University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., April 4, 2013
26 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Announcements/Updates
3. Chair's Report
4. 20% Surcharge on International Students
5. Review of the Minutes from March 7, 2013
6. Finalize Request Letter on Online Learning
7. Adjourn

---

1) Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Chair Carline at 10:30 a.m.

2) Announcements/Updates
Nana Lowell provided an update on the roll-out of online course evaluations. The evaluations will begin next Fall Quarter and is targeted for online courses. They have also been working with departments that have expressed interest to shifting to online evaluations. A pilot project was conducted with the law school which made good sense since they already require students to bring laptops to class already. An email will be sent out to all department chairs shortly explaining the new online evaluation process.

Tom Lewis updated the council on lecture capture (software that makes online recordings of lectures and presentations for later viewing by students or others). Currently Kane Hall does not allow for complete lecture capture using Tegrity, and doing so would require expensive renovations. The solution to the problem may be a similar program called "Panopto" which they are testing now. Lewis went into additional detail explaining how the software would be used. They are planning on testing Panopto for the next 2-3 weeks and asked if anyone could suggest faculty members would be willing to test the new program. A statement was raised that some faculty members might not want to replace Tegrity because they are already accustomed to the program and would not want to switch over and learn a new one. Discussion ensued. Switching program is not too difficult, the software is user-friendly. Another question was raised asking if it integrates with other products that are currently being used right now. The response was that they are just in an evaluation phase at the moment and are only looking for feedback at this time but that Panopto offers much easier integration pathways than Tegrity.

Martin-Morris updated the council on the progress made in the Scholarship in Teaching and Learning Symposium that is coming up soon. The process is going well and panelists have now been confirmed.

3) Chair's Report [Exhibits A]
Chair Carline reported that an ad hoc committee was convened to replicate a report similar to one created by Stanford that identifies the full inventory of technological resources to can be used for educational purposes. The committee is working within a short timeline and the report is to develop an outline on how to incorporate technology into the classrooms. The goal is to develop a good idea of what resources are available and how it would impact the University.

Carline also provided background of a statewide task force created by the Washington Student Achievement Council which would provide to the legislature a road map for integrating online learning opportunities for use in higher education. Carline went into detail explaining the road map. The project attempts to study how technological resources could be incorporated into a university's instructional program while assessing student cost and system capacity implications. Topics include how technology is currently being used, the appropriate criteria to evaluate efficiencies and costs, identify best practices and measuring the potential demand for using technology in education.

Carline's final announcement was suggesting that the council's final meeting (June 6th) should be held at the Faculty Club at 4:00pm. Carline will do additional research to confirm that time and location.

4) 20% Surcharge on International Students
Carline addressed a new proposed state law that would charge international students a 20% tuition surcharge. This was brought to his attention from conversations with Jim Fridley who wants FCTL to discuss what the possible impact would be on the university and wanted feedback from the council. Szatmary also pointed out that the additional revenue from the surcharge would not go to the university but to the state's general fund. Discussion ensued. One concern brought up is that this surcharge sets bad precedence and will encourage the state to take additional future funds from the UW through other similar fees. It was mentioned that international students already pay a large amount in tuition and the additional surcharge would be unethical. Additional concerns were raised asking how this would impact research assistants, university departments and international students who take online courses. Discussion ensued.

One problematic issue would be the impact on recruiting international students who will be required to pay even higher fees. Additionally, this is inconsistent to the University's mission towards teaching. Even though these students do not typically stay within Washington State once they graduate the lessons learned will be applied across the world creating a better global society. Additionally, these will be UW graduates who are creating connections and representing the UW. It is not known if this legislation applies to fee based programs, the legislative bill is very small so there is not much clarification.

It was stated that there does not seem to be any rationale to justify this surcharge other than acting as an indirect tax. A question was raised if the University will write a response to this proposed legislation, but there is no answer since Jim Fridley just wants feedback at the moment. A comment stated that FCTL is outraged at this proposal because it threatens the quality of students at the University, threatens teaching and damages UW's reputation throughout the Pacific Rim. It was noted that many of UW's students are Chinese. Overall, this proposed legislation is unethical and inappropriate. If it becomes adopted in Washington State other states may follow as well. Discussion ensued. From a quick research online the only other institution that requires additional fees for international students is Ohio State which requires a small flat fee, but nothing significant compared to this proposed surcharge.

A motion was made to respond to Jim Fridley stating that FCTL's position is very concerned:

> *The FCTL was very concerned about the potential surcharge and voted on the following statement.*
>
> *"The proposed surcharge on international students would drastically affect the quality of teaching by the reduction of teaching assistants, negatively impact the quality of international students we can recruit to the University, and significantly harm the*

international reputation of the University as an academic center for the Pacific Rim region."

It was adopted unanimously.

The motion was seconded and received unanimous approval.

5) Review of minutes from March 7, 2013
Minutes from the March 7, 2013 meeting were approved

6) Finalize Request Letter on Online Learning [Exhibit B]
Carline discussed the history of a position statement drafted by FCTL requesting the University to work on maintaining the educational quality in online learning. The last time FCTL met the council discussed ways to improve and sharpen the letter asking the University to work on the issue. Carline presented a cover letter which he drafted which outlines FCTL's policy statement and will be presented alongside the position statement. The goal today is to edit the document with the most recent updates and submit it the University leadership. Carline passed out copies of the documents and split the council into several groups to discussion new ideas. Groups discussed the position statement and cover letter for 15 minutes.

Once back together a suggestion made was to include fewer vague/technical terms and provide clearer, more straightforward language. Discussion ensued about the specifics of the wording in the letter as well as the changes to make. The spirit of the letter is not just to familiarize the reader with technology in the classroom, but to list "action items" for things that need to be achieved. The council further discussed the specifics in the document and what should be communicated.

Since the university has already made progress in this area, as well as initiating pilot projects throughout the institution, the letter should also discuss the progress that has already been achieved. Additionally, since the audience consists of the president, provost, and the dean, the document needs to address the reward culture in order to enable this activity. Discussion ensued. Unless faculty members are rewarded for using technology in their research and studies, nothing will happen. One concern is that faculty members should have adequate support time for the development of courses. A follow-up question asked if the university should offer more resources and training, or offer greater compensation. At any rate, the university's goal should be rewarding faculty for pursing education through technology which could result in release time, compensation and other benefits that recognizes a professor's efforts in their research.

One important note that was mentioned is that the university will require additional resources for training. This has always been a financial matter and FCTL needs to demonstrate to the University that this is important. The politics are quite convoluted; last year a group convened to discuss these issues and ended without any progress being made.

One suggestion was to include a sentence explaining that Professional and Continuing Education (PCE) has the experience and resources that could serve as an example of online learning. FCTL should use this to demonstrate that there are many examples around campus and any progress that would be made would simply be expanding current developments. It is also a good idea to have a paragraph that explains what is being done locally and demonstrate how the UW is ahead of other institutions. For

example, the UW has online certification programs, 16 degrees online, and a solid infrastructure to expand online learning.

Discussion ensued to determine who else should receive this policy statement. Additional issues arose such as adding a proposal section and coordinating efforts to expand online learning between all three campuses.

Carline stated that he will revise the letter and sent it out to the council next week asking for additional input. The goal is to finalize it before the council meets next month and to distribute the letter before people leave for summer break.

Szatmary wanted the council to weigh in on a proposed certification program through Coursera. In particular, if a student participates in the program he/she can receive a Certificate of Completion that is not affiliated with the UW. Szatmary went into further detail about the program, but explained that this is just an introduction to the issue and it was suggested that members think about it and bring their opinions to the next meeting.

It was also pointed out that EdX recently asked the UW to join their program. Members were asked to think about this as well and bring their opinions next month's meeting. The president and provost are both keen on joining EdX because they have a research agenda for the university. The Faculty Council on Academic Standards will be presented with this issue as well.

7) Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned by Chair Carline at 11:45 a.m.

Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst. gcourt@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Carline (Chair), Kyes, Martin-Morris, Salehi Esfahani, Nelson, Wilkes, Olavarria
President's Designee: Taylor
Ex-Officio Reps: Jankowski, Corbett, Randall
Guests: David Szatmary, Tom Lewis, Nana Lowell, Christine Sugatan

Absent: **Faculty:** Zierler, Turner, Masuda, Elkhafaifi, Harrison, Yeh
Ex-Officio Reps: Kutz

10-Year Roadmap
Activity Work Plan
POTENTIAL OF TECHNOLOGY

Planning Activity	Integrating online learning opportunities into each institution's instructional program and assessing student cost and system capacity implications.
Lead Members	Scott Brittain, Paul Francis, Constance Rice
Staff Team	**Christy England-Siegerdt (lead)** [360-753-7864, christye@wsac.wa.gov] Mark Bergeson (co-lead) Noreen Light
External Workgroup Members	Staff or Representatives from: Council of Presidents/4-yr public institutions; SBCTC/2-yr institutions; Independent Colleges of Washington/non-profit 4-yr institutions; Northwest Career Colleges Federation, Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board; OSPI; Washington Student Association; Education Research and Data Center; WGU Washington; City University; business.

Scope

Policy Issue(s):

Whether Washington could and should more effectively leverage technology to improve teaching and learning at Washington colleges and universities in ways that reduce the cost of attendance for students and expand system capacity in a cost-effective manner while maintaining quality.

Whether technology could and should also be leveraged in addressing the other areas such as remediation and meeting the needs of returning adults.

Question(s) to be Addressed:

1. How is technology currently being used for teaching and learning at colleges and universities in Washington?

2. What are the appropriate criteria for evaluating the efficacy and the cost and price impact of instructional technology?

3. What are the best practices within and outside of Washington, including institution-based and workplace based models for training and credentialing?

4. Which best practices could be applied in Washington? How can they be tailored to meet the unique missions of our institutions?

5. What is the potential demand for using technology for remediation and to meet the needs of returning adults?

Methods

Quantitative:

- Available data such as that already reported in Critical Crossroads.

Qualitative:

- Statewide review of best practices in technology relative to teaching and learning via environmental scan, interviews, focus groups and/or surveys.
- National review of best practices in technology relative to teaching and learning via literature review, environmental scan, interviews, focus groups and/or surveys.
- Focus groups, interviews, and or surveys with students, faculty, eLearning directors, and IT directors.

Key Stakeholders:

Public and private higher education institutions, students/parents, legislators, select foundations (e.g., Gates, Sloan, EDUCAUSE), Council of Presidents; SBCTC; Independent Colleges of Washington; Northwest Career Colleges Federation, Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board; Superintendent of Public Instruction, businesses.

Schedule: Identify key project tasks and determine their completion dates. Use the "Challenge Area Schedule" and "Agenda Item Report Process" as "fixed" milestones and requirements.

Task	Complete by
Staff review work plan w/Council policy coordinator and communications staff	2/15
Staff review work plan with Council leads (teleconference)	3/4
Staff identify work group members	2/15 – 2/28
Workgroup Meeting 1: Establish individual assignments	3/15
Workgroup Meeting 2	3/29
Workgroup Meeting 3	4/26
Review draft of issue brief by Workgroup & Council leads	5/1
Workgroup and Council leads review revised issue brief. Council leads share with stakeholders.	5/3
Staff make final edits to issue brief	5/10
Staff draft issue brief; transmit to Council and post to Web	5/16
Panel presentation to Council	5/23
Workgroup Meeting 4	5/31
Workgroup Meeting 5	6/7
Workgroup and Council lead review draft policy recommendations (including metrics)	6/21
Workgroup and Council members review revised policy recommendations. Council members share with stakeholders.	6/28
Staff make final edits to policy recommendation	7/3
Staff draft policy recommendation transmitted to Council and posted to Web	7/10
Recommendations presented to Council	7/17

Potential of Technology Workgroup Issue Briefing Outline

A. One-page summary of issue briefing

B. Context of the 10-Year Roadmap (standard language across all workgroups)

C. Introduction [*Literature review subgroup: Ben Meredith; Other workgroup members.*]
   1. Describe the evolution of technology and how technology is changing the playing field, including changing relationships between students, faculty, and content.
      a. Trends in the field (e.g. online, hybrid, and web-enhanced enrollment statistics; MOOCs; open courseware; competencies versus credit hours; prior learning assessment; analytics, others?)
   2. Define scope of issue briefing. Focus on use of technology for teaching and learning rather than providing online student support services such as advising, or streamlining business operations.
   3. Hopes (perceived benefits/possibilities) from the perspectives of students, instructors, government, and the public. For example, governments tend to hope technology will increase access at low cost.
   4. Concerns (perceived costs/unintended consequences) from the perspective of students, instructors, government, and the public. For example faculty have expressed concerns that quality may suffer or that only the elite will be able to afford face-to-face instruction (see "How the Embrace of MOOC's Could Hurt Middle America" http://chronicle.com/article/A-Pioneer-in-Online-Education/134654/).
   5. Cultural differences across sectors (2-year/4-year; public/private; academic/business)

D. Policy Issue (This section is in all issue briefings, and its language conforms to the work plan).
   1. Whether Washington could and should more effectively leverage technology to improve teaching and learning at Washington colleges and universities in ways that reduce the cost of attendance for students and expand system capacity in a cost-effective manner while maintaining quality.
   2. Whether technology could and should also be leveraged in addressing the other areas such as remediation and meeting the needs of returning adults.

E. Work plan question 1. How is technology currently being used for teaching and learning at colleges and universities in Washington? [*Subgroups: eLearning Directors and faculty information subgroup: Dave Rawlinson, Connie Broughton, Chris Gil; Business information subgroup: Rich Robinson; Student information subgroup: James Reisenauer; other workgroup members*]

F. Work plan question 2. What are the appropriate criteria for evaluating the efficacy and the cost and price impact of instructional technology? [*Evaluation criteria subgroup: Chris Gill, Connie Broughton; other workgroup members*]

   1. Efficacy

      a. Main criterion is the extent to which technology helps improve student learning outcomes.
      b. Factors influencing efficacy
         i. Subject attributes (e.g. some programs are more lab- or practicum-dependent. How much of a CTC welding program could be delivered online?)
         ii. Learner attributes (age, poverty, readiness, others?)
         iii. Instructor attributes (readiness, others?)

Potential of Technology Workgroup Issue Briefing Outline

    2. Cost and price impact

        a. Acknowledge limited resources but don't get bogged down with limitations
        b. Consider all costs including maintenance and "fault tolerance." Take cost of technology breakdowns into account.
        c. Costs to students
        d. Costs to instructors
            i. Learning curve
            ii. Labor intensive to develop online courses
        e. Costs to state
            i. Professional development for faculty

G. Work plan question 3. What are the best practices within and outside of Washington, including institution-based and workplace based models for training and credentialing? [*Literature review subgroup: Ben Meredith; other workgroup members*]

    1. Long shelf life - identify best practices (if any) that have a long shelf life rather than focusing on best practices that are dependent on a particular technology that might change soon.

        a. For example, the practice of sharing educational resources among institutions arguably has a long shelf life that is not dependent on a particular technology. This could occur within the state (WashingtonOnline, open course library) or outside of the state (e.g. "California May Require Colleges to Give Credit for Outside, Online Courses" http://chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/california-may-require-colleges-to-give-credit-for-outside-online-courses/56977)

    2. Question proposed as potential 6th question during last meeting – how does technology get incorporated into the learning process in the most effective way?

        a. For example, flipped classroom, others?

    3. Incentives for institutions and faculty to stay up to date.

    4. Consider P20 connections.

    5. Workplace-based models

H. Work plan question 4. Which best practices could be applied in Washington? How can they be tailored to meet the unique missions of our institutions? [*All workgroup members*]

I. Work plan question 5. What is the potential demand for using technology for remediation and to meet the needs of returning adults? [*All workgroup members*]

J. Glossary [*All workgroup members*]

    1. Best practices (supported by rigorous empirical evidence, or just "promising"?)
    2. Evaluation criteria (make sure all are well defined)
    3. Face-to-face instruction
    4. Hybrid instruction
    5. Online instruction
    6. Quality – means meeting the needs of the learner. One measure of quality is success in achieving student learning outcomes.

UW Medicine

**UW SCHOOL
OF MEDICINE**

BIOMEDICAL INFORMATICS
AND MEDICAL EDUCATION

4 April 2013

President Young
Vello Warner
Kelli Trosvig
Gerry Baldasty
UW Information Technology
ETC

In June of 2011, The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning developed a position statement regarding maintaining quality and faculty effort in on-line learning efforts of the university. This statement was based in an extensive literature review, and was recently revised based with the addition of literature more recently published. A copy of the revised document accompanies this letter.

Members of the council request the opportunity to discuss with you the issues outlined in the position statement, and methods to implement the following requests. We request that the university

- Actively support hybrid courses that include meaningful interactions with faculty and peers as well as on-line modalities such as podcasting or self-paced modules as the preferred method for course delivery.

- Limit fully on-line courses with minimal interaction between students and faculty to those topics that are introductory and whose content is declarative in nature.

- Limit enrollment in on-line courses to the current class sizes to maintain optimum educational interaction between students in faculty. Additional enrollment must be supported with additional teaching staff, either faculty or graduate teaching assistants.

- Provide faculty support in use of technology for on-line learning
    o In depth training in use of software and hardware and the pedagogical basis for use of technology
    o Technicians available for problem solving, preferably within each department
    o Adequate supported time for development of courses

- Actively highlight excellent practice in on-line education, and support those educators in translating these practices across disciplines.

We look forward to these discussions.

6 March 2013

Maintaining Educational Quality in On-Line Learning

Members of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning recognize that the movement towards provision of more courses on-line is an important step to bringing the university's programs in line with student preferences and needs. Students like on-line content and the ability to review lectures and notes, and are increasingly sophisticated in their use of electronic tools and expectations for their use in teaching and learning. The demands of family, work and other aspects of modern society limit the ability of many students to spend extended amounts of time on campus. Developing additional methods to meet students' learning needs in alternative locations and times is an appropriate task for the modern university and faculty. Therefore, an increasing number of universities are transforming themselves from single- mode on campus interaction to dual- mode, as they acknowledge the importance and advantages of on-line instruction. Movement towards on-line education may also be seen as a means to increase class enrollment without expansion of current resources. It can also reach large geographically dispersed audiences in a cost-effective, time- efficient manner. Members of the Council are concerned about the implications of these changes in course delivery for educational quality, faculty time and costs.

During this past year, the Council has held several discussions about this issue, and attempted to seek evidence about the use of on-line education around issues of quality of instruction, faculty time, class size and cost. This letter summarizes our discussions and concerns.

First, the Council recognizes that on-line learning can mean many different things, from fully on-line asynchronous learning where students can complete all course requirements on their own schedules to fully interactive synchronous learning that replicates the classroom in many locations. The choice of specific on-line methods for a course will depend both on the content and objectives of the course.

Educational quality
- There is no conclusive evidence that on-line education per se is better or worse than traditional methods of college learning. Some studies show increases in learning, particularly in declarative content. Other studies indicate that on-line activities used to augment more traditional learning can be effective and increase retention.
- As on-line tools have gotten more advanced, instructors now can provide interactions and experiences that previously were not available in the on-line format. The quality of the tool, the ability of the instructor to use the tool, and the appropriateness of the tools in meeting the needs of the students will determine its success.
- The effective use of technology requires instructors and educators to learn how to use and manage technological tools in order to increase their pedagogical efficacy to facilitate teaching and learning.
- Quality assurance should be done to ensure that online courses' objectives are aligned with accreditation standards and that evaluation will be used for continuous improvement in order to have high quality instruction. It should be carried out on a regular basis, to monitor and improve online programs so that educational services satisfy program goals and meet student needs.
- Maintaining actual and perceived quality in education requires interaction between faculty and students. Student satisfaction with on-line courses is related to the degree of perceived interaction with instructors.
- The effectiveness of online learning is based upon positive faculty to student interaction, class content and appropriate and reliable technology.

- Methods that blend on-line learning with interactive learning result in better outcomes than totally asynchronous, independent methods.
- Hybrid or blended methods of instruction are highly recommended if the educational quality is not affected.
- Other aspects of education, building community and collaboration within the class, are made more difficult as more is put online. It's important to consider not just learning outcomes but also the educational experience, interaction, and campus community.

References: [1, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 47, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 60, 62, 63, 65, 72]

Faculty effort

- Time needed for development of on-line courses can be significant. The Chronicle of Higher Education reported in 2013 that on average, over a hundred hours of faculty effort was needed for preparation of a new on-line course, and required eight to ten hours per week of time interacting on-line with students.
- Continuing maintenance of course content after initial implementation may also require significant faculty time.
- Some studies have found that on-line courses require more time spent by faculty per student than in more traditional class formats, particularly activities requiring writing and on-line discussions.
- Reductions in time commitment for faculty may be found in totally free-standing courses that do not include online interactions.
- Moving towards a model of a community of learners, where the members of the class provide comment and direction to peers may reduce the level of faculty direction, and consequently time per student, in a course. This may be more appropriate for graduate study than undergraduate courses.

References: [2, 6, 15, 29, 46, 47, 48, 51, 64, 66, 68, 70]

Class size

- The additional demands for interaction between students and instructors in teacher moderated on-line courses reduces the ideal class size compared with more traditional formats of teaching.
- Larger class sizes may be possible if adjunct faculty and staffs are used to moderate and provide most of the individual student interaction in place of regular faculty.
- Other research findings suggest the opposite, an ideal size of online classes between 25 and 30 students.
- There is a new movement towards supersized classes – Massively Open Online Courses (MOOC'S). While these courses reach a large number of students, relatively few students that begin complete the course. Universities are struggling to devise business models to support these efforts.
- The quality of learning in supersized classes is not necessarily inferior. When students engage in on-line activities and take responsibility for the quality of interaction, they can have a superior learning experience.
- Students may be sensitive to the substitution of less qualified instructors for regular faculty, and may become even more sensitive as planned tuition increases are imposed

References: [8, 23, 27, 28, 35, 39, 43, 45, 59, 61, 68, 69, 71]

Costs of on-line education

- Moving to on-line education takes time and effort. Development time must be taken into account, including time spent with the initial development of on-line course materials, ongoing maintenance of those materials, and adoption of new technologies.
- All faculty members are not native users of on-line technology in teaching, and must be trained and supported in the use of these tools in order for quality of instruction to be maintained.
- On-line education methods have increased the number of students enrolled in a class at other institutions with significant cost savings. These savings are realized primarily from the use of adjunct personnel to handle most day-to-day interactions with students. In this mode, costs are shifted to less expensive personnel without any claimed reduction in quality of instruction.
- Providing the adequate administrative support and technical expertise is necessary for the success of online instruction.

References: [3, 6, 31, 35, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 67, 68, 69]

The movement of appropriate instruction to on-line delivery is an important task for consideration by the university if it is to keep pace with student interests, characteristics of the student body and competition within

the environment of higher education. The prevalence of online instruction will only continue to spread across all forms of education and it is important that we continue to push forward with designs that leverage both the unique affordances of contemporary media technologies and established principles of human learning and cognition. At the same time, we need to be aware that any good class, whether in person or online, will be more than simply a delivery system. We must continue to emphasize the worth of interactivity and engagement between students, faculty, and course content. There are many options for on-line learning, but our focus needs to be on the appropriate technology and setting in which students will best reach the learning goals of our programs.

We believe the move toward increased on-line education alone is not an option, based on the interests and needs of our students, the rapid and continued maturation of educational technologies, and the growing body of literature that supports the strategic use of these technologies to enhance traditional educational practices. The university should attempt to become leader in quality education using these modalities while realizing that on-line education alone will probably not result in increased enrollment in our programs for less cost. Faculty will need support in mastery of on-line technology, the development of curriculum, and the maintenance of these programs. While adjunct staff may support or extend the work of faculty in on-line instruction, the teaching faculty of the university remains a major asset to its programs.

Consequently, members of the council request that the following actions be considered;
- The information we have reported in this letter be made available for future discussions of these issues with the Board of Regents, Board of Deans, and other administrative groups considering these issues. We also request that members of the Council be included in these discussions.
- Adequate technologic infrastructure to support on-line learning needs to be developed and implemented to insure the success of any educational offering.
- Support for the development of skills in use of technology and adaption of pedagogic methods to on-line learning should be provided to faculty.
- Any shift in educational responsibility from teaching faculty to temporary, adjunct, or lower paid instructors in implementation of on-line teaching should be monitored carefully for the effects of educational quality, learning outcomes for those courses, as well as indirect effects on more traditional programs.
- Faculty compensation for new teaching responsibilities in on-line educational efforts, including development of materials and courses and the supervision of adjunct staff must be developed and implemented.
- Methods to recognize the scholarly contribution of faculty in these efforts must be developed and included in decisions about merit and promotion.
- Courses chosen for on-line education need to be chosen judiciously, with decisions based on the appropriateness of goals and objectives of the course for use of on-line technology.

Jan D Carline, Professor
Chair, Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

Bibliography reviewed in preparation of this document

1) Amin, R. and Li, K. (2010). Should Graduate Mathematics Courses Be Taught Fully Online? The *Electronic Journal of Mathematics and Technology*, 4 (1): 47-56.

2) Anderson,J., Gainey, T. and Rooks, J. (2011). Academic Social Reach and Students' Acceptance of Online and Traditional Instruction: An Ego Network Perspective. Insight to a Changing World Quarterly Journal, 2011(4): 69-83.

3) Anderson, S., Davis, A., Fair, B., Waller, R. and Wickersham, L. (2009). Online Graduate Study in Education: An Examination of Tuition Costs and Faculty Salaries for Public, Private and Proprietary Institutions of Higher Learning in Texas. *Academic Leadership*, 7(2).

4) Angiello, R. (2010). Study Looks at Online Learning vs. Traditional Instruction. The *Hispanic Outlook of Higher Education*, 57-59.

5) Appana, S. (2008). A review of benefits and limitations of online learning in the context of the student, the instructor, and the tenured faculty. *International Journal on E-Learning* 7(1): 5-22.

6) Bartolic-Zlomislic, S. and Bates, A. (1999) Investing in on-line learning: Potential benefits and limitations. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 24(3), 349-366.

7) Beeckman D et al. (2008). Pressure ulcers: E-learning to improve classification by nurses and nursing students. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 17(13):1697-1707.

8) Bell, F. (2011). Connectivism: Its Place in Theory-Informed Research and Innovation in Technology-Enabled Learning. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 12(3): 98-118.

9) Bernard RM et al. (2004). How does distance education compare with classroom instruction? A meta-analysis of empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3): 379-439.

10) Borokhovski, E., Tamim, R., Bernard, R., Abrami, P. and Sokolovskaya, A. (2012). Are contextual and designed student interaction treatment equally effective in distance education? *Distance Education*, 33 (3): 311-329.

11) Bozorgmanesh, M. (2011). Online Classes and Traditional Classes in Adult Education. *Nature and Science*, 9(8): 81-84.

12) Brown, J. (2012). Online Learning: A Comparison of Web-Based and Land-Based Courses. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 13(1): 39-42.

13) Cavanaugh, C. (2001). The effectiveness of interactive distance education technologies in K-12 learning: a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications* 7 (1): 73-78.

14) Cavanaugh J. (2005). Teaching online – A time comparison. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8(1).

15) Chapman, B. and Henderson, R. (2010). E-Learning Quality Assurance: A Perspective of Business Teacher Educators and Distance Learning Coordinators. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 52(1): 16-31.

16) Chen, C., Pedresen, S. and Murphy, K. (2011). Learners' perceived information overload in online learning via computer-mediated communication. *Research in Learning Technology*, 19(2): 101-116.

17) Clark, R.E. (1994). Media will never influence Learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development* 42(2): 21-29.

18) Clark, R.E. (1983). Reconsidering research on learning from media, *Review of Educational Research*, 53(4): 445-459.

19) Cobb, T. (1997). Cognitive efficiency: toward a revised theory of media. *Education Technology, Research and Development,* 45 (4), 21-35.

20) Cook, D.A., Beckman T.J., Thomas K.G., and Thompson, W.G. (2008). Adapting web-0based instruction to residents' knowledge improves learning efficiency: a randomized controlled trial. *J General Internal Medicine.* 23(7): 985-90.

21) Emerson, L. and MacKay, B. (2011). A comparison between paper-based and online learning in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology,* 42(5): 727-735.

22) Ferguson, J. and DeFelice, A. (2010). Length of Online Course and Student Satisfaction, Perceived Learning, and Academic Performance. *The International Review of Research in Open Distance Learning,* 11(2). Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/rt.

23) Fini, A. (2009). The Technological Dimension of a Massive Open Online Course: The Case of the CCK 08 Course Tools. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning,* 10(5): 1-26.

24) Freeman, V. (2010). Focus: Online Education and Technology Introduction. *Educational Technology,* 23(3): 3-51.

25) Granger, N.A., et al. (2006). Use of web-based material to enhance anatomy instruction in the health sciences. *Anatomical Record Part B, New Anatomist,* 289(4):127-7.

26) Hamza, M., El-Houubi, A., Yaseen, N. and Duncan, B. (2011). E-Learning vs. Traditional Education: A Mata-Analysis of Distance Learning Technologies. *Dias Technology Review,* 7(2): 38-46.

27) Hewitt, J., and Brett, C. (2007). The Relationship between class size and online activity patterns in asynchronous computer conferencing environments. *Computers and Education,* 49: 1258-1271.

28) Hill, P. (2012). Online educational Delivery Models: A Descriptive View. *Educause,* 85-97. Retrieved from http://www.educause.edu/ero.

29) Hislop, G.W. and Ellis, H.J.C. (2004). A study of faculty effort in online teaching." *The Internet and Higher Education.* 7(1).

30) Hugenholtz, N.I.R, et at. (2008). Effectiveness of e-learning in continuing medical education for occupational physicians. *Occupational Medicine* 58 (5): 370-372.

31) Journell, W. (2012). Walk, Don't run-The financial lure of lower-cost online learning during a period of tight budgets shouldn't prompt schools to proceed before giving serious consideration to a multitude of factors. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 93(7): 46-50.

32) Kerfoot, B.P., Fu, Y., Baker, H., Connelly. D., Ritchey, M.L. and Genega, E.M. (2010). Online spaced education generates transfer and improves long-term retention of diagnostic skill: a randomized control trial. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons* Sep:211(3):331-337.

33) Khoury, A., Eddeen, L., Saadeh, D. and Harfoushi, O. (2011). E-Learning: Justifications and Obstacles. *Ijet,* 6(3):53-56. Retrieved from http://www.ijet.org.

34) Kozma, R. (1994). Will media influence learning? Reframing the debate. *Educational Technology Research and Development,* 42(2), 7-19.

35) Lieblein, E. (2000). Critical factors for successful delivery of online programs. *The Internet and Higher Education* (3) 161-174.

36) Lindgren, R. and McDaniel, R. (2012). Transforming Online Learning through Narrative and Student Agency. *Educational Technology and Society,* 15(4): 344-355.

37) Lion, R. and Stark, G. (2010). A Glance at Institutional Support for Faculty Teaching in an Online Learning Environment. *Educause.* Retrieved from http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/institutional-support-faculty-teaching-online-learning-environment.

38) McFarlane, D. (2011). A Comparison of Organizational Structure and Pedagogical Approach: Online versus Face-to-Face. *The Journal of Educators Online*, 8(1): 1-43.

39) McKenzie, B.K., Mims, N., Bennett, E. and Waugh, M. (2000) Needs, concerns and practices of online instruction. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration,* 3(3).

40) McKeown, K. (2012). Can Online Learning Reproduce the Full College Experience? The Heritage Foundation, (3): 1-12.

41) Means, B., et al. *Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning: A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies* U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development Policy and Program Studies Service.

42) Moore, G.T., Black, S.D., Briggs, Style, C. and Mitchell R. (1994) The influence of the new pathway curriculum on Harvard medical students. *Academic Medicine*, 69, 983–989.

43) Nagel, L. and Kotzé, T. (2010). Supersizing e-learning: What a CoI survey reveals about teaching presence in a large online class. *Internet and Higher Education*, 12: 45-51.

44) Neuhauser C. Learning style and effectiveness of online and face-to-face instruction. *American Journal of Distance education.* 16(2), 99-113

45) Olsen, F. (2002). Phoenix rises. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(10), A29.

46) O'Quinn L, Corry M. Factors that deter faculty from participating in distance education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration* 5(4) {online serial}

47) Orr, R., Williams, M. and Pennington, K. (2009). Institutional Efforts to Support Faculty in Online Teaching. *Innovative High Education*, 34: 257-268.

48) Pachnowski, L.M., Jurczyk, J.P. (2003). Perceptions of faculty on the effect of distance learning technology on faculty preparation time. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration,* 6(3).

49) Phelan, L. (2012). Interrogating students' perceptions of their online learning experiences with Brookfield's critical incident questionnaire. *Distance Education*, 33(1): 39-42.

50) Phipps, R., Merisotis, J. (1999). *What's the difference? A review of contemporary research on the effectiveness of distance learning in higher education* Washington, DC: Institute for Higher education Policy.

51) Picciano, A., Seaman, J. and Allen, E. (2010). Educational Transformation: To be or Not to Be. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 14(4): 17-35.

52) Pundak, D., Herscovitz, O. and Shacham, M. (2010). Attitudes of Face-to-Face and e-learning Instructors toward 'Active learning'. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning.* Retrieved from http://www.eurodl.org/current&article.

53) Puzziferro, M. and 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.

54) Rampage, T.R. (2002). The "No Significant Difference" Phenomenon: A Literature Review http://spark.parkland.edu/rampage_pubs/1 2002

55) Redden, E. (2009). In Global recession, global education still growing. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/05/29/international.

56) Rovai, A. and Downey, J. (2010). Why some distance education programs fail while others succeed in a global environment. *Internet and Higher Education*. 13: 141-147.

57) Russell, T.L. (2001). The no significant Difference Phenomenon: A comparative Research Annotated Bibliography on Technology for Distance Education. IDECC, Montgomery, AL.

58) Russell, T. The No Significant Difference Phenomenon Website. URL http://teleeducation.nd.ca/nosignificantdifference/

59) Ruth, S. (2006). E- Learning – A financial and strategic perspective. *Educause Quarterly. No 1.*

60) Safar, A. (2012). The Students' Perspectives of Online Training at Kuwait University. *College Student Journal*, 46(2): 436-458.

61) Sausner, R. Carving your slice of the virtual pie. *University Business.* 6 (7).

62) Schilling K et al. (2006). An interactive web-based curriculum on evidence-based medicine: Design and effectiveness. *Family Medicine*, 38(2):126-32.

63) Schulte, M., Dennis, K., Eskey, M., Taylor, C. and Zeng, H. (2012). Creating a Sustainable Online Instructor Observation System: A Case Study Highlighting Flaws when Blending Mentoring and Evaluation. *The International review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 13(3): 83-96.

64) Simpson, C. (2010). Examining the Relationship between Institutional mission and Faculty Reward for Teaching via Distance. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 13(1): 13.

65) Sitzmann, T. et al. (2006). The comparative effectiveness of web-based and classroom instruction: A meta-analysis. *Personal Psychology* 59:623-664.

66) Spector, M.J. (2005). Time demands in online learning *Distance Education,* 26(1): 5-27.

67) Taplin, R., Kerr, R. and Brown, A. (2012). Who Pays for blended learning? A cost-benefit Analysis. Internet and Higher Education. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.09.002.

68) Tomei, L.A. (2006). The impact of online teaching on faculty load: computing the ideal class size for online courses. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education* 14(3), 531-541.

69) Twigg, C.A. (2003). Improving Learning and Reducing Costs: New Models for Online Learning *Educause Review*: 28-38.

70) Van de Vord, R. and Pougue, K. (2012). Teaching Time Investment: Does Online Really Take More Time than Face-to-Face? *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 13(3). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10515/sy5n29pn6.

71) Vardi, M. (2012). Will MOOC'S Destroy Academia? *Communications of the ACM*, 55(11).

72) Zacharis, N. (2010). The Impact of Learning Styles on Student Achievement in a Web-Based Versus an Equivalent Face-to-Face Course. College Student Journal, 44(3): 591-597.