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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Changing Higher Education Landscape

Rapid changes in telecommunications and information technologies are causing significant shifts in the direction of higher education in the 21st century. Technological evolutions are changing how faculty create learning experiences and how students experience learning. As a result, these evolutions are shaping a new landscape for the future of postsecondary education. The proliferation of alternative and technology-mediated educational delivery models is forcing institutions to consider how they must reshape their traditional modes and methods of teaching and learning in order to remain relevant in a competitive higher education market. The effects of these changes reach beyond just instructional design and pedagogy considerations prompting new ways of thinking about institutional culture, organization, resourcing, and purpose. In view of current trends in higher education and the potential for on-going technological change, leaders in higher education must make strategic decisions about how they will respond to the changing dimensions of technology and education.

The changing landscape of higher education and the proliferation of technology-mediated delivery models have been marked most significantly by the rapid expansion of online learning in postsecondary education. The decision to adopt online learning models is, for many institutions, a determining factor as to whether they can remain relevant and sustainable in a competitive higher education market. In
the 21st century, the question for many institutions is not if they should adopt online education, but when and how they should do so. This shift has a profound impact on the instructional leaders who carry the responsibility of creating and delivering effective learning experiences. Of those who are experiencing and absorbing the implications of the current global movement to push more academic programs and courses online, teaching faculty experience some of the strongest effects of emerging educational technology tools. These evolutions are changing what it means to teach and they are reshaping how universities define what the college classroom is and who the 21st century college student is.

Recent shifts and trends in education and technology have been accompanied by legislative mandates from federal and state governments to increase degree completion rates. Noting the potential economic impact of increasing the number of students who attain higher levels of education, the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education’s (2011) Strategic Agenda, “Stronger by Degrees”, challenged Kentucky colleges and universities to increase degree production and completion rates by 2015. One strategic initiative proposed by the Council in support of this goal was to create new pathways for nontraditional students to complete a college degree. The push to increase the number of college graduates is prompting institutions to design new and alternative ways of making a college education accessible and available to students. The Commonwealth of Kentucky’s initial steps toward the development of the Commonwealth College concept, which is built upon
an on-demand online learning model, is evidence of this push to make it possible for more nontraditional and geographically-dispersed students to finish a degree.

In addition to the emphasis from federal and state agencies on increasing the number of college graduates, shifts toward the creation of more alternative and technology-mediated delivery models are also being prompted by changing student demographics, needs, and interests. The four-year, residential academic experience, completed at one institution of higher learning, is quickly losing ground as the first choice for many 21st century students for how they want and need to pursue their education. Economic circumstances, such as the costs associated with relocation and travel, as well as, the need many students have to maintain employment while completing college course work, are urging many students toward more flexible, web-based options for continuing their education. In response to these changing student characteristics, institutions are developing creative solutions for the design and delivery of college learning experiences. For instance, the Kentucky Community and Technology College System (2014) offers two variations of the delivery of its online programs. These variations are purposed to accommodate the different needs of students. This multi-dimensional online learning system provides one illustration as to how the need to respond to the changing student often results in increased complexity in the delivery of postsecondary education and why higher education leaders must anticipate and prepare for these changes with adequate training and support for key stakeholders.
Current trends and shifts in higher education have a profound influence on institutional decision-making related to systems and infrastructure. The implications of emerging educational technologies for institutional systems and infrastructure influence more than just the teacher-learner experience. More than ever before, changes in educational technology are forcing higher education institutions to make institutional-wide adaptations. Systems and infrastructure supporting instruction, student services, faculty training, institutional resourcing, and many other aspects of the existence and work of postsecondary institutions are touched by current shifts in higher education. This is evidenced by the fact that many higher education regulatory bodies and accrediting agencies are monitoring, more closely now than ever before, the systems and infrastructure that institutions have designated specifically to support online learning. In addition to looking more closely at how institutions are ensuring quality and equity in academic programs delivered across different delivery formats, these agencies are considering the systems and support structures that institutions have in place to ensure institutional capacity and sustainability. An institution’s decision to adopt online learning is more than just a decision to develop and teach online courses. To move in this direction is to change how an institution operates, how it allocates resources, how it supports key stakeholders, and ultimately, how it perceives its function and purpose in 21st century higher education.

One of the growing systems and infrastructure-related needs that postsecondary institutions must address as they integrate new and emerging technology tools into the learning environment is how to prepare educators to
effectively use these tools. A reality of the current shifts in educational technology is that many higher education faculty are experiencing online learning for the first time as their institutions move in this direction. How will higher education institutions ensure that faculty are adequately prepared to design and deliver effective online learning experiences and that they are well-supported for these activities? The expansion of online education necessitates a closer look at how online course facilitators are trained and professionally developed and urges institutions to consider what kinds of systems and structures are necessary to meet these needs.

How institutions train faculty for online learning has significant implications for academic quality and student learning. Ensuring that faculty have the knowledge, skills, and tools that are necessary to facilitate student learning in the online environment is paramount. How an institution trains its faculty also has implications for institutional capacity and sustainability. In light of our current economic climate and competitive higher education market, efficient and effective training systems are an essential part of an institution’s efforts to remain sustainable. In view of these important implications, the design of training systems for online teaching faculty should be grounded in current research. Current instructional design, educational technology and higher education research provide the backdrop for the design of faculty training systems that are rooted in theory, reflected in practice and supported by data.

The work of designing training systems for online teaching faculty should also include an evaluation of the exemplary systems and practices of today’s
postsecondary institutions. This research component helps to determine the challenges, barriers and opportunities that postsecondary institutions are facing in the training of online teaching faculty. This process also reveals how and whether the design and delivery of faculty training meets the needs of faculty and aligns with the needs and interests of an institution. Another benefit of this research is that it provides insights as to how effective processes and practices may be transferable to other higher education contexts. As well, this investigation may lead to understandings of the distinctive and creative training solutions that are emerging within the field. An assumption here is that the larger community of practice in higher education benefits from the sharing of intellectual capital and best practices.

Exploring the design of online teaching faculty training systems should also consider how training solutions should be right-fitted to meet the unique needs of an institution and its faculty. Institutional characteristics may influence the design of training solutions to meet the unique needs of an institution. These characteristics, such as level of accreditation, vision, mission, and purpose, speak into the design of faculty training. The organizational characteristics of an institution, such as those related to personnel and technology resources, influence an institution’s approach to the design of training. As well, how an institution defines online learning, the types of degrees and programs that it offers online and the specific students for which its online programs are purposed also have implications for training design. The characteristics of an institution’s faculty, their training needs and interests in particular, are another major consideration. Though it is unrealistic that any study
could consider all of the institutional characteristics that color how a training system should be designed to respond to an institution’s specific needs and interests, the characteristics noted above reflect the importance of the relationship between institutional context and the design of online teaching faculty training systems.

Another dynamic of the changing landscape of higher education that supports the need for strategic approaches to training is the evolution of the 21st century learner. The human experience and technology intersect in more ways now than ever before. The growing presence of telecommunications, social media, and mobile technologies in the everyday human experience is evidence of the ways in which technology is shaping how people interact with the world around them. Technology influences the information we have access to and how we send, receive, and process this information. Technology has changed the way we think about and experience community and relationships. Technology is a part of what it means to be human. These realities shape what it means to be a learner in the 21st century.

An effect of the pervasive influence of technology on so many aspects of the contemporary human experience is that many of today’s learners rely upon technology as a means of new knowledge and skill acquisition. Technology creates new possibilities for how, when, and where learning happens. Irvine, Code, and Richards (2013) found that the opportunity for learners to choose how they will access learning experiences is central to the design of higher education delivery models that meet the needs and interests of 21st century learners. In our contemporary context, traditional, classroom-based educational delivery no longer
serves as the model for learning, but one option for where and when learning can happen. The rapid expansion of web-based and distance education delivery models and the emergence of open learning models, such as massive open online courses, provide learners with more choices for how they experience learning. Higher education institutions must provide multiple access models that allow students to choose delivery methods and learning environments that meet their needs (Irvine et al., 2013). In view of the changes related to how higher education is delivered to meet the needs of 21st century learners, faculty must receive adequate training to prepare them to facilitate learning experiences in different environments.

Also, considering the characteristics of many 21st century learners, training must reach beyond the technical competencies related to technologies and tools that make new and alternative methods of educational delivery possible. On the use of information and communications technologies for instruction, Kirkwood and Price (2005) noted that 21st century learners want to know the purpose of the use of these tools in addition to instructions provided to them about what they are required to do with them. 21st century learners connect the value of ICTs with what they mean for their learning. Kirkwood and Price described this process as embedding technology tools in the pedagogy of learning experiences (p. 270). Students benefit from an understanding of how technology tools are essential to the learning process. This suggests that effective instruction in the 21st century is based not only on one’s ability to transmit content expertise but also on the ability to articulate the relationship between learning outcomes and delivery.
Another faculty training issue related to the prevalence of technology in the 21st century is that faculty must be prepared to engage learners in technology-based learning environments to which students bring different technology skill-sets. While the roles and uses of technology continue to expand in 21st century educational contexts, not all learners bring to the postsecondary educational experience the level of digital literacy or experience that is assumed to belong to a digital or Net generation. Jones, Ramanau, Cross, and Healing (2010) found that the frequency with which technology is used among different student groups varies by age, gender, and ethnicity. For instance, nontraditional and minority student groups use technologies such as social networking sites with less frequency than other primary student groups (p. 21). Generally speaking, 21st century learners may be digital natives. However, not all learners in the 21st century are digital natives. Though many of today’s students use technology with much greater regularity in their everyday lives, this does not suggest that all students bring to the learning environment the same level of familiarity and comfort with technology. The variances in digital literacy that can exist within a student population must be taken into consideration in the design of learning experiences and the integration of technology into learning environments. This means that faculty must be equipped to implement instructional methods and strategies that meet the needs of a diverse student body.

In view of the current shifts and trends in higher education and educational technology and the significance of current research and analysis in the design of
training systems for online teaching faculty noted in this section, on-going research in this area is important for the future of postsecondary education. First and foremost, at stake is student learning. Preparing and equipping students to be competitive in a global economy means delivering quality, innovative learning experiences. Also at stake are the health and growth of postsecondary education. Higher education institutions must prepare for and implement online education effectively and efficiently in order to remain viable in the 21st century. The commitment of current and future highly-qualified educators to the opportunities and initiatives associated with online learning is also at issue. The combination of these contextual realities and the global push toward expanding online education opportunities augments the need for innovative and effective online teaching faculty training systems. The training of faculty for the online learning environment has significant implications for the present and future of higher education, our culture and our communities.

**Research Objective**

The design of training models for online teaching faculty at postsecondary institutions should reflect essential principles and practices. In an effort to support the growth and development of Asbury University’s online learning initiatives, this capstone project was purposed to identify the principles and practices that are essential to the design of a training system for Asbury University’s online teaching faculty. Factors contributing to the design of effective training models were identified through a review of current research and a comparative analysis of training models at different postsecondary institutions. The project considered how
institutional characteristics influence the design of training models. The purpose of this project was to develop a proposal for an online teaching faculty training model for Asbury University.

**Context**

Asbury University, located in Wilmore, KY, is a private, Christian, four-year liberal arts university. The institution, founded in 1890, is regionally accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and holds national accreditation status in the areas of education, social work and music. Asbury University offers academic programs at the associates, bachelors and masters degree levels. As of August 2013, the current student body represented an enrollment of 1782 students originating from 44 states and 15 countries. The student body is comprised of residential undergraduate, adult degree completion, and graduate students who complete courses through traditional course schedules, evening offerings and online. The institution operates campuses in Wilmore, KY, Nicholasville, KY, and Orlando, FL. Asbury University is a multi-site, multi-state and multi-delivery institution.

In August 2011, the University launched its first undergraduate and graduate academic programs delivered entirely online. The initial push in this direction included the development of two online undergraduate degree completion programs and two online graduate education programs. These programs launched simultaneously and the institution enrolled its first students in all four online programs in the fall 2011 semester.
The University developed two groups of key stakeholders to facilitate a successful transition in this area. In preparation for this launch, the institution established an online learning task force, comprised of current faculty members, administrative leaders, and technology support staff, to develop a proposal of recommendations for the institution’s initial push in this direction. As well, the institution established a faculty development committee purposed to help faculty learn how online education can be integrated into the learning community at the University. This faculty development initiative deals specifically with communicating how current shifts and trends in educational technology are influencing directions in higher education and what this might mean for the future of Asbury University.

In preparation for and since the initial launch, the University has invested significant resources to facilitate the goal of pushing more courses and academic programs online. The institution’s first steps toward this expansion involved the modification of existing technologies and the addition of new technologies. The institution changed from an open source learning management system supported by the University to a system supported by a proprietary, third party provider through a contracted relationship. The institution also purchased web-conferencing software to support synchronous learning experiences, as well as, new software for creating, editing and sharing media-enhanced content.

The institution has also invested resources to provide additional personnel to help facilitate the transition to online education. The University created two new
positions, a full-time Director of Online Programs and a part-time Online Programs Assistant, to help lead and manage the online programs. The responsibilities of these positions encompass a number of key areas, including faculty and staff training, faculty support, monitoring activity in the learning management system, and providing institution-wide communication in this area. Another important role of these persons is that they serve as an intermediary point-of-contact between faculty and the information technology services staff.

The adoption of online education has received support from both the administrative and academic leadership of the institution. Driving the institution’s initial steps in the direction of online education has been the support of administrative leadership, as evidenced by the University’s investments in technology, human, and other resources in the establishment of the online learning task force. Faculty support of this initiative has also been a driving force for the institution’s move in this direction. This is particularly true of those faculty members who championed this effort by leading in the development of the first online programs. As well, broader faculty support was evidenced by the approval of the first online programs through the University’s Faculty Assembly. Approval of these programs by the Faculty Assembly did not suggest that all University faculty members supported moving in this direction, but that a majority of faculty support was garnered to begin developments in this area.

Investment in and support of the University’s move in the direction of online education is also evidenced in the institution’s five-year strategic plan. The strategic
plan, completed in July 2012, includes commitments to launch several new online programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The development of some of the approved programs will involve the addition of an online delivery option for an existing academic program. Other programs that are slated to be launched within the five-year period are new academic programs, some of which require level change approval through the institution’s accrediting agencies. Specific programs have been identified as institutional priorities and are slated to be completed by the fall 2013 semester. The fully online academic programs identified in the strategic plan are in the areas of business, communications, fine arts, and education. The strategic plan calls for the transfer of existing curriculum to the online environment, the development of new online academic programs within the institution’s existing undergraduate and graduate framework, and the development of new online programs that will require substantive change approvals. These types of commitments demonstrate the complexity that is inherent to the vision within the strategic plan for expanding the University’s online programs.

**Current Approach to Faculty Training**

Arising from the University’s initial online programs’ launch and commitment to developing new online programs is a growing need for systems to support the training of faculty in the integration of technology and learning in the online environment. The launch of the University’s first online programs revealed gaps in existing faculty training processes. Despite the institution’s initial investments in resources to assist in the transition to offering fully online programs and the broad
support secured across the institution in this area, the institution has not made specific and intentional efforts to create a strategic, research-supported system for providing the type and level of training to faculty that is necessary to ensure quality and sustainability. The institution lacks fluid, efficient systems for training in instructional design, the use of existing University technologies for online education, and the on-going development of faculty.

One of the shortfalls of the institution’s current approach to training is that it is based largely on demand. Presently, most online instructors are trained as they need it and when they need it. The current approach to training does not plan for or anticipate the training needs of faculty. As a result, training is often acquired by instructors, by demand, immediately prior to the start of an online course. For online instructors who are new to the University or new to teaching online, this provides little time for them to absorb and digest the training content and skills which are essential to faculty preparedness.

With the existing ill-structured, by-demand approach to training, the efficiency of faculty preparation for the online learning environment is significantly diminished. Typically, training occurs in a one-on-one setting in which one University staff member trains another faculty member. The inception of the program involved multiple online programs being launched simultaneously and, currently, multiple online programs are in the development stage. These programs are represented by multiple faculty members who need training as deadlines for course development roll out. Within the current system, the pursuit of training from
faculty has often been motivated by crisis. In these situations, faculty needed training quickly because an online course they were contracted to design or facilitate was about to begin. Consequently, multiple, simultaneous requests for training from faculty have resulted in a bottleneck in terms of people who are responsible for providing training.

The inefficiency of the University’s current approach to training online teaching faculty also places significant demands upon the time of the two employees who oversee these training activities. These demands limit what they are able to invest in the oversight and development of other key areas of the online program. With the University on the verge of designing several new undergraduate and graduate online programs, the current staffing model will be likely unable to support the demands related to faculty training based on the current approach. As these programs are being designed, faculty will likely begin to compete for the time of the staff member who provides this training, and as a result, other aspects of the online program will receive less attention.

The inefficiency of the current system also results in a training approach that is limited to introductions to basic online course design, teaching principles, and technical skills. Beyond these basic introductions, the University has no system in place to support the on-going or advanced training of faculty in these areas. Faculty members may request additional trainings in specific areas related to their work in the institution’s learning management system, but the absence of a system that requires or motivates faculty to participate in continuous development results in few requests
from faculty for more training. The focus of the current training approach is based almost entirely upon providing an overview of the basic knowledge and skills that faculty need in order to start their online courses and does little to promote the intrinsic value of more and continuous training.

Currently, the content of faculty training at Asbury University is driven primarily by the generic template and tools that are embedded in the institution’s learning management system. The general LMS template and course facilitation tools are standardized across all online courses. The current training approach, which focuses solely on teaching faculty how to use the template and tools that are built into the learning management system, assumes that all online courses can be designed and delivered within the same course structure and online teaching tools. Training includes very little exposure to instructional design theory and practice and the development of understandings regarding the different kinds of strategies and tools that are best for achieving the unique learning objectives of different courses.

Another issue arising from the absence of a clearly structured and strategically designed training system is that the existing faculty training model is ill-suited to meet the needs of a diverse faculty. Presently, the institution lacks a system for assessing faculty needs in the areas of instructional design, learning theory, online course design, and online teaching. As well, the institution lacks systems for assessing and responding to the wide spectrum of technology proficiencies that different faculty bring to the online learning environment. The current approach to training funnels all faculty members into the same progression of training, regardless
of the experience and expertise that they bring to their work in the online environment.

The University’s current approach to training is also ill-suited to meet the needs of a faculty base that is becoming more geographically-dispersed. Presently, training is most accessible to faculty members who are able to travel to the University’s Wilmore, KY campus. As well, the current training system is best-suited to meet the needs of campus-based faculty members. Current training approaches are limited to on-site, face-to-face delivery to instructors. How will the University accommodate the training needs of a growing faculty base that will likely become more geographically-dispersed as the development of more online programs necessitates the hiring of additional faculty members outside of the institution? For instance, many of the institution’s part-time faculty members maintain full-time employment outside of the University as well as other important responsibilities. The current approach to faculty training is geared toward faculty members who are available for training during regular business hours. This model does not meet the needs of faculty members who are unable to complete trainings during times that conflict with their work and life schedules.

Value of the Capstone Project

Though the University does provide some training to online teaching faculty members, the absence of a system for training that positions the institution to provide adequate training and that is responsive to the needs of the institution and its faculty will influence the effectiveness and efficiency of the University’s efforts to expand its
online programs. A goal of this capstone project was to supply the institution’s leaders with new information regarding the type and scope of support and resources that are necessary to adequately train faculty. At stake are student learning, academic excellence, faculty buy-in and institutional effectiveness. On the verge of launching several new fully online degree programs, in accordance with its five-year strategic plan and in addition to its existing online academic programs, the University will benefit greatly from a project that proposes recommendations for an online faculty training model that is reflective of current research and best practices, responsive to the unique needs of the institution and its faculty, and in alignment with the regulations set forth by the institution’s regional accrediting agency. This capstone project has the potential to shape how Asbury University positions itself for success as it progresses further into the world of online education.

**Presentation of the Results**

This capstone project is shaped as a proposal for a system of training for online teaching faculty at Asbury University to be presented to the Asbury University President’s Cabinet. Under the direction and leadership of the President, the President’s Cabinet provides administrative leadership to the institution, creates and communicates institutional policy, establishes the institutional budget, and oversees institutional effectiveness and strategic planning. The Cabinet includes the President, Provost, Vice President for Enrollment Management, Vice President of Student Development, Vice President of Human Resources, Vice President of Advancement, and Vice President of Business Affairs. The proposal includes a detailed overview of
the capstone project, research support, findings, conclusions, and recommendations

for application of the research at Asbury University. As well, Cabinet members were

provided with a copy of the completed capstone project submission.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The fast growing body of literature dealing with training and professional development for online instructors speaks to both the significance of faculty preparedness in this environment and the complexity of the organizational systems and structures that support these processes. The literature is clear that the training of faculty matters for academic quality and instructional effectiveness in online education. Current research points to critical factors and components that are essential to the design of training systems for online teaching faculty. The review will highlight three consistent threads in the literature pertaining to online faculty training: the significance of training mode and structure, principles and practices of instructional design and pedagogy, and the importance of institutional alignment.

Training System Design

The system design of a training program encompasses various aspects of how training is structured. How the system design of a training program is structured can include the delivery method, such as online or face-to-face delivery. Another structural element of training design is how online teaching faculty trainings are scheduled over time. Faculty training can be based upon intensive, repeated, or continuous schedules. Intensive trainings typically address all or most competencies and skills in one or a few sessions. Repeated training schedules include one or more training sessions that follow an initial training and that reiterate the same or similar competencies and skills in subsequent sessions. Continuous schedules provide
training in multiple sessions that may occur before, during, and after the online course design or teaching experience.

The structure of the training design can also entail the progression of the training experience. One-time, multiple non-tiered, multiple tiered trainings are examples of a structure of training progression. One-time trainings involve no developmental progression of training content and are completed in fixed sessions. Multiple, non-tiered trainings include multiple training sessions, but training content is not tiered based upon a developmental progression. Multiple, tiered trainings provide trainings to faculty that introduce training content in a developmental progression.

Delivery interface is another element of the structure of training design. Self-directed, facilitated, or a combination of the two are examples of delivery interface in the design of training systems. A self-directed training structure is based upon a training design in which faculty are responsible for managing their learning in the training experience. In this structure, faculty are usually provided with training materials and resources to support their learning and often control the pace of training. In a facilitated training structure, training is provided to faculty by one or multiple trainers in live, face-to-face sessions or through technology-mediated interactions, such as web-conferencing. A hybrid training structure combines elements of self-directed and facilitated trainings. With the hybrid approach, self-directed training elements are combined with live interactions with trainers. These structural elements are considered in the review of literature.
The literature points to both faculty needs and preferences as contributing factors to how the design of training systems is structured. Preference appears to be a driving influence on the design of training structure as much of the current research bases the analysis of faculty needs on faculty preferences and perceptions. Luck and McQuiggan’s (2006) study on the training needs of instructors teaching in Penn State University’s World Campus found that faculty preferred self-paced, web-based training experiences and informal professional development activities to formal, structured face-to-face trainings. As well, faculty identified brief training sessions, periodic half-day or one day trainings spread out over several weeks, as the preferred structure for the face-to-face faculty trainings.

The Advisory Board Company (2010), a global research and consulting firm, produced an exhaustive study on engaging faculty in online education that included contributions from over 150 leaders in higher education, including provosts, faculty members, technology officers and other key stakeholders. The study provided recommendations regarding the university’s role in training, compensating, mentoring and sustaining faculty for successful online programs. The Company recommended tiered training programs as the most effective structure for preparing a diverse faculty base with various needs. The study cited The University of Central Florida and Boise State University as institutions with exemplary online faculty development programs that are based upon a tiered structure and that include diverse training experiences (pp. 43-47). The University of Central Florida employs a tiered, mixed mode training model that includes web-based, self-paced training modules, small-group interactive
training labs, large-group classes, and one-on-one consultations between faculty and instructional designers. Boise State University uses a similar training model but offers increased flexibility to the faculty member in the selection of training modes based upon need. BSU requires instructors to complete an 8-week training program focused on pedagogy and provides the option to participate in a semester long collaborative course development workshop with an instructional designer. Interestingly, BSU rewards faculty participation in the instructional design workshops with additional stipends.

Another aspect of training structure featured in the literature pertains to whether training should be limited to one occasion or based upon a model that continuously engages the faculty member. Clay (1999) noted that efforts to train and develop online faculty must be consistent and on-going in order for faculty to fully acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to work effectively in the online environment. A training system that is built upon cultivating continuous faculty improvement and learning has a more positive influence on the effectiveness of faculty preparation. Creating more opportunities for faculty to apply knowledge and practice skills acquired from previous trainings can improve retention of content knowledge and skills that were covered in previous trainings. This training structure also affords faculty opportunities to continuously build upon a foundation of knowledge and skills throughout the training progression.

Another aspect of training that consistently appears in the literature is the benefit of engaging faculty through different modes of training. Particularly evident
in the literature is an emphasis on the development of faculty through their integration into professional learning communities. Brooks (2010) proposed a hybrid approach to the development of systems for supporting and training faculty in the 21st century. Training provided to faculty through multiple delivery formats, such as one-on-one, face-to-face contexts and through online Communities of Practice (CoP) creates different opportunities for faculty to receive the support they need when they need it and how they need it. One benefit of online CoP for faculty training is that they create spaces for faculty to share intellectual capital and to seek professional support from colleagues (Brooks, 2010). Another benefit of online CoP is that they provide a means of support and development for faculty that operates independently from a physical campus or support office. The CoP model is an effective training component for meeting the needs of institutions whose faculty require increasingly flexible measures of support. Xu and Morris’ (2007) findings related to the potential for faculty development through collaborative curriculum development is another illustration of the value of CoP.

Related to the CoP concept, Shepherd, Alpert, and Koeller (2008) found that faculty mentoring programs provided an effective model for training faculty who are transitioning to online course facilitation. One reason the faculty mentor relationship is effective is because it is based upon an inherent level of trust. Faculty mentors are trusted because of their ability to empathize with and understand the needs and concerns of faculty (Shepherd et al., 2008). Faculty mentors and the faculty they are training speak a similar language. Faculty can be effective trainers of other faculty
because they bring to the training experience a contextual and pedagogical understanding of the role and experience of an online instructor. This relational dynamic separates faculty mentors from other trainers who bring technical expertise to the faculty development process but little to no actual online teaching experience.

The Nova Southeastern University Fischler School of Education & Human Services’ adjunct faculty training model combines self-directed, self-paced online training modules with real-time, online interactive sessions between participants and trainers (Burmeister, 2009). The self-directed component of the training model is purposed to teach and assess essential competencies in the technical aspects of online instruction and best practices in online pedagogy. The interactive, online sessions that connect participants with trainers provide opportunities for adjunct faculty to witness live demonstrations of the use of technology tools and online teaching practices. Burmeister noted that the combination of synchronous and asynchronous training is purposed to equip faculty with the knowledge and skills that they need and to create opportunities for faculty to experience the implementation of best practices for effective online teaching.

A related study on the needs and preferences of faculty for training in online education identified one-on-one mentoring programs as the preferred delivery mode for faculty training. In their study, Shepherd, Alpert and Koeller (2008) noted the positive relationship between mentoring training models and the development of positive faculty attitudes toward their involvement in and commitment to online education. Citing Wilson’s (2001) study on attitudes toward distance learning, which
surveyed 1,500 faculty members from nine postsecondary institutions in Kentucky, Shepherd et al. emphasized the role of mentoring programs in helping faculty to overcome barriers related to attitudes and perceptions about their readiness for online teaching.

Another training design worth noting that is based upon a hybrid delivery model and uses peer-mentoring training strategies belongs to Florida State College at Jacksonville (FSCJ) (Hill, 2013). FSCJ is a Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accredited online institution that employs only part-time adjunct faculty members to teach courses. All FSCJ faculty members are required to complete a certification training program prior to teaching online that provides instruction and training on instructional design, online pedagogy, and essential technical competencies. As well, new faculty members are required to participate in a year-long mentoring program that pairs new faculty members with certified faculty mentors. In addition to these training elements, FSCJ uses live webinars and online workshops to provide continuous training opportunities for faculty. An objective of each component of the training program is to integrate faculty into a peer-to-peer community of learning.

Training through video-based instructional resources is another aspect of training delivery discussed in the literature. Video-based instructional resources used for training may include recordings of lectures, demonstrations, and other visual explanations. In her study on the effectiveness of training faculty on screencasting, a digital screen recording process often using both video and audio narration, Javellana
(2011) found the use of video recordings and images to be an effective training delivery method. Faculty participants completed a pre-test related to their knowledge of a screencasting tool prior to training implementation and scored higher on average on a post-test (p. 5). Faculty also responded positively to the self-directed nature of the training experience. They benefited from being able to learn at their own pace and replaying the video instructional resources when necessary (p. 6). One important piece to note regarding the study is that some faculty indicated a lack of confidence using certain aspects of the screencasting tool following the training experience. Javellana attributed this to the length of the training videos and to the particular sequencing of training content (p. 7). When using screencasting as a tool for training and instruction, trainers need to be aware that the length of video recordings can influence information retention. The study demonstrated that screencasting can be used effectively as a training tool, but these types of tools need to be evaluated following training experiences to determine how they can be modified for improved learning.

Though little consensus exists in the literature on what training structure is most effective, there appears to be strong consensus that training models based upon a mixed-method approach provide faculty with the most opportunities to acquire the knowledge, skills and experiences they need to be effective online instructors. Overwhelming support for the integration of faculty members into communities of practice and other relationship-oriented contexts that provide training and development, such as faculty mentoring relationships, is clearly present in the
literature. As well, the emphasis on faculty preference for determining the appropriate training design demonstrates that training models will inevitably vary based upon the unique needs and interests of the institutions for which they are purposed.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy**

Knowing how to effectively train faculty for 21st century online education begins with an understanding of who are 21st century faculty. Sorcinelli (2007) described “expanding faculty roles” as one of the key issues prompting the need for new and expanded faculty training efforts in postsecondary institutions (p. 5). In addition to the expectation that today’s higher education faculty should be integrating technology into traditional learning spaces, the push to create and deliver courses online is changing the roles and expectations of today’s teaching faculty. The changing roles of higher education faculty have triggered a need for institutions to consider new models for preparing and developing faculty (Sorcinelli, 2007). Considering the changes that are occurring in the roles and expectations of faculty in 21st century learning environments, institutions must consider what instructional skills and competencies faculty need in order to be effective facilitators of learning. Learning what tools are available to support online instruction and becoming familiar and comfortable with the use of these tools are essential to the preparation of faculty. Faculty must understand how pedagogical strategies that may be effective in traditional classroom settings can be transferred to online learning environments, as well as, other strategies that may be better suited for these environments. In terms of
the instructional experience, faculty must know how the role of the faculty member in online teaching may look different than it does in traditional classroom spaces in areas such as course management, learning facilitation, interactions, monitoring learner progress, and building community among students.

Current research consistently points to the need to train online course designers and facilitators in effective online teaching practices, instructional design, and in the use of the related technologies. In view of the relationship between instructional design principles and the technology tools that make online education possible, Crawford-Ferre and Wiest (2012) noted the importance of training faculty to both teach effectively in the online environment and to use the technologies that support effective online instruction. Without one or the other, faculty are inadequately prepared to facilitate quality online learning experiences. The barriers and challenges that online course instructors face when they are ill-prepared to manage the technology, student learning, or both, can be significant.

Central to the task of building effective models for online faculty training is determining the specific needs and interests of faculty members. Luck and McQuiggan’s (2006) study on the needs of faculty teaching online courses through Penn State University’s World Campus revealed important insights related to the aspects of online teaching with which faculty need most assistance. The study found that the technical aspects of delivering online courses, such as the creation of media for online learning and the conversion of curricular materials for online use, were the primary areas of need for training for the World Campus faculty. Other important
needs identified in the study pertained to the implementation of essential instructional
design practices in the online environment. Training on the assessment of student
progress and facilitating interactions and collaboration in the online environment
were identified as the two greatest areas of need.

Bailie’s (2011) study, based on the Delphi technique, analyzed Kaplan
University faculty and student perceptions of the competencies that are essential to
effective online instruction and compared the results to previous investigations.
Bailie identified strong correspondence between his results and those of the related,
previous studies, suggesting that the competencies needed for effective online
instruction are generalizable across different instructional contexts. These findings
support the contention that training on instructional design and pedagogy are critical
components of any online faculty training model. Skills in student feedback, course
organization, and learning facilitation in the online environment were among the
competencies noted in the study by both faculty and students (p. 86).

The importance of faculty training on strategies and skills for creating and
sustaining interactions in the online learning environment is also present in the
literature. In a study conducted at University of Maryland University College on
exemplary practices for online teaching, Lewis and Abdul-Hamid (2006) found that
the role of the faculty member in the cultivation of student interactions in online
courses is a critical component of effective online instruction. Lackey (2012)
received similar results from self-identified needs from faculty for more pedagogical
training on engaging students in the online environment through people-to-people and people-to-content interactions.

The literature also emphasizes training faculty how to manage the online learning environment and the roles of assessment and evaluation in the online course management process. Savery (2005) found that strategic assessment strategies are essential to the successful management of student learning in the online environment. Training faculty on the types and methods of assessment for online learning is critical to the preparation of faculty to monitor student progress toward learning goals and objectives. Faculty need training experiences that integrate two aspects of assessment for online learning, the role and function of the learning management system in the monitoring of student learning and pedagogical principles that drive the design and use of assessments for student learning.

In a study that evaluated the training needs of over two hundred faculty employed at multiple higher education institutions, Rockwell et al. (2000) found that the development of interactions and instructional materials and the application of technology tools were the greatest areas of need for training for faculty teaching in technology-mediated learning environments. The study identified faculty with ten or less years of teaching experience as those with the greatest need for training (Rockwell et al., 2000). The training needs of faculty extend beyond the technical knowledge and skills needed to facilitate learning in online environments to include training on instructional design theory and practice. As noted in Rockwell’s study, this is particularly true for faculty who bring less professional teaching experience to
learning spaces supported through new technologies and alternative delivery methods. A related study (Rockwell et al., 1999) found that instructional design and the use of technology tools for course delivery were the most significant barriers perceived by faculty in terms of their readiness for effective learning facilitation.

Regarding training in instructional design and pedagogy, Hazari and Borkowski (2001) noted the importance of providing training to faculty to support their use of online course development tools. They contended that since course development tools are sometimes generic and difficult to customize, faculty need training on the strategic uses of these tools related to their specific course needs (p. 3). It is not enough to train faculty on the technical uses of course development tools and related technology resources. Faculty need training on the pedagogical strategies that support the effective uses of these tools for learning. The Robert H. Smith School of Business at Maryland University, College Park, was cited in the study as providing an exemplary model of training to support faculty in the use of course development tools. The School provides an online teaching seminar at the beginning of each semester specifically related to the pedagogical implications of the use of a course development tool (p. 3).

Diaz and Bontenbal (2000) criticized the training approach that many postsecondary institutions take in teaching faculty how to use technology-mediated tools and but not the pedagogical implications of the uses and implementations of these tools. They argue that developing an effective educational project requires more skills than just those associated with the technical use of various technologies.
Diaz and Bontenbal suggest a pedagogy-based approach to training that begins with training faculty on predominant learning theories and how these theories relate to the design of instructional experiences and the choice of instructional technologies (p. 6). Faculty need to know the various factors related to student learning that influence how experiences should be designed to enhance and support learning. Training in instructional design and pedagogy must reach beyond teaching faculty how to use tools to teaching faculty how to create learning experiences and how and why various technologies can support learning.

Ray (2009) found that faculty preparing to teach online recognized their own need for training in instructional design and pedagogy. In a survey of over 100 faculty members representing 21 colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia, Ray found that nearly 70% of participants wanted additional training in pedagogy and over 85% recognized that faculty training in the areas of pedagogy and instructional design should be mandatory for all online instructors (p. 270). As well, the majority of participants noted that on-going training is critical to their instructional effectiveness and their readiness for teaching in the online environment.

Also present in the literature, is the connection between effective training models and faculty trainers who have expertise in the areas of instructional design, online pedagogy, and technology integration. Trainers who bring knowledge and expertise in these areas to the training context are better positioned to assess and respond to faculty needs and concerns (Dooley et al., 2009). Effective faculty training systems are dependent upon an institution’s commitment to provide the
resources that are necessary to ensure that faculty are adequately supported in their efforts to design and deliver online courses. Employing staff who are professionally trained is essential to the effectiveness of faculty training. Georgina and Hosford’s (2009) study on technological literacy and pedagogy explored faculty perceptions regarding the relationship between technology training and integration. In their analysis of the perceptions of faculty from colleges of education at 16 doctorate-granting institutions, trainer quality was identified as a key factor related to the effectiveness of training experiences and the integration of technology into learning spaces (p. 694). They concluded that the presence or availability of technology alone does not guarantee that faculty will use technology for learning or that it will be integrated effectively (p. 695). Faculty need training from qualified trainers who can coach them throughout the training experience providing tutorials, models, and strategies for how technology can be used effectively for teaching.

On the role of instructional design and pedagogy in faculty training, the Advisory Board Company (2010) noted that the informational and tracking resources that institutions supply to online course designers and instructors to guide their preparation for the online learning environment can be a means by which institutions train faculty. As noted previously, one-on-one consultation between a faculty member and an instructional designer was identified by the Company as an essential component of faculty training (p. 76). In the models proposed by the Company, guides for course design, such as checklists and design matrices, are some of the resources that can be provided to faculty members by instructional design experts to
help facilitate the use of essential instructional design principles and practices in the design and delivery of online courses. The study cited the University of Memphis as an exemplary model of an institution that provides assistive resources to help guide faculty through the online course design and delivery experiences. The University provides faculty with a comprehensive course design template to ensure that all courses include essential elements in course organization, interactions, communication, assessment, and evaluation.

An online course development approach that appears in the literature that has implications for the role of instructional design in faculty training is collaborative course development. Xu and Morris’ (2007) study on the roles of faculty members in collaborative online course development illustrated the need faculty have for guidance and support from experts trained in instructional design in the development process. Using a case-study method, Xu and Morris analyzed the interactions and contributions of a team of co-designers consisting of faculty members and a project coordinator. They found that the first and primary focus of the faculty members was the course content. Collaborations between faculty members were very strong during the initial development stage, which focused on the development of content. After the content was developed, interactions between faculty members waned and the project coordinator had to assume a stronger role in the development process to drive the instructional design considerations for the course. This provides a fitting illustration of the need for faculty members who are geared toward focusing on content to have interactions with trainers who have instructional design expertise.
In an effort to support the instructional design needs of faculty and to enhance online courses, some institutions use course review models and rubrics, such as those attributed to Quality Matters, to improve online education. Quality Matters was originally sponsored in 2003 by MarylandOnline, Inc., a non-profit consortium of community colleges and universities in the state of Maryland, as a standards-based rubric for online course development. In July 2014, Quality Matters began to operate as a standalone organization. Quality Matters is recognized nationally for its work in quality assurance research and practice in online education and is used in K-12 school systems, higher education institutions, and other education-related organizations. It is important to note that Quality Matters does not address online pedagogy, course delivery or instructional strategies. The focus of the Quality Matters process is to improve the quality of online learning through a standards-based review of the design of online courses.

The Quality Matters online course review process uses a peer-review model to enhance the instructional design of a course (Legon & Runyon, 2007). In the QM review process, online courses are reviewed by a team of individuals with experience in online education or expertise in instructional design. This process can be helpful as it provides a way for multiple reviewers to give feedback to faculty on the design of their courses based upon a standardized rubric. Rather than courses being evaluated by one instructional designer or one content expert, the QM process relies upon multiple evaluative lenses to produce recommendations for quality enhancement in online courses. The findings of Roehrs, Wang, and Kendrick’s (2013) study on
faculty perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the QM model for online course enhancement support the notion that faculty find peer-review improvement processes helpful (p. 57).

The effectiveness of the Quality Matters course enhancement process can be dependent, in part, on how faculty interface with the QM rubric and who is involved in the review process. In their study, Roehrs, Wang, and Kendrick (2013) found that some of the faculty who completed a self-review of their courses using the QM rubric struggled with the time-intensive nature of the process and bringing an objective lens to the evaluation of their own courses (p. 57). Because of familiarity of faculty with their courses and content, participants identified a tendency to move too quickly through the reviews of their own courses and that they struggled with bringing an objective lens to the self-review process. The peer-review approach was more helpful for faculty because it provided more critical, objective assessments of the quality of their courses.

Budden and Budden’s (2013) study on the implementation of a Quality Matters certification program for college faculty noted faculty perceptions regarding the benefits and challenges of a QM training program. Participants in the study identified improvements in online course structure and organization as the key benefits of the training program. The lack of improvement in online course instruction as a result of the training and the absence of course specific relevance were identified as weaknesses of the training program (pp. 382-383). Regarding faculty training for online education, these findings suggest that, while QM training
may be helpful in improving the quality of the design of online courses, the QM process alone does not meet the course specific training needs of faculty in the design of courses and training related to online teaching.

One area in which quality assurance programs such as Quality Matters may be helpful is identifying the training needs of faculty in instructional design for online learning. In a research project that peer-reviewed 111 online courses offered at 29 institutions, Legon and Runyon (2007) identified common problem areas in the design of online courses. The project was purposed to identify the effect of the QM review process on online courses following a revision based upon QM standards. The project identified QM standards that were most commonly unmet. Their findings suggest that a structured continuous improvement process for online course design can provide useful data to help better understand the training needs of faculty.

Though there is literature to support the use of online course review models such as Quality Matters because of the benefits associated with peer-review and systematic, continuous evaluation of courses, the literature also acknowledges that there is no one-size-fits-all course development and review model that meets the unique needs of every institution or faculty member. Some of the principles and strategies built into a review model such as QM may be helpful in guiding an institution toward developing its own approach to enhancing online courses and supporting faculty in course development, but administrators and trainers need to keep in mind that different online courses have different learning objectives and outcomes. Different online instructors have different hopes about what they want
their students to experience or become as a result of the learning experience.

Assessing every online course against the same rubric for assessing course quality may restrict creativity in the design of courses and limit the ability of faculty to design courses that meet their unique learning objectives.

**Institutional Alignment**

Another key theme in the research is the need for training models to be aligned with an institution’s vision, mission, and values. The most prominent way this appears in the literature concerns the relationship between an institution’s purpose for providing online education and an institution’s identity. Another aspect of institutional alignment present in the literature is a strong focus on strategies and structures for providing compensation and incentives to faculty for their contributions to online education. Though faculty compensation and incentives could also be considered as a matter of infrastructure, I have identified these pieces with institutional alignment because of the strong relationship between what an institution values and how an institution expresses what it values to its faculty. Today’s higher education institutions commonly identify academic quality or excellence as central to their educational mission. How institutions reward and motivate qualified educators to join in the institution’s efforts to deliver quality online programs is a matter of institutional alignment.

Orr, Williams, and Pennington (2009) noted that organizational mission and infrastructure influence the effectiveness of an institution’s efforts to support and train faculty for online education. How an institution communicates its larger vision,
purposes, and strategies for online education influences faculty perceptions about online teaching (Orr et al., 2009, p. 263). Faculty want to see the connection between the online learning experiences they are creating and facilitating and the institution’s strategic plan. Orr et al. found that faculty believe that online education should be more than just an add-on to the institution's true identity. The key here is that leaders must effectively communicate the outcomes and purposes that prompted and that are guiding the institution’s efforts in this area and how these purposes align with the identity and mission of the institution. Communicating this alignment is a critical component of an effective training model.

Villar and Algere (2007) found that assessing online instructor competencies depended, in part, on an understanding of the unique goals and values of an institution. The process of identifying what faculty need to know and learn in terms of developing and teaching in online environments is shaped by the distinctiveness of the institution and its curriculum. The development of training programs to prepare faculty for online course design and delivery should take into consideration curricular context. In order to assist faculty in understanding what it means to facilitate learning activities online, Villar and Algere noted that institutions “need to locate those activities with degree programme contexts that endow them with value, status and expectations” (p. 170). Systems for the development of online teaching faculty should reflect an alignment with the institution’s curricular vision. Furco and Moely’s (2012) emphasis on designing faculty development strategies that are responsive to what faculty value supports the notion that training efforts should
reflect an intentional alignment with the professional contexts in which they are provided.

Furco and Moely (2012) also identified securing faculty buy-in as a key component to the success of institution-driven faculty development efforts, such as training programs for online instructors. Faculty perceptions about how an institution’s efforts in the area of faculty development align with the institutions vision for student learning influence the success of these development initiatives (Furco et al., 2012). Establishing and communicating this alignment encourages faculty buy-in and, as a result, enhances the success of development efforts. When this occurs, faculty are more likely to embrace their role as a part of a professional learning community guided by shared goals. When alignment is evident and clearly communicated, faculty more easily discern the value and purpose of their own contributions and are more likely to commit their expertise toward institutional initiatives.

Faculty incentives and compensation are also major themes that appear consistently in the literature related to the development of faculty to design and facilitate online courses. Institutional alignment is, in part, a matter of how faculty compensation is purposed to motivate faculty to embrace and participate in an institution’s online education initiatives. What an institution values and how it reinforces its values influence the effectiveness of its efforts to train faculty. How an institution rewards its faculty for their investments in acquiring training is one way that an institution expresses what it values. A clearly communicated incentive
strategy is an important element of a system that supports faculty involvement in online education. This is especially true considering the investments that faculty must make toward securing the kind of training that is necessary to do their work well within these spaces. Incentives, whether they are manifested as intrinsic rewards and/or financial compensation, matter to faculty (Rockwell et al., 1999). From the perspective of the faculty member, recognition toward tenure and financial incentives are strategies worth considering in terms of how institutions can show value to the investments faculty make in completing training (Luck and McQuiggins, 2006). The absence of strategies for recognizing and rewarding faculty contributions and efforts can have a significant influence on the motivation of faculty to pursue training (Shepherd et al., 2008). A solution that appears frequently in the literature is to establish connections between faculty training and the promotion and tenure processes at institutions. This solution may be more financial feasible for institutions that are unable to front-end additional funds for compensating faculty for their participation in trainings.

Chen’s (2009) study analyzed data gathered from the National Center for Education Statistics PEQIS on barriers to the adoption of technology-mediated distance education. He found that nearly 70% of 1500 participating postsecondary institutions, representing two-year public, two-year private, four-year public and four-year private classifications, identified lack of faculty incentives as a barrier to the adoption of technology-mediated learning models. Chen’s analysis also revealed that over 65% of the participating institutions identified lack of faculty interest as a barrier
to adoption. The relationship between faculty interest in adoption and the presence of faculty compensation plans is worth noting.

The Advisory Board Company (2010) provided recommendations regarding the need for universities to compensate faculty appropriately in order to create and sustain successful online programs. The Company’s study identified the greatest challenge today for higher education administrative leaders as securing the necessary commitments from qualified faculty to teach online. In the study, participating institutions noted that they could not achieve their goals for expanding online offerings and developing high-quality online courses without revisiting and revising their faculty compensation structures (p. 125).

Faculty recommendations from Budden and Budden’s (2013) study on the implementation of a Quality Matters certification program support the contention that faculty value recognition for completing training. Faculty participants in the study recommended that an institution should encourage faculty participation in the certification program with both financial and non-financial rewards (p. 383). It is also worth noting that faculty recommended that administrators consider participation in the certification program a form of faculty service and development. One might suggest that participants in the study wanted administrators to recognize the value of the training completed in the certification program.

In their analysis of the professional development issues experienced by college faculty, Brown, Benson, and Uhde (2004) suggested that college administrators should provide faculty with reduced advising loads, committee
assignments, or other forms of release time to give them learn about and practice the integration of technology and teaching (p. 104). Release time from various faculty duties and assignments is one way that college administrators can show value to faculty for training that improves their skills and knowledge in online education.

Funding for professional development is one way that institutions can show value to faculty for training. The University of Cincinnati’s faculty development initiative demonstrated a multi-dimensional approach to funding the development of faculty for scholarship and teaching (Camblin, Jr. & Steger, 2000). The institution funded three levels of grants to support faculty development, including individual, collaborative, and departmental grants. Grants were to be used specifically for projects that would enhance faculty skills in research and pedagogy. The institution also hosted a summer training workshop for faculty on various technology tools that could be used for instruction. Faculty participants were given a voucher for the computer hardware and software provided to them for the training experience (p. 6). The institution showed value to faculty for training by giving them technology.

Salt Lake Community College offers another method by which institutions can recognize the value of faculty participation in training programs through compensation. Movement through the College’s salary schedule for full-time faculty is bi-directional including both vertical and horizontal movement. One way faculty can progress horizontally is by completing approved Professional Development Units (PDU). PDU can encompass a variety of development activities, including learning new applications in technology. PDU experiences must be approved and, following
completion of the PDU experience, faculty must demonstrate they have achieved approved learning outcomes for the PDU to be applied to their salary portfolio (SLCC, p. 18).

The findings of Dickinson, Agnew, and Gorman’s (1999) study on training and compensation for faculty related to distance education show that compensation for faculty who deliver distance education courses should reflect the additional time and workload that is associated with teaching in technology-mediated learning spaces. In their study on the training and course development processes of faculty preparing to teach a compressed-video distance education course, 88% of participants indicated that they received no additional compensation for designing or teaching the distance education course and 90% noted that preparing to deliver a course through this medium required more time than preparing for a traditional, classroom-based course (p. 6-7). Some skills and strategies used commonly in traditional, classroom-based learning spaces can be transferred to distance education environments, but faculty need training on how to complete this transfer and adapt what they already know. Some skills and strategies cannot be easily transferred and faculty may need to learn new pedagogical strategies for achieving learning outcomes in different environments. This requires additional training. The task of taking a learning experience that has typically been taught in a face-to-face classroom and developing it for a different environment is more than just “moving it online.” In order to maintain equitable rigor and quality in these courses, faculty need more training.
This training takes time over and above what is typical for preparing traditional, classroom-based learning experiences. Faculty should be compensated for this time.

Institutional alignment is a matter of the relationship between the work of the institution and the values of an institution. The literature suggests that this alignment must be communicated well in order to motivate faculty to complete the training that is necessary to be effective online instructors. Establishing this alignment can serve as a source of intrinsic motivation for faculty to commit to the work of the institution in this area. As well, whether and how an institutions plans to compensate faculty for their participation in these efforts also matters for achieving institutional alignment. Faculty compensation structures and strategies are critical to recognizing, extrinsically, the work of faculty in online education.

Of the key themes and issues present in the literature related to the development of training programs for online teaching faculty, one of the most apparent is how training models should be structured to ensure faculty preparedness. Another major thread is how systems are designed to train the whole faculty member by addressing faculty needs in the areas of instructional design, online pedagogy, and technology. As well, research indicates that clear and clearly communicated alignment between an institution’s identity and its online learning initiatives is vital to securing the buy-in of the faculty members who facilitate student learning in the online environment.

The literature reviewed on the design of training systems for online teaching faculty addressed important issues related to training design, instructional design and
pedagogy and institutional alignment. These emphases expand traditional concepts of essentials principles and practices beyond basic online teaching skills and technical competencies to present a larger systems perspective on training. The focus is on the system that is designed to create and support the training process and not just the training itself. This project aimed to determine whether these principles and practices should be included in the design of an online faculty training system for Asbury University and how they can be integrated to create an effective training system that meets the needs of the institution.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Research Question

Essential principles and practices for training online teaching faculty are evident in the literature in the areas of training design, instructional design, and pedagogy, and institutional alignment. How these essential components are designed, packaged and implemented in a system may look different at different institutions. What should online faculty training look like at Asbury University? This capstone project is purposed to identify the principles and practices that are essential for an effective training system for online teaching faculty at Asbury University.

Methods

This capstone project was based on a cross-case, comparative analysis of the online faculty training models at three higher education institutions. Using a mixed methods design, the project included a review of institutional archival data, a survey of online teaching faculty at the three participating institutions, and an interview with one staff or faculty member at each institution who provides direct leadership or oversight specifically in the area of online faculty training. Together, the three points of data contextualized the research process giving the results greater meaning for the development of an online faculty training model for Asbury University.

Cross-case comparative analysis, a qualitative, case study methodology, provides a way to compare two or more cases with at least one variable. McGuiggan and Ley (2008) described the benefit of a cross-case analysis as the ability to explain
“the causal links in real-life situations that are too complex for a single study or experiment” (p. 2). An analysis of multiple cases can help to contextualize and validate the data and make it more generalizable. A cross-case analysis suits this project well in terms of the importance of contextualization in comparing the cases. Baxter and Jack (2008) suggested that case study methods are often appropriate when context is especially relevant to what is being studied. There are contextual implications for the design of training systems for online teaching faculty at higher education institutions. Each of the cases that were compared in this project had unique institutional characteristics, such as characteristics related to mission, geography, student demographics, institutional culture, personnel, and resources. This project emphasized training system design specific to Asbury University. Identifying and analyzing connections between institutional characteristics and training system design and comparing these findings across the cases gave contextual meaning to the data. The contextualized data informed the recommendations for training system that best suits Asbury University. The cross-case analysis in this project was driven by a process of characteristic, context, and pattern identification, comparison, and evaluation.

**Participating Institutions**

This project examined the online faculty training models at three higher education institutions. The three institutions selected for the project were Asbury University, Wilmore, KY, Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, KY, and Spring Arbor University, Spring Arbor, MI.
Criteria for Selection of Participating Institutions

The criteria listed in Appendix A were proposed to establish greater alignment between the participating institutions in terms of the noted institutional characteristics. The three criteria for institution selection focused on accreditation, program levels, and learning management systems. Alignment to the specific criteria in these areas between Asbury University and the other participating institutions resulted in more meaningful and relevant research and results for the development of a training model for Asbury University.

Special Considerations for Participant Selection

In addition to the three criteria for participant selection listed above, other special considerations prompted the selection of the institutions for comparison.

**Eastern Kentucky University.** Including Eastern Kentucky University in the project provided a case for comparing a private, Kentucky university to a public, Kentucky university. Both institutions operate within the regulations set forth by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education.

**Spring Arbor University.** Like Asbury University, Spring Arbor University is a member institution of the Consortium of Christian Colleges and Universities. The Asbury University Office of Institutional Effectiveness, which oversees all aspects of institutional accreditation and strategic planning, benchmarks the Asbury University against other institutions in the Consortium in a number of key areas. These areas include: enrollment,
resourcing, staff and faculty credentials, and institutional organization as a part of the institution’s annual assessment efforts. Comparing Asbury University against another CCCU institution in the area of online faculty training will extend the University’s assessment efforts into a new area of data collection and analysis. This will help to align the research with Asbury University’s current assessment plan and strategies, which will further contextualize the data making it more meaningful to the institution.

**Criteria for Selection of Online Teaching Faculty Survey Participants**

The Online Teaching Faculty Survey was administered to a subset of the online teaching faculty at each participating institution. In order to complete the online teaching faculty survey, participants had to have either designed or instructed an online course at their respective institutions. Participating institutions were asked to provide the survey to faculty members who have designed or taught an online course. The purpose of this criterion was to help ensure that participants were able to provide responses to questions regarding online faculty training.

**Criteria for Selection of Staff/Faculty Interview Participants**

An interview, based on a purposive sampling, was conducted with one staff or faculty member at each participating institution who provides direct leadership or oversight specifically in the area of online faculty training. Each interview participant had direct or significant responsibility in either the design or delivery of online faculty training at their respective institutions. This criterion helped to ensure
that the person interviewed had the knowledge and experience with faculty training at their respective institution necessary to respond to the interview questions.

**Research Criteria**

The purpose of this project was to prepare a proposal of recommendations for an online faculty training system for Asbury University. Appendix B shows the essential online faculty training design components identified in the review of literature. These components were grouped into three categories: training structure, instructional design and pedagogy, and institutional alignment. These three categories provided the qualitative protocol against which the online faculty training programs at the four participating institutions were evaluated.

**Procedures and Instrumentation**

**Institutional Archival Review.** The institutional archival reviews identified the presence of training elements at each institution in the areas of training structure, instructional design and pedagogy, and institutional alignment (See Appendix C). The archival reviews were based upon information and documentation that were accessible on the participating institutions’ websites. The sources reviewed included faculty handbooks, e-campus or online learning office websites, online faculty training descriptions and documents, and institutional strategic plans. For the archival reviews, the reviewer identified training elements, strategies, schedules, and descriptions that correlated with each of the categories established in the qualitative protocol.
**Staff/Faculty Interviews.** The interview questions were designed to gather information on the system each institution uses to training faculty and the specific models, strategies, characteristics, and elements that define these systems. The interview questions addressed each of the categories of the qualitative protocol for the project (see Appendix D). The staff/faculty interviews were completed in 20 to 30 minutes through a face-to-face interview or by telephone. The interview consisted of 22 questions (Appendix E). The interview delivery method was based upon the availability and preference of the interviewee. Appendix F outlines the full protocols for the interviews and Appendix G shows the interview script. Selected interviewees were contacted by email and were provided with an informed consent form for the interview (See Appendix H). Participants who acknowledged an interest in participating in the interview were asked to provide three dates and times they are available to complete the interview and to choose which method of interview delivery they preferred. In the handling and presentation of the data, participants in the staff/faculty interview are anonymous by name and title and are only identifiable by the names of their respective institutions.

**Online Teaching Faculty Survey.** The Online Teaching Faculty Survey identified faculty perceptions about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the online faculty training programs at their respective institutions in the areas of training structure, instructional design and pedagogy, and institutional alignment. The Online Teaching Faculty Survey was administered
electronically by email using SurveyMonkey, an online survey software and questionnaire tool. Participation in the survey was voluntary. The survey data was presented and analyzed using a cross-case method comparing the mean ($M$) scores for each institution for each question and the % of faculty at each institution who provided Agree or Strongly Agree responses for each question (See Appendix I). The survey consisted of 32 questions (See Appendix J). Potential survey participants were contacted by email with a request for their participation. The email request provided information about the project, a copy of the informed consent form for the survey (See Appendix K), and a web link to the online survey. The informed consent information was also embedded into the survey and participants were given the opportunity to review the form prior to participation. The survey was designed so that only participants who indicated that they read the informed consent information and agreed to participate in the survey were permitted to continue to the survey questions. Participations were able to complete and submit surveys without responding to all questions. For submitted surveys, only questions that were completed are included in the final results. The survey was also designed so that only participants who indicated that they have either designed or taught an online course at their respective institutions were able to continue to the survey questions. In the handling and presentation of the data, survey participants remained anonymous by all personally identifiable information.
Data Analysis Methods

Data from the Institutional Archival Reviews, Staff/Faculty Interviews, and Faculty Surveys from the three institutions were compared in a cross-case format for each of the categories identified in the qualitative protocol for essential elements of online faculty training. For the category Training Structure, the three institutions were compared on delivery method, delivery interface, schedule, and content progression. For Instructional Design and Pedagogy, the three institutions were compared on course organization, creating assessments, building interactive elements, integrating multimedia, and using the learning management system for course design, assessing student learning, facilitating interactions, providing student feedback, integrating multimedia for student learning, and using the learning management system for instruction. For Institutional Alignment, the three institutions were compared on training alignment related to institutional mission and vision, institutional distinctiveness, institutional strategic plan, compensation or recognition for completing training, and valuing faculty for completing training. Based on the cross-case analysis of the data for the Institutional Archival Reviews, Staff/Faculty Interviews, and Faculty Surveys, the findings of the Capstone Project identified differences in the training approaches at the three institutions, themes present across the three institutions, areas in which one or more of the institutions excelled in training, and areas in which one or more of the institutions needed to improve training. Following each cross-case comparison, a summary was provided indicating the key findings from the data.
Presentation of Recommendations and Conclusions

The findings from Chapter Four of the Capstone Project were used to develop recommendations for online faculty training at Asbury University in each of the categories of the qualitative protocol. The recommendations identified aspects of training already present in the institution’s approach to training that the University should continue to use along with rationale for why these aspects of training are effective. As well, the recommendations identified areas of training that need to improve, the changes that should be implemented in order to address these areas, and rationale for why the changes should be made. The Capstone Project includes an executive summary, which includes a detailed overview of the project, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for application of the research at Asbury University. In addition to the proposal, Cabinet members were provided with a copy of the completed capstone project submission.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

The data presented in this chapter are the results of the faculty surveys, staff/faculty interviews, and institutional archival reviews that provided the research base for the capstone project. The design of each of these research components is aligned with the three categories of the qualitative protocol for essential elements of an online faculty training model: training structure, instructional design and pedagogy, and institutional alignment. The purpose of this capstone project was to determine what training elements are essential for preparing faculty for online course design and instruction. The capstone project aimed to answer the following question: “What model of training is most effective for preparing online faculty?”

In this chapter, the results of the research for the Capstone Project related to training structure, instructional design and pedagogy, and institutional alignment are presented in the following order: faculty survey results, staff/faculty interview results, and institutional archival review results. Following the presentation of the results, a summary is presented of the key findings from the faculty surveys, staff/faculty interviews, and institutional archival reviews. These findings are analyzed and discussed in Chapter Five.

Faculty Survey

An electronic survey was administered to online faculty at the three participating institutions. The purpose of the survey was to gather information about faculty perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the online faculty training model at
their respective institutions. The design of the survey was based upon a 4-point Likert scale with the following answer options: Strong Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. Since the survey was designed based upon essential elements for online faculty training present in the literature, a score of 3.00 was used as a benchmark for effectiveness. This benchmark was chosen based on a conclusion drawn from the review of literature that an online faculty training model must effectively train faculty in all areas represented in the survey.

The presentation of the faculty survey results includes the Mean \( (M) \) score for each of the survey questions. As well, represented in the results are the percentages of faculty at the three institutions to provide “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” responses, or, responses that meet or exceed the benchmark. The survey results for all three participating institutions are presented in a cross-case comparative format.

The Faculty Survey included three open response questions. The open response questions were positioned after the survey questions pertaining to training design, instructional design and pedagogy, and institutional alignment. Participants were invited to provide additional information related to their training experience in these specific areas. This part of the survey was optional and participants could skip the open response question and move on to the next part of the survey. The open ended survey question response data is presented in the Appendix L.

The survey was administered to faculty at the three participating institutions who have experience in online education at their respective institutions. The survey was completed by faculty who indicated that they have either designed or taught an
online course at their institution. For Asbury University, the survey was provided to 55 faculty with 33 respondents at a response rate of 60%. For Eastern Kentucky University, the survey was provided to 139 faculty with 25 respondents at a response rate of 17%. For Spring Arbor University, the survey was provided to 180 faculty with 40 respondents at a response rate of 22%. For Asbury University and Spring Arbor University, an invitation to participate in the survey was sent to faculty by an administrator from the university. For Eastern Kentucky University, a list of faculty members and their email addresses was provider to the researcher to disseminate the invitation to complete the survey.

**Faculty Survey: Training Structure (Delivery Method, Delivery Interface, Schedule, and Content Progression)**

On the faculty survey, eight questions were provided to faculty on the following areas related to training structure: delivery method, delivery interface, schedule, and content progression. As well, one open response question was provided to survey respondents on training structure. For each of these areas, faculty were asked to respond to whether their institution’s approach to training was effective and whether it meets their needs. The key findings for each of the areas of training structure, delivery method, delivery interface, schedule, and content progression, are presented below and the results of the faculty survey questions related to training structure are shown in Table 1.
Table 1

*Training Structure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M % Strongly</td>
<td>M % Strongly</td>
<td>M % Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree/Agree</td>
<td>Agree/Agree</td>
<td>Agree/Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>2.87 (N=33)</td>
<td>2.83 (N=24)</td>
<td>2.94 (N=39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Method is Effective</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>3.00 (N=32)</td>
<td>2.83 (N=24)</td>
<td>3.15 (N=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Method Meets Needs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>3.03 (N=33)</td>
<td>2.87 (N=24)</td>
<td>2.92 (N=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Interface is Effective</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>2.96 (N=32)</td>
<td>3.00 (N=24)</td>
<td>3.00 (N=39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Interface Meets Needs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>2.75 (N=32)</td>
<td>2.87 (N=24)</td>
<td>3.00 (N=39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Schedule is Effective</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>2.77 (N=31)</td>
<td>2.87 (N=24)</td>
<td>3.05 (N=38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Schedule Meets Needs</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>2.78 (N=32)</td>
<td>2.79 (N=24)</td>
<td>2.86 (N=36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Progression is Effective</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>2.77 (N=31)</td>
<td>2.87 (N=24)</td>
<td>2.94 (N=37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Progression Meets Needs</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Delivery Method.**

Question 3. The training delivery method (ex: face-to-face, web-based, or hybrid) was effective for preparing me to teach online.

Question 4. The training delivery method (ex: face-to-face, web-based, or hybrid) met my needs (your time, schedule, learning preferences, etc.).

Thirty-three Asbury University faculty responded to the question on training delivery effectiveness and thirty-two responded to whether the training delivery method meets their needs. For Eastern Kentucky University, 24 faculty responded to the question on training delivery effectiveness and 24 responded to whether the training delivery method meets their needs. Thirty-nine Spring Arbor University faculty responded to the question on training delivery effectiveness and forty responded to whether the training delivery method meets their needs. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean scores on both survey questions (2.94 and 3.15) related to training delivery. It was also found that Spring Arbor University had the highest percentage of faculty (90%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses to the question on whether training meets the needs of faculty. Asbury University had the second highest mean scores on both survey questions (2.87 and 3.00), but Eastern Kentucky University had more faculty provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses on whether training is effective and meets their needs.
**Delivery Interface.**

Question 5. The training delivery interface (ex: self-directed training, one-on-one training with a facilitator, or group training with a facilitator) was effective for preparing me to teach online.

Question 6. The training delivery interface (ex: self-directed training, one-on-one training with a facilitator, or group training with a facilitator) met my needs (your time, schedule, learning preferences, etc.).

Thirty-three Asbury University faculty responded to the question on training interface effectiveness and thirty-two responded to whether the training interface meets their needs. For Eastern Kentucky University, 24 faculty responded to the question on training interface effectiveness and 24 responded to whether the training interface meets their needs. Forty Spring Arbor University faculty responded to the question on training interface effectiveness and thirty-nine responded to whether the training interface meets their needs. Asbury University had the highest mean score (3.03) on the survey question for the effectiveness of the training interface, but the lowest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses for this question. Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University had the highest mean scores (3.00 and 3.00) on whether the training interface meets their needs. As well, these institutions had the highest percentage of faculty (87% for both) on whether the training interface meets their needs.
Training Schedule.

Question 7. The training schedule (ex: intensive training or training as a continuous process) was effective for preparing me to teach online.

Question 8. The training schedule (ex: intensive training or training as a continuous process) met my needs (your time, schedule, learning preferences, etc.).

For Asbury University, 32 faculty responded to the question on training schedule effectiveness and 31 responded to whether the training schedule meets their needs. For Eastern Kentucky University, 24 faculty responded to the question on training schedule effectiveness and 24 responded to whether the training schedule meets their needs. For Spring Arbor University, 39 faculty responded to the question on training schedule effectiveness and 38 responded to whether the training schedule meets their needs. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean scores for both the effectiveness of the training schedule (3.00) and whether the training schedule meets the needs of faculty (3.05). As well, Spring Arbor University had the highest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses to both questions. Asbury University had the lowest mean scores for both the effectiveness of the training schedule (2.75) and whether the training schedule meets the needs of faculty (2.77). As well, Asbury University had the lowest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses to both questions.
Content Progression.

Question 9. The training content progression (how the concepts build on one another) was effective for preparing me to teach online.

Question 10. The training content progression (how the concepts build on one another) met my needs (your time, schedule, learning preferences, etc.).

For Asbury University, 32 faculty responded to the question on training content progression effectiveness and 31 responded to whether the training content progression meets their needs. For Eastern Kentucky University, 24 faculty responded to the question on training content progression effectiveness and 24 responded to whether the training content progression meets their needs. For Spring Arbor University, 36 faculty responded to the question on training content progression effectiveness and 37 responded to whether the training content progression meets their needs. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean scores for both the effectiveness of the training schedule (2.86) and whether the training schedule meets the needs of faculty (2.94). Asbury University had the lowest mean scores for both the effectiveness of the training schedule (2.78) and whether the training schedule meets the needs of faculty (2.77). Asbury University had the highest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses on the survey question regarding the effectiveness of the training content progression. Eastern Kentucky University had the highest percentage
of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses to whether the
training content progression meets the needs of faculty.

**Faculty Survey: Instructional Design and Pedagogy**

On the faculty survey, thirteen questions were provided to faculty related to
training in instructional design and pedagogy for both online course design and online
course instruction. The results of the survey were grouped into four categories:
overall preparation in course design, teaching and facilitating, assessment and
evaluation, and multimedia and interactivity. An open response survey question was
also provided to faculty related to training in instructional design and pedagogy. The
key findings for instructional design and pedagogy are presented below and the
results of the related faculty survey questions are shown in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Overall Preparation for Course Design**

On the faculty survey, questions 12, 13, and 18 addressed overall preparation
in course design. For the survey questions in each of these areas, faculty were asked
to indicate whether they Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree that
training is effective. The results are presented in Table 2.
Table 2

*Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Overall Preparation for Course Design*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Course Design</td>
<td>( M = 2.71 ) ( N=32 ) % ( N=32 )</td>
<td>( M = 2.72 ) ( N=25 ) % ( N=25 )</td>
<td>( M = 2.52 ) ( N=37 ) % ( N=37 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Course Organization</td>
<td>( M = 3.00 ) ( N=32 ) % ( N=32 )</td>
<td>( M = 2.80 ) ( N=25 ) % ( N=25 )</td>
<td>( M = 2.64 ) ( N=37 ) % ( N=37 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the LMS for Course Design</td>
<td>( M = 2.77 ) ( N=31 ) % ( N=31 )</td>
<td>( M = 2.72 ) ( N=25 ) % ( N=25 )</td>
<td>( M = 2.55 ) ( N=36 ) % ( N=36 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training on Online Course Design.

Question 12. The training was effective for preparing me to design an online course.

For the faculty survey question on the effectiveness of training regarding online course design, there were 32 respondents from Asbury University, 25 respondents from Eastern Kentucky University, and 37 respondents from Spring Arbor University. Eastern Kentucky University had the highest mean score for this question (2.72) and the highest percentage of faculty (68) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Spring Arbor University had the lowest mean score for this question (2.51) and the lowest percentage of faculty (48) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.

Training on Online Course Organization.

Question 13. The training was effective for preparing me to organize an online course.

For the faculty survey question on the effectiveness of training regarding course organization, there were 32 respondents from Asbury University, 25 respondents from Eastern Kentucky University, and 37 respondents from Spring Arbor University. Asbury University had the highest mean score for this question (3.00) and the highest percentage of faculty (78) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Spring Arbor University had the lowest mean score for this question (2.64) and the lowest percentage of faculty (59) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.
Training on the Use of the Learning Management System for Course Design.

Question 18. The training was effective for preparing me to use the learning management system for online course design.

For the faculty survey, all three institutions fell below the benchmark on the effectiveness of training on the use of the learning management system for course design. Asbury University had the highest mean score (2.77) and the highest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Spring Arbor University had the lowest mean score (2.55) and the lowest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. On the surveys, 44% or more of participants from Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University indicated that they either disagree or strongly disagree that training is effective in this area. Though this appears to be an area in which training needs to improve at all three institutions, the greatest need for improvement, based on faculty perception about training effectiveness, is at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University.

Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Teaching and Facilitating

On the faculty survey, questions 19, 21, 22 and 24 addressed preparation in instructional design and pedagogy for teaching and facilitating. For the survey questions in each of these areas, faculty were asked to indicate whether they Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree that training is effective. The results are presented in Table 3.
### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Teaching and Facilitating</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 19 Teaching an Online Course</td>
<td>M: 2.62 (N=32)</td>
<td>M: 2.60 (N=23)</td>
<td>M: 3.08 (N=37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 53</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 65</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 21 Facilitating Interactions</td>
<td>M: 2.75 (N=32)</td>
<td>M: 2.56 (N=23)</td>
<td>M: 2.94 (N=37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 68</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 60</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 22 Providing Student Feedback</td>
<td>M: 2.78 (N=32)</td>
<td>M: 2.56 (N=23)</td>
<td>M: 3.02 (N=37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 68</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 56</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 24 Using the LMS for Teaching</td>
<td>M: 2.77 (N=31)</td>
<td>M: 2.65 (N=23)</td>
<td>M: 2.67 (N=37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 65</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 60</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses: 59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training on Teaching an Online Course.

Question 19. The training was effective for preparing me to teach an online course.

For the faculty survey question on the effectiveness of training regarding online course design, there were 32 respondents from Asbury University, 23 respondents from Eastern Kentucky University, and 37 respondents from Spring Arbor University. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score for this question (3.08) but the lowest percentage of faculty (51) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Eastern Kentucky University had the lowest mean score for this question (2.60) but the highest percentage of faculty (65) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.

Training on Facilitating Interactions in an Online Course.

Question 21. The training was effective for preparing me to facilitate interactions in an online course.

On the faculty surveys, all three institutions scored below the benchmark on the effectiveness of training on facilitating interactions in online courses. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score (2.94) and the highest percentage of faculty (72%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Eastern Kentucky University had the lowest mean score (2.56) and the lowest percentage of faculty (60%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.
Training on Providing Student Feedback in an Online Course.

Question 22. The training was effective for preparing me to provide student feedback in an online course.

On the faculty surveys, Spring Arbor University was the only institution to score at or above the benchmark on the effectiveness of training on providing student feedback. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score (3.02) and the highest percentage of faculty (75%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Eastern Kentucky University had the lowest mean score (2.56) and the lowest percentage of faculty (56%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.

Training on Using the Learning Management System for Online Course Teaching.

Question 24. The training was effective for preparing me to use the learning management system for online course teaching.

On the faculty survey, all three institutions fell scored below the benchmark on the effectiveness of training on the use of the learning management system for instruction. Asbury University had the highest mean score (2.77) and the highest percentage of faculty (65%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Eastern Kentucky University had the lowest mean score (2.65). Spring Arbor University had the lowest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. For all three institutions, 35% or
more of respondents indicated that they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree that training is effective in this area.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Assessment and Evaluation**

On the faculty survey, questions 14, 16, and 20 addressed preparation in instructional design and pedagogy for assessment and evaluation. For the survey questions in each of these areas, faculty were asked to indicate whether they Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree that training is effective. The results are presented in Table 4.
Table 4

*Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Assessment and Evaluation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Assessments</td>
<td>2.56 (N=32)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.64 (N=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Evaluation</td>
<td>2.48 (N=31)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.76 (N=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Student</td>
<td>2.59 (N=32)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.65 (N=23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training on Creating Assessments in an Online Course.

Question 14. The training was effective for preparing me to create assessments in an online course.

On the faculty surveys, all three institutions scored below the established benchmark on the effectiveness of training on creating assessments. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score (2.72) and Asbury University had the lowest mean score (2.56). Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University had the highest percentages of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses to this question (64% each).

Training on Building Evaluation Tools in an Online Course.

Question 16. The training was effective for preparing me to build evaluation tools into an online course.

Based on the faculty survey results, training on building evaluation tools for online learning is an area in need of improvement at all three institutions. All three institutions scored below the benchmark on this question. On the surveys, 40% or more of participants at all three institutions indicated that they either disagree or strongly disagree that training is effective in this area. Eastern Kentucky University had the highest mean score (2.76) for this question and the highest percentage of faculty (60) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Asbury University had the lowest mean score (2.48) and the lowest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly or Agree responses.
Training on Assessing Student Learning in an Online Course.

Question 20. The training was effective for preparing me to assess student learning in an online course.

On the faculty survey, all three institutions scored below the benchmark regarding the effectiveness of training on assessing student learning. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score (2.81) and the highest percentage of faculty (70%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses on the effectiveness of training on assessing student learning. Asbury University had the lowest mean score (2.59) and the lowest percentage of faculty (53%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Close to half of the respondents from Asbury University indicated that they disagree or strongly disagree that training is effective in this area.

Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Multimedia and Interactivity

On the faculty survey, questions 15, 17, and 23 addressed preparation in instructional design and pedagogy for multimedia and interactivity. For the survey questions in each of these areas, faculty were asked to indicate whether they Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree that training is effective. The results are presented in Table 5.
Table 5

*Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Multimedia and Interactivity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses (N=31)</td>
<td>Responses (N=25)</td>
<td>Responses (N=37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 15 Building Interactive Elements</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 17 Integrating Multimedia</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 23 Using Multimedia for Learning</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training on Building Interactive Elements into an Online Course.

Question 15. The training was effective for preparing me to build interactive elements into an online course.

Based on the faculty survey results, training on building interactive elements into online courses is an area in need of improvement at all three institutions. All three institutions scored below the benchmark on this question. On the surveys, 40% or more of participants at all three institutions indicated that they either disagree or strongly disagree that training is effective in this area. Eastern Kentucky University had the highest mean score (2.68) on the effectiveness of training in this area and the highest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Spring Arbor University had the lowest mean score (2.62) for this question and the lowest percentage of faculty provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.

Training on Integrating Multimedia into an Online Course.

Question 17. The training was effective for preparing me to integrate multimedia into an online course.

On the faculty survey, all three institutions scored below the benchmark on the effectiveness of training for multimedia integration. Asbury University had the highest mean score (2.74) and the highest percentage of faculty (61%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses for this survey question. Both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University had 50% or more of respondents indicate that they either disagree
or strongly disagree that training is effective in this area. Spring Arbor University had the lowest mean score on the survey (2.33) and the lowest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.

Training on Using Multimedia for Student Learning in an Online Course.

Question 23. The training was effective for preparing me to use multimedia for student learning in an online course.

On the faculty surveys, all three institutions score below the benchmark on the effectiveness of training in the area of using multimedia for student learning. Asbury University had the highest mean score (2.59) and the highest percentage of faculty (59%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Spring Arbor University had the lowest mean score (2.40) and the lowest percentage of faculty (40%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. On the surveys, 40% or more of faculty at all three institutions indicated that their either Disagree or Strongly Disagree that training is effective in this area.

Faculty Survey: Institutional Alignment

For the Capstone Project, institutional alignment referred to both contextual alignment and valuing faculty. Contextual alignment focused on training related to each institution’s vision and mission, distinctiveness, and strategic plan. Valuing faculty focused on how each institution showed value to faculty for completing training. On the faculty survey, five questions were provided to faculty related to the institutional alignment of online faculty training. The results of the survey were
grouped into two categories: contextual alignment and valuing faculty. As well, an open response survey questions was provided to faculty following each set of questions related to institutional alignment. The key findings from the faculty surveys on institutional alignment are presented below and the results of the related faculty survey questions are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

**Institutional Alignment: Contextual Alignment**

The first training category related to institutional alignment, contextual alignment, dealt with how training helps faculty to understand the relationship between online learning and an institution’s vision and mission, distinctiveness, and strategic plan. On the faculty survey, questions 26, 27, and 28 addressed these aspects of institutional alignment. For the survey questions in each of these areas, faculty were asked to indicate whether they Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree that training is effective. The results are presented in Table 6.
Table 6

**Institutional Alignment: Contextual Alignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision and Mission</td>
<td>2.25 (N=31)</td>
<td>2.29 (N=24)</td>
<td>2.92 (N=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>2.22 (N=31)</td>
<td>2.40 (N=22)</td>
<td>2.90 (N=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>2.26 (N=30)</td>
<td>2.30 (N=23)</td>
<td>2.52 (N=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Vision and Mission.**

Question 26. The online faculty training program helped me to understand the relationship between online learning and the institution’s vision and mission.

On the faculty survey, all three institutions scored below the established benchmark on the effectiveness of how training addresses the relationship between online education and vision and mission. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score (2.92) and the highest percentage of faculty (70%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Asbury University had the lowest mean score (2.25) and the lowest percentage of faculty (32%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.

**Distinctiveness.**

Question 27. The online faculty training program helped me to understand the relationship between online learning and the distinctiveness of the institution.

On the faculty survey, all three institutions scored below the benchmark on the effectiveness of training regarding the relationship between online education and institutional distinctiveness. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score (2.90) and the highest percentage (65%) of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Asbury University had the lowest mean score (2.22) and the lowest percentage of faculty (29%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.
Strategic Plan.

Question 28. The online faculty training program helped me to understand the relationship between online learning and the institution’s strategic plan.

On the faculty survey, all three institutions scored below the benchmark on the effectiveness of training for helping faculty to understand the relationship between online education and the institution’s strategic plan. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score (2.52) and the highest percentage of faculty (52%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Asbury University had the lowest mean score (2.26) and the lowest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.

Institutional Alignment: Valuing Faculty

The second training category related to institutional alignment, valuing faculty, dealt with how each institution’s shows value to faculty for completing training. Questions 30 and 31 addressed this aspect of institutional alignment. For the survey questions in each of these areas, faculty were asked to indicate whether they Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree that training is effective. The results are presented in Table 7.
Table 7

*Institutional Alignment: Valuing Faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 30</td>
<td>1.93 (N=30)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.95 (N=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation/Recognition is Adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 31</td>
<td>2.06 (N=30)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.95 (N=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Feel Valued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compensation or Recognition for Completing Training.

Question 30. Faculty are adequately compensated or recognized by the institution for completing training.

On the faculty surveys, all three institutions scored below the benchmark on whether faculty are adequately compensated for completing training. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score (2.33) and the highest percentage of faculty (41%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Asbury University had the lowest means score (1.93) and the lowest percentage of faculty (13%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.

Showing Value to Faculty for Completing Training.

Question 31. Faculty feel valued by the institution for completing training.

On the faculty surveys, all three institutions scored below the benchmark on whether faculty feel valued for completing training. Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score (2.47) and the highest percentage of faculty (52%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses. Eastern Kentucky University had the lowest mean score (1.95) and the lowest percentage of faculty (16%) to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses.

Staff/Faculty Interviews

The staff/faculty interviews were conducted to gather information on the model of online faculty training used at each institution. In the staff/faculty interviews, interviewees responded to questions regarding the training approach and
content at their respective institutions. The goal of the staff/faculty interviews was to
develop an understanding of the training model in use at each institution from the
perspective and expertise of individuals who have responsibility for providing
training to faculty. The results of the staff/faculty interviews for the three
participating institutions are presented in a cross-case comparative format.

**Staff/Faculty Interviews: Training Structure (Delivery Method, Delivery
Interface, Schedule, and Content Progression)**

In the staff/faculty interviews, interviewees were asked four questions related
to training structure in the areas of training delivery method, training delivery
interface, training schedule, and training content progression. Interviewees were
asked to describe these four aspects of online faculty training structure at their
institutions. The key findings of the interviews for each of the areas of training
structure are presented below and the results of interview questions related to training
structure are shown in Table 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3 Delivery Method</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“A mixed-method approach to training.”</td>
<td>“Vast majority is face-to-face. It is intentional.”</td>
<td>“There is an online faculty training course instructors are required to complete they can start teaching. Full-time and part-time faculty have to do it.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Online training package is pre-packaged.”</td>
<td>Moving toward a more web-based focus.”</td>
<td>“We are very limited on Blackboard training. We tell them what tools they will be expected to use.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Three fully online course offerings are available - anytime, self-paced, start and finish what you need to.”</td>
<td>“The reason we choose face-to-face is so that I can get in front of faculty so they know who I am. Also, they are used to learning in that setting. They like the camaraderie.”</td>
<td>“Prior to teaching they come to the Office of Academic Technology for face-to-face training. Sometimes we record trainings and push them online and sometimes they just do face-to-face trainings. Sometimes they have walk-ins.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There is a series of face-to-face training courses on a continued schedule with weekly sessions. Two a week are available. Included in those sessions are open work sessions.”</td>
<td>“Sessions are held by department or unit. They like the interactions and sharing war stories.”</td>
<td>“We put a lot of resources online. We have video recordings and pdfs. Trying to create a big repository.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“(The institution) has made some modifications (to the self-directed training package) to meet the needs of our institution. We have added images.”</td>
<td>“We are moving toward web-based. But, we want them to learn to walk before they run. We are trying to keep it simple.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A few just-in-time video tutorials and written tutorials are provided with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

*Training Structure*
screenshots.”

*Questions are so course-specific it is difficult to create online tutorials that apply to everyone for all courses.*

*We did pay to have a webinar broadcast and it was well attended.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4 Delivery Interface</th>
<th>“Self-directed and group training with a facilitator.”</th>
<th>“More of a roundtable discussion.”</th>
<th>“Faculty meet with ID people by phone, email, and face-to-face meetings.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“One-on-one is the most extensive aspect of training. One-on-one is what faculty seek out. Scheduled group sessions are poorly attended. Faculty want one-on-one. They have such course specific needs.”</td>
<td>“Group training with a facilitator.”</td>
<td>We have three instructional designers and a media designer.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Some faculty have done no self-directed or group training, but only one-on-one.”</td>
<td>“We also do intensive one-on-one with one of the instructional designers. One-on-one is for more course specific needs. It is much safer for them. They don’t appear stupid in front of colleagues. They also want to get real in depth about some particular aspect.”</td>
<td>“The online training is facilitated by Associated Dean for Online.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Self-paced training not required for first two years of online courses. Now it is required.”</td>
<td>“We have parts created of a self-directed training, but they are not in place yet.”</td>
<td>“We have two different models. For quality, we do most of the work. We have a style guide, we want to ensure consistency, we want to ensure everything is according to our standards, we have the faculty give us everything and we have templates and course outlines we work off of. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“In one-on-one sessions we show examples from other</td>
<td>“Most training one on one.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“More of a roundtable discussion.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
courses as models."

We also have a couple of programs that are more like a consulting role. It is a mixed model.

We have a course editor we work with.

subject matter expert gives us a course outline, we provide them feedback, identify gaps, and identify some things that may not be in alignment. It is a give and take relationship. We will load it. We have a course editor we work with.

It is a continuous process. It is intentionally done that way. They have gone so long without having any kind of training. They get to play in the pond a little bit.

A series of 60 or 90 minute courses. Often times once a week or once every two weeks.

Continuous, on-going training is in the plans. One of the issues faculty tend to have is with the gradebook. We are thinking about moving toward some training so we can offer more advanced training on

Question 5 Training Schedule

- “It is a continuous process. It is set up that way.”
- “The one-on-one experience is intensive training. Just in time training as needed is what they seek out most. One-on-one’s require more time than brief scheduled sessions.”
- “One-on-one’s can range from 1-3 hours.”
- “It is a continuous process. It is intentionally done that way. They have gone so long without having any kind of training. They get to play in the pond a little bit.”
- “A series of 60 or 90 minute courses. Often times once a week or once every two weeks.”
- “The online faculty development training last 3 weeks.”
- “We are in contact with directors of programs constantly and with faculty especially 2-3 weeks prior to course launching.”
- “Continuous, on-going training is in the plans. One of the issues faculty tend to have is with the gradebook. We are thinking about moving toward some training so we can offer more advanced training on
different pieces, such as more advanced training on gradebook. We are thinking about rolling it out 2014-2015.”

- “We have a phased approach that we work with. We follow the ADDIE model. We load the initial stuff in and then editor comes in and makes sure everything is consistent and standardized and that all the language is appropriate”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Content Progression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- “The training schedule is topic-based, but also progressive. The entire progression would take the entire semester. Currently, we do not assess their progress through the whole training experience.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Faculty who come into the semester part of the way through do the self-directed training and then one-on-one’s.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Self-directed training meets the needs of that person,”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “It is scaffolded with three tiers, beginning, intermediate, and advanced.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Beginner has 8-10 courses. The first is online teaching. Intermediate focuses on leveraging technology and use of multimedia. Advanced course covers whether objectives are in alignment with assessments. Also discuss backward course design and flipped classroom.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Yes, there is a progression of content.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “The first component of the online training is familiarizing instructors with what distance education is, what pedagogy is, what is expected of them if they teach at Spring Arbor, what the Spring Arbor online model is.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Later we discuss different approaches to online education and then how you can implement those”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specifically when learning the learning management system.”

- “Scheduled group sessions are how-to sessions. Open work sessions are for doing – completing a task. In group sessions they don’t really do anything, just observation.”

- “Each topic might get hit on three times. Need time to assimilate and reflect on it.”
Delivery Method.

Question 3. How is online teaching faculty training delivered (ex: face-to-face, web-based, or hybrid) at your institution?

The results of the staff/faculty interviews indicate that face-to-face training is a delivery method emphasized at all three institutions. Face-to-face training includes both one-on-one and group facilitated trainings. Only Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University had evidence of group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings. For Asbury University, these trainings are scheduled and open to all faculty and at Eastern Kentucky University these sessions are offered to specific departments.

All three institutions provided some rationale for the emphasis on face-to-face training delivery. The interviewee from Asbury University noted that face-to-face training is necessary because questions from faculty are course specific. The interviewee from Eastern Kentucky University indicated that face-to-face training forces interactions between faculty and training staff and that faculty appreciate the opportunity to experience training with colleagues. Both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University interviewees indicated that they are limited in the training they deliver through web-based approaches.

Based on the results of the interviews, there is evidence that both Asbury University and Spring Arbor University offer training courses delivered online. The results indicate that Spring Arbor University is the only
institution which requires completion of the online training course by faculty. There was no evidence of a web-based training course from the results for Eastern Kentucky University.

**Delivery Interface.**

Question 4. How would you describe the user interface (ex: self-directed training, one-on-one training with a facilitator, or group training with a facilitator) of your online teaching faculty training?

The results of the staff/faculty interviews indicate that one-on-one, face-to-face training is the most prevalent training interface at all three institutions. The interviewees for both Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University indicate that one-on-one training is what faculty prefer. Faculty have course specific needs and the one-on-one interface is a more comfortable training environment for faculty. For Spring Arbor University, the results indicate that instructional design staff take a lead role in the actual development of courses, while faculty serve as providers of content.

From the interviews, there is evidence of group-facilitated, face-to-face training at Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University, but not Spring Arbor University. However, the interview results for Spring Arbor University indicate that the institution offers group-facilitated, web-based training. This was not reflected in the results for Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University.
Training Schedule.

Question 5. How would you describe the schedule (ex: intensive training or training is a continuous process) for online teaching faculty training at your institution?

The interviewees from both Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University described the training schedule as a continuous process. The results for Spring Arbor University indicated that continuous, on-going training is not currently a part of the institution’s training model, but that it is a part of the institution’s future training plans.

The interview results for Asbury University emphasize how training is scheduled for one-on-one sessions between faculty and training staff. One-on-one training sessions typically last 1-3 hours. The results for Eastern Kentucky University focus on the scheduling of classroom-based, group-facilitated trainings. These sessions typically last 60-90 minutes and occur once a week or once every two weeks. The results for Spring Arbor University reference the institution’s 3 week online professional development course and address the institution’s phased approach to course development.

Content Progression.

Question 6. How would you describe the training content progression for online teaching faculty training at your institution?

The interview results suggest that content progression is evident in the training provided by all three institutions. For both Asbury University and
Eastern Kentucky University, progression of content is built into the design of group-facilitated, face-to-face training sessions. At Asbury University, faculty who enter the training process after an academic term has already commenced may not complete the entire progression as the progression is designed to be completed over the course of an entire semester. Group-facilitated, face-to-face training at Eastern Kentucky University includes training sessions at introductory, intermediate, and advanced levels. Training at Spring Arbor University progresses from introductory training on online education to strategies for online instruction.

**Staff/Faculty Interviews: Instructional Design and Pedagogy**

In the staff/faculty interviews, interviewees were asked eleven questions related to training in instructional design and pedagogy for online course design and online course teaching. The results of the interviews were grouped into four categories: overall preparation in course design, teaching and facilitating, assessment and evaluation, and multimedia and interactivity. The key findings from the interviews are presented below and the results are shown in Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Overall Preparation for Course Design**

Interview questions 7 and 12 addressed overall preparation in course design. Interviewees were asked to describe online faculty training in instructional design and pedagogy related to each of the interview questions. The results are presented in Table 9.
### Question 7

**Online Course Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Overall Preparation for Course Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Some organization is learned when they learn how to use the LMS.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We provide an online course template that is embedded into each course. The template is what faculty use to organize their courses. All courses are organized using the same template.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 12

**Using the LMS for Course Design**

| “Self-directed trainings (how-tos), group trainings, and one-on-one sessions.” |
| “Instructors aren’t held back from moving forward without passing” | “Instructional designers review Blackboard with faculty and teach them how to use it.” | “We are trying to. We get a lot of calls to the helpdesk. A lot of times it ends up coming back to the ID folks and we end up working with faculty one on one. They have videos” |
assessments in self-directed training. We don’t really know whether they are actually ready to use the LMS to design a course. We have established no minimum levels of competencies. These are subject matter experts and our focus has not been on whether they have any technology skills. Our experience has been that many faculty have been overwhelmed by the technology.”

on just about everything. If they have to find anything they will not look for it. I have to specifically send everyone there.”
Training on Online Course Organization.

Question 7. How does your institution train faculty to organize an online course?

The results of the staff/faculty interviews indicate that all three institutions provide some training in the area of course organization for online course development. For both Asbury University and Spring Arbor University, course organization is based upon development within a standardized course template. At Asbury University, faculty learn to build content within the template through training on the learning management system. For Spring Arbor University, content is loaded into the template by an instructional designer. At Eastern Kentucky University, faculty work with an instructional designer to organize content in courses. It is apparent from the interviews that course organization is a training issue that is addressed through a collaborative effort by faculty and training staff.

Training on the Use of the Learning Management System for Online Course Design.

Question 12. How does your institution train faculty to use its learning management system for online course design?

The staff/faculty interview results for Asbury University indicate that training on the use of the learning management system for course design is covered in self-directed trainings, group-facilitated trainings, and one-on-one trainings between faculty and training staff. Asbury University was the only
institution for which there was evidence of training in this area delivered in a group-facilitated format. Regarding the self-directed training, the interviewee noted that may or may not complete this aspect of training. As well, the institution has no method for determining whether a faculty member is prepared in this area.

The staff/faculty interview results for Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University indicate that the majority of training on the use of the learning management system for course design occurs in one-on-one sessions between faculty and instructional designers. As well, Spring Arbor University offers online training resources on the subject, such as video recordings. However, the interviewee noted that faculty may not take advantage of these resources because they have to search for them.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Teaching and Facilitating**

In the interviews, questions 14, 15, and 17 addressed preparation in instructional design and pedagogy for teaching and facilitating. Interviewees were asked to describe online faculty training in instructional design and pedagogy at their institutions related to each of the interview questions. The results are presented in Table 10.
### Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Teaching and Facilitating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 14</th>
<th>Facilitating Interactions</th>
<th>Question 15</th>
<th>Providing Student Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asbury University</strong></td>
<td>- “Foundations of Course Facilitation self-directed training deals with classroom management, how online is different than other environments, learning styles, communication in online classroom, instructional strategies. It takes 10-15 hours to complete that self-directed training. Zero people have done this in its entirely…I think.”</td>
<td>- “In one-on-one training sessions. This is mostly how-to though and doesn’t deal with ID.”</td>
<td>- “This is a big focus of training. We talk a great deal about reinforcement of engagement and student retention. Retention is a big focus.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Kentucky University</strong></td>
<td>- “We focus on this. We are trying to teach faculty how to teach.”</td>
<td>- “We give a Memorandum of Understanding to online faculty. It tells them what our expectations are for providing feedback to”</td>
<td>- “This is a big focus of the group sessions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Arbor University</strong></td>
<td>- “We cover this in one-on-one and group presentations.”</td>
<td>- “The online training includes discussion boards, wikis, blogs, and journals. There is no web-conferencing in the training.”</td>
<td>- “We cover instructional strategies for delivering the best learning experience for students in which they will be able to help their students encompass a great learning experience.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 17 Using the LMS for Teaching</td>
<td>“We teach them how to use the LMS to build an online course, but we don’t focus on how to use it to teach.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Most of our training covers using the LMS for design.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They cover this in the faculty development training.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Training on Facilitating Interactions in an Online Course.**

Question 14. How does your institution train faculty to facilitate interactions in an online course?

The staff/faculty interview results indicate that each institution addresses training on facilitating interactions through a different delivery format. For Asbury University, the institution’s self-directed, online training course addresses communication in the online classroom. The interviewee noted that no faculty have completed the entire self-directed course. The interviewee for Eastern Kentucky University indicated that facilitating interactions is a focal point of the institution’s training. Training is addressed in one-on-one training sessions between faculty and instructional designers and group trainings. For Spring Arbor University, training on facilitating interactions is a part of the institution’s online faculty development training course. Part of this training addresses the institution’s pedagogical model for facilitating interactions in online courses.

**Training on Providing Student Feedback in an Online Course.**

Question 15. How does your institution train faculty to provide student feedback in an online course?

The staff/faculty interview results for Asbury University indicate that the institution does not provide training on providing student feedback from an instructional design and pedagogy perspective. The institution does have a Memorandum of Understanding which outlines the University’s expectations
for providing feedback. The interviewee for Eastern Kentucky University indicated that training in this area is a focus for the institution, particularly as it relates to retention. Training in this area for Eastern Kentucky University is provided in one group-facilitated, face-to-face sessions. In the interviews, Spring Arbor University was the only institution for which there was evidence of training on instructional strategies related to providing student feedback.

**Training on the Use of the Learning Management System for Online Course Instruction.**

Question 17. How does your institution train faculty to use its learning management system for online course instruction?

The staff/faculty interview results for Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University indicate that the institution provides training on the technical uses of the LMS, but does not address pedagogical approaches to the LMS for instruction. The results for Spring Arbor University indicate that training in this area is incorporated into the institution’s faculty training course. However, it is not clear in the data how this training is incorporated into the online training course or what specific training is provided to faculty.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Assessment and Evaluation**

In the interviews, questions 8, 10, and 13 addressed preparation in instructional design and pedagogy for assessment and evaluation. Interviewees were asked to describe online faculty training in instructional design and pedagogy related to each of the interview questions. The results are presented in Table 11.
### Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Assessment and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating Assessments</td>
<td>“Need to improve upon this area from the perspective of pedagogy…teach them how to use the tools to create assessments and provide support, but in terms of generating questions and offering choices, not very proactive.”</td>
<td>“We don’t currently. We tell them what assessments are available.”</td>
<td>“This is a piece that is going to be built out in the new online faculty development program. Right now, the ID people handle it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“This happens mostly in one-on-one sessions. We aren’t assessment experts. We did pay to have a webinar broadcast and it was well-attended on assessment. This was an expert.”</td>
<td>“We do have a teaching and learning center that helps with that in terms of how to do assessments.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question 10 | Building Evaluation Tools | |
|------------|---------------------------| |
| | “Some group trainings on creating assessments using LMS quiz tool.” | “We don’t teach how to use rubrics. We show them how to use the rubric creator tool.” | “We show them examples of great syllabi. We show them examples of great rubrics.” |
| | “Group trainings and one-on-one trainings on” | | |
| | “Faculty don’t care for” | | |
**Question 13: Assessing Student Learning**

- "An area we need to improve significantly. Training has been focused on design."
- "There is one self-paced training called course facilitation and deals somewhat with faculty classroom management."
- "We don’t yet. Anything related to assessing student learning has been informal at best."
- "During one-on-one sessions we might make suggestions on how they can best or better assess students."
- "This is covered in faculty development training. They cover the purpose of assessment and evaluation."

- "Building out rubrics using LMS advanced creating functionality - rubrics, checklists, and scoring guides."
- "A smaller number of faculty go through these advanced grading/evaluation trainings. Vast majority used simple grading methods to evaluate students."
- "We talk to them about wikis."
- "Peer review."
Training on Creating Assessments for an Online Course.

Question 8. How does your institution train faculty to create assessments in an online course?

The staff/faculty interviews indicate that training on creating assessments is an area of need for all three institutions. Asbury University does address creating assessments in one-on-one training sessions between faculty and training staff. Training focuses on how to use tools within the LMS to create assessments. Eastern Kentucky University informs faculty about the types of assessments that are available, but it does not appear that the University provides formal training on the subject specifically for online learning. The institution does have a Teaching and Learning Center which can provide assistance to faculty in this area. The training center is not purposed specifically for online learning, but serves the entire institution. For Spring Arbor University, the staff/faculty interview found that creating assessments is the responsibility of the instructional design staff.

Training on Building Evaluation Tools into an Online Course.

Question 10. How does your institution train faculty to build evaluation tools into an online course?

For all three institutions, the staff/faculty interviews suggest that training on building evaluation tools focuses primarily on the functionality of each institution’s LMS. For Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University, the staff/faculty interview results suggest that training in this area
is informal. Asbury University was the only institution for which there was
evidence of structured training in this area. The University offers group-
facilitated, face-to-face training sessions on grading and evaluation tools
within the LMS.

**Training on Assessing Student Learning in an Online Course.**

Question 13. How does your institution train faculty to assess student learning
in an online course?

The interview results for both Asbury University and Spring Arbor
University suggest that training on assessing student learning in online courses
is an area in which these institutions need to improve. For Asbury University,
the staff/faculty interview did not result in any evidence of training
specifically in the area of assessment. Eastern Kentucky University addresses
training in this area informally through one-on-one training sessions. For
Spring Arbor University, training on assessing student learning is built into
the institution’s online faculty development program. This training addresses
the purpose of assessment and evaluation.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Multimedia and Interactivity**

In the interviews, questions 9, 11, and 16 addressed preparation in
instructional design and pedagogy for multimedia and interactivity. Interviewees
were asked to describe online faculty training in instructional design and pedagogy at
their institutions related to each of the interview questions. The results are presented
in Table 12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 9 Building Interactive Elements</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Some of this is addressed in instructional design review of courses after design is completed. Review covers learner engagement issues, technology use, communication strategies, policies and support, accommodations for disabilities. Faculty do not get this review at the beginning of their design efforts. ID folks aren’t always sure when faculty are assigned to courses. Sometimes faculty aren’t assigned to courses until 2 weeks until course starts. Would like rubric for design review to come with contract.”</td>
<td>“We do a lot of interactive pieces: forums, synchronous Adobe Connect sessions, virtual clickers and response systems.”</td>
<td>“Online faculty teachers and designers go through the ID department. The ID department looks at every single course.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Trainings cover Adobe Connect, Camtasia, forums, chat features,</td>
<td>“We answer the question why am I going to use this. What is the educational purpose?”</td>
<td>“We show them through teaching. We show them examples. They sometimes walk in with example in mind. If we think it is off track that’s when we show them our examples.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
peer-assessments and peer-evaluations. Group trainings available for all of these things, but one-on-one is most prevalent.”

- “Forums are also covered in self-directed, but it’s mostly how-to and not pedagogy focused.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 11</th>
<th>Integrating Multimedia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “Camtasia training and Adobe Connect training offered in the group sessions.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Video editing support is provided to faculty. We show them how to find videos to put into courses and how to embed videos in the one-on-one sessions.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 16</th>
<th>Using Multimedia for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “We don’t currently. We teach them how to imbed materials. We encourage”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Training does not hit on models for doing it well in the online classroom.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Pedagogical teaching does not happen in faculty development training.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| • “We have two guys on staff who focus on this. The ID folks are good at that too.” |
| • “A lot of it is video and some audio, podcasts, recorded lectures such as Tegrity, and Adobe Connect.” |
| • “Also, we address the why question” |
| • “We address the need for a variety of media types. You need a mix.” |
| • “We teach them about welcome videos. These are an easy way to get faculty on this train.” |

| • “They have a media designer. If they are doing a course design and a faculty member says I want to integrate multimedia, then they inquire about. We are very strict about this because of copyright.” |
| them to have a variety of materials. | • “For some faculty it is even as fundamental as how do I put my syllabus online.”
| | • “This is overwhelming for faculty and has to be scaffolded.”
| Those questions are addressed when needed. |
Training on Building Interactive Elements into an Online Course.

Question 9. How does your institution train faculty to build interactive elements into an online course?

For Asbury University, the staff/faculty interview results suggest that the institution offers training on building interactive elements in both one-on-one, face-to-face training sessions and group-facilitated, face-to-face sessions. Most training, though, happens in one-on-one sessions between faculty and training staff. The interview results also indicate that the institution provides some training on the creating of forums within the learning management system in its self-directed training package. It is also worth noting that the institution addresses interactive elements for online courses in its course development review rubric. However, this rubric is not provided to faculty until after they have completed the design process.

Similar to Asbury University, Spring Arbor University covers this training primarily through one-on-one training sessions between faculty and instructional designers. Spring Arbor University instructional designers train faculty by showing them examples of how to build interactive elements into courses. It appears that this is a specific area of focus in the review of courses that have been developed for online learning.

The interviewee from Eastern Kentucky University indicated that the institution has training on several pieces related to interactive elements. However, it is unclear from the data how or when this training happens in the
training process. Eastern Kentucky University was the online institution for which there was evidence that training covers not only how to build interactive elements into online courses, but also why these elements are built into courses.

**Training on Integrating Multimedia into an Online Course.**

Question 11. How does your institution train faculty to integrate multimedia into the design of an online course?

The staff/faculty interview results indicate that all three institutions provide support to faculty specifically in the area of multimedia integration. Asbury University was the only institution for which there was evidence that training is provided in this area in a group-facilitated format. The institution offers trainings on Camtasia and Adobe Connect. The interviews indicate that both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University have staff specifically designated to work with faculty on multimedia integration. Eastern Kentucky University was the only institution for which there was evidence that training addresses the purpose of multimedia integration into online courses and the importance of integrating a diverse types of media into courses.

**Training on Using Multimedia for Student Learning in an Online Course.**

Question 16. How does your institution train faculty to use multimedia for student learning in an online course?
The staff/faculty interview results indicate that training at all three institutions does not address the use of multimedia for student learning. The interviewees for both Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University indicated that training focuses primarily on loading media into online courses, but not on the pedagogical uses of multimedia. The interviewee from Eastern Kentucky University suggested that the integration of multimedia into online courses can be an overwhelming experience for faculty.

**Staff/Faculty Interviews: Institutional Alignment**

In the staff/faculty interviews, interviewees were asked five questions related to the institutional alignment of training. The results of the interviews were grouped into two categories: contextual alignment and valuing faculty. The key findings from the interviews related to institutional alignment are presented below and the results of the interviews are shown in Tables 13 and 14.

**Institutional Alignment: Contextual Alignment**

In the interviews, questions 18, 19, and 20 addressed the contextual alignment of training. The results are presented in Table 13.
### Table 13

**Institutional Alignment: Contextual Alignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 18</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision and Mission</td>
<td>• “Not at all.”</td>
<td>• “No.”</td>
<td>• “Not specifically.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “When working with a faculty member in a one-on-one or group setting, very rarely does the why question come up. Why are we doing this?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Majority of faculty don’t know the institution’s vision or mission.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Perhaps though here is where they need to know this is where higher education is going would be of interest to faculty.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 19</td>
<td>• “Somewhat. Not really though. We address why we have interactions with an emphasis on community.”</td>
<td>• “Instructional designers and leaders don’t know what it is.”</td>
<td>• “Our training does reiterate what our concept is. Our model supports our concept here. Our concept is we are a community of learners committed to Christ to go out into the world. This in the faculty development training. The ID model”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 20 Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Not at all.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Need to talk about online learning in broad terms. Why online learning is important.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “This would be valuable to build into training only from 25,000 foot perspective. From a faculty mentality, this won’t mean a thing for them to hear that it is part of strategic plan.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The President and Provost cover this in staff meetings once a year in August, but this is not covered in training.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vision and Mission.

Question 18. How does training at your institution help faculty to understand the relationship between online learning and the institution’s vision and mission?

The staff/faculty interview results suggest that none of the three institutions provide training that addresses how each institution’s approach to online education relates to each institution’s vision and mission. The interviewee from Eastern Kentucky University indicated that faculty rarely ask why the institution offers online education. As well, most faculty do not know the institution’s vision and mission.

Distinctiveness.

Question 19. How does training at your institution help faculty to understand the relationship between online learning and the institution’s distinctiveness?

The staff/faculty interview results for Asbury University indicate that the institution addresses the purposes of interactions in the online environment for creating community. There was no evidence of training in this area from the interview results for Eastern Kentucky University. The interviewee for Eastern Kentucky University indicated that instructional designers do not know what is distinctive about the institution. For Spring Arbor University, the interviewee noted that training for faculty is connected to the institution’s pedagogical model for online education. Training on the distinctiveness of the institution is addressed in the institution’s online faculty development training...
course. As well, training in this area is reflected in the institution’s model for online course development through an emphasis on community.

**Strategic Plan.**

Question 20. How does training at your institution help faculty to understand the relationship between online learning and the institution’s strategic plan?

At all three institutions, the staff/faculty interviews resulted in no evidence of training on the relationship between online education and the institution’s strategic plan. The interviewee for Eastern Kentucky University noted that training in this area could be beneficial from the perspective of the importance of online learning, but that faculty would not be interested in how online education is related to the institution’s strategic plan. The interviewee for Spring Arbor University indicated that administrators at the institution address the University’s strategic plan in annual staff meetings, but that this is not a part of the institution’s training of online faculty.

**Institutional Alignment: Valuing Faculty**

Questions 21 and 22 addressed how each institution shows value to faculty for completing training. The results are presented in Table 14.
Table 14

*Institutional Alignment: Valuing Faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 21 Compensation/Recognition</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- “No compensation. No recognition. They are recognized by being paid as a part of their contract for teaching a course. But, compensation is not above and beyond what they would be paid for designing a course.”</td>
<td>- “No compensation.”</td>
<td>- “They are building steps into their overall merit plan. If you are face-to-face faculty and you start to teach online, you have to go through training. They have built it into the merit plan. You will get steps toward your merit for sabbatical and research. CCCU schools don’t pay their people the way that other schools do. You have to find other ways to incentivize them, to show you care. At one point, our faculty weren’t feeling the love.”</td>
<td>- “We have no compensation for adjuncts. They get the opportunity teach.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “There are two types of online environments. One where the program is put completely online and one where a course is put online. Anyone who creates or develops courses in completely online programs gets paid a stipend to create course. Then, when they teach it, they get paid. We will not pay or give a course release for training.”</td>
<td>- “The incentive for training is simply appealing to their desire to be better instructors.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “We may create an online teacher award with a plaque and money associated with it.”</td>
<td>- “In the future, they will get a certificate when they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
complete a series of courses.

- “Most of the Deans of the colleges pretty much insist that their faculty go get trained.”
- “I have a fundamental problem with paying people to become better instructors. They should pay us to teach them.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 22</th>
<th>Showing Value to Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The long-term goal is to get faculty experts at the institution to come and lead trainings. Don’t really have a way to compensate them or to show value for their expertise other than to ask them to do additional work. There is no public value shown.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We want to move to colleagues teaching other colleagues, taking ownership of training for online instruction.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We will show value through the merit plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“At some point they may get a badge.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compensation or Recognition for Completing Training.

Question 21. How does your institution compensate or recognize faculty for completing training?

The staff/faculty interview results for all three institutions indicate that there is no compensation or recognition given to faculty for completing training. The interviewees for Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University expressed opposition to the idea of compensating faculty for completing training. They indicated that faculty are rewarded for completing training by being given the opportunity to either develop or teach an online course. The interviewee for Eastern Kentucky University also noted that the motivation for faculty to complete training should be the desire to become better instructors. The results for both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University suggest that these institutions are considering ways to recognize faculty for completing training. Eastern Kentucky University may create an online teaching award. Spring Arbor University is developing a system in which full-time faculty earn steps toward the institution’s merit plan for completing training and teaching online courses. However, it does not appear that this recognition will come for completing training online, but also for teaching online.

Showing Value to Faculty for Completing Training.

Question 22. How does your institution show value to faculty for completing training?
The staff/faculty interview results indicate that the three institutions do not have mechanisms in place to show value to faculty for completing training. The interviewees for all three institutions indicated that building this into their institution’s approach to training is a goal for the future. The goal at Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University is to show value to faculty by offering them opportunities to lead trainings using the expertise they have gained through their own training. For Spring Arbor University, the institution intends to show value to faculty for completing training through its merit plan. As well, the institution may provide a badge to faculty as a way to show value for the training they have completed.

Institutional Archival Reviews

The institutional archival reviews were conducted to gather information on the model of online faculty training used at each institution. A review of each institution’s website was conducted to gather information on the elements of training present in the areas of training design, instructional design and pedagogy, and institutional alignment. In the institutional archival reviews, website content, including schedules, resources, text, files, and graphics, were reviewed and noted to identity evidence of training elements. The results for the institutional archival reviews represent data related to the presence of training essentials, the function of some training essentials within the overall training framework, and the purpose of training. The goal of the institutional archival reviews was to develop an understanding of the training model in use at each institution based on information
present on each institution’s website. The results of the institutional archival reviews for the three participating institutions are presented in a cross-case comparative format.

**Institutional Archival Reviews: Training Structure (Delivery Method, Delivery Interface, Schedule, and Content Progression)**

For the institutional archival reviews, each institution’s website was reviewed for information pertaining to training delivery method, training delivery interface, training schedule, and training content progression. The reviews consisted of an analysis of website pages and any publically available electronic resources housed on these pages, such as documents, videos, and external links. The key findings of the institutional archival reviews for each of the areas of training structure are presented below and the results of the reviews related to training structure are shown in Table 15.
### Table 15

**Training Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A training schedule offered to faculty provides an outline of available on-campus, classroom-based, face-to-face training sessions with hands-on instruction.</td>
<td>• Face-to-face consultations, workshops, and professional development sessions conducted by instructional designers and faculty members.</td>
<td>• Face-to-face consultations between instructional designers and subject matter experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The institution provides a link to a document which introduces the basic applications of a web-conferencing tool, Adobe Connect.</td>
<td>• Web-based, asynchronous instructional video recordings, instructional documents, and case studies.</td>
<td>• Web-based instructional videos and PDF documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The institution provides a link to an external website which hosts demonstrations on the use of Microsoft Office Applications.</td>
<td>• Web-based, collaborative, group-facilitated professional development course.</td>
<td>• OATmeals – The institution hosts classroom-based, interactive group lunches called OATmeals. OATmeals consist of a presentation by a faculty member or trainer. These trainings are not exclusive to concepts or skills pertaining to online education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Interface</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Face-to-face classroom</td>
<td>• Face-to-face consultations</td>
<td>• Scheduled, face-to-face, one-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trainings are offered in a group format delivered by a training facilitator.

- Formal, group hands-on training sessions are available.
- Individualized person-to-person training for specific tasks or projects is available.
- Some sessions are offered as open work sessions without a specific training focus.

- Consultations between instructional designers and individual faculty members.
- Face-to-face group consultations between instructional designers and academic departments.
- Face-to-face group training sessions, workshops, and professional development opportunities.
- Face-to-face consultations between instructional media technicians and individual faculty members.
- Web-based group professional development sessions between instructional designers and faculty members.
- Classroom-based training sessions that deal specifically with the technical use of the LMS are facilitated in a face-to-face group format.
- On-campus, classroom-based face-to-face trainings
- Consultations between instructional designers and
- Scheduled face-to-face, one-on-one consultations between a member of the instructional design team and online faculty course developers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Schedule</th>
<th>On-campus, classroom-based face-to-face trainings</th>
<th>Consultations between instructional designers and</th>
<th>Scheduled face-to-face, one-on-one consultations between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
are delivered weekly throughout the course of a regular semester. Spring semester training sessions run from mid-January to mid-May. Approximately two sessions are offered per week. Each session is scheduled for one hour. Sessions are offered on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays from 3:00-4:00pm.

- Individual faculty members are scheduled as needed.
- Consultations between instructional media technicians and individual faculty members are scheduled as needed.
- The institution offers a 100% online professional development session for online teaching faculty that is completed in 3 weeks. The professional development session is delivered in 8 modules. The schedule includes an optional web-conferencing meeting prior to the beginning of the online training. Modules 1-2 are completed in one week. Modules 3-5 are completed in one week. Modules 6-8 are completed in one week. An additional week is provided at the end of the session to allow faculty to complete unfinished instructional designers and faculty: Faculty who are developing an online course interact and consult with members of the instructional development team at least seven times during the course development process. The expected lead time for online course development is 14 weeks. The course development schedule begins once approval has been granted by the Office of Academic Technology or the office for online learning. Course development is based on the following schedule:
  - Project Start (1 week)
  - Project Analysis (5 weeks)
  - Course Design (2 weeks)
  - Course Development (4 weeks)
  - Testing (1 week)
  - Course Approval (1 week)

- OATmeals – Classroom-based interactive group lunches are offered once per month.
| Content Progression | The online professional development session is based upon the Quality Matters Standards for online course design. The training exhibits the following progression: Modules 1-2 (Week 1): Introduction to the Quality Matters Standards, establishing presence in online courses, provided access to resources in online courses, introduction to Universal Design. Modules 3-5 (Week 2): Measurable learning objectives and planning for alignment, assessment and measurement, instructional materials. Modules 6-8 (Week 3): Learner interaction and engagement, planning course technology, expectations of Quality Matters Standards. | The instructional design process follows the following progression: 1. Project Start 2. Analysis 3. Design 4. Development 5. Review/Testing 6. Approval |

- Some on-campus, face-to-face group trainings are described as “Advanced Topics.”
- One instructional topic on the training schedule, use of the institution’s web-conferencing system, has both introductory and advanced sessions.
**Delivery Method.** The results of the institutional archival reviews indicate that all three institutions employ a mixed-method approach to training delivery. The review of Asbury University’s website indicated that the University’s training includes group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings and access to web-based training resources. The review of Eastern Kentucky University’s website indicated that the University’s training includes face-to-face, one-on-one consultations between faculty members and instructional designers, face-to-face, group-facilitated trainings, access to web-based training materials, and a web-based group-facilitated faculty development training program. The review of Spring Arbor University’s website indicated that the University’s training includes face-to-face, one-on-one consultations between faculty members and instructional designers, face-to-face, group-facilitated trainings, and access to web-based training materials.

Based on the reviews, Asbury University did not have information on its website pertaining to any face-to-face training opportunities between faculty and training staff. In comparison, there was evidence that training at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University includes both face-to-face and web-based delivery methods. As well, Eastern Kentucky University was the only institution for which there was evidence of a web-based training course facilitated by a trainer.

All three institutions offer web-based training resources and materials accessible by links to documents, Microsoft PowerPoint presentations, or
video recordings. While Asbury University offered only one resource directly related to online education, Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University offered multiple resources related to online course development and instruction. Most of these training resources are video recordings and demonstrations. Though these resources are available, it is not clear whether faculty make use of these resources as a part of their training or whether they are required as a part of training.

Delivery Interface. Based on the results of the institutional archival reviews, there is evidence of a one-on-one, face-to-face delivery interface at all three institutions. At Asbury University and Spring Arbor University, one-on-one sessions occur between a faculty member and an instructional designer or trainer. At Eastern Kentucky University, one-on-one sessions include meetings between faculty and both instructional designers and media technicians.

There was no evidence of a group-facilitated, face-to-face training interface for Spring Arbor University, while this was apparent for both Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University. For both institutions, group-facilitated, face-to-face training is classroom-based. Eastern Kentucky University was the only institution for which there was evidence of group-facilitated, web-based training. The institution offers a group-facilitated, online training course.
**Training Schedule.** The results of the institutional archival reviews indicate that each institution emphasizes a different aspect of their training schedule on their websites. For Asbury University, information was present on the training schedule for group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings. These trainings are offered two times each week on weekdays from 3:00-4:00pm during the fall and spring semesters. For Eastern Kentucky University, information was present on the training schedule for the institution’s online professional development training course. The course consists of a 3 week training that is structured into 8 modules. For Spring Arbor University, information was present on the schedule for online course development. Course development is based on a 14 week model during which faculty interact with instructional design staff a minimum of 7 times during the development process. As well, the results for both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University referenced the scheduling of one-on-one, face-to-face training sessions, while this was no present in the results for Asbury University.

**Content Progression.** Based on the results of the institutional archival reviews, the websites for all three institutions contain information that exhibit some level of content progression. For Asbury University, progression of content is evident in the group-facilitated, face-to-face training sessions. The institution identifies the content of some training sessions as introductory and some as advanced. For Eastern Kentucky University, progression of content is evident in the description of the institution’s online professional
development course. The course begins with content described as introductory and progresses to more focused topics related to online course delivery. For Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University, evidence of content progression focuses on training for online instruction. For Spring Arbor University, content progression is evident in training for online course development.

**Institutional Archival Reviews: Instructional Design and Pedagogy**

For the institutional archival reviews, each institution’s website was reviewed for information pertaining to training on instructional design and pedagogy for online course design and online course teaching. The reviews consisted of an analysis of website pages and any publically available electronic resources housed on these pages, such as documents, videos, and external links. The key findings of the institutional archival reviews on training in instructional design and pedagogy are grouped into four categories: overall preparation in course design, teaching and facilitating, assessment and evaluation, and multimedia and interactivity. The results of the reviews are presented in Tables 16, 17, 18, and 19.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Overall Preparation for Course Design**

The results of the reviews related to overall preparation for course design are presented in Table 16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Course Organization</strong></td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• The institution has a webpage that outlines the pedagogical model for interactivity in online courses. The model reveals that every online course includes the following elements: context, content, reflection, dialog, collaboration, application, and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• During the design phase of the instructional design process, the instructional designer and the faculty member create an outline of the units of a course and discuss a plan for building assessments and integrating instructional media using the institution’s approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the LMS for Course Design

- Trainings are provided on the use of the learning management system in a group-facilitated, face-to-face training format.
- The institution provides a webpage that gives instructions on basic functionality and navigation within the learning management system.
- The institution offers an online training course for the LMS that provides basic instructions for customizing the LMS and introduces the main features of the LMS.
- The institution provides website links to internal course development template. They also discuss the sequencing of the major concepts in the course.
- During the development phase, the instructional designer and the subject matter expert place content into the online course, create assessments, and insert interactive elements.
- The institution has a training resource webpage for the following elements of the LMS: assessment strategies, blogs, editing content, discussion boards, global tools, the grade center, rubrics, syllabi, using groups, and wikis. Each of the webpages include a combination of training resources, such as video recordings of GoToMeeting training.
webpages that discuss the following topics related to the LMS, including: customizing courses, discussion boards, web accessibility, the gradebook, and creating tests.

- The institution offers classroom-based group training sessions on the basic uses of the LMS, including adding content, using email, using discussion boards and chat features, posting grades, and managing groups, discussion boards, and tests.

sessions, video trainings provided by Blackboard, and PDF guides and instructions.
**Training on Online Course Organization.** For Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University, the institutional archival reviews did not result in any information pertaining to training in the area of course organization. For Spring Arbor University, training on course organization was evident in two specific areas. One, the University employs a pedagogical model for creating interactions in online courses. This model establishes a standard for the types of interactions that occur in all online courses at the institution. Two, course organization is addressed in both the design and development phases of the instructional design process for course development.

**Training on the Use of the Learning Management System for Online Course Design.** There was evidence from the institutional archival reviews that all three institutions provide training on using an LMS for course design. Both Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University provide classroom-based, group-facilitated trainings on the use of the LMS. Both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University provide resources online that address learning management system functionality and features, including instructional documents, video recordings, and tutorials. Eastern Kentucky University was the only institution for which there was evidence of training on the use of the LMS embedded into an online training course.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Teaching and Facilitating**

The results of the reviews related to teaching and facilitating are presented in Table 17.
Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Teaching and Facilitating</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Interactions</td>
<td>Introductory and advanced training sessions on a web-conferencing tool are offered in a group training format. The introductory session deals with the basic functionality of the tool. This session emphasizes the use of the tool for enhancing communication and interaction in a course synchronously. The advanced session covers creating polls, using break-out sessions, and using reporting tools available within the web-conferencing software.</td>
<td>The institution provides links to external websites that discuss participation policies for online courses, structuring discussions for online courses, and maintaining student engagement in online courses.</td>
<td>Pedagogical Model for Interaction – The institution has a webpage which outlines its pedagogical model for interactivity in online courses. The model includes four major components: student to student, student to instructor, student to content, and student to Jesus Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>Blogs - The institution has a webpage with instructional resources on creating and using blogs within the LMS. The resources include a video recording of a GoToMeeting training session and PDF documents which provide an overview of blog types, how to create</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
blogs, how to edit blogs, and grading blogs.

- **Groups** - The institution has a webpage with instructional resources on using the Groups tool within the LMS. The resources include PDF documents which provide an overview of the Groups tool, how to create and edit groups, and group assignment grading.

- **Discussion Boards** - The institution has a webpage with instructional resources on creating and facilitating discussion board interactions within the LMS. The resources include a video recording of a GoToMeeting training session, a video tutorial provided by Blackboard, and PDF documents which provide an introduction to the benefits of discussion.
boards, grading, managing and facilitating discussion boards, creating special group discussions, creating threads, moderating discussion boards, and participating in discussion boards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providing Student Feedback</th>
<th>Not present.</th>
<th>Not present.</th>
<th>Not present.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the LMS for Teaching</td>
<td>Trainings are provided on the use of the learning management system in a group training format.</td>
<td>Not present.</td>
<td>The institution has a training resource webpage for the following elements of the LMS: assessment strategies, blogs, editing content, discussion boards, global tools, the grade center, rubrics, syllabi, using groups, and wikis. Each of the webpages include a combination of training resources such as video recordings of trainings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training on Facilitating Interactions in an Online Course. The institutional archival review results indicate that all three institutions provide some training or information on facilitating interactions in online courses. Asbury University offers group-facilitated, face-to-face training sessions on the use of a web-conferencing tool to facilitate interactions in online courses. There was no evidence that Eastern Kentucky University provides person-to-person training in this area, but the institution does provide a webpage with links to external websites which discuss facilitating interactions. Spring Arbor University provides several electronic training resources in this area. The institution provides video tutorials and instructional documentation on various tools within the learning management system that can be used to facilitate interactions. The review for Spring Arbor University also found that the institution has a pedagogical model which outlines the institution’s approach to the types of interactions that students experience in online courses.

Training on Providing Student Feedback in an Online Course. The institutional archival reviews results in no evidence of training at any of the institutions on providing student feedback in online courses.

Training on the Use of the Learning Management System for Online Course Teaching. The institutional archival review results for Asbury University indicate that the institution provides training on the learning management system in group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings. It is not clear
in the data whether this training covers the technical functions of the learning management system, pedagogical strategies related to the use of the learning management system, or both. The review of Eastern Kentucky University’s website did not result in any evidence of training on the use of the learning management system for instruction. Spring Arbor University provides a webpage with training resources on various aspects of the institution’s learning management system. The resource webpage training materials on some subjects that are pedagogically focused, such as assessment strategies, the use of rubrics, and discussion boards. Like Eastern Kentucky University, there was no evidence of training in this area for Spring Arbor University provided by training staff.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Assessment and Evaluation**

The results of the reviews related to assessment and evaluation are presented in Table 18.
Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Assessment and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubrics Tool - The institution has a webpage with instructional resources on creating and using rubrics within the LMS. The resources include a video recording of a GoToMeeting training session and video tutorials provided by Blackboard on creating rubrics, grading with rubrics, and associating a rubric with a gradable item. The page also includes PDF documents which discuss creating and grading with rubrics using the rubric tool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing Student Learning</th>
<th>Not present.</th>
<th>The institution provides a link to an external website that discusses classroom assessment techniques for online learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubrics Tool - The institution has a webpage with instructional resources on creating and using rubrics within the LMS. The resources include a video recording of a GoToMeeting training session and video tutorials provided by Blackboard on creating rubrics, grading with rubrics, and associating a rubric with a gradable item. The page also includes PDF documents which discuss creating and grading with rubrics using the rubric tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blackboard on creating rubrics, grading with rubrics, and associating a rubric with a gradable item. The page also includes PDF documents which discuss creating and grading with rubrics using the rubric tool.
Training on Creating Assessments for an Online Course. Evidence of training on creating assessments for online learning was not present on Asbury University’s website. The reviews found that the websites for both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University contained training resources on creating assessments. While Eastern Kentucky University provides only one link to an external website on the training topic, Spring Arbor University provides multiple training resources and video recordings on the use of tools for creating assessments within the learning management system. As well, for Spring Arbor University, training on creating assessments is embedded into the design phase of the online course development process. Spring Arbor University is the only institution for which there was evidence of training that connects faculty members with training staff on the subject.

Training on Building Evaluation Tools into an Online Course. The institutional archival reviews found no evidence of training on building evaluation tools for Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University. For Spring Arbor University, there was evidence that the institution provides some training resources on creating and using rubrics within the learning management system. These resources include video tutorials created by the platform provider and a video recording created by the University.

Training on Assessing Student Learning in an Online Course. For Asbury University, the institutional archival reviews resulted in no evidence of
training on assessing student learning related to online course instruction. Eastern Kentucky University was the only institution for which there was evidence of training on assessment techniques for online learning. The review of Eastern Kentucky University’s website found one webpage that provides a link to an external website that contains information on student learning assessment. Spring Arbor University provides training resources on using a rubrics tool within the institution’s learning management system. These resources include video tutorials and instructional documentation.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Multimedia and Interactivity**

The results of the reviews related to multimedia and interactivity are presented in Table 19.
### Table 19

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Multimedia and Interactivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Interactive Elements</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory and advanced training sessions on a web-conferencing tool are offered in a group training format. The introductory session deals with the basic functionality of the tool. This session emphasizes the use of the tool for enhancing communication and interaction in a course synchronously. The advanced session covers creating polls, using break-out sessions, and using reporting tools available within the web-conferencing software.</td>
<td>Adobe Connect – Instructional resources in video format on the synchronous uses of the tool, including: Examples of online instructors delivering lectures with Microsoft PowerPoint, online instructors delivering lectures with document share and voice over, online instructors holding virtual office hours with online students, student presentations, and online instructors providing video feedback on student assignments.</td>
<td>Blogs - The institution has a webpage with instructional resources on creating and using blogs within the LMS. The resources include a video recording of a GoToMeeting training session and PDF documents which provide an overview of blog types, how to create blogs, how to edit blogs, and grading blogs.</td>
<td>Groups - The institution has a webpage with instructional resources on using the Groups tool within the LMS. The resources include PDF documents which provide an overview of the Groups tool, how to create and edit groups, and group assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Skype in online classrooms, including YouTube videos that cover models for using Skype in online classes and web-based resources created by Skype on features of the software, recording a meeting in Skype, screen sharing in Skype, setting up a videoconference in Skype, and downloading Skype.

- **Google+** - The institution provides web-based instructional resources on the use of Google+ in online classrooms. These resources include:

- Links to YouTube videos that cover setting up a class using Google+ Hangouts and flipping group presentations with Google+ Hangouts.

- **Discussion Boards** - The institution has a webpage with instructional resources on creating and facilitating discussion board interactions within the LMS. The resources include a video recording of a GoToMeeting training session, a video tutorial provided by Blackboard, and PDF documents which provide an introduction to the benefits of discussion boards, grading, managing and facilitating discussion boards, creating special group discussions, creating threads, moderating discussion boards, and participating in discussion boards.

- **Open Educational Resources** – The institution has a webpage with training resources on
Integrating Multimedia

- Training sessions on the use of Camtasia are offered in a group training format.
- Trainings are provided on the use of Microsoft Office tools.
- Links to online training tools provided by Microsoft are made available to faculty.

- Video Production – The institution has an in-studio video production suite used by faculty to record lectures, experiments, speakers, documentaries, and other video-based footage. The institution provides links to examples of videos that have been recorded in the video production suite.
- Lecture Capture – The institution holds a license with Tegrity and provides

- During the design phase of the instructional design process, the instructional designer and the subject matter expert develop a plan for the inclusion of instructional media elements into the online course.
- During the development phase of the instructional design process, the instructional designer and the subject matter expert load instructional media elements into the online course.

- Setting up a Google+ Hangout.

- Finding and using Open Educational Resources. The webpage includes a link to a recording of a webinar on finding open resources, links to websites which host open textbooks, videos clips, and video lectures.
- The institution offers a lecture capture service provided by the Office of Academic Technology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using Multimedia for Learning</th>
<th>Training sessions on the use of Camtasia are offered in a group training format.</th>
<th>Video Production – The institution has an in-studio video production suite used by faculty to record lectures, experiments, speakers, documentaries, and other video-based footage. The course.</th>
<th>Wikis – The institution has a webpage with instructional resources on creating and using wikis within the LMS. The resources include a video recording of a GoToMeeting training.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trainings are provided on the use of Microsoft Office tools.</td>
<td>• The institution provides written instructions for uploading an audio file into the learning management system. The institution also recommends SoundCloud as a tool for recording and hosting lectures.</td>
<td>• The institution has webpages that provide training resources on the follow multimedia tools and technologies: Wikis, podcasts, eBooks, screencasting, YouTube, iTunesU, Google Scholar, Microsoft Office Applications, and Elluminate Live. These resources include video tutorials, GoToMeeting training session recordings, and how-to documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Links to online training</td>
<td>• Transcription – The institution offers a transcription service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>links to examples of classes recorded with the software. The institution also provides links to web-based documents that give instructions for how to record a lecture using Tegrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools Provided by Microsoft are Made Available to Faculty.</td>
<td>The Institution Provides Links to Examples of Videos That Have Been Recorded in the Video Production Suite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools provided by Microsoft are made available to faculty.</td>
<td>The pool of tools includes video creation tools such as lecture capture and podcast/online video, and wiki tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution provides links to examples of videos that have been recorded in the video production suite.</td>
<td>The institution holds a license with Tegrity and provides links to examples of classes recorded with the software. The institution also provides links to web-based documents that give instructions for how to record a lecture using Tegrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Capture – The institution holds a license with Tegrity and provides links to examples of classes recorded with the software. The institution also provides links to web-based documents that give instructions for how to record a lecture using Tegrity.</td>
<td>* Podcasts – A Microsoft PowerPoint presentation is provided on creating and using podcasts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Podcast/Netcast – The institution provides written instructions for uploading an audio file into the learning management system. The institution also recommends SoundCloud as a tool for recording and hosting lectures.</strong></td>
<td>Session and PDF documents which discuss the purpose of wikis, how to create wikis, how to comment in wikis, and grading wikis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training on Building Interactive Elements into an Online Course. The institutional archival reviews indicate that all three institutions provide some form of training on building interactive elements into online courses. For Asbury University, evidence of training in this area is present in the training schedule for group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings. The institution offers introductory and advanced level training sessions on the use of Adobe Connect, a web-conferencing tool. For Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University, evidence of training in this area consisted primarily of links to internal and external websites, video recordings, tutorials, and links to other training resources that address this training area. Most of the training resources for Eastern Kentucky University consisted of links to external websites or documents created by providers of various products and software. Spring Arbor University, however, offered video recorded training tutorials created by the University on the topic. As well, there was evidence that Spring Arbor University provides assistance to faculty specifically in the area of lecture capture.

Training on Integrating Multimedia into an Online Course. The institutional archival reviews found that all three institutions provide some form of training in the area of multimedia integration. Asbury University was the only institution for which there was evidence of training in this area between faculty and training staff. The University provides group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings on Camtasia, a screen recording software, and Microsoft
Office tools. Eastern Kentucky University was the only institution for which there was evidence that technology is available to faculty to create multimedia for online courses. The institution has a video production suite that faculty can use to produce various types of media. Both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University provide multiple training resources online. Both institutions provide tutorials, video recordings, and examples of multimedia integration. Spring Arbor University was the only institution for which there was evidence that multimedia integration is addressed specifically in the instructional design process for online course development. The institution addresses multimedia integration in both the design and development stages of the course development process.

**Training on Using Multimedia for Student Learning in an Online Course.**

The institutional archival review results indicate that all three institutions provide some form of training on using multimedia for student learning. At all three institutions though, the reviews found that training deals primarily with how to use various multimedia tools and not with the pedagogical approaches or strategies related to multimedia integration. Asbury University provides training on the use of Camtasia, a device that can be used for recording lectures. Eastern Kentucky University provides training resources on its website for lecture capture software and Podcasts. Spring Arbor University also provides training resources online on the use of Wikis and Podcasts. The only evidence of training in this area specifically from a
pedagogical perspective came from the reviews for Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University. Eastern Kentucky University provides links to recordings that show examples of how lecture capture software has been used by faculty at the institution. For Spring Arbor University, video tutorials discuss the purposes of Wikis in the online environment.

**Institutional Archival Reviews: Institutional Alignment**

For the institutional archival reviews, each institution’s website was reviewed for information pertaining to the institutional alignment of training. The reviews consisted of an analysis of website pages and any publicly available electronic resources housed on these pages, such as documents, videos, and external links. The key findings of the institutional archival reviews on the institutional alignment of training are grouped into two categories: contextual alignment and valuing faculty. The results of the reviews are presented in Tables 20 and 21.

**Institutional Alignment: Contextual Alignment**

The results of the reviews related to contextual alignment are presented in Table 20.
Table 20

**Institutional Alignment: Contextual Alignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision and Mission</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Pedagogical Model for Online Learning – The institution has a webpage which presents its model for student learning in online courses. The model is based upon the fostering of community through developing the following interactions: student to student, student to instructor, student to content, and student to Jesus Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vision and Mission. The institutional archival reviews did not result in evidence for how any of the three institutions align training to the institution’s vision and mission.

Distinctiveness. For Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University, the institutional archival reviews did not result in any evidence of training on the relationship between online education and the distinctiveness of the institution. For Spring Arbor University, the review found evidence of information related to the institution’s pedagogical model for online learning. The institution’s model emphasizes how community is experienced through four types of interactions in the online environment: student-to-student, student to instructor, student to content, and student to Jesus Christ.

Strategic Plan. The institutional archival reviews did not result in evidence for how any of the three institutions align training to the institution’s strategic plan.

Institutional Alignment: Valuing Faculty

The results of the reviews related overall preparation for course design are presented in Table 21.
Table 21

_Institutional Alignment: Valuing Faculty_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation/Recognition</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing Value to Faculty</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
<td>• Not present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compensation or Recognition for Completing Training.** The institutional archival reviews did not result in evidence for how any of the three institutions compensate or recognize faculty for completing training.

**Faculty Feel Valued for Completing Training.** The institutional archival reviews did not result in evidence for how any of the three institutions show value to faculty for completing training.

**Summary of Key Findings**

**Training Structure.**

**Delivery Method.** For Asbury University, the findings of the institutional archival review and the faculty/staff interview indicate that the University employs a mixed-method training delivery model. The delivery model includes web-based, self-directed trainings completed through the institution’s learning management system, group-facilitated training sessions delivered at the institution’s Wilmore, KY campus, and one-on-one facilitated trainings between a faculty member and a trainer. Based on the findings of the staff/faculty interview, though all three training experiences are available to
faculty, the one-on-one training sessions serve as the primary source of training for most faculty. A primary reason faculty typically request one-on-one training is that their training needs are often course specific. It appears that just-in-time training that relates to the unique needs of the faculty member is what most faculty prefer. This conclusion is supported by the open responses provided by participants in the faculty survey. Of the respondents, 6 of 13 indicated that they received the training they wanted or needed through one-on-one training sessions with a trainer.

It is also worth noting that Asbury University just recently began to require completion of its self-directed, web-based training program. Since the institution has been offering online degree programs for only approximately three years, it is likely that most faculty have not completed this aspect of training. As well, according to the staff/faculty interview, some online faculty never attend an on-campus, group-facilitated training session. This suggests that one-on-one, face-to-face training could be the only delivery method experienced by some faculty and that it is the primary means of delivery experienced by most faculty.

For Eastern Kentucky University, the findings of the institutional archival review and the faculty/staff interview indicate that the University employs a mixed-method approach to training delivery. The training for online faculty includes face-to-face, one-on-one consultations between faculty members and instructional designers, face-to-face, group-facilitated trainings,
access to web-based training materials, and a web-based group-facilitated faculty development training program. The results of the staff/faculty interview clearly indicate the majority of training is delivered face-to-face by intention. The institution emphasizes face-to-face training because it is easier for faculty to learn through this delivery format and because faculty needs are often course specific. The fact that three of the eight respondents to the open response question for this section of the survey specifically referenced help that they received in one-on-one, face-to-face consultations supports the conclusion that face-to-face is a primary means of training delivery.

Though Eastern Kentucky University offers a web-based faculty development training program, there is no evidence in the data that faculty are required to complete this program. As well, the staff/faculty interview results suggest that the institution is currently moving toward web-based delivery of training. It is also worth noting that 7 of 8 respondents to the open response question for this section of the survey indicated that they either received no training or that training was informal. This suggests that, currently, the web-based faculty development training program is not emphasized in the delivery of training.

For Spring Arbor University, the institutional archival review and the staff/faculty interview results indicate that the institution provides a mixed-method approach to training delivery. Training includes face-to-face consultations between faculty members and instructional designers, a web-
based, group-facilitated training course, and access to web-based training materials. The institution’s approach to training emphasizes a combination of face-to-face and web-based facilitated training experiences. The web-based, group-facilitated training course is required for all online faculty and six of the eighteen respondents to the open response question for this section of the survey made reference to their participation in the course. The results of the staff/faculty survey suggest that most faculty have some face-to-face training experience with instructional designers as a part of the overall training process. It seems that training is intentionally designed to expose faculty to both types of training delivery.

Both the institutional archival review and the staff/faculty survey results indicate that the institution offers multiple web-based training materials and resources. Most of these training resources are video recordings. Though these resources are available, it is not clear whether faculty make use of these resources as a part of their training. It is worth noting that none of the eighteen respondents to the open response survey question made reference to these training materials.

All three institutions employ a mixed-method approach to the delivery of training for online faculty. A significant part of the training experience at all three institutions is delivered face-to-face and all three data points, the institutional archival review, the staff/faculty interview, and the faculty survey, emphasize the importance of face-to-face training in the preparation of
faculty. One of the common themes that the data supports is that face-to-face training, particularly one-on-one face-to-face training, is what faculty prefer to meet their course specific training needs.

Though all three institutions fell below the established benchmark in one or more areas of the faculty survey component for training delivery method, the survey results were similar across the institutions. 69% or more of faculty at all three institutions indicated that they Strongly Agree or Agree that the training delivery method at their institution is effective and that it meets their needs. This seems to suggest that how training is delivered at all three institutions is working for most faculty teaching online. The highest percentages of faculty who provided Strongly Agree or Agree responses were from Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University faculty. This could be attributed to the fact that these institutions offer a web-based, group-facilitated training course and that the instructional designers at both institutions take a more active role in the actual design work of online course development than at Asbury University.

Spring Arbor University had the highest mean scores on both survey questions (2.94 and 3.15) related to training delivery and the highest percentage (90%) of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses to the question on whether training meets the needs of faculty. This difference could be attributed to the fact that training seems to represent a more balanced delivery approach. As well, Spring Arbor University is the only university for
which the data clearly indicates that a web-based, group-facilitated training course is required for faculty.

**Delivery Interface.** For Asbury University, the findings of the institutional archival review and the staff/faculty interview indicate that training involves different types of interfaces. The institution offers an online training package that is self-directed. This self-directed training is web-based and may be completed anywhere with an Internet connection and access credentials to the institution’s learning management system. The institution also provides classroom-based, group-facilitated face-to-face training sessions. These training sessions are delivered by one or more training providers. Online faculty also interface with training through one-on-one, face-to-face training experiences with a training provider at the institution. These training experiences are unstructured and typically focus on a training need that is course specific or unique to the individual faculty member.

Based on the results of the staff/faculty interview and the faculty survey, it seems that one-on-one facilitated training is the most prevalent way faculty interface with training. According to the staff/faculty interview, one-on-one, face-to-face training is what faculty seek out. As well, participation in the face-to-face, group-facilitated trainings is sparse and inconsistent. The institution began offering the web-based, self-directed training package in 2013, two years after the launch of the first online degree program. This suggests that faculty choose this interface type either by choice or necessity.
Five of the thirteen respondents to the open response survey question for Training Design made specific references to the one-on-one training they received.

For Eastern Kentucky University, the institutional archival review and the staff/faculty interview indicate that the training interface includes self-directed, one-on-one, and group-facilitated training. Self-directed training consists of web-based training resources presented in various media formats, including videos, electronic documents, and links to external websites that provide information on various training topics. Group-facilitated trainings occur in both face-to-face and web-based environments. Face-to-face trainings include one-on-one trainings between an instructional designer and a faculty member and group trainings conducted by an instructional designer with individual departments. The staff/faculty interview results show that one-on-one and group-facilitated trainings in a face-to-face settings are, by the intention of the department that oversees training, the primary means by which faculty interface with training.

It is not clear in the data what faculty participation looks like for the web-based, group-facilitated training course. It is worth noting that six of the nine respondents to the open response survey question on Training Design indicated that they either received no training or no structured training. This could suggest that the web-based course did not yet exist when some faculty received training, faculty may be unaware that the web-based course exists, or
that the web-based course was not required at the time a faculty member was trained. One-on-one and group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings may also be the primary means of training interface because some faculty choose not to participate in the web-based training course.

The institutional archival review revealed that the institution offers multiple self-directed training resources that can be accessed online and that cover a wide range of online course development and design topics and issues. It is not clear in the data though whether faculty use these web-based, self-directed training resources provided on the institution’s website. No respondents to any of the open response survey questions referenced these resources as a part of their training experience.

For Spring Arbor University, the institutional archival review and the staff/faculty interview indicate that the training interface includes self-directed, one-on-one, and group-facilitated training. Self-directed training consists of web-based training resources presented in various media formats, including GoToMeeting training recordings, videos, electronic documents, and links to external websites that provide information on various training topics. Group-facilitated training is provided through a web-based training course. Face-to-face trainings include one-on-one trainings between an instructional designer and a faculty member.

The results the institutional archival review highlight the emphasis at the institution on instructional designers interfacing one-on-one with faculty.
The staff/faculty interview results suggest that most of these meetings occur in a face-to-face format, though some occur by phone or through the use of a web-based application. The staff/faculty interview results also indicate that all online faculty are required to complete a web-based, group facilitated training course. The data seems to indicate that training is built upon a design that requires faculty to interface with trainers in both one-on-one and group-facilitated formats. This does not suggest that all faculty experience both types of training interfaces. The results of the open response question on the faculty survey suggest that some online faculty either did not participate in the web-based, group-facilitated training, the face-to-face training, or both.

The institutional archival review revealed that the institution offers several web-based training materials and resources presented primarily as video recordings. These training resources do not require contact with a live person. Though they are available to all online faculty, it is not clear in the research whether and to what degree faculty use these web-based training resources.

Training at all three institutions involves self-directed, one-on-one, and group-facilitated interfaces. All three institutions scored at or above the established benchmark in one of the survey questions on training interface and just below the benchmark on one of the questions. 71% or more of respondents at all three institutions indicated that they Strongly Agree or Agree that the training interface is both effective and that it meets their needs.
The data seems to indicate that how faculty interface with training at each institution is effective for and meets the needs of most faculty.

Related to training interface, it is worth noting the difference in the one-on-one training experience for faculty at the three institutions. In terms of online course development, faculty at Asbury University are responsible for both content development and course design. One-on-one training is purposed to prepare faculty to design and teach their online courses. At Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University, one-on-one training typically occurs between a faculty member and an instruction designer. The instructional designers at these institutions are responsible for loading content provided by faculty and overseeing course design. This difference could relate to why Asbury University had the highest mean score on the effectiveness of the training interface. One-on-one training at Asbury University may be more effective because it focuses on training for both course development and instruction. This difference may also relate to why both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University scored higher on the surveys on whether the training interface meets the needs of faculty. It is possible that faculty need more assistance with course design and the technical aspects of loading content.

Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University had higher mean scores than Asbury University on whether the training interface meets the needs of faculty and both institutions had 16% more faculty indicated that
they Strongly Agree or Agree that the training interface meets their needs. A training interface employed at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University that is not present in the training experience at Asbury University is group-facilitated, web-based training. Both institutions offer a web-based course for online faculty. It is possible that this training interface meets the needs of more faculty. It is not clear though whether it is the interface itself or the training courses provided that resulted in higher scores.

**Schedule.** For Asbury University, the self-directed, pre-packaged training operates by no specific schedule regarding when this training is completed in the training experience for an online faculty member. According to the staff/faculty interview results, the institution does not prevent faculty from moving forward with online course development or instruction if they have not completed the self-directed training. Though the institution does not monitor use of the pre-packaged training, the progress of a participant can be monitored within the learning management system. The first module in the self-directed training takes between ten and fifteen hours to complete.

The institution provides scheduled, classroom-based group-facilitated trainings. During the fall and spring terms of each academic year, the institution offers between 25-30 scheduled training sessions. These sessions occur during the months of August to December and January to May. There are no scheduled sessions offered during the summer term months of June and July. All training sessions last 60 minutes and are offered from 3:00 pm to
4:00 pm on weekdays, Monday through Thursday. Participation in these group-facilitated trainings is voluntary.

All one-on-one, face-to-face trainings between a trainer and faculty member are scheduled at the request and convenience of the faculty member. The duration of these training sessions is dependent upon the nature of the training and the experience level of the faculty member with online course design and instruction. According to the results of the staff/faculty interview, the duration of one-on-one training sessions ranges from one to three hours.

For Eastern Kentucky University, regarding the face-to-face consultations between faculty and instructional designers or media technicians, it is not clear from the institutional archival review of the staff/faculty interview whether or how these sessions are scheduled. One respondent to the open response survey question on training design referenced having “informal” meetings with an instructional designer and another respondent referenced having “unstructured, unscheduled access” to a trainer. This may suggest that the one-on-one sessions are either scheduled between the faculty member and the instructional designer or that faculty have unscheduled access to training with an instructional designer.

The staff/faculty interview results suggest that faculty are provided opportunities to participate in regularly scheduled group training sessions in a classroom-based format. These trainings occur in 60 to 90 minute sessions and are offered one to two times per week. Information regarding the
scheduling of these training sessions was not present on the institution’s website. The staff/faculty interview results also indicated that these sessions are sometimes offered to specific academic departments. It is not clear in the data what specific time of the day these group training sessions are offered.

The institution also offers a three-week online professional development training course. The training course is structured into eight modules and one or more modules are completed during each week of the course. Additional time at the end of the course is provided to faculty who may need to complete some components of the course.

For Spring Arbor University, the institutional archival review results indicate that the institution operates by a fourteen-week timeframe for online course development. During this timeframe, course development flows through several stages, including project approval, project analysis, course design, course development, testing, and course approval. The course development schedule commences once all approvals have been received for the development of a course. The data seems to suggest that the course development protocol drives the scheduling of consultations between faculty and instructional designers specifically for the purpose of course development.

The institution also offers a three-week online faculty development training course. It is not clear in the data when or how often this course is offered to faculty. According to the staff/faculty interview results, this course is required before a faculty member teaches a course online.
According to the faculty survey results, Spring Arbor University was the only institution to score at or above the benchmark in the effectiveness of training and that it meets the needs of faculty. As well, the highest percentage of respondents from Spring Arbor University indicated that they Strongly Agree or Agree that the training schedule is effective and meets their needs. These results may be related to the structure and duration of the institution’s online course development protocol. Spring Arbor University is the only institution of the three for which training sessions between online faculty and instructional designers or trainers are scheduled based upon a prescribed development plan.

Asbury University scored the lowest on the survey in terms of the effectiveness of the training schedule and whether it meets the needs of faculty and had the lowest percentage of faculty to indicate that they Strongly Agree or Agree that the training schedule is effective and that it meets their needs. Compared to the other institutions, this difference could be related to the fact that both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University offer a group-facilitated online faculty training course, while Asbury University does not offer such a course. Two of the respondents from Asbury University to the open response survey question on training design indicated that the timing of the training sessions was inconvenient. Since all of Asbury University’s training sessions are offered on weekdays during the 3:00 pm to 4:00 pm, timeframe, it could be that faculty are unable to attend these sessions
because of schedule conflicts. It seems that the web-based delivery of scheduled trainings provides a scheduling format that aligns better with the scheduling needs of faculty.

It is worth noting that, based on the results of the staff/faculty interview with Asbury University, some online instructors are not assigned to teach online courses until two weeks before the start of a course. As well, sometimes instructional designers are unaware when a faculty member has been assigned to teach an online course. The short timeframe between when an instructor is assigned to teach a course and the scheduled start date of a course and the lack of communication regarding who is teaching some courses may contribute Asbury University faculty perceptions about the effectiveness of the training schedule and how it meets their needs.

**Content Progression.** For Asbury University, there is a progression of content built into self-directed training package. The first module provides an introductory overview of the learning management system and covers basics of online course facilitation. The data does not specifically address what training concepts or skills are covered beyond module one of the self-directed training course. The interviewee for the staff/faculty interview indicated that they were unaware whether any faculty members have actually completed the first module in its entirety.

The group-facilitated trainings cover several topics and skills for online course development and instruction that the interviewee for the
staff/faculty interview described as a combination of beginner, intermediate, and advanced trainings. Based on the data, there is does not seem to be a structured progression of content built into these trainings. Participation in the group-facilitated trainings is optional and, according the staff/faculty interview, only a small number of faculty participate in the advanced trainings.

There is no prescriptive, structured progression of content built into the one-on-one facilitated trainings. The content of these sessions is determined entirely by the unique needs and interests of the faculty member. Faculty members who have no experience using the institution’s learning management system or who have no knowledge or minimal knowledge of online course design or instruction may participate in multiple, one-on-one training sessions that demonstrate some progressions in training content. Some faculty do not request any one-on-one training sessions in the course of their experience designing or preparing to deliver online courses.

For Eastern Kentucky University, the institutional archival review indicated that the online professional development course follows a structured progression of content and skills related to online course instruction. The first module of the online training course introduces the role of the faculty member in an online course, Universal Design, and the standards for online instruction. The second module covers learning objectives, assessment of student learning,
and instructional materials. The third module covers interactions in the online environment and technology integration.

According to the staff/faculty interview, group-facilitated trainings that are delivered face-to-face are scaffolded with a progression from beginner, to intermediate, to advanced training. Trainings at the beginner level introduce online teaching. Trainings at the intermediate level focus on the integration of technology and the use of multimedia. Advanced level trainings cover the alignment of objectives and assessments, backward design, and the flipped classroom.

It is not clear in the data whether the one-on-one consultations between faculty members and instructional designers follow a standardized progression of content. The specific purpose of these interactions is for online course development. The staff/faculty interview results suggest that instructional designers review with faculty what a typical online course looks like and how online course content is organized in a modular format. It is possible that some of these interactions involve a progression of content as faculty work with instructional designers to develop courses from the start of course development to the completion of development.

Based on the results of the institutional archival review and the staff/faculty interview for Spring Arbor University, the one-on-one course development consultations between faculty members and instructional designers follow a structured progression. The progression is related
specifically to the course development process. It is not clear in the data though whether any training that occurs in these consultations follows a progression of content. It seems that the progression is based more on a process for developing a course than for training a faculty member. However, the staff/faculty interview results suggest that part of the course development process is instructional designers showing faculty examples of various development topics, such as syllabus construction and rubrics. Some progression of training content may exist in that faculty are shown models prior to developing their own courses.

The results of the staff/faculty interview indicate that the online professional development training course follows a progression of content. The first part of the online training introduces the faculty member to online teaching, the institution’s expectations for online instruction, and the institution’s online learning model. The next level of training covers different approaches to online education.

In the faculty surveys, all three institutions scored below the benchmark on both effectiveness and meeting faculty needs for content progression in the design of training. On the survey, 20% or more of the respondents at the three institutions indicated that they Disagree or Strongly Disagree that the training progression is effective and that it meets their needs. It is not clear in the data whether one institution’s approach to training content progression working better for faculty than at the other two institutions.
Responses to the open response survey question on training design may provide some clarity on faculty perceptions regarding the effectiveness of training content progression and whether it meets their needs. For Asbury University, of the 13 respondents to this question, one survey participant indicated they were not aware of any scheduling training, one indicated that training did not address how to teach online, one indicated they could not attend trainings because of their personal schedule, one indicated that training was haphazard and did not follow a clear progression, and one indicated that they did not know what they needed to learn beyond a basic level. For Eastern Kentucky University, three of the eight respondents indicated that they were not trained, one indicated they were unaware of a training program, one indicated that training was optional, and three indicated that training was informal. For Spring Arbor University, one of the eighteen respondents indicated that they were not trained, one indicated that training was too short and they felt underprepared, one indicated that training has improved since they started teaching online, one indicated that training did not include detailed information that they needed, one indicated that training focused only on the process, one described the training as baseline, one indicated that training is not thorough, and one indicated that they were told to do anything they wanted in their course.

The open response question results above seem to suggest that some faculty at the three institutions are not exposed to a progression of training
content and some are not trained at all. As well, it appears that the training for some faculty is entirely informal. Training for online faculty at all three institutions contains elements that could be categorized in a tiered progression, but it does not seem that all faculty training is being intentionally driven by a structure training progression.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy.**

**Overall Preparation for Course Design: Online Course Organization.** For Asbury University, the institutional archival review did not result in any evidence of training on course organization. The staff/faculty interview results indicate that course organization is addressed in the assistance that trainers provide faculty in helping them set up their courses. As well, the institution’s online course template provides standardization to how elements of all courses are organized. It appears that faculty are responsible for loading content into the course template.

For Eastern Kentucky University, the institutional archival review did not result in any evidence of training on course organization. The staff/faculty interview results suggest that course organization is covered to some degree in one-on-one consultations between faculty and an instructional designer. Instructional designers show faculty what a typical online course looks like and how their content can be organized into a modular format.

For Spring Arbor University, the institutional archival review revealed that the institution uses a structured course development model to guide
course organization. The model standardizes the organization for all online courses at the institution. Faculty meet one-on-one with instructional designers to determine how their online course content should be organized in a course based on the templates and course outlines used by the institution. During the course development process, instructional designers discuss the sequencing of content within courses and faculty are given feedback about how the content of their courses aligns with the institution’s standardized templates and course outlines.

For both Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University, it seems that the task of organizing a course in the process of online course design is managed by the instructional design staff. For Asbury University faculty, it appears that faculty learn how to organize a course through interactions with trainers and then faculty are responsible for the work of organizing their courses. Spring Arbor University, which uses a model for course development that appears more prescriptive than the other two institutions, had the lowest mean score on the faculty survey and the least percentage of faculty to indicate that they Strongly Agree or Agree that the training is effective in this area. It is possible that the more responsibility for organizing online courses that is placed on an instructional designer the less effective faculty perceive training to be in this area.

**Overall Preparation for Course Design: Using the Learning Management System for Course Design.** While Eastern Kentucky University and Spring
Arbor University emphasize training on the use of the learning management system for course design in one-on-one trainings between faculty and instructional designers, Asbury University integrates training in this area into three training spaces, a self-directed training course, group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings, and one-on-one training sessions between faculty and training staff. It is possible that faculty perceive this approach to training as being more effective because of the different opportunities for training provided in these formats. It is also possible that, while the instructional designers at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University provide direct support in this area, faculty at these institutions perceive that they are underprepared to use the learning management system for course design.

**Teaching and Facilitating: Facilitating Interactions in Online Courses.**

The fact that Spring Arbor University has a pedagogical model that serves as the basis for interactivity in online courses may speak to why the University scored the highest on the faculty survey and had the highest percentage of faculty to indicate that training is effective in this area. This is a training feature that was unique to Spring Arbor University. As well, it is possible that delivering training on facilitating interactions in online courses in an online environment, such as Spring Arbor University’s online faculty development course, may provide a more effective environment for training faculty in this area. Training in an interactive online environment may provide a better context for learning how to facilitate interactions in online courses.
Though the interviewee from Eastern Kentucky University indicated that training in this area is a focus of the institution, 40% of respondents to the survey indicated that they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree that training is effective in this area. The institution provides two different delivery interfaces for this training, one-on-one and group-facilitated. It is not clear in the data whether faculty perceive training to be ineffective because of how training on facilitating interactions is delivered or what training is provided to faculty in this area.

**Teaching and Facilitating: Providing Student Feedback in Online Courses.**

The fact that training at Spring Arbor University addresses instructional strategies related to providing student feedback in online courses may speak to why the University scored the highest on the faculty survey and had the highest percentage of faculty to indicate that training is effective in this area. This is a training feature that was unique to Spring Arbor University. Spring Arbor University was the only institution for which there was evidence of training on providing student feedback from a pedagogical perspective. Though the interviewee from Eastern Kentucky University indicated that training in this area is a focus of the institution, 44% of respondents to the survey indicated that they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree that training is effective in this area. Since the institution provides training in this area in a group-facilitated, face-to-face format, it is possible that this method of delivery is ineffective for training faculty in this area. It is also possible that
some faculty do not participate in these trainings. It is not clear in the data though whether faculty perceive training to be ineffective because of how training on providing student feedback is delivered or what training is provided to faculty in this area.

_Teaching and Facilitating: Using the Learning Management System for Online Course Teaching._ Training on the use of the learning management system for instruction is an area in need of improvement at all three institutions. A third or more of all participants on the faculty survey indicated that training is ineffective in this area. Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University provide no training specifically on the use of the learning management system from a pedagogical perspective, which explains why training needs to improve at these institutions. Even though the results for Spring Arbor University indicate that training in this area is incorporated into the institution’s online faculty training course, 41% of participants on the faculty survey indicated that training is ineffective in this area. It is not clear in the data whether the institution is deficient in this area, from the perspective of faculty, because of the type or extent of training provided to faculty. For all three institutions, it is clear that faculty need more training in this area.

_Assessment and Evaluation: Creating Assessments in Online Courses._ This appears to be an aspect of training that needs to be addressed at all three institutions. On the surveys, 36% or more of participants from all three institutions either disagreed or strongly disagreed that training is effective in
this area. Based on the results of the institutional archival review and the staff/faculty interview, Spring Arbor University is the only institution that provides formal training in this area with the construction of formative and summative assessment plans in the course development process. This could explain why Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score on the faculty survey for this question. Addressing this aspect of online course design only informally, such as the approach that Asbury University takes on training in this area, appears to be the least effective approach from the perspective of faculty.

*Assessment and Evaluation: Building Evaluation Tools in Online Courses.*

It is not clear in the data why Eastern Kentucky University scored higher than Asbury University and Spring Arbor University since all three institutions appear to employ a similar approach to training in this area. Since Asbury University was the only institution for there was evidence of structured training in this area, the data may suggest that group-facilitated, face-to-face training is a less effective method of delivering training in this area. The staff/faculty interview results for Asbury University indicated that few faculty participate in these training sessions.

*Assessment and Evaluation: Assessing Student Learning in Online Courses.* The fact that Spring Arbor University scored the highest on the faculty survey and had the highest percentage of faculty to respond with Strongly Agree or Agree responses on the effectiveness of training on
assessing student learning can be attributed to the training in this area that is built into the institution’s online faculty training course. Asbury University does not provide specific training in this area and training at Eastern Kentucky University is informal. On the fact that Spring Arbor University scored the highest on the faculty survey, it is not clear in the data whether it is how Spring Arbor University trains faculty in this area or that the institution provides some training in this area. It is worth noting that Spring Arbor University was the only institutions for which there was evidence of specific training on the purpose of assessment and evaluation in online courses and that 70% of respondents on the faculty survey indicated that they Strongly Agree or Agree that training is effective.

Multimedia and Interactivity: Building Interactive Elements into Online Courses. Though the survey results for Eastern Kentucky University were not much better than for Asbury University and Spring Arbor University, the fact that Eastern Kentucky University scored higher on the survey could be attributed to the institution’s emphasis on both how to build interactive elements into courses and the purpose of interactive elements in courses. The fact that Spring Arbor University had the lowest mean score for this question and the lowest percentage of faculty provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses could be attributed to the fact that, based on the data, the instructional design staff has the primary responsibility for building interactive elements into courses that are being developed for online learning.
It is also worth noting that the presence of multiple electronic training resources on the websites of Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University appears to have had little impact on the survey results.

**Multimedia and Interactivity: Integrating Multimedia into Online Courses.**

Since Asbury University was the only institution for which there was evidence that training on multimedia integration is delivered in a group-facilitated, face-to-face format, the fact that the University scored the highest on the faculty survey could indicate that this delivery method is more effective for training in this area than how training is delivered at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University. Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University rely on media designers and technicians to support faculty in this area. Even though assistance is provided to faculty in this area, half or more of faculty survey respondents indicated that training is deficient in this area. For all three institutions, this is an area of training that needs to be addressed.

**Multimedia and Interactivity: Using Multimedia for Student Learning in Online Courses.** Training on the use of multimedia for student learning is an area in need of improvement at all three institutions. The results from the institutional archival reviews and the staff/faculty interviews indicate that training in this area is either absent or limited to the use of specific media generating tools and software. At none of the institutions is there clear
evidence of an intentional approach to integrate training in this area into the preparation of faculty to teach online.

Institutional Alignment.

Contextual Alignment: Vision and Mission. Based on the results of the institutional archival reviews and the staff/faculty interviews, all three institutions need to improve on training regarding how online education is related to institutional vision and mission. The faculty survey results for Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University support this conclusion. For Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University, 59% or more of respondents indicated that they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree that training is effective in this area. Though 70% of respondents on the faculty survey for Spring Arbor University indicated that training is effective, it is not clear in the results of the institutional archival review and the staff/faculty interview how or what training the institution is providing in this area that would have produced these results.

Contextual Alignment: Distinctiveness. The faculty survey results for Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University speak to the fact that training on the relationship between online learning and institutional distinctiveness is either absent or minimal at these institutions. The deficiency of training in this area is evident in the Disagree or Strongly Disagree responses provided by 60% or more of faculty at Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University. Spring Arbor University addresses this aspect
of training in the institution’s online faculty training course and in the design of the institution’s online course development model. It is apparent that Spring Arbor University is addressing this aspect of training as a part of its effort to teach faculty about the institution’s pedagogical model for online learning.

Contextual Alignment: Strategic Plan. The institutional archival reviews and staff/faculty interviews resulted in no evidence of any training at the three institutions on the relationship between the institution’s approach to online education and the institution’s strategic plan. There is a correlation between the absence of training in this area and the results of the faculty surveys. On the surveys, 49% or more of respondents indicated that they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree that training is effective in this area. This is an area in which training needs to improve at all three institutions.

Valuing Faculty: Compensation or Recognition of Faculty for Completing Training. None of the three institutions provide compensation or recognition to faculty for completing training for online course development or instruction. On the surveys, 59% or more of faculty at all three institutions indicated that compensation or recognition for completing training is inadequate. This is an area that needs to be addressed at all three institutions. Since there was no evidence of compensation or recognition for completing training, the fact that some of the respondents to the faculty survey indicated that they either Strongly Agree or Agree that compensation or recognition for
completing training is adequate may be related to faculty perceptions about compensation for developing or teaching courses at their respective institutions.

**Valuing Faculty: Showing Value to Faculty for Completing Training.** The data from the institutional archival reviews, the staff/faculty interviews, and the faculty surveys suggest that showing value to faculty for completing training is an area that needs to improve at all three institutions. On the surveys, 48% or more of respondents indicated that they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree that faculty feel valued for completing training. With no evidence that Spring Arbor University employs specific ways to show value to faculty for completing training, it is not clear why 52% of respondents indicated that faculty feel valued for completing training.

**Summary of Chapter Four**

The results of the faculty surveys, staff/faculty interviews, and institutional archival reviews on the online faculty training models at the three participating institutions were presented in this chapter. In Chapter Five, these results will be discussed for the purpose of making recommendations for the most effective model for training online faculty. The findings will be presented to the Asbury University President’s Cabinet as a recommendation for how to design online faculty training at Asbury University.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this Capstone Project was to determine the most effective model for the preparation of online teaching faculty at Asbury University. In Chapter Four, the results of the institutional archival reviews, staff/faculty interviews, and faculty surveys were compared to determine how Asbury University, Eastern Kentucky University, and Spring Arbor University train online teaching faculty and whether the training models at these institutions are effective for preparing online teaching faculty. In this chapter, the results from Chapter Four will be discussed for the purpose of articulating a model of training for Asbury University that addresses each of the essential elements of training for online faculty.

**Qualitative Protocol: Training Structure**

Regarding training delivery and interface, it appears that most faculty prefer some form of one-on-one, face-to-face training. The primary reason for this preference is the benefits associated with direct access to a trainer who can adapt training to meet the specific needs of faculty. Another reason for this preference relates to the potential that face-to-face training creates for establishing an interpersonal connection between faculty and the training staff. All three institutions provide one-on-one, face-to-face training to faculty and this appears to be the most effective delivery method and interface for training and what meets the needs of most faculty.
Group-facilitated training can be effective when it is delivered in a web-based environment. Face-to-face, group-facilitated trainings meet the needs of fewer faculty because of the demands of their life and work schedules. Group-facilitated training courses delivered online, such as those provided by Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University, can be completed by faculty anytime and anywhere.

The schedule for training should be structured to allow sufficient time for faculty to receive adequate training to prepare them for online course development or instruction. When faculty enter the training process too close to a deadline for course development completion or delivery, they are limited to the amount of training they can receive with the time available to them. Spring Arbor University operates on an ideal model for the scheduling of training for online course development. The University uses a highly-structured, 14 week course development model that appears to provide faculty with sufficient time to receiving the training and support they need.

Some aspects of training structure may be intentionally ill-structured, such as one-on-one, face-to-face trainings between faculty and instructional designers or trainers. The flexibility of when these sessions are scheduled allows faculty to work training into their life and work schedules. This makes the training process more convenient for faculty. However, consistent communication needs to be maintained between faculty and training staff when faculty are assigned to develop or teach an online course. If one-on-one, face-to-face training provides the most effective means
of training delivery and interface, then it is important that every faculty member has contact with a trainer or instructional designer. The fact that some faculty indicated on the survey that they received no training or that they were unaware of training opportunities represents a gap in communication related to training.

In terms of training content progression, structured, web-based training courses seem to provide the most effective way to scaffold training content. Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University provide an online training course that exhibits a progression of content and these institutions scored better than Asbury University on the faculty survey. It is possible that their training model, which includes a structured, pre-designed online training course, provides a more effective platform for content progression than Asbury University’s model, which relies heavily on one-on-one, face-to-face training.

In terms of on-going training, training content progression was an area of need for improvement at all three institutions. Though training at each of the institutions included some level of progression of content, it does not appear that any of the institutions have a plan for on-going training for faculty beyond the initial training they might receive for online course development or instruction. Even after faculty develop or teach an online course, it is important that they continue to receive training in online education so that they can improve their knowledge and skills in this area.

**Training Structure Recommendations for Asbury University.**

**Delivery Method.** The results from Chapter Four indicate that a mixed-method approach to the delivery of training can provide an effective model for
preparing online faculty. Training that is delivered in both face-to-face and web-based formats meets the unique training needs of faculty and provides more opportunities for faculty to engage training staff, content, and resources. Every faculty member has his/her own work and life schedules. As well, online courses that faculty develop or teach may operate on different schedules, due dates, and start dates. Considering the complexity created by the different needs of individual faculty members and the dynamics of institutional scheduling, training that is delivered in multiple formats enhances accessibility.

Face-to-face training was the most prevalent method for delivering training at the three institutions. Faculty perceive training that is delivered face-to-face to be effective and to meet their needs and they respond positively to the assistance they receive from trainers and instructional designers in this setting. Face-to-face training is a method of training delivery emphasized at Asbury University. The University should continue to make this method for delivering training a part of the training experience for faculty.

An area in which the University needs to enhance its training opportunities for faculty is the delivery of web-based training. The institution offers a web-based, self-directed training course, but there is little intentionality or structure in terms of the role and purpose of this course in the overall training experience of faculty. Few faculty at the institution use this training package and no faculty have completed it in its entirety. The
institution should consider developing and offering a required web-based, facilitated training course, such as that which is offered by Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University. Considering the preference of faculty for training that involves real interaction with a trainer, a web-based, facilitated course meets this need of faculty and provides a way of delivering training to faculty that complements face-to-face training experiences. A web-based, facilitated course also provides faculty with an opportunity to experience training in an environment that is comparable to the environment for which they are developing an online course or preparing to teach an online course.

_Delivery Method Recommendations for Asbury University._

1. Continue to deliver training through a mixed-method approach providing both face-to-face and web-based training opportunities.

2. Continue to make face-to-face training a part of the training experience for every faculty member.

3. Create a web-based, facilitated training course that is required of every faculty member who develops or teaches online courses.

_Delivery Interface._ The results from Chapter Four indicate that a one-on-one training interface is the most prevalent interface for training at the three institutions and the interface preferred by most faculty. The training needs of individual faculty members vary depending on prior training, knowledge, and experience in online learning and they are often course specific. One-on-one
training provides faculty with opportunities to address with training staff the specific areas in which they need assistance and support. The primary way in which faculty interface with training at Asbury University is one-on-one training with a trainer. The institution should continue to make one-on-one training experiences between faculty and trainers a priority in its model for preparing online faculty.

Group-facilitated training can complement well the training that faculty receive in one-on-one settings when this training is provided in a web-based environment. A significant piece of the design of training at Asbury University is group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings. The life and work schedules of faculty often conflict with the scheduling of these trainings and, as such, they are poorly attended. A web-based delivery works better for faculty because faculty can complete training on their time. As well, if group-facilitated trainings are an essential part of the training experience at the University, then these trainings should be required by the institution. Asbury University does not require the participation of faculty in these group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings. Requiring faculty to participate in these trainings is the only way to ensure that they receive the training they need to be prepared for the online environment. The University should consider developing a web-based, group-facilitated training course or set of courses that are required for faculty who develop or teach online.
Training delivered through a self-directed interface can be a useful part of the training experience only as a complement to the training that faculty receive in one-on-one and group-facilitated formats. In the findings presented in Chapter Four, the presence of self-directed training opportunities and online training resources seemed to have little impact on the effectiveness of the overall training experience for faculty. Providing training resources online to faculty, such as video tutorials, recordings, and instructional documents, may be helpful to some faculty in addition to the training they receive from training staff, but these resources cannot substitute for the contextualized and specific training that faculty receive through interactions with a trainer.

If the institution chooses to continue to offer its self-directed online training course as a part of the training experience for faculty, participation in the course should be required prior to developing or teaching an online course. This is the only way to ensure that faculty receive the training they need through this system. As well, since the University provides very few other types of training resources online, such as video tutorials and recordings, the institution should consider expanding its repository of online training resources.

*Delivery Interface Recommendations for Asbury University.*

1. Continue to emphasize one-on-one training between faculty and training staff as an essential part of the training experience for every faculty member.
2. Shift the institution’s emphasis on training in group-facilitated, face-to-face to group-facilitated, web-based training.

3. Require faculty to complete the institution’s self-directed, web-based training course.

4. Expand the institution’s repository of online training resources.

**Schedule.** One of the findings of the research regarding training schedule is that faculty respond favorably to the flexibility of scheduling that is provided by one-on-one, face-to-face training opportunities. Faculty and training staff can schedule these trainings at times that work for both the faculty member and the trainer. This scheduling approach works well for faculty who have different work and life schedules within which they must create time for training. Asbury University takes this approach to the scheduling of one-on-one, face-to-face trainings and should continue to provide training in this scheduling format.

The research showed that scheduled, group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings do not meet the needs of most faculty, especially when these training sessions are consistently offered at times that regularly conflict with faculty schedules. A significant part of the training model at Asbury University is group-facilitated, face-to-face training. These training sessions are offered during regular business hours on week days and are poorly attended. The scheduling of these sessions is “open” in the sense that faculty can show up for training if they choose to do so. If the institution chooses to continue to
offer group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings, these trainings should be offered at multiple times to meet the different scheduling needs of faculty. It is recommended that these sessions be offered at times that are outside of regular business hours, such as in the evening, so that these sessions conflict less with traditional academic course schedules.

The institution should also consider condensing and intensifying the scheduling of training offered in group-facilitated formats. Asbury University offers group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings that span the entire academic year. Faculty at the University would have to participate in sessions throughout the course of an entire year in order to complete the full sequence of training. This scheduling approach does not work well with the diverse scheduling needs of faculty. Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University provide web-based, group-facilitated training courses to faculty that are completed in 3-4 weeks. The findings indicate that faculty prefer a more condensed and intense approach to the scheduling of training. Asbury University should condense the scheduling sequence of its group-facilitated trainings and provide the entire sequence multiple times each year. In doing so, the institution could meet the needs of faculty who enter the training process at different times throughout the year.

Another important training consideration for Asbury University is the lead time provided to faculty to complete training prior to developing or teaching an online course. A training issue at more than one institution was
that faculty did not receive the training they needed in the time available to them prior to the start of an online course. One way to address this issue is to require faculty to complete a training course prior to developing or teaching an online course. For instance, Eastern Kentucky University requires faculty to complete its three-week online faculty development course prior to teaching online. This training approach helps to ensure that all faculty have a certain level of training prior to entering the online learning space.

The University should also consider adopting a course development timeframe similar to Spring Arbor University’s model. Online course development at Spring Arbor University follows a 14 week process during which faculty have at least seven interactions with training staff. Spring Arbor University was the only institution to score at or above the benchmark on the survey question related to training schedules in both effectiveness and meeting the needs of faculty. Faculty need adequate lead time prior to the due date or start date of an online course in order to receive the training they need. Using a structured course development schedule that applies to all faculty who develop online courses ensures that every faculty member has the time they need to receive the training that is necessary to prepare them.

Schedule Recommendations for Asbury University.

1. In order to meet the different scheduling needs of faculty, continue to maintain as much flexibility as possible in the scheduling of one-on-one training sessions between faculty and training staff.
2. Offer group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings at multiple times, including times outside of regular business hours.

3. Condense and intensify the group-facilitated training schedule to a 3-4 week timeframe and offer the entire sequence multiple times per year.

4. Increase the lead time given to faculty for completing training prior to developing or teaching an online course.

5. Implement a structured course development sequence that ensures every faculty member has enough time to complete adequate training during the course development process.

**Content Progression.** A structured and intentional progression of content in the training experience of faculty is essential for their preparation for online learning. The aspect of training in which a clear progression of content was most evident for the institutions examined in this project was the online faculty training courses provided by Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University. A group-facilitated, web-based training course exposes faculty to a prescribed progression of content that enables faculty to develop knowledge and skills in areas of training that are essential for their preparation. Though a web-based training course with a prescribed progression of content may not meet the unique training needs of every faculty member, requiring faculty to participate in this kind of training helps to ensure that every faculty member has some exposure to the areas of training that are essential for the effective preparation of faculty. As well, when the
training course is facilitated by a trainer, this adds a level of accountability to the training process and gives institutions a better understanding of what training faculty have completed.

Asbury University offers a web-based, self-directed training course. However, participation in this course is not required for faculty and there is minimal oversight and monitoring related to whether faculty participate in this course and when they participate in it. The University should consider offering a web-based, facilitated course that guides faculty through a specific progression of content. The institution should require faculty to participate in this course. Doing so will help to ensure that every Asbury University online faculty member has an opportunity to develop knowledge and skills that will prepare them for online learning. By making this course a facilitated training experience, training staff are better positioned to monitor the training experience of faculty and to assess what kind of training individual faculty members may need beyond this experience.

For the three institutions, the findings in Chapter Four indicate that a structured progression of content is not always an intentional part of the design of training for one-on-one training experiences between faculty and training staff. Faculty bring to one-on-one training sessions different levels of prior training and experience in online learning. These training sessions are best suited to address the unique training needs and course specific questions of individual faculty members. Faculty need a training venue in which they
can seek specific assistance and support. Asbury University provides this venue for training and should continue to create opportunities for faculty to engage training staff in one-on-one settings.

An area of need at all three institutions was continuous training for faculty. At the three institutions, there was little evidence of a strategic approach to providing on-going training for faculty beyond the initial training they receive to design or teach an online course. Asbury University should consider designing training experiences that are purposed to promote continuous growth and development for faculty in the area of online learning. As on-going research in this field produces new strategies for design and instruction in online environments and as the technologies and tools that support online learning evolve, faculty will need opportunities to learn about these developments and to improve their craft.

Another important piece related to content progression and training design in that Asbury University needs to address is minimum levels of competency that faculty must meet in order to be effective in the online environment. Asbury University has no established minimum competencies for online faculty. The University should define what knowledge and skills are required for online faculty and communicate this information to faculty. Doing so will help the institution identify which faculty are ready to design or teach online course and to assess what areas of training an individual faculty member may need in order meet the institution’s requirements.
Content Progression Recommendations for Asbury University.

1. Develop a strategy for providing on-going training to online faculty beyond the initial training they receive to design or teach online courses.

2. Establish clear minimum competency levels across the training content that faculty must achieve in order to design or teach online courses for the University.

Qualitative Protocol: Instructional Design and Pedagogy

The findings for the faculty surveys, in particular, showed a need for significant improvement in training in instructional design and pedagogy. In terms of training in instructional design and pedagogy, there were only three aspects of training on the faculty surveys on which the institutions scored at or above the benchmark on effectiveness on the faculty surveys. Asbury University was the only institution to score at or above the benchmark on the effectiveness of training on Course Organization and Spring Arbor University was the only institution to score at or above the benchmark on the effectiveness of training for Online Course Teaching and Providing Student Feedback. In every other training area related to instructional design and pedagogy (Online Course Design, Creating Assessments, Building Interactive Elements, Building Evaluation Tools, Multimedia Integration, Using the Learning Management System for Course Design, Facilitating Interactions, Assessing Student Learning, Using Multimedia for Student Learning, and Using the Learning Management System for Online Course Teaching) all three institutions scored below the benchmark on the effectiveness of training. From the perspective of faculty
survey participants, training in instructional design and pedagogy needs to improve at all three institutions.

Another key takeaway from the findings in Chapter Four related to instructional design and pedagogy is that faculty are not provided enough training in instructional design and pedagogy. Even when an institution has some training on the different aspects of instructional design and pedagogy built into their overall training model, from the perspective of faculty, the amount of training in these areas may be inadequate. For example, in the staff/faculty interview results for Eastern Kentucky University, the interviewee noted that the institution gives specific focus to training on facilitating interactions and providing student feedback, yet, Eastern Kentucky University scored lower than both Asbury University and Spring Arbor University on the faculty survey questions for these aspects of training. Faculty need more training in instructional design and pedagogy. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the interviewees for the staff/faculty interviews indicated that training on certain of instructional design and pedagogy is non-existent, in development, or provided as needed.

Another major takeaway from the findings in Chapter Four relates to the relationship between training staff and faculty in the training experience. In the results of the faculty survey open response questions, staff/faculty interviews, and institutional archival reviews related to instructional design and pedagogy, it was particularly evident that instructional designers at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University have a larger role in the actual design of online courses than
training staff at Asbury University. In three areas of training for which faculty at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University receive training directly from instructional designers during the online course design process, Course Organization, Multimedia Integration, and the Use of the Learning Management System for Course Design, Asbury University scored the highest on the faculty surveys in all three areas. It is possible that the larger role of the instructional designer in the course design process could be preventing faculty from receiving the level of training that is necessary to prepare them in this area. The more that instructional designers do for faculty in course design there is less required for faculty to learn to do themselves.

It is also worth noting that the presence or amount of online training resources seems to have minimal impact on the perceptions of faculty regarding the effectiveness of training. For instance, Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University provide a significant number of online training resources in the area of multimedia integration, but 40% or more of respondents to the faculty survey at both institutions indicated that training is ineffective in this area. Asbury University had the highest mean score in the area of multimedia integration, but the University provides very few web-based resources for training in this area. It is possible that either faculty are unaware of these resources, that they are choosing not to use them, or that prefer training that involves direct contact with a training provider.

Regarding the four categories of training in instructional design and pedagogy (Overall Preparation for Course Design, Teaching and Facilitating, Assessment and
Evaluation, and Multimedia and Interactivity), Spring Arbor’s training on Teaching and Facilitating was only one area of training in which one of the institution’s stood out from the other two. Spring Arbor University was the only institution to score at or above the benchmark in the effectiveness of training for Online Course Teaching and Providing Student Feedback. As well, Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score in Facilitating Interactions. These results could be attributed to the presence of training on instructional strategies and the institution’s pedagogical model for online learning. The pedagogical model for online learning was an aspect of training noted in the findings that was unique to Spring Arbor University. The findings for Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University did not reflect a similar strategic approach to training in this area, which may indicate why both institutions struggle in this area of training.

Regarding deficiencies in training in instructional design and pedagogy for teaching and facilitating, a theme present in the data from the institutional archival reviews and the staff/faculty interviews is that training at the three institutions focuses more on preparing faculty to design online courses than to teach online courses. For instance, training on the use of the learning management system focused primarily on the functionality of the learning management system and other technology tools, but not on the pedagogical uses or purposes of these tools. For example, training may teach faculty how to capture a lecture using Camtasia, but training does not address how or why to use this tool to enhance student learning specifically in the online
environment. This theme in the findings reiterated the need that faculty have for more training on how to teach online courses.

Overall, training on instructional design and pedagogy for online learning is an area that needs to improve at all three institutions. The open response survey question data on the area of instructional design and pedagogy training (Appendix L) confirms this analysis. For Asbury University, eight survey participants responded to the open response question related to training on instructional design and pedagogy for online course design. Only half of the respondents indicated that they found training to be helpful in this area. For Eastern Kentucky University, nine survey participants responded to the open response question and six of the nine respondents indicated that there was no training in this area. For Spring Arbor University, ten survey participants responded to the open response question and six of the ten responses suggest that training is inadequate in this area. The majority of the respondents at all three institutions indicated that they are not receiving the level of training that they need in this area.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy Recommendations for Asbury University**

**University.** The results from Chapter Four indicate that the training model for Asbury University differs from the training models at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University on the roles of faculty and instructional designers/trainers in the design of online courses. At Asbury University, training staff provide training to faculty to prepare them to design online course and faculty are largely responsible for building and developing
their courses. Faculty act as both content experts and course designers. At Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University, faculty interact closely with instructional designers during the online course development process and instructional designers are largely responsible for building and developing courses. Faculty act as content experts and instructional design staff serve as course designers.

Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University combined to score higher than Asbury University on 7 of 8 survey questions related to training design. One-on-one training between faculty and instructional designers is a large part of the training experience for faculty at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University specifically for online course design. These findings suggest that faculty at these institutions appreciate the level of support and guidance that is provided by instructional designers in the process of online course development. However, Asbury University scored higher on 3 of 6 faculty survey questions related to the effectiveness of training on instructional design and pedagogy for course design and the University was the only institution to score at or above the benchmark in one of these areas, course organization. Asbury University provides training to faculty in this area to equip them to design their own courses. What these findings suggest is that the larger role of the instructional designer in the online course design process meets certain needs of faculty,
but the larger role of the instructional designer may limit the training that faculty receive from the perspective of instructional design and pedagogy.

Asbury University should consider adopting a balanced approach to training with regard to the roles of faculty and instructional designers in the online course design process. Faculty need training in the area of instructional design and pedagogy for online course design that equips them to function adequately, independently, and confidently within the online learning space. Faculty also need direct support and guidance from instructional designers who have expertise in this area, but instructional designers should not carry the entire weight of the responsibility for designing courses. The assistance and support provided by instructional designers should complement and reinforce the training that faculty receive in this area. Faculty may not be experts in instructional design, but they should be competent in the principles and strategies for design and pedagogy that support a quality online learning experience.

A consistent theme in the findings from Chapter Four is that the majority of training at the three institutions in the area of online course design focuses on preparing faculty to use the institution’s learning management system and other technology tools, such as web-conferencing software, from a technical perspective. Though this training is helpful to faculty, the overall approach to training is not resulting in adequate training in instructional design and pedagogy for online course design. On the survey questions
related to instructional design and pedagogy for online course design, a third or more of faculty respondents indicated that they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree that training is effective in the areas of creating assessments, building evaluation tools, building interactive elements, integrating multimedia, and using the learning management system for course design. In some of these training areas, 50% or more of faculty at more than one of institution indicated that training is ineffective. This is a widespread issue for all three institutions. Training needs to extend beyond the technical uses and functionality of the institution’s learning management system to include more training on pedagogical concepts, strategies, and approaches to designing online courses.

Asbury University should consider integrating a series of trainings on instructional design and pedagogy for online course design into a web-based, facilitated training course. The training sequence should introduce design principles and strategies related to course organization, creating assessments, building evaluation tools, building interactive elements, integrating multimedia, and using the learning management system for course design. This aspect of the training experience would help to ensure that faculty understand what strategies and principles for design and pedagogy they should consider as they develop online courses. This training should be completed prior to one-on-one training sessions between faculty and instructional designers. This approach will make the time that faculty have with
instructional design staff more efficient as they will bring to these one-on-one training sessions a knowledge and skill base in this area.

Asbury University should also consider specifying the role of instructional designers as facilitators of design or design consultants. Instructional designers should use their expertise to provide guidance and support to faculty in this area and should make recommendations to faculty regarding design and pedagogy throughout the online course development process. However, instructional designers should not be charged with the full responsibility of taking content from faculty members and using this content to build courses for faculty. There will be some aspects of design for which faculty will need additional support from instructional design staff, such as design pieces that require special expertise. For instance, producing some forms of multimedia requires a skill-set that faculty might not acquire through a training program. However, faculty should be expected to understand why they would integrate multimedia into a course and the instructional design principles and strategies that inform the ways in which multimedia should be integrated into courses.

One final recommendation for Asbury University related to online course design is for the institution to provide its online course review evaluation tool to faculty prior to beginning course design. Training staff use this tool to evaluate newly developed online courses. If the institution uses this tool to review courses based on an established set of expectations related
to course design, then faculty should be made aware of the institution’s expectations prior to beginning course design.

The findings from Chapter Four indicate that training faculty in instructional design and pedagogy for online course instruction was an area of training that needs to be addressed at all three institutions. For all three institutions, only one institution, Spring Arbor University, scored at or above the benchmark on one of the faculty survey questions (Providing Student Feedback) related to the effectiveness of training in instructional design and pedagogy for online instruction. Faculty need more training in the areas of assessing student learning, facilitating interactions, providing student feedback, using multimedia for student learning, and using the learning management system for online instruction.

Asbury University should consider integrating a series of trainings on instructional design and pedagogy for online course instruction into a web-based, facilitated training course. The training sequence should introduce design principles and strategies related to assessing student learning, facilitating interactions, providing student feedback, using multimedia for student learning, and using the learning management system for online instruction. This aspect of the training experience would help to ensure that faculty understand what strategies and principles for design and pedagogy they should consider as they teach online courses. This training should be required and faculty should complete it in its entirety prior to teaching an
online course. This approach will help to ensure that, prior to teaching an online course, faculty are exposed to instructional design and pedagogical principles and strategies that will support their effectiveness as online instructors.

One alarming theme present in the findings from Chapter Four is that some faculty at the institutions begin teaching a course without completing any formal training related to online course instruction. It is possible that some faculty are selected to teach a course too close to the start date of a course in order to complete any training. It is also possible that the institutions do not have clear processes in place to ensure that every faculty member completes training and to monitor what training faculty have completed. In the staff/faculty interviews, interviewees for all three institutions described at least a part of the overall training experience for faculty as required. However, some faculty are still entering the instructional process without having completed any formal training.

Asbury University should consider developing a clear set of guidelines for faculty that communicate which aspects of faculty training are required prior to teaching an online course. The institution should also develop a system for tracking and monitoring the types of training completed by each faculty member. As well, in order to maintain a sense of accountability related to online faculty training, the institution should establish protocols for addressing situations when faculty have not completed training, but are still
slated to teach a course. If faculty really are required to complete training, then the institution must have a plan in place for responding in these situations that considers both the needs of students who are enrolled in online courses and the institution’s commitment to its training process. This is one reason why it is so important that faculty are given adequate time to complete training prior to the launch of a course. The institution should never be in a position in which the quality of the experience of students is jeopardized because faculty did not have enough time to complete the training they need in order to be effective online instructors.

One of the highlights of the findings from Chapter Four on training in instructional design and pedagogy for online instruction was Spring Arbor University’s pedagogical model for online learning. Spring Arbor University was the only institution for which there was evidence of a model for the type of learning experience that the institution desires students to have in every online course. The model focuses on the experience of students from the perspective of learning interactions, including student-to-student, student-to-instructor, student-to-content, and student-to-Christ interactions. The University’s model serves as both a guide for the online instructor in terms of his/her role as facilitator of learning and as a vision for what learning should look like in the online environment. The model is addressed in the institution’s web-based, online professional development course. The effect of this model was evident in the research as Spring Arbor University scored
higher than the other two institutions in 3 of the 5 training categories on the faculty survey regarding the effectiveness of training for online instruction.

Asbury University should consider developing a vision for what the online learning experience for students should be and then articulate this vision in its own pedagogical model. The model should serve as a guide for faculty as they prepare to teach courses and as they facilitate the online learning experience. The University’s pedagogical model should be integrated into every aspect of the training experience and should be addressed specifically in a web-based, group-facilitated training experience. Addressing the model in a required training course will allow training staff an opportunity to share with every faculty member why the model exists and how the model can be achieved in the instructional process. This training piece will inspire in faculty a commonly-shared vision of what online learning can be at the institution and will motivate online instructors toward common pedagogical outcomes.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy Recommendations for Asbury University.**

1. Create a series of trainings on instructional design and pedagogy for online course design in the areas of course organization, creating assessments, building evaluation tools, building interactive elements, integrating multimedia, and using the learning management system for course design.
2. Require faculty to complete the training sequence on instructional design and pedagogy for online course design prior to interacting with instructional designers or training staff in one-on-one training sessions.

3. Specify the role of instructional designers as facilitators of design or design consultants and provide additional support to faculty in areas of course design that require special expertise.

4. Provide the online course review evaluation tool to faculty prior to course design.

5. Integrate a series of trainings on instructional design and pedagogy for online course instruction into a web-based, facilitated training course that introduce principles and strategies related to assessing student learning, facilitating interactions, providing student feedback, using multimedia for student learning, and using the learning management system for online instruction.

6. Establish clear guidelines for what training is required of faculty prior to teaching an online course.

7. Create a system for tracking and monitoring what training faculty have completed.

8. Establish a protocol for addressing situations when faculty are slated to teach an online course but have not completed training.
9. Create a vision for online learning and build a pedagogical model based upon this vision that guides faculty in their preparation for online instruction.

**Qualitative Protocol: Institutional Alignment**

Regarding how online faculty training addresses the relationship between online education and institutional vision and mission, distinctiveness, and strategic plan, Spring Arbor University was the only institution for which there was concrete evidence of this training piece in the institutional archival reviews and the staff/faculty interviews. This explains why, on the faculty survey questions related to these training pieces, Spring Arbor University had the highest mean score and the highest percentage of faculty to provide Strongly Agree or Agree responses in each area. The institution has a pedagogical model for online learning that drives the online course development process at the institution and that is integrated into the training that faculty receive in the institution’s online faculty training course. Though Spring Arbor University, like Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University, needs to improve in this area of training, the intentional inclusion of the pedagogical model for online learning into the institution’s approach to training online faculty had a positive influence on faculty perceptions related to training in this area.

The data from the open response survey question related to institutional alignment (see Appendix L) supports this analysis. At the three institutions, all responses to this open response survey question pertained to training related to the relationship between online education and institutional vision and mission,
distinctiveness, and strategic plan. For Asbury University, nine survey participants responded to the question. Seven of the nine respondents indicated that they either struggle in this area, training in this area was inadequate, or there was no training in this area. For Eastern Kentucky University, one of the three respondents indicated that this was not a part of the formal training process. For Spring Arbor University, two of the eight respondents indicated that they found training to be helpful in this area.

The institutional archival reviews and the staff/faculty interviews did not result in any evidence of an intentional or systematic way of either compensating or recognizing faculty for completing training or for valuing faculty for completing training. The results suggest that all three institutions have a goal to implement some form of recognition or way of showing value to faculty for completing training in the future. Spring Arbor was the only institution for which there was any evidence of plan to connect training to some form of compensation. All three institutions plan to establish a mechanism for recognizing faculty or showing value to faculty for completing training through some type of physical record, such as a certificate or plaque.

**Institutional Alignment Recommendations for Asbury University:**

**Contextual Alignment.** The findings from Chapter Four showed that training on the relationship between online learning and institutional vision and mission, distinctiveness, and strategic plan was an in need of improvement at all three institutions. For Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky
University, there was no evidence of these pieces built into the training experience of faculty. Spring Arbor University’s training model did show evidence of training in the area of institutional distinctiveness through to its pedagogical model for online learning. For Spring Arbor University, the institution’s online course development process emphasizes the pedagogical model and the model is discussed in the institution’s online faculty development course. Outside of this training element at Spring Arbor University, there was no other evidence of training for faculty on contextual alignment.

Asbury University should consider creating a training session specifically on the relationship between the institution’s approach to online learning and its vision and mission. One alarming finding in the results from Chapter Four is that faculty may be unaware of their institution’s vision and mission. Vision and mission are central to an institution’s identity and purpose. Faculty need to know how their contributions in online education support the institution’s vision and mission and move the institution toward its larger purpose.

Asbury University should also consider creating a training session on what makes the institution distinct and how this distinctiveness can and should be reflected in the online learning experience. Institutional distinctiveness should be reflected in both the design of online courses and how faculty facilitate the online learning experience. The training should include
information on what makes the institution distinct and recommendations for how this distinctiveness translates into principles and strategies for course design and instruction.

Asbury University also needs a training session on the relationship between the institution’s approach to online education and its strategic plan. A strategic plan articulates an institution’s goals and how it plans to reach those goals. It may not be necessary for faculty to understand every aspect of an institution’s strategic plan. For instance, it may not be necessary for training to address details related to budgets and various assessment measures and targets not directly related to the education experience. It would be helpful though for faculty to understand the place of online education in the institution’s strategic plan and how their work in online education helps the institution reach its goals and outcomes.

*Contextual Alignment Recommendations for Asbury University.*

1. Create a training session specifically on the relationship between the institution’s approach to online learning and its vision and mission.

2. Create a training session on what makes the institution distinct and how this distinctiveness can and should be reflected in the online learning experience.

3. Create a training session on the relationship between the institution’s approach to online education and its strategic plan.
Institutional Alignment Recommendations for Asbury University:

Valuing Faculty. Of all of the training areas explored in this Capstone Project, valuing faculty for completing training was the area that showed the greatest need of attention. The findings from Chapter Four showed that none of the three institutions show value to faculty for completing training outside of providing faculty the opportunity to develop or teach online courses when they complete training. There was no evidence of any tangible methods for recognizing the value of completing training. As well, there was no evidence of any ways of compensating faculty for completing training.

The findings from Chapter Four revealed that all three institutions plan to create ways to recognize faculty for completing training in the future. For instance, the institutions may create tangible ways to acknowledge the training faculty have completed such as presenting faculty with certificates of recognition. As well, the institutions may pursue a collegial form of recognition through opportunities present to faculty to train other faculty.

Based on the findings of this Project, implementing these forms of recognition did not appear to be a priority for the institutions.

Asbury University should consider creating a method for recognizing faculty for the training they complete. Providing faculty with a certificate of recognition is one simple approach that the institution could implement immediately. The institution must create a way to honor the commitment that faculty exhibit by completing the training process and the importance of what
they have learned. In doing so, the institution will communicate to faculty that training has value and that the time and effort faculty give to the training process is worthwhile.

The findings indicated that there is a perception held by some University leaders that training is an expected part of the responsibility of being a faculty member and; therefore; additional compensation for completing training is unnecessary. The findings of this Project affirm the perspective that training should be required. Regarding compensation for completing training, the opposing argument is that faculty should be compensated for the expertise that they acquire as a result of training. In other areas of the work of faculty in higher education, compensation is sometimes associated with the level and type of expertise of faculty. For instance, faculty scholarship is a common measure in the evaluation process for tenure status at some colleges and universities. Value is shown to the efforts of faculty to grow and learn in their areas of expertise.

One illustration of how an institution might compensate faculty for completing training came from the results of the staff/faculty interview for Spring Arbor University. In the future, Spring Arbor University plans to reward faculty by recognizing the training they complete as a part of the process of earning tenure status at the institution. This method of compensation would apply only to full-time faculty who are pursuing tenure.
This is one example of how an institution can communicate to faculty that training matters for their security and advancement in employment.

Asbury University should consider developing some method of compensating faculty for completing training. Compensation could take several forms, such as financial compensation, relief time from other employment responsibilities, course reductions, etc. However the institution decides to compensate faculty, compensation should be available to both full-time and part-time faculty who complete training. If the institution adopts the approach that completion of its regular training package is a requirement for all faculty who design or teach online courses and that there is no additional compensation for completion of this regular training package, the institution should consider how it might reward faculty who go above and beyond the minimum expectations for training. What will motivate online faculty to pursue the kind of training they need to help advance the institution toward its vision for online education? The intrinsic motivations associated with training that helps one to become an excellent online educator and providing students with a quality online learning experience may encourage faculty toward continuous improvement of their craft. But, valuing faculty for completing training through compensation may provide extrinsic motivation that also push faculty to be the best at what they do in online education.
**Valuing Faculty Recommendations for Asbury University.**

1. Create a method for recognizing faculty for completing training, such as providing faculty with a certificate of recognition.

2. Create a compensation model that shows value to faculty for completing training by rewarding them for improving their craft in ways that go above and beyond the minimum expectations related to training established by the institution.

**Limitations of the Capstone Project**

One limitation of this Capstone Project was that the methodology was based on the comparison of three regionally-accredited, four-year Universities. Increasing the number of institutions examined in the Project could have produced additional comparative data to support the project’s goal of determining the type of training model that is most effective for preparing online faculty. As well, considering the training models at other types of postsecondary institutions, such as community colleges, proprietary educational organizations, and for-profit institutions, may have resulted in a comparative data set that better represents the broader spectrum of training for online learning in higher education.

This project is also limited in its scope in that it is targeted to produce recommendations for a training system that is specific to one higher education institution. The project will be based, in part, on the distinct structure, organization and goals of Asbury University. Though the research base of this project may be
relevant and useful to other higher education institutions, the proposed recommendations may or may not be suited for direct transfer to other institutions.

One final limitation of the Capstone Project was that the faculty survey was designed to acquire data based upon faculty perceptions regarding the effectiveness of training. Faculty may have very different perceptions about what is or is not effective with regarding to training. A training approach that one faculty member perceived to be effective could have been perceived to be ineffective by another faculty member. It is impossible to discern all of the circumstances or experiences that contributed to the different perceptions that influenced the responses of participants to the survey questions.

Despite these limitations, this project will contribute to the growing body of research on training for online teaching faculty. As the higher education landscape continues to change and as new educational technologies emerge, new research in this area will be helpful to the fields of education, technology and leadership. As well, this project may provide data and recommendations useful for and relevant to other higher education institutions. Small, private, faith-based colleges, particularly those who share similar institutional characteristics with Asbury University, may find this project relevant to their efforts to establish systems for training that meet the unique needs of their institution and faculty.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

One recommendation for future research is to explore the implications of online faculty training with regard to specific demographic characteristics of faculty.
For instance, considering faculty position, rank, full-time or part-time status, and other characteristics could provide additional lenses through which to view the effectiveness of faculty training. For this Capstone Project, demographic information focused specifically on whether faculty have either designed or taught an online course at their institution.

Another recommendation for future research is to develop a study for examining the effectiveness of online faculty training based on evaluations of the performance of faculty in online course design and instruction. When an institution develops a model for training online faculty, it is important that the institution has a process for evaluating the effectiveness of its model. Once Asbury University has developed a training model using the results of this Capstone Project, the institution could then assess the training model by evaluating the effectiveness of faculty in the online learning space who have completed training within this model. This study could produce data that would support the institution in its efforts to continuously improve its approach to training online faculty. This study could produce answers to important questions related to continuous assessment, such as, is the training model achieving the desired outcomes related to the effectiveness of faculty teaching online courses?

**General Summary and Conclusion**

For the Capstone Project, there are two areas that Asbury University should address as priorities for improving online faculty training. Priority number one is to improve how online faculty training prepares faculty to teach online courses.
Training is heavily focused on preparing faculty to design online courses, but faculty are provided only minimal training to prepare them to be effective online instructors. Priority number two is to improve how online faculty training is aligned specifically to Asbury University. Through training, faculty must gain a clear perspective about how online learning at Asbury University relates to the institution’s vision and mission, distinctiveness, and strategic plan.

How an institution trains its online faculty matters for the preparedness of faculty for online education and the learning experience of students. It is important for leaders at institutions that provide online education to have a clear sense of the outcomes they desire to reach through online faculty training and the type of training model that is most effective for achieving these desired outcomes. A review of current literature related to online faculty training provides a foundation for understanding the essential training elements that support the effective preparation of online faculty. As well, research on the existing approaches to online faculty training at institutions and the perceptions of online faculty regarding the effectiveness of their training provides helpful data on the areas and aspects of training that are effective and those that may need to be changed or improved.

The purpose of this Capstone Project was to produce recommendations for a model for online faculty training at Asbury University based on a comparative analysis of the training models at three postsecondary institutions in the areas of training design, instructional design and pedagogy, and institutional alignment. The Project resulted in several recommendations that will be provided to the Asbury
University President’s Cabinet. These recommendations will be presented to the President’s Cabinet in an executive summary (see Appendix M). The results and recommendations of this Project will support the institution in its efforts to create a model for training online faculty that advances the institution toward its mission to provide educational experiences that equip students for a lifetime of learning, leadership, and service.
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## APPENDIX A

### INSTITUTIONAL SELECTION CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 1. Only Institutions which are regionally-accredited</th>
<th>Criteria 2. Undergraduate and graduate level course offerings</th>
<th>Criteria 3. Proprietary web-based learning management system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury University Accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Moodle Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University Accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Blackboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Arbor University Accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Blackboard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX B

## ONLINE FACULTY TRAINING QUALITATIVE PROTOCOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Structure</th>
<th>Faculty Preparedness</th>
<th>Institutional Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Method(s)</td>
<td>Content Progression</td>
<td>Instructional Design and Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course Design, Course Organization, Creating Assessments, Building Interactive Elements, Building Evaluation Tools, Integrating Multimedia, Using the Learning Management System for Design Course Instruction, Assessing Student, Learning, Facilitating Interactions, Providing Student Feedback, Integrating Multimedia for Student Learning, Using the Learning Management System for Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online and/or Face-to-Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Interface</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Self-Directed, One-on-One Facilitated, and/or Group-Facilitated (Web-based or Non-web-based)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Online and/or Face-to-Face | | |
| Delivery Interface | Schedule | Self-Directed, One-on-One Facilitated, and/or Group-Facilitated (Web-based or Non-web-based) | Intensive, Extended, and/or Continuous | |

| Online and/or Face-to-Face | | |
| Delivery Interface | Schedule | Self-Directed, One-on-One Facilitated, and/or Group-Facilitated (Web-based or Non-web-based) | Intensive, Extended, and/or Continuous | |
## APPENDIX C

### INSTITUTIONAL ARCHIVAL REVIEWS COMPARISON TOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Structure</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructional Design and Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Preparation for Course Design (Course Organization, Using the Learning Management System for Course Design Course Organization)</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Facilitating (Facilitating Interactions, Providing Student Feedback, Using the Learning Management System for Teaching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Evaluation (Creating Assessments, Building Evaluation Tools, Assessing Student Learning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia and Interactivity (Building Interactive Elements, Integrating Multimedia, Using Multimedia for Student Learning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institutional Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Alignment (Vision and Mission, Distinctiveness, Strategic Plan)</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Faculty (Compensation or Recognition for Completing Training, Showing Value to Faculty for Completing Training)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D

### STAFF/FACULTY INTERVIEWS COMPARISON TOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Structure</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Progression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructional Design and Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Preparation for Course Design (Course Organization, Using the Learning Management System for Course Design Course Organization)</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Facilitating (Facilitating Interactions, Providing Student Feedback, Using the Learning Management System for Teaching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Evaluation (Creating Assessments, Building Evaluation Tools, Assessing Student Learning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia and Interactivity (Building Interactive Elements, Integrating Multimedia, Using Multimedia for Student Learning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institutional Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Alignment (Vision and Mission, Distinctiveness, Strategic Plan)</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Faculty (Compensation or Recognition for Completing Training, Showing Value to Faculty for Completing Training)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

STAFF/FACULTY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Do you have a direct leadership role at your institution in the design or delivery of online teaching faculty training?

2. Have you designed or taught an online course for your institution?

3. How is online teaching faculty training delivered (ex: face-to-face, web-based, or hybrid) at your institution?

4. How would you describe the user interface (ex: self-directed training, one-on-one training with a facilitator, or group training with a facilitator) of your online teaching faculty training?

5. How would you describe the schedule (ex: intensive training or training is a continuous process) for online teaching faculty training at your institution?

6. How would you describe the training content progression (the way in which training content is scaffolded) for online teaching faculty training at your institution?

7. How does your institution train faculty to organize an online course?

8. How does your institution train faculty to create assessments in an online course?

9. How does your institution train faculty to build interactive elements into an online course?

10. How does your institution train faculty to build evaluation tools into an online course?
11. How does your institution train faculty to integrate multimedia into the design of an online course?

12. How does your institution train faculty to use its learning management system for online course design?

13. How does your institution train faculty to assess student learning in an online course?

14. How does your institution train faculty to facilitate interactions in an online course?

15. How does your institution train faculty to provide student feedback in an online course?

16. How does your institution train faculty to use multimedia for student learning in an online course?

17. How does your institution train faculty to use its learning management system for online course instruction?

18. How does training at your institution help faculty to understand the relationship between online learning and the institution’s vision and mission?

19. How does training at your institution help faculty to understand the relationship between online learning and the institution’s distinctiveness?

20. How does training at your institution help faculty to understand the relationship between online learning and the institution’s strategic plan?

21. How does your institution compensate or recognize faculty for completing training?
22. How does your institution show value to faculty for completing training?
APPENDIX F

STAFF/FACULTY INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Approval: Prior to conducting interviews, the researcher will work with the Institutional Review Board office at each participating institution to gain written approval to conduct the interviews and to ensure that the appropriate protocols are followed for effective research.

Identification of Interviewee: Once approval has been granted by the Institutional Review Board at a participating institution, contact will be made with the institution to identify the staff or faculty member(s) who provide direct leadership in the area of online faculty training.

Initial Communication: An email will be sent to the staff or faculty member using their institutional email address. The email will contain a request for participation in a live interview. The email request will introduce the interviewer and will include information regarding the purpose, structure, and duration of the interview. The staff or faculty member will also be apprised of the informed consent form, recording technique, and post-interview communication. The staff or faculty member will be requested to provide an email confirmation indicating their agreement to participate in the interview.

Place/Time: Faculty or staff who agree to participate in the interview will be asked to provide a date and time when they are available to complete the interview. The interview may be conducted in-person or by phone. Due to driving distance, the interviewee from Spring Arbor University will be asked to complete the interview by phone.

Structure: The interview will consist of 22 questions and may include additional questions only when clarification is necessary. At the time of the interview, the interviewee will be provided with a digital or hard copy of the interview questions and the informed consent form. The interviewee will be given an opportunity to ask any questions regarding the structure or process of the interview before the interview begins.

Informed Consent: Each interviewee will be asked to review the Informed Consent Form. The email confirmation agreement to participate in the interview will serve as acknowledgment of informed consent.

Duration: The interview will be completed in 20-30 minutes.

Recording: The interview will be recorded using an audio recording device.
Post-Interview Communication: Twenty-four hours after the interview, the interviewee will be sent an email thanking them for their participation. The email will also indicate that, at their request, the interviewee may receive a digital copy of the interview transcript.
APPENDIX G

STAFF/FACULTY INTERVIEW SCRIPT

“Thank you for your willingness to participate in this interview. My name is Josh Fee and I am a graduate student at Morehead State University in the Doctor of Education program in Educational Technology Leadership. In fulfillment of the requirements for the degree, I am completing a capstone project. This interview is one component of the capstone project I have designed to investigate essential principles and practices for training systems for online teaching faculty at postsecondary institutions. I appreciate your willingness to participate. Your input will be valuable to the goals of this project. In the interview, I will ask you 22 questions and the interview will take 20-30 minutes to complete. In addition to the 22 questions, I may ask follow-up questions for clarification. At any time during the interview, you are welcome to ask me any questions for clarification. During the interview, you may skip any questions you choose and you may discontinue the interview at any time. Do you have any questions before we begin the interview?”
APPENDIX H

STAFF/FACULTY INTERVIEW INFORMED CONSENT FORM

You have been invited to participate in an interview for a capstone research project. The following information describes the purpose of the project and the importance and implications of your voluntary participation in the interview.

Project title: An Online Faculty Training System Proposal

Principle researcher: Thomas J. Fee

Email: tjfee@moreheadstate.edu

Telephone: 859-619-9973

Organization: Morehead State University

**Purpose of the Project.** This project in online faculty training systems is being conducted by Mr. Thomas J. Fee, doctoral student, Educational Technology Leadership program, Morehead State University. The purpose of this project is to develop a proposal for an online teaching faculty training model for a private, Liberal Arts University in the Southeastern United States. The project will identify the conceptual framework, principles and specific design components for online faculty training that will meet the unique needs of the University and its faculty.

**Interview.** The interview is intended for faculty or administrators who have direct leadership roles in the design or delivery of online teaching faculty training at their respective institution. The interview will consist of questions related to the design characteristics and components of the online teaching faculty training program at their institution. The staff/faculty interview will be a formal interview completed in 20-30 minutes in a one-time, face-to-face or phone interview. The interview will consist of 22 questions. The interview delivery method will be based upon the availability and preference of the interviewee. Participants who acknowledge an interest in participating in the interview will be asked to provide three dates and times they are available to complete the interview and to choose which method of interview delivery they prefer. In the handling and presentation of the data, participants in the staff/faculty interview will remain anonymous by name, title, employer and any other personal information that could represent a direct or indirect identifier. Following the completion of the project, interview participants will be provided with an opportunity to receive the results of the entire project by email.
Benefit of this Project. By participating, you will contribute to a project that will produce valuable information regarding principles and practices that are essential to the design of effective online faculty training systems at postsecondary institutions.

Risks. There are no anticipated risks related to participation in this project. Your participation in this interview is voluntary. You may skip any interview question(s) or discontinue the interview altogether at any time. Only completed interviews will be included in the results. For completed interviews, online questions that are answered will be included in the results.

Confidentiality. In the handling and presentation of the data, you will not be personally identifiable in any direct or indirect way. The results of this project will be used for scholarly purposes only. Participants will have the option to provide an email address if they wish to receive a copy of the completed project.

Financial Considerations. There is no cost to participate in this interview, you will not receive any financial compensation for your participation in this interview, and you will not incur any financial penalty for choosing to discontinue the interview.

By replying to this email and indicating your interest in participating in the interview, you acknowledge that you have read this information and choose to participate in the interview with the understanding that you are free to discontinue the interview at any time.
## APPENDIX I

**FACULTY SURVEY CROSS-CASE COMPARISON TOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M (N=)$</td>
<td>$M (N=)$</td>
<td>$M (N=)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** “% Strongly Agree/Agree Responses” refers to the percentage of faculty respondents who provided Strongly Agree or Agree responses to individual survey questions.
APPENDIX J

FACULTY SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. I have read and understand the purpose, description, and informed consent information for this survey and I volunteer to participate.
   - Yes
   - No

2. Have you designed or taught an online course at your institution? If you respond "Yes", the survey will continue to the next question. If you respond "No", the survey will end.
   - Yes
   - No

Training Structure

3. The training delivery method (ex: face-to-face, web-based, or hybrid) was effective for preparing me to teach online.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4. The training delivery method (ex: face-to-face, web-based, or hybrid) met my needs (your time, schedule, learning preferences, etc.).
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

5. The training delivery interface (ex: self-directed training, one-on-one training with a facilitator, or group training with a facilitator) was effective for preparing me to teach online.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
6. The training delivery interface (ex: self-directed training, one-on-one training with a facilitator, or group training with a facilitator) met my needs (your time, schedule, learning preferences, etc.).
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

7. The training schedule (ex: intensive training or training as a continuous process) was effective for preparing me to teach online.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

8. The training schedule (ex: intensive training or training as a continuous process) met my needs (your time, schedule, learning preferences, etc.).
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

9. The training content progression (how the concepts build on one another) was effective for preparing me to teach online.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

10. The training content progression (how the concepts build on one another) met my needs (your time, schedule, learning preferences, etc.).
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

11. Optional: Please feel free to add any comments regarding your experience with the training structure for online faculty at your institution.
Instructional Design and Pedagogy

12. The training was effective for preparing me to design an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

13. The training was effective for preparing me to organize an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

14. The training was effective for preparing me to create assessments in an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

15. The training was effective for preparing me to build interactive elements into an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

16. The training was effective for preparing me to build evaluation tools into an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

17. The training was effective for preparing me to integrate multimedia into an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
18. The training was effective for preparing me to use the learning management system for online course design.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

19. The training was effective for preparing me to teach an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

20. The training was effective for preparing me to assess student learning in an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

21. The training was effective for preparing me to facilitate interactions in an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

22. The training was effective for preparing me to provide student feedback in an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

23. The training was effective for preparing me to use multimedia for student learning in an online course.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
24. The training was effective for preparing me to use the learning management system for online course teaching.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

25. Optional: Please feel free to add any comments regarding your experience with training in instructional design and pedagogy for online faculty at your institution.

   **Institutional Alignment**

26. The online faculty training program helped me to understand the relationship between online learning and the institution’s vision and mission.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

27. The online faculty training program helped me to understand the relationship between online learning and the distinctiveness of the institution.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

28. The online faculty training program helped me to understand the relationship between online learning and the institution’s strategic plan.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

29. Optional: Please feel free to add any comments regarding your experience with how training for online faculty was connected to your institution’s vision and mission, distinctiveness, and strategic plan.
30. Faculty are adequately compensated or recognized by the institution for completing training.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

31. Faculty feel valued by the institution for completing training.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

32. Optional: Please feel free to add any comments regarding your experience with how faculty are compensated, recognized, or valued for completing training.
APPENDIX K

FACULTY SURVEY INFORMED CONSENT FORM

You have been invited to participate in a research survey. The following information describes the purpose of the project and the importance and implications of your voluntary participation in the survey.

Project title: An Online Faculty Training System Proposal

Principle researcher: Thomas J. Fee

Email: tjfee@moreheadstate.edu

Telephone: 859-619-9973

Organization: Morehead State University

**Purpose of the Project.** This project in online faculty training systems is being conducted by Mr. Josh Fee, doctoral student, Educational Technology Leadership program, Morehead State University. The purpose of this project is to develop a proposal for an online teaching faculty training model for a private, Liberal Arts University in the Southeastern United States. The project will identify the conceptual framework, principles and specific design components for online faculty training that will meet the unique needs of the University and its faculty.

**Online Survey.** You are invited to participate in an online survey that will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. The survey is being delivered to online teaching faculty at three postsecondary institutions. The survey will be completed using SurveyMonkey, an online survey software and questionnaire tool. The survey includes questions related to the training experience of online faculty. The survey is designed for faculty who have either designed or taught an online course at their respective institutions. The survey includes questions on faculty training structure, training in instructional design and pedagogy, and whether training systems demonstrate institutional alignment.

**Benefit of this Project.** By participating, you will contribute to a project that will produce valuable information regarding principles and practices that are essential to the design of effective online faculty training systems at postsecondary institutions.

**Risks.** There are no anticipated risks related to participation in this project. Your participation in this survey is voluntary. You may skip any question(s) or leave the
survey altogether at any time. Only completed questions will be included in the results.

**Confidentiality.** Your responses will be kept completely confidential. All data is stored in a password protected digital format. The survey does not ask for any information that could personally identify you. The results of this project will be used for scholarly purposes only.

**Financial Considerations.** There is no cost to participate in this survey, you will not receive any financial compensation for your participation in this project, and you will not incur any financial penalty for choosing to withdraw from the survey.

By beginning the survey, you acknowledge that you have read this information and choose to participate in the project with the understanding that you are free to withdraw your participation at any time.
APPENDIX L

FACULTY SURVEY OPEN RESPONSE QUESTION RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Structure</th>
<th>Asbury University</th>
<th>Eastern Kentucky University</th>
<th>Spring Arbor University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I was not aware of any scheduled training. I first</td>
<td>• “I was not aware of any scheduled training. I first conducted a self-help web-based exploration of the training platform. I then requested a face-to-face training session which was very effective for how to navigate the learning platform but the focus was not on how to teach in an online environment (vs. traditional class setting)”</td>
<td>• “It was not a completely formalized process. There were many informal meetings with the instructional designer.”</td>
<td>• “There was no training. Also the first question in this survey listed &quot;design&quot; and &quot;train.&quot; I have done both. My answers would be different for design than train.&quot; I would think that would impact the reliability of your results. Also, there was no training. Why couldn't I select that option?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducted a self-help web-based exploration of the</td>
<td>• “I do not recall any training program when I began teaching online. I did meet with a colleague who offered to help me.”</td>
<td>• “My training was not formal...I was simply walked through everything and set out on my own. I have also been able to attend conferences on Distance Education and picked up additional information there.”</td>
<td>• “I answered the questions with &quot;at that time&quot; in mind. Online teaching has evolved since I began online teaching.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training platform. I then requested a face-to-face</td>
<td>• “My training was not formal...I was simply walked through everything and set out on my own. I have also been able to attend conferences on Distance Education and picked up additional information there.”</td>
<td>• “There was no training.”</td>
<td>• “The structure progressed through various skill sets and the history and philosophy of the institution.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training session which was very effective for how to</td>
<td>• “Teaching online the first</td>
<td>• “There was no training.”</td>
<td>• “You have no way to distinguish long-time online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navigate the learning platform but the focus was not</td>
<td>conducted a self-help web-based exploration of the training platform. I then requested a face-to-face training session which was very effective for how to navigate the learning platform but the focus was not on how to teach in an online environment (vs. traditional class setting)”</td>
<td>• “Teaching online the first</td>
<td>teaching.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on how to teach in an online environment (vs. traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class setting)”</td>
<td>• “The training was optional as I am an adjunct professor geographically distant from</td>
<td>“There was no training.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Teaching online the first</td>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University</td>
<td>Spring Arbor University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Teaching online the first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
couple of times was like being a deer in headlights. I did the best I could. Now that I have done it several times I need to learn new and more engaging strategies for engaging students online. More training for that is needed beyond the basic "start-up" training."

- “The training given before I had to prepare my first on-line class was wasted because the on-line system changed. I was left to depend on a person from the on-line program to help me.”
- “Staff was wonderful in helping me prepare to teach. I had several one on one interactions.”
- “I had plenty of one on one, personal time given whenever I requested/needed it and was never put aside no matter what my need was.”

the institution and I began online teaching prior to any available training. Training was self-directed and primarily based on experience (trial and error) and discussions with other faculty. None was formal.”

- “Having informal, unstructured, unscheduled access to a "mentoring" trainer when needed was the most useful assistance I experienced when I was new to online instruction.”
- “We were not trained. We were dumped into BlackBoard with an outline of what might be expected in an effective course. For my part I designed several courses on my own. The only feedback came at the end when the course was evaluated before being deployed.”

faculty from recent ones. I have participated in at least five online training seminars over the past ten or more years. They all start and end at the same place. They are aimed at education pedagogy not technical instruction--where to find things- a road map of the site, how to actually use the amazing tools that are there. You make no separation between face-to-face, online, and hybrid methods of teaching. I have taught in all three and they are very different environments--for the instructor and they heavily impact student success and instructor satisfaction. A five point scoring scale that included a neutral position of some kind would have allowed some clearer answers for me.”

- “The training schedule was tight - two weeks with
“I needed 1 on 1 for some things that not many others were struggling with. The instructors were helpful but I always felt they were so busy I was taking time they did not really have so I am slow to ask.”

“My only disagreement was in the timing of training events. Since faculty schedules change every semester, time constraints for one semester are different than at other times. I know that there were some alternatives offered, but even those times were difficult to meet depending again on personal schedule.”

“I know what I need to know at a basic level, but that's all.”

“Initial training for teaching online has been haphazard -- not a clear progress, in my opinion -- and has focused mostly on us of cms -- not on engaging students in assignments and discussion posts due almost every day. Additionally, the interface for the Blackboard version at the time was crude (back in 2008).”

“I felt very under-prepared to teach online after the training course. It was too short and assumed that I already possessed a considerable amount of knowledge that I didn't.”

“I was trained under the old system. Since then, a new training course has been implemented. However, previously approved instructors were not required to take the new course.”

“Issues arose out of ongoing training on updates and additional enhancements to Blackboard system.”

“I took the online course development and teaching training BEFORE the new director of online joined us.”
learning. Ongoing training often has been at times when I was not available.”

- “Overall, a positive training experience. There were times where I had to sit through stuff I already knew in order to get to what I didn't know or needed help on.”

- “Our instructor is very approachable and never made me feel inadequate. I am an older person for whom technology is a challenge. She allowed me to attend the same sessions as many times as I felt like I needed to and was very personable in her patience and instruction.

The plan and delivery for online teaching and instruction has been vastly improved.”

- “The training experience took the approach of a typical SAU class. It was an online format that included interfaces for interacting as a teacher and as a student. It lasted several weeks with the same pacing as a course.”

- “The initial training did not include the more detailed information that was needed at a later date. It just incorporated the basic information. A more detailed written guide with questions and answers would have been valuable.”

- “Training for six weeks where I was in a class being trained and talking to other faculty was helpful. Most training of faculty (I have had two such courses) is about the process with no
week on the technical which should be part of the process. One needs to learn how to use Blackboard.

"The above responses vary from institution to institution. The big difference is if the institution sees online delivery for enhancing learning versus making more money in an easy way.

At the beginning of online courses at SAU there was a base line instructor training offered - I have not noted additional formalized instructor training offered.

I was very familiar with Blackboard already and find it very user-friendly, so I found some of the training redundant."
• “I wasn't given any formal training to my knowledge. I was just shown how it works by a SAU director for my program informally on my own computer.”

• “I was told to do anything I wanted to the course. I managed to destroy the basic template before an educational design person helped me understand there were standards that had to be in each course. I was given little to no training! I did take a class on how to teach online after I had taught one course online. Not handled well at all.”

• “Training was not thorough in covering what I needed to know.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Design and Pedagogy</th>
<th>“Much of my training actually occurred elsewhere, so the institutional training program about which I am responding was not fully resourced. Training emphases tended to focus on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The instructional designer I worked with was very helpful in giving me ideas of how to facilitate interaction with and between students. Attending a conference dedicated solely to online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Again, you ask about design and teaching. They are two different things. I did get some help with design, but it was not helpful. No training on teaching at all. Why not that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teaching and learning was also extremely helpful, but this was "outside" what my institution offered.

- "Again, I received no training. None was offered."
- "Most of this I picked up while attending Distance Education conferences."
- "Again no training provided just expected to do it!"
- "You have to understand, the school had no real training. But I was comfortable designing the course by myself and then teaching it by myself. There was support from the department chair about online teaching methodologies. There was also support in putting the course up on Blackboard."
- "I did not receive any formal training in any of the above areas."
- "I have found none of the structured "training" offered in the survey?"
- "N/A"
- "Again, the training emphasis was on satisfying student perceptions--regular contact, prompt feedback, meeting deadlines, rather than on ways to generate interaction, address content struggles, tutor those falling behind."
- "Same as before. The new director of online instruction is vastly improving our approach to the online delivery program."
- "There was an opportunity for preparing rubrics and using multimedia but there was not enough for me to feel confident in these areas."
- "Most of the technical aspects I had to learn on my own because they were not part of the learning process and should have been."
- "I was prepared to be a good TEACHER by my
• “The help I received was useful to completing the first class, but it necessarily was not generalizable, as broader training would have been.”
• “Coming from a generation that did not grow up with technology, I cannot stress enough, the ease of learning this training provided.”
• “The training I received was primarily focused on design much more than teaching. Since I was previously familiar with many of the learning management system's components, possibly I did not attend some of the training sessions that were focused there, but I don't recall any that were specifically directed toward learning it.”
• “I've learned far more from another institution's training program before I taught an online class for them, as well as by teaching/facilitating online at any of the institutions I have taught online for to be helpful. And most recently, the popularity of "modules" design I find alarming and counter-productive as a pedagogical trend.”
• “I didn't participate in any training. My structuring of my course and teaching methods are intuitive.”
• “Once again, I had to wing it. The only feedback came when the course was sent in for approval. I guess if they didn’t like it they wouldn't have paid me.”
• “I wasn't really given a specific training. Just informal. The informal training was helpful, but I don't know if it followed a pedagogy.”
• “I was basically hired and said "have at it" by the head of the department. After I had made hash of everything in the template/master shell, the educational designer
courses designed by others, at other institutions.”

- “Good general training in design and pedagogy. Would have like more emphasis on pros and cons of particular design/LMS options in terms of how those choices might affect pedagogical objectives.”
- “It covered everything you are asking about, but I've been reluctant to step outside my comfort zone. However, I've been co-teaching lately and find that my expertise is increasing as I work with someone who is more capable than I. I'm a willing, but timid learner. I want to be successful so I stay where I feel confident.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “The implementation of building community in my course and talking about the distinctiveness of Asbury has not been a part of any of my online training. I have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Though not taught this in formal training, I picked this up through various other meetings.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “You needed in your survey to ask the question about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “I was initially trained when the program was just getting started. I cannot comment on current training for new adjuncts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “These questions need a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tried to create that on my own because I know what Asbury stands for and what our mission statement is and I know the importance of letting that flow out of the courses I teach. No one really trained me in that.”

- “As I answer these questions.....any training I received was done in a one on one situation with tech folks at Asbury.”
- “I still struggle to know how to integrate faith and learning in an online setting. I feel the need for it here more than in the classroom because I am running into many more instances of cheating, plagiarism and lying than I ever do in a classroom.”
- “Training really only helped me with core content. There was not anything regarding institution vision and plans.”
- “The vision and goals were always repeated and whether the instructor received any training to create and teach an online course. Then the survey might jump to different questions if the answer to that is no.”
- “The trend towards modules is directly reflective of the concurrent trend towards marketing and cost-cutting replacing educational goals.”
- “Not Applicable.” Adjuncts have limited contact with the campus implementation of vision and mission.”
- “We don't have a vision or mission for online.”
- “Ditto”
- “The vision and mission of our school is included in all interactions between staff and students.”
- “I felt SAU's online training did a very good job with this. I already taught for them, so I found it very redundant, but for a newcomer the emphasis on these areas would have been very helpful.”
- “I did not receive training at my institution for online faculty.”
- “See previous comments.”
declared in any training I received. I was fully aware of the institution's plan.”

- “It is still unclear whether courses in the online system are really supposed to be "somehow equivalent" to the in class. Students in the online programs often say that my courses are way more demanding than other online courses and I know they are actually quite a bit less demanding than my in seat courses.”
- “I am not aware of an online faculty training program.”
- “Our online program does not seem to fit our institution at all.”
- “I think this was the weakest area in my training. While not stated outright, my sense was that we weren't sure why we were doing it, other than the fact that others were and we didn't want to be left out. But there wasn't a clearly articulated and
"owned" sense of vision and mission in relation to online learning. My sense is that there is a atmosphere of ambivalence regarding online learning, which leads to a less than robust communication of vision and mission.”

- “Asbury is spiritually unique. That is easy to carry into an online program, but I do miss the face-to-face relationships that develop in a classroom. However, the students have commented on the sense of spirituality that they recognize and appreciate in our teaching.”
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Research Objective

The expansion of online learning opportunities in higher education necessitates that postsecondary institutions develop strategic approaches to the training of online teaching faculty. Training is essential for the effective preparation of faculty to design and deliver meaningful online learning experiences. This Capstone Project compared the online faculty training systems at three postsecondary institutions for the purpose of identifying essential elements of online faculty training and the training systems and strategies that are effective for preparing online teaching faculty. In an effort to support the growth and development of Asbury University’s online learning initiatives, the goal of this project was to develop an online faculty training system proposal for Asbury University.

Value of the Capstone Project

Though the University does provide some training to online faculty members, the absence of a system for training that positions the institution to provide adequate training and that is responsive to the needs of the institution and its faculty will influence the effectiveness and efficiency of the University’s efforts to expand its online programs. A goal of this capstone project was to supply the institution’s leaders with new information regarding the type and scope of support and resources that are necessary to adequately train faculty. At stake are student learning, academic excellence, faculty buy-in and institutional effectiveness. On the verge of launching several new fully online degree programs, in accordance with the institution’s five-year strategic plan and in addition to its existing online academic programs, the
University will benefit greatly from a project that proposes recommendations for an online faculty training model that is reflective of current research and best practices and responsive to the unique needs of the institution and its faculty. This capstone project has the potential to shape how Asbury University positions itself for success as it progresses further into the world of online education.

**Review of Literature**

The literature reviewed on the design of training systems for online teaching faculty emphasized important issues related to training design, instructional design and pedagogy and institutional alignment. These emphases expand traditional concepts of essential principles and practices beyond basic online teaching skills and technical competencies to present a larger systems perspective on training. The focus is on the system that is designed to create and support the training process and not just the training itself. The table below shows the essential online faculty training design components identified in the review of literature. These components were grouped into three categories: training structure, instructional design and pedagogy, and institutional alignment. These three categories provided the qualitative protocol against which the online faculty training programs at the three participating institutions were evaluated.
### Online Faculty Training Qualitative Protocol: Essential Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Structure</th>
<th>Faculty Preparedness</th>
<th>Institutional Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Method(s)</td>
<td>Content Progression</td>
<td>Instructional Design and Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valuing Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Course Design, Course Organization, Creating Assessments, Building Interactive Elements, Building Evaluation Tools, Integrating Multimedia, Using the Learning Management System for Design**
- **Course Instruction, Assessing Student, Learning, Facilitating Interactions, Providing Student Feedback, Integrating Multimedia for Student Learning, Using the Learning Management System for Instruction**
- **Alignment with Institutional Vision and Mission, Distinctiveness, and Strategic Plan.**
- **Compensation for Completing Training, Recognition for Completing Training, Showing Value to Faculty for Completing Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Interface</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Directed, One-on-One</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitated, and/or Group-Facilitated (Web-based or Non-web-based)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensive, Extended, and/or Continuous</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods

This capstone project was based on a cross-case, comparative analysis of the online faculty training models at three higher education institutions. The three institutions selected for the project were Asbury University, Wilmore, KY, Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, KY, and Spring Arbor University, Spring Arbor, MI. Using a mixed methods design, the project included a review of institutional archival data, a survey of online teaching faculty at the three participating institutions, and an interview with one staff or faculty member at each institution who provides direct leadership or oversight specifically in the area of online faculty training.

Training Structure: Key Findings and Recommendations for Asbury University

Delivery Method

The results of the project indicated that a mixed-method approach to the delivery of training can provide an effective model for preparing online faculty. Training that is delivered in both face-to-face and web-based formats meets the unique training needs of faculty and provides more opportunities for faculty to engage training staff, content, and resources. Every faculty member has his/her own work and life schedules. As well, online courses that faculty develop or teach may operate on different schedules, due dates, and start dates. Considering the complexity created by the different needs of individual faculty members and the dynamics of institutional scheduling, training that is delivered in multiple formats enhances accessibility.

Face-to-face training was the most prevalent method for delivering training at the three institutions. Faculty perceive training that is delivered face-to-face to be
effective and to meets their needs and they respond positively to the assistance they receive from trainers and instructional designers in this setting. Face-to-face training is a method of training delivery emphasized at Asbury University. The University should continue to make this method for delivering training a part of the training experience for faculty.

An area in which the University needs to enhance its training opportunities for faculty is the delivery of web-based training. The institution offers a web-based, self-directed training course, but there is little intentionality or structure in terms of the role and purpose of this course in the overall training experience of faculty. Few faculty at the institution use this training package and no faculty have completed it in its entirety. The institution should consider developing and offering a required web-based, facilitated training course, such as that which is offered by Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University. Considering the preference of faculty for training that involves real interaction with a trainer, a web-based, facilitated course meets this need of faculty and provides a way of delivering training to faculty that complements face-to-face training experiences. A web-based, facilitated course also provides faculty with an opportunity to experience training in an environment that is comparable to the environment for which they are developing an online course or preparing to teach an online course.

**Delivery Method Recommendations for Asbury University**

1. Continue to deliver training through a mixed-method approach providing both face-to-face and web-based training opportunities.
2. Continue to make face-to-face training a part of the training experience for every faculty member.

3. Create a web-based, facilitated training course that is required of every faculty member who develops or teaches online courses.

**Delivery Interface**

The results indicated that a one-on-one training interface is the most prevalent interface for training at the three institutions and the interface preferred by most faculty. The training needs of individual faculty members vary depending on prior training, knowledge, and experience in online learning and they are often course specific. One-on-one training provides faculty with opportunities to address with training staff the specific areas in which they need assistance and support. The primary way in which faculty interface with training at Asbury University is one-on-one training with a trainer. The institution should continue to make one-on-one training experiences between faculty and trainers a priority in its model for preparing online faculty.

Group-facilitated training can complement well the training that faculty receive in one-on-one settings when this training is provided in a web-based environment. A significant piece of the design of training at Asbury University is group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings. The life and work schedules of faculty often conflict with the scheduling of these trainings and, as such, they are poorly attended. A web-based delivery works better for faculty because faculty can complete training on their time. As well, if group-facilitated trainings are an essential part of the
training experience at the University, then these trainings should be required by the institution. Asbury University does not require the participation of faculty in these group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings. Requiring faculty to participate in these trainings is the only way to ensure that they receive the training they need to be prepared for the online environment. The University should consider developing a web-based, group-facilitated training course or set of courses that are required for faculty who develop or teach online.

Training delivered through a self-directed interface can be a useful part of the training experience only as a complement to the training that faculty receive in one-on-one and group-facilitated formats. The presence of self-directed training opportunities and online training resources seemed to have little impact on the effectiveness of the overall training experience for faculty. Providing training resources online to faculty, such as video tutorials, recordings, and instructional documents, may be helpful to some faculty in addition to the training they receive from training staff, but these resources cannot substitute for the contextualized and specific training that faculty receive through interactions with a trainer.

If the institution chooses to continue to offer its self-directed online training course as a part of the training experience for faculty, participation in the course should be required prior to developing or teaching an online course. This is the only way to ensure that faculty receive the training they need through this system. As well, since the University provides very few other types of training resources online,
such as video tutorials and recordings, the institution should consider expanding its repository of online training resources.

**Delivery Interface Recommendations for Asbury University**

1. Continue to emphasize one-on-one training between faculty and training staff as an essential part of the training experience for every faculty member.
2. Shift the institution’s emphasis on training in group-facilitated, face-to-face to group-facilitated, web-based training.
3. Require faculty to complete the institution’s self-directed, web-based training course.
4. Expand the institution’s repository of online training resources.

**Schedule**

One of the findings of the research regarding training schedule is that faculty respond favorably to the flexibility of scheduling that is provided by one-on-one, face-to-face training opportunities. Faculty and training staff can schedule these trainings at times that work for both the faculty member and the trainer. This scheduling approach works well for faculty who have different work and life schedules within which they must create time for training. Asbury University takes this approach to the scheduling of one-on-one, face-to-face trainings and should continue to provide training in this scheduling format.

The research showed that scheduled, group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings do not meet the needs of most faculty, especially when these training sessions are
consistently offered at times that regularly conflict with faculty schedules. A significant part of the training model at Asbury University is group-facilitated, face-to-face training. These training sessions are offered during regular business hours on week days and are poorly attended. The scheduling of these sessions is “open” in the sense that faculty can show up for training if they choose to do so. If the institution chooses to continue to offer group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings, these trainings should be offered at multiple times to meet the different scheduling needs of faculty. It is recommended that these sessions be offered at times that are outside of regular business hours, such as in the evening, so that these sessions conflict less with traditional academic course schedules.

The institution should also consider condensing and intensifying the scheduling of training offered in group-facilitated formats. Asbury University offers group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings that span the entire academic year. Faculty at the University would have to participate in sessions throughout the course of an entire year in order to complete the full sequence of training. This scheduling approach does not work well with the diverse scheduling needs of faculty. Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University provide web-based, group-facilitated training courses to faculty that are completed in 3-4 weeks. The findings indicate that faculty prefer a more condensed and intense approach to the scheduling of training. Asbury University should condense the scheduling sequence of its group-facilitated trainings and provide the entire sequence multiple times each year. In doing so, the institution
could meet the needs of faculty who enter the training process at different times throughout the year.

Another important training consideration for Asbury University is the lead time provided to faculty to complete training prior to developing or teaching an online course. A training issue at more than one institution was that faculty did not receive the training they needed in the time available to them prior to the start of an online course. One way to address this issue is to require faculty to complete a training course prior to developing or teaching an online course. For instance, Eastern Kentucky University requires faculty to complete its three week online faculty development course prior to teaching online. This training approach helps to ensure that all faculty have a certain level of training prior to entering the online learning space.

The University should also consider adopting a course development model similar to that which is employed at Spring Arbor University. Online course development at Spring Arbor University follows a 14 week process during which faculty have at least seven interactions with training staff. Spring Arbor University was the only institution to score at or above the benchmark on the survey question related to training schedules in both effectiveness and meeting the needs of faculty. Faculty need adequate lead time prior to the due date or start date of an online course in order to receive the training they need. Using a structured course development schedule that applies to all faculty who develop online courses ensures that every
faculty member has the time they need to receive the training that is necessary to prepare them.

**Schedule Recommendations for Asbury University**

1. In order to meet the different scheduling needs of faculty, continue to maintain as much flexibility as possible in the scheduling of one-on-one training sessions between faculty and training staff.

2. Offer group-facilitated, face-to-face trainings at multiple times, including times outside of regular business hours.

3. Condense and intensify the group-facilitated training schedule to a 3-4 week timeframe and offer the entire sequence multiple times per year.

4. Increase the lead time given to faculty for completing training prior to developing or teaching an online course.

5. Implement a structured course development sequence that ensures every faculty member has enough time to complete adequate training during the course development process.

**Content Progression**

A structured and intentional progression of content in the training experience of faculty is essential for their preparation for online learning. The aspect of training in which a clear progression of content was most evident for the institutions examined in this project was the online faculty training courses provided by Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University. A group-facilitated, web-based training course exposes faculty to a prescribed progression of content that enables faculty to
develop knowledge and skills in areas of training that are essential for their preparation. Though a web-based training course with a prescribed progression of content may not meet the unique training needs of every faculty member, requiring faculty to participate in this kind of training helps to ensure that every faculty member has some exposure to the areas of training that are essential for the effective preparation of faculty. As well, when the training course is facilitated by a trainer, this adds a level of accountability to the training process and gives institutions a better understanding of what training faculty have completed.

Asbury University offers a web-based, self-directed training course. However, participation in this course is not required for faculty and there is minimal oversight and monitoring related to whether faculty participate in this course and when they participate in it. The University should consider offering a web-based, facilitated course that guides faculty through a specific progression of content. The institution should require faculty to participate in this course. Doing so will help to ensure that every Asbury University online faculty member has an opportunity to develop knowledge and skills that will prepare them for online learning. By making this course a facilitated training experience, training staff are better positioned to monitor the training experience of faculty and to assess what kind of training individual faculty members may need beyond this experience.

For the three institutions, the findings of the project indicated that a structured progression of content is not always an intentional part of the design of training for one-on-one training experiences between faculty and training staff. Faculty bring to
one-on-one training sessions different levels of prior training and experience in online learning. These training sessions are best suited to address the unique training needs and course specific questions of individual faculty members. Faculty need a training venue in which they can seek specific assistance and support. Asbury University provides this venue for training and should continue to create opportunities for faculty to engage training staff in one-on-one settings.

An area of need at all three institutions was continuous training for faculty. At the three institutions, there was little evidence of a strategic approach to providing on-going training for faculty beyond the initial training they receive to design or teach an online course. Asbury University should consider designing training experiences that are purposed to promote continuous growth and development for faculty in the area of online learning. As on-going research in this field produces new strategies for design and instruction in online environments and as the technologies and tools that support online learning evolve, faculty will need opportunities to learn about these developments and to improve their craft.

Another important piece related to content progression and training design in that Asbury University needs to address is minimum levels of competency that faculty must meet in order to be effective in the online environment. Asbury University has no established minimum competencies for online faculty. The University should define what knowledge and skills are required for online faculty and communicate this information to faculty. Doing so will help the institution identify which faculty are ready to design or teach online course and to assess what
areas of training an individual faculty member may need in order meet the institution’s requirements.

**Content Progression Recommendations for Asbury University**

1. Develop a strategy for providing on-going training to online faculty beyond the initial training they receive to design or teach online courses.

2. Establish clear minimum competency levels across the training content that faculty must achieve in order to design or teach online courses for the University.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy: Key Findings and Recommendations for Asbury University**

The results of the project indicated that the training model for Asbury University differs from the training models at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University on the roles of faculty and instructional designers/trainers in the design of online courses. At Asbury University, training staff provide training to faculty to prepare them to design online course and faculty are largely responsible for building and developing their courses. Faculty act as both content experts and course designers. At Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University, faculty interact closely with instructional designers during the online course development process and instructional designers are largely responsible for building and developing courses. Faculty act as content experts and instructional design staff serve as course designers.
Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University combined to score higher than Asbury University on 7 of 8 survey questions related to training design. One-on-one training between faculty and instructional designers is a large part of the training experience for faculty at Eastern Kentucky University and Spring Arbor University specifically for online course design. These findings suggest that faculty at these institutions appreciate the level of support and guidance that is provided by instructional designers in the process of online course development. However, Asbury University scored higher on 3 of 6 faculty survey questions related to the effectiveness of training on instructional design and pedagogy for course design and the University was the only institution to score at or above the benchmark in one of these areas, course organization. Asbury University provides training to faculty in this area to equip them to design their own courses. What these findings suggest is that the larger role of the instructional designer in the online course design process meets certain needs of faculty, but the larger role of the instructional designer may limit the training that faculty receive from the perspective of instructional design and pedagogy.

Asbury University should consider adopting a balanced approach to training with regard to the roles of faculty and instructional designers in the online course design process. Faculty need training in the area of instructional design and pedagogy for online course design that equips them to function adequately, independently, and confidently within the online learning space. Faculty also need direct support and guidance from instructional designers who have expertise in this
area, but instructional designers should not carry the entire weight of the responsibility for designing courses. The assistance and support provided by instructional designers should complement and reinforce the training that faculty receive in this area. Faculty may not be experts in instructional design, but they should be competent in the principles and strategies for design and pedagogy that support a quality online learning experience.

A consistent theme in the findings of the project was that the majority of training at the three institutions in the area of online course design focused on preparing faculty to use the institution’s learning management system and other technology tools, such as web-conferencing software, from a technical perspective. Though this training is helpful to faculty, the overall approach to training is not resulting in adequate training in instructional design and pedagogy for online course design. On the survey questions related to instructional design and pedagogy for online course design, a third or more of faculty respondents indicated that they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree that training is effective in the areas of creating assessments, building evaluation tools, building interactive elements, integrating multimedia, and using the learning management system for course design. In some of these training areas, 50% or more of faculty at more than one of institution indicated that training is ineffective. This is a widespread issue for all three institutions. Training needs to extend beyond the technical uses and functionality of the institution’s learning management system to include more training on pedagogical concepts, strategies, and approaches to designing online courses.
Asbury University should consider integrating a series of trainings on instructional design and pedagogy for online course design into a web-based, facilitated training course. The training sequence should introduce design principles and strategies related to course organization, creating assessments, building evaluation tools, building interactive elements, integrating multimedia, and using the learning management system for course design. This aspect of the training experience would help to ensure that faculty understand what strategies and principles for design and pedagogy they should consider as they develop online courses. This training should be completed prior to one-on-one training sessions between faculty and instructional designers. This approach will make the time that faculty have with instructional design staff more efficient as they will bring to these one-on-one training sessions a knowledge and skill base in this area.

Asbury University should also consider specifying the role of instructional designers as facilitators of design or design consultants. Instructional designers should use their expertise to provide guidance and support to faculty in this area and should make recommendations to faculty regarding design and pedagogy throughout the online course development process. However, instructional designers should not be charged with the full responsibility of taking content from faculty members and using this content to build courses for faculty. There will be some aspects of design for which faculty will need additional support from instructional design staff, such as design pieces that require special expertise. For instance, producing some forms of multimedia requires a skill-set that faculty might not acquire through a training
program. However, faculty should be expected to understand why they would integrate multimedia into a course and the instructional design principles and strategies that inform the ways in which multimedia should be integrated into courses.

One final recommendation for Asbury University related to online course design is for the institution to provide its online course review evaluation tool to faculty prior to beginning course design. Training staff use this tool to evaluate newly developed online courses. If the institution uses this tool to review courses based on an established set of expectations related to course design, then faculty should be made aware of the institution’s expectations prior to beginning course design.

The findings also indicated that training faculty in instructional design and pedagogy for online course instruction was an area of training that needs to be addressed at all three institutions. For all three institutions, only one institution, Spring Arbor University, scored at or above the benchmark on one of the faculty survey questions (Providing Student Feedback) related to the effectiveness of training in instructional design and pedagogy for online instruction. Faculty need more training in the areas of assessing student learning, facilitating interactions, providing student feedback, using multimedia for student learning, and using the learning management system for online instruction.

Asbury University should consider integrating a series of trainings on instructional design and pedagogy for online course instruction into a web-based, facilitated training course. The training sequence should introduce design principles
and strategies related to assessing student learning, facilitating interactions, providing student feedback, using multimedia for student learning, and using the learning management system for online instruction. This aspect of the training experience would help to ensure that faculty understand what strategies and principles for design and pedagogy they should consider as they teach online courses. This training should be required and faculty should complete it in its entirety prior to teaching an online course. This approach will help to ensure that, prior to teaching an online course, faculty are exposed to instructional design and pedagogical principles and strategies that will support their effectiveness as online instructors.

One alarming theme present in the findings was that some faculty at the institutions taught courses without completing any formal training related to online course instruction. It is possible that some faculty were selected to teach courses too close to the start date of a course in order to complete any training. It is also possible that the institutions did not have clear processes in place to ensure that every faculty member completed training and to monitor what training faculty completed. In the staff/faculty interviews, interviewees for all three institutions described at least a part of the overall training experience for faculty as required. However, some faculty entered the instructional process without completing any formal training.

Asbury University should consider developing a clear set of guidelines for faculty that communicate which aspects of faculty training are required prior to teaching an online course. The institution should also develop a system for tracking and monitoring the types of training completed by each faculty member. As well, in
order to maintain a sense of accountability related to online faculty training, the institution should establish protocols for addressing situations when faculty have not completed training, but are still slated to teach a course. If faculty really are required to complete training, then the institution must have a plan in place for responding in these situations that considers both the needs of students who are enrolled in online courses and the institution’s commitment to its training process. This is one reason why it is so important that faculty are given adequate time to complete training prior to the launch of a course. The institution should never be in a position in which the quality of the experience of students is jeopardized because faculty did not have enough time to complete the training they need in order to be effective online instructors.

One of the highlights of the findings on training in instructional design and pedagogy for online instruction was Spring Arbor University’s pedagogical model for online learning. Spring Arbor University was the only institution for which there was evidence of a model for the type of learning experience that the institution desires students to have in every online course. The model focuses on the experience of students from the perspective of learning interactions, including student-to-student, student-to-instructor, student-to-content, and student-to-Christ interactions. The University’s model serves as both a guide for the online instructor in terms of his/her role as facilitator of learning and as a vision for what learning should look like in the online environment. The model is addressed in the institution’s web-based, online professional development course. The effect of this model was evident in the
research as Spring Arbor University scored higher than the other two institutions in 3 of the 5 training categories on the faculty survey regarding the effectiveness of training for online instruction.

Asbury University should consider developing a vision for what the online learning experience for students should be and then articulate this vision in its own pedagogical model. The model should serve as a guide for faculty as they prepare to teach courses and as they facilitate the online learning experience. The University’s pedagogical model should be integrated into every aspect of the training experience and should be addressed specifically in a web-based, group-facilitated training experience. Addressing the model in a required training course will allow training staff an opportunity to share with every faculty member why the model exists and how the model can be achieved in the instructional process. This training piece will inspire in faculty a commonly-shared vision of what online learning can be at the institution and will motivate online instructors toward common pedagogical outcomes.

**Instructional Design and Pedagogy Recommendations for Asbury University**

1. Create a series of trainings on instructional design and pedagogy for online course design in the areas of course organization, creating assessments, building evaluation tools, building interactive elements, integrating multimedia, and using the learning management system for course design.
2. Require faculty to complete the training sequence on instructional design and pedagogy for online course design prior to interacting with instructional designers or training staff in one-on-one training sessions.

3. Specify the role of instructional designers as facilitators of design or design consultants and provide additional support to faculty in areas of course design that require special expertise.

4. Provide the online course review evaluation tool to faculty prior to course design.

5. Integrate a series of trainings on instructional design and pedagogy for online course instruction into a web-based, facilitated training course that introduce principles and strategies related to assessing student learning, facilitating interactions, providing student feedback, using multimedia for student learning, and using the learning management system for online instruction.

6. Establish clear guidelines for what training is required of faculty prior to teaching an online course.

7. Create a system for tracking and monitoring what training faculty have completed.

8. Establish a protocol for addressing situations when faculty are slated to teach an online course but have not completed training.
9. Create a vision for online learning and build a pedagogical model based upon this vision that guides faculty in their preparation for online instruction.

Institutional Alignment: Key Findings and Recommendations for Asbury University

Contextual Alignment

The findings showed that training on the relationship between online learning and institutional vision and mission, distinctiveness, and strategic plan was an in need of improvement at all three institutions. For Asbury University and Eastern Kentucky University, there was no evidence of these pieces built into the training experience of faculty. Spring Arbor University’s training model did show evidence of training in the area of institutional distinctiveness through to its pedagogical model for online learning. For Spring Arbor University, the institution’s online course development process emphasizes the pedagogical model and the model is discussed in the institution’s online faculty development course. Outside of this training element at Spring Arbor University, there was no other evidence of training for faculty on contextual alignment.

Asbury University should consider creating a training session specifically on the relationship between the institution’s approach to online learning and its vision and mission. One alarming finding in the results from Chapter Four is that faculty may be unaware of their institution’s vision and mission. Vision and mission are central to an institution’s identity and purpose. Faculty need to know how their
contributions in online education support the institution’s vision and mission and move the institution toward its larger purpose.

Asbury University should also consider creating a training session on what makes the institution distinct and how this distinctiveness can and should be reflected in the online learning experience. Institutional distinctiveness should be reflected in both the design of online courses and how faculty facilitate the online learning experience. The training should include information on what makes the institution distinct and recommendations for how this distinctiveness translates into principles and strategies for course design and instruction.

Asbury University also needs a training session on the relationship between the institution’s approach to online education and its strategic plan. A strategic plan articulates an institution’s goals and how it plans to reach those goals. It may not be necessary for faculty to understanding every aspect of an institution’s strategic plan. For instance, it may not be necessary for training to address details related to budgets and various assessment measures and targets not directly related to the education experience. It would be helpful though for faculty to understand the place of online education in the institution’s strategic plan and how their work in online education helps the institution reach its goals and outcomes.

**Contextual Alignment Recommendations for Asbury University**

1. Create a training session specifically on the relationship between the institution’s approach to online learning and its vision and mission.
2. Create a training session on what makes the institution distinct and how this distinctiveness can and should be reflected in the online learning experience.

3. Create a training session on the relationship between the institution’s approach to online education and its strategic plan.

Valuing Faculty

Of all of the training areas explored in this Capstone Project, valuing faculty for completing training was the area that showed the greatest need of attention. The findings showed that none of the three institutions show value to faculty for completing training outside of providing faculty the opportunity to develop or teach online courses when they complete training. There was no evidence of any tangible methods for recognizing the value of completing training. As well, there was no evidence of any ways of compensating faculty for completing training.

The findings revealed that all three institutions plan to create ways to recognize faculty for completing training in the future. For instance, the institutions may create tangible ways to acknowledge the training faculty have completed such as presenting faculty with certificates of recognition. As well, the institutions may pursue a collegial form of recognition through opportunities present to faculty to train other faculty. Based on the findings of this Project, implementing these forms of recognition did not appear to be a priority for the institutions.

Asbury University should consider creating a method for recognizing faculty for the training they complete. Providing faculty with a certificate of recognition is
one simple approach that the institution could implement immediately. The institution must create a way to honor the commitment that faculty exhibit by completing the training process and the importance of what they have learned. In doing so, the institution will communicate to faculty that training has value and that the time and effort faculty give to the training process is worthwhile.

The findings indicated that there is a perception held by some University leaders that training is an expected part of the responsibility of being a faculty member and; therefore; additional compensation for completing training is unnecessary. The findings of this Project affirm the perspective that training should be required. Regarding compensation for completing training, the opposing argument is that faculty should be compensated for the expertise that they acquire as a result of training. In other areas of the work of faculty in higher education, compensation is sometimes associated with the level and type of expertise of faculty. For instance, faculty scholarship is a common measure in the evaluation process for tenure status at some colleges and universities. Value is shown to the efforts of faculty to grow and learn in their areas of expertise.

One illustration of how an institution might compensate faculty for completing training came from the results of the staff/faculty interview for Spring Arbor University. In the future, Spring Arbor University plans to reward faculty by recognizing the training they complete as a part of the process of earning tenure status at the institution. This method of compensation would apply only to full-time faculty
who are pursuing tenure. This is one example of how an institution can communicate to faculty that training matters for their security and advancement in employment.

Asbury University should consider developing some method of compensating faculty for completing training. Compensation could take several forms, such as financial compensation, relief time from other employment responsibilities, course reductions, etc. However the institution decides to compensate faculty, compensation should be available to both full-time and part-time faculty who complete training. If the institution adopts the approach that completion of its regular training package is a requirement for all faculty who design or teach online courses and that there is no additional compensation for completion of this regular training package, the institution should consider how it might reward faculty who go above and beyond the minimum expectations for training. What will motivate online faculty to pursue the kind of training they need to help advance the institution toward its vision for online education? The intrinsic motivations associated with training that helps one to become an excellent online educator and providing students with a quality online learning experience may encourage faculty toward continuous improvement of their craft. But, valuing faculty for completing training through compensation may provide extrinsic motivation that also push faculty to be the best at what they do in online education.

Valuing Faculty Recommendations for Asbury University

1. Create a method for recognizing faculty for completing training, such as providing faculty with a certificate of recognition.
2. Create a compensation model that shows value to faculty for completing training by rewarding them for improve their craft in ways that go above and beyond the minimum expectations related to training established by the institution.

**Conclusion and Institutional Priorities**

Based on the findings of the Capstone Project, there are two areas that Asbury University should address as priorities for improving online faculty training. Priority number one is to improve how online faculty training prepares faculty to teach online courses. Training is heavily focused on preparing faculty to design online courses, but faculty are provided only minimal training to prepare them to be effective online instructors. Priority number two is to improve how online faculty training is aligned specifically to Asbury University. Through training, faculty must gain a clear perspective about how online learning at Asbury University relates to the institution’s vision and mission, distinctiveness, and strategic plan.
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