



Online Education at UMKC: What We Learned From the Sloan-C Quality Scorecard Survey

January 6, 2014

Contact Information

Devon A. Cancilla, Ph.D.

Vice Provost for Online and Distance Learning

University of Missouri Kansas City

5100 Rockhill Road

Kansas City, MO 64110-2499

Phone: 816-235-5431

Email: Cancillad@umkc.edu

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Subject: Summary Quality Scorecard Survey Office of Institutional Research	6
Appendix 1 Survey Results	9
Table 1: Respondents' Role at UMKC.....	10
Table 2: Institutional Support Score (All Respondents)	11
Table 3: Institutional Support Score (Administrative Respondents)	12
Table 4: Institutional Support Score (Online Instructor Respondents).....	13
Table 5: Institutional Support Score (Staff Respondents)	14
Table 6: Institutional Support Score ("Other" Respondents).....	15
Table 7: Technology Support (All Respondents)	16
Table 8: Technology Support (Administrative Respondents)	17
Table 9: Technology Support (Online Instructor Respondents).....	18
Table 10: Technology Support (Staff Respondents).....	19
Table 11: Technology Support ("Other" Respondents)	20
Table 12: Course Development and Instructional Design Score (All Respondents).....	21
Table 13: Course Development and Instructional Design Score (Admin. Respondents).....	22
Table 14: Course Development and Instructional Design Score (Online Instructors Respondents).....	23
Table 15: Course Development and Instructional Design Score (Staff Respondents)	24
Table 16: Course Development and Instructional Design Score ("Other" Respondents)	25
Table 17: Course Structure Score (All Respondents).....	26
Table 18: Course Structure Score (Administrative Respondents)	27
Table 19: Course Structure Score (Online Instructor Respondents).....	28
Table 20: Course Structure Score (Staff Respondents)	29
Table 21: Course Structure Score ("Other" Respondents).....	30
Table 22: Teaching and Learning Score (All Respondents).....	31
Table 23: Teaching and Learning Score (Administrative Respondents)	32
Table 24: Teaching and Learning Score (Online Instructor Respondents).....	33
Table 25: Teaching and Learning Score (Staff Respondents)	34
Table 26: Teaching and Learning Score ("Other" Respondents).....	35
Table 27: Social and Student Engagement Score (All Respondents).....	36
Table 28: Social and Student Engagement Score (Administrative Respondents)	36
Table 29: Social and Student Engagement Score (Online Instructor Respondents).....	36

Table 30: Social and Student Engagement Score (Staff Respondents)	37
Table 31: Social and Student Engagement Score ("Other" Respondents).....	37
Table 32: Faculty Support Score (All Respondents.....	38
Table 33: Faculty Support Score (Administrative Respondents)	39
Table 34: Faculty Support Score (Online Instructor Respondents)	40
Table 35: Faculty Support Score (Staff Respondents).....	41
Table 36: Faculty Support Score ("Other" Respondents)	42
Table 37: Student Support Score (All Respondents)	43
Table 38: Student Support Score (Administrative Respondents)	45
Table 39: Student Support Score (Online Instructor Respondents).....	47
Table 40: Student Support Score (Staff Respondents)	49
Table 41: Student Support Score ("Other" Respondents).....	51
Table 42: Evaluation and Assessment Score (All Respondents)	53
Table 43: Evaluation and Assessment Score (Administrative Respondents).....	54
Table 44: Evaluation and Assessment Score (Online Instructor Respondents).....	55
Table 45: Evaluation and Assessment Score (Staff Respondents)	56
Table 46: Evaluation and Assessment Score ("Other" Respondents).....	57
Table 47: Overall Score Card Summary	58
Table 48: Category Scores (All Respondents).....	59
Table 49: Category Scores (Administrative Respondents).....	60
Table 50: Category Scores (Online Instructor Respondents)	61
Table 51: Category Scores (Staff Respondents)	62
Table 52: Category Scores ("Other" Respondents).....	63
Appendix 2: Written Comments by Section.....	64
Technology Support.....	66
Course Development and Instructional Design.....	68
Course Structure.....	70
Teaching and Learning.....	71
Social and Student Engagement	72
Faculty Support.....	72
Student Support	74
Evaluation and Assessment.....	75



January 6, 2014

From: Devon A. Cancilla, Ph.D., Vice Provost for Online and Distance Learning

Executive Summary - Online Education at UMKC: What We Learned From the Sloan-C Quality Scorecard Survey.

Background:

Institutions across the United States use the “Quality Scorecard” survey, developed by the Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C), to benchmark their online programs, infrastructure, and activities against recognized quality standards in online education. To provide a more comprehensive understanding of UMKC’s strengths and weaknesses in online education, UMKC Online, working with the UMKC Office of Institutional Research, asked 297 UMKC faculty, staff and administrators to participate in a Quality Scorecard survey.

The survey included seventy questions on nine topics: Institutional Support, Technology Support, Course Development and Instructional Design, Course Structure, Teaching and Learning, Social and Student Engagement, Faculty Support, Student Support, Evaluation and Assessment. Collectively, these categories comprise the overall framework necessary for universities to deliver and administer high quality online programs. Survey participants were also given the opportunity to provide written comments within each of the categories.

A total of 111 surveys were completed for a 38.4% response rate. The Appendices set forth the compiled data.

Results:

Survey results indicate that significant improvements are needed across each of the nine topic areas. An advantage to the use of the Quality Scorecard is that it provides both a benchmark by which program improvements can now be measured and a framework by which specific improvements can be implemented.

One of the key elements highlighted in the survey was the need to provide improved support services to all constituencies, including Institutional Support, Faculty Support, and Technology Support. Because of the survey’s design, students did not directly participate in the survey. Nonetheless, Student Support services were also frequently identified as needing additional support.

Support service covers a broad range of areas, including issues such as “getting help” and ongoing training and development. For example, orientation and training for students and faculty new to online education were identified as an important need. Also mentioned was the need for “helpdesk” support, to provide rapid response and after hours help. Often, this was

related to technology-based issues that arise during the delivery of a course. Two types of technology support needs were identified: support during classes and support during preparation/development of a class.

Additional needs and concerns fell into two main overlapping categories: Pedagogy and Instruction, and Evaluation and Assessment at student, faculty, course, and institutional levels.

Actions:

UMKC has the potential to become a strong provider of online programs and courses. To accomplish this, UMKC must focus on expanding the infrastructure necessary to build, deliver and support these programs and courses. This will involve effectively leveraging and realigning existing resources, as well as developing new resources to support students and faculty. The survey categories identify the framework for the development of the infrastructure, while the survey results identify the priorities.

Two UMKC groups, the Online Educational Advisory Group (OEAG) and the newly constituted eLearning Action Committee, will be tasked with the development of and implementation of specific recommendations and actions based on to the survey results. The primary goal of these actions is to develop the robust infrastructure needed to deliver high quality online programs at UMKC. The specific objectives related to this goal are to achieve scores at the 85th percentile in each of the nine survey categories within two years.

The results of this survey will be disseminated to stakeholder groups, including survey participants, deans, chairs and other interest groups. The survey results will be incorporated as part of the development of a strategic plan to further develop the online capabilities at UMKC.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI ~ KANSAS CITY
~ OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ~

5115 Oak, Kansas City, MO 64110-2499
816.235.1045 • Fax: 816.235.5509

DATE: DECEMBER 12, 2013

TO: Devon Cancilla

FROM: Larry Bunce

Subject: Summary Quality Scorecard Survey Office of Institutional Research

Attached are multiple tables detailing results of the recent survey of online instructors, administrators, and staff connected with online education at the University of Missouri – Kansas City regarding their opinions of the quality within the online education program at UMKC. For this study, we utilized the Quality Scorecard survey developed by the Sloan Consortium (Sloan-C), a nationally recognized organization promoting quality online education. The survey was sent to 297 faculty, staff and administrators. A total of 8 invitations were bounced back due to inaccurate e-mail addresses. A total of 111 surveys were completed for an adjusted response rate of 38.4%. As seen in Table 1, over half of the respondents were online instructors. The remaining responses were relatively evenly distributed between administrators, staff, and “other” personnel.

The Quality Scorecard includes 70 items separated out into 9 subcategories:

- Institutional Support (4 items; UMKC added one additional item in this section)
- Technology Support (6 items)
- Course Development and Instructional Design (12 items)
- Course Structure (8 items)
- Teaching and Learning (5 items)
- Social and Student Engagement (1 items)
- Faculty Support (6 items)
- Student Support (17 items)
- Evaluation and Assessment (11 items)

For each item respondents were asked to indicate how much improvement was needed (Much Improvement = 1; Some Improvement = 2; and No Improvement = 3). The mean for each of the items in a subcategory were summed for a total score and then the total scores for all 9 subcategories were summed for an overall score for the university.

Sloan-C then offers a scale to assess the state of online education at the institution:

- 90-99% = Exemplary
- 80-89% = Acceptable
- 70-79% = Marginal
- 60-69% = Inadequate
- 59% and below = Unacceptable

Tables 2-46 portray the results for each of the 9 subcategories. Results are provided for all of the respondents together and also for each subgroup (e.g., online instructors). It is important to note that respondents were given the opportunity to indicate “Not Observed” if they did not feel they had enough information to answer a given question. The “Not Observed” responses were coded as 0, which impacts the item mean. Thus, within each table the mean and standard deviation with and without “Not Observed” responses are provided.

Table 47 summarizes the entire Scorecard, both with and without the “Not Observed” responses included for all of the respondents as well as the individual groups. If the “Not Observed” responses are removed, UMKC’s total score is 152.31, which equates to marginal performance (meaning significant improvement is needed in multiple areas). If the “Not Observed” responses are included, UMKC’s total score drops to 127.73, which equates to inadequate performance. Table 48 compares UMKC’s score in each subcategory with the total score possible. It appears that the three areas in most need of improvement are Institutional Support, Faculty Support, and Technology Support. Table 49-52 make the same comparisons for the subgroups of respondents.

An examination of the item means throughout the entire Scorecard shows 13 items with means below 2.0. Eight of these items fall under the three areas in greatest need of improvement discussed above. Thus, it may be helpful to highlight these 13 items in particular as focal points for future actions. Here are the 13 items:

- The institution has a governance structure to enable effective and comprehensive decision making related to online learning.
- The institution has defined the strategic value of online learning to its enterprise and to its stakeholders.
- The institution has the infrastructure and resources necessary to comply with local, state, and national accreditation and compliance standards.
- A centralized system provides support for building and maintaining the online education infrastructure.
- The course delivery technology is considered a mission critical enterprise system and supported as such.
- Faculty, staff, and students are supported in the development and use of new technologies and skills.
- There is consistency in course development for student retention and quality.
- Current and emerging technologies are evaluated and recommended for online teaching and learning.
- Instructors are prepared to teach online education courses and the institution ensures faculty receive training, assistance, and support at all times during the development and delivery of courses.

- Clear standards are established for faculty engagement and expectations around online teaching.
- Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they possess the self-motivation and commitment to learn online.
- Program demonstrates a student-centered focus rather than trying to fit service to the online education student in on-campus student services.
- The institution provides guidance to both students and faculty in the use of all forms of technologies used for course delivery.

Participants were also afforded an opportunity to provide additional comments at the end of each survey subsection. Each of these verbatim comments is attached as well. It is important to remember that each comment only reflects the opinion of one person. That being said, there are a couple of general observations that can be made from reviewing the comments. First, there does not appear to be a strong sense of an over-arching structure for online education at UMKC. Respondents were able to comment on their course and in some cases their department, but not at a university-wide level. Second, it will be important to invest in sufficient training and support for online instructors. Finally, an orientation program for students before they enroll in an online course may be beneficial for both the students and the faculty.

I realize this is a lot of information to sift through. I would be very willing to come speak with you and any groups you would select about the results and to answer any questions. Please give me a call at 235-1045 if you have any questions about these results or if you need further analyses run and I will be happy to discuss them with you.

Enclosures

Appendix 1 Survey Results

Table 1: Respondents' Role at UMKC

Role at UMKC	N	Percent
Administrator	18	16.2%
Online Instructor	59	53.2%
Staff	13	11.7%
Other	21	18.9%

Table 2: Institutional Support Score (All Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The institution has a governance structure to enable effective and comprehensive decision making related to online learning.	99	22 (22.2%)	31 (31.3%)	36 (36.3%)	10 (10.1%)	1.34	0.94	1.72	0.68
Policies and guidelines are in place to authenticate that students enrolled in online courses and receiving college credit are indeed those completing the course work.	99	37 (37.3%)	15 (15.1%)	30 (30.3%)	17 (17.2%)	1.27	1.14	2.03	0.72
Policy for intellectual property of course materials exists. (If policy exists, 1 pt.; If policy specifically addresses online course materials, 2 pts.; If policy specifically addresses online course materials and is publicly visible online, 3 pts.)	99	28 (28.3%)	15 (15.1%)	40 (40.4%)	16 (16.1%)	1.44	1.07	2.01	0.66
The institution has defined the strategic value of online learning to its enterprise and to its stakeholders.	97	24 (24.7%)	29 (29.9%)	32 (33.0%)	12 (12.4%)	1.33	0.98	1.76	0.72
The institution has the infrastructure and resources necessary to comply with local, state, and national accreditation and compliance standards. ²	97	26 (26.8%)	27 (27.8%)	22 (22.7%)	22 (22.7%)	1.41	1.11	1.92	0.83
TOTAL SCORE						5.38		7.52	

¹ The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

² This item was added at the request of the client. It is not included in the analysis since it is not a part of Quality Scorecard.

Table 3: Institutional Support Score (Administrative Respondents)

	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The institution has a governance structure to enable effective and comprehensive decision making related to online learning.	18	3 (16.7%)	9 (50%)	5 (27.8%)	1 (5.6%)	1.22	0.80	1.50	0.64
Policies and guidelines are in place to authenticate that students enrolled in online courses and receiving college credit are indeed those completing the course work.	18	8 (44.4%)	3 (16.7%)	6 (33.3%)	1 (5.6%)	1.00	1.02	1.80	0.63
Policy for intellectual property of course materials exists. (If policy exists, 1 pt.; If policy specifically addresses online course materials, 2 pts.; If policy specifically addresses online course materials and is publicly visible online, 3 pts.)	18	4 (22.2%)	6 (33.3%)	5 (27.8%)	3 (16.7%)	1.39	1.03	1.80	0.80
The institution has defined the strategic value of online learning to its enterprise and to its stakeholders.	18	2 (11.1%)	8 (44.4%)	8 (44.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1.33	0.68	1.50	0.51
The institution has the infrastructure and resources necessary to comply with local, state, and national accreditation and compliance standards. ²	18	1 (5.6%)	12 (66.7%)	4 (22.2%)	1 (5.6%)	1.27	0.67	1.35	0.60
TOTAL SCORE						4.94		6.60	

¹ The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

² This item was added at the request of the client. It is not included in the analysis since it is not a part of Quality Scorecard.

Table 4: Institutional Support Score (Online Instructor Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The institution has a governance structure to enable effective and comprehensive decision making related to online learning.	54	13 (24.1%)	14 (25.9%)	21 (38.9%)	6 (11.1%)	1.37	0.97	1.80	0.68
Policies and guidelines are in place to authenticate that students enrolled in online courses and receiving college credit are indeed those completing the course work.	54	19 (35.2%)	6 (11.1%)	17 (31.5%)	12 (22.2%)	1.40	1.18	2.17	0.71
Policy for intellectual property of course materials exists. (If policy exists, 1 pt.; If policy specifically addresses online course materials, 2 pts.; If policy specifically addresses online course materials and is publicly visible online, 3 pts.)	54	17 (31.5%)	4 (7.4%)	24 (44.4%)	9 (16.7%)	1.46	1.11	2.13	0.58
The institution has defined the strategic value of online learning to its enterprise and to its stakeholders.	53	14 (25.9%)	10 (18.5%)	21 (39.6%)	8 (15.1%)	1.43	1.04	1.95	0.69
The institution has the infrastructure and resources necessary to comply with local, state, and national accreditation and compliance standards. ²	53	15 (28.3%)	9 (17.0%)	15 (28.3%)	14 (26.4%)	1.53	1.17	2.13	0.78
TOTAL SCORE						5.66		8.05	

¹ The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

² This item was added at the request of the client. It is not included in the analysis since it is not a part of Quality Scorecard.

Table 5: Institutional Support Score (Staff Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The institution has a governance structure to enable effective and comprehensive decision making related to online learning.	11	2 (18.2%)	4 (36.4%)	4 (36.4%)	1 (9.1%)	1.36	0.92	1.67	0.71
Policies and guidelines are in place to authenticate that students enrolled in online courses and receiving college credit are indeed those completing the course work.	11	3 (27.3%)	3 (27.3%)	4 (36.4%)	1 (9.1%)	1.27	1.00	1.75	0.71
Policy for intellectual property of course materials exists. (If policy exists, 1 pt.; If policy specifically addresses online course materials, 2 pts.; If policy specifically addresses online course materials and is publicly visible online, 3 pts.)	11	3 (27.3%)	1 (9.1%)	6 (54.5%)	1 (9.1%)	1.45	1.03	2.00	0.53
The institution has defined the strategic value of online learning to its enterprise and to its stakeholders.	11	4 (36.4%)	5 (45.4%)	1 (9.1%)	1 (9.1%)	0.90	0.94	1.43	0.79
The institution has the infrastructure and resources necessary to comply with local, state, and national accreditation and compliance standards. ²	10	2 (20.0%)	3 (30.0%)	2 (20.0%)	3 (30.0%)	1.60	1.17	2.00	0.92
TOTAL SCORE						4.98		6.85	

¹ The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

² This item was added at the request of the client. It is not included in the analysis since it is not a part of Quality Scorecard.

Table 6: Institutional Support Score ("Other" Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The institution has a governance structure to enable effective and comprehensive decision making related to online learning.	16	4 (25.0%)	4 (25.0%)	6 (37.5%)	2 (12.5%)	1.37	1.02	1.83	0.72
Policies and guidelines are in place to authenticate that students enrolled in online courses and receiving college credit are indeed those completing the course work.	16	7 (43.8%)	3 (18.7%)	3 (18.7%)	3 (18.7%)	1.12	1.20	2.00	0.87
Policy for intellectual property of course materials exists. (If policy exists, 1 pt.; If policy specifically addresses online course materials, 2 pts.; If policy specifically addresses online course materials and is publicly visible online, 3 pts.)	16	4 (25.0%)	4 (25.0%)	5 (31.3%)	3 (18.7%)	1.43	1.09	1.92	0.79
The institution has defined the strategic value of online learning to its enterprise and to its stakeholders.	15	4 (26.7%)	6 (40.0%)	2 (13.3%)	3 (20.0%)	1.22	1.09	1.72	0.90
The institution has the infrastructure and resources necessary to comply with local, state, and national accreditation and compliance standards. ²	16	8 (50%)	3 (18.7%)	1 (6.3%)	4 (25.0%)	1.06	1.29	2.12	0.99
TOTAL SCORE						5.14		7.47	

¹ The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

² This item was added at the request of the client. It is not included in the analysis since it is not a part of Quality Scorecard.

Table 7: Technology Support (All Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
A documented technology plan that includes electronic security measures (e.g., password protection, encryption, secure online or proctored exams, etc.) is in place and operational to ensure quality standards, adherence to FERPA, and the integrity and validity of information.	98	21 (21.4%)	13 (13.3%)	34 (34.7%)	30 (30.6%)	1.74	1.11	2.22	0.72
The technology delivery systems are highly reliable and operable with measurable standards being utilized such as system downtime tracking or task benchmarking.	98	15 (15.3%)	19 (19.4%)	44 (44.9%)	20 (20.4%)	1.70	0.96	2.01	0.69
A centralized system provides support for building and maintaining the online education infrastructure.	95	16 (16.8%)	25 (26.3%)	37 (38.9%)	17 (17.9%)	1.58	0.97	1.90	0.73
The course delivery technology is considered a mission critical enterprise system and supported as such.	98	11 (11.2%)	30 (30.6%)	33 (33.7%)	24 (24.5%)	1.71	0.96	1.93	0.79
The institution maintains system backup for data availability.	97	25 (25.7%)	3 (3.1%)	34 (35.0%)	35 (36.1%)	1.81	1.18	2.44	0.58
Faculty, staff, and students are supported in the development and use of new technologies and skills.	96	5 (5.2%)	23 (23.9%)	48 (50.0%)	20 (20.8%)	1.86	0.80	1.97	0.69
TOTAL SCORE						10.40		12.47	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 8: Technology Support (Administrative Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
A documented technology plan that includes electronic security measures (e.g., password protection, encryption, secure online or proctored exams, etc.) is in place and operational to ensure quality standards, adherence to FERPA, and the integrity and validity of information.	18	3 (16.7%)	3 (16.7%)	7 (38.9%)	5 (27.8%)	1.77	1.06	2.13	0.74
The technology delivery systems are highly reliable and operable with measurable standards being utilized such as system downtime tracking or task benchmarking.	18	5 (27.8%)	3 (16.7%)	7 (38.9%)	3 (16.7%)	1.44	1.09	2.00	0.71
A centralized system provides support for building and maintaining the online education infrastructure.	18	0 (0.0%)	10 (55.6%)	7 (38.9%)	1 (5.6%)	1.50	0.61	1.50	0.62
The course delivery technology is considered a mission critical enterprise system and supported as such.	18	0 (0.0%)	9 (50%)	6 (33.3%)	3 (16.7%)	1.67	0.76	1.67	0.77
The institution maintains system backup for data availability.	18	4 (22.2%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (33.3%)	8 (44.4%)	2.00	1.18	2.57	0.51
Faculty, staff, and students are supported in the development and use of new technologies and skills.	18	0 (0.0%)	9 (50%)	6 (33.3%)	3 (16.7%)	1.67	0.76	1.67	0.77
TOTAL SCORE						10.05		11.54	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 9: Technology Support (Online Instructor Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
A documented technology plan that includes electronic security measures (e.g., password protection, encryption, secure online or proctored exams, etc.) is in place and operational to ensure quality standards, adherence to FERPA, and the integrity and validity of information.	54	13 (24.1%)	7 (13.0%)	15 (27.7%)	19 (35.2%)	1.74	1.18	2.29	0.75
The technology delivery systems are highly reliable and operable with measurable standards being utilized such as system downtime tracking or task benchmarking.	54	6 (11.1%)	10 (18.5%)	25 (46.3%)	13 (24.1%)	1.83	0.92	2.06	0.70
A centralized system provides support for building and maintaining the online education infrastructure.	54	12 (22.2%)	10 (18.5%)	20 (37.0%)	12 (22.2%)	1.59	1.07	2.05	0.73
The course delivery technology is considered a mission critical enterprise system and supported as such.	54	7 (13.0%)	11 (20.4%)	20 (37.0%)	16 (29.6%)	1.83	1.00	2.10	0.76
The institution maintains system backup for data availability.	54	16 (29.6%)	1 (1.8%)	20 (37.0%)	17 (31.5%)	1.70	1.20	2.42	0.55
Faculty, staff, and students are supported in the development and use of new technologies and skills.	52	3 (5.8%)	8 (15.4%)	28 (53.8%)	13 (24.1%)	1.98	0.80	2.10	0.65
TOTAL SCORE						10.67		13.02	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 10: Technology Support (Staff Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
A documented technology plan that includes electronic security measures (e.g., password protection, encryption, secure online or proctored exams, etc.) is in place and operational to ensure quality standards, adherence to FERPA, and the integrity and validity of information.	10	1 (10.0%)	1 (10.0%)	7 (70.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1.80	0.78	2.00	0.50
The technology delivery systems are highly reliable and operable with measurable standards being utilized such as system downtime tracking or task benchmarking.	10	1 (10.0%)	2 (20.0%)	6 (60.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1.70	0.82	1.89	0.60
A centralized system provides support for building and maintaining the online education infrastructure.	10	2 (20.0%)	2 (20.0%)	5 (50.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1.50	0.97	1.87	0.64
The course delivery technology is considered a mission critical enterprise system and supported as such.	10	1 (10.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3 (30.0%)	2 (20.0%)	1.60	0.97	1.78	0.83
The institution maintains system backup for data availability.	10	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (30.0%)	6 (60.0%)	2.40	0.97	2.67	0.50
Faculty, staff, and students are supported in the development and use of new technologies and skills.	10	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (80.0%)	2 (20.0%)	2.20	0.42	2.20	0.42
TOTAL SCORE						11.20		12.41	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 11: Technology Support ("Other" Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
A documented technology plan that includes electronic security measures (e.g., password protection, encryption, secure online or proctored exams, etc.) is in place and operational to ensure quality standards, adherence to FERPA, and the integrity and validity of information.	16	4 (25.0%)	2 (12.5%)	5 (31.3%)	5 (31.3%)	1.68	1.19	2.25	0.75
The technology delivery systems are highly reliable and operable with measurable standards being utilized such as system downtime tracking or task benchmarking.	16	3 (18.7%)	4 (25.0%)	6 (37.5%)	3 (18.7%)	1.56	1.03	1.92	0.76
A centralized system provides support for building and maintaining the online education infrastructure.	13	2 (15.3%)	3 (23.1%)	5 (38.5%)	3 (23.1%)	1.69	1.03	2.00	0.77
The course delivery technology is considered a mission critical enterprise system and supported as such.	16	3 (18.7%)	6 (37.5%)	4 (25.0%)	3 (18.7%)	1.43	1.03	1.77	0.83
The institution maintains system backup for data availability.	15	4 (26.7%)	2 (13.3%)	5 (33.3%)	4 (26.7%)	1.60	1.18	2.18	0.75
Faculty, staff, and students are supported in the development and use of new technologies and skills.	16	2 (12.5%)	6 (37.5%)	6 (37.5%)	2 (12.5%)	1.50	0.89	1.71	0.73
TOTAL SCORE						9.46		11.83	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 12: Course Development and Instructional Design Score (All Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Guidelines regarding minimum standards are used for course development, design, and delivery of online instruction (such as course syllabus elements, course materials, assessment strategies, faculty feedback).	90	7 (7.7%)	13 (14.4%)	39 (43.3%)	31 (34.4%)	2.04	0.89	2.21	0.70
Technology is used as a tool to achieve learning outcomes in delivering course content.	89	5 (5.6%)	11 (12.3%)	47 (52.8%)	26 (29.2%)	2.05	0.80	2.18	0.64
Instructional materials, course syllabus, and learning outcomes are reviewed periodically to ensure they meet program standards.	88	17 (19.3%)	10 (11.4%)	27 (30.7%)	34 (38.6%)	1.88	1.13	2.34	0.72
Courses are designed so that students develop the necessary knowledge and skills to meet learning objectives at the course and program level. These may include engagement via analysis, synthesis and evaluation.	90	8 (8.9%)	7 (7.7%)	43 (47.7%)	32 (35.5%)	2.10	0.88	2.30	0.62
Learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable.	90	7 (7.7%)	8 (8.9%)	37 (41.1%)	38 (42.2%)	2.17	0.89	2.36	0.65
Selected assessments measure the course learning objectives and are appropriate for an online learning environment.	89	9 (10.1%)	7 (7.9%)	42 (47.2%)	31 (34.8%)	2.06	0.91	2.30	0.62
Student-centered instruction is considered during the course development process.	89	9 (10.1%)	11 (12.3%)	37 (41.6%)	32 (35.9%)	2.03	0.94	2.26	0.69
There is consistency in course development for student retention and quality.	89	18 (20.2%)	22 (24.7%)	37 (41.6%)	12 (13.5%)	1.48	0.96	1.86	0.68
Course design promotes both faculty and student engagement.	87	8 (9.2%)	15 (17.2%)	41 (47.1%)	23 (26.4%)	1.90	0.89	2.10	0.69
Current and emerging technologies are evaluated and recommended for online teaching and learning.	90	9 (10.0%)	24 (26.7%)	35 (38.9%)	22 (24.4%)	1.77	0.93	1.97	0.76
Instructional design is provided for creation of effective pedagogy for both synchronous and asynchronous class sessions.	90	6 (6.7%)	20 (22.2%)	40 (44.4%)	24 (26.7%)	1.91	0.86	2.05	0.73
Curriculum development is a core responsibility for faculty (i.e., faculty should be involved in either the development or the decision making for the online curriculum choices).	88	6 (6.8%)	6 (6.8%)	40 (45.4%)	36 (40.9%)	2.20	0.84	2.36	0.62
TOTAL SCORE						23.59		26.29	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 13: Course Development and Instructional Design Score (Admin. Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Guidelines regarding minimum standards are used for course development, design, and delivery of online instruction (such as course syllabus elements, course materials, assessment strategies, faculty feedback).	18	1 (5.6%)	1 (5.6%)	10 (55.6%)	6 (33.3%)	2.17	0.78	2.29	0.59
Technology is used as a tool to achieve learning outcomes in delivering course content.	18	1 (5.6%)	4 (22.2%)	6 (33.3%)	7 (38.9%)	2.05	0.93	2.17	0.81
Instructional materials, course syllabus, and learning outcomes are reviewed periodically to ensure they meet program standards.	18	3 (16.7%)	2 (11.1%)	9 (50%)	4 (22.2%)	1.77	1.00	2.13	0.64
Courses are designed so that students develop the necessary knowledge and skills to meet learning objectives at the course and program level. These may include engagement via analysis, synthesis and evaluation.	18	2 (11.1%)	2 (11.1%)	10 (55.6%)	4 (22.2%)	1.89	0.90	2.12	0.62
Learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable.	18	2 (11.1%)	2 (11.1%)	9 (50%)	5 (27.8%)	1.94	0.93	2.19	0.65
Selected assessments measure the course learning objectives and are appropriate for an online learning environment.	17	2 (11.1%)	2 (11.1%)	10 (55.6%)	3 (16.7%)	1.82	0.88	2.07	0.59
Student-centered instruction is considered during the course development process.	18	2 (11.1%)	4 (22.2%)	6 (33.3%)	6 (33.3%)	1.89	1.02	2.12	0.80
There is consistency in course development for student retention and quality.	18	2 (11.1%)	9 (50%)	5 (27.8%)	2 (11.1%)	1.39	0.85	1.56	0.73
Course design promotes both faculty and student engagement.	17	1 (5.6%)	4 (22.2%)	9 (50%)	3 (16.7%)	1.82	0.80	1.94	0.68
Current and emerging technologies are evaluated and recommended for online teaching and learning.	18	0 (0.0%)	5 (27.8%)	8 (44.4%)	5 (27.8%)	2.00	0.77	2.00	0.77
Instructional design is provided for creation of effective pedagogy for both synchronous and asynchronous class sessions.	18	0 (0.0%)	5 (27.8%)	7 (38.9%)	6 (33.3%)	2.05	0.80	2.05	0.80
Curriculum development is a core responsibility for faculty (i.e., faculty should be involved in either the development or the decision making for the online curriculum choices).	18	0 (0.0%)	3 (16.7%)	9 (50%)	6 (33.3%)	2.17	0.70	2.17	0.70
TOTAL SCORE						22.96		24.81	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 14: Course Development and Instructional Design Score (Online Instructors Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Guidelines regarding minimum standards are used for course development, design, and delivery of online instruction (such as course syllabus elements, course materials, assessment strategies, faculty feedback).	51	3 (5.9%)	11 (21.6%)	20 (39.2%)	17 (33.3%)	2.00	0.89	2.12	0.76
Technology is used as a tool to achieve learning outcomes in delivering course content.	50	2 (4.0%)	4 (8.0%)	30 (60.0%)	14 (28.0%)	2.12	0.71	2.21	0.58
Instructional materials, course syllabus, and learning outcomes are reviewed periodically to ensure they meet program standards.	50	11 (22.0%)	3 (6.0%)	14 (28.0%)	22 (44.0%)	1.94	1.18	2.49	0.64
Courses are designed so that students develop the necessary knowledge and skills to meet learning objectives at the course and program level. These may include engagement via analysis, synthesis and evaluation.	51	4 (7.8%)	2 (3.92%)	24 (47.0%)	21 (41.2%)	2.21	0.85	2.40	0.58
Learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable.	51	3 (5.9%)	2 (3.9%)	21 (41.2%)	25 (49.0%)	2.33	0.81	2.48	0.58
Selected assessments measure the course learning objectives and are appropriate for an online learning environment.	51	3 (5.9%)	2 (3.9%)	25 (49.0%)	21 (41.2%)	2.25	0.79	2.40	0.57
Student-centered instruction is considered during the course development process.	50	5 (10.0%)	2 (4.0%)	24 (48.0%)	19 (38.0%)	2.14	0.90	2.38	0.57
There is consistency in course development for student retention and quality.	50	11 (22.0%)	7 (14.0%)	26 (52.0%)	6 (12.0%)	1.54	0.97	1.97	0.58
Course design promotes both faculty and student engagement.	49	4 (8.2%)	5 (10.2%)	24 (49.0%)	16 (32.6%)	2.06	0.87	2.24	0.64
Current and emerging technologies are evaluated and recommended for online teaching and learning.	51	6 (11.8%)	14 (27.4%)	18 (35.3%)	13 (25.5%)	1.74	0.98	1.98	0.78
Instructional design is provided for creation of effective pedagogy for both synchronous and asynchronous class sessions.	51	4 (7.8%)	9 (17.6%)	25 (49.0%)	13 (25.5%)	1.92	0.86	2.08	0.69
Curriculum development is a core responsibility for faculty (i.e., faculty should be involved in either the development or the decision making for the online curriculum choices).	49	3 (6.1%)	0 (0.0%)	22 (44.9%)	24 (49.0%)	2.36	0.78	2.52	0.50
TOTAL SCORE						24.61		27.27	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 15: Course Development and Instructional Design Score (Staff Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Guidelines regarding minimum standards are used for course development, design, and delivery of online instruction (such as course syllabus elements, course materials, assessment strategies, faculty feedback).	8	2 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1.75	1.16	2.33	0.52
Technology is used as a tool to achieve learning outcomes in delivering course content.	8	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (75.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1.87	0.83	2.14	0.38
Instructional materials, course syllabus, and learning outcomes are reviewed periodically to ensure they meet program standards.	8	1 (12.5%)	2 (25.0%)	4 (50.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1.62	0.91	1.85	0.69
Courses are designed so that students develop the necessary knowledge and skills to meet learning objectives at the course and program level. These may include engagement via analysis, synthesis and evaluation.	8	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (75.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1.87	0.83	2.14	0.38
Learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable.	8	1 (12.5%)	2 (25.0%)	4 (50.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1.62	0.91	1.86	0.69
Selected assessments measure the course learning objectives and are appropriate for an online learning environment.	8	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	5 (62.5%)	1 (12.5%)	1.75	0.88	2.00	0.58
Student-centered instruction is considered during the course development process.	8	1 (12.5%)	3 (37.5%)	3 (37.5%)	1 (12.5%)	1.50	0.92	1.71	0.76
There is consistency in course development for student retention and quality.	8	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1.37	0.91	1.57	0.79
Course design promotes both faculty and student engagement.	8	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1.37	0.91	1.57	0.79
Current and emerging technologies are evaluated and recommended for online teaching and learning.	8	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	5 (62.5%)	1 (12.5%)	1.75	0.88	2.00	0.58
Instructional design is provided for creation of effective pedagogy for both synchronous and asynchronous class sessions.	8	1 (12.5%)	3 (37.5%)	3 (37.5%)	1 (12.5%)	1.50	0.92	1.71	0.75
Curriculum development is a core responsibility for faculty (i.e., faculty should be involved in either the development or the decision making for the online curriculum choices).	8	2 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (62.5%)	1 (12.5%)	1.62	1.06	2.17	0.41
TOTAL SCORE						19.59		23.05	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 16: Course Development and Instructional Design Score ("Other" Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Guidelines regarding minimum standards are used for course development, design, and delivery of online instruction (such as course syllabus elements, course materials, assessment strategies, faculty feedback).	13	1 (7.7%)	1 (7.7%)	5 (38.5%)	6 (46.1%)	2.23	0.92	2.41	0.67
Technology is used as a tool to achieve learning outcomes in delivering course content.	13	1 (7.7%)	3 (23.1%)	5 (38.5%)	4 (30.8%)	1.92	0.95	2.08	0.79
Instructional materials, course syllabus, and learning outcomes are reviewed periodically to ensure they meet program standards.	12	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (58.3%)	2.00	1.27	2.40	0.97
Courses are designed so that students develop the necessary knowledge and skills to meet learning objectives at the course and program level. These may include engagement via analysis, synthesis and evaluation.	13	1 (7.7%)	3 (23.1%)	3 (23.1%)	6 (46.1%)	2.07	1.03	2.25	0.87
Learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable.	13	1 (7.7%)	2 (15.3%)	3 (23.1%)	7 (53.8%)	2.23	1.01	2.41	0.79
Selected assessments measure the course learning objectives and are appropriate for an online learning environment.	13	3 (23.1%)	2 (15.3%)	2 (15.3%)	6 (46.1%)	1.84	1.28	2.40	0.84
Student-centered instruction is considered during the course development process.	13	1 (7.7%)	2 (15.3%)	4 (30.8%)	6 (46.1%)	2.15	0.98	2.33	0.78
There is consistency in course development for student retention and quality.	13	4 (30.8%)	2 (15.3%)	4 (30.8%)	3 (23.1%)	1.46	1.19	2.11	0.78
Course design promotes both faculty and student engagement.	13	2 (15.3%)	2 (15.3%)	6 (46.1%)	3 (23.1%)	1.77	1.01	2.09	0.70
Current and emerging technologies are evaluated and recommended for online teaching and learning.	13	2 (15.3%)	4 (30.8%)	4 (30.8%)	3 (23.1%)	1.61	1.04	1.90	0.83
Instructional design is provided for creation of effective pedagogy for both synchronous and asynchronous class sessions.	13	1 (7.7%)	3 (23.1%)	5 (38.5%)	4 (30.8%)	1.92	0.95	2.08	0.79
Curriculum development is a core responsibility for faculty (i.e., faculty should be involved in either the development or the decision making for the online curriculum choices).	13	1 (7.7%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (30.8%)	5 (38.5%)	2.00	1.00	2.17	0.83
TOTAL SCORE						23.20		26.63	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 17: Course Structure Score (All Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The online course site or other web site includes a syllabus outlining course objectives, learning outcomes, evaluation methods, textbook information, and other related course information, making course requirements transparent at time of registration.	84	14 (16.7%)	5 (5.9%)	21 (25.0%)	44 (52.4%)	2.13	1.11	2.55	0.63
The institution ensures that all online education students, regardless of where they are located, have access to library/learning resources that are adequate to support the courses they are taking (SACS statement).	85	13 (15.3%)	13 (15.3%)	21 (24.7%)	38 (44.7%)	1.98	1.10	2.35	0.77
Expectations for student assignment completion, grade policy, and faculty response are clearly provided in the course syllabus.	85	8 (9.4%)	4 (4.7%)	22 (25.9%)	51 (60.0%)	2.36	0.94	2.61	0.59
Links or explanations of technical support are available in the course (i.e., each course provides suggested solutions to potential technical issues and/or links for technical assistance).	85	8 (9.4%)	11 (12.9%)	29 (34.1%)	37 (43.5%)	2.11	0.96	2.34	0.72
Instructional materials are easily accessible and easy to use for the student.	85	7 (8.2%)	4 (4.7%)	38 (44.7%)	36 (42.3%)	2.21	0.87	2.41	0.59
The course adequately addresses the needs of students with disabilities via alternative instructional strategies and/or referral to special institutional resources.	85	17 (20.0%)	17 (20.0%)	28 (32.9%)	23 (27.0%)	1.67	1.08	2.09	0.77
Opportunities/tools are provided to encourage student-student collaboration (i.e., web conferencing, instant messaging, etc.) if appropriate.	85	6 (7.0%)	11 (12.9%)	34 (40.0%)	34 (40.0%)	2.12	0.89	2.29	0.70
Documents attached to modules are in a format that is easily accessed with multiple operating systems and productivity software (PDF, for example).	84	8 (9.5%)	4 (4.8%)	33 (39.3%)	39 (46.4%)	2.22	0.92	2.46	0.60
TOTAL SCORE						16.80		19.10	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 18: Course Structure Score (Administrative Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The online course site or other web site includes a syllabus outlining course objectives, learning outcomes, evaluation methods, textbook information, and other related course information, making course requirements transparent at time of registration.	17	7 (41.2%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (23.5%)	6 (35.3%)	1.52	1.37	2.60	0.52
The institution ensures that all online education students, regardless of where they are located, have access to library/learning resources that are adequate to support the courses they are taking (SACS statement).	17	1 (5.9%)	5 (29.4%)	2 (11.8%)	9 (52.9%)	2.11	1.05	2.25	0.93
Expectations for student assignment completion, grade policy, and faculty response are clearly provided in the course syllabus.	17	3 (17.6%)	2 (11.8%)	8 (47.0%)	4 (23.5%)	1.76	1.03	2.14	0.66
Links or explanations of technical support are available in the course (i.e., each course provides suggested solutions to potential technical issues and/or links for technical assistance).	17	4 (23.5%)	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)	4 (23.5%)	1.52	1.12	2.00	0.82
Instructional materials are easily accessible and easy to use for the student.	17	3 (17.6%)	2 (11.8%)	7 (41.2%)	5 (29.4%)	1.82	1.07	2.21	0.70
The course adequately addresses the needs of students with disabilities via alternative instructional strategies and/or referral to special institutional resources.	17	6 (35.3%)	3 (17.6%)	7 (41.2%)	1 (5.9%)	1.17	1.01	1.82	0.60
Opportunities/tools are provided to encourage student-student collaboration (i.e., web conferencing, instant messaging, etc.) if appropriate.	17	0 (0.0%)	4 (23.5%)	7 (41.2%)	6 (35.3%)	2.11	0.78	2.11	0.78
Documents attached to modules are in a format that is easily accessed with multiple operating systems and productivity software (PDF, for example).	17	3 (17.6%)	1 (5.9%)	6 (35.3%)	7 (41.2%)	2.00	1.11	2.43	0.65
TOTAL SCORE						14.01		17.56	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 19: Course Structure Score (Online Instructor Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The online course site or other web site includes a syllabus outlining course objectives, learning outcomes, evaluation methods, textbook information, and other related course information, making course requirements transparent at time of registration.	46	3 (6.5%)	4 (6.8%)	10 (8.7%)	29 (6.3%)	2.41	0.90	2.58	0.66
The institution ensures that all online education students, regardless of where they are located, have access to library/learning resources that are adequate to support the courses they are taking (SACS statement).	47	9 (19.1%)	5 (10.6%)	12 (25.5%)	21 (44.7%)	1.95	1.16	2.42	0.72
Expectations for student assignment completion, grade policy, and faculty response are clearly provided in the course syllabus.	47	2 (4.2%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (14.9%)	38 (80.9%)	2.72	0.68	2.84	0.37
Links or explanations of technical support are available in the course (i.e., each course provides suggested solutions to potential technical issues and/or links for technical assistance).	47	2 (4.2%)	3 (6.4%)	16 (34.0%)	26 (55.3%)	2.40	0.80	2.51	0.63
Instructional materials are easily accessible and easy to use for the student.	47	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	19 (40.4%)	26 (55.3%)	2.49	0.65	2.54	0.54
The course adequately addresses the needs of students with disabilities via alternative instructional strategies and/or referral to special institutional resources.	47	6 (12.8%)	9 (19.1%)	15 (31.9%)	17 (36.2%)	1.91	1.03	2.19	0.78
Opportunities/tools are provided to encourage student-student collaboration (i.e., web conferencing, instant messaging, etc.) if appropriate.	47	3 (6.4%)	5 (10.6%)	17 (36.2%)	22 (46.8%)	2.23	0.89	2.40	0.69
Documents attached to modules are in a format that is easily accessed with multiple operating systems and productivity software (PDF, for example).	47	3 (6.4%)	1 (2.1%)	16 (34.0%)	27 (57.4%)	2.42	0.82	2.59	0.54
TOTAL SCORE						18.53		20.07	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 20: Course Structure Score (Staff Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The online course site or other web site includes a syllabus outlining course objectives, learning outcomes, evaluation methods, textbook information, and other related course information, making course requirements transparent at time of registration.	8	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1.87	0.99	2.14	0.69
The institution ensures that all online education students, regardless of where they are located, have access to library/learning resources that are adequate to support the courses they are taking (SACS statement).	8	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	3 (37.5%)	3 (37.5%)	2.00	1.06	2.30	0.76
Expectations for student assignment completion, grade policy, and faculty response are clearly provided in the course syllabus.	8	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (50.0%)	3 (37.5%)	2.12	0.99	2.42	0.53
Links or explanations of technical support are available in the course (i.e., each course provides suggested solutions to potential technical issues and/or links for technical assistance).	8	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1.87	0.99	2.14	0.69
Instructional materials are easily accessible and easy to use for the student.	8	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (75.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1.87	0.83	2.14	0.38
The course adequately addresses the needs of students with disabilities via alternative instructional strategies and/or referral to special institutional resources.	8	2 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)	3 (37.5%)	1 (12.5%)	1.37	1.06	1.83	0.75
Opportunities/tools are provided to encourage student-student collaboration (i.e., web conferencing, instant messaging, etc.) if appropriate.	8	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (75.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1.87	0.83	2.14	0.38
Documents attached to modules are in a format that is easily accessed with multiple operating systems and productivity software (PDF, for example).	7	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	5 (71.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1.57	0.78	1.83	0.41
TOTAL SCORE						14.54		16.94	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 21: Course Structure Score ("Other" Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The online course site or other web site includes a syllabus outlining course objectives, learning outcomes, evaluation methods, textbook information, and other related course information, making course requirements transparent at time of registration.	13	3 (23.1%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (23.1%)	7 (53.8%)	2.07	1.25	2.70	0.48
The institution ensures that all online education students, regardless of where they are located, have access to library/learning resources that are adequate to support the courses they are taking (SACS statement).	13	2 (15.3%)	2 (15.3%)	4 (30.8%)	5 (38.5%)	1.92	1.11	2.27	0.79
Expectations for student assignment completion, grade policy, and faculty response are clearly provided in the course syllabus.	13	2 (15.3%)	2 (15.3%)	3 (23.1%)	6 (46.1%)	2.00	1.15	2.36	0.81
Links or explanations of technical support are available in the course (i.e., each course provides suggested solutions to potential technical issues and/or links for technical assistance).	13	1 (7.7%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (30.8%)	5 (38.5%)	2.00	1.00	2.17	0.83
Instructional materials are easily accessible and easy to use for the student.	13	2 (15.3%)	1 (7.7%)	6 (46.1%)	4 (30.8%)	1.92	1.03	2.27	0.65
The course adequately addresses the needs of students with disabilities via alternative instructional strategies and/or referral to special institutional resources.	13	3 (23.1%)	3 (23.1%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (30.8%)	1.61	1.19	2.10	0.87
Opportunities/tools are provided to encourage student-student collaboration (i.e., web conferencing, instant messaging, etc.) if appropriate.	13	2 (15.3%)	2 (15.3%)	4 (30.8%)	5 (38.5%)	1.92	1.11	2.27	0.79
Documents attached to modules are in a format that is easily accessed with multiple operating systems and productivity software (PDF, for example).	13	1 (7.7%)	1 (7.7%)	6 (46.1%)	5 (38.5%)	2.15	0.89	2.33	0.65
TOTAL SCORE						15.59		18.47	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 22: Teaching and Learning Score (All Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Student-to-Student interaction and Faculty-to-Student interaction are essential characteristics and are facilitated through a variety of ways.	85	4 (4.7%)	11 (12.9%)	39 (45.9%)	31 (36.5%)	2.14	0.81	2.24	0.68
Feedback on student assignments and questions is constructive and provided in a timely manner.	85	9 (10.6%)	11 (12.9%)	29 (34.1%)	36 (42.3%)	2.08	0.99	2.32	0.72
Students learn appropriate methods for effective research, including assessment of the validity of resources and the ability to master resources in an online environment.	84	14 (16.7%)	14 (16.7%)	31 (36.9%)	25 (29.8%)	1.79	1.05	2.15	0.73
Students are provided access to library professionals and resources that help them to deal with the overwhelming amount of online resources.	85	9 (10.6%)	7 (8.2%)	32 (37.6%)	37 (43.5%)	2.14	0.96	2.39	0.65
Instructors use specific strategies to create a presence in the course.	85	10 (11.8%)	10 (11.8%)	35 (41.2%)	30 (35.3%)	2.00	0.97	2.27	0.68
TOTAL SCORE						10.15		11.37	

¹

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 23: Teaching and Learning Score (Administrative Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Student-to-Student interaction and Faculty-to-Student interaction are essential characteristics and are facilitated through a variety of ways.	17	1 (5.9%)	3 (17.6%)	8 (47.0%)	5 (39.4%)	2.00	0.86	2.12	0.72
Feedback on student assignments and questions is constructive and provided in a timely manner.	17	4 (23.5%)	5 (39.4%)	5 (39.4%)	3 (17.6%)	1.41	1.06	1.85	0.80
Students learn appropriate methods for effective research, including assessment of the validity of resources and the ability to master resources in an online environment.	17	4 (23.5%)	4 (23.5%)	7 (41.2%)	2 (11.8%)	1.41	1.00	1.85	0.69
Students are provided access to library professionals and resources that help them to deal with the overwhelming amount of online resources.	17	1 (5.9%)	1 (5.9%)	6 (35.3%)	9 (52.9%)	2.35	0.86	2.50	0.63
Instructors use specific strategies to create a presence in the course.	17	5 (39.4%)	1 (5.9%)	8 (47.0%)	3 (17.6%)	1.52	1.12	2.17	0.58
TOTAL SCORE						8.69		10.49	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 24: Teaching and Learning Score (Online Instructor Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Student-to-Student interaction and Faculty-to-Student interaction are essential characteristics and are facilitated through a variety of ways.	47	1 (2.1%)	3 (6.4%)	23 (49.0%)	20 (42.5%)	2.31	0.69	2.34	0.61
Feedback on student assignments and questions is constructive and provided in a timely manner.	47	2 (4.2%)	3 (6.4%)	16 (34.0%)	26 (55.3%)	2.40	0.80	2.51	0.63
Students learn appropriate methods for effective research, including assessment of the validity of resources and the ability to master resources in an online environment.	46	6 (13.0%)	6 (13.0%)	18 (39.1%)	16 (34.8%)	1.95	1.01	2.25	0.71
Students are provided access to library professionals and resources that help them to deal with the overwhelming amount of online resources.	47	6 (12.8%)	3 (6.4%)	17 (36.2%)	21 (44.7%)	2.12	1.01	2.44	0.63
Instructors use specific strategies to create a presence in the course.	47	3 (6.4%)	5 (10.6%)	18 (38.3%)	21 (44.7%)	2.21	0.88	2.36	0.68
TOTAL SCORE						10.99		11.9	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 25: Teaching and Learning Score (Staff Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Student-to-Student interaction and Faculty-to-Student interaction are essential characteristics and are facilitated through a variety of ways.	8	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (62.5%)	2 (25.0%)	2.00	0.92	2.30	0.49
Feedback on student assignments and questions is constructive and provided in a timely manner.	8	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1.87	0.99	2.14	0.69
Students learn appropriate methods for effective research, including assessment of the validity of resources and the ability to master resources in an online environment.	8	2 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (62.5%)	1 (12.5%)	1.62	1.06	2.17	0.41
Students are provided access to library professionals and resources that help them to deal with the overwhelming amount of online resources.	8	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	5 (62.5%)	1 (12.5%)	1.75	0.88	2.00	0.58
Instructors use specific strategies to create a presence in the course.	8	1 (12.5%)	2 (25.0%)	3 (37.5%)	2 (25.0%)	1.75	1.03	2.00	0.82
TOTAL SCORE						8.99		10.61	

¹

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 26: Teaching and Learning Score ("Other" Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Student-to-Student interaction and Faculty-to-Student interaction are essential characteristics and are facilitated through a variety of ways.	13	1 (7.7%)	5 (38.5%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (30.8%)	1.77	1.01	1.92	0.90
Feedback on student assignments and questions is constructive and provided in a timely manner.	13	2 (15.3%)	2 (15.3%)	4 (30.8%)	5 (38.5%)	1.92	1.11	2.27	0.79
Students learn appropriate methods for effective research, including assessment of the validity of resources and the ability to master resources in an online environment.	13	2 (15.3%)	4 (30.8%)	1 (7.7%)	6 (46.1%)	1.84	1.21	2.18	0.98
Students are provided access to library professionals and resources that help them to deal with the overwhelming amount of online resources.	13	1 (7.7%)	2 (15.3%)	4 (30.8%)	6 (46.1%)	2.15	0.98	2.33	0.78
Instructors use specific strategies to create a presence in the course.	13	1 (7.7%)	2 (15.3%)	6 (46.1%)	4 (30.8%)	2.00	0.91	2.17	0.72
TOTAL SCORE						9.68		10.87	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 27: Social and Student Engagement Score (All Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Students should be provided a way to interact with other students in an online community.	79	7 (8.9%)	17 (21.5%)	29 (36.7%)	26 (32.9%)	1.93	0.95	2.12	0.77
TOTAL SCORE						1.93		2.12	

Table 28: Social and Student Engagement Score (Administrative Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Students should be provided a way to interact with other students in an online community.	15	3 (20.0%)	3 (20.0%)	5 (33.3%)	4 (26.7%)	1.67	1.11	2.08	0.79
TOTAL SCORE						1.67		2.08	

Table 29: Social and Student Engagement Score (Online Instructor Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Students should be provided a way to interact with other students in an online community.	43	2 (4.6%)	10 (23.2%)	15 (34.9%)	16 (37.2%)	2.04	0.90	2.14	0.79
TOTAL SCORE						2.04		2.14	

¹ The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 30: Social and Student Engagement Score (Staff Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Students should be provided a way to interact with other students in an online community.	8	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1.87	0.99	2.14	0.69
TOTAL SCORE						1.87		2.14	

Table 31: Social and Student Engagement Score ("Other" Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Students should be provided a way to interact with other students in an online community.	13	1 (7.7%)	3 (23.1%)	5 (38.5%)	4 (30.8%)	1.92	0.95	2.08	0.79
TOTAL SCORE						1.92		2.08	

¹

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 32: Faculty Support Score (All Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Technical assistance specifically for online course development and online teaching is provided for faculty.	83	2 (2.4%)	21 (25.3%)	38 (45.8%)	22 (26.5%)	1.96	0.78	2.01	0.73
Instructors are prepared to teach online education courses and the institution ensures faculty receive training, assistance, and support at all times during the development and delivery of courses.	83	2 (2.4%)	23 (27.7%)	39 (47.0%)	19 (22.9%)	1.90	0.77	1.95	0.72
Faculty receive training and materials related to Fair Use, plagiarism, and other relevant legal and ethical concepts.	83	5 (6.0%)	12 (14.5%)	37 (44.6%)	29 (34.9%)	2.08	0.85	2.21	0.69
Faculty are provided on-going professional development related to online teaching and learning.	83	4 (4.8%)	18 (21.7%)	41 (49.4%)	20 (24.1%)	1.92	0.80	2.02	0.70
Clear standards are established for faculty engagement and expectations around online teaching.	82	9 (11.0%)	23 (28.0%)	31 (37.8%)	19 (23.2%)	1.73	0.94	1.94	0.76
Faculty workshops are provided to make them aware of emerging technologies and the selection and use of these tools.	82	3 (3.7%)	18 (21.9%)	32 (39.0%)	29 (35.4%)	2.06	0.85	2.14	0.76
TOTAL SCORE						11.65		12.27	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 33: Faculty Support Score (Administrative Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Technical assistance specifically for online course development and online teaching is provided for faculty.	17	0 (0.0%)	8 (47.0%)	5 (29.4%)	4 (23.5%)	1.76	0.83	1.76	0.83
Instructors are prepared to teach online education courses and the institution ensures faculty receive training, assistance, and support at all times during the development and delivery of courses.	17	1 (5.9%)	6 (35.3%)	6 (35.3%)	4 (23.5%)	1.76	0.90	1.87	0.81
Faculty receive training and materials related to Fair Use, plagiarism, and other relevant legal and ethical concepts.	17	2 (11.8%)	2 (11.8%)	10 (58.9%)	3 (17.6%)	1.82	0.88	2.07	0.59
Faculty are provided on-going professional development related to online teaching and learning.	17	1 (5.9%)	4 (23.5%)	9 (52.9%)	3 (17.6%)	1.82	0.80	1.94	0.68
Clear standards are established for faculty engagement and expectations around online teaching.	17	4 (23.5%)	3 (17.6%)	8 (47.0%)	2 (11.8%)	1.47	1.00	1.92	0.64
Faculty workshops are provided to make them aware of emerging technologies and the selection and use of these tools.	17	1 (5.9%)	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)	7 (41.2%)	2.05	0.96	2.19	0.83
TOTAL SCORE						10.68		11.75	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 34: Faculty Support Score (Online Instructor Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Technical assistance specifically for online course development and online teaching is provided for faculty.	47	1 (2.1%)	9 (19.1%)	24 (51.0%)	13 (27.6%)	2.04	0.75	2.08	0.69
Instructors are prepared to teach online education courses and the institution ensures faculty receive training, assistance, and support at all times during the development and delivery of courses.	47	0 (0.0%)	12 (25.5%)	25 (53.2%)	10 (21.3%)	1.95	0.69	1.96	0.69
Faculty receive training and materials related to Fair Use, plagiarism, and other relevant legal and ethical concepts.	47	2 (4.2%)	6 (12.8%)	21 (44.7%)	18 (38.3%)	2.17	0.81	2.27	0.69
Faculty are provided on-going professional development related to online teaching and learning.	47	1 (2.1%)	11 (23.4%)	23 (48.9%)	12 (25.5%)	1.98	0.76	2.02	0.71
Clear standards are established for faculty engagement and expectations around online teaching.	46	2 (4.3%)	15 (32.6%)	18 (39.1%)	11 (23.9%)	1.82	0.85	1.90	0.77
Faculty workshops are provided to make them aware of emerging technologies and the selection and use of these tools.	46	1 (2.2%)	10 (8.7%)	19 (41.3%)	16 (34.8%)	2.08	0.81	2.13	0.76
TOTAL SCORE						12.04		12.36	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 35: Faculty Support Score (Staff Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Technical assistance specifically for online course development and online teaching is provided for faculty.	6	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	4 (66.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1.50	0.83	1.80	0.45
Instructors are prepared to teach online education courses and the institution ensures faculty receive training, assistance, and support at all times during the development and delivery of courses.	6	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.33	0.81	1.60	0.55
Faculty receive training and materials related to Fair Use, plagiarism, and other relevant legal and ethical concepts.	6	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.33	0.81	1.60	0.55
Faculty are provided on-going professional development related to online teaching and learning.	6	1 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (83.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.67	0.81	2.00	0.00
Clear standards are established for faculty engagement and expectations around online teaching.	6	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.33	0.81	1.60	0.55
Faculty workshops are provided to make them aware of emerging technologies and the selection and use of these tools.	6	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	4 (66.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1.50	0.83	1.80	0.45
TOTAL SCORE						8.66		10.4	

¹

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 36: Faculty Support Score ("Other" Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Technical assistance specifically for online course development and online teaching is provided for faculty.	13	0 (0.0%)	3 (23.1%)	5 (38.5%)	5 (38.5%)	2.15	0.80	2.15	0.80
Instructors are prepared to teach online education courses and the institution ensures faculty receive training, assistance, and support at all times during the development and delivery of courses.	13	0 (0.0%)	3 (23.1%)	5 (38.5%)	5 (38.5%)	2.15	0.80	2.15	0.80
Faculty receive training and materials related to Fair Use, plagiarism, and other relevant legal and ethical concepts.	13	0 (0.0%)	2 (15.3%)	3 (23.1%)	8 (61.6%)	2.46	0.77	2.46	0.77
Faculty are provided on-going professional development related to online teaching and learning.	13	1 (7.7%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (30.8%)	5 (38.5%)	2.00	1.00	2.17	0.83
Clear standards are established for faculty engagement and expectations around online teaching.	13	2 (15.3%)	3 (23.1%)	2 (15.3%)	6 (46.1%)	1.92	1.18	2.27	0.90
Faculty workshops are provided to make them aware of emerging technologies and the selection and use of these tools.	13	0 (0.0%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (30.8%)	6 (46.1%)	2.23	0.83	2.23	0.83
TOTAL SCORE						12.91		13.43	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 37: Student Support Score (All Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they possess the self-motivation and commitment to learn online.	81	23 (28.4%)	21 (25.9%)	22 (27.2%)	15 (18.5%)	1.35	1.08	1.90	0.78
Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they have access to the minimal technology required by the course design.	81	21 (25.9%)	21 (25.9%)	18 (22.2%)	21 (25.9%)	1.48	1.14	2.00	0.84
Students receive (or have access to) information about programs, including admission requirements, tuition and fees, books and supplies, technical and proctoring requirements, and student support services prior to admission and course registration.	81	28 (34.6%)	9 (11.1%)	23 (28.4%)	21 (25.9%)	1.45	1.21	2.22	0.72
Students are provided with access to training and information they will need to secure required materials through electronic databases, interlibrary loans, government archives, new services and other sources.	81	23 (28.4%)	13 (16.0%)	26 (32.1%)	19 (23.4%)	1.50	1.14	2.10	0.74
Throughout the duration of the course/program, students have access to appropriate technical assistance and technical support staff.	81	9 (11.1%)	16 (19.7%)	31 (38.3%)	25 (30.9%)	1.88	0.97	2.12	0.75
Student support personnel are available to address student questions, problems, bug reporting, and complaints.	81	11 (13.6%)	13 (16.0%)	32 (39.5%)	25 (30.9%)	1.87	1.00	2.17	0.72
Students have access to effective academic, personal, and career counseling.	81	23 (28.4%)	11 (13.6%)	27 (33.3%)	19 (23.4%)	1.52	1.14	2.10	0.72
Minimum technology requirements for skills and equipment are established and made available to students.	79	22 (27.8%)	13 (16.4%)	26 (32.9%)	18 (22.8%)	1.50	1.13	2.09	0.74
Student support services are provided for outside the classroom such as academic advising, financial assistance, peer support, etc.	79	19 (24.0%)	12 (15.2%)	24 (30.4%)	24 (30.4%)	1.67	1.15	2.20	0.75
Policy and process is in place to support ADA requirements.	81	24 (29.6%)	12 (14.8%)	20 (24.7%)	25 (30.9%)	1.56	1.21	2.23	0.78
Students are provided relevant easy access to required course materials in print and/or digital format, such as ISBN numbers for textbooks, book suppliers, and delivery modes.	81	13 (16.0%)	9 (11.1%)	27 (33.3%)	32 (39.5%)	1.96	1.07	2.34	0.70

Program demonstrates a student-centered focus rather than trying to fit service to the online education student in on-campus student services.	81	16 (19.7%)	21 (25.9%)	25 (30.9%)	19 (23.4%)	1.58	1.05	1.97	0.79
Efforts are made to engage students with the program and institution.	80	14 (17.5%)	14 (17.5%)	31 (38.7%)	21 (26.2%)	1.73	1.04	2.10	0.72
Students are instructed in the appropriate ways of communicating with faculty and students.	80	14 (17.5%)	10 (12.5%)	34 (42.5%)	22 (27.5%)	1.80	1.03	2.18	0.67
The institution provides guidance to both students and faculty in the use of all forms of technologies used for course delivery.	81	9 (11.1%)	18 (22.2%)	38 (46.9%)	16 (19.7%)	1.75	0.90	1.97	0.69
Tutoring is available as a learning resource.	81	25 (30.9%)	16 (19.7%)	24 (29.6%)	16 (19.7%)	1.38	1.12	2.00	0.76
Students are instructed in the appropriate ways of enlisting help from the program.	80	18 (22.5%)	13 (16.2%)	29 (36.2%)	20 (25.0%)	1.63	1.09	2.11	0.72
TOTAL SCORE						27.61		35.8	

Table 38: Student Support Score (Administrative Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they possess the self-motivation and commitment to learn online.	17	7 (41.2%)	4 (23.5%)	2 (11.8%)	4 (23.5%)	1.17	1.23	2.00	0.94
Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they have access to the minimal technology required by the course design.	17	6 (35.3%)	4 (23.5%)	1 (5.6%)	6 (35.3%)	1.41	1.32	2.18	0.98
Students receive (or have access to) information about programs, including admission requirements, tuition and fees, books and supplies, technical and proctoring requirements, and student support services prior to admission and course registration.	17	7 (41.2%)	3 (17.6%)	1 (5.6%)	6 (35.3%)	1.35	1.36	2.30	0.95
Students are provided with access to training and information they will need to secure required materials through electronic databases, interlibrary loans, government archives, new services and other sources.	17	5 (29.4%)	3 (17.6%)	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)	1.52	1.23	2.17	0.83
Throughout the duration of the course/program, students have access to appropriate technical assistance and technical support staff.	17	1 (5.6%)	5 (29.4%)	6 (35.3%)	5 (29.4%)	1.88	0.92	2.00	0.82
Student support personnel are available to address student questions, problems, bug reporting, and complaints.	17	1 (5.6%)	5 (29.4%)	6 (35.3%)	5 (29.4%)	1.88	0.92	2.00	0.82
Students have access to effective academic, personal, and career counseling.	17	5 (29.4%)	7 (41.2%)	3 (17.6%)	2 (11.8%)	1.11	0.99	1.58	0.79
Minimum technology requirements for skills and equipment are established and made available to students.	17	5 (29.4%)	4 (23.5%)	4 (23.5%)	4 (23.5%)	1.41	1.17	2.00	0.85
Student support services are provided for outside the classroom such as academic advising, financial assistance, peer support, etc.	16	3 (17.6%)	6 (35.3%)	4 (23.5%)	3 (17.6%)	1.43	1.03	1.77	0.83
Policy and process is in place to support ADA requirements.	17	4 (23.5%)	4 (23.5%)	6 (35.3%)	3 (17.6%)	1.47	1.06	1.92	0.76
Students are provided relevant easy access to required course materials in print and/or digital format, such as ISBN numbers for textbooks, book suppliers, and delivery modes.	17	5 (29.4%)	3 (17.6%)	5 (29.4%)	4 (23.5%)	1.47	1.17	2.08	0.79

Program demonstrates a student-centered focus rather than trying to fit service to the online education student in on-campus student services.	17	3 (17.6%)	5 (29.4%)	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)	1.64	1.11	2.00	0.88
Efforts are made to engage students with the program and institution.	17	3 (17.6%)	5 (29.4%)	6 (35.3%)	3 (17.6%)	1.52	1.00	1.85	0.77
Students are instructed in the appropriate ways of communicating with faculty and students.	17	5 (29.4%)	3 (17.6%)	7 (41.2%)	2 (11.8%)	1.35	1.05	1.91	0.67
The institution provides guidance to both students and faculty in the use of all forms of technologies used for course delivery.	17	3 (17.6%)	3 (17.6%)	9 (52.9%)	2 (11.8%)	1.58	0.93	1.92	0.61
Tutoring is available as a learning resource.	17	6 (35.3%)	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)	2 (11.8%)	1.17	1.07	1.82	0.75
Students are instructed in the appropriate ways of enlisting help from the program.	17	6 (35.3%)	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)	2 (11.8%)	1.17	1.07	1.82	0.75
TOTAL SCORE						24.53		33.32	

Table 39: Student Support Score (Online Instructor Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they possess the self-motivation and commitment to learn online.	45	13 (28.9%)	13 (28.9%)	14 (31.1%)	5 (11.1%)	1.24	1.00	1.75	0.72
Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they have access to the minimal technology required by the course design.	45	12 (26.7%)	12 (26.7%)	12 (26.7%)	9 (20.0%)	1.40	1.09	1.91	0.80
Students receive (or have access to) information about programs, including admission requirements, tuition and fees, books and supplies, technical and proctoring requirements, and student support services prior to admission and course registration.	45	18 (40.0%)	3 (6.7%)	15 (33.3%)	9 (20.0%)	1.33	1.20	2.22	0.64
Students are provided with access to training and information they will need to secure required materials through electronic databases, interlibrary loans, government archives, new services and other sources.	45	15 (33.3%)	4 (8.9%)	17 (37.8%)	9 (20.0%)	1.44	1.15	2.17	0.65
Throughout the duration of the course/program, students have access to appropriate technical assistance and technical support staff.	45	6 (13.3%)	6 (13.3%)	18 (40.0%)	15 (33.3%)	1.93	1.00	2.23	0.70
Student support personnel are available to address student questions, problems, bug reporting, and complaints.	45	8 (17.8%)	5 (11.1%)	18 (40.0%)	14 (31.1%)	1.84	1.06	2.24	0.68
Students have access to effective academic, personal, and career counseling.	44	15 (34.1%)	1 (2.3%)	17 (38.6%)	11 (25.0%)	1.54	1.20	2.34	0.55
Minimum technology requirements for skills and equipment are established and made available to students.	44	14 (31.8%)	5 (11.4%)	16 (36.4%)	9 (20.4%)	1.45	1.15	2.13	0.68
Student support services are provided for outside the classroom such as academic advising, financial assistance, peer support, etc.	45	12 (26.7%)	4 (8.9%)	14 (31.1%)	15 (33.3%)	1.71	1.19	2.33	0.69
Policy and process is in place to support ADA requirements.	45	16 (35.6%)	4 (8.9%)	10 (22.2%)	15 (33.3%)	1.53	1.29	2.38	0.73
Students are provided relevant easy access to required course materials in print and/or digital format, such as ISBN numbers for textbooks, book suppliers, and delivery modes.	45	5 (11.1%)	1 (2.2%)	18 (40.0%)	21 (46.7%)	2.22	0.95	2.50	0.55

Program demonstrates a student-centered focus rather than trying to fit service to the online education student in on-campus student services.	45	10 (22.2%)	9 (20.0%)	16 (35.6%)	10 (22.2%)	1.57	1.07	2.03	0.75
Efforts are made to engage students with the program and institution.	44	9 (20.4%)	6 (13.6%)	15 (34.1%)	14 (31.8%)	1.77	1.11	2.23	0.73
Students are instructed in the appropriate ways of communicating with faculty and students.	44	7 (15.9%)	6 (13.6%)	16 (36.4%)	15 (34.1%)	1.88	1.06	2.24	0.72
The institution provides guidance to both students and faculty in the use of all forms of technologies used for course delivery.	45	4 (8.9%)	10 (22.2%)	22 (48.9%)	9 (20.0%)	1.80	0.86	1.97	0.69
Tutoring is available as a learning resource.	45	16 (35.6%)	7 (15.5%)	12 (26.7%)	10 (22.2%)	1.35	1.19	2.10	0.77
Students are instructed in the appropriate ways of enlisting help from the program.	45	10 (22.2%)	4 (8.9%)	18 (40.0%)	13 (28.9%)	1.75	1.11	2.20	0.77
TOTAL SCORE						27.75		36.97	

Table 40: Student Support Score (Staff Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they possess the self-motivation and commitment to learn online.	7	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	1.71	0.95	2.00	0.63
Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they have access to the minimal technology required by the course design.	7	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.8%)	1 (14.3%)	1.57	0.97	1.83	0.75
Students receive (or have access to) information about programs, including admission requirements, tuition and fees, books and supplies, technical and proctoring requirements, and student support services prior to admission and course registration.	7	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	2 (28.6%)	2.14	0.69	2.14	0.69
Students are provided with access to training and information they will need to secure required materials through electronic databases, interlibrary loans, government archives, new services and other sources.	7	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.8%)	3 (42.8%)	1 (14.3%)	1.71	0.75	1.71	0.76
Throughout the duration of the course/program, students have access to appropriate technical assistance and technical support staff.	7	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	1.85	0.69	1.85	0.69
Student support personnel are available to address student questions, problems, bug reporting, and complaints.	7	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	1.85	0.69	1.86	0.69
Students have access to effective academic, personal, and career counseling.	7	2 (28.6%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	1.57	1.13	2.20	0.45
Minimum technology requirements for skills and equipment are established and made available to students.	7	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	1.85	0.69	1.86	0.69
Student support services are provided for outside the classroom such as academic advising, financial assistance, peer support, etc.	6	2 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (50.0%)	1 (16.7%)	1.50	1.22	2.25	0.50
Policy and process is in place to support ADA requirements.	7	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	1.71	1.11	2.00	0.89
Students are provided relevant easy access to required course materials in print and/or digital format, such as ISBN numbers for textbooks, book suppliers, and delivery modes.	7	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.8%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	1.85	0.90	1.86	0.90

Program demonstrates a student-centered focus rather than trying to fit service to the online education student in on-campus student services.	7	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.8%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	1.42	0.97	1.70	0.82
Efforts are made to engage students with the program and institution.	7	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	5 (71.4%)	1 (14.3%)	2.00	0.57	2.00	0.57
Students are instructed in the appropriate ways of communicating with faculty and students.	7	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (85.7%)	1 (14.3%)	2.14	0.37	2.14	0.37
The institution provides guidance to both students and faculty in the use of all forms of technologies used for course delivery.	7	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.8%)	3 (42.8%)	1 (14.3%)	1.71	0.76	1.71	0.76
Tutoring is available as a learning resource.	7	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.8%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	1.42	0.97	1.70	0.82
Students are instructed in the appropriate ways of enlisting help from the program.	7	0 (0.0%)	4 (57.1%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	1.57	0.78	1.57	0.78
TOTAL SCORE						29.57		32.38	

Table 41: Student Support Score ("Other" Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they possess the self-motivation and commitment to learn online.	12	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.6%)	1.83	1.19	2.20	0.92
Before starting an online program, students are advised about the program to determine if they have access to the minimal technology required by the course design.	12	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.6%)	1.83	1.19	2.20	0.92
Students receive (or have access to) information about programs, including admission requirements, tuition and fees, books and supplies, technical and proctoring requirements, and student support services prior to admission and course registration.	12	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	4 (33.3%)	1.67	1.23	2.22	0.83
Students are provided with access to training and information they will need to secure required materials through electronic databases, interlibrary loans, government archives, new services and other sources.	12	3 (25.0%)	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	4 (33.3%)	1.58	1.24	2.11	0.93
Throughout the duration of the course/program, students have access to appropriate technical assistance and technical support staff.	12	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	3 (25.0%)	4 (33.3%)	1.75	1.13	2.10	0.87
Student support personnel are available to address student questions, problems, bug reporting, and complaints.	12	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.4%)	4 (33.3%)	5 (41.6%)	2.00	1.12	2.40	0.70
Students have access to effective academic, personal, and career counseling.	12	1 (8.4%)	3 (25.0%)	3 (25.0%)	5 (41.6%)	2.00	1.04	2.18	0.87
Minimum technology requirements for skills and equipment are established and made available to students.	11	3 (27.3%)	2 (18.2%)	2 (18.2%)	4 (36.3%)	1.63	1.28	2.25	0.89
Student support services are provided for outside the classroom such as academic advising, financial assistance, peer support, etc.	12	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	5 (41.6%)	1.91	1.16	2.30	0.82
Policy and process is in place to support ADA requirements.	12	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.6%)	1.75	1.28	2.33	0.87
Students are provided relevant easy access to required course materials in print and/or digital format, such as ISBN numbers for textbooks, book suppliers, and delivery modes.	12	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.6%)	1.75	1.28	2.33	0.87

Program demonstrates a student-centered focus rather than trying to fit service to the online education student in on-campus student services.	12	2 (16.7%)	4 (33.3%)	3 (25.0%)	3 (25.0%)	1.58	1.08	1.90	0.87
Efforts are made to engage students with the program and institution.	12	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.6%)	3 (25.0%)	1.75	1.05	2.10	0.74
Students are instructed in the appropriate ways of communicating with faculty and students.	12	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.4%)	5 (41.6%)	4 (33.3%)	1.91	1.08	2.30	0.67
The institution provides guidance to both students and faculty in the use of all forms of technologies used for course delivery.	12	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	4 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	1.83	1.11	2.20	0.79
Tutoring is available as a learning resource.	12	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.6%)	3 (25.0%)	1.75	1.05	2.10	0.74
Students are instructed in the appropriate ways of enlisting help from the program.	11	2 (18.2%)	1 (9.1%)	4 (36.3%)	4 (36.3%)	1.90	1.13	2.33	0.71
TOTAL SCORE						30.42		37.55	

Table 42: Evaluation and Assessment Score (All Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The program is assessed through an evaluation process that applies specific established standards.	81	14 (17.3%)	13 (16.0%)	24 (29.6%)	30 (37.0%)	1.86	1.10	2.25	0.76
A variety of data (academic and administrative information) are used to regularly and frequently evaluate program effectiveness and to guide changes toward continual improvement.	80	15 (18.7%)	15 (18.7%)	21 (26.2%)	29 (36.2%)	1.80	1.12	2.21	0.80
Intended learning outcomes at the course and program level are reviewed regularly to ensure clarity, utility, and appropriateness.	80	11 (13.7%)	8 (10.0%)	30 (37.5%)	31 (38.7%)	2.01	1.02	2.33	0.68
A process is in place for the assessment of support services for faculty and students.	81	19 (23.4%)	15 (18.5%)	28 (34.6%)	19 (23.4%)	1.58	1.09	2.06	0.74
Course and program retention is assessed.	80	15 (18.7%)	10 (12.5%)	27 (33.7%)	28 (35.0%)	1.85	1.10	2.28	0.72
Recruitment and retention are examined and reviewed.	81	18 (22.2%)	10 (12.3%)	27 (33.3%)	26 (32.1%)	1.75	1.13	2.25	0.72
Program demonstrates compliance and review of accessibility standards (Section 508, etc.).	79	30 (38.0%)	7 (8.9%)	19 (24.0%)	23 (29.1%)	1.44	1.26	2.32	0.72
Course evaluations are examined in relation to faculty performance evaluations.	80	19 (23.7%)	6 (7.5%)	20 (25.0%)	35 (43.7%)	1.88	1.21	2.47	0.67
Faculty performance is regularly assessed.	80	15 (18.7%)	8 (10.0%)	21 (26.2%)	36 (45.0%)	1.97	1.14	2.43	0.70
Alignment of learning outcomes from course to course exists.	80	15 (18.7%)	9 (11.2%)	26 (32.5%)	30 (37.5%)	1.88	1.11	2.32	0.71
Course evaluations collect student feedback on quality of content and effectiveness of instruction.	79	8 (10.1%)	8 (10.1%)	23 (29.1%)	40 (50.6%)	2.20	0.99	2.45	0.69
TOTAL SCORE						20.22		25.37	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 43: Evaluation and Assessment Score (Administrative Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The program is assessed through an evaluation process that applies specific established standards.	17	2 (11.8%)	5 (29.4%)	6 (35.3%)	4 (23.5%)	1.70	0.98	1.93	0.80
A variety of data (academic and administrative information) are used to regularly and frequently evaluate program effectiveness and to guide changes toward continual improvement.	17	3 (17.6%)	5 (29.4%)	5 (29.4%)	4 (23.5%)	1.59	1.06	1.93	0.83
Intended learning outcomes at the course and program level are reviewed regularly to ensure clarity, utility, and appropriateness.	17	2 (11.8%)	2 (11.8%)	9 (52.9%)	4 (23.5%)	1.88	0.92	2.13	0.64
A process is in place for the assessment of support services for faculty and students.	17	2 (11.8%)	5 (29.4%)	8 (47.0%)	2 (11.8%)	1.59	0.87	1.80	0.68
Course and program retention is assessed.	17	3 (17.6%)	4 (23.5%)	5 (29.4%)	5 (29.4%)	1.70	1.10	2.07	0.83
Recruitment and retention are examined and reviewed.	17	4 (23.5%)	2 (11.8%)	6 (35.3%)	5 (29.4%)	1.70	1.16	2.23	0.72
Program demonstrates compliance and review of accessibility standards (Section 508, etc.).	17	8 (47.0%)	3 (17.6%)	5 (29.4%)	1 (5.8%)	0.94	1.02	1.78	0.67
Course evaluations are examined in relation to faculty performance evaluations.	17	5 (29.4%)	2 (11.8%)	6 (35.3%)	4 (23.5%)	1.52	1.18	2.17	0.72
Faculty performance is regularly assessed.	17	3 (17.6%)	3 (17.6%)	5 (29.4%)	6 (35.3%)	1.82	1.13	2.21	0.80
Alignment of learning outcomes from course to course exists.	17	3 (17.6%)	3 (17.6%)	8 (47.0%)	3 (17.6%)	1.64	0.99	2.00	0.68
Course evaluations collect student feedback on quality of content and effectiveness of instruction.	16	2 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (50.0%)	6 (37.5%)	2.12	0.95	2.43	0.51
TOTAL SCORE						18.2		22.68	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 44: Evaluation and Assessment Score (Online Instructor Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The program is assessed through an evaluation process that applies specific established standards.	45	9 (20.0%)	7 (15.6%)	10 (22.2%)	19 (42.2%)	1.86	1.18	2.33	0.79
A variety of data (academic and administrative information) are used to regularly and frequently evaluate program effectiveness and to guide changes toward continual improvement.	45	8 (17.8%)	7 (15.6%)	12 (26.7%)	18 (40.0%)	1.89	1.13	2.30	0.78
Intended learning outcomes at the course and program level are reviewed regularly to ensure clarity, utility, and appropriateness.	45	6 (13.3%)	4 (8.9%)	15 (33.3%)	20 (44.4%)	2.09	1.04	2.41	0.68
A process is in place for the assessment of support services for faculty and students.	45	14 (31.1%)	7 (15.6%)	13 (28.9%)	11 (24.4%)	1.47	1.18	2.13	0.76
Course and program retention is assessed.	45	8 (17.8%)	4 (8.9%)	16 (35.6%)	17 (37.8%)	1.93	1.09	2.35	0.67
Recruitment and retention are examined and reviewed.	45	11 (24.4%)	4 (8.9%)	14 (31.1%)	16 (35.6%)	1.78	1.19	2.35	0.69
Program demonstrates compliance and review of accessibility standards (Section 508, etc.).	45	18 (40.0%)	2 (4.4%)	9 (20.0%)	16 (35.6%)	1.51	1.34	2.51	0.64
Course evaluations are examined in relation to faculty performance evaluations.	45	11 (24.4%)	2 (4.4%)	8 (17.8%)	24 (53.3%)	2.00	1.26	2.64	0.60
Faculty performance is regularly assessed.	45	8 (17.8%)	2 (4.4%)	12 (26.7%)	23 (51.1%)	2.11	1.13	2.57	0.60
Alignment of learning outcomes from course to course exists.	45	7 (15.6%)	4 (8.9%)	14 (31.1%)	20 (44.4%)	2.04	1.08	2.42	0.68
Course evaluations collect student feedback on quality of content and effectiveness of instruction.	44	5 (11.1%)	6 (13.3%)	9 (20.0%)	24 (53.3%)	2.18	1.06	2.46	0.75
TOTAL SCORE						20.86		26.47	

¹

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 45: Evaluation and Assessment Score (Staff Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The program is assessed through an evaluation process that applies specific established standards.	7	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (85.7%)	1 (14.3%)	2.14	0.37	2.14	0.37
A variety of data (academic and administrative information) are used to regularly and frequently evaluate program effectiveness and to guide changes toward continual improvement.	6	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	1.50	1.04	1.80	0.84
Intended learning outcomes at the course and program level are reviewed regularly to ensure clarity, utility, and appropriateness.	6	0 (0.0%)	1 (16.7%)	4 (66.7%)	1 (16.7%)	2.00	0.63	2.00	0.63
A process is in place for the assessment of support services for faculty and students.	7	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	1.85	0.69	1.85	0.69
Course and program retention is assessed.	6	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	3 (50.0%)	1 (16.7%)	1.67	1.03	2.00	0.71
Recruitment and retention are examined and reviewed.	7	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	4 (57.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1.42	0.79	1.70	0.52
Program demonstrates compliance and review of accessibility standards (Section 508, etc.).	5	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)	3 (60.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.40	0.89	1.75	0.50
Course evaluations are examined in relation to faculty performance evaluations.	6	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	3 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.17	0.98	1.75	0.50
Faculty performance is regularly assessed.	6	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.00	0.89	1.50	0.58
Alignment of learning outcomes from course to course exists.	6	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	1.33	1.21	2.00	0.82
Course evaluations collect student feedback on quality of content and effectiveness of instruction.	7	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	2 (28.6%)	2.14	0.69	2.14	0.69
TOTAL SCORE						17.62		20.63	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 46: Evaluation and Assessment Score ("Other" Respondents)

Items	N	Not Observed (0)	Much Improvement Needed (1)	Some Improvement Needed (2)	No Improvement Needed (3)	Mean	SD	Mean ¹	SD ¹
The program is assessed through an evaluation process that applies specific established standards.	12	3 (25.0%)	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50.0%)	1.91	1.31	2.56	0.73
A variety of data (academic and administrative information) are used to regularly and frequently evaluate program effectiveness and to guide changes toward continual improvement.	12	3 (25.0%)	1 (8.4%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50.0%)	1.91	1.31	2.56	0.73
Intended learning outcomes at the course and program level are reviewed regularly to ensure clarity, utility, and appropriateness.	12	3 (25.0%)	1 (8.4%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50.0%)	1.91	1.31	2.56	0.73
A process is in place for the assessment of support services for faculty and students.	12	3 (25.0%)	1 (8.4%)	3 (25.0%)	5 (41.6%)	1.83	1.26	2.44	0.73
Course and program retention is assessed.	12	3 (25.0%)	1 (8.4%)	3 (25.0%)	5 (41.6%)	1.83	1.26	2.44	0.73
Recruitment and retention are examined and reviewed.	12	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	3 (25.0%)	5 (41.6%)	1.91	1.16	2.30	0.82
Program demonstrates compliance and review of accessibility standards (Section 508, etc.).	12	3 (25.0%)	1 (8.4%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50.0%)	1.91	1.31	2.56	0.73
Course evaluations are examined in relation to faculty performance evaluations.	12	1 (8.4%)	1 (8.4%)	3 (25.0%)	7 (58.3%)	2.33	0.98	2.54	0.69
Faculty performance is regularly assessed.	12	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.4%)	2 (16.7%)	7 (58.3%)	2.16	1.19	2.60	0.70
Alignment of learning outcomes from course to course exists.	12	3 (25.0%)	1 (8.4%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50.0%)	1.91	1.31	2.56	0.73
Course evaluations collect student feedback on quality of content and effectiveness of instruction.	12	1 (8.4%)	1 (8.4%)	2 (16.7%)	8 (66.5%)	2.41	0.99	2.63	0.67
TOTAL SCORE						22.02		27.75	

1

The values presented in these columns exclude "Not Observed" responses.

Table 47: Overall Score Card Summary

Group	Score (with 'Not Observed' category)		Quality	Score (without 'Not Observed' category)		Quality
	Score	Percentage		Score	Percentage	
All	127.73	60.8%	Inadequate	152.31	72.5%	Marginal
Administrative	117.00	55.7%	Unacceptable	142.18	67.1%	Inadequate
Online	134.68	63.4%	Inadequate	160.38	75.4%	Marginal
Staff	118.62	55.7%	Unacceptable	137.41	64.5%	Inadequate
Other	131.4	62.1%	Inadequate	158.2	74.3%	Marginal

Key

90-99% = 189-209 - Exemplary (little improvement is needed)

80-89% = 168-188 - Acceptable (some improvement is recommended)

70-79% = 147-167 - Marginal (significant improvement is needed in multiple areas)

60-69% = 126-146 - Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the

program) 59% and below = 125 points and below – Unacceptable

Table 48: Category Scores (All Respondents)

Area	Possible Score	UMKC Score	UMKC Score (w/o Not Observed)
Institutional Support	12	5.38	7.52
Technology Support	18	10.40	12.47
Course Development and Instructional Design	36	23.59	26.29
Course Structure	24	16.80	19.1
Teaching and Learning	15	10.15	11.37
Social and Student Engagement	3	1.93	2.12
Faculty Support	18	11.65	12.27
Student Support	51	27.61	35.8
Evaluation and Assessment	33	20.22	25.37
TOTAL	210	127.73	152.31
Percentage	60.82%		72.53%
Level of Quality	Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the program)		Marginal (significant improvement is needed in multiple areas)

Key

90-99% = 189-209 - Exemplary (little improvement is needed)

80-89% = 168-188 - Acceptable (some improvement is recommended)

70-79% = 147-167 - Marginal (significant improvement is needed in multiple areas)

60-69% = 126-146 - Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the program)

59% and below = 125 points and below - Unacceptable.

Table 49: Category Scores (Administrative Respondents)

Area	Possible Score	Admin Score	Admin Score (w/o Not Observed)
Institutional Support	12	4.94	6.60
Technology Support	18	10.05	11.54
Course Development and Instructional Design	36	22.96	24.81
Course Structure	24	14.01	17.56
Teaching and Learning	15	8.69	10.49
Social and Student Engagement	3	1.67	2.08
Faculty Support	18	10.68	11.75
Student Support	51	24.53	33.32
Evaluation and Assessment	33	18.2	22.68
TOTAL	210	115.73	140.83
Percentage	55.11%		67.06%
Level of Quality	Unacceptable		Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the program)

Key

90-99% = 189-209 - Exemplary (little improvement is needed)

80-89% = 168-188 - Acceptable (some improvement is recommended)

70-79% = 147-167 - Marginal (significant improvement is needed in multiple areas)

60-69% = 126-146 - Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the program)

59% and below = 125 points and below - Unacceptable.

Table 50: Category Scores (Online Instructor Respondents)

Area	Possible Score	Online Score	Online Score (w/o Not Observed)
Institutional Support	12	5.66	8.05
Technology Support	18	10.67	13.02
Course Development and Instructional Design	36	24.61	27.27
Course Structure	24	18.53	20.07
Teaching and Learning	15	10.99	11.90
Social and Student Engagement	3	2.04	2.14
Faculty Support	18	12.04	12.36
Student Support	51	27.75	36.97
Evaluation and Assessment	33	20.86	26.47
TOTAL	210	133.15	158.25
Percentage	63.40%		75.36%
Level of Quality	Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the program)		Marginal (significant improvement is needed in multiple areas)

Key

90-99% = 189-209 - Exemplary (little improvement is needed)

80-89% = 168-188 - Acceptable (some improvement is recommended)

70-79% = 147-167 - Marginal (significant improvement is needed in multiple areas)

60-69% = 126-146 - Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the program)

59% and below = 125 points and below - Unacceptable.

Table 51: Category Scores (Staff Respondents)

Area	Possible Score	Staff Score	Staff Score (w/o Not Observed)
Institutional Support	12	4.98	6.85
Technology Support	18	11.20	12.41
Course Development and Instructional Design	36	19.59	23.05
Course Structure	24	14.54	16.94
Teaching and Learning	15	8.99	10.61
Social and Student Engagement	3	1.87	2.14
Faculty Support	18	8.66	10.40
Student Support	51	29.57	32.38
Evaluation and Assessment	33	17.62	20.63
TOTAL	210	117.02	135.41
Percentage	55.72%		64.48%
Level of Quality	Unacceptable		Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the

Key

90-99% = 189-209 - Exemplary (little improvement is needed)

80-89% = 168-188 - Acceptable (some improvement is recommended)

70-79% = 147-167 - Marginal (significant improvement is needed in multiple areas)

60-69% = 126-146 - Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the program)

59% and below = 125 points and below - Unacceptable.

Table 52: Category Scores ("Other" Respondents)

Area	Possible Score	Other Score	Other Score (w/o Not Observed)
Institutional Support	12	5.14	7.47
Technology Support	18	9.46	11.83
Course Development and Instructional Design	36	23.20	26.63
Course Structure	24	15.59	18.47
Teaching and Learning	15	9.68	10.87
Social and Student Engagement	3	1.92	2.08
Faculty Support	18	12.91	13.43
Student Support	51	30.42	37.55
Evaluation and Assessment	33	22.02	27.75
TOTAL	210	130.34	156.08
Percentage	62.07%		74.32%
Level of Quality	Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the program)		Marginal (significant improvement is needed in multiple areas)

Key

90-99% = 189-209 - Exemplary (little improvement is needed)

80-89% = 168-188 - Acceptable (some improvement is recommended)

70-79% = 147-167 - Marginal (significant improvement is needed in multiple areas)

60-69% = 126-146 - Inadequate (many areas of improvement are needed throughout the program)

59% and below = 125 points and below - Unacceptable.

Appendix 2: Written Comments by Section

Institutional Support

- 01 - We do not meet best practices in respect to student support services (for example, no 24/7 technical support), nor do we have an effective system for state authorization issues.
- 02 - We have archaic rules for streaming films on blackboard that prevent us from using any films that are not hollywood blockbusters. This is not conducive for teaching film. Faculty and departments do not have complete control over curriculum in VSI and HS/CP courses. Students need cultural preparation for how to take online courses: Expectations for behavior and the study skills required to succeed in them. Pathways does not adequately identify and mark online courses for them in a way that prepares them before entering the course. Students need lots of IT support in advance of their coursework to ensure a positive online experience during their courses. Above all, we need viable testing centers where students can take examinations on campus while taking hybrid and online courses, along with paid proctors, large numbers of computers, an easy way to reserve these spaces for a course, and a wide range of available times.
- 03 - We need to get Arkansas asap.
- 04 - What we have is piecemeal. Our certification effort and requirements seem almost random.
- 05 - Infrastructure and resources with accreditation primarily at the unit level it appears.
- 06 - The existence of any over-arching governance structure is not clear, nor is it evident that UMKC has much institutional investment in online education. Recent large monetary disbursements have gone to projects supporting development of UMKC as a brick-and-mortar, residential campus (new dorms and apartment buildings, MNL library expansion, Bloch expansion, etc.) rather than adding support personnel, equipment, or additional software licensing to support online teaching. Furthermore, the State of Missouri's investment in online education delivered via the UM System is not clear. It appears state support is going to <http://missouri.wgu.edu/>. Decision-making currently devolves to individual departments and the results vary widely as far as program quality and availability; however, improvement would probably be most effectively supported at this time by working within the current framework of department autonomy to provide resources, training, assistance, and advice. Any attempt to wrest control of online programs from the departments who have created and nurtured them is going to result in a tremendous amount of pushback. Policy for intellectual property of course materials exists, but is not well-publicized. The institution may be technically out of compliance with some standards, e.g. formal approval to deliver online courses in all of the states in which they are currently attempting to do so.
- 07 - Comment 1 - Some of the policies or actions taken by IT are designed to make their work more routinized rather than to meet the needs of faculty and students. For example, all courses are made available to students on the same date- even if the actual course does not open until the second 8 weeks of the semester. This causes great confusion among students and it makes the work of the faculty more difficult (answering needless emails and trying to

get the site ready 8 weeks early) as well as simply initiating disorder and chaos unnecessarily. Comment 2 - While UMKC offers a demanding and lengthy certification course for online instructors, the certificate is not tied to a higher pay scale for the faculty. Comment 3 - While it is relatively simple to assure that papers cannot be purchased (simply by tying the paper to discussion and to unique questions the student must answer) there is not any mechanism in place to assure that the student on my class site is the student of record. This should be addressed. (Possible solutions should be discussed: for example, maybe picture id's of students provided to faculty and online discussion with camera required?).

08 - Lack of Online Infrastructure. Needs to be improved.

09 - Pathway remains a confusing place. When sections of a course are combined into one main course with multiple instructors, the combination does not take place in Pathway.

10 - We have had (and continue to have) issues with Blackboard support for our courses. We frequently have to explain all over again the specific ways in which we need Blackboard to work for us, and are often simply told that there's no way to make things work the way we need them to.

11 - I'm not sure on some of these as I'm not full time faculty. In the past I was asked to share my online class with another instructor and I did not feel like that was fair. I spent hours and continue to spend hours on my class. It is my intellectual property. I'll share ideas, but not how I've organized and structured and created directions.

12 - I like Molly Mead, and she was super helpful when I taught my first online course. But when I had to complete paper work to have an online course "certified," I was really angry that the "instructional designer" (not sure if he works with or for Molly!?!?) was trying to get me to make changes to the syllabus that run counter to best pedagogical practices in my field as established by my professional organization. Not to mention my only 25 years of teaching this particular subject. Need clear lines between certifying an online class and not infringing on expertise of faculty.

13 - Comment about policies: if they exist then more communication about them is needed.

14 - There is no support. I was told to learn it myself.

Technology Support

01 - The rules for when we can check papers for plagiarism using the computer are inflexible. The problem with the technology lies in the speed and preparedness for the students on their own computers, which has to be fixed prior to enrollment to ensure a positive experience during the course; and on our side, the vendor provided software systems (blackboard, campuspack, java, etc.) do not interface well in many cases and this can cause many many problems. This issue is the most overriding problem for using the tools they provide us with, causing not only slowness but also crashes and frustration. That said, the IT staff do their

very best and are wonderful in trying to find solutions even on short notice but also in advance training.

- 02 - I feel there is little available education for instructors who are part time to get educated about the new technology. An online "How To" course would be great. Often have problem connecting with live person when I teach - (7-10 pm.)
- 03 - Training opportunities here are done for the convenience of IT staff. When I have trouble with blackboard, calling the faculty help number is a waste of time. I have more expertise than front line help staff and by the time I get an answer, class has moved on to something else. It is also frustrating to have support staff who have never taught students arrogantly tell us that we need to be using the neatest new toy like tegrity or wimba but who can't support it in a real-time teaching situation.
- 04 - Yes, we need a technology plan. No, not every course instructor needs to know about it--we just need to know that someone(s) with those job responsibilities are doing their job. For #2, I know that systems are not reliable but I know nothing about how that is tracked.
- 05 - UMKC's strict interpretation of FERPA requirements is out of step with the practices of the other UM System campuses and puts faculty and students at a disadvantage by limiting features and software they are permitted to use. Uptime and performance are generally good but improvement is always possible. Faculty are somewhat supported in development of new technologies and skills. There is, however, little in place for staff and virtually nothing for students.
- 06 - Comment 1 - IT requires all faculty to back up their own courses. If a personal computer crashes, the data are lost. Comment 2 - In theory IT answers students and faculty questions and does training. Blackboard also provides online video and handouts. I don't know what the answer may be, but new students who don't know how to use the internet, don't know the software and don't even have a computer are allowed to enroll in online courses without any question. This makes the beginning of every semester a real challenge.
- 07 - Online teachers are mostly supported by and learning from each other through informal networks.
- 08 - Blackboard is not a user friendly product and has lots of glitches and often the staff can't even help quickly with issues. There are frequent times when it crashes and causes issues with tests. I don't feel like we have a good product or strong support for the product. To the defense of those that support us there is so much they would have to master to truly be helpful with this product. Testing is especially a problem as the measures Bb offers to help with cheating cause other issues so we are encouraged not to use those options. I feel we could use a lot of improvement for the new undergraduate student level. It seems to work well when there are no tests and we want to do basic blog, discussion board, etc. When testing is involved or grading of submitted work there is much improvement needed.

- 10 - I don't want to criticize. In my department, I was the first to put a course up on line, and so I've watched the support function for Blackboard and other tools increase steadily over the years. Having said that, I've also taught online for other universities and know that we could be doing MUCH better, starting with making someone available late into the night and on the weekends, since if you track my students' online activities, you'd see that probably half of them work late into the night, after their other jobs/family stuff/chores have been completed. My best experience was at KSU, under Scott Finkeldei. Their practices were amazing, both in responsiveness to students, and also support for faculty. Two really great things Scott implemented at KSU (among many): 1) Orient on-line students and help them self-determine whether they were a match for online learning, 2) once a year get all the online instructors together and ask them what was working, what isn't, and what kind of tools they'd like to see - and those tools more often than not showed up the next year.
- 11 - Molly Mead et al have been extremely supportive and have provided critical training and technical assistance to advance online education at UMKC.
- 12 - I only do "a little" online teaching. Technology support has always been timely when I ask. I have not taken advantage of all of our resources so I am naive if there are gaps. I believe there are useful resources I have not tapped.
- 13 - I have observed glitches in all these items. They have been solved by the invaluable professional assistance of David Ta Pryor. Without his personal commitment to online education and support, I would not have been able to continue teaching my on-line class. Yet, I believe we need more than the personal commitment on the part of David Ta Pryor and other individuals who always help.
- 14 - The primary delivery of my online courses is through Blackboard, but IT decided to update to a newer version of Blackboard right in the middle of the Summer 2013 term, causing havoc for my students and me.
- 15 - Online course development and delivery are not incentivized.

Course Development and Instructional Design

- 01 - Decisions about what courses are offered are not always under the control of departmental faculty. This situation means that the faculty does not control the curriculum.
- 02 - I take real issue with the wording of the last question: you write faculty should be involved in either the development or the decision making for the online curriculum choices Faculty are the ONLY ones who should be involved in online curriculum choices. IT should provide platforms - it is not their role to select content.
- 03 - Little or no support from IT dept if student has a problem with access through blackboard.

- 04 - Guidelines and standards vary by school, as do course material review policies, etc. I do not believe there are any institution-wide diktats currently in place. There is no way to answer these questions on anything but a department-by-department level. More instructional designers are desperately needed.
- 05 - These are true for those courses designed by faculty who have earned the UMKC certificate in Online Teaching and Learning.
- 06 - I have answered the above based on the "assumption" that the faculty have worked with Instructional Design in developing and implementing their online courses.
- 07 - My department actively encourages interactive pedagogy in its online courses and this has always been supported by the instructional design consultants. I would like to see enhancements in this, but not necessarily heavy-handed policing of assessment at a time when we need to encourage more faculty to teach online courses. Getting these courses approved is already more onerous than a f2f class and I believe this is good, but I wouldn't want to see it swing too far in the other direction (i.e. Big Brother-esque intrusion into online course outcomes and design) as this should be largely a department/faculty oversight and decision with support networks available through Instructional Design specialists. That said, there should be some sort of review and accountability for online courses. This is a difficult balance to strike!
- 08- Teaching methods have to be adapted to the technology. The technology is not adaptive.
- 09 - I think this occurs by department at varying levels. The department I am part of spends a lot of time on curriculum development. We receive lots of emails for support of tools and ways to learn i.e. classes or one to one instruction.
- 10 - I've been teaching on-line for several years and would love to have more help with course development and instructional design. I am an adjunct instructor in my field, and haven't had formal education in education. I have taken the initiative to contact someone in Instructional design when I needed help on a new course, but I would love to see more offered proactively in this area. I feel I am on my own and am sure I could be doing things better.
- 11 - I wasn't sure how to answer most of these-if you mean does my department help with these things then the answer is no. If you mean do I make sure they are done the answer is yes.
- 12 - Not all faculty in some Departments understand or support on-line courses.
- 13- I took part in the online learner certification program, and then I reworked my courses to make sure they contained everything required and submitted them for review. The woman who headed the program was either let go or left, and my course submissions went into a black hole. I contacted someone who said that they would be found and pulled from oblivion but that never happened. I do see things "going by" in my email about requirements, changes, and so forth, but if I were to ignore them (not that I intentionally do), there is no follow-up. Also, and I can't

stress this strongly enough. I get paid the same peanuts for developing and teaching an online class that I do for teaching in a classroom, even though there is a LOT more work involved. I'm not complaining, but I also haven't always found the time to create rubrics, which are what I really need for adequate assessment. I know what I want students to learn, and I hope I've described it adequately in my syllabus, etc. But to be fair, I'm an adjunct. I'm not paid to develop the courses I teach, and I'm not paid enough to support myself teaching, and so I do the best - the very best - I can under the circumstances. If I had more time or was paid better and could therefore work fewer other jobs, I can think of a LOT of things I could be doing better or differently. And also along those lines, I should say that I see that the tech department puts out newsletters regularly, and sometimes I even find time to read them and think - boy, I'd like to learn more about that technology - but then I rarely have time. The time when I find out about new technology is when I have something I need to teach and I take the time to figure out the best way to teach it - something I always DO find time to do - and I run across a new technology during that research. But otherwise, I'm sure there are a lot of tools we've recently obtained at UMKC, now that we're taking online more seriously, that I don't know how to use.

14 - My course meets all of these.

15 - I believe that mechanisms and resources are in place to support those faculty that want to utilize online technologies in their teaching the problem is that they are not required of faculty. As a faculty member that teaches online and as a student who has taken classes online, I can attest to the fact that there is a huge variation in the quality of online instruction at UMKC. I personally feel that all faculty that teach online need to be online certified as do their classes. With that being said, the folks in IT need a lot more help and resources to accommodate this. They are severely understaffed and funded!

16 - Need additional instructional design support. Educational technology support is critical.

17 - There is no support available for course development unless the faculty knows where to look and who to go to for help.

18 - I think there is the will to implement these aims. But, we need better commitment on the part of those interested. For example, why can't we have more grants for faculty to continue learning about on-line instruction?

Course Structure

01 - It is not clear how students who cannot type well can participate adequately in text-based online courses or exams, and how we can support them properly.

02 - As far as I understand it, online instructors in our department do do all of these things. I think where we need assistance is in innovation, but we have the basics covered.

03 - Again, I am answering these with the "assumption" that the course was developed with the Instructional Designer.

- 04 - Not enough after 5pm technical support for students or faculty.
- 05 - This is difficult to rate. It depends on the course, the instructor, the support available.
- 06 - Student collaboration is difficult in an online environment because the instructor can't walk around and listen in on or redirect the discussions as we can in a classroom.
- 07 - Access to library/learning resources is up to the student if they live outside the area but encourage them to find the resources that are free i.e. public library.
- 08 - I am answering these questions about my own work, obviously. The way some of the questions are framed, it's difficult to tell.
- 09 - These items feel so "unit/division/section/school' specific. I imagine that some sites are great, and others not so much.
- 10 - I do encounter issues with students being unable to view video links unless using a university based computer.
- 11 - Financial aid needs to be revised to allow students with disabilities, families, and full-time jobs, to take 1 or 2 classes at a time, on-line, and still get financial support.

Teaching and Learning

- 01 - For those courses which have been submitted for Quality Matters review, I assume all of these things are true. Library staff are very helpful to students -- e.g., through preparation of subject-specific LibGuides -- as well as faculty -- e.g. Larry Ruzich's direct assistance in uploading library-based Bb site content, copyright seminars and assistance, FACET training, etc. The library *does* need to work on making their faculty resources more well known, e.g. the 'Netflix-for-educators' program (I've forgotten the actual name, sorry) which has been paid for and barely used because no one knows about it.
- 02 - These are true for courses taught by those faculty who have earned the UMKC certification in Online Teaching and Learning.
- 03 - Again, I answer these questions with the assumption that the course went through the process of working with Instructional Designers. I also answer these in regard to the coursework in my discipline at UMKC.
- 04 - I can only speak to my class and those that I have discussed online learning with in my area.
- 05 - I have a strong belief that the online classroom must be crafted to facilitate student interaction but I'm not always successful at it. You can lead a horse to water, as they say... I do a lot of collaborative projects, and I create space for students to post pictures and personal information and give credit to students who do an exercise that forces them to go through their fellow students' personal space, etc. Still, it's difficult. As for library, my courses are upper level and graduate, and I expect my students to know about the library and how to

research already. So far, I haven't had any trouble with that. I do sometimes have to teach about "plagiarizing."

06 - These are not really questions about the UMKC on-line environment but rather what individual faculty members do. Can only speak to what I, as a faculty member do and, of course, that is self-reported data and not very reliable.

07 - Excellent library resources are available. I am not sure if students are made aware.

08 - On-line instructors need release time to be able to do research on new technologies that could be added to existing on-line courses, to write textbooks to complement their on-line classes, to convert existing on-campus classes to on-line ones, and to develop new on-line classes.

09 - As I said, I would like to be able to devote more time to perfect my on-line instruction. I cannot do that simply relying on committed individuals. Grants and workshops will be the most helpful.

Social and Student Engagement

01 - Blackboard provides many ways for doing this. I use the discussion board and actually grade participation on the discussion board. Students are highly active and it promotes learning across the board.

02 - My courses, and those of my colleagues, are highly interactive. Do some instructors fall down on the job at times? Probably. But the intention to provide a high quality, engaged learning environment is definitely there already. We could use help sometimes to do this the best we can. We tend to use text-based methods of instruction and writing (blogs, wikis, discussion boards) and to require student collaboration.

03 - The online structure prevents students from talking to each other except in the simplest manner (assertion > reply, assertion > reply.)

04 - Again - these responses reflect my experience, in my unit/school/division.

Faculty Support

01 - Faculty development activities are definitely provided and beneficial, but I'm not aware of a standard across campus that faculty must attend these offerings.

02 - All faculty are not given the opportunity to use online instruction even after completing an online certification course.

03 - More staff providing technical assistance is desperately needed. Expanded support hours would be very helpful as well; much online ed is conducted asynchronously or synchronously during evening hours to cater to the working students most in need of online

programs. Support that ends at 5 or 6 PM is not sufficient to meet these needs. Faculty training is, for the most part, entirely voluntary on the part of the instructor. Simply requiring some training in general online pedagogical and design principles prior to assigning faculty to teach online sections would do a GREAT deal to improve the level of the online student experience. Faculty participation in workshops is generally not high.

04 - We often show films in class. The online course also needs a way to show films. Perhaps the library should host a site for films rather than each faculty person trying to track down emails from producers to OK the showing of specific films in an online course.

05 - I answer these with the assumption the faculty have taken the Online Certification course, they have worked with Instructional Design on course development, etc.

06 - The workshops and learning opportunities are available ... taking advantage of them is another story. I wonder how many faculty (the %) attend these activities.

07 - Again, I am adjunct faculty teaching on-line and I don't feel that there is much support offered in this area. I see emails for training and workshops, but all are on-campus during the day, and I work full time at another job. I did take advantage of the On-line Teaching and Learning certification class offered on-line a couple years ago and found it helpful. But I would love to see more offered on a regular basis. For me...I don't know what I don't know. I am sure there are tools that I could use to enhance my class, that I don't even know about.

08 - Instead of or in addition to emerging technologies, strongly suggest workshops on pedagogy of e-learning. Seems to be much easier to teach about blogs and wikies than it is to teach about the different style and philosophy of on-line teaching.

09 - All workshops should be available in an online format for those faculty who are unable to be physically present at the event or unable to attend the live event.

10 - Workshops, assistance, etc., are available, just not sure how many take advantage or are given time to be able to participate.

11 - Departments need to be educated on the value of on-line courses, for students with disabilities, for students with family obligations, and for students with full-time jobs, for retention, and faculty who teach on-line classes need GTA's as much or more so than faculty who teach on-campus classes.

12 - Funds to support online course development such as have been available in the past are very useful insofar as they allow faculty collaboration (and incentives) to build a course and maintain it.

13 - Most of this is done, and done fairly well, but many faculty choose not to take advantage of these support services, particularly in hybrid courses.

01 - We need more courses, available throughout the year. And, we need to free up time to learn how to perfect online learning.

Student Support

- 01 - I do not know if there are online equivalents of some of the student supports offered on-campus, such as tutoring, the Writing Center, programs offered through the Student Success Center, etc. If there are online resources for student support, faculty need to know in order to communicate these opportunities to students enrolled in our classes.
- 02 - This whole survey is hard to score, as I believe the items are inconsistently addressed -- sometimes they're done well and in other times/places they need work!
- 03 - Need 24 hour tech support.
- 04 - It would be very useful to have online tutors available to students. Students need to learn how to participate in an online course before the semester begins so that the coursework is not reduced because of the technology.
- 05 - Improvement needed by IT dept as some online instruction programs work better using Firefox instead of internet explorer.
- 06 - The answers vary wildly. In general, programs that are entirely online, e.g. those at the nursing school, make strong efforts to select and support students accepted into the program. The students who fall through the cracks are those who are taking online classes while NOT enrolled in an online program, for instance MSW students taking one or two online classes. These students get very little support and assistance. My comments from the previous page about the tech support hours also apply to students.
- 07 - This is an area of mixed success in service delivery.
- 08 - The students I have online are often freshmen or this is the first online class they have ever taken and come with minimal information about what to expect. I contact the students before the class starts with some basic information about how to be successful and the syllabus with lots of information. I also open the Bb site 2 weeks early so they have plenty of time to prepare. They do not seem to have received any other support about taking an online class at this point and it's clear in their interaction or should I say lack thereof interaction. There is good support with Bb as long as you have plenty of time to work on the issue. Testing and recording with Tegrity present lots of issues and often can't be resolved in time before exam is over or in time for lecture to be recorded. We use Bb for our face to face classes also and I think there is a need for the students to be more prepared with updates on computers, etc., for this to work.
- 09 - As far as I can tell, my syllabus is the only place my students are getting advice on what to expect from an ONLINE class. Many still think it's going to be like a correspondence course.

It's not uncommon for students not to show up for the first couple of weeks, thinking it's like independent study. I spend too much time "chasing" students the first few weeks, to try and help them settle in. This year, I lost one student who had very bad English language skills, despite my chasing down anyone at UMKC who could offer support. This sort of support did not exist, even though we have a large population of foreign students.

- 10 - In my unit students attend a pre-career 2-day session that covers all this.
- 11 - Online students complain they do not have access to UMKC's program events as onsite students are afforded in the form of either virtual connection to the event or access to the recording of the event.
- 12 - Students need more orientation and mentoring for all classes. Some don't seem to realize that just attending class will not ensure a passing grade. Some don't understand that they need to read emails from instructors often. Some don't understand that taking all 4 quizzes will not guarantee a high grade, even when a syllabus says they also have to post comments on a Discussion Board regularly. Maybe they need an Orientation Quiz?

Evaluation and Assessment

- 01 - Only the online classes that receive grant-funding for development are required to go through an evaluation process. There is no quality control for online class offerings beyond the program's usual means of student course evaluations at the end of the semester.
- 02 - There is a huge difference between my instructors who are Certified Nurse Educators (CNE), and those who are not. I feel like those who do not have their CNE make this the worst program anyone could have the misfortune of choosing to attend! I am very frustrated about this. Those instructors WITH their CNE are the saving grace of this school. No faculty (including Program Directors) should be hired unless they have their CNE certification because otherwise getting through this program feels more like a game (just jumping through the hoops), than getting a respectable education. PLEASE do something.
- 03 - Again, some programs/courses do these well, and others do not.
- 04 - Course evaluations are poor measures of faculty performance. In the college of arts and sciences, we do not have effective course evaluation procedures no less effective measures for evaluating the quality of teaching, which is not the same thing by far. But this issue should be addressed by the faculty as part of a general reform rather than a separate initiative just for online education; appropriate procedures can then be designed with online, hybrid, and traditional courses each in mind.
- 05 - You need a separate column for "no intervention wanted."
- 06 - I am not in a position to know what administration is doing. There is a disconnect between adjunct and part-time faculty and administration, particularly with the very short sighted cutting of faculty hours due to the upcoming healthcare coverage law. If people don't teach as

many courses as they used to, where will the College funds come from? People are working for the same pay they earned 15 years ago. To cut their hours because they are not valued enough to meet the intention of the law by providing them with insurance is a real slap in the face and reduces morale. Most part-time people are married to full-time employed family members who provide the insurance. I doubt if most of us would ask for insurance even if it were offered. This is an area in which UMKC really lets down its part-time and adjunct faculty. It is a shame.

07 - There is a course evaluation process in place and it parallels the f2f evaluation process. The problem is that fewer students do those evaluations and it is more difficult to track the success of instructors in online courses.

08 - I don't know that these things aren't being done. I just know I don't see them. Also, I lose a lot of students because they're not prepared to be online learners. Those who are self-motivated or who are willing to work with me will make it through and enjoy the course. I started with 25 this semester and ended up with 19. I'm positive the attrition was attributable in large part to the surprise of the requirements of online learning (no, it's not independent study) or the difficulty with motivating themselves to "show up" to class when there's no actual time or date they must "be there" (even though I use due dates for assignments and activities).

09 - Response rate for course evaluations is unacceptably low. Zero of 25 students in my last online class provided feedback. This feedback is critical for development and course improvement, but also may discourage faculty who rely heavily on course evaluations as a component of annual review and P&T. This is a BIG problem.

10 - Again, these questions are about overall teaching environment, not specific at all to on-line education. Many of these items are school specific.

11 - Some faculty do not appreciate how much work it is to design and update on-line courses. The Advising Committees in some departments do not work.

12 - I am answering these with respect to online teaching--would answer differently if the questions are meant to be just in general.

13 - I would like to see more faculty involvement here.