COLLIN COLLEGE ONLINE CLASS VISIT				
Faculty Name:	Course & CRN:			
Evaluator:	Date:			
 Meet with the instructor either face-to-face or via a web conference to discuss the structure and dynamics of the course at which time the faculty member will guide the evaluator through the course to demonstrate the criteria listed below; Access the course in student view to gain a student perspective with regard to the criteria listed below; For each category, the evaluator should include substantive clarification/commentary pinpointing strengths as well as any areas in need of improvement; Set goals to address any areas in need of improvement. 				
LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	MEETS Expected Level of Performance	DOES NOT MEET Expected Level of Performance	N/A	
1.1 Students have an opportunity to get to know the instructor and classmates through resources/activities intended to build community, support communication, and establish trust.				
1.2 Instructor uses a variety of activities and resources to accommodate different learning styles.				
1.3 Instructor facilitates critical thinking and/or collaboration.				
1.4 Learning activities and assignments are aligned with course goals and objectives to facilitate the accomplishment of learning outcomes.				
Evaluator description of strengths and/or areas in need of improvement:				
Instructor Comments:				
ENGAGEMENT	MEETS Expected Level of Performance	DOES NOT MEET Expected Level of Performance	N/A	
2.1 Course offers access to a variety of engaging resources that facilitate communication and collaboration, deliver content, and support student learning and engagement.				
2.2 Course provides activities that emulate real world applications of the discipline, such as experiential learning, case studies, and problem-based activities.				

2.3 Students are encouraged to exchange ideas, share resources, and collaborate with classmates to accomplish learning outcomes.			
2.4 Instructor remains approachable and available throughout the semester.			
Evaluator description of strengths and/or areas in need of improvem	ent:		
Instructor Comments:			
ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE	MEETS Expected Level of Performance	DOES NOT MEET Expected Level of Performance	N/A
3.1 Course design and layout is logical, consistent, easy to navigate, and up-to-date per OAB standards.			
3.2 Instructions, expectations, requirements, grading criteria, and policies (including consequences of late submissions) are clearly			
stated, defined, measurable, and promote student success.			
Evaluator description of strengths and/or areas in need of improvem	ent:		
Instructor Comments:			
ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK	MEETS Expected Level of Performance	DOES NOT MEET Expected Level of Performance	N/A
4.1 Expectations for timely and regular feedback from the instructor are clearly stated and adhered to.			

4.2 Criteria for the assessment of a graded assignment are clearly	
articulated, instruments used for grading (rubrics, exemplary work,	
etc.) are readily available to students prior to completing	
assignment.	
4.3 Instructor provides plenty of constructive feedback to encourage	
continuous improvement and to help students understand how well	
they have accomplished course learning outcomes/assignment	
goals.	
4.4 Instructor completes grading in accordance with grading policy	
as stated in the syllabus, and students have easy access to a well-	
designed and up-to-date gradebook.	
Evaluator description of strengths and/or areas in need of improvement:	
Instructor Comments:	
Faculty signature:	Date signed:
Evaluator signature:	Date Signed:

Adapted from the OSCQR Rubric, Dashboard, and Process are made available by Online Learning Consortium, Inc. (OLC) under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC By 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The OSCQR Rubric, Dashboard and Process were originally developed by the State University of New York, through the Open SUNY® Center for Online Teaching Excellence (http://commons.suny.edu/cote/).