

**Peer Evaluation of Online Courses (revised 4/11/03)**  
**Assessment Instrument**  
Department of Industry and Technology

Course:

Developers:

Instructors:

Reviewer:

Date:

**Directions:** For each pair of items, indicate your agreement with the first statement by circling one whole number using the following 5-point scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree. Next, regardless of this rating, please provide meaningful, constructive criticism to improve the course in response to the second item in the pair.

1a. The course structure is sound and appropriate for delivery via the Internet, making accommodations for the sensory and proximity deficits as well as the advantages of Web-mediated education.

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

1b. The course structure might be improved for Internet delivery by:

2a. The content is appropriate and well-developed, and there is a strong congruence among the course's title, description, objectives, outline, lessons, activities, assessment areas, and needs of the target audience.

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

2b. Course content and unity might be improved by:

3a. Instructional (and supplemental) materials seem to be effective in an online setting, and appealing to online students.

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

3b. Instructional materials might be improved by:

4a. The organization of and navigation through all online materials is simple and intuitive (user-friendly), and made clear to students at the beginning of the course with appropriate contextualization and calendar; multiple access points are provided to instructional and informational supports.

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

4b. The organization and navigation of online materials might be improved or made clearer to students by:

5a. The course and instructor provide students with adequate communications and interactions, making good use of Web-mediated communication opportunities for communications among students, between students and the instructor, and between students and those outside the class, as appropriate.

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

5b. Communications and interactions might be enhanced by:

6a. The course and instructor adequately provide for sufficient and effective learning appropriate to the topic, the learner, the level of instruction, and the Web-mediated environment.

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

6b. Provisions for student learning might be improved by:

7a. The course and instructor adequately provide for sufficient and effective learning assessment appropriate to the topic, the learner, the level of instruction, and the Web-mediated environment.

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

7b. Provisions for the assessment of student learning might be improved by:

8a. The overall quality of this course meets expectations.

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

8b. Consider improving this course by:

**Peer Evaluation of Online Courses (revised 4/11/03)**  
**Procedure for Implementing the Assessment**  
Department of Industry and Technology

Step 1. The course developer chooses two individuals who have actual pedagogical experience as the instructor of record in an online class that has concluded prior to participation as an assessor. (The department's Director of Online Education will perform a separate assessment, and will not participate as one of these two assessors.)

Step 2. The course developer grants course Blackboard access to each of the two assessors and the Director as a "Grader" or "Instructor," or logs in to the developer's Blackboard account on a computer to be used by the developer for their assessment.

Step 3. The course developer contacts the assessors after they have been granted Blackboard access as a Grader or Instructor to inform them of the Blackboard course site, and of the location of additional online materials. Any print or other physical materials that are distributed to students are also distributed to the assessors. The assessor is provided with a copy of the assessment instrument.

Step 4. Each assessor uses the assessment instrument to conduct an initial assessment of the course without benefit from the developer's presentation; it is important for this to occur without explanation of the course by the developer. One week is allotted for this initial assessment.

Step 5. The assessors bring their initial assessment documents to a joint meeting wherein the developer illustrates the course and explains critical elements. Others are encouraged to participate in this session and to provide informal constructive criticism to the developer. The Director of Online Education attends. During this session, a meaningful dialog among the assessors, the developer and others should aid the assessors as they revise or add to their initial assessment. The purpose of this, it should be stressed, is both formative and summative, and substantial suggestions for improvement specifically in light of Web-mediation should be generated.

Step 6. At the end of this session, or within one week, the assessors provide a copy of their written assessments to the instructor and to the Director of Online Education, keeping a copy for their records. After review of these documents and of the course, the Director provides a written assessment to the developer within one week.

Step 7. Within two weeks of this session, the course developer writes a plan for revision in light of this assessment, and furnishes a copy to the Director of Online Education.