A Solution-Finding Report

Title*: Teacher, Principal, and Leader Evaluation in Online and Blended Learning*
Date: April 3, 2013

This solution-finding report provides information requested by Emily Rukobo of the Northeast Comprehensive Center (NECC). The request, generated in preparation for NECC's "two online technical assistance modules that discuss online and blended learning," indicated "a gap in the currently available research involving teacher and leader evaluation in online and blended environments." The focus of the information to be discovered, therefore, was twofold:

1. "Teacher evaluation in online and blended environments."
2. "Principal and leader evaluation in online and blended environments."

Resources cited for teaching evaluation may address the topic tangentially, for example, through student assessment of online, blended learning, and may suggest criteria by which to build an evaluation schema. There are very few resources for or studies of principal and leader evaluation that specifically address online and blended environments, although several of the resources for "teacher evaluation" are applicable or could be adapted to "leader evaluation" as well.

Solution-finding Reports are intended to provide a quick response to the request for information; they are not intended to be a definitive literature survey or synthesis of the topic.

Contents

I. Teacher Evaluation in Online and Blended Environments

Eskey, M. T., & Schulte, M. (2012). Comparing attitudes of online instructors and online college students: quantitative results for training, evaluation and administration. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *15*(5).

http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter154/eskey_schulte154.html

According to the abstract of this paper, "The past decade has witnessed an explosion in online learning opportunities for post-secondary students throughout the United States. The university has developed a Faculty Online Observation (FOO) model to allow for an annual observation of online adjunct faculty with a focus on five major areas of facilitation. To test the effectiveness and support of the FOO, a survey related to the observation areas was administered to online faculty and students. The results determined a number of areas of agreement and non-agreement between the groups. The findings will provide valuable information for future training and professional development needs of online instructors, and processes of teaching based on perspectives of instructors, course developers, students, and discipline managers."

Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *Internet and Higher Education*, *7*, 95–105.

http://cecs.anu.edu.au/files/flu_presentation/blended_learning/data/resources/Garrison_2004_The-Internet-and-Higher-Education.pdf

This article discusses the transformative potential of blended learning in the context of the challenges facing higher education—including administrative and leadership issues. It states, in part, "Successful adoption of a blended learning approach to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of teaching and learning will require...systematic evaluation of satisfaction and success of the teaching, learning, technology and administration of new course."

Ginns, P., & Ellis, R. (2007). Quality in blended learning: Exploring the relationships between on-line and face-to-face teaching and learning. *Internet and Higher Education*, *10*, 53–64.

https://associatie.kuleuven.be/altus/seminaries/1011/seminarie7/QualityBL.pdf

This article begins, "Teachers concerned about the quality of learning in universities are facing a number of challenges related to information and communication technologies (ICT). High on the list of these challenges is identifying appropriate ways of evaluating the extent of their contribution to quality learning experiences."

Keppell M., & Carless, D. (2006). Learning-oriented assessment: A technology-based case study. *Assessment in Education*, *13*(2), 179–191.

http://www.niu.edu/assessment/committees/CAN/PresentationsPapersArticles/Learningorientedassessment_atechnologybasedcasestudy.pdf

This article focuses on reconfiguring assessment processes so that they support a learning function, in addition to the more traditional measurement function. In the first half of the paper, the authors discuss a framework for "learning-oriented assessment" derived from a project carried out in Hong Kong. They conceptualize learning-oriented assessment as containing three key components: assessment tasks as learning tasks, student involvement in assessment, and explicitly forward-looking feedback. The second

half of the paper presents an action research case in which the first author implemented some of the principles of learning-oriented assessment within a module in a teacher education context. The module, focusing on multimedia and web authoring, was taught through blended learning with an emphasis on peer learning and project-based learning. A particular feature was the interplay between students' learning experiences and the module assessments.

Luis Miguel Villar Angulo, L. M. V., & de la Rosa, O. M. A. (2007). Online faculty development and assessment system (OFDAS): A study of academic learning. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *20*, 21–41.

http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11092-007-9045-4?LI=true

The abstract for this article states, "The rapid growth of online learning has led to the development of faculty inservice evaluation models that are geared towards the demands of quality improvement of degree programs. Based on the best practices of student online assessment, the Online Faculty Development and Assessment System (OFDAS) created at the Canary Islands was designed to serve the dual purpose of faculty development and classroom learning environment assessment. Results of analyses showed that OFDAS maximized the potential of online faculty development to encourage staff to reflect on Curriculum and Teaching Capacities (CTC). Implications were discussed in terms of emphasizing the process of online CTC learning and incorporating perspectives to capture a comprehensive view of faculty teaching attitudes and their association with student classroom learning perceptions."

Natale, C. F. (2011, July). *Teaching in the world of virtual k–12 learning: Challenges to ensure educator quality*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

http://www.ets.org/s/educator_licensure/ets_online_teaching_policy_final_report.pdf

This report presents the results of a 6-month research project examining virtual K–12 teaching and learning, where "the issue of teacher quality remains critically important, and attention is gradually shifting to focus on such a critical matter."

New York Comprehensive Center. (2011, September*). Recommendations from the New York State Online and Blended Learning Summit 2*. Albany, NY: Author.

http://nycomprehensivecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Recommendations-from-the-New-York-State-Online1.pdf

The New York State Online and Blended Learning Summit 2 was hosted by the New York State Education Department, the International Association for K–12 Online Learning, and the University at Albany School of Education, with support from Intel, Microsoft, and the New York Institute of Technology. These are recommendations from that summit, prepared by the New York Comprehensive Center. The principal theme of the summit was "supporting online teachers through strong pre-service and in-service teacher education programs, professional development, and course/instructor evaluation."

Oliver, W. L. (2010). *Investigating Whether a Value-Added Teaching Effectiveness Model Designed for Traditional Classrooms Can Be Used to Measure Online Teaching Quality* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga).

http://search.proquest.com/pqdt/docview/851893465/13D0D93BCBF207400D/1?accountid=14270

This dissertation focuses on assessing teacher quality in online environments. The purpose of the study, conducted in Tennessee, was to explore the feasibility of using the same method Tennessee currently uses to gauge teaching quality of traditionally delivered courses to determine teaching quality in the online environment. Research questions included: (1) Is there a significant difference in program effects of traditional classrooms (as measured by end-of-course scores for a sample of traditionally-taught students in a Tennessee school district) and online classrooms (as measured by end-of-course scores for a sample of Tennessee's online students)?; (2) Do program effects between traditional and online environments vary significantly by subject area (i.e., Algebra I, Biology, and English I)?; (3) Do Tennessee educators perceive that Tennessee's model for teacher-effect scores can be used equally well in both traditional and online environments?; and (4) What factors and strategies do educators perceive should be considered in determining teaching quality in the traditional and online environments?

Sanders, S., Walia, B., Potter, J., & Linna, K. W. (2011). Do more online instructional ratings lead to better prediction of instructor quality? *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, *16*(2).

http://pareonline.net/pdf/v16n2.pdf

This study begins, "Online instructional ratings are taken by many with a grain of salt. This study analyzes the ability of said ratings to estimate the official (university-administered) instructional ratings of the same respective university instructors. Given self-selection among raters, we further test whether more online ratings of instructors lead to better prediction of official ratings in terms of both R-squared value and root mean squared error. We lastly test and correct for heteroskedastic error terms in the regression analysis to allow for the first robust estimations on the topic."

Schulte, M. (2009). Efficient evaluation of online course facilitation: The "quick check" policy measure. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 57(2), 110–116

http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/07377360902995685

This article begins, "In distance education and online learning, the exponential growth of programs and the need for instructors has forced proper analysis of instructor teaching and learning to the background. To meet the immediate needs of students and technical operations, distance learning institutions often fail to evaluate how well instructors follow needed online policies and online best practices, and do not provide general mentoring or remediation for instructors. One task confronting many distance learning programs is to properly evaluate a large number of instructors in a short time. Another task is to then use the completed evaluations to promote professional development."

Southern Regional Education Board. (2006, August). *Standards for Quality Online Teaching*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

http://publications.sreb.org/2006/06T02_Standards_Online_Teaching.pdf

This report, prepared by the Educational Technology Cooperative of the SREB, contains standards for quality online teaching "developed by knowledgeable, experienced resource persons from K-12 and postsecondary education, drawn from national and regional organizations, SREB state departments of education, and colleges and universities....These standards have been supported by practice over time, as well as substantiated by research. In fact, research at both the K-12 and postsecondary levels is creating a growing body of evidence that quality online teaching is not only as good as traditional teaching — in many ways it can be superior."

Southern Regional Education Board. (2006, October). *Online Teaching Evaluation for State Virtual Schools*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

http://publications.sreb.org/2006/06T04_Online_teaching_evaluation_checklist.pdf

This tool is based on the SREB publication *Standards for Quality Online Teaching* and provides state virtual schools in SREB states with an instrument to evaluate the quality of online teachers of middle grades and high school students. Specifically, it is designed to gauge whether an online teacher has accomplished the intent of each standard and is fully supporting student academic performance.

Wortmann, K., Cavanaugh, C., Kennedy, K., et al. (2008, October). *Online teacher support programs: mentoring and coaching models*. Vienna, VA: North American Council for Online Learning.

http://www.inacol.org/research/docs/NACOL_OnlineTeacherSupportPrograms08-lr.pdf

This report describes the mentoring relationship from the perspectives of several virtual schools that have built mentoring programs to assist their new teachers, with an emphasis on evaluations of courses and teaching performance.

II. Principal and Leader Evaluation in Online and Blended Environments

LoTi Connection (n.d.). LoTi principal evaluation instrument/rubric samples. Carlsbad, CA: Learning Quest, Inc.

http://loticonnection.cachefly.net/global_documents/LPES-Instrument-Sample.pdf

http://loticonnection.cachefly.net/global_documents/LPES-Rubric-Sample.pdf

Although the criteria are not specific to online and blended learning, these sample evaluation instruments—from "a longstanding educational consulting firm specializing in the integration of 21st-century skills into K–12 classrooms"—include the principal's ability to "facilitate digital age teaching and learning" within the domain of "organization and resource management." Work is evaluated across a spectrum of effectiveness, from "ineffective" to "highly effective." The rubric provides two samples of indicators of high effectiveness of facilitating digital teaching and learning: (a) "Staff members are able to enroll in online courses that focus on the tenets of digital age teaching and learning (e.g., collaborative problem-solving, complex thinking skills) anytime during the school year;" and (b) "The principal attempts to optimize staff planning time for designing engaging investigations for the classroom while leaving many of the conventional tasks that are typically discussed in grade level meetings for office personnel to complete."

The Center on Innovations in Learning (CIL) is a national content center established to work with regional comprehensive centers and state education agencies (SEA) to build SEAs' capacity to stimulate, select, implement, and scale up innovations in learning. Learning innovations replace currently accepted standards of curricular and instructional practice with new practices demonstrated to be more effective or more efficient in the context in which they are applied.

The Center on Innovations in Learning is administered by the Institute for Schools and Society (ISS) at Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in partnership with the Academic Development Institute (ADI), Lincoln, Illinois.

The Center is funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), under the comprehensive centers program, Award # S283B120052-12A.