Faculty Development for Online Educators at

the Fashion Institute for Design and Merchandising

An Action Research Project

Rosemary Tyrrell

454A – Introduction to Action Research

University of California at Los Angeles

Table of Contents

Abstract

This study examined attitudes and perceptions about faculty development of online instructors at the Fashion Institute of Design and Merchandising (FIDM). The purpose of this study was to determine how FIDM could increase participation in available faculty development training opportunities and improve the orientation course currently in development. A total of 184 student evaluations of teaching were analyzed, 35 instructors were surveyed, and 10 instructors were interviewed in order to answer the research questions. The results of this study indicate that instructors want professional development that is convenient and provides specific skills that can be applied to their online courses. Students want instructors to be more responsive to their needs in their online courses. Instructors responded positively to the new faculty orientation course in development and felt that it should be required of all new instructors. According to interview responses, formal incentive programs currently being considered may not result in increased participation by faculty in available training options.

Keywords: faculty development, professional development, online instruction, student evaluation of instruction

Section One – Background and Context

Background

FIDM is a private college educating students for careers in the fashion, graphics, interior design, and entertainment industries. Founded in 1969 by Toni Hohberg, the college has grown to four campuses with a student body of 7,500. FIDM offers a number of A.A. degrees related to design industries and one B.S. degree in business management. Online courses are currently offered in general studies and the bachelor's program. Students working toward an A.A. degree may not take more than 50% of their courses online; however, students working toward the B.S. degree may take their entire program online.

To improve the quality of teaching in the online courses, I was hired as the eLearning Instructional Specialist. My eLearning position is part-time, and I split my time between the eLearning position, a position as Instructional Specialist for the face-to-face instructors on the San Diego campus, and my own teaching load that includes both face-to-face and online classes.

To be most effective in my position, I want to create faculty training and development programs that inform teaching practice. During my first year as the eLearning Instructional Specialist, I created and held webinars on a variety of topics. Due to sparse attendance at the webinars, it was determined that another method of training was needed. I am creating a five-week online training course to meet this need. The first three modules have been launched and the final two modules are scheduled to be completed by the end of the school year. When all five weeks are available, all new online instructors will be required to take the course prior to teaching. All current instructors are being asked to take each module as it becomes available.

Problem Statement

A body of research reveals increasing concerns over the quality of online programs (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Bangert, 2004; Coppola et al., 2002). The online program for the BS degree at FIDM has received negative feedback from students. When comparing student evaluations of teaching of online course with their face-to-face counterparts, online courses are rated lower in every category. Even taking into consideration the lower responses rates in the online courses, it is clear that the program needs improvement.

As the demand for online courses grows, the urgency to improve our programs increases. FIDM, unfortunately, has not escaped the fallout of both the recession and the relentless negative press regarding for-profit institutions. Despite the challenges, we must address the problem. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) requires evidence of faculty-to-student interactions and of on-going faculty development. To meet all these demands, we need ongoing faculty development that is efficacious, well attended, and cost effective. Perhaps most importantly, development for online faculty is a key element to ensuring quality courses and positive learning outcomes for students at FIDM and other institutions committed to excellence in online education.

The first challenge is getting instructors to participate in training and development. The next challenge will be to ensure they use what they have learned to inform their practice.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this action research study is to inform decision-making. Results of the study will be used to consider an incentive program that encourages faculty participation in training and development. Further, the results of the study will be used to adapt and improve the

e-learning training course currently in development and to provide additional training and development for online instructors.

To develop and implement this study, I worked closely with the chair of the bachelor's program, George Sims. In my position as eLearning Instructional Specialist I report directly to him. I will also be reporting the results of the study to the Institution Research Office and Sheryl Rabinovich, the chair of the Department of General Studies and Dean of Academic Affairs. In my position as Instructional Specialist I report directly to her and also serve as an instructor in her department. The Office of Institutional Research was instrumental in providing access to student evaluation data. They also must approve any research done at our institution that will inform decision-making or practice. I interviewed 10 instructors teaching online at FIDM; five who have attended some form of training, and five who have not attended any training.

In addition to the interviews I incorporated data from student evaluations. I coded student comments in the evaluations to determine what general categories of complaints we receive. This information helped inform what areas should be addressed in the faculty orientation course currently under development. I also observed an e-learning planning committee meeting to get a general sense of how the decision-makers in the department interact and the process they use to make decisions.

Research Questions

1. According to online instructors, how can FIDM increase their involvement in faculty development?

    a. What do instructors say prevent them from attending available training?

    b. What types of faculty development do instructors need or want?

    c. What incentive programs would be effective in motivating instructors to attend faculty development?

2. How can the orientation course currently in development improve teaching in online courses?

    a. What changes are needed in the orientation course to meet the faculty's professional development needs?

To discover answers to these questions, it is necessary to speak directly with instructors and explore their feelings about teaching online, their needs for faculty development and what incentives would entice them to participate in faculty development.

Section Two – Literature Review

Over the last few decades extensive research has focused on faculty development in higher education (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Bangert, 2004; Graham, Cagiltay, Lim, Craner, & Duffy, 2001; Reilly, Vandenhouten, Gallagher-Lepak, & Ralston-Berg, 2012; Steinert et al., 2012; Wilson & Stacey, 2004). The literature agrees that more study is needed in the field of faculty development. Since 1981 four comprehensive analyses have all concluded that the research in faculty development is of low quality. All cited a need for more rigorous research, mixed methods, and longitudinal studies (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Levinson-Rose & Menges, 1981; Steinert et al., 2012; Stes, Min-Leliveld, Gijbels, & Van Petegem, 2010).

Not only is research on faculty development in higher education limited, but also research for development of online instruction is even more sparse. The proliferation of e-learning courses has created a demand for faculty development in online teaching. Researchers have yet to agree, however, on what methods will produce quality online educators, yet they generally agree that more research is needed in this fast growing arena (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Levinson-Rose & Menges, 1981; Stes, Min-Leliveld, et al., 2010).

The terms faculty development, instructional development, educational development, and academic development are used interchangeably within the literature. For the purpose of this synthesis, the phrase faculty development will be used to refer to any formalized program that seeks to improve course instruction and pedagogical methodology.

Faculty Development Online

Researchers generally disagree on the best ways to accomplish faculty development for online educators (Reilly et al., 2012). While much faculty development in this area has centered on technical skills, some researchers urge a focus on pedagogy and skills in the affective domain (Reilly et al., 2012; Wilson & Stacey, 2004). Wilson and Stacey (2004) identify a need for framing online education as one of many new teaching methods, emphasizing innovation, and incorporating online development with faculty development generally.

The most common method of faculty development is a short-term workshop (Bangert, 2004; Graham et al., 2001; Lawless & Pellegrino, 2007). However, researchers generally agree that short-term workshops without follow up are not effective in improving online pedagogy. Lawless and Pellegrino (2007) found that short-term programs often include as little as one hour to one day of development in a year. They found that only 9 of the 21 studies they reviewed used any explicit method for evaluating the changes in teacher skills following short-term programs.

Short workshops may be common, but other methods have been studied. One key study conducted by Reilly et al. (2012) was a year-long, multi-campus online virtual learning community of practice with nursing students at the University of Wisconsin. Participants attended six monthly videoconferences conducted by expert guest speakers who focused on integrating new technologies into online courses. Training included technologies such as Twitter, Skype, Adobe Connect, Polleverywhere.com, and Prezi. The program culminated with a two-day

e-learning conference where best practices were showcased. The program included discussion boards, PowerPoint presentations, and online resources. Self-reflection was a primary tool for encouraging a paradigm shift in new faculty.

Using another approach, Terantino and Agbehonou (2012) studied a faculty development course at a large, southeastern university which blended both F2F sessions with online sessions. They compared two iterations of a 12-week course, which included eight F2F sessions and four online sessions. The training course focused on increasing technology skills with topics such as creating a web page, wiki or blog, using streaming media and interactive course content, and designing banners and buttons. The courses trained faculty both to design and deliver online classes and select appropriate software to increase student engagement. At the culmination of the training course, participants designed and presented online courses that were required to pass a quality review before they could be offered to students. Over a period of two years, a questionnaire was given to faculty completing the course with an impressive 96% return rate excluding faculty who did not complete the course. The research found that 94% of the participants reported that the course provided useful information, incorporated effective online components, and integrated the learning management system effectively.

Finding similar results, Fisher, et al. (2010) specifically studied differences between professional development conducted online or F2F. Participants were randomly assigned to either a F2F or online workshop. No significant differences were found in posttest scores between the two groups. When evaluating the performance of teachers in their classrooms, the mean after-training score of the F2F group was 75.20% and the online was 88.51%. The researchers also tested students of the teachers who attended the development workshops. The students of teachers who attended the F2F workshop scored 62% correct answers while the

students of the teachers who attended online workshops received 67.75%. Singer (2008) found similar results in a study of a five week course conducted over three semesters. Based on 113 faculty surveys, they found that teachers who had previously taken F2F training stated a strong preference for the online format. Teachers surveyed further agreed that the online development courses increased levels of comfort using technology and allowed them to reinforce and apply their learning through online discussions with colleagues. They further stated they would continue to enroll in online development courses.

Researchers generally agree that an online format for faculty development allows participants to walk in the shoes of their online students (Reilly et al., 2012; Terantino & Agbehonou, 2012). By establishing a learner-centered approach, the developers encourage instructors to use a similar approach in their own teaching. Terantino and Agbehonou (2012) state that the goal is to train faculty members to apply andragogy theory which focuses on engaging independent and self-directed learners.

Competencies Needed for Teaching Online

While some researchers study specific methods of conducting online faculty development, others focus on faculty competencies identified for teaching online (Bangert, 2004; Coppola et al., 2002; Graham et al., 2001; Leh, 2005; Shea, Pickett, & Li, 2005; Terantino & Agbehonou, 2012). Unlike other researchers, Wilson and Stacey (2004) focused their study on instructor predisposition for online teaching. They framed instructor readiness using Roger's theory of adoption of technology. Roger's theory suggests that people are inherently predisposed to either adopt or reject new technology. While Roger states that 13.5% of the population are early adopters who see new technology as fun and challenging, the majority (68%) fall into a

category who tend to only adopt proven technologies and methods. Wilson and Stacey state that most instructors are pragmatic, conservative and averse to risk.

The majority of the researchers, however, agree on specific competencies that can be taught for teaching online. Five competencies were most frequently addressed in the literature.

First, the most common theme in this research is constructivist learning (Bangert, 2004, 2006; Coppola et al., 2002; Gaytan & McEwen, 2010; Graham et al., 2001; Guasch, Alvarez, & Espasa, 2010; Leh, 2005; Shea et al., 2005; Terantino & Agbehonou, 2012). In fact, Bangert et al. (2006) note that constructivist learning is exclusively recommended as a method to design and deliver online courses. In their earlier 2004 study, Bangert et al. reported that 97% of students indicated that the course was specifically designed so they could take responsibility for their own learning. Graham et al. (2001) similarly found that instructors were able to get students to relate learning to the real-world projects and gave effective and specific feedback on assignments. They noted that the instructors in the study underscored the importance of disciplined work, application of learning, self-pacing and scheduling. Leh (2005) echoed these findings and noted that constructivist learning theory was a good fit for online learning because students are increasingly able to access their own information sources and instructors are ceasing to be givers of information.

Second, related to constructivist learning, another competency found in the literature is creating collaborative environments (Bangert, 2006; Guasch et al., 2010; Roman, Kelsey, & Lin, 2010; Wilson & Stacey, 2004). Guasch et al. (2010) classify areas of competency including: design/planning; social function; instructive function; technological domain; and management. Based on a content analysis of 125 thematic units, they identify the competencies of structuring and consensus as the conceptual basis for collaborative learning; analysis of available

technological resources; and design of collaborative activities. Bangert et al. (2006) report 83%

of the students surveyed felt their instructor created activities that provided several ways for

students to demonstrate competency in course concepts. They also discuss other competencies

including cooperation among students, faculty interaction, active learning, and time on task.

Third, an additional competency for online teaching is utilizing technology effectively

(Gaytan & McEwen, 2010; Graham et al., 2001; Guasch et al., 2010; Lawless & Pellegrino,

2007; Terantino & Agbehonou, 2012). Graham et al. (2001) specifically identify sufficient

ability to assess technology as a key competency. They detail the ability to manage content,

design collaborative activities, and identify and consolidate knowledge as important

competencies. Gaytan and McEwen (2010) surveyed research on methods of training for

technology use. They reviewed 20 studies which all detailed programs designed to increase

faculty technology use. The faculty development included workshops and semester-long courses

conducted both online and F2F. Lawless and Pellegrino (2007) discovered that 9 of the 21

studies they reviewed focused on evaluating change in technology skill levels. They reported that

participants felt more confident and comfortable using technology.

Fourth, the literature addresses the competency of designing courses which provoke

meaningful discourse through problem-solving, cooperative learning activities, simulations,

case-studies, and discussion prompts (Bangert, 2004, 2006; Coppola et al., 2002; Guasch et al.,

2010; Shea et al., 2005). For example, Bangert et al. (2004) found 79% of students identified that

threaded discussions helped provoke thoughtful discourse and 92% felt it increased their interest

in the subject matter of the course. Coppola et al. (2002) also reported that faculty engaged in

deeper mental processing when responding to questions in online courses.

Finally, the fifth competency discussed in the literature is facilitation (Bangert, 2004; Coppola et al., 2002; Graham et al., 2001). Instructors use a variety of tools to facilitate learning including asynchronous conferencing, face-to-face meetings, and feedback (Bangert, 2004, 2006; Coppola et al., 2002). Bangert et al. (2004) showed that 96% of the students felt instructor feedback was both timely and supportive. One student commented: "I was impressed with his prompt responses to my questions. I felt like he understood the difficulties I was having because I was new to WebCT and he was very patient and available for help" (Bangert, 2004, p. 225). Likewise, Graham et al. (2001) reported that instructors were good about giving information and feedback, monitoring group bulletin boards, and publically calling attention to excellence.

In Coppola et al. (2002) faculty found that relationships with their online students were more intimate than those with students they teach face-to-face. They further noted that teaching online required more attention to detail and student monitoring. Graham et al. (2001) also reported that instructors found ways to strengthen student relationships and build trust.

Section Three - Data Collection and Analysis Methods

The purpose of this study is to examine faculty perceptions of teaching online, the new faculty orientation course, and professional development and training for overall online teaching at the Fashion Institute of Design and Merchandising (FIDM). This study had a dual focus of generating feedback on the new faculty orientation course specifically and examining faculty attitudes toward professional development and training overall. The study attempted to answer these research questions: According to online instructors, how can FIDM increase their involvement in faculty development? What do instructors say prevent them from attending available training? What types of faculty development do instructors need or want? What incentive programs would be effective in motivating instructors to attend faculty development?

How can the orientation course currently in development improve teaching in online courses?

What changes are needed in the orientation course to meet the faculty's professional

development needs?

This section will (1) describe the research methodology, (2) explain the selection of

participants, (3) describe the instrument used, and (4) explain the implementation of the study.

Diagnosing

The online program for the BS degree at the Fashion Institute for Design and

Merchandising (FIDM) has received consistently negative feedback from students. When

comparing student evaluations of teaching of online course with their face-to-face counterparts,

online courses are rated lower in every category. Table 3.1 illustrates the differences between

instructional modes for 2012. Even taking into consideration the lower response rates in the

online courses, it is clear that the program needs improvement.

Table 3.1 Evaluation of Instructional by Instructional Mode using a 1-4 Scale

Instructional Mode	# of Responses	1. Objectives	2. Effective	3. Activities	4. Feedback	5. Engage	6. Materials	7. Organizes	Average Rating
Face-to-face	22821	3.59	3.50	3.57	3.54	3.50	3.53	3.47	3.53
eLearning	2470	3.53	3.34	3.46	3.36	3.37	3.43	3.38	3.41
All FIDM	**25291**	**3.60**	**3.51**	**3.57**	**3.54**	**3.50**	**3.53**	**3.48**	**3.53**

As the demand for online courses grows, the urgency to improve our programs increases.

Due to negative press and the actions of some institutions, the Western Association of Schools

and Colleges (WASC) has been scrutinizing online programs at for-profit schools closely and

recommending new procedures, including evidence of on-going faculty development.

Consequently, FIDM needs ongoing faculty development that is efficacious, well attended, and

cost effective. Most importantly, development for online faculty is a key element to ensuring quality courses and positive learning outcomes for students at FIDM and other institutions committed to excellence in online education.

The first challenge is getting instructors to participate in training and development. After FIDM created the position of eLearning Instructional Specialist, a quarterly webinar was launched to provide professional development specifically for the online instructors. At the start, the webinars were well attended, but attendance dropped significantly from the beginning of the program. As a response to poor attendance, it was determined that a new online course would be created for the purpose of giving sufficient orientation to all new hires. In addition, it was decided that all current instructors would be "grandfathered" into the program and asked to complete each module as it becomes available. To date, three modules have been launched and two remain to be published.

Methodology

A descriptive research methodology was used for this study. Five primary methods for data collection were used: (1) background survey, (2) interviews with faculty members, (3) survey on preferred content, (4) student evaluations of teaching, and (5) observation of Educational Technology Committee meeting.

To make best use of the time during the interviews, each instructor was asked to complete a background survey prior to the interview. Questions included background information on the instructor's experience with either taking or teaching online courses both within and outside of FIDM. Instructors were also asked what courses they taught online at FIDM and how many years they had taught at FIDM and in the online program. Eight of the ten instructors interviewed

completed the survey. The survey was created on Google drive and the link was provided to each instructor as part of the confirmation e-mail for the interview.

The action research plan was to interview 10 faculty members teaching online at FIDM. All 10 interviews were conducted, recorded, transcribed and coded. The coding categories included: (1) background, motives for teaching online, advantages of and complaints about online teaching; (2) training received, professional development needed or wanted, format of professional development preferred, obstacles to attending training, and motivations to participate in training; (3) changes needed, preferred content, preferred mode, and preferred length for the orientation course; and (4) insights regarding potential incentive programs.

Interviews proved to be an inefficient method to determine what content instructors would recommend for the orientation course. To respond to this need, I created a checklist of potential orientation topics and asked instructors to circle the five topics that they would consider the most important. Subsequently, I created a Google form of the same document and sent it via e-mail to all online instructors. Using this method, I received responses from 27 of the 35 instructors teaching online at the present time. The content survey is provided in Appendix C.

A total of 184 student evaluations of teaching from a three year period in the Business Management (BUMT) program were collected and coded according to concerns students expressed in the following categories: (1) grading and feedback; (2) responsiveness to inquiries; (3) course content; (4) and technology.

Observation of the Educational Technology Committee meeting helped determine the constraints that currently exist, the dynamics of decision-making, and the current priorities for the eLearning program. The observation also provided insight into the relationships between the e-learning technology staff and educational leadership.

A follow-up survey was also planned following the implementation of changes in the

new faculty orientation course. The interviews, however, took longer than anticipated and a

follow-up survey was not possible given time constraints. A follow up survey is planned for the

end of the calendar year. All instructors teaching online will be surveyed.

Participants

For this study, all faculty members teaching online courses in either the Business

Management or General Studies departments in the Fall 2012 quarter were identified. The list of

35 faculty members was then divided into two categories. The first category represented

instructors who had participated in faculty development provided by the e-learning instructional

specialist or had completed work in the online orientation course. The second category

represented instructors who had not participated in any online faculty development provided by

the e-learning instructional specialist nor had they completed any part of the new faculty

orientation course. Five instructors from each list were selected randomly by choosing slips of

paper from an envelope. The selected instructors were e-mailed a request to participate. Initially,

all 10 instructors agreed. I was both pleased and surprised at the willingness of instructors to

participate. My initial concern was that instructors would be suspicious that the study might

result in more professional development hours being required of them. After initially agreeing,

two instructors refused to be interviewed face-to-face and were replaced by two other instructors

randomly selected from the original list. Table 3.2 describes the faculty interviewees.

Table 3.2   Background of Faculty Interviewees

	Pseudonym	Gender	Years teaching at FIDM	Years teaching online	Experience teaching online outside FIDM
1.	Erin Logan	Female	10+	3 – 5	No
2.	Stephen Hackett	Male	3 – 5	3 – 5	Yes
3.	Joel Bowen	Male	3 – 5	3 – 5	Yes
4.	Dylan Powers	Male	6 – 10	3 – 5	No
5.	Luke Woodall	Male	10+	5+	No

6.	Katherine Hurst	Female	10+	5+	No
7.	Veronica Simmons	Female	6 – 10	3 – 5	No
8.	Hannah Merchant	Female	6 – 10	3 – 5	Yes
9.	Adam Conroy	Male	Did not provide	3-5	No
10.	Juliana Schafer	Female	Did not provide	Did not provide	No

Instruments

The interview protocols were piloted within my critical reflection group. The protocols focused on four distinct areas. First, the instructor was asked questions regarding their online teaching experiences at FIDM and what kind of training was provided prior to teaching the first course. Second, the instructor was asked questions regarding the online orientation course. In this section, two separate protocols were created, one for the instructors who had participated in online training and one for those who had not. The instructors who had participated in the online training and the e-learning orientation course were asked questions about their experiences in using the course. Instructors who had not yet experienced the course were asked more general questions exploring their feelings about such a course. Third, instructors were asked about their overall experiences in training and development whether face-to-face or online. Finally, instructors were asked specific questions about potential incentive programs being considered. The interview protocols are provided in Appendix A and B.

Implementation

Implementing the action plan involved obtaining the approval of the Institutional Research Office. I also worked closely with George Sims, the head of the bachelor's program in planning the study. Lisa Marie Mickey, assistant to George Sims, was a critical partner in facilitating the interviews with faculty members.

Since the beginning of the study the third week of the e-learning orientation course has been created and launched. Based on preliminary findings, changes were made in the week three module, which included adapting the kind of content and length of the module.

Some assumptions about the faculty's willingness to participate in faculty development and training have been challenged by the interview process. I discovered that far from being unwilling to participate in faculty development, most instructors were eager for more opportunities. Additionally, few instructors felt that an incentive program would be motivational for them personally, yet they believed that it would be motivational for others. Instructors provided a number of suggestions for ways to incentivize participation in professional development, including tying participation to the annual faculty of the year award and acknowledging participation on online instructor's class websites. One thing that regularly emerged from the interviews was that few instructors felt they had been adequately prepared before teaching their first online course at FIDM; however, many felt that they needed little training. Another theme that emerged was the role of schedule conflicts in participating in professional development. Finally, one clear theme was that the instructors hold the e-learning team in high regard. This is important information in understanding the context and political landscape of training and development in the area of online education. Any program which appears to be critical of the efforts of the e-learning team may be perceived negatively.

Section Four – Evaluation and Discussion

Findings from faculty interviews and surveys

Instructors were first asked about their experience teaching online at FIDM and the initial training that they received. The most common thing that instructors said they liked about

teaching online is its flexibility. Out of the 10 instructors interviewed, 7 stated flexibility as the primary advantage. This sentiment was reflected in comments such as this:

> It is flexible. Because I do a fair amount of travel with my consulting work, and if I'm in a hotel room and having to wait to do some preparation, I would just as soon catch up with my students and make sure that they're okay. I can do that anywhere. So the flexibility is a good situation for the instructor as well as the student. (Hannah Merchant)

Flexibility was not the only advantage mentioned, however. Four instructors stated that teaching online was a new challenge and four said that they liked the advantages online courses gave students. Most surprisingly, six out of the ten instructors said they felt that online students were better than those in their face-to-face classes. Perceptions of better students were reflected in comments like:

> I feel like the caliber of the students is better. They are more articulate because they have time, they focus, and they take the time to answer the questions. Their spelling is not the greatest, but they definitely think more seriously. They seem to understand research better than even our live students, and part of it is just because they are on their own time and on their own wherewithal about where to find the information. I find that I tend to get a lot more quality projects constantly from my online students. When they're writing and obviously they're thinking differently than when they're doing that orally in the classroom. (Erin Logan)

A key finding was that when discussing their experience, six of the ten instructors praised the support they received from the e-learning team and cited it as one of the things they liked most about teaching online at FIDM. This sentiment was represented in comments like this one:

> E-learning has been so great; so patient. I've sent them a few things, and I know they probably think, "Oh! You again!" but they've been very helpful. (Adam Conroy)

While instructors discussed many positives about teaching online at FIDM, there were also some complaints. The two key complaints that instructors expressed about teaching online were 1) limitations or problems with the technology and 2) a lack of connection with students. One instructor shared her feeling that she was not properly trained about technical procedures.

When I first, for example, got the course and was asked to edit it, I was not aware that anything I wanted to do I couldn't just do. I needed to work with someone else like the Department Chair or the Assistant Department Chair. There was no communication or training on that. Actually, I didn't know that until the third quarter I was teaching online, which is probably kind of silly. (Veronica Simmons)

Seven out of the ten instructors interviewed expressed concern that there is a lack of

connection with students. One instructor expressed her frustration in this way:

Sometimes I have fabulous students, and I never get to meet them face-to-face. I really wish I could. I do miss that connection because the post-class connection is not as strong. That bond is not as strong. That's really my only sadness in all of it. (Katherine Hurst)

Six out of the 10 instructors felt that the students were not getting the same value in the

online course as they were in the face-to-face alternative. This concern was expressed with

comments like:

I don't think the students get the depth of understanding or value. I don't have my skills up to do more of the chat room or more interactive kind of experience online that could stimulate more. There is something about face-to-face that you can't replace online easily. I can't do some of the interactive exercises online. I don't know how to translate that online, and I think that that's the sort of thing that you're missing out on because of the richness of experience. It's hard to simulate that online, and I guess that's one frustration. (Stephen Hackett)

While it was not an opinion of half or more of the interviewees, four instructors

expressed displeasure with what they perceived as unrealistic expectations from the students.

These instructors felt that students expected them to be available at all times and to respond

faster than they were able to. One instructor expressed her frustration by saying:

The fact that students feel like they are connected to me as an instructor 24/7, and they expect feedback, not as a live class would be within a week; they expect feedback within a day. Typically, they will submit something and then e-mail me the next day and say, "I haven't seen my grade yet." Before the allotted time that I have told them it would take me to grade them, they still want to know. (Veronica Simmons)

In the next section of the interview instructors were asked to discuss training that they

had received before teaching online at FIDM for the first time. When describing the training, all

10 instructors indicated that the training was not hands on. While one instructor described the

training as "sufficient" eight out of the 10 said that there was not enough training. Dissatisfaction

with the amount of training was represented in comments like these:

> Zero. I was given the course and the date that it started. All I was given at that time was a
> very bullet pointed kind of list of information. "Here's how quickly you are expected to
> respond to students." "Here is the Tuesday date that we set for close and then open of the
> next week's modules." Very general things. That was it. (Veronica Simmons)

> I hate to be negative because I'm not, but the training that I got was actually minimal. I
> sat down and tried to help myself. I had to train myself. (Dylan Powers)

In addition to feeling that the training was insufficient, five out of ten instructors had

other complaints regarding the training represented in comments like:

> She's (Samantha) very savvy with this and sometimes it was a little overwhelming
> because of how fast it was delivered. It was more showing versus me trying it out so that
> I could understand it. (Stephen Hackett)

Not all instructors were completely unhappy with the training. Five out of the ten

instructors also made positive comments. These comments were directed at the e-learning team

and their willingness to answer questions when needed in comments like these:

> You know one thing about Sam is you never feel afraid to ask a question. That's been so
> good about the whole staff, really. I cannot say too much good about them because they
> are amazing. (Erin Logan)

Even given the praise for the e-learning team, all 10 instructors expressed a desire for

more professional development. A wide range of topics for ongoing professional development

was suggested including: managing time, dealing with the discussion board, creating videos,

updating content, dealing with error codes, working with groups, using synchronous learning

tools, using new technologies, incorporating social media, presenting in an online course,

creating podcasts, and so on. The desire for professional development was expressed in

comments like:

I always want training. Even if I've seen the material, I want to see it again to make sure that I'm doing what I'm supposed to be doing. (Joel Bowen)

When asked what format instructors preferred for professional development, five out of ten instructors said that they would prefer face-to-face training, while four out of ten expressed a preference for online training. The face-to-face preference was described in comments such as:

It would be nice to be able to meet other e-learning faculty and to see what they're doing and what's working for them. (Julianna Schaffer)

In fact, one of the motivators instructors identified for attending professional development was an opportunity to collaborate with colleagues. The two most frequent answers given were 1) gaining new ideas (8/10) and 2) a chance to collaborate with colleagues (6/10). One reason some faculty preferred face-to-face professional development is the opportunity to interact with colleagues. That sentiment is expressed in comments like this one:

I like to have that interconnectedness. Then I get to see the connections between departments that I may not have had in a previous life in academia. I don't get to meet with my colleagues very often, so I appreciate the opportunity. (Adam Conroy)

The most common reason instructors expressed for not attending available professional development was time and/or scheduling with five out of the ten instructors referencing it specifically. Other issues that were mentioned were commuting distance, personal reasons, illness, and other priorities such as grading, e-mail, and jobs outside of FIDM. While it was not the majority opinion, three instructors did discuss importance of being paid in motivating them to attend professional development with comments like these:

I think getting paid helped. Maybe that's the bottom line, you know. It helps to have George say, "I really want you to do this." (Stephen Hackett)

In the third section of the interview, instructors were asked about their experiences or perceptions of the orientation course being developed. Key findings from this section of the interview included positive attitudes about 1) the program overall, 2) being treated as a student in

the course, and 3) content and recommended content. The most significant finding was that all of

the 10 instructors interviewed said that they felt the orientation program was a good idea and was

something that was needed. Comments that represent the feelings of instructors interviewed are:

> For one thing, I think orientation for new instructors is really a good idea. In fact, maybe it is a critical idea that they know what to expect when they come in. I see a lot of instructors who need an orientation on how to use technology, period. (Luke Woodall)

> I think it's very beneficial because I never had that. None of us have had anything like that, so I think it is very beneficial. (Hannah Merchant)

Perhaps most surprisingly, none of the instructors expressed any concern about being

treated as a student in the course. In fact, all eight of the instructors asked said the thing they

liked most about the program was being in the role of the student or the idea of being in the role

of the student. When asked how he responded to being treated as a student, one instructor said:

> I don't think I've ever approached the system from a student point of view. I think that was really helpful. I think that should be part of our training; I really do. Then we can help the students better. I think that would be important to understand. (Stephen Hackett)

> Among the five who participated in the beta test of the online orientation program, four

instructors specifically mentioned they liked the videos used throughout the course:

> I like your videos. It's engaging. It's engaging. I can see people sitting down and saying, "Yeah, this stuff is not boring as all get out." It's interesting. (Joel Bowen)

> I think that can set the tone for the class in a very positive way. That's why I really want to do more video. More little mini videos to not only welcome, but also when we get into assignments say, "Here's what I'm looking for. If you have questions, contact me." I think videos can be very powerful. (Stephen Hackett)

Three of the five beta testers recommended a more seamless way to navigate within the

course. They also commented that their experience made them more empathetic to students who

might be struggling with navigation in their own online courses.

> If there was an icon that would help you get to where you want to go from the syllabus, from my experience that would have helped me. I don't know what the technology is behind that or anything else, but from a user point of view it was a little frustrating. It

seemed almost duplicative in a sense where we have a module and then the syllabus and then you got the assignment and they're not linked together. I guess maybe that's a way to think about it. (Stephen Hackett)

Instructors recommended a wide range of content, and the most common suggestions from the survey are listed in Table 4.1. The two topics tied for first place were both related to using technology. The two topics, "Navigating Sakai" and "How to Use Available Technology Tools/Incorporating Emerging Technologies into Your Online Course" were selected by 48% of those responding for their top five topics to be included. The next three topics were all related to student faculty interaction in some way.

Table 4.1 Top Suggested Content for e-Learning Orientation Course

Topic	# of Responses	% of Total
Navigating Sakai	13	48%
How to Use Available Technology Tools/Incorporating Emerging Technologies in Your Online Course	13	48%
Communicating Effectively with the E-Learning Student	12	44%
Best Practices for Teaching Online	11	41%
Creating Community in an Online Course	9	33%
Planning and Setting up Your Online Course	8	30%
Tips for Using the Discussion Board	8	30%
Creating a Welcoming Learning Environment	7	26%
Writing Rubrics for Online Assignments	6	22%
Writing Policy Statements	6	22%
Creating Learner Centered Instruction in an Online Environment	6	22%

When discussing the preferred format for the orientation program, instructors were split right down the middle. Five instructors preferred a fully online format, while five instructors

preferred either a blended or face-to-face approach. The differences can be expressed in

comments like these:

> Well, I mean you're teaching on a system that is online. I wouldn't expect it to be face-to-face. I think that's the only method to go. The only way to go. (Joel Bowen)

> I think when you first start you have certain questions are difficult maybe to communicate properly when you're not near someone, so for me it doesn't have to be all face-to-face, but maybe something to start me off and then to supplement online would work well. (Veronica Simmons)

When discussing the length of the program the instructors were again split. Five

instructors felt five weeks was just right, while the other five felt it was either too much or had

no preference when it came to length of program. One instructor said that he felt the program

should be half the length it currently is, while another felt it should be four sessions rather than

five. The range of opinions is reflected in comments like these:

> Yeah, cutting it in half, that's better, but it still seems like a lot of time. I would say not more than three. Has to be at least one, right? One, they get started, two they cover a lot of material, and three they wrap it up. I know some instructors are super busy and the demands on the instructor's time are really kind of high. This is introductory, so maybe it would work out, but it seems like three would be about right. (Luke Woodall)

> I honestly didn't think it was too much. I'm not saying you're too easy, but I don't believe that it's too much. I'm sure it is not going to take three hours if they are willing. If they're not willing, of course, whatever you do is too much. Whatever you ask is too much. Honestly, I don't think that there's too much. (Dylan Powers)

The final section of the interview focused on creating a formal incentive program at

FIDM for attending professional development. The overall response to the idea was positive with

eight out of the ten instructors approving. One interesting finding, however, was that most

instructors felt an incentive program would be motivational for others, but not for themselves

with comments like:

> I think it's fine. It won't make a difference whether I attend or not. The reward for me is that students all did well, but I think that for the individuals that need that or want that, I think it's a motivator. (Veronica Simmons)

Five out of ten instructors felt that an incentive program would be motivational only if it

were paired with something else that was more meaningful. These additional incentives included

gift cards, a new rolling bag, and incorporating the incentive program into the faculty of the year

award. Three instructors also mentioned getting paid was the most important incentive for them.

One instructor suggested that the incentive program would be most meaningful if it was visible

to the students.

> Another thought would be to have that recognition show up on your student's site so that
> they could see you have been certified in this training. To motivate our faculty so that
> they see they can also achieve it. I think showing on the website that this instructor has
> been certified in XYZ would also lend some credibility so that students who come up to
> the plate will see it and say, I have a problem with this and I see you are certified."
> Hopefully, that would be enough motivation. Put it right on the header in Sakai right next
> to your name, you know a star or a gold star means you're certified. (Adam Conroy)

Although their first reaction was positive, seven instructors also had negative comments.

Two of these instructors felt an incentive program did not fit with the FIDM culture with

comments such as:

> I would laugh if FIDM did something like that. I don't know. It just doesn't seem very
> FIDM environment like. (Katherine Hurst)

> I don't know. I mean, I'm all for types of incentives to get people there, but I don't know.
> I think that FIDM is different. It's a different learning institution. (Hannah Merchant)

Mostly, instructors said that it simply would be of no value to them with comments like

these:

> To me, it wouldn't make any difference. My incentive is personal and professional, but
> it's not social. It's not just to have something to do. I really don't think that would be
> important to me. I've got enough of those (certificates) to paper my walls. It's nice to have
> them, but that's not a motivation. (Luke Woodall)

> My gut reaction is that it's just another thing I have to think about. If I have to keep track
> of it or get an e-mail about it, I'd rather not. I'd rather keep it simple. Like at X College
> they have a program if they have trainings or special events you can get a paper and you

can submit it and get paid or get time. To me, it's very onerous. I'm sure I've left money on the table that I haven't taken advantage of. (Stephen Hackett)

Findings from student evaluation of instruction

The first important finding from reviewing the student evaluations of teaching is that 69% of the comments are negative. Findings from the analysis are given in Table 4.2 . Students expressed most dissatisfaction with the level of feedback they received on graded work with 71% making negative comments. Students also complained about both the quality and timeliness in the way that instructors responded to their questions and e-mails with 68% negative responses. In addition to dissatisfaction with teaching in the online courses, students were unhappy with that content and organization of the courses themselves with 64% complaining. While technology was not frequently mentioned by students, when it was, it was 100% negative. Students expressed their dissatisfaction in comments like these:

> This teacher NEVER responds to e-mails. He never gives feedback. I currently have 3 projects that have been turned in over the last 6 weeks that he has not even looked at. They all revolve around my final project which I already had to turn in without any feedback. If you are going to choose someone to be an online teacher be sure they are at least willing to grade papers.

> Another issue I have with this instructor is she's lazy! On at least a couple occasions she did not post grades for assignments turned in until 2-3 weeks after they were due. To me, this sets a bad example for students. How and why is it that we are expected to turn in every assignment right on time, no excuses and no make-ups, yet the person in charge (the teacher) can take her sweet time and correct those assignments whenever she feels like? I'm assuming this is not FIDM policy since this is the only teacher I've ever experienced this with. How can we, as students, be expected to do our best and stay motivated when we cannot get an accurate assessment of our current grade in the class because the instructor doesn't post grades in a timely manner, and also gives the impression that she genuinely doesn't care about the class or teaching it with her lack of good lesson plans or posting of grades in a timely manner? Also, on a couple occasions she did not even bother to respond to email inquiries I sent to her about class assignments. Luckily, I knew some people that were taking her campus class and was able to ask them for guidance because heaven forbid I rely on the teacher for help!

Table 4.2. Student Evaluation of Instruction Comments

Category	Positive Comments	Percentages	Negative Comments	Percentages
Feedback/grading	65	29%	159	71%
Responsiveness	45	32%	96	68%
Course content	141	36%	255	64%
Technology			44	100%
Totals	**251**	**31%**	**554**	**69%**

Discussion

Through this research several important themes emerged. Instructors and students have different ideas about the need for development. While instructors focused on technology, students complained more about personal skills like communication and feedback. Program leadership wants to see better teaching in the online programs and would like more instructors to participate in development; however, the resources needed to ensure a vital faculty development program are not made available. Even though instructors claim an interest in attending professional development and motivation does not appear to be lacking, it has not translated into increased participation in the faculty orientation course. Finally, certain kinds of incentive programs may do little to increase attendance.

The findings allow us to answer some of the research questions. We have a better idea of what prevents instructors from attending available training. Time was the most often cited reason for why instructors did not attend available training, but instructors also discussed personal reasons and financial compensation.

We also gained insight into the question of what kinds of faculty development instructors need or want. The instructors interviewed said they wanted more faculty development but had different ideas on what was needed. Both students and instructors identified faculty-to-student interactions as a critical area for training and development. Instructors also expressed an interest

in gaining new technology skills and incorporating new methods into their courses. Instructors want development that is convenient, does not take too much time, and allows them to use specific skills in their online courses. Students want to see instructors who are more responsive to their needs. They expressed few concerns regarding the use of technology.

As far as answering the question about what types of incentive programs would be effective in motivating instructors to attend faculty development, the results of the study are inconclusive. Nearly all the instructors had both positive and negative comments about the idea. Further, instructors felt that a certificate or awards program would motivate others, but not themselves. Based on this study, it would seem that generating a formal incentive program would not be an effective means of motivating faculty to attend more faculty development programs. Some of the suggestions by instructors, such as incorporating attendance as a factor in the faculty of the year award and placing a "badge" onto a class site are worthy of further research.

It is too early to tell if the overall goal of getting more faculty members to attend professional development will be achieved. We have launched week three of the new faculty orientation course, and only one additional instructor has accessed the course this quarter. Getting instructors to participate continues to be an ongoing challenge.

When addressing the orientation course specifically, only small changes seem to be needed. Instructors who had beta tested the orientation program and those who had not both responded positively to it. All the instructors felt it was something which should be required of all new instructors. A few technical problems need to be addressed and a decision should be made as to whether or not we want to shorten the five week course to three or four weeks; otherwise, the program seems to work well as it is.

Lessons Learned

If I were to start this research project again from the beginning, I would make some changes. First, I would begin with a survey of all the online faculty teaching at FIDM. I would include not only background information, but also questions about training and development.

The second change I would make is to the interviews themselves. I would invite all instructors to participate. I found that the interview itself not only informed this research study, but had a secondary benefit of allowing me to interact personally with online instructors I had previously only worked with virtually. Even though I felt the interviews carried a hidden benefit, I would develop a more efficient method of scheduling. A significant amount of time was wasted in traveling back and forth to the LA campus to interview one person in order to accommodate for schedules. In future, when trying to interview a group of instructors, I will use a scheduling program like Doodle to set up the interview dates. I would also incorporate a tour of the orientation site into the interview protocol. There were five instructors interviewed who had not experienced the site, and I discovered that some instructors who had beta tested had difficulty remembering their experience and specifics about the course.

If given more time, the third change I would implement would be to code more student evaluation data and include other majors to determine whether or not issues raised in the BUMT evaluations were consistent throughout the program.

Finally, I would follow-up instructor interviews with focus groups. Having faculty bounce ideas off one another could result in some additional innovative suggestions for the program. Focus groups would also serve a dual purpose of giving instructors an opportunity to interact with their peers and could renew interest in participating in faculty development.

Next Steps

To improve practice at my workplace I will be presenting a report of my findings to the head of the BUMT program, George Sims. I will be making the following recommendations:

1) Require all new online instructors take the orientation course, regardless of department.

2) Shorten the online orientation course to four weeks, and develop a face-to-face introductory session.

3) Develop a wider variety of professional development opportunities. Include:

   a. Face-to-face professional development programs on best practices for communication and feedback.

   b. Asynchronous online content for current online instructors.

   c. Videos or podcasts of an "experts" panel consisting of the most effective online instructors sharing their best practices.

   d. Professional learning community with on-going self-reflection as a way to shift thinking of online instructors and increase commitment to teaching excellence.

   e. Incorporate online as a separate thread in the faculty in-service. Even though the annual in-service is currently suspended, when it is reinstituted, I would recommend creating a break out program specifically for online instructors.

4) Create a valid and reliable instrument for evaluating online courses and online teaching.

   a. Encourage faculty to develop Week 3 student evaluations for individual courses.

5) Continue to explore the possibility of creating incentives for attending professional development. The data suggests that instructors are motivated more by intrinsic rewards.

Ultimately, it would be my recommendation to create a department dedicated to teaching and learning at FIDM. This department would develop, implement and coordinate all faculty training and development at the institution including online instruction. I would recommend that control of the educational component of online courses be within the authority of this department, with the exclusion of curricula, which would remain the responsibility of department chairs. It is my hope that continued research and analysis will help inform decision-making in this vital area. While budget constraints might render this recommendation unfeasible, I agree with Sir Ken Robinson who said, "Investing in professional development is not a cost. It's an investment, and every other country that's succeeding well knows that." To achieve quality teaching in online courses and programs, more research is needed to understand fully the impact of faculty development on improving pedagogy of online instructors.

References

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2011, November). Going the distance: online education in the United

    States, 2011. *The Sloan Consortium*. Retrieved October 24, 2012, from

    http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/going_distance_2011

Amundsen, C., & Wilson, M. (2012). Are we asking the right questions?: A conceptual review of

    the educational development literature in higher education. *Review of Educational*

    Research, *82*(1), 90–126.

Bangert, A. W. (2004). The seven principles of good practice: A framework for evaluating on-

    line teaching. *Internet and Higher Education*, *7*(3), 217–232.

Bangert, A. W. (2006). The development of an instrument for assessing online teaching

    effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *35*(3), 227–244.

Coppola, N. W., Hiltz, S. R., & Rotter, N. G. (2002). Becoming a virtual professor: Pedagogical

    roles and asynchronous learning networks. *J. Manage. Inf. Syst.*, *18*(4), 169–189.

Fisher, J. B., Schumaker, J. B., Culbertson, J., & Deshler, D. D. (2010). Effects of a

    computerized professional development program on teacher and student outcomes.

    Journal of Teacher Education, *61*(4), 302–312. doi:10.1177/0022487110369556

Gaytan, J. A., & McEwen, B. C. (2010). Instructional technology professional development

    evaluation: Developing a high quality model. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, *52*(2), 77–94.

Graham, C., Cagiltay, K., Lim, B.-R., Craner, J., & Duffy, T. M. (2001). Seven principles of

    effective teaching: A practical lens for evaluating online courses. *Technology Source*.

    Retrieved from

    http://search.proquest.com/eric/docview/62260435/13A41C18FB23BEACDD3/1?accoun

    tid=14512

Guasch, T., Alvarez, I., & Espasa, A. (2010). University teacher competencies in a virtual

teaching/learning environment: analysis of a teacher training experience. *Teaching and

Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, *26*(2), 199–206.

Lawless, K. A., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2007). Professional development in integrating technology

into teaching and learning: knowns, unknowns, and ways to pursue better questions and

answers. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(4), 575–614.

Leh, A. S. (2005). Lessons learned from service learning and reverse mentoring in faculty

development: A case study in technology training. *Journal of Technology and Teacher

Education*, *13*(1), 25–41.

Levinson-Rose, J., & Menges, R. J. (1981). Improving college teaching: A critical review of

research. *Review of Educational Research*, *51*(3), 403–434.

doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543051003403

Reilly, J. R., Vandenhouten, C., Gallagher-Lepak, S., & Ralston-Berg, P. (2012). Faculty

development for e-learning: A multi-campus community of practice (cop) approach.

Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, *16*(2), 99–110.

Roman, T., Kelsey, K., & Lin, H. (2010). Enhancing online education through instructor skill

development in higher education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*,

13(4), 10.

Shea, P., Pickett, A., & Li, C. S. (2005). Increasing access to higher education: A study of the

diffusion of online teaching among 913 college faculty. *International Review of Research

in Open and Distance Learning*, *6*(2), 27.

Signer, B. (2008). Online professional development: Combining best practices from teacher,

technology and distance education. *Journal of In-service Education*, *34*(2), 205–218.

Steinert, Y., Naismith, L., & Mann, K. (2012). Faculty development initiatives designed to

promote leadership in   medical education. A BEME systematic review: BEME Guide

No. 19. *Medical Teacher*, *34*(6), 483–503.

Stes, A., Coertjens, L., & Van Petegem, P. (2010). Instructional development for teachers in

higher education: impact on teaching approach. *Higher Education: The International

Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, *60*(2), 187–204.

Stes, A., Min-Leliveld, M., Gijbels, D., & Van Petegem, P. (2010). The impact of instructional

development in higher education: The state-of-the-art of the research. *Educational

Research Review*, *5*(1), 25–49.

Terantino, J. M., & Agbehonou, E. (2012). Comparing faculty perceptions of an online

development course: Addressing faculty needs for online teaching. *Online Journal of

Distance Learning Administration*, *15*(2). Retrieved from

http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer152/terantino_agbehonou152.html

Walton-Radford, A. (2011). *Learning at a distance: Undergraduate enrollment in distance

education courses and degree programs*. Retrieved from

http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=80

Wilson, G., & Stacey, E. (2004). Online interaction impacts on learning: Teaching the teachers to

teach online. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *20*(1), 33–48.

Appendix A

Interview Protocol for instructors who have participated in the elearning orientation course:

As you know, FIDM's online program has been experiencing tremendous growth. More and more students are taking at least one online course, and some are even taking their entire program online.

I'm conducing an action research project as part of my job as your e-Learning Instructional Specialist. Our goals for this project are to explore and understand the needs of our online faculty and to adapt our training and development programs to meet those needs.

The information you provide in this interview will be used to improve our faculty training, and ultimately, student experiences in our online programs. We want to learn from your expertise and we are interested in anything you wish to share about your experience teaching online at FIDM.

The interview will take approximately one hour. The comments you make will be collected, synthesized and shared with management. Individual identities will be kept confidential and not released to management. The interview will be recorded so I can accurately represent everything that you say. You can stop the recording or the interview at any time.

1. Tell me a little bit about how you came to teach online.
    a. What about your first experience was positive?
    b. What about it was negative?

2. What do you like most about online teaching?
    a. Tell me about some positive experiences you have had as an online instructor.

3. What do you like least about online teaching?
    a. Tell me about some negative experiences you have had as an online instructor.

Thank you for giving me that background. I'd like to hear a bit more now about your experiences teaching here at FIDM.

4. Tell me about your first online course here at FIDM. (**SKIP if first experience teaching was at FIDM**)
    a. What was that experience like for you?
    b. What about it was positive?
    c. What about it was negative?

5. How would you describe your overall online teaching experience here at FIDM?
    a. What about it is positive?
    b. What about it is negative?

Next, I'd like to hear about your experiences with training for teaching online.

6. Describe the training you received before you taught online for the first time.
   a. What did you find most helpful?
   b. What did you find least helpful?
   c. Describe any formal training you received teaching somewhere other than FIDM.
   d. Please describe any new skills that were self taught.

7. When you first started teaching online at FIDM, how would you describe the training you received? (**SKIP if the first time teaching was at FIDM**)
   a. What did you find most helpful?
   b. What did you find least helpful?
   c. What training did you need or want that you didn't receive?

8. As you move forward in your online teaching, what kinds training do you need or want?
   a. What format of training would you find the most helpful? (f2f, online, blended)
   b. What kinds of topics would you like to see?
   c. How can FIDM help you grow and develop as an online instructor?

Next, I'd like to hear your feedback on the online elearning orientation course you participated in. Please know that I value your input, and I won't be offended by anything you say. I encourage you to be completely honest. My only goal is to make the program useful for our online faculty.

9. Tell me about your experience with the new elearning orientation course.
   a. What did you find the most helpful?
   b. What did you find the least helpful?

10. How did you react to the fully online format of the course?
    a. What about the format did you find the most helpful?
    b. What about the format did you find the least helpful?
    c. What other format would you recommend?

11. How did you respond to the content of the first two modules?
    a. What content did you find the most helpful?
    b. What content did you find the least helpful?
    c. What content did you feel was missing?

12. As we move forward, what would you like to see in the next three modules?
    a. What would you find most useful?
    b. What would you find least useful?

13. Are there any other changes you would recommend?

Lastly, I'd like to talk about what you think motivates faculty to participate in development or training programs.

14. Tell me what kinds of feedback on your teaching you find most helpful?
    a. What kinds of feedback have informed your teaching practice in the past?

15. What motivates you to attend faculty development or training programs?
    a. What things are most compelling?
    b. What things are least compelling?

16. Can you share anything that has prevented you from attending faculty development programs in the past?

17. Some schools have incentive programs, like certificates, awards or recognition groups to motivate faculty to attend development.
    a. How would you react to such a program being implemented at FIDM?
    b. What would like most about it?
    c. What would you like least about it?

18. If there was such a recognition program, what would make it meaningful for you?
    a. What form would you like to see such a program take? (i.e., a certificate, annual club)

Thank you so much for sharing your insights today.

19. Is there anything else you would like to share?

Appendix B

Interview Protocol for instructors who have not participated in the elearning orientation course:

As you know, FIDM's online program has been experiencing tremendous growth. More and more students are taking at least one online course, and some are even taking their entire program online.

I'm conducing an action research project as part of my job as your e-Learning Instructional Specialist. Our goals for this project are to explore and understand the needs of our online faculty and to adapt our training and development programs to meet those needs.

The information you provide in this interview will be used to improve our faculty training, and ultimately, student experiences in our online programs. We want to learn from your expertise and we are interested in anything you wish to share about your experience teaching online at FIDM.

The interview will take approximately one hour. The comments you make will be collected, synthesized and shared with management. Individual identities will be kept confidential and not released to management. The interview will be recorded so I can accurately represent everything that you say. You can stop the recording or the interview at any time.

1. Tell me a little bit about how you came to teach online.
   a. What about your first experience was positive?
   b. What about it was negative?

2. What do you like most about online teaching?
   a. Tell me about some positive experiences you have had as an online instructor.

3. What do you like least about online teaching?
   a. Tell me about some negative experiences you have had as an online instructor.

Thank you for giving me that background. I'd like to hear a bit more now about your experiences teaching here at FIDM.

4. Tell me about your first online course here at FIDM. (**SKIP if first experience teaching was at FIDM**)
   a. What was that experience like for you?
   b. What about it was positive?
   c. What about it was negative?

5. How would you describe your overall online teaching experience here at FIDM?
   a. What about it is positive?
   b. What about it is negative?

Next, I'd like to hear about your experiences with training for teaching online.

6. Describe the training you received before you taught online for the first time.
    a. What did you find most helpful?
    b. What did you find least helpful?
    c. Describe any formal training you received teaching somewhere other than FIDM.
    d. Please describe any new skills that were self taught.

7. When you first started teaching online at FIDM, how would you describe the training you received? (**SKIP if the first time teaching was at FIDM**)
    a. What did you find most helpful?
    b. What did you find least helpful?
    c. What training did you need or want that you didn't receive?

8. As you move forward in your online teaching, what kinds training do you need or want?
    a. What format of training would you find the most helpful? (f2f, online, blended)
    b. What kinds of topics would you like to see?
    c. How can FIDM help you grow and develop as an online instructor?

There is currently an orientation course being created and tested for new online faculty here at FIDM. I'd like to get your thoughts about that next.

9. What is your first reaction to the idea of an orientation course for online faculty?

10. What format would you find most helpful for such a course? (f2f, blended or fully online)

11.   What content would you like to see covered?

12.   Any other thoughts about such an orientation course?

Lastly, I'd like to talk about what you think motivates faculty to participate in development or training programs.

13. Tell me what kinds of feedback on your teaching you find most helpful?
    a. What kinds of feedback have informed your teaching practice in the past?

14. What motivates you to attend faculty development or training programs?
    a. What things are most compelling?
    b. What things are least compelling?

15. Can you share anything that has prevented you from attending faculty development programs in the past?

16. Some schools have incentive programs, like certificates, awards or recognition groups to motivate faculty to attend development.
    a. How would you react to such a program being implemented at FIDM?
    b. What would like most about it?

      c.   What would you like least about it?

17. If there was such a recognition program, what would make it meaningful for you?
      a.   What form would you like to see such a program take? (i.e., a certificate, annual club)

Thank you so much for sharing your insights today.

Is there anything else you would like to share?

Appendix C

Content Survey for eLearning Orientation Course

Please circle your topic 5 choices.

Writing policy and expectation statements

Best practices for teaching online

Navigating Sakai

Planning and setting up your online course

Creating community in an online course

Effective use of video

Communicating effectively with the elearning student

Tips for using the discussion board

Creating a welcoming learning environment

Writing rubrics for online assignments

Monitoring student feedback for improvement

How to narrate a PowerPoint lecture

Basics of screencasting or podcasting

Writing effective discussion questions

Strategies for web conferencing

Designing effective group projects in the online classroom

Class management for online teaching

How to use available technology tools

Incorporating emerging technologies in your online course

Creating learner centered instruction in an online environment

Research and trends in online learning

The role of Netiquette in an online course

Developing a lesson plan for an online course

Formative and summative assessment in online learning

Using backward design to plan effective assessment

Other: _____