

3-Point Rubric for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

For each 21f online course a district offers, the district is responsible for including the results of its online course quality review as part of the syllabus published on the Michigan's Online Course Catalog website (<http://micourses.org>). This course review is to be conducted using the *iNACOL National Standards for Quality Online Courses*. The rubric contained in this document is provided as a supplemental resource to assist course reviewers in the review process. *MVU* developed this rubric based on feedback from school representatives who were looking for more guidance on how to conduct a quality review.

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Content: Academic Content Standards and Assessments			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+A1. The goals and objectives clearly state what the participants will know or be able to do at the end of the course. The goals and objectives are measurable in multiple ways.	Within the learning management system, course goals and objectives are not present.	Within the learning management system, course goals and objectives are present but not easily found or clear to students. The course measures goals and objectives in only ONE or TWO ways.	Within the learning management system, course goals and objectives are present, explicitly stated, and can be easily found by students. The student's level of mastery is measured in THREE or more ways against the goals and objectives.
*A2. The course content and assignments are aligned with the state's content standards, common core curriculum, or other accepted content standards set for Advanced Placement® courses, technology, computer science, or other courses whose content is not included in the state standards.	A substantial number of the state content standards are not observed or partially observed.	Some of the course content and assignments are aligned to the state's academic standards, assessments, or nationally/internationally accepted content standards set for Advanced Placement® or other elective courses whose content is not included in state standards.	The course content and assignments are ALL explicitly and thoroughly aligned to the state's academic standards, assessments, or nationally/ internationally accepted content standards set for Advanced Placement® or other elective courses whose content is not included in state standards.
*A3. The course content and assignments are of sufficient rigor, depth and breadth to teach the standards being addressed.	Course components (objectives, assessments, instructional strategies, content, assignments, and technology) have little or no rigor or depth and breadth.	Course components (objectives, assessments, instructional strategies, content, assignments, and technology) lack sufficient rigor or depth and breadth. Some assignments require additional instruction to ensure rigor and depth.	Course components (objectives, assessments, instructional strategies, content, assignments, and technology) are especially broad, deep and rigorous such that successful students will have the knowledge and skills required by the standards upon completion of the course.
A4. Information literacy and communication skills are incorporated and taught as an integral part of the curriculum.	Minimal and insufficient information literacy and communication skills are integrated in the course content.	Information literacy and communication skills are somewhat incorporated as part of the curriculum.	Information literacy including digital fluency and communication skills are incorporated as an integral part of the curriculum.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Content: Academic Content Standards and Assessments (Continued)			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+A5. Multiple learning resources and materials to increase student success are available to students before the course begins.	Before the course begins, there are little to no learning resources available for students.	Before the course begins, students are provided with some learning resources (textbooks, instructional materials, links to browser plug-ins, and other software, which students must install) that prepare them for the online course.	Before the course begins, students are provided multiple learning resources (textbooks, instructional materials, links to browser plug-ins, and other software, which students must install) that prepare them for the online course. Additional materials related to successful strategies for completing an online course, tutorials, orientations, and prerequisite knowledge and skills are also provided at this time.
Content: Course Overview and Introduction			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+A6. A clear, complete course overview and syllabus are included in the course.	There is either no course overview or syllabus, or there is a location within the course for an overview/syllabus but they are missing .	One or more of the following components of the syllabus or overview is missing : course objectives and student learning outcomes, assignments, student expectations, time requirements, required materials, grading policy, teacher contact information, and content scope and sequence.	The course overview and syllabus include all of the following: course objectives and student learning outcomes, assignments, student expectations, time requirements, required materials, grading policy, teacher contact information, intended audience, content scope and sequence, and other helpful information.
A7. Course requirements are consistent with course goals, are representative of the scope of the course and are clearly stated.	Course requirements are missing , vague, and/or are not consistent with the course goals.	Most course requirements (timeframe for participation, approximate time required for individual activities and expectations for communications) are consistent with course goals, representative of the scope of the course and clearly stated .	The course requirements include all of the following : a detailed timeframe for participation, an approximate time required for individual activities, and specific expectations for communications, and are consistent with course goals, representative of the scope of the course and clearly stated.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL’s National Standards for Quality Courses

Content: Course Overview and Introduction (Continued)			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+A8. Information is provided to students, parents and mentors on how to communicate with the online instructor and course provider.	There is no instructor/provider contact information available.	There is little or inaccurate instructor/provider contact information provided.	Appropriate instructor/provider communication information such as office hours, phone number, email, and biographical information is provided. The process for communicating with the instructor is clearly outlined .
Content: Legal and Acceptable Use Policies			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
*A9. The course reflects multicultural education, and the content is accurate, current and free of bias or advertising.	Content is missing TWO of four conditions (multicultural, up-to-date, accurate or free of any bias or advertising).	Content is missing ONE of four conditions (multicultural, up-to-date, accurate or free of any bias or advertising).	The course reflects all conditions of multicultural education: the content is accurate, current and free of bias or advertising.
A10. Expectations for academic integrity, use of copyrighted materials, plagiarism and netiquette (Internet etiquette) regarding lesson activities, discussions, e-mail communications are clearly stated.	Copyright, plagiarism, netiquette, and integrity information are not included in the course or are not linked to if located outside of the course.	Some, but not all expectations are clearly stated or present in the course, or are not linked to if located outside of the course.	All issues addressing copyrighted materials, plagiarism, netiquette, and integrity are included in the course or are linked to if located outside of the course.
+A11. Privacy policies are clearly stated.	Privacy policies are not included in the course or are not linked to if located outside of the course.	A privacy policy statement is included in the course or is linked to if located outside of the course. The policy discloses the organization’s information gathering and dissemination practices.	A privacy policy statement is posted on the course provider’s website and in the course and is easily found by the student. The policy discloses the organization’s information gathering and dissemination practices.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency’s Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Content: Instructor Resources			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
A12. Online instructor resources and notes are included.	Instructor resources and notes are not included in the course.	Minimal instructor resources and notes are available in the course.	Ample instructor resources and notes are available for every learning unit in the course.
A13. Assessment and assignment answers and explanations are included.	No answers, explanations, rubrics or examples are included.	Some answers, explanations, and rubrics are provided; no examples are included or explanations are limited.	Answers, explanations, rubrics, and examples of completed assessments and assignments are included in the instructor resources.
Instructional Design: Instructional and Audience Analysis			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
*B1. Course design reflects a clear understanding of all students' needs and incorporates varied ways to learn and master the curriculum.	There is no variety of instructional and assessment methods.	There is a limited variety of instructional and assessment methods. Additional instructional methods, materials and assessments would strengthen the course.	There is a rich variety of instructional and assessment methods. Engaging materials and authentic assessments are used throughout the course to allow students to demonstrate achievement of the goals and objectives of the course.
Instructional Design: Course, Unit and Lesson Design			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
*B2. The course is organized by units and lessons that fall into a logical sequence. Each unit and lesson includes an overview describing objectives, activities, assignments, assessments, and resources to provide multiple learning opportunities for students to master the content.	The course is not organized into units/ modules and lessons that fall into a logical sequence.	The course is somewhat organized in a logical sequence, including modules/units; some lessons do not include an overview, or few or limited resources are noted.	The course is clearly well-organized by units and lessons. At the start of each unit or lesson, an overview is posted describing the objectives, activities, assignments, assessments, and resources to be used and completed.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Instructional Design: Instructional Strategies and Activities			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
* B3. The course instruction includes activities that engage students in active learning.	The course instruction does not include activities that engage students in active learning.	The course provides limited opportunities for students to be actively engaged in the content.	The course provides several opportunities for students to be actively engaged in the content that includes meaningful and authentic learning experiences such as collaborative learning groups, student-led review sessions, games, analysis or reactions to videos, discussions, concept mapping, analyzing case studies, etc.
* B4. The course and course instructor provide students with multiple learning paths, based on student needs that engage students in a variety of ways.	The course and course instructor do not address a variety of learning styles.	The course and course instructor provide a limited variety of activities, assignments, assessments, and resources that address a variety of learning styles. Few alternative assignments/assessments are present.	The course and course instructor consistently provide a wide variety of learning activities that address different learning styles and preferences (auditory, visual, tactile/kinesthetic).
* B5. The course provides opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking, critical reasoning activities and thinking in increasingly complex ways.	The course does not provide opportunities for students to elevate their thinking beyond remembering and understanding.	The course provides a limited amount of assignments, activities, and assessments for students to elevate their thinking beyond remembering and understanding.	The course consistently provides assignments, activities, and assessments for students to elevate their thinking beyond remembering and understanding, and engage in high-order thinking, critical reasoning, and thinking in increasingly complex ways.
+B6. The course provides options for the instructor to adapt learning activities to accommodate students' needs.	The course does not provide options for the instructor to adapt the course to meet the students' needs.	The course provides limited options for the instructor to adapt the course to meet the students' needs by providing additional assignments, resources, and activities for remediation or enrichments for the course.	The course provides a wide variety options for the instructor to adapt the course (as well as add content to the LMS) to meet the students' needs by providing additional assignments, resources, and activities for remediation or enrichments for the course.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Instructional Design: Instructional Strategies and Activities (Continued)			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
B7. Readability levels, written language assignments and mathematical requirements are appropriate for the course content and grade-level expectations.	Readability levels, written language assignments and mathematical requirements are not appropriate for the course content and grade-level expectations.	Readability levels, written language assignments and mathematical requirements are sometimes inappropriate for the course content and grade-level expectations.	Readability levels, written language assignments and mathematical requirements are consistently appropriate for the course content and grade-level expectations. Grade levels are prominently explained within the course description.
Instructional Design: Communication and Interaction			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
B8. The course design provides opportunities for appropriate instructor-student interaction, including opportunities for timely and frequent feedback about student progress.	The course design does not provide opportunities for appropriate instructor-student interaction, including opportunities for timely and frequent feedback about student progress.	The course design provides few opportunities for appropriate instructor-student interaction, or few opportunities for timely and frequent feedback about student progress. Auto-feedback is infrequent or lacks detail.	Multiple learning activities and other opportunities are created to foster instructor-student interaction. Students receive timely and frequent feedback on their progress that emphasizes the intended learner outcomes. The feedback is individualized and detailed.
+B9. The course design includes explicit communication/ activities (both before and during the first week of the course) that confirm whether students are engaged and are progressing through the course. The instructor will follow program guidelines to address non-responsive students.	There is no evidence of instructor-student interactions before and during the first week of the course to confirm active participation by all students.	There is little evidence of instructor-student interactions before or during the first week of the course to confirm active participation, engagement, and progression by all students.	Introductory student communication and activities are present and required before and during the first week of the course to confirm active participation by all students. Instructor-student interactions begin early enough in the course to confirm active participation by all students.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Instructional Design: Communication and Interaction (Continued)			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
* B10. The course provides opportunities for appropriate instructor-student and student-student interaction to foster mastery and application of the material.	There is no opportunity for instructor-student and student-student interaction with the purpose of mastering content.	There is limited opportunity capable of fostering instructor-student and student-student interaction. These activities are integral to content but may lack monitoring and clarity. Interaction assignments and activities tend to be instructor-driven.	There are several opportunities capable of fostering instructor-student and student-student interaction. These activities are integral to content but may lack monitoring and clarity. Interaction assignments and activities tend to be instructor-driven. There is appropriate depth, complexity and rigor to these activities. Additionally, technology and course content encourage exchanges amongst the instructor and students through email, discussions, synchronous chats, simulations, lab activities and other group projects.
Instructional Design: Resources and Materials			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+B11. Students have access to resources that enrich the course content.	No additional tools and resources are identified or available within the course to enrich the content.	Some supplemental tools and resources are identified but do not enrich and are inappropriate and/ or not relevant to the content.	A wide variety of supplemental tools and resources are clearly identified and readily available within the learning management system (or linked to outside of the LMS). The resources enrich and are relevant to the content.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Student Assessment: Evaluation Strategies			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
C1. Student evaluation strategies are consistent with course goals and objectives, are representative of the scope of the course and are clearly stated.	Strategies to assess students are not aligned with the course goals and objectives.	Some assessments are not consistent or aligned with the course goals and objectives.	All strategies used to assess students throughout the course are consistent with and aligned to what is presented in the course goals and objectives posted within the course.
*C2. The course structure includes adequate and appropriate methods and procedures to assess students' mastery of content.	Course has no form of assessment to determine student mastery.	The course structure includes inadequate/ inappropriate methods and procedures to assess students' mastery of content.	Multiple types of assessments allow students to demonstrate their understanding, and assessment types are matched to the level of knowledge being tested. Formative and summative assessments are a part of the structure of the course. Student-selected assessment options, enabling learners to demonstrate mastery in different ways, are available.
Student Assessment: Feedback			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
*C3. Ongoing, varied, and frequent assessments are conducted throughout the course to inform instruction.	Student assessment is not ongoing, varied and/or frequent.	The course contains inadequate or infrequent assessments to check for student understanding and to ensure they are prepared for the next lesson. Formative assessments are too often self-graded or do not inform instruction.	The course consistently provides ongoing, varied, and frequent formative assessments to check for student understanding and to ensure they are prepared for the next lesson. Pre-assessments are provided to determine student readiness.
+C4. Assessment strategies and tools make the student continuously aware of his/her progress in class and mastery of the content.	No feedback tools or procedures are found in the course.	There are limited tools and procedures built into the course for student self-monitoring.	There are numerous feedback tools and procedures built into the course for continuous student self-monitoring.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Student Assessment: Assessment Resources and Materials			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
C5. Assessment materials provide the instructor with the flexibility to assess students in a variety of ways.	The course does not offer any type of assessment.	The course only offers ONE type of assessment with no variation.	The course offers a wide variety of assessment techniques to measure ongoing student progress on clearly identified learner outcomes. Alternative evaluation methods are used to gauge student progress, and authentic assessments are provided to demonstrate mastery.
+C6. Grading rubrics are provided to the instructor and may be shared with students.	There are no rubrics available for assignments.	Grading rubrics are provided for some assignments; rubrics may be provided to the instructor but are not shared with the student.	Explicit rubrics, rationale, and work samples are provided for each type of graded assignment and are shared with both the student and instructor.
+C7. The grading policy and practices are easy to understand.	The course does not contain a grading policy.	The course includes a grading policy that is either difficult to locate or hard to understand.	Grading policy and practices are easy to locate and are well-defined.
Technology: Course Architecture			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+D1. The course architecture permits the online instructor to add content, activities and assessments to extend learning opportunities.	The course architecture does not allow the teacher to add content, activities and assessments to extend learning opportunities.	The course architecture provides limited opportunity for the teacher to add content, activities and assessments to extend learning opportunities.	The course architecture provides multiple opportunities for the teacher to add content, activities and assessments to extend learning opportunities within the LMS.
+D2. The course accommodates multiple school calendars; e.g., block, 4X4 and traditional schedules.	The course does not accommodate multiple school calendars.	The course does little to accommodate multiple school calendars.	The course amply accommodates multiple school calendars. Assignments and deadlines can easily be adapted and updated depending on the program offering the course's schedule.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Technology: User Interface			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
D3. Clear and consistent navigation is present throughout the course.	The course navigation is inconsistent and unpredictable . At times the navigation is missing.	Course navigation is sometimes unclear or not intuitive . Some training is required to navigate the course.	The course utilizes consistent and predictable navigation methods. Students can move logically and easily between areas of the course; color, graphics and icons are used to guide the student through the course; and a consistent look and feel exist throughout the course (consistent text, colors, bullets, and heading styles).
*D4. Rich media are provided in multiple formats for ease of use and access in order to address diverse student needs.	The course does not provide rich media in any format.	The course uses some media but not in multiple formats . The media may be insufficient in quality or richness .	The course makes maximum use of the robust capabilities of the online medium and makes these resources available by alternative means (video, CDs, podcasts).
Technology: Technology Requirements and Interoperability			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+D5. All technology requirements (including hardware, browser, software, etc...) are specified.	Technology requirements are not specified.	Technology requirements (including hardware, browser, software, etc...) are incomplete or difficult to locate .	All technology (hardware, Web browser and software) requirements are identified in the course description or during registration. Links for available downloads are provided to students at the beginning of the course.
D6. Prerequisite skills in the use of technology are identified.	No prerequisite skills in the use of technology are identified.	Prerequisite technology skills necessary for the specific class are incomplete or difficult to locate .	All prerequisite technology skills necessary for the specific class are identified in the course description or during the registration process and are shared with students before they begin the course.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Technology: Technology Requirements and Interoperability (Continued)			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
D7. The course uses content-specific tools and software, appropriately.	The course does not utilize appropriate content-specific tools and software.	The course utilizes tools and software that are not always content-specific or appropriate. Additional online tools or software would improve the course.	A variety of software and online tools are used appropriately and as needed within the online course. The tools are easy to use, necessary for teaching and/or enriching the lesson, cross-platform, and are linked from within the course or sent as software with other course materials at the beginning of the course.
+D8. The course is designed to meet internationally recognized interoperability standards.	The course provider has no plans to meet the interoperability standards.	The course provider has a target date to meet the interoperability standards.	Interoperability technical standards are met and allow sharing content among different learning management systems and ensure sharing of questions, assessments, and results with others.
+D9. Copyright and licensing status, including permission to share where applicable, is clearly stated and easily found.	Copyright and licensing status, including permission to share where applicable, is not stated or found .	Copyright and licensing status, including permission to share where applicable, is difficult to find .	Course developers or publishers clearly state the copyright and licensing status of all content, including permission to share where applicable. Copyright and licensing information is readily available , understandable and standardized in terms of use.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL's National Standards for Quality Courses

Technology: Accessibility			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
* D10. Course materials and activities are designed to provide appropriate access to all students. The course, developed with universal design principles in mind, conforms to the U.S. Sections 504 & 508 provisions for electronic and information technology as well as the W3C's Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG 2.0).	The course does not provide appropriate access.	N/A	Through the use of web accessibility evaluation tools, all web pages required for students to engage in online education (e.g., registration, library, course materials, grade retrieval) are validated to conform to accessibility standards. The National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS) is used to ensure textbooks and other instructional materials are accessible to the visually impaired.
Technology: Data Security			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+D11. Student information remains confidential, as required by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).	Course procedures for reporting grade and student information are not included .	N/A	Defined course procedures for reporting grade and student information comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).
Course Evaluation and Support: Assessing Course Effectiveness			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+E1. The course provider uses multiple ways of assessing course effectiveness.	The course provider does not provide multiple ways of assessing course effectiveness.	The course provider uses only ONE way of assessing course effectiveness.	A combination of student, instructor, content experts, instructional designer and outside reviewers are used to evaluate the course for effectiveness. A variety of evaluations methods are used, including: course evaluations, student completion rates, satisfaction surveys, peer review, teacher and student feedback, and student performance on in-course as well as state or national assessments.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency's Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL’s National Standards for Quality Courses

Course Evaluation and Support: Assessing Course Effectiveness (Continued)			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+E2. The course is evaluated using a continuous improvement cycle for effectiveness and the findings are used as a basis for improvement.	The course is not evaluated regularly for effectiveness.	The course is evaluated regularly for effectiveness, but it remains unclear how evaluations results are used to improve the course.	The provider indicates the frequency of course evaluations, whether reviews are conducted internally or externally, and how the provider uses evaluation results to improve courses.
Course Evaluation and Support: Course Updates			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+E3. The course is updated periodically to ensure that the content is current.	The course is not updated periodically.	The course is updated a minimum of every five years ; the date of the last course update is not clearly posted .	The course is updated every two to three years to ensure the content is current, engaging, and relevant. The date the course was last updated is posted .
Course Evaluation and Support: Certification			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+E4. Course instructors, whether face-to-face or virtual, are certificated and “highly qualified.” The online course teacher possesses a teaching credential from a state-licensing agency and is “highly qualified” as defined under ESEA.	The online course instructor is neither credentialed nor “highly qualified.”	The online course instructor possesses a teaching credential from a state licensing agency OR is “highly qualified” as defined under Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).	The online course instructor possesses a teaching credential from a state licensing agency AND is “highly qualified” as defined under Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency’s Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL’s National Standards for Quality Courses

Course Evaluation and Support: Instructor and Student Support			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+E5. Professional development about the online course delivery system is offered by the provider to assure effective use of the courseware and various instructional media available.	No professional development is offered.	Professional development for online instructors is referred to, but may not be easily accessed or pertinent to the course itself.	Professional development is easily available for instructors of online courses, which includes using the technology tools specific to the course. Appropriate evidence could include training schedules, materials, tutorials, or external links, as well as expectations for training frequency and annual hours of training.
+E6. The course provider offers technical support and course management assistance to students, the course instructor, and the school coordinator.	No technical support or course management assistance is offered.	Technical support and course management assistance is available, but not clearly posted within the course or on the online provider’s website.	Technical support and course management assistance is readily available and hours are clearly posted within the course or on the online provider’s website. Assistance may take the form of Frequently Asked Questions, training resources, mentors or peer support.
+E7. Course instructors, whether face-to-face or virtual, have been provided professional development in the behavioral, social, and when necessary, emotional, aspects of the learning environment.	No professional development has been provided in the behavioral, social, and emotional aspects of the learning environment.	Online instructors are provided limited professional development in behavioral, social, and emotional aspects of the learning environment.	Online instructors have been provided ample professional development in behavioral, social, and emotional aspects of the learning environment to identify and address the ways in which the online environment can enhance and hinder the learning experience and have sensitivity to the perception of written online language.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency’s Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>

Modified Ratings for iNACOL’s National Standards for Quality Courses

Course Evaluation and Support: Instructor and Student Support (Continued)			
Standard	Not Met	Partially Met	Fully Met
+E8. Course instructors, whether face-to-face or virtual, receive instructor professional development, which includes the support and use of a variety of communication modes to stimulate student engagement online.	No professional development has been provided in support and use of a variety of communication modes to stimulate student engagement online.	Professional development is offered but is limited to only synchronous or asynchronous forms of communication.	Professional development fully prepares the instructor to use multiple, varied means of communication with and stimulating engagement of online students via synchronous and asynchronous communication. Modes include but should not be limited to email, messaging, threaded discussions, live chat/whiteboard sessions, document sharing, etc.
+E9. The provider assures that course instructors, whether face-to-face or virtual, are provided support, as needed, to ensure their effectiveness and success in meeting the needs of online students.	No support is provided to ensure the instructor’s effectiveness and success in meeting the needs of online students.	Limited support is provided to ensure the instructor’s effectiveness and success in meeting the needs of online students.	Ongoing curricular support, contact numbers, guidelines, mentor assistance, best instructional practices, accessibility and participation in professional networks are available.
+E10. Students are offered an orientation for taking an online course before starting the coursework.	No student orientation is offered before starting the course.	Students are offered an orientation for taking an online course before starting the coursework, but the process is lacking in some or all of the elements of the “Fully Met” rating.	Students are offered an orientation for taking an online course before starting the coursework, detailing the experience of learning online and what is needed to manage challenges successfully. All of the following should be covered: time commitments, software and hardware requirements and how to set up the student's computer and work environment. The training may be provided either in written form, face-to-face, through a video or entirely online.

+MVU recommends collecting additional information from the provider (using the [Provider Course Review Documentation Form](#)) to evaluate the standard.

*MVU recommends reviewers invest a higher percentage of review time on these standards.

Ratings were developed by modifying the Sample Course Review Scoring Rubric developed by the Texas Education Agency’s Texas Virtual School Network (TxVSN). The standards and original rubric can be found at http://www.inacol.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/iNACOL_CourseStandards_2011.pdf In modifying the rubric, we also consulted resources available through CLRN (<http://www.clrn.org>), including the Online Course Tutorials available at <https://sites.google.com/site/ocrtutorials/>