2018

The Relationship Between Formal Evaluations and Online Adjunct Faculty Teaching Practices

Euwanna Antoinette Heard
Walden University

Walden University

College of Education

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Euwanna Antoinette Heard

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Donald Poplau, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Suzy Harney, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Richard Hammett, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2018

Abstract

The Relationship Between Formal Evaluations and Online Adjunct Faculty Teaching Practices

by

Euwanna Antoinette Heard

MSN, Bowie State University, 2007

BSN, Bowie State University, 2005

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

August 2018

Abstract

The increased enrollment of adult learners in colleges and universities that offer online programs has provoked a need for skilled online adjunct faculty. Administrators at online universities in the Mideastern region of the United States have sought to better understand the relationship between formal evaluations and teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty. Guided by the theory of adult learning, the purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between formal evaluations of the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty and their professional development. A correlational study was completed to determine the association between online adjunct faculty's perceptions of formal evaluation processes, attitudes about teaching and, decisions to make changes in instructional behavior. This study also addressed the association between formal evaluations and online adjunct faculty's willingness to participate in professional development opportunities. Online adjunct faculty with 1 or more years of online teaching experience at a local university who had experienced a formal evaluation participated in this research. A Spearman correlation analysis indicated a positive association between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and their perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations. A Spearman correlation analysis also indicated a positive association between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development and their perception of the quality of formal evaluations. The project study supports strategies for developing and implementing evaluative processes that measure effective teaching practices and encourage professional development for online adjunct faculty. Formal evaluative processes can affect social change by ensuring the maintenance of quality academic standards at online universities.

Formal Evaluations and Online Adjunct Faculty

by

Euwanna Antoinette Heard

MSN, Bowie State University, 2007

BSN, Bowie State University, 2005

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

August 2018

Dedication

This project is dedicated to my family who have always inspired and encouraged me in so many ways.

Acknowledgments

I would like to extend a very special thank you to my committee members for their support and assistance during my doctoral journey. To my husband, children, daughter-in-law, and grandchildren thank you for your unwavering love, support, and encouragement. Thank you to my family and friends for your moral support, concerns, thoughtfulness, and prayers during some very challenging times along this journey. Most importantly, I thank God for providing this opportunity and giving me the strength and courage to persevere and reach this goal in my professional and academic career.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Section 1: The Problem

Introduction

Online community colleges and universities are experiencing increased enrollment of adult learners. This increase in enrollment presents an urgent need for skilled and knowledgeable instructors to help withstand and maintain course curriculum and community expectations (Bedford, 2009). The rapid growth of the student population and online programs has created many challenges for school administrators and faculty. As enrollment increases, program administrators face the demands of student expectations by ensuring quality education that is in line with the vision, mission, and integrity of the institution. Strycker (2009) acknowledged that institutions rely increasingly on adjunct faculty in response to student needs. Strycker further acknowledged that high-quality adjunct faculty is crucial to an institution's success. The increased demand for online programs and need for part-time instructors are two very distinct yet interconnected conditions that challenge administrators of higher learning (Tipple, 2010). The paradigm shift of increasing online programs and increased enrollment of adult learners in colleges and universities requires strengthening and maintaining the essential characteristics and attributes of reputable online institutions of higher learning.

Administrators at online universities in the Mideastern region of the United States meet the demands of integrating online courses into certain curricula as well as offer degree programs online. While some colleges and universities in the Mideastern region have transitioned full-time faculty to online courses (Allen & Seaman, 2005), many must

hire adjunct online faculty to meet the demand for online courses (Bedford & Miller, 2013; Carnevale, 2004). The efforts of meeting the expectations of adult learners and maintaining quality education through distance learning have attracted adjunct faculty to online teaching in support of the continuous progression of higher learning.

Definition of the Problem

The market for online education is expanding rapidly in the United States, and universities are hiring adjunct faculty exponentially to meet this demand (Paquette, Corbett, & Cassess, 2015). The increased reliance on the adjunct faculty for online programs has revolutionized the expansion for assessing quality instruction (Mandernach, Donnelli, Dailey, & Schulte, 2005; Mandernach, Register, & O'Donnell, 2015). The reliance on adjunct faculty also requires that universities ensure the quality of instruction, organization, development, and support for attracting and retaining qualified instructors (Bedford & Miller, 2013). Evaluative processes of the online adjunct faculty are essential for assessing teaching practices, improvement strategies, and retention of students for successful outcomes (Tobin, Mandernach, & Taylor, 2015). Understanding the characteristics and needs of online adjunct faculty is an integral attribute of supporting effective teaching practices (Mandernach et al., 2015). This study addresses the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty.

Rationale

Understanding the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty is paramount to the achievements of institutions of

higher learning. The current trend regarding the increase of student enrollment and distance learning curricula has resulted in the rise of adjunct faculty employment at online colleges and universities (Bedford & Miller, 2013; Puzziferro & Shelton, 2009). This shift in course delivery leads to adjunct faculty challenges and expectations as well as expectations of the respective hiring institutions. Clarifying the expectations that institutions have for their faculty and that faculty have for their performance is important for successful faculty evaluation processes (Arreola, 2006). Online adjunct faculty needs a mechanism for measuring the effectiveness of their teaching practices related to successful student outcomes, personal achievement, and meeting institutional goals (Mandernach et al., 2015). Addressing the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty may assist administrators with the process of developing and implementing formal evaluations that affect teaching methods and the professional development of online adjunct faculty.

Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level

Educational administrators must understand the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty at local colleges and universities in the Mideastern region of the United States. There needs to be a process that demonstrates the relationship between formal evaluations and teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty. Analyzing the association between formal evaluations and teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty may demonstrate the effectiveness of teaching practices and identify needs for improvement. By understanding the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty, local

institutions of higher learning may benefit from maximizing academic and institutional success (Heuerman, Jones, Kelly, & Mandrell, 2013).

Evidence of the Problem From the Professional Literature

Colleges and universities are hiring adjunct faculty at an increased rate to meet the challenges of higher demand with fewer resources (Heuerman et al., 2013; Pearch & Marutz, 2005). Many of these challenges involve the hiring practices, staff development, and evaluation practices of colleges and universities employing adjunct faculty. It is important that colleges and universities employ the same selection criteria for hiring faculty members at every level to maintain a continuity of quality and standards (Pearch & Marutz, 2005). The implementation of systematic evaluation of part-time faculty is another aspect of ensuring that institutional standards are upheld (Pearch & Marutz, 2005).

Part-time faculty are hired more frequently for the essential support of classroom instruction in higher learning (Langen, 2011). The evaluation of adjunct faculty is of concern as the number of adjunct faculty in colleges and universities increases. The significant increase in the use of adjunct faculty in higher education classrooms warrants that administrators understand the process and use of evaluations (Langen, 2011). Logical and precise processes ensure more straightforward methods for measuring quality instruction. Such practices also inform administrators of ways for developing proficiency in how they evaluate adjunct faculty (Langen, 2011). Evaluation processes are a critical component of maintaining effective practices for faculty development and positive student outcomes in academia.

Definitions

Adjunct faculty: Individuals who teach college-level courses on a part-time basis. Adjunct faculty staff members are non-tenured track, temporary, and part-time employees without benefits or job security (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Adjunct faculty generally teach on an as needed per course contract (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

Effective teaching: Effective teaching is an environment involving students in significant, sociological, intellectual, and stimulating learning opportunities and course instruction (Northcote, Seddon, & Brown, 2011).

Efficacy: Efficacy in teaching is the confidence in a teacher's ability to promote students' learning (Hoy & Spero, 2005).

Evaluation: Evaluation types come in two forms: Formative and summative. Formative evaluations are done throughout the course while student learning is taking place in forms of classroom observation, review of teaching materials, or syllabus review. Summative evaluations occur once the course is completed to determine learning outcomes and the effectiveness of teaching strategies through student evaluations, peer evaluations, or self-evaluations (Suskie, 2009).

Formal evaluation: A formal evaluation is a documented summary of a faculty member's performance. Formal evaluations provide information for the employee and faculty member on the appraisal of the faculty member's teaching performance relative to institution standards (Arreola, 2006).

Fulltime faculty: Fulltime faculty members are individuals who teach college-level courses on an academic year appointment with full employee benefits. Full-time

faculty members are generally tenured and salaried professors with administrative and student advisement responsibilities. Fulltime faculty also may conduct research and serve on college committees and community projects (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007).

Online adjunct faculty: Individuals who teach college-level courses on a part-time basis in an online program (Bedford, 2009).

Professional development: Courses and programs for online adjunct faculty that focus on training and quality assurance of faculty performance, instruction, organizational effectiveness, and evaluation (McDaniel & Shaw, 2010)

Quality: Quality in higher education can be conceptualized in definitive terms of various standards of excellence, proficiency, intention, and value, and the ability to affect change (Harvey & Green, 1993). Quality can be perceived as an expression of value (Dochy, Segers, & Wijnen, 1990). As a subjective term, quality correlates with what is expressed as positive, valuable, or beneficial (Pfeffer & Coote, 1991).

Teaching practices: Methods or strategies that educators incorporate in their planning, preparation, implementation, and assessment for effective course instruction (Westwood, 2008).

Significance

This study was done to determine the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty. This study examined online adjunct faculty's attitudes and beliefs toward formal evaluations. This study also explored online adjunct faculty's perceptions about the quality and efficacy of formal evaluative

processes. This study also was conducted to identify the association between formal evaluations and online adjunct faculty's efforts to seek and take advantage of opportunities for professional growth. The results from this study will inform administrators of online universities regarding the effectiveness of formal evaluations. The information from this study will also catalyze increasing awareness for administrators and online adjunct faculty at large of the potential effects that formal evaluations have on classroom instructional practices at online colleges and universities.

Guiding/Research Question

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty and their inclination for seeking professional development based on their perception of the quality of a formal evaluative process. The guiding question for the study centered on the following question: What is the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty for effective teaching and professional development? The guiding question further developed the study's research questions to identify the relationship between the independent variable (online adjunct faculty's perceptions of formal evaluation) and the dependent variables (changes in online adjunct faculty's teaching practices and online adjunct faculty's interest in seeking and taking advantage of opportunities for professional development). H_0 represents the null hypothesis, and H_1 represents the alternate hypothesis for each research question. The research questions and hypotheses for this study were:

RQ1: What is the relationship between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations?

$H_0 1$: There is no significant relationship between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations.

$H_a 1$: There is a significant relationship between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations.

RQ2: What is the relationship between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations?

$H_0 2$: There is no significant relationship between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations.

$H_a 2$: There is a significant relationship between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations.

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty and their inclination for seeking professional development based on their perception of the quality of the formal evaluative process. This study was also conducted to determine online adjunct faculty's perceptions of the efficacy of formal evaluative processes. I conducted research on the topic using Questia Library, Google Scholar, UMI Dissertations, ProQuest Central, The

Education Resource Information Center (ERIC), Education Research Complete, The Department of Education, Education: A SAGE full-text database, Academia.edu, Teacher Reference Center, SocINDEX, Academic Search Complete/Premier, Expanded Academic ASAP, Amazon.com, and SAGE Research Methods Online. I also conducted a web search by exploring the University System of Maryland and Affiliated Institutions (USMAI) Library Catalog and a review of the reference lists of sources used in this study. Keywords and search terms used for the literature review included: *online adjunct faculty*, *evaluation of online adjunct faculty*, *evaluation of faculty*, *evaluation of adjunct faculty*, *teaching practices of online faculty*, *teaching practices of online adjunct faculty*, *motivation of online adjunct faculty*, *role of online adjunct faculty*, *perceptions of online adjunct faculty*, *preparation of online adjunct faculty*, *faculty evaluation systems*, *evaluation processes*, and *formal evaluations*.

Several researchers have addressed professional development of adjunct faculty and its impact on the perceptions, role, teaching practices, and satisfaction of adjunct faculty (see Betts, Kramer, & Gaines, 2011; McDaniel & Shaw, 2010; Palloff & Pratt, 2011). The literature related to professional development of adjunct faculty also focused on or addressed assessments of evaluative processes of adjunct faculty. Research is scant regarding evaluation of adjunct faculty. Langen (2011) found that little is understood about the evaluation of adjunct faculty and how evaluation information is used. Additionally, no studies were found to have a specific focus on evaluations of online adjunct faculty. In my literature search, I found few current articles in peer-reviewed journals that addressed the evaluation of online adjunct faculty. To address the

relationship between formal evaluations on the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty, I decided to focus the review of the literature on related topics in support of online adjunct faculty. This literature review will address the use of online adjunct faculty and the increased reliance on the adjunct faculty in distance education, the perceptions of online adjunct faculty about their role, preparation, teaching practices, and formal evaluation processes, and the effect of formal evaluations concerning the development of online evaluation systems

The Use of Online Adjunct Faculty

Distance education and the colleges and universities that offer fully online programs have increased in number. The U. S. Department of Education (2012) projected a 14% yearly increase in college enrollment up to the year 2019. The increase in enrollment in online community colleges and universities correlates with the responsibility for hiring qualified instructors to meet this demand. Fagan-Wilen, Springer, Ambrosino, and White (2006) reported a marked increase in the number of adjunct faculty hired nationally and internationally at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, impacting all areas of academia. In the United States, the NCES (2010) showed that of the 1,439,144 instructional faculty members at degree-granting institutions, 728,977 (50.7%) of instructional faculty are full-time employees and 710,167 (49.3%) or nearly half are part-time employees.

Current challenges faced by many institutions inclusive of diminishing operational budgets increased the need for student financial aid and the upkeep of technological advances and has prompted many institutions to turn to adjunct faculty

(Stenerson, Blanchard, Fassiotto, Hernandez, & Muth, 2010). The reliance on adjunct faculty is continually rising as enrollment increases, shrinking budgets (Charlier & Williams, 2011; Christensen, 2008), and paradigm shifts assuage the tenure track system (American Federation of Teachers, 2009). Stenerson et al. (2010) acknowledged the significant role of the professoriate as the common thread and steady source of stability and knowledge base for institutions of higher learning. Full-time tenured faculty have historically been and continue to be the status quo for the traditional institutional practice of maintaining and ensuring the best in academic instructors (Stenerson et al., 2010). However, the majority of faculty are outside of the tenure system either as full-time or part-time employees (Gappa, 2000, 2008). Moreover, it is also acknowledged that adjunct faculty are essential to the quality of standards in higher education and crucial to the integrity of institutional missions and values that impact the culture, climate, and expectations of adult learners (Green, 2007).

Perceptions of Online Adjunct Faculty

The rapid increase in distance education has prompted institutions of higher learning and online colleges and universities to hire online adjunct faculty. The success of these web-based courses and online programs depend greatly on the faculty and adjunct professors who teach online (Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner, 2009). More significant to the success and satisfaction of online adjunct faculty is the perception of adjunct faculty regarding certain aspects of distance education, institutional practices, and expectations. As distance education and online institutions of higher education continue to proliferate,

studies are emerging that explore the perceptions of online adjunct faculty regarding their role, teaching practices, preparation, and required support.

The growing number of part-time and adjunct faculty has prompted some studies exploring views of individuals who teach part-time. Leszinske, Jolley, and Bryant (2012) reported adjunct faculty concerns regarding low job stability, low compensation, and minimal faculty voice. Rogers, McIntyre, and Jazzar (2010) acknowledged the relevance and need for mentors and the development of relationships to support and assist adjunct faculty. Consequently, Wickun and Stanley (2007) described a lack of departmental support by way of guidance, mentoring, communication, office space, supplies, and adequate salary as weaknesses in the adjunct system. In the effort to begin to grasp how formal evaluations may impact the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty, it is necessary to understand certain perceptions held by online adjunct faculty. Increased awareness of online adjunct faculty perceptions about their role, support, expectations, and development can facilitate the adoption of formal evaluation processes for online adjunct faculty.

Role of Online Adjunct Faculty

The increasing need for online adjunct faculty has prompted defining the role of adjunct faculty in higher education and distance learning. A plethora of opportunities exist for many professionals to work as part-time professors to meet the needs of their communities as budgetary limitations and overextended full-time instructors create challenges for higher education and distance learning (Wickun & Stanley, 2007). The increased demand for instructors in the 1960s and the beginning of the budget crises in

the mid-1980s led to the call by college administrators to seek help in the professional community of academia to assist with meeting the challenges of increased enrollment and evening course offerings (Wickun & Stanley, 2007). These challenges were fulfilled through the response of committed and dedicated professional citizens meeting the need for more instructors. As qualified part-time instructors came forward, administrators of college and universities developed policies for hiring adjunct faculty with the notion of acquiring more instructors to work for less pay (Wickun & Stanley, 2007) and under variable teaching circumstances including non-contingent temporary positions, no benefits, no job security, long commutes, and alienation from the academic culture of the institution (McLaughlin, 2005).

Most academic instruction at institutions of higher learning is provided by adjunct or part-time faculty members (Rogers et al., 2010; Wickun & Stanley, 2007). These staff members comprise over half of the faculty at community colleges and universities (Leslie & Gappa, 2002; McLaughlin, 2005; Tipple, 2010). As distance education and online programs continue to grow, adjunct faculty continues to increase in number, and the defined role of adjunct faculty presents a different challenge for academia. The role of full-time tenure-track faculty has been defined and well established over the years. However, the role of adjunct faculty currently extends beyond the need for filling teaching positions in the wake of increased enrollment, distance education, budget crunches, and overworked full-time faculty. Online adjunct faculty members teach for various reasons, including extra income, satisfying a need for service in the community, remaining stimulated intellectually, the hope of acquiring a tenure-track position, or

spending time in the company of other adults (Green, 2007). Therefore, adjunct faculty can best define the perceptions of their role in higher education.

Most online colleges and universities use the term facilitator instead of instructor or teacher in conveying the role and responsibilities of the faculty member teaching online. The word facilitator is an acceptable title when considering the approach to learning and expectations of the online environment. A facilitator is often a term that describes the teacher, professor, or instructor in an online environment (Hoyle, 2010). The term facilitator invokes an atmosphere that enables students to take more of a responsive, self-directed, and critical thinking approach to problem solving (Hoyle, 2010). Online faculty perceive their role in the benefits of distance education as they facilitate and maximize student learning, train students in online technology, promote more personal dialogue with instructors and classmates, promote deep learning and critical thinking skills, increase student-centered learning, and increase student participation (Lei & Govra, 2010).

Teaching Practices of Online Adjunct Faculty

Online adjunct faculty concepts of effective teaching practices and strategies for the success of student achievements and learning are fundamental as distance education continues to evolve. Distance education has become the preferred method of learning for many adult learners. The integration of online courses and the development of online institutions of higher learning have created more opportunities for instructors to teach online (Schulte, 2010). Instructors who teach online often obtain new skills and have

increased opportunities to apply innovative practices in online courses (Scagnoli, Buki, & Johnson, 2009).

For the past two decades, researchers have held varying views of what constitutes teachers' effective practices in the traditional classroom (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Danielson, 1996; Shachar & Neuman, 2010). Teaching practices are an integral part of the process for effective teaching and student success. Teaching practices embody the classroom experience and an array of classroom behaviors (Cabrera & La Nasa, 2002) within a creative natural critical learning environment (Bain, 2004). Cabrera and La Nasa (2002) summarized 10 lessons from their study on classroom teaching practices for effective college teaching regarding its effect on students. The researchers summarized the lessons as follows: (1) good teaching promotes student development through instruction that values the student's potential. Cabrera and La Nasa further argued that (2) learning is a social phenomenon, a complex process that should take into account that (3) students' learning methods are affected by a variety of factors (i.e., gender, learning needs, learning preferences, and culture). Four, college teaching is multidimensional; effective instruction employs a wide range of practices and methods. The researchers further concluded that (5) there is no absolute best way of teaching, and effectiveness of teaching differs with the clarity of curricular objectives and expected student outcomes. Six, a classroom climate should be nurturing and devoid of prejudice and discrimination for equitable and fair interactions and relationships involving students, and the same for interactions and relationships involving students and teachers. Seven, students are instrumental in rating teaching performance and their input is invaluable for identifying

significant teaching behaviors. Eight, students are also reliable evaluators of their learning and adequate growth. Nine, college professors do not use innovative teaching methods. No matter how much innovation exists in teaching methods, the traditional way of lecturing is the primary method of knowledge transmission for college professors. Ten, effective teaching precludes training and rewards.

Bain (2004) reported seven common principles demonstrated in the teaching practices of the best college teachers that emerged from his study. The first principle indicated that the best college teachers tend to create a natural critical learning environment that engages students and guides them in stimulating higher-order intellectual activities. Secondly, the best college teachers are effective in getting and keeping the students' attention by using interesting case studies or goal-based scenarios. The third principle is best college teachers take into account where the students are, rather than where the discipline traditions might dictate. For the fourth principle, best college professors also seek commitments from the students to the class and learning and will, as noted by principle five: encourage students to learn on their own, outside of class. The best college professors as illustrated in principle six, will engage their students in disciplinary thinking. They will help students understand and think about the information and ideas the way scholars in the discipline do. The seventh principle is that the best college professors create diverse learning experiences by conducting class in multiple ways and employing a variety of techniques (Bain, 2004).

Danielson (1996) published the "Framework for Teaching" to enhance professional practice by identifying the significance of the teacher's responsibility in

promoting student learning. The “Framework for Teaching” includes four domains of teaching responsibility for professional practice (Danielson, 2007).

The first domain consists of concepts for course design and preparedness that demonstrate a knowledge of pedagogy and strategies for student learning. It is reflective of the instructor’s plan for goal setting based on their knowledge of student learning and the assessment of learning outcomes. The second domain involves the development of a secure classroom of trust and respect to support of an environment that is conducive to the effective management of class activities and student behavior. Domain three centers on instruction and communication with students. It delves into the process of encouraging and maintaining the student’s interest in learning by maintaining an active presence of resourcefulness and flexibility in instruction. Domain four involves the professional responsibilities of teaching, including consistent record keeping, open communication with family and the community, demonstrating professional character, involvement with professional activism, and professional growth and development (Danielson, 2007).

With more colleges and universities offering online programs, it is important that the quality and effectiveness of teaching practices are not compromised. Faculty who teach online often rely on their traditional teaching practices as reference points (Baran, Correia, & Thompson, 2011) and face the challenges of ensuring an effective learning experience for the online adult learner. The traditional classroom environment provides opportunities for students to readily interact in a teacher-centered structure whereby instruction flows from teacher to student in a one-to-many schooling environment (Lui, Chan, Hung, & Lee, 2002). The virtual classrooms in an online environment provide

curriculum and instructions for students where information flows to students from the system in a one-to-one learning process without direct or readily available interaction with the teacher (Lui et al., 2002). The learner is the center of focus, and the teacher becomes the facilitator and mentor in this shift from teacher-centered learning to student-centered learning (Lui, et al., 2002).

The strategy for online adjunct faculty is to be there for the distance learner in a way that ensures they are not alone. It is a significant challenge for online adjunct faculty to make a connection in the classroom and unify the environment to successfully collaborate with the committee of one who is the distance learner, and effectively transfer information with the group of distance learners comprising the virtual classroom. Recent research has shown that online instruction relies on design and delivery methods for teaching strategies and practices to be optimum and effective for successful outcomes. For example, Kim and Bonk (2006) for instance, found that the development of high-quality online courses and the online instructor's ability to facilitate learning are critical components for the success of online learning in higher education. In another study, The Hanover Research Council (2009) found that the planning and management of online instruction, online teaching techniques and online student assessment and evaluation methods are important strategies for the success of online programs. Additionally, Abdous (2011) presented a process-oriented framework consisting of three phases for developing competent online faculty. The three phases include a sequential process described in before, during and after phases for developing online faculty roles and competencies. The before phase includes the preparing, planning, and design phase which

involves faculty development, designing effective learning activities, and reflecting on the transition from face to face teaching to online teaching. The during phase includes facilitating, interacting, and providing and seeking feedback by interacting and engaging the learner, ensuring learner readiness and motivation, and providing prompt and meaningful feedback. The after phase includes reflecting and drawing form lessons learned. The online instructor reflects on the online teaching experience in the after phase and incorporates action for making revisions and course updates and plans for future course offerings (Abdous, 2011).

The Rubric for Online Instruction (ROI) was developed in 2002 by the Committee for Online Instruction (COI) at California State University, Chico (CSU, 2009) as a result of their research and review of teaching practices, student learning methods, and academic customs, policies and procedures (CSU, 2009) and "is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 United States License" (CSU, 2009, p. 1). The rubric was designed to offer a framework for providing teaching strategies and describing the characteristics of an exemplary online course (California State University CSU, 2014). The framework was also developed to assist online instructors with self-evaluation of existing online courses; provide a system for community acknowledgment of achievement, and, to provide a roadmap for the design of courses for the online classroom (CSU, 2014). The framework provides six categories each with a set of criteria for considering characteristics of the course based on three rankings from the lowest rank of baseline, to the mid-rank of effective, to the highest rank of exemplary (CSU, 2014). A chart representing the six categories of the ROI can be found in Appendix C.

Permission to use this information can be found in Appendix B. The concept of what online learning represents to the adult learner is incumbent upon the effectiveness and appropriateness of the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty. How then are online adjunct faculty prepared to meet these expectations and challenges?

Preparation of Online Adjunct Faculty

Much attention has been geared towards the best practices for teaching and training online faculty. Administrators throughout higher learning institutions across the country embark on the task of preparing faculty for online instruction. With the increase in distance learning and technology, institutions are hiring more part-time instructors to facilitate the implementation of online programs (Stauber & Simon, 2010). Along with the effort of hiring online adjunct faculty comes the responsibility of maintaining the quality of service that is characteristic of institutional values. The care with which the task is undertaken for hiring and retaining online adjunct faculty must correlate with the determination of ensuring the staff is adequately prepared for engaging adult learners in the virtual classroom. There are studies that address the development and implementation of programs for the guidance and influence of online adjunct faculty as the reliance on adjunct faculty increases for online instruction in higher education.

A study by Shattuck, Dubins, and Zilberman (2011) documented three phases of an ongoing inter-institutional project that implemented "a statewide online training course for higher education adjunct faculty who were preparing to teach their first online course" (p. 40) in the state of Maryland. The study began in 2008 as an ongoing project and focused on the need for training for online adjunct faculty that would be effective,

attainable and influential for instructors who were new to online teaching (Shattuck et al., 2011). The Maryland Online (MOL) statewide consortium of institutions of higher learning funded an exploratory research project by the Instructional Design Affinity Group (IDAG) that sought institutions' concerns for collaborative programs designed for preparing adjunct faculty in online instruction. The resultant survey of 22 institutions that have credit online course offerings or programs indicated a "supported interest by Maryland's higher education distance learning to develop a state-wide training program focused on the competencies needed to teach online" (Shattuck et al., 2011, p. 45). Phase one project report led to a recommendation for MOL to fund phase two which led to the development of the Certificate for Online Adjunct Training (COAT) course (Shattuck et al., 2011). Once adjunct faculty completed the pilot COAT course, the researchers evaluated the course by collecting data from a survey and journals of reflection submitted by the instructors that taught the course, the team that designed the course and the adjunct faculty that completed the course (Shattuck et al., 2011). The collection of data from the "pilot course was to focus on how the participants and the instructor perceived the effectiveness of the course content and design for preparing adjunct faculty to teach their first online course" (Shattuck et al., 2011, p. 51). Phase three of the project was implemented in the academic year 2010-2011 with the goal of determining the financial self-sustainability of the COAT courses (Shattuck et al., 2011). The courses were offered for three semesters beginning in fall 2010 semester to the spring semester 2011 and summer semester 2011 (Shattuck et al., 2011). The course fee was "$300.00 for adjunct faculty living and teaching in Maryland and $600.00 for all others" (Shattuck et al., 2011,

p. 58). Processes evaluated in phase three were done with the expectation of recommendations for 2011 -2012 phase four of the research (Shattuck et al., 2011). Phase four would provide the evident need for expanding the availability of COAT courses and continuous process improvement modalities of the course (Shattuck et al., 2011) In general, the needs and expectations of training adjunct faculty to teach online is a valued prospect for professional development programs in distance education.

Hill (2009a) published a special report that featured articles on the processes developed by colleges and universities for ensuring effective training, connectedness, and support of online adjunct faculty at their institution. The articles were intended to provide administrators and faculty with strategies for improving the training and retention of online faculty. Hill (2009b) further reported on the effective tools implemented by Florida Community College (FCCJ), an online institution that employs adjunct faculty only. These tools included an orientation program, a mentoring program, a certification program, an electronic newsletter, live webinars, V-Compass (communications and information forum in Blackboard), online workshops and videos, quality assurance and a resources page (where adjuncts post different resources). The guiding philosophy at FCCJ focused on peer-to-peer communication. Other institutions in the report relied on innovative approaches for training and retention strategies that helped instructors manage their courses and maintain a sense of connectedness by providing support through open learning websites, virtual faculty lounges, and mentoring programs (Lorenzetti, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c). Other approaches included online professional enhancement programs (Donelli, Mandernach, & Dailey, 2009), and certificate programs for online instruction

and the development of hybrid courses (Carter, 2009). Strategies according to Vail (2009) included faculty management programs that provide clear expectations, extensive training and close monitoring of course instruction.

Evaluation Process of Online Adjunct Faculty

With the proliferation of online courses, increasing enrollment and reliance on adjunct faculty, significant concerns for methods used to evaluate online teaching have emerged. The innovations of technological advances and distance education have altered the dynamics of the way people work and learn (Tunks, 2012). Standards of practice have routinely extrapolated the effectiveness of college courses from student evaluations completed at the end of a course or term. In the grand scheme of things, however, most colleges and universities conduct formal evaluations for the process of tenure and promotions of full-time faculty. Adjunct faculty mostly rely on feedback from student end-of-course evaluations and some self-reflection of their teaching strategies and the effectiveness of student learning.

Before analysis of the relationship of formal evaluations can begin, it is important to determine the existence of an understanding of the scope of evaluative processes of adjunct faculty implemented in institutions of higher learning. Evaluations in academia are used to examine and make informed judgments on the impact, effectiveness, and appropriateness of faculty members, teaching strategies, learning styles, and student achievement of learning goals (Suskie, 2009). These procedures involve a process designed to provide information that will help educators make a judgment about the objectives, goals, standards, and procedures in question (Kizlik, 2012).

Formative evaluations can identify areas of strength and areas of weaknesses throughout the teaching process and provide feedback for improvement of future performance. Summative evaluations judge the overall performance or outcome of the learner-teacher experience and are of particular interest to stakeholders external to the classroom, such as administrators, employers, and policymakers (Kizlik, 2012; Suskie, 2009). The study of evaluation processes is key to the continued assessment of goals and objectives of learning programs and the effectiveness of teaching strategies for adjunct faculty.

Langen (2011) developed a study that examined how academic administrators in higher education evaluate adjunct faculty and how the results of evaluations are used. The study intended to seek a deeper understanding of the evaluation processes of adjunct faculty so that administrators can ensure quality learning (Langen, 2011). The results of the study revealed that most colleges and universities (63%) evaluate part-time faculty on a regular schedule; some colleges and universities (20%) do not evaluate part-time faculty on a regular schedule, and fewer (7%) do not evaluate part-time faculty (Langen, 2011). In addition to frequency, the study examined documented sources most heavily relied upon by administrators when assessing part-time faculty for formative and summative results (Langen, 2011). Source of information categories included student evaluation tools (SETs), classroom observations, syllabus reviews, review of teaching materials, informal faculty feedback, peer evaluation, grade reviews, informal student feedback, and instructor self-evaluation (Langen, 2011). The majority (87%) relied strongly on SETs as a highly rated source of information, 58% rated classroom

observation as next highest source followed by syllabus reviews, review of teaching materials, informal faculty feedback, peer evaluation, grade reviews, informal student feedback, and self-evaluation (Langen, 2011).

Administrators also considered formative and summative evaluations ratings based on various sources of information (Langen, 2011). Administrators relied mostly on SET results, followed by classroom observation results as the first and second highest reliable sources for overall evaluation, summative, and formative evaluations (Langen, 2011). Near the top of the ranking for the reliance of source in all three situations (overall, summative and formative) were syllabus review and informal faculty feedback. The lowest rank for all three situations was self-evaluation. The rank for peer evaluation rated high for summative results than for formative results and overall results (Langen, 2011).

Administrators next rated classroom observation at a high level of accuracy for sources of information, and rated SETs lower (Langen, 2011). When asked to rate the accuracy of various sources of information using a six-point scale (six indicating a high level of accuracy and one indicating a low level of accuracy), administrators rated classroom observation at a high level of accuracy while SET results had a lower rating (Langen, 2011). Differences between the accuracy and reliance ratings were attributed to time consumption, expense, and administrator reliance on gathering information by classroom observations versus SET results (Langen, 2011). Administrators further rated teaching performance at the highest level of importance for evaluations and reappointment decisions, followed by work experience, positive SET results, and

availability (Langen, 2011). Research and salary received the lowest rate for evaluation and reappointment purposes (Langen, 2011).

Drawing from evaluative processes used in traditional on-site classroom faculty evaluations, researchers began looking at ways of incorporating effective evaluation processes for online faculty. Tobin (2004) acknowledged the substantial research on the effectiveness of online teaching and learning in higher education and the lack of corollary research on effective ways to evaluate the performance of online instructors. By covering topics of evaluation of on-site traditional teaching similarities, and the differentiating circumstances unique to online teaching, researchers can incorporate established principles and develop rubrics for measuring online instructor teaching and performance (Tobin 2004).

Eskey and Roehrich (2013) reported on the "Faculty Online Observation method (FOO)" (Abstract section) for online instructors used at Park University. Park University initially developed an online faculty evaluation system in 2001 based upon face-to-face classroom instruction (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013). The system eventually evolved to address the differences of online instruction and the need for direct evaluation of learning outcomes, teaching practices, student access, and course associated administrative duties (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013). The "Online Instructor Evaluation System (OIES)" (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013, "Institutional Context," para. 2) was developed based on an extensive review of findings, standards, and protocols of effective practices of online teaching (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013). The OIES was piloted in 2004 and remained the sole online adjunct instructor evaluation system until 2008 (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013). The OIES

provided evaluation and mentoring of online faculty, and was concluded to be “a very complete and functional, albeit tedious, and time-consuming method of evaluating online adjunct instructors” (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013, p. 15).

The FOO was then “developed as a follow-on to the OIES for online adjunct faculty at Park University” (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013, “Implementation of the FOO,” para. 1). The FOO was developed as a mechanism for systematic annual evaluations of online adjunct faculty members. Five full-time Park University faculty serving halftime on Park Distance Learning (PDL) conducted the pilot for the FOO (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013). The instructors were observed over a specified two -week period of an eight-week term. Five areas of course facilitation were observed that included: The instructors were also observed over five course facilitation areas, that included: “course organization and facilitation, building community in the online classroom, discussion facilitation and instruction, assessment, grading, and feedback, and course climate and online classroom environment (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013, “Overview of FOO System”, para. 3). Tests on the effectiveness and support of the FOO concluded that “The Faculty Online Observation (FOO) is a valuable tool for observing the facilitation of courses by online adjunct faculty” (Eskey & Schulte, 2010, p. 17); for not only Park University, but also for the institution of distance learning (Eskey & Schulte, 2010). Eskey & Roehrich (2013) further concluded that the FOO has the potential for adaptability to other institutions seeking to incorporate formal online faculty evaluation processes. Evaluation processes for online adjunct faculty can serve as valuable documents of evidence for continuous

process improvement for online faculty development, effective online teaching strategies, and successful student learning outcomes in distance education.

Implications

Since the inception of distance education, school administrators have had to contend with ensuring the quality of course instruction and student outcomes. These issues are as real today as in years past as researchers continue to explore the complexities of the quality and integrity of distance education that satisfy the concerns of administrators, faculty and the community. The goal undoubtedly for online adjunct faculty is to promote learning, as is the goal of any instructional system. Adjunct faculty serves as significant proponents in the field of distance learning and higher education. The role of adjunct faculty is changing from occasional hires to individuals who are crucial in the field of higher learning (Langen, 2011). Online institutions of higher learning and colleges or universities with online programs are at the forefront of employing adjunct faculty for online course instruction.

The need for examining the relationship of how online adjunct faculty is judged and valued in higher education is critical for the assurance of teaching practices that positively affect learning outcomes and administrative goals and objectives for institutions of higher learning. This study is intended to examine the relationship between evaluative processes of online adjunct faculty and the effects of these processes on the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty. The findings of this study are also intended to assist in the development of a project that might inform online adjunct faculty

and administrators on developing effective measures for evaluating online adjunct faculty that support and enhance effective teaching practices (see Appendix D).

The intent of this study was also to provide information for administrators at online colleges and universities and online adjunct faculty of how the association of formal evaluations and online adjunct faculty's perceptions about the quality of evaluations can affect instructional practices of the online adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculties are vital to the education of the nation's college students (American Federation of Teachers, 2010) and this study is further intended to explore the practices paramount to the success of online adjunct faculty.

Summary

In Section 1 of this study, I introduced the challenge that increased enrollment in online universities has on the need for skilled online adjunct faculty. The significance of online adjunct faculty to these institutions demonstrated a need for understanding the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty. The needs and expectations of quality instruction at online universities reflect evaluative processes that effectively measure the quality instruction by the online adjunct faculty, and how such methods associate with the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty.

In Section 2, I describe the research methodology. This section includes the research design and approach, setting and selection of participants, and a description of instruments and materials used, the data collection and analysis processes used, and findings of the study. In Section 3, I present a proposed project based on the findings

from my research. Section 4 includes a discussion of the project, reflections, implications, conclusions, and recommendations for practice and future research.

Section 2: The Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty and their inclination for seeking professional development based on their perception of the quality of formal evaluative processes. This study was also conducted to determine the association between online adjunct faculty's perceptions about the quality and efficacy of formal evaluative processes and their willingness to seek professional development opportunities. This section contains descriptions of the research design, methodology, data analysis and findings of the study. First, the selected research design, setting, and instrumentation are discussed. The next section includes descriptions of the data collection and analysis, as well as the assumptions, limitations, scope, and delimitations of the study. Protection of participants' rights is also discussed. The final section of the methodology contains the results of the data analysis.

Research Design

This study used a quantitative correlational survey approach to determine the relationship between formal evaluations and online adjunct faculty teaching practices. This study design was used to determine the association between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations. The design was also used to determine the association between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of opportunities for professional development, and their perceptions of the quality of such evaluations. A quantitative correlational survey design was a

logical choice because the study used a survey to examine associations between variables "at a single point in time" (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2010, p. 224). A correlational design also provides a numeric exposition of attitudes, opinions, or trends of a selected population (Creswell, 2008; Lodico et al., 2010). With a correlational approach, individuals are not randomly assigned to a group, and the independent variable is not manipulated as in experimental research (Creswell, 2008; Lodico et al., 2010). The correlational approach allows for the use of criteria other than random assignment of groups to treatment or control (Creswell, 2008). The researcher has no control over the independent variable, but has control over how the dependent variable is measured (Lodico, et al., 2010).

Data and information were gathered by administering a survey of the participant's perceptions, opinions, attitudes, and beliefs about formal evaluations and online adjunct faculty teaching practices and professional development. A correlational survey was a logical choice for this study because there was no control or manipulation of the evaluations received by the participants. This study did not seek to prepare groups for random assignment of treatment and control. This approach also allowed for an online survey to be distributed quickly, inexpensively, and electronically, online to each participant, since the population for this study primarily works online. This approach seeks to provide evidence of key elements of effective evaluation experiences of online adjunct faculty and the relationship of these experiences with their teaching practices.

The online adjunct faculty was asked to volunteer for the study by following instructions for completing a questionnaire. The raw data from the questionnaire were

collected for statistical analysis of each question. Each survey question was analyzed through descriptive statistical analysis for determining the frequency and percent of responses to each item on the Likert scale. Spearman correlation analyses will be conducted to address the research questions.

Setting and Sampling

A stratified sample of online universities in the Mideastern region of the United States was identified. The Mideastern region states include Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania (U.S. Department of Education, 2013). Universities selected included those universities that offered bachelors, masters, and doctoral online degree programs. Four universities were invited to participate. Three universities responded to the invitation. University 1 (pseudonym) agreed to participate in the survey after approval from their Institutional Review Board (IRB). University 2 (pseudonym) agreed to reconsider my proposal at a later date upon completion of another survey that their staff was participating in at the time of my request. Since University 2 was taking my proposal under consideration at a later date, I invited another university (University 3; pseudonym) to participate in the survey. University 3 agreed to participate upon approval from their IRB.

A convenience sample was drawn from the online universities. Convenience sampling is a form of purposeful sampling for selecting participants who have the characteristics and knowledge to identify with the intended research (Lodico et al., 2010). Administrators were asked to identify online adjunct faculty with one or more years of experience at their institution. This strategy allowed for a selection of available

participants that fit the criteria for online adjunct faculty. Administrators at University 1disseminated the email invitation and informed consent by an email blast to their online adjunct faculty. University 2 provided a list of email contacts for a portion of their online adjunct faculty. The invitation to participate in the survey and consent form was also posted on the Participation Pool website at University 3. A power analysis was conducted using a G* Power 3.1.9.2 to determine the minimum sample of participants required for the statistical analysis of results. The power analysis was based on a bivariate correlation analysis with a medium effect size (0.30), a power level of .80, and a significance level of .05 (two-tailed). The results of the power analysis showed that the minimum sample size required for this study is 84 participants.

Instrumentation and Materials

The Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire (TEEQ) was used to obtain data from the online adjunct faculty. This questionnaire was initially developed to assist teachers and administrators in understanding their perceptions and effectiveness of current evaluative processes to analyze the potential for teacher performance and promoting growth (Duke & Stiggins, 1986). Because in this study one of my variables of interest was teacher evaluation, the TEEQ was a logical candidate instrument for collecting data.

The questionnaire was introduced in a joint publication of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and the National Education Association (NEA). The TEEQ was designed for

school systems to reproduce or locally adapt and distribute copies of the questionnaire to teachers for describing their last evaluation experience and how it affected them (Duke & Stiggins, 1986; see Appendices F and G). There were no similar tools found that address the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of the faculty.

The TEEQ is a Likert type scale questionnaire. The teachers select responses that reflect on their recent evaluation and then rate the experience in terms of the quality of the evaluation, the impact of the evaluation experience on their attitudes about teaching, their teaching behaviors and strategies, and their understanding of the teaching-learning process. The teachers also describe themselves and the nature of their most recent evaluation experience by ranking their attributes as a teacher, their interpersonal manner, and their teaching experience. The teachers also rank their perceptions of the evaluator, the attributes of the information gathered on their performance, the attributes of the feedback received, and the attributes of the evaluation content (see Appendix E). No validity or reliability information was provided in the document where the TEEO was introduced. The instrument was not found during an Internet search of the Mental Measurements Yearbook (MMY) and Test Review Online at *Buros.org* website. The MMY and Test Review Online is a database that provides a comprehensive review of tests and survey instruments available to researcher.

The TEEQ was adapted with permission. The definition of teacher evaluation was modified in the original questionnaire to address online adjunct faculty evaluation (see Appendix I). Four faculty members served as a panel of experts to review the adapted survey for content validity. Feedback provided by the group determined that content

validity was present for the survey. The panel determined that the extent of the relationship could be generalized from what the questionnaire is meant to represent. The panel also concluded that content validity is present for the overall topic of teacher evaluations. The adapted version contains directions, definitions, and specific terms with response options that are easy to understand, and represents the areas of interest (D. Clark, personal communication, March 6, 2015).

Data Collection and Analysis

I contacted the appropriate person(s) (University Administrator) by email to explain the study and request permission for seeking volunteers for participation in the survey. I also requested confirmation or letter of commitment from the institution to participate in the study (see Appendix J) A letter introducing the researcher, confirming the name of the researcher's institution and providing an explanation of the purpose of the study was sent by email to each participant (see Appendix K). The letter served as the informed consent and also included a statement of the voluntary nature of the study, the right of refusal to participate at any time during the study without penalty, a statement of confidentiality and anonymity, and the researcher's contact information. The letter of informed consent communicated the benefits and purpose of the study and how the results of the study will be reported. The letter of informed consent also communicated that the participant's completion of the survey would indicate their consent to participate in the survey. The letter of informed consent also included instructions for completing the survey and informed of the time frame for submitting the completed survey.

The Institutional Review Board at Walden University approved (IRB 01-08015-014834) the study. Approval from each community partner was received by email (see Appendices M, N, and O) before collecting data for this research study. The survey instrument was available on SurveyMonkey®, an online survey tool.

The survey link was included in the informed consent emailed to the participants at their institutions. This process allowed the participants the convenience of accessing the survey through the Internet in a reliable, convenient and private manner. The survey was available to the participants for a five-week period. The plan was to close the survey after a target response rate of 84 was achieved or at the end of five weeks. At the end of five weeks, the target response rate was not met. Reminder emails were disseminated with the assistance of the community partners, and the survey availability was extended for another two-week period. The reminder emails and extended survey period did not yield any more responses, and the survey was closed at the end of the two-week extension period.

As stated previously, I received responses from two universities to participate in the study. However, the key to moving forward with my community partners was dependent on my community partners' IRB approval and university administrator approval. While waiting for the completion of my community partners' approval process, I submitted a request to post to University 3's Participation Pool website. A description of the study, the approved informed consent and invitation to participate was posted to their website upon IRB approval ($N = 2$ responses). University 1 responded with IRB approval and university administrator approval to participate and agreed to disseminate

the email invitation by email broadcast to their online adjunct faculty. University 1 did not report the number of invitations disseminated by email. A follow-up email (see Appendix P) was sent to University 1 with no response received. University 2 considered my request at this time and responded with IRB approval and university administrator approval to participate in the study. University 2 provided a list of email contacts of 75% of the total faculty available to participate ($N = 389$). Most responses for non-participation from University 2 indicated ineligibility of inclusion criteria of one-year experience as online adjunct faculty and experience of having received a formal evaluation as online adjunct faculty. In other words, it was indicated that the majority of online adjunct asked to participate either had less than one-year experience as online adjunct faculty or met the one-year experience criteria, but did not meet the formal evaluation experience criteria. Completed surveys were numbered and coded to help de-identify data and to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of each participant.

The purpose of this study was to collect and analyze data to determine the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty. This study was also conducted to determine the association between online adjunct faculty's perceptions about the quality and efficacy of formal evaluative processes and their willingness to seek professional development opportunities. I used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Statistical Software Package to analyze the data for this study. Means and standard deviations were computed for continuous and Likert scale survey items. Frequencies and percentages were computed for the categorical demographic items.

Research Question 1 was: What is the relationship between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations? A Spearman correlation analysis was conducted to address this question. A Spearman correlation analysis is appropriate when the goal of the research is to examine the relationship between two variables that are measured on an ordinal scale (Creswell, 2008). In this analysis, the variables being correlated were the Likert responses to the questions for the overall quality of the evaluation and the impact on teaching behaviors.

Research Question 2 was: What is the relationship between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations? A Spearman correlation analysis was conducted to address this question. In this analysis, the variables being correlated were the Likert responses to the questions for the overall quality of the evaluation and understanding of professional development.

Assumptions

I assumed that the respondents would provide honest responses to the survey questions that would be reflective of their perceptions at the time. It was also assumed that participants' responses would not be influenced by the length of time since their most recent evaluation. Additionally, I also assumed that differences in career trajectory (e.g., new teachers versus teachers nearing retirement) would not influence the responses. Further assumptions acknowledged that the participants were familiar with formal evaluation practices and would, therefore, provide meaningful data for the study.

Limitations

This study was limited to the perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs of formal evaluations on the teaching practices of the online adjunct faculty. The study was also limited to a specific population of online adjunct faculty employed at three online institutions in the United States. The number of responses to the survey also limited this study. Non-response to the main survey is reported as a limitation to the study by a low response rate. I also acknowledge the potential for bias as an adjunct faculty member with no formal evaluation experience. Formal evaluation processes vary greatly from one university to another (Hallinger, Heck, & Murphy, 2014). I did not compare or control for any variations in the evaluation processes between the participating universities, and this limitation is also acknowledged.

Scope

The study was limited to the perceptions of online adjunct faculty who worked for two universities in the Mideastern U.S.A. region. The variables focused on the participants' attitudes about the effectiveness and quality of formal evaluation processes. The scope of the survey also focused on the relationship between formal evaluations and teaching practices of online adjunct faculty and professional development opportunities sought by online adjunct faculty.

Delimitations

I delimited this study to online adjunct faculty who had experienced formal evaluation by their employing institutions in their adjunct faculty roles. I looked for the relationship between formal evaluations and faculty's perceptions about how the

evaluation influenced teaching practices and strategies. The results of this study will not be compared with other forms of evaluative processes. The results of this study may not be generalized to a larger population of adjunct faculty or full-time faculty in a traditional classroom of higher education.

Protection of Participants' Rights

Participants volunteered for this study. There was no force or coercion in any way to enact participation in this study. I completed the training for the protection of human participants in research and ethics in research before obtaining IRB approval from my institution of study and before obtaining IRB approval and completing requirements from each community partner.

Recruitment of participants was conducted through a private server by an Email broadcast that was coordinated by the community partners. This process allowed for the anonymity of the email recipient for potential participation in the study. Informed consent was presented in the email that included a description of the study, how the results of the study would be reported, and the assurance of participant anonymity. The voluntary nature of the study was also explained, including the assurance that any participant could withdraw from the study at any time during the study without any repercussions or harm.

Data Analysis Results

Demographic Data

A total of 46 participants returned the survey. Demographic data obtained included the number of years of experience for online teaching at their current institution,

years of online teaching of current content, the usefulness of their evaluation experience, the number and type of evaluation experiences, and the title of the person(s) completing the evaluation. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics of the study participants.

Less than 5% (n = 2) taught online for one year, and the largest proportion taught for 6 to 10 years (n = 14, 30.4%). The largest proportion of participants had 6 to 10 years of experience teaching their current content. When asked about the usefulness of their evaluation, the largest proportion of participants indicated that the evaluation was helpful (n = 15, 32.6%). Nearly 40% of the participants (n = 18) indicated that they had zero formal and informal observations each year. The most commonly reported length of the formal observations was a few minutes (n = 13, 28.3%). Finally, half of the participants (n = 23) reported that only their supervisor was present during observations.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages for Demographic Variables

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Teaching experience at current grade		
1 year	2	4.3
2 to 3 years	11	23.9
4 to 5 years	8	17.4
6 to 10 years	14	30.4
11 or more years	8	17.4
Missing	3	6.5
Teaching experience with current content		
1 year	3	6.5
2 to 3 years	8	17.4
4 to 5 years	7	15.2
6 to 10 years	17	37.0
11 or more years	11	23.9

(*table continues*)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Usefulness of evaluation experience	8	17.4
Waste of time		
A little helpful	5	10.9
Somewhat helpful	9	19.6
Mostly helpful	8	17.4
Helpful	15	32.6
Missing	1	2.2
Formal observations per year		
0	18	39.1
1	13	28.3
2	9	19.6
3	1	2.2
4 or more	5	10.9
Informal observations		
None	18	39.1
Less than one per month	13	28.3
Once per month	7	15.2
Once per week	7	15.2
Missing	1	2.2
Average length of formal observation		
Brief (few minutes)	13	28.3
A little more than a few minutes	7	15.2
More than a few minutes	10	21.7
Much more than a few minutes	6	13.0
Extended (40 minutes or more)	3	6.5
Missing	7	15.2
Number of different people observing and evaluating		
Supervisor only	23	50.0
Supervisor & 1 other person	10	21.7
Supervisor & 2 other people	2	4.3
Supervisor & 3 or more people	3	6.5
Other	4	8.7
Missing	4	8.7

Online adjunct faculty with more than five years of experience teaching online considered their formal evaluation experience helpful. Additionally, while a large proportion of the respondents had years of experience teaching their content, a large proportion reported that they did not experience yearly evaluations. For the most part, formal evaluations were brief for those that experienced formal evaluations conducted only by supervisors.

Survey Responses

The Likert scale questions were grouped into three categories. The response range for survey questions 1-5 was organized in a 10-point scale to a 5-point scale for ease of the data analysis, the dissemination of the data, and for the consistency of reporting the data. Survey questions 1-5 asked participants about the overall quality of evaluation, impact on attitudes, impact on teaching behaviors, impact on the understanding of the teaching-learning process, and impact on the understanding of professional development. Descriptive statistics for these questions are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages for Questions 1 – 5

	Frequency (%)					
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	Missing
Overall quality of evaluation	5 (10.9)	5 (10.9)	10 (21.7)	14 (30.4)	11 (23.9)	1 (2.2)
Impact on attitudes	6 (13)	6 (13)	8 (17.4)	11 (23.9)	15 (32.6)	0 (0.0)
Impact on understanding of teaching-learning process	6 (13)	9 (19.6)	7 (15.2)	13 (28.3)	11 (23.9)	0 (0.0)
Impact on understanding of professional development	4 (8.7)	4 (8.7)	8 (17.4)	12 (26.1)	17 (37)	1 (2.2)

For overall quality of evaluation, the largest proportion of participants (30.4%) answered 4, which indicated "very good" quality. For each of the questions assessing impact on attitudes, impact on teaching behaviors, impact on the understanding of the teaching-learning process, and impact on the understanding of professional development, the largest proportion of participants answered either 4 or 5, indicating a "significant impact" or "strong impact."

Table 3 presents the frequencies and percentages for the specific survey items that addressed the quality of the formal evaluation (Questions 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 30, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59). Each question

was answered on a 5-point scale from A to E with A representing the lowest response on the scale and E representing the highest response on the scale.

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Quality of Formal Evaluation Questions

	Frequency (%)					
Question	A	B	C	D	E	Missing
19	Credibility as a source feedback					
	3 (6.5)	5 (10.9)	12 (26.1)	11 (23.9)	15 (32.6)	0 (0.0)
20	Working relationship with you					
	2 (4.3)	3 (6.5)	12 (26.1)	9 (19.6)	19 (41.3)	1 (2.2)
21	Level of trust					
	3 (6.5)	2 (4.3)	9 (19.6)	10 (21.7)	22 (47.8)	0 (0.0)
22	Interpersonal manner					
	1 (2.2)	4 (8.7)	13 (28.3)	9 (19.6)	18 (39.1)	1 (2.2)
23	Temperament					
	1 (2.2)	5 (10.9)	11 (23.9)	9 (19.6)	20 (43.5)	0 (0.0)
24	Flexibility					
	4 (8.7)	2 (4.3)	15 (32.6)	9 (19.6)	16 (34.8)	0 (0.0)
25	Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching					
	2 (4.3)	4 (8.7)	7 (15.2)	10 (21.7)	22 (47.8)	1 (2.2)
26	Capacity to demonstrate or model needed improvements					
	7 (15.2)	4 (8.7)	10 (21.7)	11 (23.9)	14 (30.4)	0 (0.0)
27	Familiarity with your particular classrooms					
	3 (6.5)	5 (10.9)	7 (15.2)	13 (28.3)	17 (37.0)	1 (2.2)
28	Experience in classrooms in general					
	2 (4.3)	2 (4.3)	11 (23.9)	12 (26.1)	19 (41.3)	0 (0.0)
29	Usefulness or suggestions for improvement					
	3 (6.5)	9 (19.6)	9 (19.6)	9 (19.6)	16 (34.8)	0 (0.0)
30	Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions					
	3 (6.5)	9 (19.6)	8 (17.4)	15 (32.6)	11 (23.9)	0 (0.0)
43	Amount of information received					
	4 (8.7)	6 (13.0)	16 (34.8)	11 (23.9)	9 (19.6)	0 (0.0)
44	Frequency of feedback					
	14 (30.4)	10 (21.7)	9 (19.6)	7 (15.2)	5 (10.9)	1 (2.2)

(table continues)

Question	Frequency (%)					
	A	B	C	D	E	Missing
45	Formality of feedback					
	9 (19.6)	1 (2.2)	14 (30.4)	14 (30.4)	8 (17.4)	0 (0.0)
46	Depth of information provided					
	9 (19.6)	8 (17.4)	9 (19.6)	11 (23.9)	8 (17.4)	1 (2.2)
47	Quality of the ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback					
	11 (23.9)	3 (6.5)	15 (32.6)	9 (19.6)	8 (17.4)	0 (0.0)
48	Specificity of information provided					
	8 (17.4)	10 (21.7)	8 (17.4)	9 (19.6)	9 (19.6)	2 (4.3)
49	Nature of information provided					
	4 (8.7)	5 (10.9)	13 (28.3)	15 (32.6)	9 (19.6)	0 (0.0)
50	Timing of the feedback					
	7 (15.2)	7 (15.2)	11 (23.9)	12 (26.1)	9 (19.6)	0 (0.0)
51	Feedback focused on district teaching standards					
	9 (19.6)	4 (8.7)	12 (26.1)	9 (19.6)	9 (19.6)	3 (6.5)
52	Amount of time spent on the evaluation process					
	4 (8.7)	10 (21.7)	16 (34.8)	13 (28.3)	3 (6.5)	0 (0.0)
55	Clarity of policy statements regarding purpose for evaluation					
	10 (21.7)	2 (4.3)	12 (26.1)	12 (26.1)	10 (21.7)	0 (0.0)
56	Intended role of evaluation					
	4 (8.7)	3 (6.5)	10 (21.7)	11 (23.9)	11 (23.9)	7 (15.2)
57	Recent history of labor relations in district					
	6 (13.0)	4 (8.7)	5 (10.9)	16 (34.8)	13 (28.3)	2 (4.3)
58	Impact of bargaining agreement on evaluation process					
	29 (63.0)	3 (6.5)	2 (4.3)	5 (10.9)	1 (2.2)	6 (13.0)
59	Impact of state law on evaluation process					
	26 (56.5)	2 (4.3)	6 (13.0)	6 (13.0)	3 (6.5)	3 (6.5)

For the questions pertaining to credibility, working relationship, level of trust, interpersonal manner, temperament, flexibility, knowledge of technical aspect of teaching, capacity to demonstrate or model needed improvements, familiarity with your particular classroom, experience in classrooms in general, and usefulness, the largest proportion of participants selected E, which was the most positive possible response. For

the questions pertaining to persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions, depth of information provided, nature of information provided, timing of the feedback, and recent history of labor relations in the district, the largest proportion of participants selected D indicating a "mostly" positive response. For the questions pertaining to frequency of feedback, impact of bargaining agreement on evaluation process, and impact of state law on evaluation process, the largest proportion of participants selected A, which was the most negative response.

Table 4 presents the frequencies and percentages for the survey items about the perceptions of teaching practices (Questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 19, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15). Each question was answered on a 5-point scale from A to E with A representing the lowest response on the scale and E representing the highest response on the scale.

Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages for Teaching Practices Questions

	Frequency (%)					
Question	A	B	C	D	E	Missing
6			Overall competence as a teacher			
	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.2)	25 (54.3)	20 (43.5)	0 (0.0)
7			Strength of professional self-expectations			
	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	11 (23.9)	35 (76.1)	0 (0.0)
8			Orientation to risk taking			
	1 (2.2)	4 (8.7)	13 (28.3)	15 (32.6)	13 (28.3)	0 (0.0)
9			Orientation to others			
	2 (4.3)	4 (8.7)	11 (23.9)	13 (28.3)	16 (34.8)	0 (0.0)
10			Attribution of reasons for success/failure			
	0 (0.0)	1 (2.2)	3 (6.5)	17 (37.0)	25 (54.3)	0 (0.0)
11			Orientation to change			
	0 (0.0)	1 (2.2)	4 (8.7)	12 (26.1)	28 (60.9)	1 (2.2)
12			Orientation to experimentation in classroom			
	0 (0.0)	1 (2.2)	8 (17.4)	20 (43.5)	17 (37.0)	0 (0.0)
13			Openness to criticism			
	1 (2.2)	2 (4.3)	10 (21.7)	16 (34.8)	17 (37.0)	0 (0.0)
14			Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching			
	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (10.9)	22 (47.8)	19 (41.3)	0 (0.0)
			Knowledge of subject matter			
15	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	12 (26.1)	31 (67.4)	3 (6.5)

For overall competence as a teacher, the largest proportion of participants (54.3%) answered D, which indicated "very competent." For strength of professional self-expectations, the largest proportion of participants (76.1%) answered E, which indicated, "I demand a great deal." For orientation to risk taking, the largest proportion of participants (32.6%) answered D, which indicated, "I mostly take risks." For orientation to others, the largest proportion of participants (34.8%) indicated they were "open" to others. For attribution of reasons for success or failure, the largest participants (54.3%)

answered E which indicated "I hold myself responsible." For orientation to change, the largest proportion of participants (60.9%) answered E which indicated they were "relatively flexible" to change. For orientation to experimentation the largest proportion of participants (43.5%) answered D, which indicated, "I experiment sometimes". For openness to criticism, the largest proportion of participants (37.0%) answered E, which indicated, "relatively open." For knowledge of technical aspects of teaching, the largest proportion of participants (47.8%) answered D, which indicated, "I know a lot". For knowledge of subject matter, the largest proportion of participants (67.4%) answered E, which indicated, "I know a great deal."

The perception of professional development was addressed in survey items 53 and 54. Participants coded the perception of their understanding of professional development by reflecting on the allotted time and available training programs and models. Each question was answered on a 5-point scale from A to E with A representing the lowest response on the scale and E representing the highest response on the scale.

Table 5 presents the frequencies and percentages on the perceptions of professional development.

Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages for Professional Development Questions

	Frequency (%)					
Question	A	B	C	D	E	Missing
53	Time allotted during the day for professional development					
	16 (34.8)	9 (19.6)	11 (23.9)	8 (17.4)	1 (2.2)	1 (2.2)
54	Available training programs and models					
	4 (8.7)	7 (15.2)	12 (26.1)	10 (21.7)	11 (23.9)	2 (4.3)

For time allotted during the day, the largest proportion of participants (34.8%) selected A which indicated "none" or no time. For available training programs and models, the largest proportion of participants (26.1%) selected C, which indicated "little" time.

Analysis of Research Questions

Research question 1 is: What is the association between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations? A Spearman correlation analysis was conducted to address this question. Data from 46 participants were employed for this analysis. In this analysis, the variables being correlated were the Likert responses to the questions for the overall quality of the evaluation and teaching practices. The correlation between the perceived overall quality of the supervisor evaluation and the perceived impact on teaching behaviors was significant ($\rho = .37$, $p = .014$), indicating that there was a positive association between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations. According to Cohen (1988), a correlation coefficient of .37 represents a moderate effect size. This effect size is larger than that used for the *a priori* power analysis (0.30) with the result that there was sufficient power for statistical significance to occur despite the smaller than targeted response. The coefficient of determination ($r^2 \; x \; 100\%$) represents the proportion of variance shared between the variables (Field, 2013). The coefficient of determination for this analysis was .14%, which can be interpreted to mean that 14% of the variance in perceptions of changes in teaching practice and teaching strategies was associated with the teachers' perceptions of

the quality of supervisor evaluations. While the null hypothesis is rejected, the statistically significant association between the variables was relatively small.

Research question 2 is: What is the association between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations? A Spearman correlation analysis was conducted to address this question. Data from 46 participants were available for this analysis. In this analysis, the variables being correlated were the Likert responses to the questions for the overall quality of the evaluation and understanding of professional development. The correlation between overall quality of the evaluation and the perceived impact on professional development was significant (ρ = .39, p = .009), indicating that there was a positive association between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations. According to Cohen (1988), a correlation coefficient of .39 represents a moderate effect size. This effect size is larger than that used for the *a priori* power analysis (0.30) with the result that there was sufficient power for statistical significance to occur despite the smaller than targeted response.

The coefficient of determination ($r^2 \ x \ 100\%$) represents the proportion of variance shared between the variables (Field, 2013). The coefficient of determination for this analysis was .15, which can be interpreted to mean that 15% of the variance in professional development is associated with the perception of the quality of evaluations.

This result demonstrates that while statistical significance between the variables exists, the extent of the association between the variables is relatively small.

Summary

Increased enrollment at online universities has resulted in an increase in the hiring of online adjunct faculty (Tipple, 2010). The challenge of maintaining effective classroom instruction requires a process for evaluating teaching practices and providing professional development for online adjunct faculty. The effectiveness of evaluative processes and how these processes relate to teaching practices and professional development is integral to the success of online programs. The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between formal evaluations of the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty and their inclination for seeking professional development.

The concept of formative and summative evaluation processes as standard measures of teacher evaluations informed this study for identifying the association between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and their perception of the quality of formal evaluations. The study further examined online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and their perception of the quality of formal evaluations.

Four universities identified from a stratified sample of online universities in the Mideastern region of the United States were invited to participate in the survey. Three universities agreed to participate in the survey. Email invitations and informed consent were disseminated by an email blast to online adjunct faculty. Forty-six participants completed the survey. A correlational survey approach was undertaken to determine the

relationship between the independent variable online adjunct faculty's perceptions of formal evaluation and the dependent variables changes in online adjunct faculty's teaching practices and online adjunct faculty's interest in seeking and taking advantage of opportunities for professional development. Spearman correlations were conducted to address the research questions. The results of the analysis indicated that there was a significant positive association between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations (Research Question 1). Additionally, there was also a significant positive association between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations (Research Question 2).

Findings from this study align with the literature review of evaluative processes of online adjunct faculty previously mentioned. Studies by Suskie (2009), Langen (2011), and Kizlik (2012) concluded that the quality evaluative processes are effective tools for informing administrators of effective teaching practices. Eskey and Roehrich (2013) reported on the effectiveness of established formative and summative online evaluation tools as integral for measuring online teaching and providing support for online adjunct faculty to ensure quality education for online students.

Section 3: The Project

Introduction

In this section, I will explain my proposed project stemming from my research, which involved the association between formal evaluations and online adjunct faculty. First, I describe the project and goals to provide the rationale for the project. Next, I provide the review of the literature regarding the development of online teacher evaluation systems that gauge effective teaching practices and professional development. The basis of this project also stems from the theoretical framework of adult learning theory and formative and summative evaluation theory. These concepts are necessary for the proposal of implementing formal evaluation processes for online adjunct faculty. Finally, I explain the implementation and project evaluation processes and conclude with ideas regarding how my project can affect social change.

Description and Goals

The proposed project is a white paper addressed to the administration and faculty of several Mideastern universities with online programs. The white paper will explain the results of my study and present options for implementing an evaluation process for online adjunct faculty that supports effective teaching practices and influences their professional development. The project addresses the problem as identified in Section 1 by providing essential information for developing and implementing a process that addresses the concerns and needs of adjunct faculty regarding the role of online adjunct faculty, the preparation of online adjunct faculty for effective teaching, and the evaluation of online adjunct faculty. The project will assist administrators and online adjunct faculty with

developing tools that reflect the expectations of organizational goals and objectives that align with the mission and vision of their institution.

Rationale

The research findings indicate that online adjunct faculty favor evaluative processes that reflect an emphasis on teaching practices and also support their professional development. The data analysis completed in Section 2 indicates a significant positive association between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations. There was also a significant positive association between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and their perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations. The project provides information that can be reflective of expectations and activities that support effective strategies for successful student outcomes. The project also provides in-depth solutions to the problem by offering a mechanism for the tracking and record keeping of effective teaching strategies and professional development activities of online adjunct faculty members.

A white paper project is appropriate for this study. Other projects such as the development of a curriculum plan or professional development/training curriculum would not address the specific dynamics of effective evaluative processes for online adjunct faculty members. A white paper provides the opportunity for administrators and faculty members to incorporate formal evaluations as a standard for gauging the teaching practices and professional development of the online adjunct faculty.

Prior to developing the project, I reviewed scholarly literature that supports the development of a white paper. The literature review focuses on adult learning and evaluation systems and the association of these concepts with teaching practices and professional development. The literature review also focuses on evaluation tools for online adjunct faculty and strategies for developing evaluation tools that support effective teaching practices and their professional development.

Review of the Literature

The review of literature for the project focused on adult learning theory, evaluation systems, and how these topics are associated with teaching practices and the professional development of online adjunct faculty. I conducted my research using Questia Library, Google Scholar, UMI Dissertations, ProQuest Central, ERIC, Education Research Complete, The Department of Education, Education: a SAGE full-text database, Academia.edu, Teacher Reference Center, SocINDEX, Academic Search Complete/Premier, Expanded Academic ASAP, Amazon.com, and SAGE Research Methods Online. Keywords and search terms used for this literature review included: *Applying adult learning theory to online teaching*, *adult learning and online adjunct faculty*, *online adjunct faculty evaluation model*, *formative evaluation and professional development*, *administrators and online adjunct faculty evaluation*, *online adjunct faculty*, *evaluation of online adjunct faculty*, *evaluation tools for online adjunct faculty*, *professional development of online adjunct faculty*, *impact of online adjunct faculty evaluation*, *classroom observation of online adjunct faculty*, *effective teaching strategies of online adjunct faculty and student outcomes in online classrooms*, *teacher evaluation*

and professional development, *teacher evaluation and teaching practice*, *white paper*, *white paper format*, and *writing a white paper*.

My analysis of the data used in this study indicated a positive association between formal evaluations and teaching practices of online adjunct faculty. Further, the analysis revealed a positive correlation between online adjunct faculty's perception of the quality of formal evaluations and teaching practices and the willingness of online adjunct faculty to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities. The criteria from the study indicate a need for formal evaluations to emphasize and recognize effective teaching strategies and professional development. These findings led to the development of a project that introduces strategies for the implementation of an effective evaluative process for online adjunct faculty. The basis of the project is for administrators to consider the significance of the association between formal evaluations and the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty and their tendency to seek and take advantage of opportunities for professional development.

Adult Learning and Professional Development

Knowles' theory of adult learning informed the framework for this project. Knowles's principles of adult learning (andragogy and self-directed learning) have been a discussion of relevance for adult education for many years. Knowles (1970) proposed that adults learn differently from children and the terms andragogy and self-directed learning should apply to an adult's way of learning instead of the term pedagogy as applied to educating children and teaching in general. Knowles further argued that adults should be taught differently than children since the learning process for adults is different

from children with the main difference being that adults have more life experiences and pre-established beliefs than children have.

Since the introduction of andragogy and self-directed learning in the early 1970s, adult learning theory has been closely tied to professional development (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2015). According to Knowles et al. (2015) "andragogy is a set of core adult learning principles that apply to all adult learning situations" (p. 3). The six core adult learning principles are: (a) self-concept of the learner; adult learners are independent self-directed learners, (b) prior experience of the learner; adult learners bring the resource of experience to the learning environment (c) readiness to learn; adults come to the learning environment when ready to learn something new, (d) orientation to learning; adult learners are problem-oriented and will seek learning to help in acquiring knowledge for applying to life situations, (e) motivation to learn; adults are motivated by internal factors such as increased self-esteem, self-actualization, or recognition, (f) learner's need to know; adults need to know the reason for learning something as the adult learner invests time, expense and energy in the learning process (Knowles et al., 2015).

The concept of self-directed learning also informed this project. An understanding of adults as self-directed learners has been important for the application of adult learning theory in practice. Self-directed learning involves a process in which adult learners initiate actions toward the realization of their learning goals and objectives (Knowles, 1975; Smith, 2002). Adult learners invoke self-directed learning by seeking resources and

incorporating strategies for learning, teaching, and evaluating outcomes (Knowles, 1975; Smith, 2002).

Adult learning principles are core tenets of teacher development (Gravani, 2012; Johnson, Wisniewski, Kuhlemeyer, Isaacs, & Kryzykowski, 2012; Meyer & Murrell, 2014). Professional development programs are designed for adult faculty who teach other adults. Thus, professional development of adult faculty should be viewed from the perspective of adult learning theory (McQuiggan, 2012). Professional development for faculty is recognized as a significant component of successful online programs (Elliott, Rhoades, Jackson, & Mandernach, 2015). Recent literature addressed professional development through the lens of adult learning with an emphasis on the characteristics of adult learning and the six core principles of andragogy (Gravani, 2012: Todd, Ravi, Akoh, & Gray, 2015) as well as an emphasis on self-direction and reflection (Gravani, 2012).

Johnson et al. (2012) reported on the use of the principles of andragogy in a 3-day workshop designed to provide faculty development for online teaching. Activities at the workshop incorporated Knowles (1970) adult learning principles that involved faculty in course design, provided hands-on experience of technology and learning objectives, included topics of relevance and interest, and focused on problem-based learning. As a result of the training, faculty members reflected more on theories and principles of teaching and learning and were able to redesign their online courses to meet student needs (Johnson, et al., 2012). Gravani (2012) investigated the significance of applying adult learning principles in the design of learning activities for teacher development.

Results of the study revealed that adult learning theory is crucial to the design and implementation of faculty development programs. In a study on the use of theories in the development of faculty who teach in the online program, Meyer and Murrell (2014) reported that 69% of the 39 higher institutions surveyed used self-directed and adult learning theories to guide faculty development and that 59% used adult learning theory. Therefore, it stands to reason that processes used to evaluate the online adjunct faculty teacher performance and professional development of online adjunct faculty should follow an adult learning model that involves faculty participation in key areas of identifying progress and the need for development through self-direction, self-reflection, and action (Gravani, 2012).

Formal evaluations, both formative and summative, could also provide opportunities for professional growth and development (Silva & Thomsen, 2013) for online adjunct faculty. Formative evaluations conducted in an ongoing process during the course of instruction can inform the professional development of online adjunct faculty through processes that are self-directed and self-reflective, whereas summative evaluations at the end of a course can inform administrative and personnel decisions concerning course development and institutional practices (Afitska, 2014; Popham, 2013a). Educators continue to advocate for formative evaluative processes as commonplace initiatives for desirable teacher-learner outcomes in the form of self-assessment and peer-assessment review. (Afitska, 2014; Earl, 2013; Popham, 2013b).

As online adjunct faculty members are adults, it is vital to recognize adult learning principles when evaluating their performance and professional development. The

design and implementation of evaluation tools need to reflect a consideration of the principles of adult learning theory and formative evaluation concepts. The design and implementation of evaluation tools for online adjunct faculty should reflect the following: online adjunct faculty recognizes and understands the significance of formal evaluation, online adjunct faculty acknowledge the impact of their teaching practices on student outcomes, and online adjunct faculty members are self-directed learners who seek opportunities for professional development.

Teacher Evaluation, Teaching Practices and Professional Development

Professional literature was also explored to determine the link between formal evaluations, teaching practices, and professional development. Goe, Biggers and Croft (2012) developed a "research and policy brief" (p. 1) in support of efforts for using teacher evaluation processes to inform professional growth decisions and opportunities for teachers. The goal of the project was to improve the levels of teacher performance and learning outcomes (Goe et al., 2012). The policies were based on the belief that "evaluation for accountability and for improving performance can be part of the same system" (Goe et al., 2012, p. 2). The project outlined six components considered to be essential in evaluation processes that align teacher evaluation and professional development. The six components to incorporate in a teacher evaluation process that also support professional development effectively begin with high-quality standards for instruction. Evaluators should first establish standards for instruction and define the criteria for quality teaching to ensure an equitable and fair understanding of teacher expectations. Secondly, the evaluation system should include multiple standards-based

measures of teacher effectiveness. These measures can include classroom observations, student surveys and portfolios to provide a more complete picture of the instructor's strengths and weaknesses for better alignment with professional growth opportunities. Thirdly, the evaluator or observer should receive high-quality training on the standards, tools, and measures in the evaluation system to ensure familiarity and effectiveness with the evaluation process. Fourthly, trained individuals are needed to interpret results and make professional development recommendations to effectively direct and coordinate professional development goals and activities. The fifth component is high-quality professional growth opportunities for individuals and groups of teachers. The sixth component is high-quality standards for professional learning to ensure that professional development opportunities are beneficial and align with the standards of instruction.

> Goe et al. (2012) also reported the benefits of an aligned evaluation system include efficient use of resources; it provides a collaborative approach for teachers learning from each other; the system's transparency includes the teachers in every stage of development; aligned evaluation systems receive greater buy-in from teachers. When teachers understand that the key role of the evaluation system is to improve teaching and learning, they can take a role in their own development. (p. 22)

Evaluation systems are important for online adjunct faculty at institutions of higher learning. Survey results from this project study suggest that online adjunct faculty who place a high rating for the overall quality of their evaluation process also understand and appreciate its impact on teaching practices and professional development and their

willingness to seek professional development opportunities. Evaluation systems are integral for appraising teacher practice and providing teachers with the feedback they need for professional development (Kane & Staiger, 2012). Feedback provided from evaluation systems that intentionally focus on ensuring teacher quality and professional development is essential to the credibility of evaluation systems (Danielson, 2010). Approaches to teacher evaluation are more effective when teachers find the evaluation system to be engaging in self-reflection, and self-assessment, and that are meaningful, rigorous, valid and reliable for enhancing teacher practice and promoting professional development (Danielson, 2010).

Evaluation Systems

Online programs are increasing to meet the needs of adult learners. Administrators at online universities are hiring online adjunct faculty to meet the demands of increased enrollment. Administrators at online universities are also challenged with hiring online instructors that meet the academic standards and quality of practices for effective course instruction and positive student outcomes (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013; Schulte, 2009). Administrators at online universities also realize the challenge of developing evaluation processes that are effective for ensuring quality teaching and professional development of online adjunct faculty (DeCosta, Berquist, Holbeck & Greenberger, 2016).

Evaluations of teaching performance at colleges and universities take place in many ways (DeCosta et al., 2016). Researchers have explored the evaluation of faculty in traditional face-to-face settings for years. However, few studies examine online faculty

perceptions of evaluation processes (DeCosta et al., 2016) and even fewer studies were found that examined online adjunct faculty perceptions of evaluation processes. It is widely understood by administrators and faculty that evaluation tools should be utilized for traditional face-to-face teaching as well as for the online instruction of course curriculum, teacher performance and professional development. Online evaluation systems may be drawn from conventional evaluation systems even though it has been determined that online teaching requires a unique set of skills (Berk, 2013). Critical differences in online instruction versus traditional face-to-face instruction call for evaluation systems that examine the quality of online teaching (Berk, 2013).

Evaluation tools for online faculty are being developed as administrators and faculty realize that such processes are essential to course development, teaching practices, and professional development. Chickering and Gamson's (1987) "Seven Principles for Good Practice" (p. 3) is a framework that is still considered for guiding traditional face-to-face evaluations (Amrein-Beardsley, & Haladyna, 2012; Graham, Cagiltay, Byung-Ro, Craner & Duffy, 2001). Chickering and Gamson's (1987) first principle of good practice encourages contacts between students and faculty and stresses the significance of student faculty interaction as an important factor in student motivation. The second principle; develops reciprocity and cooperation among students; stresses the importance of encouraging teamwork amongst students to increase awareness and involvement in the learning process. The third principle; uses active learning techniques; focuses on active learning by engaging students in discussions, writing exercises, team projects and peer critiques. The fourth principle; gives prompt feedback;

stresses the importance of providing prompt feedback to the student to assure the student of learning progress and to help the student focus on learning and improving performance. The fifth principle; emphasizes task on time; focuses on effective time management of course delivery and encouraging effective time management strategies to students for studying and learning activities. The sixth principle; communicates high expectations; focuses on teachers' high self-expectations and encouraging students' high expectations of performance through preparation workshops of academic subjects, test taking skills, study skills, and time management. The seventh principle; respects diverse talents and ways of learning; stresses the importance of recognizing the diversity of talents and learning styles amongst college students by offering learning activities through individualized degree programs, life-career educational planned courses, or computer-based courses.

These seven principles also apply six "powerful forces in education" (Chickering & Gamson, 1987, p 3): activity, cooperation, diversity, expectations, interaction and responsibility (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). Evaluators at online universities have often utilized these seven principles to guide the development of evaluation systems for online adjunct faculty (Akram & Zepeda, 2015; Bangert, 2006; Schulte, 2009; Tobin, 2015). Many of these evaluation tools come in the form of peer reviews while others may take on the self-assessment model for examining effective teacher practice. At best the goal of most online evaluation systems is the design of a tool that meets the needs of the uniqueness of online teaching. The trend of a growing number of online universities is to design evaluation methods that engage online adjunct faculty in self-reflection and self-

directed goal setting for effective teaching practices and professional development (Eskey & Schulte, 2012; Goe et al., 2012).

An "Online Instructor Evaluation System (OIES)" (Mandernach, et al, 2005, "Overview of the OIES", para. 1) was implemented by Park University in 2004 for formative reviews and summative evaluation of online faculty for the purpose of inspiring reflection and growth and encouraging professional development of online faculty (Mandernach et al, 2005). The evaluation process provides objective quantity measures, notifications of insufficient policy compliance, as well as a process for faculty members to facilitate improvements based on best practices and institutional policy (Mandernach et al., 2005; Schulte, 2009). Evaluation systems develop over time as institutions of higher learning continue to incorporate policies and procedures for the improvement of online programs and teacher development that can result in successful learning outcomes.

Implementation

Implementation of the white paper will involve a meeting with the academic program director or dean of my community partner participants to determine who would best benefit from the white paper. Decisions would be made as a result of this meeting to decide the best way for disseminating the information. Existing support and needed resources would be available from faculty members and institutional data of existing programs. Ensuring inclusiveness of faculty members and staff affected by evaluation processes may help alleviate potential barriers to implementing the white paper.

Project Evaluation

Resources are provided in the white paper for administrators and faculty who seek solutions to the need for resolving issues related to formal evaluation and professional development of online adjunct faculty. Interest in the results of my research and feedback on my white paper will indicate the favorability of the proposal for developing an evaluation process. The implementation of an evaluation process for online adjunct faculty with the collection of data over a one-year period will determine the achievement of goals. Program administrators and faculty are also welcome to contact me as a resource. I look forward to a constructive feedback on the white paper and my research findings.

Implications Including Social Change

Local Community

Policies and procedures that govern curriculum development, tuition and fees, administrative duties and responsibilities, teacher qualifications, teacher performance and professional development are significant to the success of online university programs. Research has shown that policies and procedures influence the development of an effective evaluation process that promote effective teaching practices and professional development (Hopkins, 2016). Studies further support that effective teaching practices have a positive impact on student achievement (Rothstein, 2010; Stronge, Ward, & Grant, 2011). Learners at the local level can benefit from having online adjunct faculty members who are committed to effective teaching practices and professional growth that assures successful and satisfactory student outcomes. Instructors and administrators benefit from

this project by having a tool that allows for self-reflection, self-direction, information, and feedback.

Far-Reaching

The number of online programs and courses are increasing at institutions of higher education in the United States (Allen & Seaman, 2014). Online adjunct faculty members are integral to the success of quality education at universities and colleges that offer online programs. Adult learners have expectations that faculty members should have the attributes and qualifications for teaching online courses. Studies that address faculty success in online education recognize the goal of online course curriculum is to make sure that learning facilitates student achievements (Kranzow, 2013). The studies also acknowledge that online faculty need to be committed, competent and concerned about the success of their students (Portugal, 2015; Todd et al., 2015).

The white paper offers a plan for interjecting self-reflective and self-directed goals of online adjunct faculty in the overall evaluation process. The white paper informs administrators and evaluators about a process that will provide invaluable information for ensuring quality instruction and professional development. Evaluative processes are essential for documenting and gauging activities that ensure legislators, community partners, administrators, teachers and students of quality academic experiences that result in success.

Conclusion

The white paper was developed based on my research findings. My research indicated that online adjunct faculty considers the quality of formal evaluation process to

have a significant association with their teaching practices and professional development. Section 4 will include reflections and conclusions of this study. First, a review of the project's strengths, limitations, and recommendations for remediation will be introduced. This section also includes a discussion on scholarship, project development, leadership and change and a self –analysis. Finally, I will present a discussion on the implications for social change and application for future research.

Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions

Introduction

Online adjunct faculty take on a challenging responsibility shared by all educators: Teaching. Faculty development and instructional strategies are integral to education. However, the technical environment of computer-based instruction further impacts online teaching. As an adjunct faculty member, I recognize the need for continued professional development and the importance of formal evaluations. As I reflect on my own experiences, I realize the potential for continued growth and development. I also recognize the importance of ensuring the success of my students.

In this section, I provide a review of the process of completing this study. I enumerate the project strengths and recommendations for addressing limitations of the project. I also examine and provide reflections of what I learned about scholarship, project development, and evaluation, as well as leadership and change. Finally, I will present what I consider to be the project's potential impact on social change, as well as its implications, applications, and directions for future research.

Project Strengths

I addressed the challenge of providing effective evaluation processes for online adjunct faculty. The primary strength of this project lies in providing strategies for the development and implementation of an effective evaluation system for online adjunct faculty in higher education. Another strength of this project is highlighting the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices and professional development of online adjunct faculty. The importance of understanding how online

adjunct faculty members feel about evaluation experiences is key to developing effective processes that measure the quality of teaching performances and support and encourage professional development. Strategies that address the quality and effectiveness of online teaching are integral to ensuring the success of the teacher-learner experience (Ragan, 2009).

This white paper discusses strategies for providing a method for online adjunct faculty to reflect on their teaching practices and identify the effectiveness of their instructional strategies for success. DeCosta et al (2016) acknowledged the significance of engaging online faculty in the evaluation process. DeCosta et al further supported the reflections of online faculty as essential to the development of an effective evaluation system that recognizes teaching skills and supports professional development. The white paper highlights online adjunct faculty's concerns regarding formal evaluations.

A third strength of this project is the integrative nature of aligning evaluation methods based on the data derived from online adjunct faculty perceptions of formal evaluation practices. Additionally, the project is based on an evaluation system that incorporates a formative and summative framework. Teachers are responsive to evaluation systems that also include evaluations by the students. The student evaluation of teaching performance often provides significant indicators of effective teaching strategies (Boysen, 2015). Formative processes that include classroom observations and peer reviews are a part of the process that can identify and recognize effective teaching performance and professional development activities and offer suggestions for continuing development opportunities (Atkinson & Bolt, 2010). The literature found in my white

paper provides strategies for developing and implementing evaluation tools specifically designed for online faculty. This project serves as a starting point for administrators of online programs at institutions of higher learning who desire to engage online adjunct faculty in the process of formal evaluations.

Recommendations for Remediation of Limitations

The project has limitations that should be addressed. Acquiring qualified staff for online programs is challenging. As administrators continue the practice of hiring online adjunct faculty, they must also consider that these positions are filled on a part-time and often temporary basis. The increase in the number of courses taught by adjunct faculty versus full-time faculty has elicited debate regarding the effectiveness of courses taught by adjunct versus full-time faculty (Meuller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013; Rhoades, 2013). The economic impact on the budget at institutions of higher learning, the growth of online learning programs, and increased reliance on adjunct faculty place pressure on universities to meet increasing demands for highly qualified and skilled instructors (Meuller et al., 2013).

The satisfaction of adult learners is significant for the continued success of online programs. Meuller et al. (2013) acknowledged that student performance and satisfaction were at an advantage in course sections taught by full-time online faculty versus adjunct or part-time online faculty. Universities should review online adjunct faculty support systems and incentives to require excellence in instruction (Meuller et al., 2013). A remedy for the limitation of maintaining quality staff for online programs would be to offer extended contracts to part-time faculty members. Stable employment of online

adjunct faculty helps to maintain instructional quality for improved student outcomes (Magda, Poulin, & Clinefelter, 2015).

Scholarship

I started this journey with the expectation of increasing my awareness and knowledge of education as a profession. I entered the program as an adjunct faculty member in a nursing program. My understanding of theory in practice is well grounded in nursing theory. My intention for professional growth and development was to learn and grow in my knowledge of educational theory and the adult learning process. My understanding of scholarship has expanded to include the need for professional development as an educator to ensure my personal growth and effectiveness in the classroom.

During this process, I have gained an appreciation for teachers at every level. I understand the significance of scholarship as an important avenue for social justice, change, and civility. As a healthcare educator, adult educator, and adult learner, I realize my responsibility of applying my knowledge to encourage and develop others while at the same time remaining accountable for my continued growth and professional development.

The knowledge and experience I have gained through research, reviewing scholarly literature, data analysis, and project development have enhanced my practice and intellect. The project study was much more than a learning experience; it has also broadened my knowledge of what constitutes effective teaching practices and teacher professional development. As a university adjunct faculty member, I thought that I was

meeting university expectations as an instructor. New students would often request my course section as suggested by previously satisfied students. Administrators would ask me to teach semester to semester. Now, even as I continue this endeavor, the new administration at my university has implemented a self-assessment for full-time and adjunct faculty members. I look forward to reflecting on my teaching experience and documenting my achievements and goal setting to guide my professional development.

Scholarship is lifelong learning. It is a process that requires commitment and dedication to meeting the needs of an ever-changing society. I consider it a privilege and responsibility to motivate, encourage, and inspire others. As I learn, I teach, and as I teach, I learn. This is my motivation for scholarship.

Project Development and Evaluation

Project development and evaluation is a tedious process. The commitment required to developing a project seemed quite daunting and uncertain. Project development that involves research is even more of a tedious and arduous process. As I developed my skills as a researcher and project developer during this process, I learned that procrastination was not in my best interest. Developing projects involves a long-term consideration for ongoing and future works. At times, it seemed the more literature I reviewed, the more problems I identified related to my topic. I increasingly understood why researchers continue to address problems over and over as ideas and hypotheses emerge constantly. I have learned to appreciate the work of researchers and project developers as I reflected on the fact that life experiences are enriched by hard work and dedication to scholarly research.

Developing a project evaluation is a just as tedious task. Evaluations provide a resource for the effectiveness of instructional programs. The evaluation should take into consideration changes and improvements needed for the success of the project. An evaluation following implementation of a project is the beginning of the result of the project itself. An evaluation may indicate necessary changes or re-working certain aspects of the project that may hold a large measure of significance for the project developer and facilitator.

Leadership and Change

I have learned that leadership involves more than just being in charge of something or someone. Leadership involves releasing one's inhibitions and moving forward with confidence all the while acknowledging your service as a leader. Leadership involves service and understanding the community and its expectations. Leadership requires a level of self-motivation and self –development to affect change.

Leadership in education involves students, teachers, family members, community activists, and administrators. Leadership takes more than just offering guidance and direction; it takes a level of tenacity and innate skill. Leadership involves skills that establish visions and talents that encourage others to share in the vision. Leaders are active visionaries who provide information, and knowledge for bringing a vision to fruition. Leadership involves acting in times of crisis and the ability to resolve issues constructively for the benefit and interests of stakeholders affected by a change. Change can be difficult for anyone; especially in times of uncertainty. Change requires effective leadership. Leadership is needed to ensure that change in a process or program occurs

smoothly and with clarity in every situation. I have accepted my role in leadership and acknowledge my capacity to affect change and mentor others to develop as leaders.

Analysis of Self as Scholar

I learned that being a scholar requires commitment, perseverance, self-reliance, and support. I realized my commitment to self-motivation and learning during this endeavor. The commitment was very much realized once I decided to pursue my goal of a doctorate through online learning. At first, I was intrigued and nervous about online learning. The challenge of staying focused and overcoming my habit of procrastination was a definite struggle. At times it seemed that the more I planned my study, research, and writing, the more distracted I became by life experiences, world events and self – indulgence. Commitment became a conscious effort throughout this process.

I also had to develop a strong sense of perseverance through times of hardships, loss, and grief. While suffering some of the most painstaking experiences imaginable, I found strength in my faith to move forward and remain persistent. I learned that I had to keep going and persevere in spite of life's uncertainties, discouragement, disappointments, and obstacles.

As a scholar, I also see myself as self-reliant. There were times that I felt lonely and uncertain. Self-reflection and self-motivation enhanced my determination to succeed. I also realized in spite of self, that not only did I need support; but that I had support all around me. As a scholar, I know that overcoming loneliness and uncertainty is reliant on support from family, friends, colleagues, and my professors and committee members at Walden University. As I reflect on this journey, I am astounded by how much I have

learned about academia, research, and teaching. I had no prior experience in writing a thesis for my Master's degree or completing a research study beyond the experience of a required research course in a baccalaureate program. I look forward to continued learning and professional development as an educator. I also look forward to sharing my experiences and encouraging my students and others toward achieving their goals.

Analysis of Self as Practitioner

As an educator, I have affirmed my passion for life-long learning. I am accustomed to continuing education as a health care provider. I am experienced in educating individual clients and the community on preventative health care and health practices. The process of assessment, planning, implementing and evaluation is my daily practice as a health care provider. The concept of developing my role as a practitioner in education is life changing for me. I view my role in education as an extension of my current profession.

I have a new sense of purpose and privilege for learning and teaching as an educator. I have learned to work collaboratively with other faculty members, department chairpersons, and administrators for the common goal of ensuring that our students achieve success. There is a strong sense of satisfaction and pride in sharing knowledge and seeing the excitement and eagerness in your student's accomplishments. There are also times when I have to be patient and understanding of my students' concerns and a need for that extra time and attention it may take for them to succeed. As an educator, I realize my responsibility to remain current on effective strategies and methods that ensure successful outcomes.

Analysis of Self as Project Developer

Taking on the task of project developer was the most challenging during this process. When I began this program, I had the option of doing a dissertation for a research study or doing a project study. I chose to do a project study for the challenge of learning a new process. During my research, I was able to understand the time consuming and meticulous task of process development and program development in education. My concern during this process was wondering if I would capture the essence of my research findings in the proposed project.

The Project's Potential Impact on Social Change

The project's potential impact on social change is incumbent upon an effective process for evaluating online adjunct teacher performance and monitoring professional development of online adjunct faculty members. Education plays an important role in society. We live in a world that is constantly developing and changing in science and technology (Kelemen, 2015). Institutions of higher learning impact the expectations of continuous education in a progressive society. As indicated throughout this study, online education is growing exponentially and the increased reliance on online adjunct faculty is interrelated to meeting the demands of teaching online courses (Meuller et al., 2013). Institutions of higher learning have a responsibility for ensuring quality curricula and quality instruction. Processes for evaluating online adjunct faculty and supporting professional development are an integral part of successful programs. As indicated by the findings of this study, online adjunct faculty consider the quality of evaluation processes as a significant factor having a positive association on their teaching practices and

professional development. Engaging online adjunct faculty in an evaluative process that recognizes effective teaching strategies and supports professional development will enhance online programs for ensuring continued success locally, nationally and globally.

Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research

Online adjunct faculty members are integral to the success of online programs at institutions of higher learning. Administrators of online colleges and universities are faced with the dilemma of developing an evaluative process for assessing teaching performance and supporting the professional development of online adjunct faculty (Benton & Li, 2015). Online adjunct faculty members view evaluative processes as important and necessary. Online adjunct faculty realizes the importance of engaging in effective teaching strategies and professional development.

My project could serve as a basis for developing evaluation tools at various schools looking to support effective teaching practices and professional development of online adjunct faculty. As online programs are faced with other challenges such as budgetary concerns and staffing concerns, my project could also assist with identifying the measures that work and do not work for process improvement. As an integrative portion of the evaluation process, my project provides an opportunity for collaborative teamwork. Online adjunct faculty members and evaluators can work together to identify effective teaching performance, successful outcomes, document professional development and support further professional development opportunities.

This study focused on the relationship between formal evaluations and the teaching practices and professional development of online adjunct faculty. Further

research could determine if professional development programs meet the needs of online adjunct faculty and their preference(s) for engaging in professional development programs. Further study could also determine incentives and motivations that impact the retention rate of the online adjunct faculty.

Conclusion

This project study focused on the experiences of online adjunct faculty that informed their perspectives on the quality of formal evaluations. Findings in the research provided evidence that online adjunct faculty consider an evaluation process of high quality as a positive association to their teaching practices and understanding and willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities. A white paper was created as a result of the findings of the research and after further review of the literature. Online adjunct faculty members are a part of a collaborative academic team. As team members, online adjunct faculty share the common goal of satisfying stakeholders at institutions of higher learning for the sake of social change, academic development and successful outcomes.

References

Abdous, M. (2011). A process-oriented framework for acquiring online teaching competencies. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 23*(1), 60-77. Retrieved from https://search-proquest.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Afitska, O. (2014). Use of formative assessment, self- and peer-assessment in the classrooms: Some insights from recent language testing and assessment (LTA) research. *I-Manager's Journal of English Language Teaching, 4*(1), 29-39. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1068442.pdf

Akram, M., & Zepeda, S. J. (2015). Development and validation of a teacher self-assessment instrument. *Journal of Research and Reflections in Education, 9*(2), 134-148. Retrieved from http://www.ue.edu.pk/jrre

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2005). Growing by degrees: Online education in the United States. *The Sloan Consortium.* Retrieved from http:/www.sloan-c.org/publications/growing_by_degrees_southern_1.pdf

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2014). Grade level: Tracking online education in the United States. *The Sloan Consortium*. Retrieved from https://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/gradelevel.pdf

American Federation of Teachers (2009). Academic staffing crisis. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/issues/higher_ed/acadstaffing.cfm

American Federation of Teachers (2010). A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty. *American Academic, 2,* 3-15. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/pdfs/highered/aa_partimefaculty0310.pdf

Amrein-Beardsley, A., & Haladyna, T. (2012). Validating a theory-based survey to evaluate teaching effectiveness in higher education. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 23*(1)*,* 17-42. Retrieved from http://libproxy.unh.edu

Arreola, R. A. (2006). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A guide to developing, building, and operating large-scale faculty evaluation systems* (3rd ed.)*.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Atkinson, D. J., & Bolt, S. (2010). Using teaching observations to reflect upon and improve teaching practice in higher education. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10*(3), 1-19. Retrieved from www.iupui.edu~josotl

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bangert, A. W. (2006). The development of an instrument for assessing online teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 35*(3), 227-244. Retrieved from eds.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Baran, E., Correia, A. P., & Thompson, A. (2011). Transforming online teaching practice: Critical analysis of the literature on the roles and competencies of online teachers. *Distance Education, 32*(3)421-439. doi:10.1080/01587919.2011.610293

Bedford, L. A. (2009). The professional adjunct: An emerging trend in online instruction. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 12*(3). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/distance/ojdla/fall123/bedford123html

Bedford, L., & Miller, H. (2013). All adjuncts are not created equal: An exploratory study of teaching and professional needs of online adjuncts. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 15*(1). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/distance/ojdla

Benton, S., & Li, D. (2015). Professional development for online adjunct faculty: The chair's role. *The Department Chair: A Resource for Academic Administrators, 26*(1). Retrieved from web.a.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Berk, R. A. (2013). Face-to-face versus online evaluations: A consumer's guide to seven strategies. *Journal of Online Teaching and Learning, 9*(1), 140-148. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Betts, K., Kramer, R., & Gaines, L. L. (2011). Online faculty and adjuncts: Strategies for meeting current and future demands of online education through online human touch training and support. *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design, 1*(4)*,* 20-38. doi:10.4018/ijopcd.2011100102

Boysen, G. A. (2015). Uses and misuses of student evaluations of teaching: The interpretation of differences in teaching evaluation means irrespective of statistical information. *Teaching of Psychology, 42*(2), 109-118. Retrieved from http://www.sagepub.com

Cabrera, A. F., & La Nasa, S. M. (2002). Classroom teaching practices: Ten lessons learned. In W. de Vries (Ed). *Calidad, eficiencia y evaluacion de la educacion superior,* 129-151Spain,Madrid: Netbiblo. Retrieved from http://www.education.umd.edu

California State University, Chico (2009) The rubric for online instruction. Retrieved from http://www.csuchico.edu/tlp/resources/rubric/rubric.pdf

California State University, Chico (2014). *Welcome to the Rubric for Online Instruction (ROI)*. Retrieved from http://www.csuchico.edu/celt/roi/history.shtml

Carnevale, D. (2004). For online adjuncts, a seller's market. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 50*(34), A31-A32. Retrieved from https://www-chronicle-com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Carter, P. M. (2009). Designing a certificate program for preparing faculty for online teaching and hybrid course development. In C. Hill (Ed). *Best practices for training and retaining online adjunct faculty: Featuring content from distance education report* (Faculty Focus Report) (pp. 23-25). Retrieved from http://www.facultyfocus.com

Charlier, H. D., & Williams, M. R. (2011). The reliance on and demand for adjunct faculty members in America's rural, suburban, and urban community colleges. *Community College Review, 39*(2), 160-180. doi:10.1177/0091552111405839

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles of good practice in undergraduate education. *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin 39,* 3-7. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED282491.pdf

Christensen, C. (2008). The employment of part-time faculty at community colleges. *New Directions for Higher Education, 143*. doi: 10.1002/he.310

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

Cook, R. G., Ley, K., Crawford, C., & Warner, A. (2009). Motivators and inhibitors for university faculty in distance and e learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 40(1), 149-163*

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2010). Evaluations that help teachers learn. *Educational Leadership, 68*(4), 35-49. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

DeCosta, M., Berquist, E., Holbeck, R., & Greenberger. S. (2016). A desire for growth: Online full-time faculty's perceptions of evaluation processes. *The Journal of Educators Online, 13*(2); 19-52. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Dochy, F. J. R. C., Segers, M. S. R., & Wijnen, W. H. F. W. (1990). Preliminaries to the implementation of a quality assurance systems based on management information and performance indicators. In *Management Information and Performance Indicators in Higher Education: an International Issue,* 64 – 94. Maastricht: VanGorcum.

Duke, D. L., & Stiggins, R. J. (1986). *Teacher evaluation: Five keys to growth*. National Education Association. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED275069)

Earl, K. (2013). Self-assessement: Questioning my classroom practice. *New Zealand Journal of Teacher's Work, 10*(2), 209-213. Retrieved from http://www.ebscohost.com

Elliott, M., Rhoades, N., Jackson, C. M., & Mandernach, B. J. (2015). Professional development: Designing initiatives to meet the needs of online faculty. *Journal of Educators Online, 12*(1). Retrieved from https://eric.gov/?1d=EJ1051031

Eskey, M. T., & Roehrich, H. (2013). A faculty observation model for online instructors: Observing faculty members in the online classroom. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 16*(2). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer162/eskey_roehrich162.html

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

Eskey, M. T., & Schulte, M. (2010). What online college students say about online instructors and what do online faculty members say about online instruction: a comparison of attitudes. *Journal of Online Education,* August, 2010. Retrieved from http://www.googlescholar.com

Fagan-Wilen, R., Springer, D. W., Ambrosino, B., & White, B. W. (2006). The support of adjunct faculty: An academic imperative. *Social Work Education, 25*(1), 39-51. doi: 10.1080/02615470500477870

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Gappa, J. M. (2000). The new faculty majority: Somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 105*, 77-86. doi: 10.1002/lr.10507

Gappa, J. M. (2008). Today's majority: faculty outside the tenure system. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 40*(4), 50-54. doi:10.3200/CHNG.40.4.50-54

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goe, L., Biggers, K., & Croft, A. (2012). Linking teacher evaluation to professional development: *Focusing on Improving Teaching and Learning,* May 2012. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED540962.pdf

Graham, C., Cagiltay, K., Byung-Ro, L., Craner, J., & Duffy, T. M. (2001). Seven principles of effective teaching: A practical lens for evaluating online courses. *The Technnology Source Archives, March/April, 2001.* Retrieved from www.technologysource.org

Gravani, M. N. (2012). Adult learning principles in designing learning activities for teacher development. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 31*(4*),* 419-432, doi: 10.1080/02601370.2012.663804

Green, D. W. (2007). Adjunct faculty and the continuing quest for quality. *New Directions for Community Colleges.* doi: 10.1002/cc.302

Hallinger, P., Heck, R. H., & Murphy, J. (2014). Teacher evaluation and school improvement: An analysis of the evidence. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 26*(1), 5-28. doi:10.1007/s11092-013-9179-5

Hanover Research Council (2009). Best practices in online teaching strategies. *Academy Administration Practice.* Washington, D.C. Retrieved from https://www.uwec.edu

Harvey L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 18*(1), pp. 9 – 34. Retrieved from www.tandfonline.com

Heuerman, D., Jones, S., Kelly, J., & Mandrell, J. (2013). Adjunct faculty in community colleges: Issues & implications. *AT Issue 3*(1). Retrieved from www.AtIssue-2013_Adjunct-Faculty.pdf

Hill, C. (2009a). *Best practices for training and retaining adjunct faculty: Featuring content from distance education report* (Faculty Focus Special Report). Retrieved from www.facultyfocus.com

Hill, C. (2009b). Training online adjuncts the florida way. In C. Hill (Ed.), *Best Practices for training and retaining adjunct faculty: Featuring content from distance education report* (Faculty Focus Special Report) (pp. 5-6). Retrieved from www.facultyfocus.com

Hopkins, P. (2016). Teacher voice: How teachers perceive evaluations and how leaders can use this knowledge to help teachers grow professionally. *NASSP Bulletin 100*(1). *Retrieved from journals.sagepub.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org*

Hoyle, J. (2010). The trials and accomplishments of an online adjunct faculty member. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 150*. doi: 10.1002/cc.403

Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21* (4), 343-356. Retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov

Johnson, T., Wisniewski, M. A., Kuhlmeyer, G., Isaacs, G., & Krzykowski, J. (2012). Technology adoption in higher education: Overcoming anxiety through faculty boot camp. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 16*(2), 63-72. Retrieved from www.ericed.gov

Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2012). Gathering feedback for teaching: Combining high-quality observations with student surveys and achievement gains. *MET Project Policy & Practice Brief.* Seattle, WA: Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED540962

Kelemen, G. (2015). Essay – Education in contemporary society. *Journal Plus Education, 7*(2), 68-80. Retrieved from web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenlibrary.org

Kim, K-J., & Bonk, C. J. (2006). The future of teaching and learning in higher education: The survey says. *Educase Quarterly, 4*, 22-30. Retrieved from www.faculty.weber.edu

Kizlik, B. (2012). *Measurement, assessment, and evaluation in education*. Retrieved from www.academia.edu

Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy: Revised and updated.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents. Retrieved from www.hospitalist.cumc.columbiau.edu

Knowles, M. S. (1975). *Self-directed learning: A guide for learners and teachers.* New York, N. Y.: Associated Press

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., III, & Swanson, R. A. (2005). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human research development, (6th ed).* New York, NY: Elsevier. Retrieved from www.ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/waldenu

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., III, & Swanson, R. A. (2015). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human research development, (8th ed).* New York, NY: Elsevier. Retrieved from www.ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/waldenu

Kranzow, J. (2013). Faculty leadership in online education: Structuring courses to impact student satisfaction and persistence. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 9*(1). Retrieved from http://jolt.merlot.org

Langen, J. M. (2011). Evaluation of adjunct faculty in higher education institutions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 36(2),* 185-196. doi:10.1080/02602930103221501

Lei, S. A., & Govra, R. K. (2010). College distance education courses: Evaluating benefits and costs from institutional, faculty and students' perspectives. *Education, 130*(4), 616-631. Retrieved from http://web.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Leslie, D. W., & Gappa, J. M. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 118.* Retrieved from http://web.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenu.library.org/ehost

Leszinske, E., Jolley, M., & Bryant, M. (2012). *Contingent faculty: Exploring adjunct assessment in higher education environments.* Retrieved from http://scholar.google.com

Lui, J., Chan, S., Hung, A., & Lee, R. (2002). Facilitators and inhibitors of e-learning. In L. C. Jain, R. J. Howlett & N. S. Ichalkaranje (Eds.), *Virtual environments for teaching and learning* (pp. 75–107). Retrieved from http://site.ebrary.com/lib/waldenu

Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2010). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lorenzetti, J. P. (2009a). The virtual faculty lounge: Providing online faculty development for adjunct instructors. In C. Hill (Ed.), *Best practices for training and retaining online adjunct faculty: Featuring content from distance education* (Faculty Focus Special Report) (pp. 7-8). Retrieved from www.facultyfocus.com

Lorenzetti, J. P. (2009b). Tips for designing an online faculty workshop. In C. Hill (Ed.), *Best practices for training and retaining online adjunct faculty: Featuring content from distance education* (Faculty Focus Special Report) (pp. 11-12). Retrieved from www.facultyfocus.com

Lorenzetti, J. P. (2009c). Getting by with a little help from one's friends: Mentoring program boosts faculty retention. In C.Hill (Ed.), *Best practices for training and retaining online adjunct faculty: Featuring content from distance education* (Faculty Focus Special Report) (pp. 9-10). Retrieved from www.facultyfocus.com

Magda, A. J., Poulin, R., & Clinefelter, D. L. (2015). Recruiting, orienting & supporting online adjunct faculty: A survey of practices. *The Learning House, Inc. and WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies.* Retrieved from https://wcet.wiche.edu/sites/default/files/OnlineAdunctFacultySurveyReport.pdf

Mandernach, J. B., Donnelli, E., Dailey, A., & Schulte, M. (2005). A faculty evaluation model for online instructors: mentoring and evaluation in the online classroom. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 8*(3). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu~distance/ojdla/fall83/mandernack83.htm

Mandernach, J., Register, L., & O'Donnell (2015). Characteristics of adjunct faculty teaching online: Institutional implications. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 18*(1). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu

McDaniel, H., & Shaw, M. E. (2010). Online adjunct faculty professional development and training in higher education. *Journal of eLearning and Online Teaching, 1*(5). Retrieved from http://www.theelearninginstitute.org/journal

McLaughlin, F. (2005). Adjunct at the community college: Second-class professoriate? *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 33*(2), 185-193. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

McQuiggan, C. A. (2012). Faculty development for online teaching as a catalyst for change. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks 16*(2), 27-61. Retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ971044

Meyer, K. A., & Murrell, V. S. (2014). A national study of theories and their importance for faculty development for online teaching. *Online Journal of Distance Learning*

Administration, 17(2). Retrieved from http:www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer172/Meyer_Murrell172.html

Meuller, B., Mandernach, B. J., Sanderson, K. (2013). Adjunct versus full-time faculty: Comparison of student outcomes in the online classroom. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 9*(3). Retrieved from web.b.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

National Center for Education Statistics (2007). Employees in postsecondary institutions, fall 2005 and salaries of full-time instructional faculty, 2005-06. *First Look.* U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007150.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics (2010). Number of instructional faculty in degree-granting institutions, by employment status, sex, control, and type of institution: Selected years, fall 1970 through fall 2009. *Digest of Education Statistics, 2010 Tables and Figures.* U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov.programs/digest/dt10_259.asp

Northcote, M., Seddon, J., & Brown, P. (2011). Benchmark yourself: Self-reflecting about online learning. *Education Papers and Journal Articles, Paper 34.* Retrieved from http://research.avondale.edu.au/edu_papers/34

Pallof, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2011). *The excellent online instructor: Strategies for Professional development.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pappas, C. (2013). The adult learning theory: Andragogy of Malcolm Knowles. *eLearning Industry.* Retrieved from https://elearningindustry.com

Paquette, K. R., Corbett, F., Jr., & Cassess, M. (2015). Student evaluation response rates of teacher performance in higher education online classes. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education 16*(4) pp. 71-82. Retrieved from www.web.b.ebscohost.com

Pearch, W. J., & Marutz, L. (2005). Retention of adjunct faculty in community colleges. *The Community College Enterprise, Spring, 2005.* Retrieved from http://ww.schoolcraft.edu/pdfs/161.29-44.pdf

Pfeffer, N., & Coote, A. (1991). *Is quality good for you? A critical review of quality assurance in welfare services.* Retrieved from https://books.google.com

Popham, W. J. (2013a). On serving two masters: Formative and summative teacher evaluation. *Principal Leadership, 13*(7), 18-22. Retrieved from eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1016421

Popham, W. J. (2013b). Tough teacher evaluation and formative assessment: Oil and water? *Voices from the Middle, 21*(2), 10-14. Retrieved from http://searchproquest.com

Portugal, L. M., 2015. Work, ethic, characteristics, attributes, and traits of successful online faculty. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 28*(1). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/odjla/spring181/portugal181.html

Puzziferro, M., & Shelton, K (2009). Supporting online faculty – Revisiting the seven principles (a few years later). *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 12*(3). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall123/puzziferro123.html

Ragan, L. C. (2009). 10 principles of effective online teaching: Best practices in distance education. *Faculty Focus Special Report.* Retrieved from https://www.facultyfocus.com/free-reports

Rhoades, G. (2013). Disruptive innovations for adjunct faculty: Common sense for the common good. *The NEA Higher Education Journal*. Retrieved from whp_template.nea.org

Rogers, C. B. H., McIntyre, M., & Jazzar, M. (2010). Mentoring adjunct faculty using the cornerstones of effective communication and practice. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 18*(1), 53-59. Retrieved from http://ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Rothstein, J. (2010). Teacher quality in educational production: Tracking, decay, and student achievement. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 125*, 175-214. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2010.15.1.175

Scagnoli, N. I., Buki, L. P., & Johnson, S. D. (2009). The influence of online teaching on face-to-face teaching practices. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 13*(2), 115-128. Retrieved from http://webebscohost.com.exp.waldenulibrary.org

Schulte, M. (2009). Best practices: Efficient evaluation of online course facilitation: The "quick check" policy measure. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 57;* 110-116. Retrieved from doi:10.1080/07377360902995685

Schulte, M. (2010). Faculty perceptions of technology distance education transactions: Qualitative outcomes to inform teaching practices. *The Journal of Educators Online, 7*(2). Retrieved from http://content.ebscohost.com.ezp.walenulibrary.org

Shachar, M. & Neumann, Y. (2010). Twenty years of research on the academic performance between traditional and distance learning: Summative meta-analysis and trend examination. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 6*(2). Retreived from www.jolt.merlot.org

Shattuck, J., Dubins, B., & Zilberman, D. (2011). Marylandonline's inter-institutional project to train higher education adjunct faculty to teach online. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 12*(2), 40 – 61. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov

Silva, K., & Thomsen, D. (2013). Faculty assessment and evaluation: Fair, formative, and focused. *The Department Chair, 24*(1), 9-10. Retrieved from onlinelibrary.wiley.com

Smith, M. K. (2002). Malcolm Knowles, informal adult education, self-direction and andragogy. *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education.* Retrieved from www.infed.org/thinkers/et-knowl.htm

Stauber, K. W., & Simon, S. R. (2010). Engaging adjunct faculty: Enhancing their voice and building an online community. In *A Collection of Papers on Self-Study and Institutional Improvement* (26th ed., pp.93-96). Retrieved from https://sharepoint.estrellamountain.edu/selfstudy_2009_11

Stenerson, J., Blanchard, L., Fassiotto, M., Hernandez, M., & Muth, A. (2010). The role of adjuncts in the professoriate. *Peer Review, 12*(3), 23-26. Retrieved from http:www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-su10/Stenerson.cfm

Stewart, S., & Kogan, L. (2015). Evaluation of online courses/Teaching in the department of clinical sciences. Retrieved from csu-cvmbs.colostate.edu/documents/clinsci-eval-online-courses.pdf

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(4). Retrieved from https://journals.sage.pub..com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Strycker, W. K. (2009). 1.3.5 Recruiting and maintaining adjunct faculty. Retrieved from http://cetl.matcmadison.edu/efgb/1/1_3_5.htm

Suskie, L. (2009). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide (2nd ed).* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Tipple, R. (2010). Effective leadership of online adjunct faculty. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 13*(1). Retrieved from http://www/westga.edu/~dostance/ojdla/spring131/tipple131.html

Tobin, T. J. (2004). Best practices for administrative evaluation of online faculty. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 7*(2). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer72/tobin72.html

Tobin, T. J. (2015). Don't tell the faculty: Administrators' secrets to evaluating online teaching. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 18*(3). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu~distance/ojdla/fall183/tobin183.html

Tobin, T. J., Mandernach, B. J., & Taylor, A. H. (2015). *Evaluating online teaching: Implementing best practices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Todd, C. L., Ravi, K., Akoh, H., & Gray, V. (2015). An online adult-learner focused program: An assessment of effectiveness. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 28*(3). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall

Tunks, K. W. (2012). Transforming teaching through supplementary evaluations. *Faculty Focus.* Retrieved from www.facultyfocus.com

U. S. Department of Education, Institute for Education Sciences: National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Enrollment in public institutions, fall 2010; financial statistics, fiscal year 2010; and graduation rates, selected cohorts, 2002-2007: First look*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs20122280.pdf

U. S. Department of Education, Institute for Education Sciences: National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *College Navigator*. Retrieved from www.collegenavigator.gov

Vail, K. (2009). A system for managing online faculty. In C. Hill (Ed.), *Best practices for training and retaining online adjunct faculty: Featuring content from distance education report* (Faculty Focus Report) (pp. 18-19). Retrieved from www.facultyfocus.com

Westwood, P. S. (2008). *What teachers need to know about teaching methods.* Camberwell Victoria, Australia: ACER Press.

Wickun, W. G., & Stanley, R. E. (2007). The role of adjunct faculty in higher education. Retrieved from http://mtprof.msun.edu/Win2000/Wickun.html

Appendix A: The Project

White Paper on Best Practices for Evaluating Online Adjunct Faculty

Online education has grown rapidly within the last ten years (Betts, Kramer & Gaines, 2011). Studies show that enrollment in online courses has increased from 1.6 million students to 5.6 million students from 2002 to 2009 (Allen & Seaman, 2013). Further projections indicate that 60% of students enrolled in higher education by the year 2020 will pursue courses entirely online (Betts et al., 2011). Administrators face challenges with innovative and creative ways of meeting the demand of accommodating online educational programs in higher education. The influx of this genre of students correlates with the strategies for hiring and training faculty for this enormous shift in curriculum development and student learning. Aside from the challenge of recruiting online adjunct faculty, is the concern for integrating evaluation systems that support teacher-student relationships for long-term success (Betts et al., 2011). Within this white paper I discuss and present research-derived best practices for developing and implementing evaluative processes for online adjunct faculty.

Details of Study

Data from a quantitative correlational survey was collected to determine the relationship between formal evaluations and online adjunct faculty teaching practices, and their inclination or willingness for seeking professional development based on their perception of the quality and efficacy of formal evaluative processes. The participants included online adjunct faculty from three online universities in the Mideastern region of the United States. A stratified sample of online universities that offered bachelor, masters

and doctoral online degrees was identified. Two out of four universities responded to the invitation to participate in the study upon approval from their institutional IRB (University 1 and University 2). A third university (University 3) was also invited to participate upon approval from their IRB. Administrators at University 1 and University 2 identified online adjunct faculty with one or more years of experience at their university. Administrators at University 1 agreed to disseminate the email invitation and informed consent by email broadcast to their online adjunct faculty. Administrators at University 2 provided a list of email contacts for a portion of their online adjunct faculty. The invitation to participate in the survey and consent form was posted on a Participation Pool website at University 3. All ethical treatment protocols and approval guidelines for permission to conduct the study were followed. The results of a power analysis showed that the minimum sample size required for this study was 84 participants.

Email invitations were sent to University 1 and to the list of contacts at University 2 that served as an introduction of myself as the researcher, explained the purpose of the study, and provided the informed consent for voluntary participation in the study. I also posted a description of the study, the informed consent, and the invitation to participate on the Participation Pool website at University 3. The invitations also specified the inclusion criteria for participating in the study as online adjunct faculty at the university for one year or more with at least one experience of having a formal evaluation as online adjunct faculty at the university. The invitations included a survey link with instructions for completing the survey. The survey instrument was available on SurveyMonkey® for a seven-week period.

A total of 46 participants responded to the survey. Most responses for non-participation from University 2 indicated ineligibility of inclusion criteria of one-year experience as online adjunct faculty and experience of having received a formal evaluation as online adjunct faculty. In other words, it was indicated that the majority of online adjunct asked to participate either had less than one-year experience as online adjunct faculty or met the one-year experience criteria, but did not meet the formal evaluation experience criteria.

The Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire (TEEQ, Duke & Stiggins, 1986) was used to obtain data from online adjunct faculty members. The questionnaire contains scales that asked teachers to reflect on their recent evaluation and to rate the experience in areas of quality of the evaluation, the impact of the evaluation experience on their attitudes about teaching, their teaching behaviors and strategies, and on their understanding of the teaching-learning process. The questionnaire also asked teachers to describe themselves and the nature of their most recent evaluation experience by ranking their attributes as a teacher, their interpersonal manner, and their teaching experience. They were also asked to rank their perceptions of the evaluator, the attributes of the information gathered on their performance, the attributes of the feedback received, and the attributes of the evaluation content.

Demographic Data

Demographic data obtained from the study included the number of years of experience of online teaching at their current institution, years of online teaching of

current content, the usefulness of their evaluation experience, number and type of evaluation experiences, and the title of person(s) performing the evaluation. Less than 5% (n = 2) taught online for one year, and the largest proportion taught for 6 to 10 years (n = 14, 30.4%). The largest proportion of participants had 6 to 10 years of experience teaching their current content. When asked about the usefulness of their evaluation, the largest proportion of participants indicated that the evaluation was helpful (n = 15, 32.6%). Nearly 40% of the participants (n = 18) indicated that they had zero formal and informal observations each year. The most commonly reported length of the formal observations was a few minutes (n = 13, 28.3%). Finally, half of the participants (n = 23) reported that only their supervisor was present during observations.

Summary of Analysis of Research Questions

Research question 1 was: What is the association between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations? Research question 2 was: What is the association between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations? A Spearman correlation analysis was conducted to address this question. Data from 46 participants were available for this analysis. In this analysis, the variables being correlated were the Likert responses to the questions for the overall quality of the evaluation and teaching practices. The correlation between the perceived overall quality of the supervisor evaluation and the perceived impact on teaching behaviors was significant (ρ = .37, p = .014), indicating that there was a positive association between online adjunct faculty

teaching practices and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations. According to Cohen (1988), a correlation coefficient of .37 represents a moderate effect size. This effect size is larger than that used for the *a priori* power analysis (0.30) with the result that there was sufficient power for statistical significance to occur despite the smaller than targeted response. The coefficient of determination ($r^2\ x\ 100\%$) represents the proportion of variance shared between the variables (Field, 2013). The coefficient of determination for this analysis was .14%, which can be interpreted to mean that 14% of the variance in perceptions of changes in teaching practice and teaching strategies was associated with the teachers' perceptions of the quality of supervisor evaluations. While the null hypothesis is rejected, the statistically significant association between the variables was relatively small.

Research question 2 was: What is the association between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations? A correlational survey approach was done to determine the relationship between the independent variable online adjunct faculty's perceptions of formal evaluation and the dependent variables changes in online adjunct faculty's teaching practices and online adjunct faculty's interest in seeking and taking advantage of opportunities for professional development. Spearman correlations were conducted to address the research questions. The results of the analysis indicated that there was a significant positive association between online adjunct faculty teaching practices and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations (Research Question 1). Additionally, there was also a significant positive

association between online adjunct faculty willingness to seek and take advantage of professional development opportunities and online adjunct faculty perceptions of the quality of formal evaluations (Research Question 2).

Findings from this study align with the literature review of evaluative processes of the online adjunct faculty. Studies by Suskie (2009), Langen, (2011), and Kizlik (2012) demonstrated that quality evaluative processes are effective tools for informing administrators of effective teaching practices. Eskey and Roehrich (2013) reported on the effectiveness of established formative and summative online evaluation tools used at Park University. The Online Instructor Evaluation System (OIES) and the Faculty Online Observation model (FOO) provide invaluable feedback, reflections, and information for evaluation of online faculty teaching practices as well as identifying needs for mentoring and professional development (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013). Based on the results of the research, an online instructor evaluation system would benefit the process for sustaining the viability and competence of online programs.

Online Instructor Evaluation

Online instructor evaluation involves methods for measuring the effectiveness of online teaching strategies incorporated by the instructor. Online instruction evaluation also consists in recognizing the significance of the professional development of online faculty for maintaining quality online facilitation of course curricula. Methods of evaluation of online instruction can also increase an awareness of opportunities for process improvement in the management of online programs. With the increasing development of online courses over the past ten years, administrators are challenged with

hiring adjunct faculty to teach classes online. With the increased demand for hiring qualified instructors, administrators are also challenged with the notion of developing measures to use for evaluating online adjunct faculty. Traditional face-to-face measures of evaluation once deemed a viable option for assessing online teaching is an uncertain option when considering the uniqueness of online learning. As online programs increase, administrators are faced with developing new processes for evaluating online teaching (Berk, 2013).

The development of online evaluation systems is incumbent upon understanding the similarities and differences in the dynamics of face-to-face instruction, online instruction, and course evaluation. Similarities in face-to-face instruction and online course instruction are centered on the general functional perspective of courses offered for educational purposes of higher learning (Drouin, 2012). The differences in online course instruction are based on the structure and technological delivery. The difference in online course instruction also lies in student-instructor interaction through social networking tools (Drouin, 2012). Drouin (2012) further posits after her review of online evaluation rubrics that online evaluation tools mostly differ in their process, but are similar in context to criteria for best practices in online evaluation and face-to-face peer, self, and student evaluations. The categories determined to meet these criteria include student-student and student-instructor interaction, instructor support and mentoring, lecture content and delivery quality, course content, and course structure (p. 69). The challenge of measuring the effectiveness of differing technological factors require strong

evaluative processes in spite of the similarities that support measures in traditional and online settings (Drouin, 2012).

Creasman (2012) in opposition to the similarities mentioned above, identified differing characteristics of online courses. The differences involve the asynchronous nature of student activities; non-linear online discussions; interactions preferred by written texts; slower communication between student and teacher; the increased demand for teacher presence; readily available information; and; instructor role changes from lecturer to facilitator and co-learner (Creasman, 2012). Understanding the concepts of traditional classroom instruction and online instruction can guide the process for developing online evaluation systems. Concepts theorized from the similarities between the two modalities can provide key elements for measuring the effectiveness of online instruction. The technological differences unique to online instruction are the defining characteristic for developing effective measures for evaluating online teaching strategies, professional development, and student outcomes.

Strategies for Developing Online Evaluation Systems

Several institutions have designed evaluation systems for measuring effective online teaching, professional development, and student outcomes. Among them are evaluation tools designed as rubrics used for peer evaluation, self-evaluation, or student evaluation (Drouin 2012). As online teaching and hiring practices increasingly rely on adjunct faculty, quality and accountability measures must take precedence for monitoring online instruction (Shulte, Dennis, Eskey, Taylor, and Zeng, 2012). Researchers have also determined strategies for designing and implementing online evaluation systems in

attempts to keep up with the increase of online programs. Resources from behavioral theories, pedagogical methods, and traditional measures of formative and summative evaluation processes are frameworks for designing and implementing online evaluation systems. Systematic approaches to developing evaluation tools for online instruction is integral to maintaining a steadfast approach to quality instruction, faculty training and development, positive student outcomes and institutional values. Studies have shown that online institutions have based online evaluation systems from works by Chickering and Gamson's (1987) "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" (Chickering & Ehrman, 1996; Schulte et al., 2012; Stewart & Kogan, 2015). Some researchers also acknowledge the formative and summative evaluation influence for the development of online teaching evaluation systems (Baleni, 2015; Perera-Ditz & Moe, 2014; Vonderwell & Bobek, 2013).

A strategic approach to developing online evaluation systems will help guide the process for including significant components that require analysis. Learning environments, whether face-to-face or online, have to maintain that particular level of effectiveness for successful outcomes. The first step of the strategic planning process for developing an online evaluation system is to consider the university mission and the components of the traditional setting and how these components influence the online virtual classroom. The second step for the strategic planning process is to consider current evaluation processes used in the traditional climate and how best to simulate and revise the process for an online evaluation system. The third step would be to consider the resources (including IT support), technological system and programs in place,

financial impact, and staff members involved in the process. Universities that have successfully developed and implemented online evaluation systems report on the benefit of the process for developing online evaluation programs. The fourth step in the process is to consider a useful framework for the basis of an online evaluation system.

An example of a successful process for developing and implementing an online evaluation system is the process utilized at Park University (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013; Eskey & Schulte, 2010; Schulte et al., 2012). Following a review of findings, standards, and protocols of effective practices of online teaching, and based on face-to-face classroom instruction, Park University staff developed and implemented the Online Instructor Evaluation System (OIES) (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013; Eskey & Schulte, 2010; Schulte et al., 2012). The OIES addressed the differences between online instruction and the need for direct evaluation of learning outcomes, teaching practices, student access, and course associated administrative duties (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013). The OIES was implemented at Park University in 2004 as a source for evaluating and mentoring online faculty until 2008. The university staff then developed the Faculty Online Observation (FOO) instrument as a method for focusing on the annual evaluation of online adjunct faculty (Eskey & Roehrich, 2013; Schulte et al., 2012). The FOO provided the necessary model for maintaining the standards of evaluating online adjunct faculty for meeting the criteria and expectations of the university for best practices (Eskey & Roerich, 2013; Schulte et al., 2012).

Taylor, a faculty member at the Dutton Institute at Penn State University, also designed, implemented and assessed an evaluation process for online teaching (Taylor,

2017). The Peer Review Guide for Online Teaching at Penn State is an evaluation tool also based on Chickering and Gamson's "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education." The evaluation tool is a two-stage process that incorporates input from the instructor and input from the peer reviewer. The first step involves the completion of the instructor input form. This form provides relevant information about the course, including the provision to access the course Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and other technological features of the course (Taylor, 2017). The instructor input form is forwarded to the identified peer reviewer in advance of the review. The second step is the peer review of the online course. The peer reviewer gains access to the online course and uses the peer review guide for online courses to observe the how the instructor addresses the seven principles within the course content (Taylor, 2017). The peer reviewer documents the instructor's strengths and areas for improvement in each principle. The peer reviewer then provides feedback summarized in a letter along with a copy of the completed peer review guide to the online adjunct faculty member. The peer reviewer also shares a copy of the completed peer review guide and summarized letter with the online program manager (Taylor, 2017).

The seven principles were adapted in the peer review guide for online teaching. Each principle is described and includes examples of how a particular principle is met in the course (Taylor, 2017). A synopsis of how the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education are adaptable to the evaluation of online teaching is demonstrated below. Good practice in undergraduate education according to Chickering

and Gamson (1987) is demonstrated by the seven principles listed below with examples of how these principles apply to online evaluation according to Taylor (2017).

1. Good practice encourages contacts between students and faculty (welcome message, introduction, announcement area, discussion forums, E-mail, course syllabus, chat space)

2. Good practice develops reciprocity and cooperation among students (students engage in meet each other activities, group assignments, instructor facilitation of group discussion, facilitating study groups)

3. Good practice uses active learning techniques (student activities involving active use of forms of self-expression through, writing, speaking, reflection, research, use of resources, and participation in design, or development of educational games and simulations)

4. Good practice gives prompt feedback (options for student submission of drafts of assignments for instructor feedback, clear, positive, specific, and focused feedback on areas for improvement in a timely manner, open discussion forum, student surveys, up to date grade book for student access)

5. Good practice emphasizes time on task (course schedule outlines topics and assignments due dates, time management strategies, course-specific study and focus tips for efficient time utilization)

6. Good practice communicates high expectations (explicit communication of skills and knowledge needed for success with the course, explanation of course learning

goals, examples of high and low quality work with a discussion of differences, encourages and inspires students to explore more complex solutions)

7. Good practice respects diverse talents and ways of learning (gauge student progress with a variety of assessment tools, allow students to demonstrate progress through alternative assignments based on individual talent, supplemental resources for students who lack prerequisite knowledge, accommodation for students with disabilities)

Colorado State University also provides the instructors with a peer review guide that incorporates modified best practice principles for online teaching evaluation and for the review of on-campus course delivery (Stewart & Kogan, 2015). The Institute for Teaching and Learning (TILT) also includes two more principles in addition to the modified seven principles for both online teaching and on-campus teaching. The two additional principles are: the establishment of clear course procedures and the effective use of technology. Guidelines for observation of online teaching enhance the process for developing tools to measure best practices.

Goals for establishing online observation tools include a process that is common among technological aspect of online courses. The process that is shared by most institutions for the assessment of online teaching is recognizing the institution's policy and procedure for evaluating adjunct faculty. Administrators at online institutions have accountability that requires evaluations of online teaching to ensure quality course instruction (Schulte et al., 2012; Tobin, Mandernach & Taylor, 2015). Guidelines for the process of evaluation can include checklists for the faculty review.

Checklists can forge a line of communication between the adjunct online instructor and the reviewer. The checklist can include mutually agreed upon guidelines for the evaluation process. Some of the options can include the class module and time of observation, the reviewer's access to the course, and the length of time the reviewer has to access the course. Online adjunct faculty and the reviewer will also know to check for the course syllabus, instructor contact information, instructor biography, instructor policies, procedures and expectations, and text and Internet resource information. They will also look for student learning outcomes, grading criteria, grading scale, student resources, time requirements, course calendar, course orientation and course organization (Stewart & Kogan, 2015). Guidelines for the process also generally follow similar activities for where to look for evidence of best practices in the course during the observation. Evidence of best practices can be observed in the course syllabus, discussion posts, announcements, Email communication, chat rooms, instructional materials, study groups, team assignments, assignment drop boxes, survey instruments, and course grade books (Stewart & Kogan, 2015; Taylor, 2017). Guidelines and checklists for the evaluation of online courses can also reflect the expectation of end of course summative evaluations. Students can reflect on their course experience and interaction with the instructor. Practice guidelines and checklists are effective accessory tools for the observation of online teaching that remind online adjunct faculty and reviewers of student expectations that may be reflected as well in summative reviews.

Summative evaluations offered by students are necessary and important for continuing education; however, formative evaluations are imperative for monitoring the

quality of instruction on an ongoing basis. Such reviews allow for feedback and guidance to online adjunct faculty for the critical analysis of teaching strategies. The online review of learning components can also help online adjunct instructors capitalize on effective strategies and motivate online adjunct faculty to seek opportunities for professional development. Formative evaluation of online adjunct faculty during the course of instruction by observation can be a collaborative effort between faculty, online adjunct faculty, and administrators.

Literature also suggests that adult learning principles are core tenets of teacher development (Johnson, Wisniewski, Kuhlemeyer, Isaacs & Kryzykowski, 2012; Meyer & Murrell, 2014). Professional development programs are designed for adult faculty who teach other adults. Thus, professional development of adult faculty should also be viewed from the perspective of adult learning theory (McQuiggan, 2012). Professional development for faculty is recognized as a significant component of successful online programs. Recent literature addressed faculty development through the lens of adult learning with an emphasis on the characteristics of adult learning and the six core principles of andragogy (Gravani, 2012; Todd, Ravi, Akoh, & Gray, 2015) as well as an emphasis on self-direction and reflection (Gravani, 2012).

Adult learning theory has been the framework for professional faculty development activities. Johnson et al. (2012) reported on the use of the principles of andragogy in a 3-day workshop designed to provide faculty development for online teaching. Gravani (2012) investigated the significance of applying adult learning principles in the design of learning activities for teacher development. In a study on the

use of theories in the development of faculty who teach in the online program, Meyer and Murrell (2014) reported that 69% of 39 higher institutions surveyed used self-directed and adult learning theories to guide faculty development and that 59% used andragogy theory. Therefore, it stands to reason that processes used to evaluate online adjunct faculty teacher performance and professional development should follow an adult learning model that involves faculty participation in key areas of identifying progress and the need for development through self-direction, self-reflection, and action (Gravani, 2012).

Online teaching is an evolutionary process for learning strategies that has impacted academia. Keeping in step with the increased demands of online learning is challenging to administrators, faculty members, and online adjunct faculty members. Inherent to the challenge for online institutions is the development and implementation of an evaluation system for observing online teaching. Developing an online evaluation tool that is right for any particular institution is an arduous task. Fortunately, a number of online institutions have shared the success of their process for developing and implementing online observation evaluation tools for online adjunct faculty. A number of institutions have also developed rubrics and resources available to online institutions interested in developing tools for evaluating online teaching and training peer reviewers for online observation. Materials are available for formative and summative evaluation of online teaching from some institutions for a fee and some are available for free. Drouin (2012) includes a list of networks for online review rubrics for peer review, self-review,

and student review. The list includes the following networks for peer review and self-review resources:

Quality Matters (QM) available at: http://www/qmprogram.org/rubric

Illinois Online Network: QOCI available at:

http://www.ion.illlinois.edu/parners/nationalpartners/index.asp

Monterey Institute: OCEP available at:

http://www.montereyinstitute.org/pdf/OCEP%20Evaluation%20Categories.pdf

Texas A&M: OCAT available at:

https://elerningtools.tamu.edu/chedklist/login.do

Western Carolina: OCAT available at:

http://www.scu.edu/WebFiles/PDFs/facultycenter_OCAT_v2.0_25apr07.pdf

California State University-Chico: ROI available at

http://www.csuchico.edu/tlp/resources/rubric/rubric.pdf

Developing and implementing online evaluation tools may take time. Administrators and faculty members at online institutions are tasked with the responsibility of ensuring quality online educational experiences for successful student outcomes. Online adjunct faculty is a part of the process as institutions increasingly rely on creative hiring practices as online learning expands. Developing and incorporating online observation evaluation tools for reviewing online teaching is an excellent start for meeting the challenge of ensuring effective online teaching strategies and professional development of online adjunct faculty.

References

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2013). Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States. *The Sloan Consortium*. Retrieved from https://files.eric.gov/fulltext/ED541571

Baleni, Z. G. (2015). Online formative assessment in higher education: Its pros and cons. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning, 13*(4), 228 – 236. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1062122

Berk, R. A. (2013). Face-to-face versus online evaluations: A consumer's guide to seven strategies. *Journal of Online Teaching and Learning, 9*(1)*,* 140-148. Retrieved from eds.b.ebscohost.ezp.waldenulibrary.org

Betts, K., Kramer, R., & Gaines, L. L. (2011). Online faculty and adjuncts: Strategies for meeting current and future demands of online education through online human touch training and support*. International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design, 1*(4), 20-38. doi: 10.4018/ijopcd.2011100102

Chickering A., & Ehrmann, S. (1996). Implementing the seven principles: Technology as lever. *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin, 49* (2), 3-6. Retrieved from http://www.aahebulletin.com/public/archive/sevenprinciples.asp?

Chickering, A. W, & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles of good practice in undergraduate education. *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin 39,* 3-7. Retrieved from files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED282491.pdf

Creasman, P. A. (2012). Considerations in online course design. *The IDEA Center* Retrieved from http://www.theideacenter.org/sites/default/files/idea_paper_52.pdf

Drouin, M. (2012). What's the story on evaluations of online teaching? In M. E. Kite (Ed.), *Effective evaluation of teaching: A guide for faculty and administrators* (pp. 60-70). Washington, DC: Society for the Teaching of Psychology. Retrieved from http://www.teachpsych.org/Resources/Documents/ebooks/evals2012.pdf

Duke, D. L., & Stiggins, R. J. (1986). *Teacher evaluation: Five keys to growth*. National Education Association. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED275069)

Eskey, M. T., & Roehrich, H. (2013). A faculty observation model for online instructors: Observing faculty members in the online classroom. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 16*(2). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer162/eskey_roehrich162.html

Eskey, M. T., & Schulte, M. (2010). What online college students say about online instructors and what do online faculty members say about online instruction: a comparison of attitudes. *Journal of Online Education,* August, 2010. Retrieved from http://www.googlescholar.com

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Gravani, M. N. (2012). Adult learning principles in designing learning activities for teacher development. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 31*(4)*,* 419-432, doi: 10.1080/02601370.2012.663804

Johnson, T., Wisniewski, M. A., Kuhlmeyer, G., Isaacs, G., & Krzykowski, J. (2012). Technology adoption in higher education: Overcoming anxiety through faculty boot camp. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 16*(2)*,* 63-72. Retrieved from www.ericed.gov

Kizlik, B. (2012). *Measurement, assessment, and evaluation in education*. Retrieved from www.academia.edu

Langen, J. M. (2011). Evaluation of adjunct faculty in higher education institutions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 36*(2), 185-196. doi:10.1080/02602930103221501

Meyer, K. A., & Murrell, V. S. (2014). A national study of theories and their importance for faculty development for online teaching. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 17*(2). Retrieved from http:www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer172/Meyer_Murrell172.html

Perera-Ditz, D.M., & Moe, J. L. (2014). Formative and summative assessment in online education. *Journal of research in innovative teaching, 7*, 130-142. Retrieved from https://www.nu.edu

Schulte, M., Dennis, K., Eskey, M., Taylor, C., & Zeng, H. (2012). Creating a sustainable online instructor observation system: A case study highlighting flaws when blending mentoring and evaluation. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 13*(3). Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1135/2200

Stewart, S., & Kogan, L. (2015). Evaluation of online courses/Teaching in the department of clinical sciences. Retrieved from csu-cvmbs.colostate.edu/documents/clinsci-eval-online-courses.pdf

Suskie, L. (2009). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide (2nd ed).* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, A. H. (2017). A peer review guide for online courses at Penn state (rev 6/23/2017). Dutton e – Education Institute, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, The Pennsylvania State University. Retrieved from https://facdev.e-education.psu.edu

Tobin, T. J., Mandernach, B. J., & Taylor, A. H. (2015). *Evaluating online teaching: Implementing best practices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Todd, C. L., Ravi, K., Akoh, H., & Gray, V. (2015). An online adult-learner focused program: An assessment of effectiveness. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 28*(3). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall

Vonderwell, S. K., & Bobek, M. (2013). Promoting formative assessment in online teaching and learning. *TechTrends 57*(4), 22 – 27. Doi.org/10.1007/s11528-013-0673-x

Appendix B: Permission Letter for Reprint of ROI Table

Subject: Re: ROI table
Date: Mon, Jun 11, 2012 05:08 PM CDT
From: "Sederberg, Laura" Lsederberg@csuchico.edu
To: Euwanna Heard <euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu>

YES, it is fine with us. CSU, Chico has offered the ROI under the Creative Commons licensing to share with credit. Thanks for asking.

Sent from my iPad
Laura Sederberg

On Jun 11, 2012, at 1:43 PM, "Euwanna Heard" <euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu> wrote:

Hello Ms. Sederberg,

My name is Euwanna Heard. I am currently working on my dissertation titled "The Impact of Formal Evaluations on the Teaching Practices of Online Adjunct Faculty" at Walden University. I have referenced the Rubric for Online Instruction (ROI) in my own study and would like permission to use the ROI in a table format for my paper with proper reference to the Committee for Online Instruction at California State University, Chico of course. I would like to include this information in my literature review section of "Teaching Practices of Online Adjunct Faculty". Please advise and be assured that I will not use this information without proper reference or permission.

Thank your for your consideration.
Respectfully,
Euwanna Heard
euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu
301-552-5912 (H)
301-275-4864 (M)

Appendix C: The Rubric for Online Instruction

The Rubric for Online Instruction

Category 1	Baseline	Effective	Exemplary
Learner Support and Resources	A. Course contains limited information for online learner and support links to campus resource.	A. Course contains adequate information for online learner support and links to campus resources.	A. Course contains extensive information about being an online learner and links to campus resources.
	B. Course provides limited course-specific resources, limited contact information for instructor, department and/or program.	B. Course provides adequate course-specific resources, some contact information for instructor, department, and program.	B. Course provides a variety of course-specific resources, contact information for instructor, department, and program.
	C. Course offers limited resources supporting course content and different learning abilities.	C. Course offers access to adequate resources supporting course content and different learning abilities.	C. Course offers access to a wide range of resources supporting course content and different learning abilities

Category 2	Baseline	Effective	Exemplary
Online Organization and Design	A. Much of the course is under construction, with some key components identified such as the syllabus. B. Course syllabus is unclear about what is expected of students. C. Aesthetic design does not present and communicate course information clearly. D. Web pages are inconsistent both visually and functionally. E. Accessibility issues are not addressed. (Including: sight, mobility, hearing, cognition, ESL, and technical.	A. Course is organized and navigable. Students can understand the key components and structure of the course. B. Course syllabus identifies and delineates the role the online environment will play in the course. C. Aesthetic design presents and communicates course information clearly. D. Most web pages are visually and functionally consistent. E. accessibility issues are briefly addressed. (Including: sight, mobility, hearing, cognition, ESL, and technical.	A. Course is well organized and easy to navigate. Students can clearly understand all components and structure of the course. B. Course syllabus identifies and clearly delineates the role the online environment will play in the total course. C. Aesthetic design presents and communicates course information clearly throughout the course. D. All web pages are visually and functionally consistent throughout the course. E. Accessibility issues are addressed throughout the course. (Including: sight, mobility, hearing, cognition, ESL, and technical.

Category 3	Baseline	Effective	Exemplary
Instructional Design and Delivery	A. Course offers limited opportunity for interaction and communication student to student, student to instructor and student to content. B. Course goals are not clearly defined and do not align to learning objectives. C. Learning objectives are vague or incomplete and learning activities are absent or unclear. D. Course provides limited visual, textual, kinesthetic and/or auditory activities to enhance student learning and accessibility. E. Course provides limited activities to help students develop critical thinking and/or problem-solving skills.	A. Course offers adequate opportunities for interaction and communication student to student, student to instructor and student to content. B. Course goals are adequately defined but may not align to learning objectives. C. Learning objectives are identified and learning activities are implied. D. Course provides adequate visual, textual, kinesthetic and/or auditory activities to enhance student learning and accessibility. E. Course provides adequate activities to help students develop critical thinking and/or problem-solving skills.	A. Course offers ample opportunities for interaction and communication student to student, student to instructor and student to content. B. Course goals are clearly defined and aligned to learning objectives. C. Learning objectives are identified and learning activities are clearly integrated. D. Course provides multiple visual, textual, kinesthetic and/or auditory activities to enhance student learning and accessibility. E. Course provides multiple activities that help students develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

Category 4	Baseline	Effective	Exemplary
Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning	A. Course has limited activities to assess student readiness for course delivery. B. Learning objectives, instructional and assessment activities are not aligned. C. Assessment strategies are limited in use to measure content knowledge, attitudes, and skills. D. Opportunities for students to receive feedback about their own performance are infrequent and sporadic. E. Students' self-assessments and/or peer feedback opportunities are limited.	A. Course has adequate activities to assess student readiness for course content and mode of delivery. B. Learning objectives, instructional and assessment activities are adequately aligned. C. Ongoing strategies are used to measure content knowledge attitudes, and skills. D. Opportunities for students to receive feedback about their own performance are provided. E. Students' self-assessments and/or peer feedback opportunities exist.	A. Course has multiple timely and appropriate activities to assess student readiness for course content and mode of delivery. B. Learning objectives, instructional and assessment activities are closely aligned. C. Ongoing multiple assessment strategies are used to measure content knowledge, attitudes and skills. D. Regular feedback about student performance is provided in a timely manner throughout the course. E. Students' self-assessments and peer feedback opportunities exist throughout the course.

Category 5	Baseline	Effective	Exemplary
Innovative Teaching with Technology	A. Course uses limited technology tools to facilitate communication and learning. B. New teaching methods applied to enhance student learning are limited. C. There are limited multimedia elements and/or learning objects for accommodating different learning styles. D. Course uses Internet access and engages students in the learning process in a very limited way.	A. Course uses adequate technology tools to facilitate communication and learning. B. New teaching methods are adequately applied to innovatively enhance student learning. C. Multimedia elements and/or learning objects are used and are relevant to accommodate different learning styles. D. Course optimizes Internet access and effectively engages students in the learning process.	A. Course uses a variety of technology tools to appropriately facilitate communication and learning. B. New teaching methods are applied and innovatively enhance student learning, and interactively engage students. C. A variety of multimedia elements and/or learning objects are used and are relevant to accommodate different learning styles throughout the course. D. Course optimizes Internet access and effectively engages students in the learning process in a variety of ways throughout the course.

Category 6	Baseline	Effective	Exemplary
Faculty use of Student Feedback	A. Instructor offers limited opportunity for students to give feedback to faculty on course content. B. Instructor offers limited opportunity for students to give feedback on ease of online technology and accessibility of course. C. Instructor uses student feedback to help plan instruction and assessment of student learning for the next semester in a limited way.	A. Instructor offers adequate opportunities for students to give feedback on course content. B. Instructor offers adequate opportunities for students to give feedback on ease of online technology and accessibility of course. C. Instructor requests and uses student feedback a couple times during the semester to help plan instruction and assessment of student learning for the rest of the semester.	A. Instructor offers multiple opportunities for students to give feedback on course content. B. Instructor offers multiple opportunities for students to give feedback on ease of online technology and accessibility of course. C. Instructor uses formal and informal student feedback in an ongoing basis to help plan instruction and assessment of student learning throughout the semester.

From Committee for Online Instruction, California State University, Chico (2009).

The Rubric for Online Instruction. Reprinted with permission.

Appendix D: Effective Teaching as Cited from Various Sources

The prime indicators of effective teaching include:

Intellectual competence, integrity and independence

Evidence of knowledge of the field of study or specialty

Evidence of knowledge and use of a variety of teaching methods

Evidence of providing opportunities for student review and feedback

Evidence of responding to student concerns, and provides feedback in a timely manner

Evidence of willingness to consider suggestions that emerge from peer review

Evidence of the ability to work with other faculty members in designing and delivering curricula that fosters student learning

Evidence of the use of multiples strategies to assess student's learning

Evidence of adjusting one's teaching in relation to the findings from assessing student's learning

Evidence of an ability to stimulate student's intellectual interest and enthusiasm

Evidence of advising students about their program of academic study

Evidence of communicating with families and community stakeholders

Evidence of knowledge of educational, professional, and community resources

Evidence of continuing professional development

Evidence of organization of accurate records and educational documents

Evidence of the resources and willingness to support different learning abilities

Evidence of knowledge of advances in technology and online instruction

Appendix E: The Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire

This form has been designed to allow you to describe your experience with teacher evaluation in some detail. Your responses will be combined with those of other teachers to yield a clearer picture of the key ingredients in an effective teacher evaluation experience. The goal of this research is to determine if and how the evaluation process can be revised to help it serve relevant and useful purposes. If we are to reach this goal, it will be important for you to provide frank and honest responses. This is why your answers will remain anonymous.

As you will see, this is not a superficial questionnaire. It is designed to be comprehensive in scope and will take more than a few minutes to complete. For this reason, it is crucial that you read and follow directions very carefully. Please set a side twenty uninterrupted minutes to provide thoughtful responses.

The Definition of Teacher Evaluation

Guidelines for teacher evaluation often suggest that probationary and tenured teachers be formally evaluated annually. The process leading to the once a year evaluation may consist of goal setting, classroom observation, and conferencing between teacher and supervisor before and after the observation. Sound practice also may include less formal, more frequent interactions between supervisor and teacher. When reference is made in this questionnaire to teacher evaluation, it should be understood to encompass all these elements.

Specific instructions

Given this definition of teacher evaluation, please reflect on the last time you were evaluated-your *most recent* experience with your teacher evaluation system. Regard the entire evaluation process, including planning for evaluation, classroom observations, and feedback. As you think about this experience, how would you rate the overall quality of the evaluation? Circle the appropriate number:

Low quality 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 High quality

Next, please rate the *impact* of that teacher evaluation experience on three specific aspects of your professional practices. Use the scales provided to indicate impact, from 0 meaning no impact to 9 meaning strong impact.

Please code the *impact on your attitudes* about teaching: A strong impact rating (9) would reflect a profound change in how you feel about the content you teach, your students, and/ or yourself as a teacher.

No impact 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Strong impact

Code the *impact on your teaching behaviors and strategies*: A strong impact (9) would reflect major changes in your instructional behavior, classroom management strategies, evaluation practices, and/or other observable dimensions of your teaching.

No impact 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Strong impact

Code the *impact on your understanding of the teaching- learning process*: A strong impact (9) would reflect a change in your ability to account for your effectiveness (or lack thereof), explain the reasons for your instructional decisions, and/or better understand student needs or behavior.

No impact 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Strong impact

Finally, please use the scales provided below (A through E) to describe yourself and the nature of your *most recent* teacher evaluation experience. Do this by-

- Considering the attribute to be described
- Studying the scale to be used to describe it
- Selecting the letter that represents the point you select on each continuum
- Circling that letter

A. Describe your attributes as a teacher:

1. Rate your overall competence as a teacher

I'm minimally competent A B C D E I'm an outstanding teacher.

2. Rate the strength of your professional expectations of yourself.

I demand little A B C D E I demand a great deal.

Describe your interpersonal manner:

3. Orientation to risk-taking

I avoid risks A B C D E I take risks

4. Orientation to others

I'm reserved, private A B C D E I'm open, public

5. Attribution of reasons of your success/failure

I hold others responsible A B C D E I hold myself responsible

6. Orientation to change

I'm relatively slow to change A B C D E I'm relatively flexible

7. Orientation to experimentation in classroom

I don't experiment A B C D E I experiment frequently

8. Openness to criticism

I'm relatively closed A B C D E I'm relatively open

9. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching

I know little A B C D E I know a great deal

10. Knowledge of subject matter

I know a little A B C D E I know a great deal

Describe your teaching experience:

11. At current grade

A: 0 to 1 year B: 2 to 3 years C: 4 to 5 years D: 6 to 10 years E: 11 or more years

12. With current content (if secondary teacher)

A: 0 to 1 year B: 2 to 3 years C: 4 to 5 years D: 6 to 10 years E: 11 or more years

13. Experience with teacher evaluation prior to most recent experience

Waste of time A B C D E Helpful

B. Describe your perceptions of the person who evaluated your performance (most recently):

14. Credibility as a source feedback

Not credible	A	B	C	D	E	Very credible

15. Working relationship with you

Adversary	A	B	C	D	E	Helper

16. Level of trust

Not trustworthy	A	B	C	D	E	Trustworthy

17. Interpersonal manner

Threatening	A	B	C	D	E	Not threatening

18. Temperament

Impatient	A	B	C	D	E	Patient

19. Flexibility

Rigid	A	B	C	D	E	Flexible

20. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching

Not knowledgeable	A	B	C	D	E	Knowledgeable

21. Capacity to demonstrate or model needed improvements

Low	A	B	C	D	E	High

22. Familiarity with your particular classroom

Unfamiliar	A	B	C	D	E	Very familiar

23. Experience in classrooms in general

Little	A	B	C	D	E	A great deal

24. Usefulness or suggestions for improvement

Useless	A	B	C	D	E	Useful

25. Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions

Not persuasive A B C D E Very persuasive

C. Describe the attributes of the information gathered on your performance during your most recent evaluation:

What procedures were used to address the dimensions of your teaching (standards) to be evaluated?

26. Were standards communicated to you?

Not at all A B C D E In great detail

27. Were standards clear to you?

Vague A B C D E Clear

28. Were standards endorsed by you as appropriate for your classroom?

Not endorsed A B C D E Endorsed

29. What was the form of the standards?

A: Goals to be attained B: Personal and/or professional traits to possess

30. Were the standards…

The same for all teachers? A B C D E Unique to you?

To what extent were the following sources of performance information tapped as part of the evaluation?

31. Observation of your classroom performance

Not considered A B C D E Used extensively

32. Examination of classroom or school records (lesson plans, etc.)

Not considered A B C D E Used extensively

33. Examination of student achievement

Not considered A B C D E Used extensively

Extent of observations in your classroom:

(Note: In these items, FORMAL refers to observations that were preannounced and were preceded and followed by a conference with the evaluator; INFORMAL refers to unannounced drop-in visits.)

34. Number of FORMAL observations per year (most recent experience)

A: 0 B: 1 C: 2 D: 3 E: 4 or more

35. Approximate frequency of INFORMAL observations (most recent experience)

A: None B: Less than 1 per month C: Once per month D: Once per week E: Daily

Average length of observation (most recent experience):

36. FORMAL

Brief (few minutes) A B C D E Extended (40 minutes or more)

37. INFORMAL

Brief (few minutes) A B C D E Extended (40 minutes or more)

38. Number of different people observing and evaluating you during the year

A: Supervisor only

B: Supervisor & 1 other person

C: Supervisor & 2 other people

D: Supervisor & 3 or more others

E: Other

If others besides your supervisor evaluated you, who were they (titles only)?

_____

_____

_____

D. Please describe the attributes of the feedback you received:

39. Amount of information received

None	A	B	C	D	E	Great deal

40. Frequency of feedback

Infrequent	A	B	C	D	E	Frequent

41. Formality of feedback

Informal	A	B	C	D	E	Formal

42. Depth of information provided

Shallow	A	B	C	D	E	In-depth

43. Quality of the ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback

Low	A	B	C	D	E	High

44. Specificity of information provided

General	A	B	C	D	E	Specific

45. Nature of information provided

Judgmental	A	B	C	D	E	Descriptive

46. Timing of the feedback

Delayed	A	B	C	D	E	Immediate

47. Feedback focused on district teaching standards

Ignored them	A	B	C	D	E	Reflected them

E. Describe the attributes of the evaluation context:

48. Amount of time spent on the evaluation process, including your time and that of all other participants

None	A	B	C	D	E	Great deal

Resources available for professional development:

49. Time allotted during the teaching day for professional development

None A B C D E Great deal

50. Available training programs and models

None A B C D E Many

District values and policies in evaluation:

51. Clarity of policy statements regarding purpose for evaluation

Vague A B C D E Clear

52. Intended role of evaluation

Teacher accountability A B C D E Teacher growth

53. Recent history of labor relations in district

Turbulent A B C D E Tranquil

54. Impact of bargaining agreement on evaluation process

None A B C D E Great deal

55. Impact of state law on evaluation process

None A B C D E Great deal

F. Are there other dimensions of you as a teacher, the nature of the performance data collected, the nature of the feedback, the evaluation context, or other factors that you think are related to the success (or lack of success) of your past teacher evaluation experiences that should be included in the above list? If so, please specify.

_____

_____

DESCRIBING YOURSELF AS AN EVALUATOR OF TEACHERS

This form has been designed to allow you to describe yourself as an evaluator of teachers. Your responses will be combined with those of teachers and other evaluators to yield a clear picture of the key ingredients in an effective teacher evaluation experience. The goal of this research is to determine if and how the evaluation process can be revised to help it serve relevant and useful purposes. If we are to reach this goal, it will be important for you to provide frank and honest responses. This is why your answers will remain anonymous.

Please use the following scales to describe yourself on the attributes listed. Circle the letter that represents the point you select on each continuum.

How would you describe your –

1. Knowledge of the technical aspects of teaching?

I know little A B C D E I know a great deal

2. Capacity to demonstrate or model needed changes in teacher performance?

Low A B C D E High

3. Amount of experience as a teacher in the classroom?

None A B C D E Extensive

4. Recency of experience as a teacher in the classroom?

Not recent A B C D E Recent

5. Repertoire of suggestions for good teaching?

Limited A B C D E Extensive

6. Persuasiveness of the rationale you use to defend your suggestions?

Not persuasive A B C D E Persuasive

7. Knowledge of subject matter taught by teachers you evaluate?

Limited A B C D E Extensive

8. Strength of your expectations for yourself?

Demand little A B C D E Demand a great deal

9. Experience as a supervisor of teachers?

A: 0 to 1 year
B: 2 to 4 years
C: 5 to 7 years
D: 8 to 10 years
E: 11 or more years

10. General expectations of teachers?

Not able to improve A B C D E Able to improve

11. Expectations regarding teachers' motivations?

Willing to improve A B C D E Not willing to improve

12. Ability to encourage risk-taking in teachers?

Low A B C D E High

13. Willingness to take risks yourself?

I don't take risks A B C D E I take risks

14. Working relationship to teachers?

Adversary A B C D E Helper

How would you describe your interpersonal manner in terms of your –

15. Level of teacher trust?

Low	A	B	C	D	E	High

16. Interpersonal manner?

Threatening	A	B	C	D	E	Not threatening

17. Temperament?

Impatient	A	B	C	D	E	Patient

18. Flexibility?

Rigid	A	B	C	D	E	Flexible

19. Attitude regarding the purpose of teacher evaluation?

Teacher accountability	A	B	C	D	E	Teacher growth

20. Confidence that this purpose will be achieved?

Lack confidence	A	B	C	D	E	Very confident

21. Training in teacher evaluation?

None	A	B	C	D	E	Extensive

22. Listening skills?

Ineffective	A	B	C	D	E	Very effective

23. Ability to convey your messages to teachers clearly?

Unclear	A	B	C	D	E	Very clear

24. Ability to give teachers positive feedback?

Ineffective	A	B	C	D	E	Very effective

25. Ability to give teachers negative feedback?

Ineffective	A	B	C	D	E	Very effective

26. Ability to mix positive and negative feedback?

Relatively ineffective at mixing	A	B	C	D	E	Very effective at mixing

Appendix F: Permission Letter from Dr. Duke

Euwanna Heard <euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu> Aug 18 (4 days ago)

to dld7g

Hello Dr. Duke,

My name is Euwanna Heard. I am currently working on my dissertation titled "The Impact of Formal Evaluations on the Teaching Practices of Online Adjunct Faculty" at Walden University. I have referenced an article in my study published by the NEA titled "Teacher Evaluation: Five Keys to Growth" by Daniel L. Duke and Richard J. Stiggins. The article was published in 1986 and contains The Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire. I would like to use and modify the Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire for my study.

Please advise and be assured that I will not use nor modify the questionnaire without your permission.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Euwanna Heard
euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu
240-762-1790

Daniel L. Duke <dld7g@cms.mail.virginia.edu> Aug 18 (4 days ago)

to me

Dear Euwanna:

Congratulations on getting this far in your doctoral program. You have my permission to use (or modify) the Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire in your dissertation research. I trust that you will come up with some interesting findings.

All the best,
Dan Duke

Euwanna Heard <euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu> Aug 18 (4 days ago)

to Daniel

Thank you Dr. Duke for your permission to use and modify the Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire. I will take great care to ensure proper reference to the questionnaire in my study.

Sincerely,

Euwanna

Appendix G: Permission Letter form Dr. Stiggins

Aug 18 (4 days ago)

Euwanna Heard <euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu>

to rickstiggins

Dear Dr. Stiggins,

My name is Euwanna Heard. I am currently working on my dissertation titled "The Impact of Formal Evaluations on the Teaching Practices of Online Adjunct Faculty" at Walden University. I have referenced an article in my study published by the NEA titled "Teacher Evaluation: Five Keys to Growth" by Daniel L. Duke and Richard J. Stiggins. The article was published in 1986 and contains The Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire. I would like to use and modify the Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire for my study.

Please advise and be assured that I will not use nor modify the questionnaire without your permission.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Euwanna Heard
euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu
240-762-1790

Rick Stiggins Aug 18 (4 days ago)

to me

Euwanna,

You have my permission to use the questionnaire in it original form or adapted in collecting data for your dissertation.

Euwanna Heard <euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu> Aug 18 (4 days ago)

to Rick

Thank you Dr. Stiggins for your permission to use/adapt the Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire for my study. I will take great care to ensure proper reference to the questionnaire in my dissertation.

Sincerely,

Euwanna Heard

Appendix H: Permission Letter from NAESP and NEA

Aug 18 (9 days ago)

Meredith Barnett <MBarnett@naesp.org>

to me

Hi Euwanna,

There should be no problem with your use of the Teacher Evaluation Experience survey from the report *Teacher Evaluation: Five Keys to Growth*. (This is the document you were referring to, right?)

If you reprint the survey in its entirety, please include this credit line: **Reprinted with permission. Copyright 1986. National Association of Elementary School Principals. All rights reserved.**

Please let me know if you need any other assistance. Thanks!

Meredith Barnett, Public Affairs Associate
National Association of Elementary School Principals
703-518-6261

Johnson, Laurie [NEA] Aug 25 (2 days ago)

to me

Thank you for forwarding the other permission acceptances to me. The National Education Association also provides permission to use/modify the survey requested in your study. Good luck and congratulations on your work!

Laurie
Laurie D. Johnson
*Center for Business Operations Financial & Membership Services/Membership Management Services (202) 822-7366 * (202) 822-7669 (fax)*

Appendix I: Letter to Expert Faculty

Dear Faculty Member,

My name is Euwanna Heard. I am currently working on my dissertation titled "The Impact of Formal Evaluations on the Teaching Practices of Online Adjunct Faculty for Effective Teaching and Professional Development" at Walden University. I have adapted The Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire with permission for data collection in a descriptive survey.

The instrument was adapted to address the following research questions: 1. How do formal evaluations impact the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty for effective teaching and professional development? 2. How does online adjunct faculty perceive the quality of formal evaluative processes? How does online adjunct faculty perceive the efficacy of formal evaluative processes?

You are being asked to review the adapted instrument to assist in establishing validity of the instrument. I am asking that you examine the instrument and consider the following criteria for determining content validity and construct validity respectively: Are the questions representative of the area of interest? Are the scores from the instrument significant, meaningful and purposeful for the area of study?

Your feedback and suggestions are appreciated and valued as expert opinions for the completion of this survey and for the support of my endeavor as a doctoral candidate at Walden University.

Respectfully,

Euwanna Heard
euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu
240-762-1790

Appendix J: The Teacher Evaluation Experience Questionnaire (Adapted Version)

The Definition of Teacher Evaluation

Guidelines for online teacher evaluation often suggest that probationary online adjunct faculty be formally evaluated annually. The process leading to the once a year evaluation may consist of goal setting, classroom observation, and conferencing between teacher and supervisor before and after the observation. Sound practice also may include less formal, more frequent interactions between supervisor and teacher. When reference is made in this questionnaire to teacher evaluation, it should be understood to encompass all these elements.

Specific instructions

Given this definition of teacher evaluation, please reflect on the last time you were evaluated-your *most recent* experience with your teacher evaluation system. Regard the entire evaluation process, including planning for evaluation, classroom observations, and feedback. As you think about this experience, how would you rate the overall quality of the evaluation? Circle the appropriate number:

Low quality 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 High quality

Next, please rate the *impact* of that teacher evaluation experience on three specific aspects of your professional practices. Use the scales provided to indicate impact, from 0 meaning no impact to 9 meaning strong impact.

Please code the *impact on your attitudes* about teaching: A strong impact rating (9) would reflect a profound change in how you feel about the content you teach, your students, and/ or yourself as a teacher.

No impact 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Strong impact

Code the *impact on your teaching behaviors and strategies*: A strong impact (9) would reflect major changes in your instructional behavior, classroom management strategies, evaluation practices, and/or other observable dimensions of your teaching.

No impact 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Strong impact

Code the *impact on your understanding of the teaching- learning process*: A strong impact (9) would reflect a change in your ability to account for your effectiveness (or lack thereof), explain the reasons for your instructional decisions, and/or better understand student needs or behavior.

No impact 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Strong impact

Code the impact of *your understanding of professional development:* A strong impact (9) would reflect your willingness to seek and take advantage of opportunities for ongoing faculty development and enrichment.

Finally, please use the scales provided below (A through E) to describe yourself and the nature of your *most recent* teacher evaluation experience. Do this by-

- Considering the attribute to be described
- Studying the scale to be used to describe it
- Selecting the letter that represents the point you select on each continuum
- Circling that letter

A. Describe your attributes as a teacher:

1. Rate your overall competence as a teacher

I'm minimally competent A B C D E I'm an outstanding teacher.

2. Rate the strength of your professional expectations of yourself.

I demand little A B C D E I demand a great deal.

Describe your interpersonal manner:

3. Orientation to risk-taking

I avoid risks A B C D E I take risks

4. Orientation to others

I'm reserved, private A B C D E I'm open, public

5. Attribution of reasons of your success/failure

I hold others responsible A B C D E I hold myself responsible

6. Orientation to change

I'm relatively slow to change A B C D E I'm relatively flexible

7. Orientation to experimentation in classroom

I don't experiment A B C D E I experiment frequently

8. Openness to criticism

I'm relatively closed A B C D E I'm relatively open

9. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching

I know little A B C D E I know a great deal

10. Knowledge of subject matter

I know a little A B C D E I know a great deal

Describe your online teaching experience:

11. At current institution

A: 0 to 1 year B: 2 to 3 years C: 4 to 5 years D: 6 to 10 years E: 11 or more years

12. With current content

A: 0 to 1 year B: 2 to 3 years C: 4 to 5 years D: 6 to 10 years E: 11 or more years

13. Experience with online adjunct teacher evaluation prior to most recent experience

Waste of time A B C D E Helpful

B. Describe your perceptions of the person who evaluated your performance (most recently):

14. Credibility as a source feedback

Not credible A B C D E Very credible

15. Working relationship with you

Adversary A B C D E Helper

16. Level of trust

Not trustworthy A B C D E Trustworthy

17. Interpersonal manner

Threatening	A	B	C	D	E	Not threatening

18. Temperament

Impatient	A	B	C	D	E	Patient

19. Flexibility

Rigid	A	B	C	D	E	Flexible

20. Knowledge of technical aspects of teaching

Not knowledgeable	A	B	C	D	E	Knowledgeable

21. Capacity to demonstrate or model needed improvements

Low	A	B	C	D	E	High

22. Familiarity with your particular classroom

Unfamiliar	A	B	C	D	E	Very familiar

23. Experience in classrooms in general

Little	A	B	C	D	E	A great deal

24. Usefulness or suggestions for improvement

Useless	A	B	C	D	E	Useful

25. Persuasiveness of rationale for suggestions

Not persuasive	A	B	C	D	E	Very persuasive

C. Describe the attributes of the information gathered on your performance during your most recent evaluation:

What procedures were used to address the dimensions of your teaching (standards) to be evaluated?

26. Were standards communicated to you?

Not at all A B C D E In great detail

27. Were standards clear to you?

Vague A B C D E Clear

28. Were standards endorsed by you as appropriate for your classroom?

Not endorsed A B C D E Endorsed

29. What was the form of the standards?

A: Goals to be attained B: Personal and/or professional traits to possess

30. Were the standards…

The same for all teachers? A B C D E Unique to you?

To what extent were the following sources of performance information tapped as part of the evaluation?

31. Observation of your classroom performance

Not considered A B C D E Used extensively

32. Examination of classroom or school records (lesson plans, etc.)

Not considered A B C D E Used extensively

33. Examination of student achievement

Not considered A B C D E Used extensively

Extent of observations in your classroom:

(Note: In these items, FORMAL refers to observations that were preannounced and were preceded and followed by a conference with the evaluator; INFORMAL refers to unannounced drop-in visits.)

34. Number of FORMAL observations per year (most recent experience)

A: 0 B: 1 C: 2 D: 3 E: 4 or more

35. Approximate frequency of INFORMAL observations (most recent experience)

A: None B: Less than 1 per month C: Once per month D: Once per week E: Daily

Average length of observation (most recent experience):

36. FORMAL

Brief (few minutes) A B C D E Extended (40 minutes or more)

37. INFORMAL

Brief (few minutes) A B C D E Extended (40 minutes or more)

38. Number of different people observing and evaluating you during the year

A: Supervisor only

B: Supervisor & 1 other person

C: Supervisor & 2 other people

D: Supervisor & 3 or more others

E: Other

If others besides your supervisor evaluated you, who were they (titles only)?

_____

_____

_____

D. Please describe the attributes of the feedback you received:

39. Amount of information received

None A B C D E Great deal

40. Frequency of feedback

Infrequent A B C D E Frequent

41. Formality of feedback

Informal	A	B	C	D	E	Formal

42. Depth of information provided

Shallow	A	B	C	D	E	In-depth

43. Quality of the ideas and suggestions contained in the feedback

Low	A	B	C	D	E	High

44. Specificity of information provided

General	A	B	C	D	E	Specific

45. Nature of information provided

Judgmental	A	B	C	D	E	Descriptive

46. Timing of the feedback

Delayed	A	B	C	D	E	Immediate

47. Feedback focused on district teaching standards

Ignored them	A	B	C	D	E	Reflected them

E. Describe the attributes of the evaluation context:

48. Amount of time spent on the evaluation process, including your time and that of all other participants

None	A	B	C	D	E	Great deal

Resources available for professional development:

49. Time allotted during the teaching day for professional development

None	A	B	C	D	E	Great deal

50. Available training programs and models

None	A	B	C	D	E	Many

District values and policies in evaluation:

51. Clarity of policy statements regarding purpose for evaluation

Vague	A	B	C	D	E	Clear

52. Intended role of evaluation

Teacher accountability	A	B	C	D	E	Teacher growth

53. Recent history of labor relations in district

Turbulent	A	B	C	D	E	Tranquil

54. Impact of bargaining agreement on evaluation process

None	A	B	C	D	E	Great deal

55. Impact of state law on evaluation process

None	A	B	C	D	E	Great deal

Appendix K: Permission Letter to Conduct Research at University

Dear Administrator,

My name is Euwanna Heard. I am a doctoral student at Walden University in the Richard W. Wiley School of Education. To further my studies, I would like request permission to conduct a survey of the online adjunct faculty at your institution of higher learning.

The purpose of my study is to determine how formal evaluations affect the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty. This study is intended to examine the evaluative processes of online adjunct faculty and the effects of these processes on the teaching practices of online adjunct faculty for effective teaching and professional development. The results of this study are also intended to assist in the development of a project that might inform online adjunct faculty and administrators of online colleges and universities of evaluative processes that support and enhance the role of online adjunct faculty in institutions of higher learning. This study has been approved by ……

I assure you that the confidentiality and anonymity of the university and faculty will be maintained throughout the study. Survey reports received from the participants will remain anonymous with the use of a numeric coding system. You and the participating staff will be provided with copies of the final results and findings of the study.

Please reply to this letter at euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu and indicate your approval for participation and your permission to conduct my survey at your university or non-approval for participation and no permission to conduct my survey at your university.

Thank you for your consideration and support of my doctoral studies at Walden University. You may also contact me at 301-275-4864 (mobile) or 301-552-5912 (home) if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Euwanna Heard

Appendix L: Letter to Participants

Dear Faculty Member,

My name is Euwanna Heard. I am a doctoral student at Walden University in the Richard W. Wiley School of Education. I am conducting a research study titled "The Impact of Formal Evaluations on the Teaching Practices of Online Adjunct Faculty for Effective Teaching and Professional Development".

I am requesting your participation in this study, which will involve completing an online survey answering questions about your perception and the effects of faculty evaluations on your teaching practices. Your response to this survey will be beneficial for informing online adjunct faculty and administrators of the effectiveness of formal evaluations and serve as a guide for evaluating evaluative processes that will support and enhance the role of online adjunct faculty at institutions of higher learning. No risks or discomforts are anticipated from taking part in this study. If you feel uncomfortable with a question, you can skip that question or withdraw from the study altogether without penalty.

This survey contains 30 items and should take approximately 15 – 20 minutes of your time. Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate. If you decide to participate in this research study, you may withdraw at any time. If you choose not to participate or withdraw at any time, there will be no penalty. If you feel uncomfortable with a question, you can skip that question or withdraw from the study altogether. If you decide to withdraw at any time before you have finished the survey, your answers will not be recorded.

The online survey is anonymous, and your responses will be kept confidential. All data will be stored in a password protected electronic format. To help protect your identity, the survey will not contain information that will personally identify you. The results of the survey will be used for scholarly purposes only and may be shared with Walden University representatives. The online survey is located at http://.....com. Return of a completed survey will serve as you consent to participate.

If you have any questions concerning this research study, please call me at 240-762-1790 or email me at euwanna.heard@waldenu.edu. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant, you can call ...., the Walden University representative at.... Walden University's approval number for this study is IRB..... and it expires on.....

Thank you sincerely for your support. Respectfully,

Euwanna Heard

Appendix M: Approval to Post Study to the University Participant Pool

Hi Euwanna,

Your study has been approved and is now visible to participants. Please note, if you make any changes to your study at this point, it will automatically hide the study from participants. Thus, you will need to send an e-mail to participantpool@.edu to request that the study be re-approved, and thus be made available to participants again.

When your data collection is complete, you will need to deactivate your study (by clicking on "no" in the Active Study field on the Change Study Information page). This will hide the study from the participants' view, but you as the researcher will still have access to it until your IRB approval expires.

Sincerely,

Research Ethics Support Specialist
Office of Research Ethics and Compliance
University

Phone:
Fax:

Appendix N: Approval from University 1

Hi Euwanna,

Thank you for providing your protocol and supporting documents for your study. After looking over everything, it does not appear that our University is considered engaged in this research, so no separate IRB review or approval would be required from our office. The study appears to be minimal risk and does not conflict with any of our state laws or University policies.

This correspondence can serve as a determination of "Not Engaged" and should be kept in your research records. However, if your institution desires a more formal letter determination, we have procedures available where you can submit into our CATS submission system for review and formal determination. If this is required, please let me know so that I can obtain and provide instructions on how you may obtain a temporary University access account to be able to login to the CATS system. I can also provide instructions for how to navigate through PRAMS. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks!

IRB Analyst
Office for Research Protections
University

Euwanna,

I believe I am able to accommodate this request. I will send an email that you draft, requesting that part-time faculty teaching an online course consider completing your survey. Please note that part-time faculty might not be teaching exclusively online. They might teach one course in residence (face to face) and one course online, as a part-time instructor.

I will be able to provide you with the number of email invitations that were sent.
Best,

Director, Outreach Analytics and Reporting Outreach and Online Education
email:
phone:

Appendix O: Approval from University 2

Hello Ms. Heard,

I am please to inform you that the _____College Institutional Review Board has approved your research project for one year from this date. Please read this letter carefully and save a copy for your files. You will need to contact us no later than one year from today to close the loop on this research project. We wish you all the best and please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

(See attached file: Approval-Form-signed-5-20-15.pdf)

Institutional Review Board, Chair
_____College