objectives in great detail.</li> <li>• The instructor used <i>innovative</i> and varied methods for delivering content and appropriately employed many of the latest online tools and resources.</li> </ul>		

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p><b>4</b></p> <p>Instructional Modes:</p> <p>Demonstrated a variety of instructional techniques.</p>	<p><b>Note:</b> Learning methodologies, approaches, and strategies might include the use of resources such as written text, video, audio, images, and other media, Web sources, spoken words, music, interactive activities, white boards and/or other technologies.</p>		
	<p>Instructor presented course material using a variety of modes and strategies and incorporated varied resources to enhance student interest and to help improve learning, comprehension, retention of information, and critical thinking.</p> <p>For example, course assignments were varied and incorporated a variety of learning methodologies.</p>	<p>Instructor's use of a variety of modes and strategies of delivery of course material and varied resources was somewhat limited.</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement might include providing a greater variety of assignments or incorporating means for greater student involvement and communication with other students and/or the instructor.</p>	<p>Instructor made little or no effort to provide variety and challenge in the online learning environment by varying techniques, approaches and strategies.</p> <p>For example, all assignments were reading assignments.</p>
Other Factors to Consider:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructor created a dynamic and challenging online environment through the use of multiple techniques, approaches, and strategies.</li> <li>• Choice of course materials, assignments and online activities enhanced the learning environment.</li> <li>• The instructor used innovative and varied methods for delivering online course content and effectively incorporated appropriate resources. For example, the instructor offered multiple forms of media (video, audio, images) to enhance student interest.</li> </ul>		

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p><b>5</b></p> <p><b>Engagement</b></p> <p>Engages and maintained student interest.</p>	Instructor effectively communicated enthusiasm and interest by creating an online learning environment that is motivating and challenging, as evidenced by student participation, interaction, and attention.	Instructor communicated interest by creating an online learning environment, but it may need more stimulation, as evidenced by minimal student participation, interaction, and attention.	Instructor did not adequately communicate enthusiasm and interest to the students, and there was a notable lack of student participation.
	<p>Instructor used a variety of techniques, tools and activities to encourage student interest and participation.</p> <p>Timely and constructive instructor feedback is also evident.</p>	<p>Instructor used minimal techniques, tools and activities to encourage student participation.</p> <p>Minimal instructor feedback was evident.</p>	Instructor did not use effective techniques, tools and activities to encourage student participation, and little or no instructor feedback was evident.
Other Factors to Consider:	<p>Instructor communicated exceptional enthusiasm and interest by creating an online learning environment that is stimulating, exciting and rigorous, as evidenced by student participation and attention.</p> <p>Instructor used a variety of techniques, tools and activities that resulted in a high level of student participation and interest, such as dynamic discussions (meaningful and topic-based), pertinent questions or (individualized) comments about assignments. Timely and constructive instructor feedback was also evident.</p>		



Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>Interaction:</b></p> <p>Demonstrated rapport and respectful interaction with all students.</p>	The instructor was approachable and established effective rapport with students, as evidenced by frequent and actively engaged communication between students and instructor.	The instructor was approachable and rapport was minimally established with students.	The instructor was insufficiently available and approachable and did not establish an effective rapport with students.
	The instructor was polite and respectful and exhibited patience when interacting with students.	The instructor was polite and respectful most of the time when interacting with students.	The instructor was impolite or disrespectful at times when interacting with students.
	A sufficient variety of appropriate interactive practices were employed.	A minimal variety of appropriate interactive practices were employed.	Instructor needs to provide opportunities for interaction between instructor and students and among students.
Other Factors to Consider:	<p>The instructor was friendly and readily approachable and established a strong rapport with students. For example, instructor actively monitored student progress, provided encouraging responses and timely, detailed, and meaningful feedback.</p> <p>The instructor was consistently respectful, and exhibited patience, compassion and understanding at all times when interacting with students.</p> <p>A wide variety of appropriate interactive practices were employed. For example, the instructor initiated and facilitated suitable activities, made announcements, moderated discussions (with appropriate instructor participation), and/or clarified assignments.</p>		

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p>7</p> <p><b>Classroom Management:</b></p> <p>Demonstrated successful classroom management techniques by maintaining an environment conducive to learning.</p>	<p>The instructional period was clearly defined and observed, and students understood what they must do to participate in class.</p> <p>For example, the instructional session started and ended at the scheduled time. All links were accessible and functioning and were easy to access.</p>	<p>The instructional period was defined but not always apparent or observed and students had some confusion about what they must do to participate in class.</p> <p>For example, the instructional session did not start and end at the scheduled time and/or links or other resources were not always accessible and functioning.</p>	<p>The instructional period was insufficiently defined, or students were unclear about what they must do to participate in class.</p> <p>For example, it was not clear to students when instructional sessions were to start and/or end. Links and/or other resources were not always accessible or functioning.</p>
	<p>Instructor provided a forum conducive to student-to-student interaction and created a participatory learning environment (as applicable).</p>	<p>Instructor provided a forum but did little to encourage student-to-student interaction or to create a highly interactive or collaborative and participatory learning environment (as applicable).</p>	<p>Instructor did not provide a forum for student-to-student interaction or create a collaborative and participatory learning environment (as applicable).</p>
	<p>The instructor provided regularly-scheduled feedback to students and monitored class communications for student understanding, providing adequate opportunity for questions. Instructor responses were complete, respectful, and competently addressed the student's issue or question.</p>	<p>The instructor sporadically monitored class communications for student understanding and provided some opportunities for questions, feedback and instructor responses.</p>	<p>The instructor inadequately monitored class communications for student understanding and did not provide sufficient opportunities for questions, feedback and instructor responses.</p>
<p>Other Factors to Consider:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The instructional period was thoroughly defined and consistently observed, and students intuitively understood what they must do to participate in class. For example, the instructor sends reminders about dates and/or provides appropriate notes and additional information, as needed, for clarification. All links were accessible and functioning at appropriate times and were easy to access.</li> <li>• The learning unit contained a well-planned assortment and sequencing of appropriate reading assignments, explanatory/lecture text, discussion forum, and/or activities and exercises.</li> <li>• Instructor provided a forum encouraging student-to-student interaction and created a highly interactive or collaborative and participatory learning environment (as applicable).</li> <li>• The instructor frequently monitored class communications for student understanding and provided abundant opportunities for questions, feedback and adequate instructor responses.</li> </ul>		

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p><b>8</b></p> <p><b>Course Syllabus:</b></p> <p>Organized course, syllabus and presentation to</p>	<p>The course syllabus is in compliance with the Course Outline of Record (COR). There is evidence of clear and direct alignment and connection of syllabus, section page, objectives, content, and class activities/assignments to the COR.</p>	<p>The course syllabus is in compliance with the major aspects of the COR. There was some evidence of incomplete alignment and connection of syllabus, section page, objectives, content, and class activities/assignments to COR.</p>	<p>The course syllabus is out of compliance with the COR. There was inadequate alignment and connection of syllabus, section page, objectives, content, and class activities/assignments to COR.</p>

<p>correspond to the most current Course Outline of Record (COR).</p> <p>Policy 3.9.1P COURSE SYLLABI</p>	<p>The course syllabus includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course description, including student learning outcomes</li> <li>• Reading and lecture schedule</li> <li>• An electronic link or direction to the COR</li> <li>• Office location, office hours, and instructor contact information, including an SRJC email address</li> <li>• Required texts and supplemental materials</li> <li>• List of assignments</li> <li>• Grading policy, including grading scale</li> <li>• Late work policy</li> <li>• Attendance and lateness policy.</li> <li>• Statement about academic integrity and consequences</li> <li>• Date and time of the final exam according to the established college final exam schedule.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the syllabus includes many of the following optional best practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of topics</li> <li>• Calendar of assignments with language indicating that dates are tentative</li> <li>• Instructor's pedagogical philosophy</li> <li>• Emergency preparedness information, including evacuation areas and directions about specific emergencies, such as an earthquake, fire, or live shooter.</li> <li>• Guidelines about student conduct and appropriate classroom behavior</li> <li>• Information on services for students with disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>The course syllabus may be <i>minimally</i> non-compliant with the COR in terms of student learning outcomes, course content, assignments, methods of evaluation, etc.</p> <p>For example, some assignments may not be in compliance or percentages are inconsistent with the Methods of Evaluation stated in the COR.</p>	<p>The course syllabus is missing some or many of the required elements.</p> <p>For example, the instructor's contact information, the grading policy, or the course description may be missing.</p> <p>In addition, topics covered in the observed class session may not have been in alignment with the Topics and Scope in the COR.</p>
<p>Other Factors to Consider:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was evidence of comprehensive and obvious alignment and connection of syllabus, section page, objectives, content, and class activities/assignments to the COR.</li> <li>• In addition, the syllabus included many or all of the following: optional Best Practices.</li> <li>• A comprehensive grading policy is provided with detailed guidelines (rubric) for what constitutes an A grade, a B grade, etc.</li> </ul>		

Criterion	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory/Minor Improvement Needed (2)	Improvement Needed (follow-up evaluation required) (1)
<p><b>9</b></p> <p><b>Currency:</b></p> <p>Demonstrated currency in the discipline.</p>	<p>The instructor exhibits a high level of knowledge in the discipline and demonstrated this by regularly citing research and providing links to cited resources.</p> <p>Textbooks and other teaching materials contain up-to-date information in the field.</p>	<p>The instructor exhibits a basic familiarity and knowledge in the discipline.</p> <p>However, the instructor needs to include (as applicable) some new developments in the field or at minimum cite current research and/or resources.</p>	<p>The instructor does not exhibit adequate current familiarity and/or knowledge in the discipline and/or did not cite research and resources, as appropriate.</p> <p>For example, the instructor did not include or address significant new developments.</p>
	<p>Instructor thoroughly understands the current scope of the discipline and is able to convey that to students, helping them to connect the information within a broader context.</p> <p>For example, instructor responds knowledgeably to students' questions and refers students to alternative sources, as appropriate,</p>	<p>Instructor adequately understands the scope of the discipline and is able to convey that to students.</p> <p>However, some of the information provided to the students does not reflect the most current scope of the discipline and/or instructor is not always able to answer questions with the most current information in the discipline.</p>	<p>Instructor inadequately understands the current scope of the discipline and/or is not able to convey to students the connection to the broader context.</p> <p>For example, instructor is not comfortable with routine and basic information and fails to adequately answer basic questions.</p>
	<p>Course text and materials adequately reflect current developments, theories, standards, and/or research in the discipline.</p>	<p>Course text and/or materials are not as up-to-date as they should be and may not include current developments, theories, standards, and/or research in the discipline.</p>	<p>Course text/materials are not current with regard to developments and standards in the discipline.</p> <p>For example, significant materials are outdated, incorrect, or flawed.</p>
	<p><b>Other Factors to Consider:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The instructor is exhibits <i>comprehensive</i> knowledge in the discipline. For example, the instructor frequently cited new developments in the field.</li> <li>• Instructor's advanced understanding of the current scope of the discipline clearly helps students consider the information within a broader context.</li> <li>• Course text/materials selected are at the forefront of developments and standards in the discipline.</li> </ul>		

## Part III Resources

### Resources Used:

There are many resources available to help you become more familiar with online learning and the evaluation process.

- Course Outline of Record (COR): [https://portal.santarosa.edu/SRweb/SR\\_CourseOutlines.aspx](https://portal.santarosa.edu/SRweb/SR_CourseOutlines.aspx)
- AFA Article 17 – Job Descriptions
  - <http://www.afa-srjc.org/Contract/Articles/art17.pdf> (Pending: Article 17 update to contain language inclusive of the online environment)
- Best Practices in Designing and Conducting Online Courses (from OEI)
  - <https://de.santarosa.edu/content/best-practices-overview>
- SRJC Distance Education For Faculty Pages:
  - Getting Started - <https://de.santarosa.edu/getting-started>
  - Teaching Online - <https://de.santarosa.edu/teaching-online>
  - Moving a face-to-face class to an online environment - <https://de.santarosa.edu/moving-face-face-class-online-environment>
  - How to handle no-shows in online classes - <https://de.santarosa.edu/how-handle-no-shows-online-classes>
  - How to handle bounced email messages - <https://de.santarosa.edu/how-handle-bounced-email-messages>

AFA Article 17 – Job Descriptions

AFA Article 14A and 14B – Regular and Adjunct Faculty Evaluations

AFA Article 30 – Tenure Review

SRJC District Online Committee Best Practices

The statewide Academic Senate web site contains:

- ["Sound Principles for Faculty Evaluation" \(Spring 2013\)](#)
- ["Guidelines for Good Practice: Effective Instructor-Student Contact in Distance Learning" \(Spring 1999\)](#)

Chancellor's Office DE 2008 Guidelines - [http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/AA/DE/de\\_guidelines\\_081408.pdf](http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/AA/DE/de_guidelines_081408.pdf)

SRJC DEAC forms and procedures & Curriculum Committee Handbook:

- Curriculum Review Committee site – <https://curriculum.santarosa.edu/curriculum-review-committee>
- Distance Education Getting Started page - <https://de.santarosa.edu/getting-started>

SRJC Board Policy & Procedures: Online Instruction & Accessibility – [Board Policy 3.28P](#) and [Board Policy 3.12.3P](#)

SRJC Accessibility Guidelines - <https://de.santarosa.edu/accessibility/introduction>

Seven Principles of Effective Teaching: A Practical Lens for Evaluating Online Courses (The Technology Source Archives, University of North Carolina):

[http://technologysource.org/article/seven\\_principles\\_of\\_effective\\_teaching/](http://technologysource.org/article/seven_principles_of_effective_teaching/)

American Distance Education Consortium:

Five Best Practices for Developing Online Courses

[http://adec.edu/wp-content/uploads/Best\\_practices\\_developing\\_online\\_courses\\_6-20-16.pdf](http://adec.edu/wp-content/uploads/Best_practices_developing_online_courses_6-20-16.pdf)