SURVEY OF TRADITIONAL AND DISTANCE LEARNING FACULTY MEMBERS AT PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS IN THE SOUTHEAST: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT

by

ELIZABETH MARY SIMONETTI

(Under the direction of Sylvia M. Hutchinson, Ph.D.)

ABSTRACT

This study reports the results of a survey of traditional and distance learning faculty members at private four-year institutions in the Southeast regarding their opinions, perceptions, and beliefs about distance learning. A 60-question survey instrument was sent to 564 traditional and distance learning faculty members, with a response rate of 39.3%. Traditional faculty members are concerned about job security, teaching loads, course control and quality, and ownership of intellectual property. By contrast, distance learning faculty members viewed distance learning as a way to reach new students without increasing faculty teaching loads. Approximately ten percent of traditional faculty members and sixty percent of distance learning faculty members surveyed reported teaching distance learning courses. Both traditional and distance learning faculty members reported using technology to increase student participation in courses; and both groups are concerned about student cheating in distance learning courses. Traditional faculty members reported that their distance learning courses were taught at the undergraduate level as an addition to place-based courses, while distance learning faculty members reported that their distance learning courses replaced place-based courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Neither group reported that distance learning courses attracted new enrollments from students outside their institutions; moreover, enrollments in distance learning courses averaged less than twenty students per course. Threaded discussion and e-mail were the most popular technologies used to interact with distance learning students. Faculty reported that they needed additional time in preparing and delivering distance learning courses, but few received release time for them. Future research should include examining policies for compensation for distance learning, and reviewing faculty development programs to prepare faculty to maximize teaching strategies in distance learning.

INDEX WORDS: Higher education, Distance learning, Distance education, Faculty members, Policy development

SURVEY OF TRADITIONAL AND DISTANCE LEARNING FACULTY MEMBERS AT PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS IN THE SOUTHEAST: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT

by

ELIZABETH MARY SIMONETTI

B. S., The University of Connecticut, 1983

B. A., The University of Connecticut, 1983

M. G. A., The University of Maryland, University College, 1989

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

SURVEY OF TRADITIONAL AND DISTANCE LEARNING FACULTY MEMBERS AT PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS IN THE SOUTHEAST: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT

by

ELIZABETH MARY SIMONETTI

Approved:

Major Professor: Sylvia M. Hutchinson

Committee: James Fletcher
Patricia Kalivoda
Edward Simpson
Ronald Simpson

Electronic Version Approved:

Gordhan L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2002

DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated to the memory of my father, John A. Simonetti. He sought success and happiness in equal measure. He was honest, hard-working, dedicated, social, professional, and always one step ahead of everyone else.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to acknowledge many people who helped me complete this doctoral program and to make this dissertation a reality. My first thanks go to my wonderful family—my parents, brothers and sisters, and their families—who were steadfast in their support, encouragement, and understanding as I pursued my goal to complete this program. They helped me weather many personal milestones throughout this program, and also helped me celebrate successes along the way. I am most thankful for my family.

I wish to thank colleagues at Mercer University who supported my decision to pursue this program—colleagues at the School of Pharmacy, in the Office of International Programs, and in the Office of Distance Learning. To tell the truth, the opportunity to complete this program was a gift from President Godsey; it was he who first encouraged me to pursue this degree, and gave me the support to complete it. I remain most grateful for the opportunity.

I am grateful to the leadership at the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools who allowed me to access their databases and records for my study. I appreciated their sincere interest in the project, and very much enjoyed comparing stories about their doctoral experiences throughout this project.

Thank you to Richard Jackson, who coached me through the statistics portion of the study. Learning a new statistics software package while writing a dissertation was not a strategic decision on my part, and Richard was indeed a patient teacher.

Finally, I am very grateful for the guidance and direction from my Graduate Committee: Sylvia Hutchinson, Jim Fletcher, Trish Kalivoda, Ed Simpson and Ron Simpson. Although Sylvia served as my major professor and coached me through the academic rigor of dissertation scholarship, we also shared family stories, personal experiences, and the human side of tackling a doctoral dissertation; we often laughed about keeping "life" going while writing a dissertation. Thinking about those conversations and discussions will make me smile for a long time to come.

As we know in higher education, we stand on the shoulders of the scholars that came before us; because of Sylvia, I can see for miles and miles.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Institutions of higher education have experimented with offering distance learning programs in response to diverse opportunities. The first major factor that helped increase distance learning programs was the convergence of communication, computing, and learning technologies (Sherron & Boettcher, 1997). From printed course materials in the 1890s, to audio and television technology developments in the 1960s and 1970s, to contemporary computer technologies that accommodate video-streaming, chat rooms and interactive CD ROM technologies, distance learning initiatives have grown from solitary self-paced self-instruction to interactive, participatory learning programs. In addition to the changes to communications technologies, changes in educational philosophy and curriculum design have also contributed to the growth of distance learning offerings (Sherron & Boettcher, 1997). The belief that students are self-directed learners, rather than "empty vessels" seeking knowledge, contributed to developing active learning strategies accompanied by new pedagogical methods that meet students' life-long learning goals. In fact, Clark (1995) has stated that distance learning has shifted the focus of higher education from "course-based" activities to flexible, modular initiatives targeted to meet individual learning goals. To accommodate curricular and pedagogic innovations, institutions have developed new models of infrastructure (Sherron & Boettcher, 1997) that increased students' access to educational resource materials; moreover, institutions have developed new administrative structures that enhanced and

increased flexibility and accountability in higher education (Clark, 1995), provided increased opportunities for training and staff development (Baume, 1995), and afforded greater opportunities for institutional partnerships within higher education (Layer, 1995).

Clark (1995) identified several benefits to faculty who participate in distance learning, including the ability to accommodate diverse learning styles; the ability to focus on learning rather than on providing information; the ability to work with small groups of students; and the freedom from the responsibilities of lecturing. However, she believed that faculty's view of the constantly changing background for open and flexible learning made them fearful for their jobs and suspicious of distance learning (Clark, 1995). As a follow up to her report, this study examined faculty members' expressed opinions, perceptions, and beliefs about distance learning.

Distance learning in higher education has expanded to institutions across the United States. The December 1999 report from the National Center on Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education estimated that 78% of four-year public post-secondary institutions offered some type of distance learning courses; by contrast, only 19% of four-year private institutions offered distance learning courses (NCES, 1999). The majority of the growth during the period was in courses that used asynchronous computer-based technology, primarily the Internet, rather than video-based technology (NCES, 1999). To accommodate new offerings and new delivery methods, policy makers at the federal, regional, state, and institutional levels have continued to evaluate, and in some cases modify, higher educational policy.

On October 7, 1998, Congress voted to extend authorization of the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965. As an outcome to the re-authorization of the Higher

Education Act, several initiatives related to distance learning policy were implemented. The first outcome was to create the Web-Based Education Commission, charged with conducting a thorough study to assess the educational software available in retail markets for secondary and post-secondary students who choose to use such software (CHEA, 1999). Second, in June 1999, the United States Copyright Office published its report examining how recent changes in legislation affected materials used in distance education. While the report recommended requiring Online Service Providers (OSPs) to monitor the content of the Websites they host, the Office also made several exemptions to the law that extended the "fair use" doctrine. This allowed for limited use of copyrighted materials in the classroom into distance education (CHEA, 1999). These changes represented important national policy initiatives to accommodate the growth of distance learning.

In addition, at the national level, the Council of Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) has taken the initiative to develop a policy agenda for distance learning academic accreditation for the accreditation community as well as for federal agencies (Phipps, et al. 1998). CHEA has set this agenda to prepare for the increase in distance learning programs offered by higher education consortia, virtual universities, and contracted or brokered arrangements in higher education.

In their most recent survey of state policies and distance education technology "Measuring Up 2000," the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) reported that four important issues have shaped the agenda of distance education policy at the state level: (1) policies regarding the overall coordination and planning for distance learning; (2) policies regarding the planning and implementing of a statewide distance learning

infrastructure; (3) coordination of statewide program development; and (4) statewide faculty and curriculum development (www.sheeo.org). Although most states have begun addressing these policy areas, SHEEO reported that only six states have developed separate policies for approving new degree programs offered through distance education technology.

Even regional accreditation organizations have adapted policies to accommodate distance learning initiatives. For example, representatives from four regional accrediting commissions joined to form the Interregional Accrediting Committee (IRAC) to work with Western Governors University, a regional virtual university created to deliver degree programs through distance learning technology. The four regional accrediting commissions-- the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools; the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges; the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC); and the WASC Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges-- collaborated to address the accreditation needs of a consortium of institutions offering courses solely through distance learning technologies. In another example, the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) proposed revisions to the Criteria for Accreditation to accommodate all higher education offerings, including distance learning programs (SACS, 2000); final Criteria were approved by the SACS membership in December 2001.

On the institutional level, university administrators have reviewed model policy recommendations from national professional organizations in response to the increase in distance learning offerings. For example, model institutional policies regarding intellectual property rights of faculty have been proposed by the American Association of

University Professors (www.aaup.org/deipdocs/htm). In addition, the National Education Association (www.nea.org/he/abouthe/distance.htm) has made recommendations on security and privacy of distance learning courses, and the Association of College and Research Libraries (www.ala.org/acrl/guides/distlrng.htm) has proposed guidelines for library services to support distance learning programs throughout their institutions. University administrators who are writing institutional policies to manage distance learning have consulted these model policies as templates.

Within institutions, distance education challenged the traditional roles and responsibilities of faculty. The traditional roles of academic authority, curriculum, and academic standards competed with commercially-available courseware, standardized courseware, and commercially-prepared curricula (Eaton, 2001). CHEA proposed faculty intellectual and academic authority as a Core Value in higher education; because of this view, CHEA recommended that policies be created that allow faculty to continue to provide stewardship for curriculum and quality standards by using electronic tools to improve academic work. (Eaton, 2000). However, before distance learning policies can be developed, approved, and adopted by an institution, factors associated with distance education, including faculty opinions and perceptions about distance learning, have to be explored.

Background

This study used several working definitions of distance education or distance learning, and the definitions used similar terms. In a recent review of distance education, CHEA (1998) defined distance learning as education delivered over a distance to one or more

individuals located in one or more venues. CHEA suggested that distance learning possessed these characteristics:

> teaching and learning process that involves activities where the learners are at a distance from the instructor; a combination of media may be used; knowledge and content are available through a variety of sources; courses can be offered anytime and anyplace; and there is direct interaction between and among teachers and students (page 5).

In addition, they suggested that distance learning can be synchronous or asynchronous.

For purposes of accreditation review, SACS (1997) defined distance education as

> a formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction occurs when student and instructor are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. Distance education may employ correspondence study, or audio, video, or computer technologies. (page 1)

As early as 1968, Dilling (in Keegan, 1990) identified eight dimensions of distance education– a learner, society, an organization, learning objectives, content to be learned, the result of learning, distance, and a signal carrier. These dimensions continued to identify the hallmarks of distance learning. Garrison and Shale (1990) reported that during the last thirty years, institutions continued to focus on similar parameters of distance learning, including appropriate teaching tools and technology for distance education, such as teleconferencing, computer-based technology, ancillary media, and video-based instruction.

In preparing to offer distance learning programs, institutions have evaluated curricular, logistical and pedagogical parameters unique to distance learning. These

parameters included student motivation and appropriate sequencing of courses (Garrison and Shale, 1990), and successful teaching and learning strategies for distance learning coursework (Holmberg, 1989). Planning a distance education syllabus (Holmberg, 1989), selecting appropriate teaching tools (Willis, 1993), conducting faculty development programs (Willis, 1993), and monitoring faculty workload and faculty compensation for distance education (Olcott, 1991) were other parameters institutions evaluated when deciding about offering distance education programs. Finally, institutions have evaluated the level of funding required to support distance learning course offerings, as well as resource allocation, including space allocation (Carey, 1996).

While institutions have evaluated many parameters in depth, faculty perceptions, opinions, and expectations were not listed as key parameters that institutions evaluated or should have evaluated when preparing to offer distance learning programs. Few institutions reported soliciting faculty input in the initial decision to offer distance learning courses; in fact, several anecdotes in the higher education press (Carr, 2000) described situations where faculty strongly objected to the lack of consultation about implementing distance learning programs. In fact, Olcott (1991) has suggested that the emphasis on technology in distance education has overshadowed needed attention on academic policy to accommodate distance learning. This study solicited faculty input and opinions on distance learning programs.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to explore the opinions, perceptions, and beliefs of faculty members at private institutions with membership in the Commission on Colleges of SACS regarding distance learning. Only two recently published studies reported the

attitudes and opinions of faculty toward distance learning. In 1993, Clark surveyed full-time faculty members in the chemistry, marketing, and political science departments of 57 public institutions nationally; he included 16 two-year institutions, 20 large comprehensive universities, and 21 public research institutions in the project. The survey included 20 multiple choice questions and Likert scale responses. He reported that faculty maintained cautious optimism toward distance education, and that they expressed concerns regarding quality, effectiveness, adequate administrative and technical support, and professional rewards for distance learning programs.

More recently, the National Education Association (NEA, 2000) conducted a national study of unionized faculty members at public two-year and four-year institutions nationwide. They reported that faculty who teach in distance education hold a more positive view of distance education than traditional faculty. In addition, compensation for intellectual property was the deepest concern expressed by faculty. In contrast, however, all faculty surveyed believed that the quality of education would not decline because of distance learning. Research describing the opinions and perceptions of distance learning by faculty in private institutions in the Southeast had not been conducted; little was known about their views and experiences, and how their input was included when setting academic policy related to distance learning.

Research Design

This study reported the results of a survey of faculty members who teach via traditional or distance learning methods at private colleges and universities with membership in the Commission on Colleges of SACS. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What do faculty members at private institutions with membership in the Commission on Colleges of SACS think about possible outcomes of distance learning programs?

2. What concerns do faculty members have about distance learning?

3. To what extent do faculty members participate in distance learning programs at their institutions?

Definition of Terms

Several terms were used frequently in this study. Distance education and distance learning were defined earlier in this paper and are repeated here; other terms, important for this study, are defined as follows:

Distance Learning-- education delivered over a distance to one or more individuals located in one or more venues (CHEA, 1998; p.5) with the following characteristics: a) teaching and learning process that involves activities where the learners are at a distance from the instructor; b) a combination of media may be used; c) knowledge and content are available through a variety of sources; d) courses can be offered anytime and anyplace; and e) direct interaction between and among teachers and students.

Distance Education—for purposes of accreditation review, distance education is a formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction occurs when student and instructor are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. Distance education may employ correspondence study, or audio, video or computer technologies. (SACS, 1997; p 1)

Traditional Faculty– full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members at private, four year higher education institutions

Distance Learning Faculty – full-time tenured, or tenure track faculty members at private, four-year higher education institutions, who currently teach or who have taught a distance learning course within the last three years

Private, four-year higher education institutions– colleges and universities, separate from state or federal control, that offer a minimum of the bachelor's degree

Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools– the regional accrediting body for degree-granting higher education institutions in the U. S. Southeastern states (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia) and in Latin America

Framework for the Study

This study investigated the research questions from the perspective of higher education administrators charged with setting policy on distance learning at private institutions. The study examined the expressed opinions and attitudes of faculty members toward distance learning, and solicited information about technology, curriculum development, financing, and pedagogy used in distance learning at private institutions throughout the Southeast. The information gathered in this study can assist higher education administrators as they evaluate and shape policy on distance education initiatives at private institutions in the Southeast.

Limitations of the Study

This study used a quantitative survey. The limits of the quantitative survey included sample selection errors, ambiguous survey questions, and lack of appropriate open-ended responses for each question. To overcome the limits of survey research, a careful sample

was determined for both distance learning faculty and for traditional faculty. Because the sample was limited to only full-time and part-time, tenured or tenure-track faculty at private institutions, the results were not generalizable to the entire population of faculty at all institutions in the Southeast. (Kingery, et al., 1989)

Another limit of quantitative survey research was lack of responses to create meaningful results. To increase the response rate to the survey, each participant received a cover letter encouraging them to participate, a copy of the survey, and a postage paid return envelope. Participants were offered a copy of the executive summary of the report as an incentive to participate. In addition, to encourage response to the survey, the Executive Director of SACS sent a letter to all participants encouraging them to return the survey.

Scope and Significance

Research on distance learning delivery was extensive; however little of the research examined faculty's expressed opinions, perceptions, and beliefs about distance learning. While university administrators have set policy and make decisions about offering distance learning programs based on an evaluation of the finances, technology, curriculum design, registration, and library support services that support distance learning, this study provided administrators in private institutions in the Southeast with another parameter to evaluate when setting institution-wide policy regarding distance learning.

Organization of the Study

In chapter two of this dissertation, the specific literature related to the research topic was presented. A discussion of the research methods followed in chapter three. In

chapter four, findings related to the survey responses were described. In chapter five, a summary of the findings and an interpretation of how institutions might incorporate the findings of this study into their decision-making and policy-development processes were suggested. The chapter concluded with recommendations for future research.

Chapter Summary

Institutional administrators have continually sought information to assist them in making decisions about offering new initiatives, and to help maximize resources to support current initiatives. Information about distance learning programs has been focused on technology, curricula, and financing; the information on faculty roles in setting policy related to distance learning, and information about faculty opinions about distance learning has been limited to discussions of faculty development programs and appropriate teaching methods. Institutional decision-making, policy development, and program review regarding expanding and continuing distance learning programs was hindered without accurate comprehensive data about the opinions, perceptions and concerns from faculty about distance learning. This study provided survey data on the opinions, perceptions, and concerns from faculty in private institutions with membership in the Commission on Colleges of SACS.

CHAPTER 2

CRITIQUE OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to explore the opinions, perceptions, and beliefs of faculty toward distance learning. This study reported the results of a survey of traditional and distance learning faculty who teach at private colleges and universities in the Southeast regarding their opinions, perceptions, and beliefs about distance learning. Specifically, the study helped determine a) to what extent faculty members participate in distance learning programs, b) what faculty members think about possible outcomes of distance learning programs, and c) what concerns faculty members have about distance learning.

Recent literature and research on distance learning, including administrative and pedagogical issues, as well as internal and external policies governing distance learning, guided this study. The literature provided a contextual background for understanding distance learning, institutional factors used in planning for distance learning, and policy development for distance learning. The process of policy development and the factors that were evaluated when setting policy have been conceptualized, yet a greater understanding of how policy considering faculty opinion related to distance learning were developed and adopted in higher education was still needed.

Introduction

The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) defined distance learning as education or training courses delivered to remote (off campus) locations via audio, video,

or computer technology. More than one third of higher education institutions nationwide provided distance education courses. Most of this education was provided to undergraduate students (81%); other target markets for distance learning included professionals needing continuing education, and lifelong learners (NCES, 1997).

The Southern Association of Colleges and School (SACS) defined distance education in a similar way. SACS stated that, for the purposes of accreditation review, distance education is a formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction occurs when student and instructor are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. Distance education may employ correspondence study, or audio, video, or computer technologies (SACS, 1997).

The growth of distance education has been attributed to many factors, including a change in demographics that shows a decrease in the number of 18-21 year-olds, the ages of traditional undergraduate students; increased access to education driven by technology; a shift in control of education from providers to consumers; a new educational culture based on the influence of technology to deliver education to consumers; and consumer choice of location and time to earn education (Connick, 1997). Newman and Couturier (2001) believed that the growth of distance learning was attributed to these unprecedented market forces in higher education. They described new providers that had an impact on higher education: new not-for profit and for-profit institutions offer traditional as well as virtual education; and increased collaboration between and among new and traditional providers offered a variety of education including the spectrum of certificates to graduate degrees (p. 12). In addition, students sought choices in higher education, to include undergraduate and graduate degrees, as well as single courses to

meet professional requirements. Moreover, students were willing to mix- and -match programs at multiple institutions to meet their learning needs (p. 13). Most importantly, students were looking for evidence that institutions had the capacity to deploy technology that will increase student learning and increase students' interest in learning (p. 14). Newman and Couturier (2001) suggested that institutions meet these new market demands by maintaining focus and implementing strategies that addressed these new demands. Colleges and universities have attempted to meet these new demands by creating and offering courses offered by a variety of technologies, including two-way interactive audio and video, one-way video and two-way audio, World Wide Web, Internet, CD- ROM, and audioconferences, telephone, interactive television, and networked learning environments among others (NCES, 1997).

Policy Framework for Distance Learning

Many authors agreed that institutions which offer distance education needed a policy base on which to build new instructional technologies in their offerings; however, authors did not agree on a common base for creating and implementing distance learning programs. Zeller (1995) viewed the development of distance learning programs as an instrument of public policy in higher education. She suggested that a "comprehensive model" of distance learning would feature collaboration between and among institutions and state coordinating agencies to provide professional development as well as degree-granting programs. This model would serve as an instrument of public policy in order to increase access to higher education to a broad range of students in a cost effective manner. However, in a study conducted by Hotznagel and Olsen (1989) that focused on

statewide policies related to distance learning and their effect on budget formulae and operational policies, they reported no effect of those policies on state budgets.

Moss (1997) agreed that distance learning as a methodology warranted its own policy considerations. His focus, however, was on institutional policies which he believed must evolve from traditional classroom instruction. He recommended that distance learning policy development within institutions include an examination of program flexibility, administrative coordination, and technology considerations within an institution; he believed that institutional policies regarding distance learning should include these factors.

Froke (1994) offered three foundations for distance learning policy. First, policy for distance education might have been generated through professional associations which represent faculty and administration, or might have been generated to address issues of public policy generated by increasing demands of higher education from the public. Conversely, policy might have been generated from an institutional level, such as from institutional governing boards, including Boards of Trustees, or from institutional administration. Alternatively, policy might have been generated from academic units within institutions, or from faculty and the institution's faculty senate. He did not recommend any one foundation as the sole basis for distance education policy development.

In 1995, the Distance Education Research Symposium identified key research initiatives in distance learning, including research on Policy and Administration of Distance Learning (Moore, 1995). While efficient finance and financial models, important administrative policies, and the socioeconomic impact of distance learning

programs were key components of policy considerations, the report identified two additional research components. The first component of the research agenda on policy was to understand the legitimacy of distance education in the professional lives of faculty and administrators; and the second component of the research agenda was to change the faculty culture to encourage participation in distance learning. These two initiatives suggested that the policy basis for distance education was aimed at the institutional level.

While the policy base on which to build distance learning programs was drawn from detailed environmental scanning (Reichel & Preble, 1989), internal policies related to faculty qualifications and workload, organizational structure, pedagogical changes, as well as academic standards also underpinned the development of distance learning programs (Berge & Schrumm, 1998). Although the steps for environmental scanning have been outlined elsewhere, Berge and Schrumm (1998) suggested that when setting policy for distance education, institutions should conduct overall institutional planning, including policy evaluation and reform, at the same time as program implementation, in order to integrate both into the fabric of the institution. They believed that this dual approach not only increased the success of distance learning programs, but it also increased the acceptance of the institutional policies to support them.

Considerations in Planning for Distance Education

To implement distance learning programs that were supported by institutional policy, institutions engaged in planning processes to integrate distance learning programs into the institution. Successful strategic planning in higher education involved mobilizing fundamental change in the current environment on at least two levels within the institution: at the external policy level, and at the internal institutional level (Muniz, et al.,

1998). Although evaluating the external environment in distance learning was beyond the scope of this study, the institutional environmental factors will be addressed.

During the decision-making process, institutions evaluated several key internal parameters related to distance learning; these parameters included factors at the institutional level as well as at the departmental level. These decisions were based on a thorough analysis of internal and external factors (Berge and Schrumm, 1998). At an institutional level, an in-depth market analysis for distance learning programs helped identify segments of the student population for whom the programs are developed, including those seeking undergraduate or graduate degrees, those seeking degree completion programs, or those seeking continuing professional education. By examining the strengths and weaknesses of an institution's ability to meet the needs of these markets, institutions identified the opportunities that distance learning programs offer to help meet the markets.

Strategic planning for implementing distance learning involved determining what changes were needed throughout the institution as well as mobilizing the resources to implement the changes (Dunn, 1998). When evaluating distance learning programs, institutions considered a number of factors that addressed course requirements, technological support, learning resources, financial considerations, and pedagogical factors. Planning for implementing distance learning programs included an evaluation of pedagogical changes, institutional issues, and organizational structure (Berge and Schrumm, 1998). They suggested that internal as well as external policies were evaluated as part of the leadership involvement in planning and developing distance learning programs. Defining faculty workload, identifying faculty resources, articulating

academic standards, and confirming faculty roles were important factors that had been considered in the planning process for distance learning programs (Berge and Schrumm, 1998). Requirements for course creation and appropriate teaching tools have been fully described by Garrison and Shale (1990) and Willis (1993). Communication technologies, such as teleconferencing, vidoebased instruction, and ancillary mediated teaching tools (Garrison and Shale, 1990) have been evaluated in light of appropriate methods of teaching and learning (Keegan, 1990). In addition, institutions have created plans for administering distance learning programs that included issues related to faculty recruitment, library resources, testing procedures, and student learning outcome evaluation in order to meet accreditation requirements (Holmberg, 1989).

Despite the emphasis on institutional strategic panning for distance learning, an emphasis on technology to support the content of distance learning programs has overshadowed attention to the academic policies to accommodate distance learning (Olcott, 1991). In fact, much has been published about the technology, teaching techniques, and content of distance learning courses. Faculty have been given direction, advice, suggestions, techniques and strategies to help them improve teaching at a distance. Some suggestions included using a student centered learning philosophy as a fundamental principle of distance education (Berge, 1997); likewise, Lookatch (1996) recommended that faculty create a suitable environment for learning at a distance to include collaboration among students for all distance learning courses. Specific teaching techniques, including creating distance learning course study guides (Moore, 1997) and detailed course pre-planning and organization (Cyrs, 1997) were strategies faculty used to improve student outcomes at a distance. In addition, several broad academic policy

issues, including faculty compensation (Scott, 1984), workload and professional faculty development (Beaudoin 1990), faculty control (Froke, 1994), faculty release time (Olcott, 1996), and promotion and tenure guidelines have been proposed for faculty members who consider participating distance learning programs. As an example, Edwards and Rinick (1998) reported the results of a recent survey of institutional practices in distance learning, including faculty compensation, intellectual property rights, and faculty development and support for teaching in distance learning. They concluded that although these factors were important in managing distance learning programs, they cautioned that they did not identify the underlying assumptions about distance learning that guided the institution in developing distance learning programs. Despite these previous studies and policy recommendations, Wolcott (1995) believed that there was a lack of established norms, skills, and rewards for distance learning; moreover, she believed that because of this lack of common practices, distance learning was not integrated into the reward system of an institution in the way that other activities are valued. Because of this lack of common practices and value, she believed that distance learning had an ambiguous structure in most institutions.

Several authors have made recommendations about the role and input of faculty and faculty members in creating policies to implement distance learning in institutions nationwide. Beaudoin (1990) suggested that institutions help faculty become effective distance education educators. He suggested that institutions offer quality in-service programs and excellent faculty development programs, and encouraged collaboration between and among faculty members. For institutions in the southeast, SACS' Statement of Distance Education stated that faculty must assume responsibility for and exercise

oversight over distance education, ensuring both the rigor of programs and the quality of instruction (SACS, 1997).

Barriers to Faculty Participation in Distance Learning

Many authors described barriers for faculty participation in distance learning programs. Cardenas (1998) suggested that faculty resist technology applications for distance education for two main reasons: fear of losing control, and self-preservation. She stated that because faculty members feel powerless over many parts of their professional lives, they believed the mode of teaching was the only aspect of teaching over which they have any control; therefore, they were unwilling to give up control of teaching to technology applications and resisted distance learning technologies.

Another barrier to faculty participation in distance learning programs were institutional policies related to instructional practices (Olcott, 1996). Faculty cited numerous policies throughout the institution that created barriers to participating in distance learning, including: an unclear commitment from senior administration for distance learning; unclear policies regarding royalties for intellectual property; lack of technical support; and unknown application of distance education efforts toward promotion and tenure review (Olcott, 1996). Moreover, Olcott and Wright (1995) concluded that the values of distance learning innovation and the values of traditional teaching were not congruous; in fact, they believed that the traditional core values of intellectual property rights, promotion and tenure, teaching, research and service, autonomy, academic freedom, and specialization of discipline were indeed threatened by educational innovation in distance learning.

To overcome numerous barriers toward distance learning, Yong and Wang (1996) strongly recommended that institutions study faculty attitudes toward their involvement in distance learning. Because they believed instructors were the key to the success of distance learning programs, Yong and Wang suggested institutions study factors that were essential to faculty who participated in distance learning, such as personal growth, professional growth, and overall concerns about distance learning. In addition, they further recommended that institutions not only learn about faculty beliefs about distance learning, but also that they involved faculty in the policy-making process for distance learning. In addition, faculty members should have played a role in designing, implementing, and evaluating distance learning programs. Moreover, they recommended that the faculty's role in policy development should have complemented the role of administrators-- to round out and balance the institutional policy-development process.

Policy Development in Higher Education

Nelson (1982) observed that institutions have assumed that policy development was the "business" of the Board of Trustees, and that administration was the "business" of the president and the faculty. However, he suggested that there were different levels of policy decisions within institutions. While market factors, financial resources, technologic expertise, and institutional vision were important in developing institutional policy regarding distance learning, Dasher-Alston and Patton (1998) agreed that institutions also consider faculty and their roles and responsibilities in offering distance learning programs. In fact, several authors suggested that the most critical aspect of

policy development in higher education was people (Aune, 1995; Keller, 1997; Robinson, 2000; Swann, 1997). Moreover, Baldridge and Tierney (1979) stated that successful policy implementation in higher education required strong faculty support and input.

Bannister and Bacon (1999) criticized decision-making on campus by calling it dysfunctional and counterproductive. They strongly believed that faculty would not erect roadblocks throughout the decision-making process if faculty were involved in decision-making in a meaningful way. In fact, Benjamin (1999) recommended that better, more informed decisions arise from more, not less, participation from all levels within the institution. He further recommended that the decision-making circles in an institution be widened, not narrowed. Finally, because faculty perform the central role of any institution, Kashner (1990) strongly recommended that institutions view faculty as a necessary component in the policy development process within an institution.

Previous Studies

Two previous studies have sought the input of faculty members in helping to make the decision of whether or not to create and develop distance learning programs. Clark (1993) conducted a national survey of faculty at public higher education institutions in the United States. He used a 20-question instrument comprised of multiple choice questions and Likert Scales, which he sent to full-time faculty in chemistry, marketing, and political science departments at 57 public higher education institutions. He reported cautious optimism from faculty about distance learning; while faculty believed in increasing the access to higher education through distance learning, they were concerned about three important factors. First, he reported that faculty were concerned about the quality of education provided via a distance learning medium. In addition to quality,

faculty were concerned about the lack of adequate administrative and technical support to ensure effectiveness of distance education. Finally, faculty were concerned about the professional rewards available to faculty who teach in distance learning.

In a second important study of unionized faculty members at traditional two- and four-year public institutions nationwide with National Education Association (NEA) members, the NEA reported overall positive opinions of distance learning (NEA, 2000). The purpose of the study was to provide demographic and descriptive data about the faculty who teach distance learning courses. In addition, it explored the opinions about distance learning held by faculty who teach distance learning courses as well as by faculty teaching traditional place-based courses. Telephone interviews using a multi-page questionnaire were conducted with 532 faculty members who teach via distance learning or in a traditional classroom setting. The NEA reported that although faculty believe they will be hurt financially by distance learning, their enthusiasm for offering distance education to students outweighed financial concerns.

Limitations of Current Literature

While the parameters of distance learning, including financing, delivery systems, methods of instruction, and proposed institutional principles, procedures, and policies have been summarized, the literature did not describe the role of faculty in the development, initiation or implementation of policy decisions regarding distance learning programs. The literature reported many of the financial and technological parameters institutions have evaluated before offering distance learning courses, but reported little regarding the input, opinions or concerns from faculty who participate in distance learning offerings. Although Froke (1994) made an important point by stating that for

distance learning to achieve its full potential in higher education, institutional policy required faculty control of distance education, there were few sources in the literature that indicated the faculty had a voice in the policy development process. While institutions reported processes that evaluated technological infrastructure, pedagogy, and learning resources, each lacked the opinions, perceptions, and beliefs of faculty members who were involved or would be involved in distance learning initiatives.

The purpose of this study was to provide data on faculty members' opinions, perceptions, and beliefs regarding distance learning: the results of the study provided an important data set from faculty regarding distance learning programs to help private four-year institutions in the Southeast shape policy about distance learning. The results of this study provided critical information for private institutions in the Southeast to help develop comprehensive policies on distance learning programs. It also provided answers for several of the research questions initiated by the Distance Education Research Symposium regarding the role of faculty in distance education.

Chapter Summary

Numerous authors have described the technological requirements, financial support, pedagogical changes, teaching techniques, and teaching tools to support distance learning. Other authors have described faculty workload, compensation, faculty development, and intellectual property policy issues needed in distance learning. In addition, authors have proposed several frameworks from which to develop overarching policy decisions regarding distance learning. Despite this literature, little was know about the opinions, perceptions and concerns that faculty members have regarding

distance learning, or the role faculty members had or should have had in setting institutional policy regarding distance learning programs.

Chapter two has provided a review of the literature relevant to the study. It described the factors, parameters, and policy frameworks that decision-makers consider when making decisions about offering distance learning programs. A review of previous studies on the opinions of faculty members toward distance learning has been presented. In chapter three, the research methodology was discussed.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study provided information and data about the opinions, perceptions and concerns that faculty members at private four-year institutions in the southeast have regarding distance learning. The purpose of this study was to explore the opinions, perceptions, and beliefs of faculty toward distance learning. This study reported the results of a survey of traditional and distance learning faculty members who teach at private colleges and universities accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) regarding distance learning. Specifically the research questions that guided this study determined a) to what extent faculty members participate in distance learning programs, b) what faculty members think about possible outcomes of distance learning programs, and c) what concerns faculty members have about distance learning.

In this chapter, the methods used in this study, including the design of the study, sample selection, methods for data collection, and data analysis are described.

Design of the Study

The goals of this study were well-suited to survey research. Survey research was considered a major branch of social science research, and methods and procedures for survey research have been developed and used by sociologists, psychologists, educational researchers, and political scientists, among others (Kingery, et al., 1989). More importantly, survey research has demonstrated importance as a tool for applied research

purposes (Kingery, et al., 1989). Suskie (1996) agreed that surveys are not ends in themselves, but rather tools used to help make decisions. Specifically, Kingerly (1989) suggested that survey research may be used for many important purposes, including establishing the distribution of attitudes or behaviors in a population, or as a guide to policy (p. 2).

Institutional Context

This study was conducted with faculty members at private or independent institutions currently accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). SACS is the regional accrediting body for degree-granting higher education institutions in the southeastern United States including Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, and in Latin America.

Of the 784 institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges of SACS, 325 were four-year private or independent institutions, separate from state or federal control, that offer a minimum of the bachelor's degree. In 1999, SACS distributed a Baseline Survey on Distance Education to all member institutions. For purposes of the Baseline Survey, SACS gathered information

> on all distance education and off-campus programs/ coursework offered by its member institutions where a student can obtain at least 25% of his/her coursework toward a degree. Part I of the Baseline Survey requested information about off campus locations where institutions offer group instruction (categorized as either traditional classroom group instruction or technology-based classroom group instruction) and where a student can obtain 25% of his/her coursework toward a degree. Part II of the Survey requested information on distance education offered to individual students separated geographically from instructors and other students, and where a student can obtain at least 25% of his/her coursework toward a degree.

The Baseline Survey requested the name of the institution, the educational program(s) offered via distance learning, the location of the program(s) if they were offered off-site, and the method of delivering distance education programs. All colleges and universities, including two-year and four-year, private and public institutions, in the SACS region responded to the survey. The SACS Database on Distance Education represented a comprehensive baseline view of all distance learning programs offered in the southeastern region.

Sample Selection

The study used a purposeful sampling technique to identify faculty who either teach or do not teach in distance learning programs offered by four-your private institutions in the southeast. This study used the SACS Database on Distance Education to:

a. identify the private, four-year institutions in the southeast that do not offer distance education programs;

b. identify the private, four-year institutions in the southeast that offer distance education programs; and

c. identify the programs offered via distance education by private, four-year institutions in the Southeast.

Names of faculty members who teach at universities in the Southeast were identified by consulting the most recent (2000-2001) college or university catalogue at the SACS headquarters office in Decatur, GA. The names, mailing addresses, phone numbers, gender, faculty rank, and academic discipline or department of the faculty members who teach in distance learning programs were recorded in an Access database; each name was coded in the database.

Exclusion Criteria for Institutions and Faculty Members

There were several exclusion criteria for institutions and for faculty members in this study. Only private, four-year liberal arts institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges of SACS were included in this study. The following categories of institutions were excluded from this study: independent theological seminaries, community colleges, medical centers or medical schools, independent military schools or institutes, or schools sponsored by the U.S. military, such as the U.S. Air Force, for example. This study only included American private four-year liberal arts institutions in the southeast.

There were several exclusion criteria for faculty participation in this study. Only full-time tenured, or tenure track faculty members were included in this study. The following categories of faculty were excluded from this study: part time faculty, adjunct faculty, clinical faculty, and adjunct clinical faculty. This study included only full-time faculty members at private four-year institutions in the southeast.

Selection Criteria for Institutions that Do Not Offer Distance Learning Programs

Using the SACS Database on Distance Learning, private institutions that do not offer distance learning programs were identified. At least three private institutions from each state in the SACS region were identified. Six faculty members from each institution were selected at random: one full professor, one associate professor, and one assistant professor of each gender were selected at random. To the extent available, faculty in different departments or disciplines within the institution were selected. Every attempt was made to select a male and female faculty member at each academic rank. The names, mailing addresses, phone numbers, gender, faculty rank, and academic discipline

or department of the faculty who do not teach in distance learning were recorded in an Access database; each name was coded in the database.

Selection Criteria for Institutions that Offer Distance Learning Programs

Using the SACS Database on Distance Learning, private institutions that offer distance learning programs were identified. At least three private institutions from each state in the SACS region were identified. At least six faculty members from each institution were selected at random: one full professor, one associate professor, and one assistant professor of each gender were selected at random. To the extent possible, faculty in different departments or disciplines within the institution were selected. Every attempt was made to select a male and female faculty member at each academic rank. The names, mailing addresses, phone numbers, gender, faculty rank, and academic discipline or department of the faculty who teach in distance learning were recorded in an Access database; each name was coded in the database.

Sample size

The sample for the study included 528 faculty members:198 faculty members who did not teach in distance learning, and 330 faculty members who taught in distance learning.

Data Collection Procedures

This study used a 59 -question survey instrument adapted from an instrument developed and pilot tested by the National Education Association (NEA) for a national survey of their members on the same topic. Five questions from the original survey were eliminated for this survey instrument; two questions were added (Q. 58 and Q. 59). The survey instrument was extensive, and requested information on the opinions and

perceptions of faculty members, but also specific information on distance learning courses faculty offer.

Because the dataset was small, and to maximize the response to the survey, the Executive Director of SACS sent a letter to all participants four days before the survey was mailed to participants. The letter encouraged participants to respond to the survey and to return it promptly. The letter was prepared on SACS' letterhead, but to assure confidentiality, the researcher affixed the mailing labels on the letters. As an additional incentive for responding, participants were offered the option of returning a business card in exchange for the executive summary of the study.

The survey was sent with a postage-paid return envelope via first-class mail to participants. A cover letter requesting their participation, assurance of confidentiality, and information about the use of the data accompanied the survey. Participants were asked to return the survey within 15 days. A reminder postcard was sent to non-responders after 10 days. If they did not reply in 15 days, participants were sent a reminder letter with additional survey, cover letter, and return envelope, requesting that they respond in 10 days.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the survey of faculty were analyzed using the software package Statistix (1998). Descriptive statistics of the responses from faculty were generated, including frequency, mean, comparison of means, and median for answers to questions. In addition, correlations between answers regarding opinions and perceptions about distance learning were reported for both faculty groups.

Validity and Reliability

The primary threat to the validity of this survey was content-related evidence of validity. There were several aspects of content-related validity that were important for this study. The first component of content-related validity referred to how comprehensive the survey instrument was, how appropriate the content of the survey was for the sample population, how appropriate the format was for the sample population, or how adequately the questions in the survey represented the content of the survey (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990).

The second component of content-related validity was how the instrument was formatted. If the type font was unclear, the progression of questions was illogical, or if the directions for completing and returning the survey were unclear, the validity of the survey was threatened.

To overcome these threats to validity, this study used a pre-existing survey instrument developed and pilot tested through a national survey using a similar sample of participants. In addition, a panel of reviewers has evaluated the survey, and believed that it was formatted with clear instructions, and clear choices to each question.

The primary threat to reliability for this study was reliability within the questionnaire, or internal consistency (Suskie, 1996). Internal consistency referred to the requirement that similar questions should provide similar responses. However, as Suskie pointed out, surveys often ask a variety of questions about a variety of topics, and may not repeat similar questions within the survey. This survey did not repeat questions related to distance learning, but rather asked a variety of questions related to different aspects of distance learning.

Chapter Summary

This study provided information and data about the opinions, perceptions and concerns held by faculty members at private four-year institutions in the Southeast regarding distance learning. It is intended as a as a first step in understanding faculty's opinions of distance learning. The goals of this study were well-suited to survey research in that survey research may be used to determine the attitudes in a population, or as a guide to helping to develop policy. The institutional context, methods of data collection, sample selection with inclusion and exclusion criteria, data analysis, and threats to validity and reliability are described in this chapter.

Chapter Four reports the results of the responses to the survey.

CHAPTER 4

SURVEY RESULTS

This study provided information and data about the opinions, perceptions and concerns that faculty members at private four-year institutions had regarding distance learning. The purpose of this study was to address the lack of research on the opinions, perceptions, and beliefs of faculty toward distance learning. This study reported the results of a survey of traditional and distance learning faculty members who teach at private colleges and universities in the Southeastern United States accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) regarding distance learning. Specifically the research questions that guided this study determined a) to what extent faculty members participate in distance learning programs, b) what faculty members think about possible outcomes of distance learning programs, and c) what concerns faculty members have about distance learning.

This chapter described the results of the study.

Response Rate

The 60-question survey instrument was mailed via first class through the U.S. Postal Service to 513 traditional and distance learning faculty members on October 15, 2001; 11 surveys were returned "undeliverable" as addressed. On October 31, 2001, a reminder post card was sent to all participants, and on November 16, 2001, surveys were sent to 349 non-responders.

An additional 62 surveys were sent to faculty members recommended by survey respondents. Therefore, for this study, a total of 564 surveys were sent to traditional and distance learning faculty members in private institutions accredited by SACS. For purposes of this study, traditional faculty members served as full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members at private, four year higher education institutions. Distance learning faculty members served as full-time tenured, or tenure track faculty members at private, four-year higher education institutions, who currently teach or who have taught a distance learning course within the last three years

A total of 222 surveys were returned by the deadline of December 31, 2001 for a response rate of 39.3 percent; 205 were responses from the original survey mailing, and 17 were returned from faculty recommended by respondents. Five surveys were returned after the deadline.

Survey Results

The responses to each question of the survey are summarized in this chapter.

Question 1: Are distance learning courses being taught at your institution?

An overwhelming majority of distance learning faculty members reported that distance learning courses were offered at their institutions. By contrast, only one third of traditional faculty members indicated that distance learning courses were offered at their institutions. Of the 222 respondents, 64 percent reported that distance learning courses are taught at the institution, while 27 percent reported that no distance learning was offered; 9 percent of respondents were not sure if distance learning courses were being offered. Of the traditional faculty members whose institutions do not offer distance learning courses, 30 percent reported that they indeed offer distance learning courses, 53

percent reported that they do not offer distance learning courses, and 16 percent were not sure. In addition, of the distance learning faculty members, 89 percent reported that they offer distance learning courses, 7 percent reported that they did not offer distance learning courses, and 3 percent were not sure. These results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Distance Learning Courses Taught at Institution (N=222)

	Distance learning courses offered n (%)	Distance learning courses not offered n (%)	Not sure n (%)	Total
Traditional faculty	29 (30.2)	51 (53.1)	16 (16.7)	96
Distance learning faculty	113 (89.7)	9 (7.1)	4 (3.2)	126
Total	142 (64)	60 (27)	20 (9)	222

Several distance learning faculty members also provided additional comments about their distance learning offerings. One reported that the institution offered distance learning courses from 1997 to 2000, but they were discontinued. Another reported that the institution had a non-traditional program via distance learning, but it is not currently offered.

Question 2: Are distance learning courses being considered at your institution?

The majority of traditional faculty members reported that distance learning courses were being considered at their institutions; indeed, the overwhelming majority of distance learning faculty indicated that distance learning courses were considered and offered at their institutions. Of the traditional faculty members, 54 percent responded that distance

learning courses were being considered at their institutions, while 19 percent stated that they were not being considered, and 25 percent were unsure. Ninety-two percent of distance learning faculty members indicated that distance learning courses were being considered at their institutions, while 3 percent stated that they were not being considered and 4 percent were unsure. Of the responders, 32 did not provide a response to this question. These results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Distance Learning Courses Considered at Institution (N=190)

	Distance learning courses considered n (%)	Distance learning courses not considered n (%)	Not sure n (%)	Total
Traditional faculty	51 (54.8)	18 (19.4)	24 (25.8)	93
Distance learning faculty	90 (92.8)	3 (3.1)	4 (4.1)	97
Total	141 (74.2)	21 (11.1)	28 (14.7)	190

Question 3: In general, what are your feelings toward distance learning courses?

Of the respondents, 6 percent of traditional faculty members felt very positive about distance learning courses compared with 34 percent of distance learning faculty members. Nineteen percent of traditional faculty members were somewhat positive about distance learning, compared with 35 percent of distance learning faculty members. Therefore, 26 percent of traditional faculty members and over 69 percent of distance learning faculty members were either very positive or somewhat positive toward distance learning. Thirty percent of traditional faculty members were neutral about distance

learning courses, compared to 9 percent of distance learning faculty members, while 32 percent of traditional faculty were somewhat negative toward distance learning compared to 16 percent of distance learning faculty members. Ten percent of traditional faculty members were very negative toward distance learning courses compared to 4 percent of distance learning faculty members; only one traditional faculty member was unsure. Therefore, 42 percent of traditional faculty members and almost 21 percent of distance learning faculty members were either somewhat negative or very negative toward distance learning. One did not report a response to this question. The results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Feelings Toward Distance Learning Courses (N=221)

	V. Pos. n (%)	S. Pos. n (%)	Neutral n (%)	S. Neg. n (%)	V. Neg. n (%)	Not sure n (%)	Total n
Traditional Faculty	6 (6.3)	19 (19.8)	29 (30.2)	31 (32.2)	10 (10.4)	1 (1.0)	96
Distance learning faculty	43 (34.4)	44 (35.2)	12 (9.6)	21 (16.8)	5 (4.0)	0	125
Total	49	63	41	52	15	1	221

Question 4: Listed below are possible outcomes of distance learning. In your opinion, how likely is each possible outcome as a result of distance learning—extremely likely, very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, not likely at all, or don't know.

Extremely likely	**Very likely**	**Somewhat likely**	**Not too likely**	**Not likely at all**	**Don't know**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**

The response don't know was not calculated in the mean score, but was reported separately.

Q4A. Distance learning courses will reach many students who could not take traditional college courses.

Fifty five percent of traditional faculty and seventy- seven percent of distance learning faculty members indicated that this outcome was extremely likely or very likely; however, only 4 percent of traditional or distance learning faculty members indicated that it was not too likely or not likely at all. One faculty member responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.29 compared to 1.80 for distance learning faculty members; the median of the responses was 2.00 for each group. Even though the median of the responses indicate that both groups believe this outcome is very likely, the difference in the mean of the two groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 4A.

Table 4A Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding access (N=220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									3.99	0.0001
Trad. Faculty (n=96)	19 (20)	33 (35)	37 (39)	3 (3)	1 (1)	1 (1)	2.00	2.29		
Distance Learning Faculty (n=125)	58 (46)	40 (31)	22 (17)	6 (4.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2.00	1.80		

Q4B: Distance learning will encourage teachers who design such courses to be entrepreneurs and market their courses.

While an equal number of distance learning and traditional faculty members believed that it was extremely likely that distance learning will encourage teachers to be entrepreneurs and market their courses, more distance learning faculty members than traditional faculty members believed that this outcome was very likely. Therefore, 23 percent of traditional faculty members and 29 percent of distance learning faculty members believed that it was extremely likely or very likely that distance learning would encourage faculty to become entrepreneurs. An almost equal number believed that this outcome of distance learning was somewhat likely or not too likely. By contrast, 31 percent of traditional faculty members and 33 percent of distance learning faculty members believed that this outcome was either not too likely or not likely at all. Ten faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.03 compared to 3.09 for distance learning faculty members and the median for the responses was 3.00 for both groups. One distance learning respondent noted in a written comment that this question "was not clear." The difference between the mean for both groups was not significant. The results are summarized in Table 4B.

Table 4B: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding entrepreneurship (N=219)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									3.39	0.6965
Trad. Faculty (n= 95)	8 (8)	15 (15)	36 (37)	26 (27)	4 (4)	6 (6)	3.00	3.03		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 124)	8 (6)	29 (23)	41 (33)	28 (22)	14 (11)	4 (3)	3.00	3.09		

Q4C: Distance learning will allow students to learn from the best teachers in the country.

An overwhelming majority of distance learning faculty members compared to traditional faculty members believed that it is extremely likely, very likely, *or* somewhat likely that distance learning will allow students to learn from the best teachers in the country. Twenty percent of distance learning faculty members, compared to 4 percent of traditional faculty members believed that this outcome was either extremely likely or very likely. An equal number of traditional and distance learning faculty members believe that this outcome is either not too likely or not likely at all; 56 percent of traditional faculty members and 42 percent of distance learning faculty members believed that this outcome was not too likely or not likely at all. Seven faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.75 compared to 3.28 for distance learning faculty members; the median scores of 4.00 and 3.00 respectively mirrored the mean scores. The difference is

the mean was significant ($p < .05$). In addition, several respondents provided additional written comments. One distance learning faculty respondent indicated that this question "seems irrelevant, " and another asked "How would students know which are the best? Extremely subjective judgment, even in one institution." Two traditional faculty members indicated this outcome "will not happen." The results are summarized in Table 4C.

Table 4C: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding faculty (N=220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	1 (1)	3 (3)	31 (33)	35 (37)	18 (19)	6 (6)	4.00	3.75	3.31	0.0011
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	9 (7)	17 (13)	45 (35)	37 (29)	17 (13)	1 (0.1)	3.00	3.28		

Q4D. Through distance learning tools such as chat rooms, more students will participate actively in class.

More distance learning faculty members than traditional faculty members believed that through distance learning tools such as chat rooms, more students will participate actively in class. More distance learning faculty rated this outcome of distance learning extremely likely or very likely than traditional faculty members did; 8 percent of

traditional faculty members compared to 32 percent of distance learning faculty members indicated that this outcome was extremely likely or very likely. However, 46 percent of traditional faculty members compared with 32 percent of distance learning faculty members indicated that this outcome is either not too likely or not likely at all. Nine faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.51 compared to 3.23 for distance learning faculty members, and the median of the responses was 4.00 and 3.00 respectively. The difference in the mean between to two groups was not significant. In addition, one traditional faculty member offered the comment that this "will not happen." Several distance learning faculty members also provided additional comments, stating that "threaded discussions are more likely, because chat rooms appeal to fast talkers and fast typers." Another also suggested "threaded discussions" would also encourage students to actively participate, while another distance learning faculty member asked "Why only chat rooms?" The results are summarized in Table 4D.

Table 4D: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding participation (N=221)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some .likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 95)	1 (1)	7 (7)	36 (37)	35 (36)	10 (10)	6 (6)	4.00	3.51	1.02	0.3084
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	13 (10)	28 (22)	40 (31)	31 (24)	11 (8)	3 (2)	3.00	3.23		

Q4E: Smaller institutions will be able to offer a richer curriculum

While a larger proportion of distance learning faculty members (32 percent) than traditional faculty members (20 percent) believed that it is extremely likely or very likely that institutions will be able to offer a richer curriculum via distance learning, an equal number of distance learning faculty and traditional faculty believed that this outcome is somewhat likely. A larger proportion of traditional faculty (52 percent) than distance learning faculty (36 percent) believed that this outcome is not too likely or not likely at all. Six faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.36 compared to 2.97 for distance learning faculty members; the median scores for the two groups mirrored the mean scores with 3.00 for each group. Despite these similarities, the difference in the mean of the scores between the two groups was significant ($p < .05$). In addition to these data, one traditional faculty member suggested that this outcome "will not happen." These results are summarized in Table 4E.

Table 4E: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding curriculum (N=221)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 95)	1 (1)	18 (19)	32 (33)	28 (29)	13 (13)	3 (3)	3.00	3.36	2.66	0.0084
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	17 (13)	25 (19)	35 (27)	36 (28)	10 (8)	3 (2)	3.00	2.97		

Question 5: In your opinion, how important is each of these possible outcomes of distance learning-- extremely important, very important, somewhat important, not too important, not important at all, or don't know.

Extremely important	Very important	Somewhat important	Not too important	Not important at all	Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	6

The response don't know was not calculated in the mean score, but was reported separately.

Question 5A. Distance learning courses will reach many students who could not take traditional college courses.

Sixty percent of traditional faculty members and 82 percent of distance learning faculty members indicated that the outcome that distance learning courses will reach many students who could not take traditional college courses was extremely important or very important. More traditional faculty members than distance learning faculty members indicated that this outcome was somewhat important. Few faculty members from either group believed that this outcome was not too important or not important at all; only 5 percent of both traditional and distance learning faculty members indicated that this outcome was not too important or not important at all. Two faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.29 compared to 1.79 for distance learning faculty members; the median scores mirrored the mean score with 2.00 for both groups. The difference between the mean scores was significant ($p < .05$). These results are summarized in Table 5A.

Table 5A: Frequency, percent median, mean, T value, and p value regarding access (N=218)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									4.14	0.0001
Trad. Faculty (n= 93)	15 (16)	41 (44)	30 (32)	3 (3)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2.00	2.29		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 125)	59 (47)	40 (32)	19 (15)	7 (5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2.00	1.79		

Question 5B: Distance learning will encourage teachers who design such courses to be entrepreneurs and market their courses.

Only 8 percent of traditional faculty members and 15 percent of distance learning faculty members believed that the outcome that distance learning will encourage teachers who design such courses to be entrepreneurs and market their courses was extremely important or very important. However, more distance learning faculty members than traditional faculty members believed that this outcome is somewhat important. Sixty-six percent of traditional faculty members and 52 percent of distance learning faculty members believed that this outcome is not too important or not important at all. Nine faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.85 compared to 3.54 for distance learning faculty members, while the median score for both groups was 4.00. The difference between the mean scores was significant ($p < .05$). These results are summarized in Table 5B.

Table 5B: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding entrepreneurship (N=218)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. Impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									2.01	0.0455
Trad. Faculty (n= 93)	3 (3)	5 (5)	19 (20)	38 (40)	25 (26)	3 (3)	4.00	3.85		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 125)	9 (7)	11 (8)	33 (26)	38 (30)	28 (22)	5 (4)	4.00	3.54		

Question 5C: Distance learning will allow students to learn from the best teachers in the country.

Thirty-two percent of traditional faculty members and 36 percent of distance learning faculty members believed that the outcome that distance learning will allow students to learn from the best teachers in the country was extremely important or very important. More distance learning faculty members compared to traditional faculty members believed that it was somewhat important. An almost equal proportion of traditional faculty and distance learning faculty members (25 percent and 22 percent respectively) believed that this outcome was not too important or not important at all. Eighteen faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.945 compared to 2.78 for distance learning faculty members; the median score for both groups was 3.00. One distance learning faculty

member commented "I am concerned about the potential lack of quality." The results are summarized in Table 5C.

Table 5C: Frequency, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding faculty (N=217)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. Impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									1.01	0.3122
Trad. Faculty (n= 93)	8 (8)	23 (24)	29 (31)	14 (15)	10 (10)	9 (9)	3.00	2.94		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 124)	11 (8)	35 (28)	41 (33)	24 (19)	4 (3)	9 (7)	3.00	2.78		

Question 5D: Through distance learning tools such as chat rooms, students will participate actively in class.

A larger proportion of distance learning faculty members (77 percent) than traditional faculty members (69 percent) indicated that the outcome that through distance learning tools such as chat rooms, students will participate actively in class was extremely important, very important, or somewhat important. About an equal proportion of traditional (22 percent) and distance learning faculty (20 percent) believed that this outcome is not too important or not important at all. Ten faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.79 compared to 2.55 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for both groups was 3.00. The results are summarized in Table 5D.

Table 5D: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding participation (N=218)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. Impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									1.51	0.1329
Trad. Faculty (n= 93)	8 (8)	31 (33)	26 (28)	13 (14)	8 (8)	7 (7)	3.00	2.79		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 125)	21 (16)	41 (32)	37 (29)	17 (13)	6 (4)	3 (2)	3.00	2.55		

Question 5E: Small institutions will be able to offer a richer curriculum.

A larger proportion of distance learning faculty members (46 percent) than traditional faculty members (43 percent) indicated that the outcome that small institutions will be able to offer a richer curriculum through distance learning was extremely important, or very important. In addition, an almost equal proportion of distance learning faculty members (20 percent) and traditional faculty members (17 percent) believed that this outcome was not too important or not important at all. Thirteen faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.72 compared to 2.60 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for both groups was 3.00. One traditional faculty member commented that "this will not happen." The results are summarized in Table 5E.

Table 5E: Frequency, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding curriculum (N=217)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. Impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 93)	8 (8)	33 (35)	28 (30)	9 (9)	8 (8)	7 (7)	3.00	2.72	0.77	0.4414
Distance Learning Faculty (n=124)	20 (16)	38 (30)	35 (28)	19 (15)	6 (4)	6 (4)	3.00	2.60		

Question 6: Listed below are concerns some people have about distance learning. In your opinion, how likely is each possible concern--extremely likely, very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, not likely at all, or don't know.

Extremely likely	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not too likely	Not likely at all	Don't know
1	2	3	4	5	6

The response don't know was not calculated in the mean score, but was reported separately.

Q6F: The quality of education for students will decline.

Forty nine percent of traditional faculty members and 28 percent of distance learning faculty members believed that the concern that quality of education for students will decline was extremely likely or very likely. More distance learning faculty members than traditional faculty members believed that this concern is somewhat likely or not too likely to happen. Only 10 percent of traditional faculty and only one percent of distance

learning faculty members believed that this concern was not too likely or not likely at all. Five faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.61 compared to 3.05 for distance learning faculty members; the median scores for each group mirrored the mean scores with 2.00 and 3.00 respectively. The results are summarized in Table 6F.

Table 6F: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding quality (N=220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	20 (21)	27 (28)	32 (34)	9 (9)	1 (1)	3 (3)	2.00	2.61	1.83	0.0684
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	17 (13)	19 (15)	43 (34)	30 (24)	0 (0)	2 (1)	3.00	3.05		

Question 6G. Distance learning will decrease the need for trained faculty and result in fewer faculty jobs.

Twenty eight percent of traditional faculty members compared to 8 percent of distance learning faculty members believed that the concern that distance learning will decrease the need for faculty and result in fewer faculty jobs was extremely likely or very likely to happen. An almost equal number of faculty members believed this concern was somewhat likely. A larger proportion of distance learning faculty (75 percent) than traditional faculty (45 percent) believed this concern is not too likely or not likely at all to happen. Three faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean

of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.17 compared to 3.96 for distance learning faculty members; the median scores for each group mirrored the mean scores, with 3.00 and 4.00 respectively. The difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 6G.

Table 6G: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding job security (N= 220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n=94)	10 (10)	17 (18)	22 (23)	33 (35)	10 (10)	2 (2)	3.00	3.17	5.16	0.0001
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	4 (3)	7 (5)	29 (23)	53 (42)	41 (32)	1 (.8)	4.00	3.96		

Question 6H: Professors will have less control over the content, perspective, and approaches in teaching their courses.

Almost twice the proportion of traditional faculty members (37 percent) than distance learning faculty members (18 percent) believed that the concern that professors will have less control over the content, perspective and approaches in teaching their courses was extremely likely or very likely to happen. An equal number of faculty members believed this concern was somewhat likely. A larger proportion of distance learning faculty (62 percent) than traditional faculty (35 percent) believe this concern is not too likely or not likely at all to happen. Two faculty members responded to the question with don't know.

The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.93 compared to 3.63 for distance learning faculty members; the median scores of 3.00 and 4.00 respectively parallel the mean scores. The difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). One distance learning faculty member noted on the survey that "this already happens." The results are summarizes in Table 6H.

Table 6H: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding academic control (N=220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									4.28	0.0001
Trad. Faculty (n=94)	13 (14)	22 (23)	23 (24)	26 (27)	8 (8)	2 (2)	3.00	2.93		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	8 (6)	16 (12)	23 (18)	46 (36)	33 (26)	0 (0)	4.00	3.63		

Question 6I: Distance learning faculty will lose control over their intellectual property.

An almost equal proportion of traditional (64 percent) and distance learning faculty members (56 percent) believed that the concern that distance learning faculty will lose control over their intellectual property was extremely likely, very likely, or somewhat likely to happen. More than twice the proportion of distance learning faculty (38 percent) than traditional faculty (16 percent) indicated that this concern was not too likely or not likely at all to happen. One faculty member responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.12 compared to 3.14 for

distance learning faculty members, and the median score for both groups was 3.00. The results are summarized in Table 6I.

Table 6I: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding intellectual property (N=220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	13 (13)	23 (24)	34 (27)	13 (13)	3 (3)	1 (1)	3.00	3.12	0.03	0.9740
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	11 (8)	24 (19)	37 (29)	35 (27)	14 (11)	0 (0)	3.00	3.14		

Question 6J: Faculty will be less candid in the classroom, because comments in a classroom can be taken out of context when recorded and used in other settings.

A larger proportion of traditional faculty members (54 percent) than distance learning faculty members (28 percent) believed that the concern that faculty will be less candid in the classroom, because comments in a classroom can be taken out of context when recorded and used in other settings was extremely likely or very likely to happen. A larger proportion of distance learning faculty (31 percent) than traditional faculty (16 percent) believed this concern is not too likely or not likely at all to happen. Five faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.46 compared to 3.00 for distance learning faculty members; the median scores for each group was 2.00 and 3.00 respectively. The

difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 6J.

Table 6J: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding teaching style (N= 220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	19 (20)	32 (34)	26 (27)	13 (14)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2.00	2.46	3.63	0.0004
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	13 (10)	23 (18)	47 (37)	30 (23)	10 (8)	3 (2)	3.00	3.00		

Question 6K: Each teacher will be responsible for more students.

A larger proportion of traditional faculty members (74 percent) than distance learning faculty members (46 percent) believed that the concern that faculty will be responsible for more students was extremely likely or very likely to happen. Almost twice the proportion of distance learning faculty members than traditional faculty members believed this concern was somewhat likely. A larger proportion of distance learning faculty (27 percent) than traditional faculty (7 percent) believe this concern is not too likely or not likely at all to happen. Three faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.01 compared to 2.65 for distance learning faculty members. The median score for each

group was 2.00 and 3.00 respectively. The difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 6K.

Table 6K: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding student load (N=218)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n=94)	27 (28)	44 (46)	13 (14)	6 (6)	1 (1)	3 (3)	2.00	2.01	4.66	0.0001
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 124)	22 (17)	36 (29)	33 (26)	29 (23)	4 (3)	0 (0)	3.00	2.65		

Question 6L: More students will cheat and get credit for work they did not do.

Almost twice the proportion of traditional faculty members (54 percent) than distance learning faculty members (30 percent) believed that the concern that students will cheat and get credit for work they did not do was extremely likely or very likely to happen. A much larger proportion of distance learning faculty members (30 percent) as traditional faculty members (7 percent) believe this concern is not too likely, and few believed it was not likely at all to happen. Four faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.29 compared to 2.86 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was

2.00 and 3.00 respectively. The difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 6L.

Table 6L: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding cheating (N=220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									4.08	0.0001
Trad. Faculty (n=94)	22 (21)	31 (33)	33 (35)	5 (5)	2 (2)	1 (1)	2.00	2.29		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	17 (13)	22 (17)	50 (39)	29 (23)	5 (3)	3 (2)	3.00	2.86		

Question 6M: The quality of faculty will decline as their roles change from creating content to managing information and students.

A much larger proportion of traditional faculty members (51 percent) as distance learning faculty members (23 percent) believed that the concern that the quality of faculty will decline as their roles change from creating content to managing information and students was extremely likely or very likely to happen. More than twice the proportion of distance learning faculty members (52 percent) as traditional faculty members (27 percent) believed this concern was not too likely or not likely at all. Two faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.59 compared to 3.36 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 2.00 and 4.00 respectively. The

difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 6M.

Table 6M: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding faculty roles (N=220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									4.97	0.0001
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	17 (18)	31 (33)	18 (19)	24 (25)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2.00	2.59		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	9 (7)	20 (16)	30 (24)	50 (39)	17 (13)	0 (0)	4.00	3.36		

Question 6N: Distance learning will result in more work for the same amount of pay.

An almost equal proportion of traditional (53 percent) and distance learning faculty members (49 percent) believed that the concern that distance learning will result in more work for the same amount of pay was extremely likely or very likely to happen. More than twice the proportion of distance learning faculty members (18 percent) as traditional faculty members (9 percent) believed this concern was not too likely, or not likely at all to happen. Twelve faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.19 compared to 2.54 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 2.00 and 3.00 respectively. The difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p <$

.05). One distance learning faculty member noted on the survey that "this is already happening." The results are summarized in Table 6N.

Table 6N: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding workload compensation (N=220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	30 (32)	20 (21)	27 (28)	7 (7)	2 (2)	8 (8)	2.00	2.19	2.19	0.0298
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	25 (20)	37 (29)	36 (28)	17 (13)	7 (5)	4 (3)	3.00	2.54		

Question 6O: Faculty will not be fairly compensated for their intellectual property.

An almost equal proportion of traditional faculty members (57 percent) and distance learning faculty members (40 percent) believed that the concern that faculty will not be fairly compensated for their intellectual property was extremely likely or very likely to happen. Twice as many distance learning faculty members (16 percent) as traditional faculty members (8 percent) believed this concern was not too likely, or not likely at all to happen. Fourteen faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.15 compared to 2.50 for distance learning faculty members; the median score for each group was 2.00 and 3.00 respectively. The difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 6O.

Table 6O: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding intellectual property compensation (N=220)

	Ext. likely 1 n (%)	V. likely 2 n (%)	Some. likely 3 n (%)	Not too likely 4 n (%)	Not likely at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									2.34	0.0202
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	27 (28)	28 (29)	22 (23)	6 (6)	2 (2)	9 (9)	2.00	2.15		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 126)	24 (10)	38 (30)	38 (30)	16 (12)	5 (4)	5 (4)	3.00	2.50		

Question 7: How important is each of these concerns about distance learning—extremely important, very important, somewhat important, not too important, not at all important, or don't know.

Extremely important	**Very important**	**Somewhat important**	**Not too important**	**Not important at all**	**Don't know**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**

The response don't know was not calculated in the mean score, but was reported separately. One traditional faculty member commented that "It is hard to say how important they are when I don't think they are true." Two distance learning faculty members commented that "this is not a good question" and that it was "poorly worded."

Question 7F: The quality of education for students will decline.

An almost equal proportion of traditional (87 percent) and distance learning faculty members (82 percent) believed that the concern that the quality of education for students

will decline was extremely important or very important. Twice as many distance learning faculty members (4 percent) as traditional faculty members (2 percent) believed this concern was not too important or not important at all. One faculty member responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 1.55 compared to 1.80 for distance learning faculty members; the median score for each group was 1.00 and 2.00 respectively. The results are summarized in Table 7F.

Table 7F: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding quality (N=216)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. imp. 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n = 94)	62 (66)	20 (21)	8 (8)	2 (2)	0 (0)	1 (1)	1.00	1.55	.61	0.1099
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	53 (43)	48 (39)	15 (12)	4 (3)	2 (1)	0 (0)	2.00	1.80		

Question 7G: Distance learning will decrease the need for training faculty and result in fewer faculty jobs.

A larger proportion of traditional faculty members (61 percent) than distance learning faculty members (40 percent) believed that the concern that distance learning will decrease the need for training faculty and result in fewer faculty jobs was extremely important or very important; more distance learning faculty members believed this concern was somewhat important. Almost than twice the proportion of distance learning

faculty members (35 percent) as traditional faculty members (16 percent) believed this concern was not too important or not important at all. Four faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.61 compared to 3.07 for distance learning faculty members; the median score for each group was 2.00 and 3.00 respectively. The results are summarized in Table 7G.

Table 7G: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding job security (N=216)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T 1.05	p 0.294
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	25 (26)	33 (35)	19 (20)	13 (14)	2 (2)	1 (1)	2.00	2.61		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	23 (18)	27 (22)	26 (21)	34 (28)	9 (7)	3 (2)	3.00	3.07		

Question 7H: Professors will have less control over the content, perspective, and approaches to teaching their courses.

A larger proportion of traditional faculty members (73 percent) than distance learning faculty members (58 percent) believed that the concern that professors will have less control over the content, perspective, and approaches to teaching their courses was extremely important or very important. More than twice as many distance learning faculty members (13 percent) as traditional faculty members (6 percent) believed this

concern was not too important, or not important at all. Two faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.14 compared to 2.28 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 2.00. The results are summarized in Table 7H.

Table 7H: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding academic control (N=216)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n=94)	37 (39)	32 (34)	16 (17)	4 (4)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2.00	2.14	0.56	0.576
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	35 (28)	37 (30)	33 (27)	14 (11)	3 (2)	0 (0)	2.00	2.28		

Question 7I: Distance learning faculty will lose control over their intellectual property.

A larger proportion of traditional faculty members (67 percent) than distance learning faculty members (53 percent) believed that the concern that professors will lose control over their intellectual property was extremely important or very important. A much greater proportion of distance learning faculty members (21 percent) than traditional faculty members (4 percent) believed this concern was not too important, or not important at all. Eight faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.03 compared to 2.66 for

distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 2.00. The difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 7I.

Table 7I: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding intellectual property (N=216)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	26 (27)	38 (40)	21 (22)	4 (4)	0 (0)	5 (5)	2.00	2.03	2.16	0.032
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	33 (27)	32 (26)	27 (22)	26 (21)	1 (.8)	3 (2)	2.00	2.66		

Question 7J: Faculty will be less candid in the classroom, because comments in a classroom can be taken out of context when recorded and used in other settings.

An almost equal proportion of distance learning (48 percent) and traditional faculty members (60 percent) believed that the concern that faculty will be less candid in the classroom because comments can be taken out of context when recorded and used in other settings was extremely important, or very important. However, more than twice the proportion of distance learning faculty members (21 percent) than traditional faculty members (9 percent) believed this concern was not too important, or not important at all. Two faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.26 compared to 2.54 for distance

learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 2.00 and 3.00 respectively. The difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 7J.

Table 7J: Frequency, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding teaching style (N=216)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. imp. 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	21 (22)	36 (38)	26 (27)	8 (8)	1 (1)	2 (2)	2.00	2.26	2.04	0.042
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	24 (19)	36 (29)	35 (28)	25 (20)	2 (1)	0 (0)	3.00	2.54		

Question 7K: Student to teacher ratios will increase.

An almost equal proportion of distance learning (65 percent) and traditional faculty members (69 percent) believed that the concern that student to teacher ratios will increase was extremely important, or very important. In addition, an almost equal proportion of distance learning faculty members (10 percent) and traditional faculty members (9 percent) believed this concern was not too important, or not important at all. Two faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.07 compared to 2.19 for distance learning faculty members and the median score for each group was 2.00. One traditional faculty member

noted on the survey that this was a "changed question." The results are summarized in Table 7K.

Table 7K: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding student load (N=216)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	31 (33)	34 (36)	19 (20)	8 (8)	1 (1)	1 (1)	2.00	2.07	0.88	0.378
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	34 (28)	46 (37)	28 (23)	9 (7)	4 (3)	1 (.8)	2.00	2.19		

Question 7L: More students will cheat and get credit for work they did not do.

An almost equal proportion of distance learning (65 percent) and traditional faculty members (77 percent) believed that the concern that more students will cheat and get credit for work they did not do was extremely important or very important. Almost eight times the proportion number of distance learning faculty members (15 percent) than traditional faculty members (2 percent) believed the concern was not too important, or not important at all. Two faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean scores for traditional and distance learning faculty members as 1.77 and 2.19 respectively, and the median score for each group was 2.00. The difference in the mean scores for these groups is significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 7L.

Table 7L: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding cheating (N=216)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									3.12	0.0021
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	43 (45)	30 (32)	18 (19)	2 (2)	0 (0)	1 (1)	2.00	1.77		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	42 (34)	38 (31)	19 (15)	19 (15)	1 (.8)	1 (.8)	2.00	2.19		

Question 7M: The quality of faculty will decline as their roles change from creating content to managing information and students.

A larger proportion of traditional faculty members (73 percent) than distance learning faculty members (56 percent) believed that the concern that the quality of faculty will decline as their roles change from creating content to managing information and students was extremely important, or very important. More than twice the proportion of distance learning faculty members (13 percent) than traditional faculty members (5 percent) believed the concern was not too important or not important at all. Four faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 1.88 compared to 2.36 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for both groups was 2.00. The difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 7M.

Table 7M: Frequency, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding faculty roles (N= 216)

	Ext. imp. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	37 (39)	32 (34)	16 (17)	4 (4)	1 (1)	4 (4)	2.00	1.88	3.37	0.009
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	29 (23)	41 (33)	35 (28)	13 (10)	4 (3)	0 (0)	2.00	2.36		

Question 7N: Distance learning will result in more work for the same amount of pay.

An almost equal proportion of distance learning (76 percent) and traditional faculty members (72 percent) believed that the concern that distance learning will result in more work for the same amount of pay was extremely important, or very important. More than twice the proportion of distance learning faculty members (8 percent) as traditional faculty members (3 percent) believed the concern was not too important or not important at all. Four faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 1.94 compared to 2.14 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 2.00. The results are summarized in Table 7N.

Table 7N: Frequency, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding workload compensation (N=216)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. impt. 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	31 (33)	37 (39)	20 (21)	3 (3)	0 (0)	3 (3)	2.00	1.94	1.56	0.120
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	36 (39)	45 (37)	29 (23)	9 (7)	2 (1)	1 (.8)	2.00	2.14		

Question 7O: Faculty will not be fairly compensated for their intellectual property.

An almost equal proportion of distance learning (61 percent) and traditional faculty members (74 percent) believed that the concern that distance learning will result in more work for the same amount of pay was extremely important, or very important. However, more distance learning faculty (8 percent) than traditional faculty (2 percent) believed the concern was not too important or not important at all. Eleven faculty members responded to the question with don't know. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 1.88 compared to 2.15 for distance learning faculty members and the median score for each group was 2.00. The difference in the mean scores for these groups was significant ($p < .05$). The results are summarized in Table 7O.

Table 7O: Frequency, median, mean, T value, and p value regarding intellectual property compensation (N=216)

	Ext. impt. 1 n (%)	V. imp. 2 n (%)	Some. impt. 3 n (%)	Not too impt. 4 n (%)	Not impt. at all 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
									2.14	0.033
Trad. Faculty (n= 94)	30 (32)	40 (42)	16 (17)	2 (2)	0 (0)	6 (6)	2.00	1.88		
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	37 (30)	38 (31)	31 (25)	9 (7)	2 (1)	5 (4)	2.00	2.15		

Question 8: Who is the most forceful proponent of distance learning at your institution?

An equal number of traditional and distance learning faculty members indicated that individual faculty members were the most forceful proponents of distance learning at their institutions. However, the overwhelming majority of distance learning faculty indicated that the administration was the most forceful proponent of distance learning. Of the respondents, 52 percent of traditional faculty members reported that individual faculty members were the most forceful proponents of distance learning, followed by 34 percent of respondents stating that the administration was the most forceful proponent. While traditional faculty members did not report any activity from their governing boards, 13 percent reported that outside companies were the most forceful proponents. For distance learning faculty members, 30 percent reported that individual faculty members were the most forceful proponent, and 65 percent reported that administration was the most forceful opponent. Two reported that governing boards were the most forceful proponent, and one reported that outside companies were the most forceful

proponent. Two distance learning faculty member reported that they were unsure who the most forceful proponent of distance learning at their institutions were. One traditional faculty member noted on the survey that "there are none around!," and one distance learning faculty member indicated that individual faculty, administration, the governing board, and outside companies all were forceful proponents of distance learning at the institution. The results are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8: Most Forceful Proponents of Distance Learning (N=198)

	Individual faculty n (%)	Administration n (%)	Governing board n (%)	Outside companies n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional faculty	39 (52)	26 (34.7)	0 (0)	10 (13.3)	0 (0)
Distance learning faculty	38 (30.9)	80 (65)	2 (1.6)	1 (0.8)	2 (1.6)
Total	77 (38.9)	106 (53.5)	2 (1)	11 (5.6)	2 (1)

Question 9: Has your institution developed a set of policies for distance learning courses?

A majority of traditional faculty members indicated that their institutions have not developed policies for distance learning courses. In contrast, an overwhelming majority of distance learning faculty members indicated that their institutions had developed policies for distance learning courses. Only 4.3 percent of traditional faculty members indicated that their institutions have developed a set of policies for distance learning courses; 57 percent indicated that they have no policies for distance learning, and 38 percent were unsure. Of the distance learning faculty members, 64 percent indicated that

their institutions have developed policies regarding distance learning, but 23 percent of faculty members indicated that they did not have distance learning policies; 11 percent of faculty members were unsure. One distance learning faulty member indicated that they had policies at the department level but not at the university level. These results are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9: Policies Regarding Distance Learning(N-219)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	Unsure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	4 (4.3)	54 (57.4)	36 (38.3)
Distance Learning Faculty	81 (64.3)	30 (23.8)	14 (11.1)
Total	85 (38.6)	84 (38.2)	50 (22.7)

Question 10: Who makes policy related to distance learning courses at your institution?

While distance learning faculty members clearly indicated that administration made policy related to distance learning courses, traditional faculty members are almost equally split between the administration, and the faculty senate and administration together. Of the respondents, 20 percent of traditional faculty members indicated that the administration sets the policy, while 21 percent of respondents indicated that the faculty senate and administration set the policy. While 13 percent indicated that an individual faculty member and the administration sets the policy, the majority (40 percent) of traditional faculty members indicated that they were unsure about who sets the policy for distance learning courses. One faculty member indicated that an individual faculty member is responsible for making policy related to distance learning courses at his

institution. One traditional faculty member noted on the survey that the individual faculty member makes the policy related to distance learning; another traditional faculty member indicated that the adult degree program faculty group and the administration make the policy related to distance learning. The majority of distance learning faculty members (34 percent) indicated that the administration makes the policy, and that the faculty senate and administration (24 percent) and an individual faculty member and administration (29 percent) were almost equally responsible for setting the policy related to distance learning courses. Surprisingly, 11 percent of distance learning faculty members were unsure about who makes the policy related to distance learning courses. One distance learning faculty member noted on the survey that faculty and administration together set policy for distance learning at the department level. The results are summarized in Table 10.

Table 10: Who Sets Policy Related to Distance Learning Courses? (N=218)

	Administration n (%)	Faculty Senate and Administration n (%)	Individual Faculty and Administration n (%)	Not Sure n (%)	Individual Faculty n (%)
Traditional Faculty	19 (20.7)	20 (21.7)	12 (13)	40 (43.5)	1 (1.1)
Distance Learning Faculty	43 (34.1)	31 (24.6)	37 (29.4)	15 (11.9)	0 (0)
Total	62	51	49	55	1

Question 11: Are distance learning courses approved through the same curriculum review process as other courses at your institution?

The vast majority of distance learning faculty members indicated that distance learning courses were approved through the same curriculum review process as other courses; however, the majority of traditional faculty members were not sure of the approval process of distance learning courses. Of the traditional faculty members, 42 percent indicated that distance learning courses were approved through the same curriculum review process as other courses, compared to 67 percent of distance learning faculty members. 5 percent of traditional faculty members indicated that distance learning courses were not approved through the same curriculum review process, compared 17 percent of distance learning faculty members. The majority of traditional faculty members were unsure of the distance learning curriculum review process: 51 percent of traditional faculty members, compared to 15 percent of distance learning faculty members were unsure of the curriculum review process for distance learning courses. These results are summarized in Table 11.

Table 11: Same Curriculum Review Process for Distance Learning Courses (N=212)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	Not Sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	37 (42.5)	5 (5.7)	45 (51.7)
Distance Learning Faculty	84 (67.2)	22 (17.6)	19 (15.2)
Total	121 (57.1)	27 (12.7)	64 (30.2)

Question 12: Have you taught a distance learning course in the last 3 years, including this year, where more than half of the instruction takes place when you and your students are at different locations and is delivered through audio, video, or computer technologies?

The vast majority of traditional faculty indicated that they had not taught a distance learning course. Of the distance learning faculty, almost two- thirds indicated that they had taught a distance learning course, while more than one-third indicated that they had not taught a distance learning course. Only 9 percent of traditional faculty members indicated that they had taught a distance learning course, compared to 62 percent of distance learning faculty members. Of the traditional faculty members, 89 percent indicated that they had not taught a distance learning course, compared to 37 percent of distance learning faculty members. An equal number of traditional and distance learning faculty members were unsure if they had taught a distance learning course. These results are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12: Faculty Have Taught Distance learning Course(N=220)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	Not Sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	9 (9.6)	84 (89.4)	1 (1.1)
Distance Learning Faculty	78 (61.9)	47 (37.3)	1 (0.8)
Total	87 (39.5)	131 (59.5)	2 (0.9)

For Questions 13-45, the responses from only those faculty members who have taught distance learning courses were analyzed; for questions 13-45, the number of responses was 87.

Question 13: How many different courses—that is courses with different titles—have you taught in the last 3 years, including this year, where more than half of the instruction takes place when you and your students are at different locations?

The majority of traditional faculty members have taught at least one distance learning course; 66 percent of traditional faculty members have taught one course compared to 31 percent of distance learning faculty members. 22 percent of traditional faculty members and 24 percent of distance learning faculty members have taught two courses. 16 percent of distance learning faculty reported that they have taught three courses, and an almost equal number of distance learning faculty members have taught 4 or 5 distance learning courses. 15 percent of distance learning faculty members reported having taught more than 5 distance learning courses. One distance learning faculty member noted on the survey "I'm not sure how the question applies in my situation. We stream most of out classes over the Intent. Usually I have some students present in the classroom as well as some watching live or archived videos or sometimes videotapes." The results are summarized in Table 13.

Table 13: Number of Different Distance Learning Courses Faculty Have Taught (N=87)

	1 n (%)	2 n (%)	3 n (%)	4 n (%)	5 n (%)	>5 n (%)
Traditional Faculty	6 (66.7)	2 (22.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	25 (31.6)	19 (24.1)	13 (16.5)	5 (6.3)	4 (5.1)	12 (15.2)
Total	31 (35.2)	21 (23.9)	13 (14.8)	5 (5.7)	5 (5.7)	12 (13.6)

Question 14. In a typical year, what proportion of your assigned courses are distance learning courses?

For the majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members, less than 25 percent of their assigned courses are distance learning courses. Almost half the distance learning faculty members reported that distance learning courses are 25 percent of their assigned courses. One quarter of the distance learning faculty members reported that distance learning courses represent up to 50 percent of their assigned courses; only 9 faculty members reported that distance learning courses made up to 75 percent of their assigned courses. Nine distance learning faculty members reported that distance learning courses made up 100 percent of their assigned courses. One distance learning faculty member noted that the students "were a mixture of campus and distance students." These results are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14: Proportion of Courses that are Distance Learning Courses (N=87)

	<25% n (%)	25-<50% n (%)	50-<75% n (%)	75-<100% n (%)	100% n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	7 (77.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (11.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	36 (46.2)	20 (25.6)	9 (11.5)	3 (3.8)	9 (11.5)	1 (1.3)
Total	43 (49.4)	20 (23)	9 (10.3)	4 (4.6)	9 (10.3)	1 (1.1)

Question 15: Did you participate in a workshop or training session on how to teach distance learning courses?

Forty percent of traditional and 66 percent of distance learning faculty who teach distance learning courses participated in a faculty training workshop; over half (60

percent) of traditional faculty and one third of distance learning faculty reported that they did not participate in a training session or workshop. These results are summarized in Table 15.

Table 15: Participation in Faculty Training Workshop (N=87)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)
Traditional Faculty	4 (40)	5 (60)
Distance Learning Faculty	52 (66.7)	26 (33.3)
Total	56 (63.6)	31 (36.4)

Question 16: Are there workshops and training session on teaching distance learning courses that are available to you on a regular basis?

Twenty percent of traditional faculty and more than half the distance learning faculty respondents (57 percent) reported that training sessions and workshops on teaching distance learning courses were available on a regular basis; however, 60 percent of traditional and almost 40 percent of distance learning faculty members reported that training sessions are not available. The results are summarized in Table 16.

Table 16: Training Sessions Available to Faculty Regularly(N=87)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	Not Sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	2 (20)	6 (60)	2 (220)
Distance Learning Faculty	45 (57.7)	30 (38.5)	3 (3.8)
Total	47 (53.4)	36 (40.9)	5 (5.7)

Question 17: How are you currently being paid for teaching your distance learning courses.

The most common payment for distance learning courses for traditional faculty members was a fixed dollar amount; by contrast, the most common payment for distance learning faculty members was as part of the normal assignment. Fifty- five percent of traditional faculty members were paid by a fixed amount; in contrast 60 percent of distance learning faculty reported compensation as part of a normal assignment. Few faculty members had a payment with royalties arrangement. One distance learning faculty member noted on the survey that "You missed an important issue: Are you PAID to DEVELOP distance learning courses?" Another respondent noted that "payment is a fixed dollar amount if it is an overload; otherwise it is part of the normal assignment." A third respondent noted on the survey that "payment is either a fixed dollar amount or part of the normal assignment." These results are summarized in Table 17.

Table 17: Payment for Distance Learning Courses(N=87)

	Payment with royalties n (%)	Fixed dollar amount n (%)	Part of normal assignment n (%)
Traditional Faculty	0 (0)	5 (55.6)	4 (44.4)
Distance Learning Faculty	6 (7.7)	25 (32.1)	47 (60.3)
Total	6 (6.9)	30 (34.5)	51 (58.6)

Question 18. In general, how would you prefer to be compensated for the materials you prepare for distance learning courses?

Neither group of faculty members expressed a preference for compensation for distance learning courses. An almost equal number of faculty members in each group

indicated preference for payment either with royalties, a fixed dollar amount, or part of the normal assignment. These results are summarized in Table 18.

Table 18: Preferred Compensation Plans (N=87)

	Payment with royalties n (%)	Fixed dollar amount n (%)	Part of normal assignment n (%)	Not Sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	4 (44.4)	3 (33.3)	0 (0)	2 (22.2)
Distance Learning Faculty	25 (32.1)	23 (29.5)	23 (29.5)	7 (9.0)
Total	29 (33.3)	26 (29.9)	23 (26.4)	9 (10.3)

Question 19: In your opinion, rank this particular distance learning course on how well it meets these education goals compared with a traditional course on the subject—much better, somewhat better, same, somewhat worse, much worse, don't know.

The response don't know was not calculated in the mean score, but was reported separately.

Question 19A: Developing student interactivity.

Few traditional faculty members (1 percent) compared to a large proportion of distance learning faculty (45 percent) believed that distance learning was much better or somewhat better in developing student interactivity than traditional courses. A greater proportion of traditional faculty (45 percent) than distance learning faculty (32 percent) believed that they were somewhat worse or much worse than traditional courses at

developing student interactivity. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.44 compared to 2.76 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 4.00 and 3.00 respectively. The results are summarized in Table 19A.

Table 19A: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T, and p value for developing student interactivity (N=87)

	Much better 1 n (%)	Some. better 2 n (%)	Same 3 n (%)	Some. worse 4 n (%)	Much worse 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	P
Trad. Faculty (n= 9)	1 (1)	0 (0)	3 (33)	4 (44)	1 (1)	0 (0)	4.00	3.44	1.46	0.1471
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 78)	17 (21)	19 (24)	16 (20)	17 (21)	9 (11)	0 (0)	3.00	2.76		

Question 19B. Giving students access to information.

The overwhelming proportion of traditional faculty members (55 percent) and distance learning faculty members (49 percent) believed that distance learning provided much better or somewhat better regarding access to information as traditional courses. While no traditional faculty members believed it provided somewhat worse or much worse access to information, 14 percent of distance learning faculty believed it did. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 2.22 compared to 2.39 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 2.00 and 2.50 respectively. The results are summarized in Table 19B.

Table 19B: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T, and p value for giving students access to info (N=87)

	Much better 1 n (%)	Some. better 2 n (%)	Same 3 n (%)	Some. worse 4 n (%)	Much worse 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 9)	2 (22)	3 (33)	4 (44)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2.00	2.22	0.50	0.6184
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 78)	19 (24)	20 (25)	28 (35)	11 (14)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2.50	2.39		

Question 19C. Assessing the educational effectiveness of the course.

The majority of traditional (55 percent) and distance learning faculty members (54 percent) believed that assessing the educational effectiveness of distance learning courses was the same as traditional courses. An equal proportion of distance learning and traditional faculty members believed it was much better or somewhat better (22 percent for both groups) or much worse or somewhat worse (18 percent and 22 percent respectively) than traditional courses. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.11 compared to 2.96 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 3.00. The results are summarized in Table 19C.

Table 19C Frequency, percent, median, mean, T, and p value for assessing educational effectiveness (N=87)

	Much better 1 n (%)	Some. better 2 n (%)	Same 3 n (%)	Some. worse 4 n (%)	Much worse 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 9)	0 (0)	2 (22)	5 (55)	1 (11)	1 (11)	0 (0)	3.00	3.11	0.46	0.6436
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 78)	5 (6)	13 (16)	42 (54)	10 (12)	5 (6)	3 (3)	3.00	2.96		

Question 19D. Providing students with high quality course materials.

The largest proportion of traditional (66 percent) and distance learning faculty members (61 percent) believed that distance learning courses provided the same opportunity to provide students with high quality course materials as traditional courses. An almost equal proportion of distance learning faculty members (27 percent) as traditional faculty members (22 percent) indicated that the opportunities were somewhat better or much better. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.00 compared to 2.70 for distance learning faculty members, and the median scores were 3.00 and 3.00 respectively. The results are summarized in Table 19D.

Table 19D Frequency, percent, median, mean, T, and p value for providing high quality course materials (N=87)

	Much better 1 n (%)	Some. better 2 n (%)	Same 3 n (%)	Some. worse 4 n (%)	Much worse 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Traditional Faculty (n= 9)	0 (0)	2 (22)	6 (66)	0 (0)	1 (11)	0 (0)	3.00	3.00	1.02	0.3110
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 122)	9 (11)	13 (16)	48 (61)	6 (7)	1 (1)	1 (1)	3.00	2.70		

Question 19E. Improving verbal skills.

No traditional faculty members believed that distance learning courses were much better or somewhat better at improving verbal skills than traditional courses; however, 21 percent of learning faculty members believed they were much better or somewhat better than traditional courses. The largest proportion of distance learning faculty members (49 percent) and believed that distance learning courses were somewhat worse or much worse at improving verbal skills than traditional courses, while the largest proportion of traditional faculty members (66 percent) believed that distance learning courses were the same as traditional courses. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.55 compared to 3.36 for distance learning faculty members, and the median scores for each group was 3.00 and 4.00 respectively. The results are summarized in Table 19E.

Table 19E Frequency, percent, median, mean, T, and p value for improving verbal skills (N=87)

	Much better 1 n (%)	Some. better 2 n (%)	Same 3 n (%)	Some. worse 4 n (%)	Much worse 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n= 9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (66)	1 (11)	2 (22)	0 (0)	3.00	3.55	0.48	0.6338
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 78)	6 (7)	11 (14)	18 (23)	28 (35)	11 (14)	4 (5)	4.00	3.36		

Question 19F. Addressing the variety of student learning styles.

An equal proportion of traditional faculty members (44 percent) believed that distance learning courses were the same as or somewhat worse or much worse than traditional courses in assessing the variety of student learning styles. The largest proportion of distance learning faculty members (41 percent) believed that distance learning courses were much better or somewhat better than traditional courses in addressing a variety of students learning styles. However, 30 percent of distance learning faculty members believed they were somewhat worse or much worse at addressing the variety of learning styles. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.44 compared to 2.89 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for both groups was 3.00. The results are summarized in Table 19F.

Table 19F: Frequency, percent, median, mean, T, and p value for addressing learning styles (N=87)

	Much better 1 n (%)	Some. better 2 n (%)	Same 3 n (%)	Some. worse 4 n (%)	Much worse 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	P
Trad. Faculty (n= 9)	0 (0)	1 (11)	4 (44)	3 (33)	1 (11)	0 (0)	3.00	3.44	1.38	0.1723
Distance Learning Faculty (n- 78)	7 (8)	26 (33)	20 (25)	16 (20)	8 (10)	1 (1)	3.00	2.89		

Question 19G. Helping students master the subject matter.

The largest proportion of traditional (44 percent) and distance learning faculty members (48 percent) believed that distance learning courses were the same as traditional courses in helping students master the subject matter. However, more traditional faculty (33%) believed that distance learning courses were somewhat worse or much worse than distance learning faculty members (24%) in helping students master the subject matter. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.22 compared to 2.96 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 3.00. The results are summarized in Table 19G.

Table 19G: Frequency, median, mean, T, and p value for helping students master the subject matter (N=87)

	Much better 1 n (%)	Some. better 2 n (%)	Same 3 n (%)	Some. worse 4 n (%)	Much worse 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n = 9)	0 (0)	2 (22)	4 (44)	2 (22)	1 (11)	0 (0)	3.00	3.22	0.78	0.4392
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 78)	7 (8)	12 (15)	38 (48)	17 (21)	3 (3)	1 (1)	3.00	2.96		

Question 19H. Helping students deliver better oral presentations.

The largest proportion of traditional faculty members (50 percent) indicated that distance learning courses were the same as traditional courses in helping students deliver better oral presentations. The largest proportion of distance learning faculty members (48 percent) believed that distance learning courses were somewhat worse or much worse than traditional courses in helping students deliver better oral presentations. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.37 compared to 3.92 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 3.00 and 4.00 respectively. The results are summarized in Table 19H.

Table 19H: Frequency, median, mean, T, and p value for helping students deliver better oral presentations (N=85)

	Much better 1 n (%)	Some. better 2 n (%)	Same 3 n (%)	Some. worse 4 n (%)	Much worse 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	P
Trad. Faculty (n=8)	0 (0)	1 (12)	4 (50)	2 (25)	1 (12)	0 (0)	3.00	3.37	1.32	0.1905
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 77)	3 (3)	4 (5)	15 (19)	18 (23)	27 (35)	10 (13)	4.00	3.92		

Question 19I: Improving quantitative skills

The largest proportion of both traditional faculty members (66 percent) and distance learning faculty members (52 percent) believed that distance learning courses were about the same as traditional courses in improving quantitative skills. An equal proportion of distance learning faculty believed they were much better or somewhat better as were somewhat worse or much worse than traditional courses in improving quantitative skills. The mean of the responses for traditional faculty members was 3.25 compared to 3.03 for distance learning faculty members, and the median score for each group was 3.00. The results are summarized in Table 19I.

Table 19I: Frequency, median, mean, T, and p value for improving quantitative skills (N=86)

	Much better 1 n (%)	Some. better 2 n (%)	Same 3 n (%)	Some. worse 4 n (%)	Much worse 5 n (%)	Don't Know 6 n (%)	Median	Mean	T	p
Trad. Faculty (n =9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (66)	2 (22)	0 (0)	1 (11)	3.00	3.25	0.68	0.4995
Distance Learning Faculty (n= 77)	3 (3)	7 (9)	40 (52)	6 (7)	3 (3)	18 (23)	3.00	3.03		

Question 20: Does this particular course fulfill a requirement to complete the major or to graduate, or is it an elective?

The overwhelming majority of distance learning courses offered fulfill requirements in the major or to graduate; 66 percent of traditional faculty members and 92 percent of distance learning faculty reported that distance learning courses fulfilled a requirement. These results are summarized in Table 20.

Table 20: Courses is required to fulfill requirement or elective (N=87)

	Fulfill requirement n (%)	Elective n (%)
Traditional Faculty	6 (66.7)	3 (33.3)
Distance Learning Faculty	72 (92.3)	6 (7.7)
Total	78 (89.7)	9 (10.3)

Question 21. At what level is this course offered?

Courses offered via distance learning were almost equally split between graduate and undergraduate courses. However, 77 percent of distance learning courses offered by traditional faculty members were undergraduate courses, compared to only 43 percent of distance learning faculty offerings. One distance learning faculty member indicated on the survey that the course was offered at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The results are summarized in Table 21.

Table 21: Level of Course (N=87)

	Graduate n (%)	Undergraduate n (%)	Both n (%)
Traditional Faculty	2 (22.2)	7 (77.8)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	42 (53.8)	34 (43.6)	2 (2.6)
Total	44 (50.6)	41 (47.1)	2 (2.6)

Question 22. What percentage of this course would you estimate consisted of full-time students?

Only 11 percent of students in distance learning courses offered by traditional faculty members and 10 percent of the students in distance learning courses offered by distance learning faculty were full-time students. These results are summarized in Table 22.

Table 22: Proportion of fulltime students (N=87)

	<25% n (%)	25-<50% n (%)	50-<75% n (%)	75-<100% n (%)	100% n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	3 (33.3)	3 (33.3)	0 (0)	2 (22.2)	1 (11.1)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	34 (43.6)	14 (17.9)	11 (14.1)	9 (11.5)	8 (10.3)	2 (2.6)
Total	37 (42.5)	17 (19.5)	11 (12.6)	11 (12.6)	9 (10.3)	2 (2.3)

Question 23. In some instances the teacher of the distance learning course designs the content of the course and has assistants or other teachers manage the information with the students. For your course, would you say you were more the designer of the content or the manager of the information?

The overwhelming majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members both designed the content of their distance learning courses and managed the information with their students. 88.9 percent of traditional and 61.5 percent of distance learning faculty reported both designing content and managing information. Almost one third of the distance learning faculty members designed the course content only. The results are summarized in Table 23.

Table 23: Design or Manage Content (N=87)

	Design content n (%)	Manage information n (%)	Both n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	0 (0)	1 (11.1)	8 (88.9)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	22 (28.2)	7 (9)	48 (61.5)	1 (1.3)
Total	22 (25.3)	9 (9.2)	56 (64.4)	1 (1.1)

Question 24. Did you develop original course content or did you mostly use pre-packaged materials?

Five respondents left this question blank. The overwhelming majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members developed original content for distance learning courses. 50 percent of traditional and 82 percent of distance learning faculty developed their own content. Only 6 percent of all faculty respondents use pre-packaged materials, and 13 percent of all faculty respondents were unsure. The results are summarized in Table 24.

Table 24: Develop original content or use pre-packaged materials(N=82)

	Develop content n (%)	Pre-packaged materials n (%)	Both n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	4 (50)	2 (25)	0 (0)	2 (50)
Distance Learning Faculty	61 (82.4)	3 (4.1)	1 (1.4)	9 (12.2)
Total	65 (79.3)	5 (6.1)	1 (1.2)	11 (13)

Question 25: If you developed the course content, do you own the property rights to the materials you developed for the course?

Seven respondents left this question blank. One-third of traditional and distance learning faculty members reported that they owned the property rights to the materials they developed for the course. Almost half of all faculty respondents reported that they

did not own the property rights to their course content. One distance learning faculty member reported that he has joint ownership of the content with university administration. The results are summarized in Table 25.

Table 25: Ownership of property rights to materials(N=80)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	Not sure n (%)	Co-own with admin. n (%)
Traditional Faculty	3 (37.5)	3 (37.5)	2 (25)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	24 (33.3)	36 (50)	11 (15.3)	1 (1.4)
Total	27 (33.8)	39 (48.8)	13 (16.3)	1 (1.3)

Question 26: Did you have professional assistance in choosing materials or developing the course material?

Five respondents left this question blank. The vast majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members reported receiving no assistance in developing or choosing distance learning course materials. Less than 20 percent of all faculty reported receiving assistance for distance learning courses. These results are summarized in Table 26.

Table 26: Assistance with course materials(N=82)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	14 (18.9)	59 (79.7)	1 (1.4)
Total	15 (18.3)	66 (80.5)	1 (1.2)

Question 27. How many times have you taught this particular course?

One respondent left this question blank. Traditional faculty members reported that they taught their distance learning courses one time most often, followed by 4 times or 6 times. By contract, distance learning faculty members reported that they have taught their distance learning courses 8 times or more most often, followed by 3 times and 2 times. The results are summarized in Table 27.

Table 27: Number of times distance learning course was taught (N=86)

	1 x n (%)	2 x n (%)	3 x n (%)	4 x n (%)	5 x n (%)	6 x n (%)	7 x n (%)	8 x or more n (%)	Don't know n (%)	Open Regis. n (%)
Trad. Fac.	3 (37.5)	1 (12.5)	0 (0)	2 (25)	0 (0)	2 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Dist. Learn Fac.	7 (9)	12 (15.4)	13 (16.7)	8 (10.3)	7 (9)	4 (5.1)	2 (2.6)	23 (29.5)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)
Total	10 (11.6)	13 (15.1)	13 (15.1)	10 (11.6)	7 (8.1)	6 (7)	2 (2.6)	23 (26.7)	1 (1.2)	1 (1.2)

Question 28. Did you teach this course as a traditional course before it was a distance learning course?

The majority of both traditional and distance learning faculty members taught their distance learning courses as traditional courses first. 55 percent of traditional faculty and 83 percent of distance learning faculty reported that they had taught the course as a traditional course before it was a distance learning course. The results are summarized in Table 28.

Table 28: Traditional course before distance learning course (N=87)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)
Traditional Faculty	5 (55.6)	4 (44.4)
Distance Learning Faculty	65 (83.3)	13 (16.7)
Total	70 (80.5)	17 (19.5)

Question 29: Is the distance learning component of your course an addition to a traditional version or does it replace all or part of the traditional course?

One respondent left this question blank. More traditional faculty members reported that the distance learning course replaced a traditional course; however, 44 percent indicated that the distance learning component was an addition to a traditional course. The overwhelming majority of distance learning faculty members indicated that the distance learning course was a replacement of a traditional course; only one third indicated that it was an addition to a traditional course. The results are summarized in Table 29.

Table 29: Addition or replace traditional course(N=86)

	Addition n (%)	Replace n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	4 (44.4)	5 (55.6)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	24 (31.2)	51 (66.2)	2 (2.6)
Total	28 (32.6)	56 (65.1)	2 (2.3)

Question 30: Were most of the distance students enrolled in another campus of your institution, or enrolled at a different institution?

Six respondents left this question blank. Traditional faculty members reported that the students enrolled in distance learning courses were from their own institution; in addition, an equal number reported that students enrolled in distance learning courses were from another campus, or that they were not sure. The majority of distance learning faculty members reported that students enrolled in distance learning courses were from another campus; an almost equal number reported that either students were from the same institution, or that they were not sure. The results are summarized in Table 30.

Table 30: Student enrollment (N=81)

	Another campus n (%)	Different institution n (%)	Not sure n (%)	Same institution n (%)	Neither n (%)
Traditional Faculty	2 (25)	0 (0)	2 (25)	3 (37.5)	1 (12.5)
Distance Learning Faculty	29 (39.7)	5 (6.8)	20 (27.4)	19 (26)	0 (0)
Total	31 (38.3)	5 (6.2)	22 (27.2)	22 (27.2)	1 (1.2)

Question 31: Which one of the following technologies did you use in this course?

Traditional faculty members reported using threaded discussions and chat rooms most often in their distance learning courses. Distance learning faculty reported using threaded discussions most often in their distance learning courses, followed by one-way pre-recorded video and chat room. The results are summarized in Table 31.

Table 31: Technologies used in distance learning courses (N=86)

	2-way int. video n (%)	1-way live video n (%)	1-way pre-rec. video n (%)	Chat rooms n (%)	Threaded discussions n (%)	Other N (%)
Traditional faculty	1 (11.1)	0 (0)	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	4 (44.4)	0 (0)
Distance learning faculty	9 (11.7)	6 (7.8)	16 (20.8)	15 (19.5)	25 (32.5)	6 (7.8)
Total	10 (11.6)	6 (7)	17 (19.8)	18 (20.9)	29 (33.7)	6 (7)

Question 32: Was your course an online web-based course?

The overwhelming majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members reported that their distance learning courses were online web-based courses. The results are summarized in Table 32.

Table 32: Online Web-based course (N=86)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)
Traditional Faculty	8 (88.9)	1 (11.1)
Distance Learning Faculty	52 (67.5)	25 (32.5)
Total	60 (69.8)	26 (30.2)

Question 33: How frequently did you have the following types of personal interaction with your distance learning students about this course? Only indicate interactions that are over and above the normal instruction time.

Seven respondents left this question blank. The most common personal interaction

reported by traditional and distance learning faculty members was through e-mail. Distance learning faculty members reported never using face- to- face student meetings or chat rooms, while traditional faculty members reported never using chat rooms. The results are summarized in Table 33.

Table 33: Frequency of personal interactions with distance learning students (N=80)

Face to face student meetings		>1x/week	1x/week	2x/month	1-2x/term	Never
	Traditional Faculty	0	3	0	3	3
	Distance Learning Faculty	4	3	3	17	44
E-mail		>1x/week	1x/week	2x/month	1-2x/term	Never
	Traditional Faculty	5	3	0	1	0
	Distance Learning Faculty	35	18	11	6	1
Chat rooms		>1x/week	1x/week	2x/month	1-2x/term	Never
	Traditional Faculty	0	1	1	2	5
	Distance Learning Faculty	10	9	4	7	38
Telephone		>1x/week	1x/week	2x/month	1-2x/term	Never
	Traditional Faculty	1	2	1	3	2
	Distance Learning Faculty	4	8	18	31	10

Question 34. In your opinion, is the time required for preparing and deliver this distance learning course less, more or about the same as for your traditional courses?

The overwhelming majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members indicated that they required more time to prepare and deliver a distance learning course compared to a traditional course. Almost 25 percent of distance learning faculty and 12 percent of traditional faculty indicated that it took about the same amount of time. Only 9 percent of the distance learning faculty indicated it took less time. The results are summarized in Table 34.

Table 34: Preparation for distance learning course(N=84)

	More time n (%)	Less time n (%)	About the same n (%)
Traditional Faculty	7 (87.5)	0 (0)	1 (12.5)
Distance Learning Faculty	50 (65.8)	7 (9.3)	18 (23.7)
Total	57 (67.9)	7 (8.3)	19 (22.6)

Question 35: If more time, roughly how much more time did you spend preparing and delivering your distance learning course?

More traditional faculty members reported spending 1-2 hours more per week preparing and delivering distance learning courses. An equal number of traditional faculty members reported spending between 3-5 hour more per week or 6-10 hour more

per week. In contrast, 39 percent of distance learning faculty member reported spending 3-5 hours more per week preparing and delivering distance learning courses. An almost equal number reported spending 1-2 hours more per week or 6-10 hours more per week. Four distance learning faculty members reported spending more than 10 hours more per week. The results are summarized in Table 35.

Table 35: More time preparing and delivering distance learning course(N=60)

	1-2 hrs more/week n (%)	3-5 hrs more/week n (%)	6-10 hrs. more/week n (%)	>10 hrs more/ week n (%)
Traditional Faculty	3 (42.9)	2 (28.6)	2 (28.6)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	13 (24.5)	21 (39.6)	15 (28.3)	4 (7.5)
Total	16(26.7)	23 (38.3)	17 (28.3)	4 (6.7)

Question 36. If less time, roughly how much less time did you spend preparing and delivering your distance learning course?

An equal number of traditional faculty members reported spending between 3-5 hours less and 6-10 hours less preparing and delivering distance learning courses. The majority of distance learning faculty reported spending between 1-2 hour less per week preparing and delivering courses; 22 percent reported spending between 6- 10 hours less per week, and 11 percent reported spending 3-5 hours less. The results are summarized in Table 36.

Table 36: Less time preparing and delivering distance learning course(N=11)

	1-2 hrs less/week n (%)	3-5 hrs less/week n (%)	6-10 hrs. less/week n (%)	>10 hrs less/ week n (%)
Traditional Faculty	0 (0)	1 (50)	1 (50)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	6 (66.7)	1 (11.1)	2 (22.2)	0 (0)
Total	6 (54.5)	2 (18.2)	3 (27.3)	0 (0)

Question 37: Did you get a reduction in the number of courses you were required to teach or in any other work requirements in exchange for teaching or preparing your distance learning course?

The majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members indicated that they did not receive a reduction in workload in exchange for preparing or teaching a distance learning course. The results are summarized in Table 37.

Table 37: Reduction in Workload (N=87)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)
Traditional Faculty	1 (11.1)	8 (88.9)
Distance Learning Faculty	16 (20.5)	62 (79.5)
Total	17 (19.5)	70 (80.5)

Question 38. About how many students were enrolled for credit in your course at the beginning of the term?

The majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members reported enrolling between 1-20 students in their distance learning course. One third of the distance learning faculty members reported enrolling between 21 and 40 students, while 14 percent of distance learning faculty members reported enrolling over 41 students. The results are summarized in Table 38.

Table 38: Students enrolled for credit (N=87)

	1-20 students n (%)	21-40 students n (%)	>41 students n (%)
Traditional Faculty	7 (77.8)	2 (22.2)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	41 (52.6)	26 (33.3)	11 (14.1)
Total	48 (55.2)	28 (32.2)	11 (12.6)

Question 39. About how many non-credit students were enrolled in your course at the beginning of the term?

The majority of traditional faculty members reported that there were no non-credit students enrolled in their distance learning courses. One third of the traditional faculty members reported that they were not sure how many non-credit students were enrolled. Forty percent of the distance learning faculty members reported that they were not sure how many non-credit students were enrolled in their distance learning courses; an almost equal number reported that there were no non-credit students enrolled in their courses.

However, almost 15 percent of distance learning faculty members reported up to 20 non-credit students in their courses. These results are summarized in Table 39.

Table 39: Non-credit students enrolled (N=83)

	1-20 students n (%)	21-40 students n (%)	>41 students n (%)	Not sure n (%)	None N (%)
Traditional Faculty	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (33.3)	6 (66.7)
Distance Learning Faculty	11 (14.9)	1 (1.4)	3 (4.1)	30 (40.5)	29 (39.2)
Total	11 (13.3)	1 (1.2)	3 (3.6)	33 (39.8)	35 (42.2)

Question 40: What percentage of you students finished the course, including both credit and non-credit students?

One third of traditional faculty members reported that 90 percent or more students finished the distance learning course; however, 22 percent reported that between 70 and 80 percent of students completed the course, and 11 percent each reported that between 25- 50 percent and 50-70 percent of students completed the course. The overwhelming majority of distance learning faculty member reported that 90 percent or more of students completed the distance learning course; over 20 percent of distance learning faculty reported that between 80-90 percent of students completed the course. The results are summarized in table 40.

Table 40: Percentage of students who finished distance learning courses (N=87)

	<25% n (%)	25-<50% n (%)	50-<70% n (%)	70-<80% n (%)	80-<90% n (%)	90% or more n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	0 (0)	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)	2 (22.2)	2 (22.2)	3 (33.3)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)	3 (3.8)	3 (3.8)	18 (23.1)	49 (62.8)	2 (2.6)
Total	1 (1.1)	3 (3.4)	4 (4.6)	5 (5.7)	20 (23)	52 (59.8)	2 (2.3)

Question 41. Was there a limit to the number of students who could enroll in your course?

The majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members reported having a limit on enrollments of their distance learning courses. One third of all respondents reported having no limit on student enrollments, and 5 percent of all respondents were not sure. The results are summarized in Table 41.

Table 41: Limit to student enrollment (N=87)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	5 (55.6)	3 (33.3)	1 (11.1)
Distance Learning Faculty	50 (64.1)	24 (30.8)	4 (5.1)
Total	55 (63.2)	27 (31)	5 (5.7)

Question 42. How would you describe the technical support available to you and your students during the course?

One third of traditional faculty members reported poor technical support for their distance learning course. An equal number of traditional faculty members reported either good support or none needed; in addition, an equal number of traditional faculty members reported either excellent and not so good support. In contrast, the majority (59 percent) of distance learning faculty member reported good technical support services; 25 percent of distance learning faculty members reported excellent technical support services. The results are summarized in Table 42.

Table 42: Quality of technical support for distance learning course (N=87)

	Excellent n (%)	Good n (%)	Not so good n (%)	Poor n (%)	None needed n (%)
Traditional Faculty	1 (11.1)	2 (22.2)	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	2 (22.2)
Distance Learning Faculty	20 (25.6)	46 (59)	6 (7.7)	5 (6.4)	1 (1.3)
Total	21 (24.1)	48 (55.2)	7 (8)	8 (9.2)	3 (3.4)

Question 43. How would you describe the library and laboratory facilities available to you and your students during this course?

Traditional faculty members reported either good library and laboratory facilities for distance learning courses, or that none were needed. Distance learning faculty members reported either good or excellent library and laboratory facilities to support distance learning courses. The results are summarized in Table 43.

Table 43: Quality of library/ lab facilities for distance learning course (N=87)

	Excellent n (%)	Good n (%)	Not so good n (%)	Poor n (%)	None needed n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	22 (28.2)	36 (46.2)	7 (9)	2 (2.6)	8 (10.3)	3 (3.8)
Total	23 (26.4)	39 (44.8)	8 (9.2)	3 (3.4)	11 (12.6)	3 (3.4)

Question 44:Was your teaching in the course evaluated by any of the following groups?

Students were the most common group to evaluate distance learning courses offered by both traditional and distance learning faculty members. In addition, administration was the second most common group to evaluate distance learning faculty members, followed by peers. Other groups that were reported to evaluate distance learning courses included the US Department of Education, and the distance education department.

Table 44: Distance learning evaluation

Students		Yes	No	Not sure
	Traditional Faculty	7	1	0
	Distance Learning Faculty	73	2	2
Peers		Yes	No	Not sure
	Traditional Faculty	1	7	0
	Distance Learning Faculty	8	44	6
Administration		Yes	No	Not sure
	Traditional Faculty	2	6	0
	Distance Learning Faculty	24	37	7

Question 45: Did you volunteer to teach this course or was it assigned to you?

The overwhelming majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members volunteered to teach a distance learning course. Almost 25 percent of the distance learning faculty were assigned to teach a distance learning course, but an almost equal number reported that they were both assigned as well as volunteered to teach the course. The results are summarized in Table 45.

Table 45: Volunteer or assigned to teach distance learning course (N=87)

	Volunteer n (%)	Assigned n (%)	Both n (%)
Traditional Faculty	7 (77.8)	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)
Distance Learning Faculty	41 (52.6)	19 (24.4)	18 (23.1)
Total	48 (55.2)	20 (23)	19 (21.8)

Question 46. What is your age?

Over one third of the traditional and distance learning faculty members were between the ages of 46 and 55; approximately 25 percent of the respondents in both groups stated their ages between 36-45, or 56-65. The results are summarized in Table 46.

Table 46: Age of respondents (N=217)

	25-35 n (%)	36-45 n (%)	46-55 n (%)	56-65 n (%)	>66 n (%)
Traditional faculty	5 (5.5)	28 (30.8)	33 (36.3)	30 (22)	5 (5.5)
Distance learning faculty	5 (4)	30 (23.8)	47 (37.3)	33 (26.2)	11 (8.7)
Total	10 (4.6)	58 (26.7)	80 (36.9)	53 (24.4)	16 (7.4)

Question 47: What is your gender?

The majority of traditional faculty members was female, and the majority of distance learning faculty members was male. The results are summarized in Table 47.

Table 47: Gender of respondents

	Male	Female
Traditional Faculty	40	52
Distance Learning Faculty	75	51
Total	115	103

Question 48. All total, how many years have you worked in a full-time or part-time capacity in a post-secondary institution?

Traditional faculty members have worked an average of 18 years in post-secondary education; the responses ranged from 2 years to 41 years. Distance learning faculty members have worked an average of less than 17 years in post-secondary education; the responses ranged from 1 year to 40 years. The results are summarized in Table 48.

Table 48: Years in post-secondary institution (N=220)

	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Traditional faculty	94	18.09	2	41
Distance learning faculty	126	16.86	1	44

Question 49: About how many years have you worked in a full-time capacity at your current institution?

Traditional faculty members have worked an average of 12 years at their current institutions; the responses ranged from 1 year to 35 years. Distance learning faculty members have worked an average of 11 years at their current institution, the responses ranged from1 year to 44 years. The results are summarized in Table 49.

Table 49: Years at current post-secondary institution (N=219)

	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Traditional faculty	94	12	1	35
Distance learning faculty	125	11.16	1	44

Question 50: If less than ten years of teaching at your current institution, when you were interviewing for your job at your current institution, were you asked about your ability or willingness to teach a distance learning course?

Approximately half the respondents did not provide a response to this question. The overwhelming majority of traditional faculty members and distance learning faculty members indicated that they were not asked about distance learning during their interview. The results are summarized in Table 50.

Table 50: Interviewed about distance learning courses (N=110)

	Yes n (%)	No n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	5 (11.1)	39 (86.7)	1 (2.2)
Distance Learning Faculty	16 (24.6)	47 (72.3)	2 (3.1)
Total	21 (19.1)	86 (78.2)	3 (2.7)

Question 51: Is your institution part of a statewide system with multiple campuses, a district system with 3 or more campuses, or is it primarily one main campus?

The overwhelming majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members indicated that their institutions consisted of primarily one campus; less than 10 percent of

all respondents indicated that their institutions were district systems with 3 or more campuses. The results are summarized in Table 51.

Table 51: Type of institution

	State/ mult. Campuses n (%)	District/ 3+ campuses n (%)	One campus n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional faculty	0 (0)	2 (2.2)	91 (97.8)	0 (0)
Distance learning faculty	9 (7.6)	15 (12.6)	94 (79)	1 (.8)
Total	9 (4.2)	17 (8)	185 (87.3)	1 (1.5)

Question 52. State where you are employed.

The majority of traditional faculty member respondents are employed in LA, MS, and NC, while the majority of distance learning faculty members are employed in TX and FL. There were no distance learning faculty members from KY who responded to the survey. The results are summarized in Table 52.

Table 52: Employment by state (N=219)

	AL n (%)	FL n (%)	GA n (%)	KY n (%)	LA n (%)	MS n (%)	NC n (%)	SC n (%)	TN n (%)	TX n (%)	VA n (%)
Trad. Fac.	6 (6.4)	7 (7.4)	7 (7.4)	10 (10.6)	11 (11.7)	10 (10.6)	10 (10.6)	8 (8.5)	8 (8.5)	7 (7.4)	10 (10.6)
Dist. Lrn. Fac	15 (12)	23 (18.4)	14 (11.2)	0 (0)	5 (4)	3 (2.4)	1 (0.8)	11 (8.8)	16 (12.8)	35 (28)	2 (1.6)
Total	21 (9.6)	30 (13.7)	21 (9.6)	10 (4.6)	16 (7.3)	13 (5.9)	11 (5)	19 (8.7)	24 (11)	42 (19.2)	12 (5.5)

Question 53. Type of institution.

The majority of traditional faculty members reported working a four-year college, compared to the majority of distance learning faculty member who reported working in a university with a graduate program. The results are summarized in Table 53.

Table 53: Type of institution (N=218)

	4-year college n (%)	Univ/ grad program n (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	71 (75.5)	23 (24.5)	0 (0)
Distance Learning faculty	30 (24)	92 (73.6)	2 (1.6)
Total	101 (46.1)	115 (52.2)	2 (.9)

Question 54. For the current academic year, are you a full-time or part-time employee? If you are part-time, are you less than half-time?

The overwhelming majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members reported that they are full-time employees of their institutions. The results are summarized in Table 54.

Table 54: Full-time or part-time status (N=219)

	Full time n (%)	Part-time, half-time or more n (%)	Less than half-time n (%)
Traditional Faculty	92 (97.9)5.5)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)
Distance Learning faculty	124 (98.40)	2 (1.6)	0 (0)
Total	216 (98.2)	3 (1.4)	1 (.5)

Question 55: Are you tenured, or on a tenure track but not yet tenured?

The majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members reported that they are tenured at their institutions. However, 25 percent of distance learning faculty reported not having tenure at their institutions. The results are summarized in Table 55.

Table 55: Tenure status of respondents (N=211)

	Tenured n (%)	Tenure track n (%)	Not sure n (%)	No tenure n (%)
Traditional Faculty	60 (66.7)	23 (25.6)	3 (3.3)	4 (4.4)
Distance learning faculty	58 (47.5)	23 (18.9)	9 (7.4)	31 (25.4)
Total	118 (55.7)	46 (21.7)	12 (5.7)	35 (16.5)

Question 56. What is your academic rank?

Over one third of traditional and distance learning faculty report holding the rank of associate professor or full professor. Approximately 25 percent of respondents in both groups reported holing the rank of assistant professor. The results are summarized in Table 56.

Table 56: Academic Rank (N=217)

	Assist. Prof. n (%)	Assoc. Prof. n (%)	Professor N (%)	Not sure n (%)
Traditional faculty	23 (24.5)	35 (37.2)	34 (36.2)	1 (1.1)
Distance learning faculty	31 (24.8)	42 (33.6)	48 (38.4)	3 (2.4)
Total	54 (24.7)	77 (35.2)	82 (37.4)	4 (1.8)

Question 57. About how many students are enrolled at your institution, including both full-time and part-time students?

The majority of traditional faculty members reported working at institutions with enrollment between 1000 but less than 2500 students. Distance learning faculty members reported working at institutions with enrollment between 2500 but less than 5000 students. One quarter of all respondents reported working at institutions with enrollment less than 1000 students. The results are summarized in Table 57.

Table 57: Student enrollment (N=218)

	<1000 n (5)	1000-<2500 n (%)	2500-<5000 n (%)	5000-< 10,000 n (%)	10,000-<20,000 n (%)	>20,000 n (%)
Traditional Faculty	23 (24.7)	46 (49.5)	21 (22.6)	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	0 (0)
Distance Learning Faculty	29 (23.2)	27 (21.6)	53 (42.4)	8 (6.4)	6 (4.8)	2 (1.6)
Total	52 (23.9)	73 (33.5)	74 (33.9)	10 (4.6)	7 (3.2)	2 (0.9)

Question 58: What is your highest level of education?

The majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members indicated that they hold a doctorate degree; 13 percent of the respondents indicated that they hold a master's degree. The results are summarized in Table 58.

Table 58: Level of education

	Masters n (%)	2-yr. postgraduate n (%)	Ph.D/ Ed.D n(%)	Grad/ prof. Degree n (%)	Other n (%)
Traditional faculty	14 (14.9)	0 (0)	75 (79.8)	1 (1.1)	4 (4)
Distance learning faculty	15 (11.9)	3 (2.4)	84 (66.7)	11 (8.7)	13 (10)
Total	29 (13.2)	3 (1.4)	159 (72.3)	12 (5.5)	17 (7)

- Other responses included D. Min., DBA, DA, DocMusArt.

Chapter Summary

The responses to a survey sent to traditional and distance learning faculty members who teach at private colleges and universities in the Southeastern United States accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) were reported in this chapter. Ninety six traditional faculty members and one hundred twenty six distance learning faculty members responded to the survey; the response rate for this study was 39.3%. Traditional faculty members reported stronger concerns about the outcomes of distance learning compared to distance learning faculty. Traditional faculty members were more negative toward distance learning while distance learning faculty members were more positive toward distance learning. Information about courses offered via distance learning, student enrollment in distance learning courses, faculty compensation, ownership of intellectual property, and demographic information about survey participants were reported.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to explore the opinions, perceptions, and beliefs of faculty members toward distance learning. This study reported the results of a survey of traditional and distance learning faculty members who teach at private colleges and universities in the Southeast regarding their opinions, perceptions, and beliefs about distance learning. Specifically, the study helped determine a) to what extent faculty members participate in distance learning programs, b) what faculty members think about possible outcomes distance learning programs, and c) what concerns faculty members have about distance learning.

Recent literature and research on distance learning, including administrative and pedagogical issues, as well as internal and external policies governing distance learning, guided this study. The literature provided a contextual background for understanding distance learning, institutional factors used in planning for distance learning, and policy development for distance learning. The process of policy development and the factors that were evaluated when setting policy have been conceptualized, yet a greater understanding of how policy considering faculty opinion related to distance learning were developed and adopted in higher education was still needed.

This study used a 59 -question survey instrument adapted from an instrument developed, piloted, and validated by the National Education Association (NEA) for a national survey of their members on the same topic. Five questions from the original

survey were eliminated for this survey instrument; two questions were added (Q. 58 and Q. 59). The survey instrument was extensive, and requested information on the opinions and perceptions of faculty members, but also specific information on distance learning courses faculty offer.

The analysis of the results, summary, and conclusions of the Survey of Traditional and Distance Learning Faculty Members at Private Institutions in the Southeast is reported in this Chapter.

Summary of Participant Demographics

The majority of traditional faculty members was female, and almost equally divided into three age groups; approximately one third reported their age to be between 36 and 45 year old, another third reported their age to be between 46 and 55 years old, and a final third reported their age to be between 56 and 65 years old. By contrast, the majority of the distance learning faculty members was male and more than one third reported their age to be between 46 and 55 years. Approximately one quarter of the respondents reported their age to be between 36 and 45 years old, and another quarter reported their age to be between 56 and 65 year old.

Both groups have worked in higher education throughout their careers; traditional faculty members reported an average of 18 years compared to almost 17 for distance learning faculty members. Both groups have been employed by their current institution for an average of approximately 12 years. Although only half provided a response to the question of being asked about distance learning during an employment interview, the overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that they were not asked about distance learning during their employment interviews.

The overwhelming majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members reported working at single-campus institutions, however, the groups were almost evenly split between small to mid-size four-year colleges and a university with a graduate program, almost evenly split between institutions with enrollments between 1000- <2500 and 2500- <5000 students. A majority of respondents were senior faculty members who held the academic rank of associate or full professor and almost all faculty members reported holding a doctorate degree. Almost all the respondents in both groups reported that they were full-time employees; just over half of the respondents reported having tenure at their institutions, while 16% reported that their institutions did not have a tenure system. The majority of traditional faculty member respondents were employed in Louisiana, Mississippi, and North Carolina, while the majority of distance learning faculty members were employed in Texas and Florida. No distance learning faculty members from the Kentucky responded to the survey.

Of the traditional faculty members surveyed in this study, less than 10% of them reported having taught a distance learning course in that last 3 years; almost 90% reported that had not taught a distance learning course. While this was expected, what was surprising is that only 60% of distance learning faculty member reported having taught a distance learning course during the last 3 years, and over one-third of distance learning faculty members reported not having taught a distance learning course in the last 3 years. Even though the survey was sent to faculty members in programs that were taught via distance learning, not all faculty members in the programs teach distance learning courses. One distance learning faculty member explained that "We have a core faculty (6-12) out of 120 who are actively involved in developing DL courses. The

remainder seem to have minimal interest in developing online courses. However, many are interested in integrating technology use in regular classes."

Summary of Distance Learning Offerings by Institutions

The overwhelming majority of distance learning faculty reported that their institutions currently offer distance learning courses. One third of the traditional faculty members reported offering distance learning courses, with most of the traditional faculty member respondents reporting comments such as "I'm sorry to be unhelpful, but I have no experience with distance learning, nor do I know anyone else who has had direct experience," and "I have no experience with distance learning." One traditional faculty member even commented that "I am horrified that a small, liberal arts institution would consider distance learning as a substitute for the classroom."

Several traditional faculty members did report some experience with distance learning, however. One remarked that "Courses are taught at my institution rarely," and another stated that "Distance learning has not been very successful on our campus. Few off-campus students enrolled in courses offered. We hope that a new Web course will be more popular. Faculty, however, are skeptical about distance learning because of past failures." Another traditional faculty member reported his experience by stating that "I taught one class where we met over a week and then had on-line discussions asynchronously. They had to answer discussion questions. I don't think my current institution plans to develop distance learning courses." Another continued to offer a distance learning courses, stating that "I do offer a class by distance but it is not officially sanctioned. They gave me permission to do it but I think they forgot and I don't bring it up. The day students meet once per week and the night students twice per semester.

Everyone is required to utilize the class website." Another traditional faculty member reported problems with their distance learning experiment by stating that "Students, instructors, and administration were all ill-prepared for the course. The assumption that students are computer literate was false. We should have done a detailed needs assessment." A final traditional faculty member stated "I have taught distance learning courses in the past. They may be suitable for some disciplinary areas (i.e. math) but they represent yet another nail in the coffin of the liberal arts…"

Summary of Distance Learning Plans by Institutions

Although distance learning courses were not offered by the majority of traditional faculty members, over half them reported that distance learning courses were being considered by their institutions. This finding indicated that traditional institutions without distance learning programs were investigating distance learning courses. Several traditional faculty members provided the following written comments on the future plans of their institutions:

"This is just getting stated here; first course was taught summer session this year."

"I know about distance learning; however, my institution has not yet involved itself in distance learning. It may be another decade before the school becomes involved. Presently, my interest is focused on another innovation."

"We have no distance learning program and, as far as I know, no plans to develop one."

"Our school prides itself on small intimate classes where personal contact is emphasized. Distance learning formats are not encouraged or supported."

"I suspect distance learning will not be an issue here because the school markets itself as providing extensive face to face contact between profs and students."

"Can't replace small liberal arts colleges."

"Our students frequently say that the reason they attend our (expensive) college is the close personal interaction between faculty and students. Faculty come on board for the same reason. Distance learning would destroy those incentives!"

"We are currently exploring the options and have had information and training classes. Our state systems have implemented and will probably force us to. This approach is simply the technology approach to correspondence courses and I never had much confidence in the quality of them. I teach performance based speech communication and theatre courses. Despite what "experts" say right now I don't see how they can be Internet based. I usually have 90-100 students each semester."

Perceptions, Beliefs, and Concerns of Faculty Regarding Distance Learning

Distance learning faculty members reported feeling more positive than traditional faculty members toward distance learning. While the overall feeling of traditional faculty members toward distance learning tended to be neutral or slightly negative, the overall feeling of distance learning faculty members tended to be very positive or somewhat positive. However, what was striking was that over 20% of distance learning faculty members reported somewhat negative or very negative feelings toward distance learning, and over 25% of traditional faculty members who were very positive or somewhat positive toward distance learning. In fact, one distance learning faculty member stated that "I'm still completely unsure how I feel about DL—and I'm the tech-ed teacher at my

school. I know all the pro's, I know it is here to stay, but many aspects I still heartily dislike (no standards, etc)." Another commented that " Nothing can replace face- to- face classroom teaching/ learning." A distance learning faculty member stated that his "primary concern is that the teacher/learner dynamic, which I feel critical to the growth of each, will be lost. I don't believe there is a healthy substitute for a good faculty member and positive learning environment, and a student excited about learning." One distance learning faculty member expressed concern about additional resources needed for the program; he stated "We seem committed to this distance learning program but don't have the staffing or money to do it really well—it drains the faculty and sometimes makes us less effective!" In an opposite view, a distance learning faculty member reported that "I love it! It saves me time because I do not have to drive to campus to teach this course."

Outcomes of Distance Learning

Traditional and distance learning faculty reported that it was both likely and important that distance learning courses would reach many students who could not take traditional courses. However, the groups' responses differed significantly in their opinions about how important this outcome was. Distance learning faculty believed that it was extremely likely and extremely important that distance learning reach students who could not take traditional courses, while traditional faculty members believed that this outcome was slightly less likely and less important than distance learning faculty members. The data suggested that traditional faculty members are cautious about accepting the promise of broad reach of distance learning courses.

Both traditional and distance learning faculty reported that is was somewhat likely that distance learning faculty members would become entrepreneurs and market their distance learning courses; however, the two groups differed significantly in their ideas about how likely this outcome was. Distance learning faculty members believed this outcome was more important than traditional faculty members. The data suggested that distance learning faculty members recognize the new opportunities available to them through distance learning.

Traditional faculty members believed that it was less likely than distance learning faculty members that distance learning would allow students to learn from the best teachers in the country. By contrast, distance learning faculty members believed that this was a more important outcome of distance learning than traditional faculty members. The groups differed significantly on their opinion about how likely this outcome was. The data indicated that traditional faculty members appear skeptical that distance learning courses would be taught by faculty from different institutions.

Both traditional and distance learning faculty members had similar opinions about the use of distance learning technologies, including chat rooms. Both traditional and distance learning faculty members believed that through distance learning technologies, it was somewhat likely yet very important that more students would actively participate in class. The data indicated that both traditional and distance learning faculty members are continually seeking ways to actively engage students participation in class, regardless of the teaching method.

Finally, distance learning faculty believed it was not too likely, although very important, that institutions could offer a richer curriculum through distance learning. By

comparison, traditional faculty who indicated it was somewhat likely and very important that institutions could offer a richer curriculum through distance learning. While both groups believed it was very important, distance learning faculty members' opinions reflect their positive experience of enhancing the curriculum through distance learning.

In summary, traditional and distance learning faculty members agreed on the importance and likelihood of two outcomes of distance learning: the idea that faculty members might become entrepreneurs and that distance learning would increase active participation by students. Distance learning faculty members believed that reaching more students through distance learning was more likely and more important than traditional faculty members did. This suggests that traditional faculty members were more conservative in the idea that distance learning would reach more students compared to distance learning faculty members, who rated reaching more students as extremely likely and extremely important.

Traditional faculty members also appear skeptical in their opinions about the ability of distance learning to broaden opportunities for faculty and for curriculum development. While both traditional and distance learning faculty members believed that allowing students to learn from the best faculty in the country was somewhat important, and that it was very important that distance learning would allow for a richer curriculum, traditional faculty believe that neither was too likely to happen through distance learning. These results are compared in Table 59.

Table 59: Comparison of mean scores regarding likelihood and importance of five possible outcomes of distance learning reported by traditional and distance learning faculty members.

	Traditional Faculty (Mean)		Distance Learning Faculty (Mean)	
Outcomes of Distance Learning	Likely	Important	Likely	Important
a. Distance learning courses will reach many students who could not take traditional college courses.	2.29	2.29	1.80	1.79
b. Distance learning will encourage teachers who design such courses to be entrepreneurs and market their courses.	3.03	3.85	3.09	3.54
c. Distance learning will allow students to learn from the best teachers in the country.	3.75	2.94	3.28	2.78
d. Through distance learning tools such as chat rooms, more students will participate actively in class.	3.51	2.79	3.23	2.55
e. Smaller institutions will be able to offer a richer curriculum.	3.36	2.72	2.97	2.60

Concerns about Distance Learning

Both traditional and distance learning faculty members believed that the concern that the quality of education for students would decline was both somewhat likely and extremely important. The data suggest that both groups are equally concerned about and recognize the importance of the quality of distance learning. One distance learning faculty member was optimistic about his view of quality in distance learning by stating that "I am convinced that distance learning can and should be potentially as high quality as conventional education with attention to its unique problems."

The two faculty groups differed, however, regarding their concerns about distance learning decreasing the need for training faculty and resulting in fewer faculty jobs. While the majority of traditional faculty believed this concern was somewhat likely,

distance learning faculty members believed it was not too likely. More traditional faculty believed this concern was very important, compared to distance learning faculty who believed it was not too important. This finding indicated that traditional faculty members were more concerned about being displaced by distance learning than faculty who teach in distance learning were.

Both groups believed that control of course content, perspective, and approaches in teaching is very important; however, traditional faculty members believed it was somewhat likely, while distance learning faculty members believed it is not too likely that professors would lost that control with distance learning. The data suggest that regardless of the teaching format, both groups believed that course control by the professor is extremely important.

Although both faculty groups believed that it was somewhat likely that faculty would lose control over their intellectual property, the two faculty groups differed significantly in its importance. Traditional faculty members believed that this concern was very important, compared to distance learning faculty members who believed it was somewhat important. This suggested that traditional faculty members appear more skeptical than distance learning faculty members about maintaining their intellectual property rights in distance learning courses.

Traditional faculty members believed that the concern that they will be less candid in the classroom, because comments in a classroom can be taken out of context when recorded and used in other settings was very likely, compared to distance learning faculty who believed that this concern was somewhat likely. Both groups believed that this concern was very important to them. This finding indicated that distance learning faculty

members' opinions reflect their experience of not compromising their teaching style or philosophy in distance learning.

Both traditional and distance learning faculty members believed that the concern that faculty will have more students was very important; yet distance learning faculty members reported it was only somewhat likely to happen, compared to traditional faculty members who reported that it was very likely to happen. These data reflected the experience of distance learning faculty who have not seen an increase in the number of students for whom they are responsible, and the fear of traditional faculty members regarding increased student loads because of distance learning.

Cheating and getting credit for work students did not do was a concern of both traditional and distance learning faculty. Traditional faculty believed this concern was very likely compared to distance learning faculty who believed this concern was somewhat likely. Traditional faculty members believed this concern was extremely important compared to distance learning faculty who believed it was very important. The data suggested that traditional faculty members' concerns about student cheating in distance learning courses appeared to be more acute than distance learning faculty's concerns. One traditional faculty member's remark "Cheating potential is large concern" was echoed by a distance learning faculty member who stated "I hate I-Net courses. No way to hold students responsible for <u>own</u> work. ITV classes no way to maintain order or monitor exams… I will not teach I-Net courses again."

There was a difference in the view of the faculty groups regarding the quality of faculty and faculty roles in distance learning. Traditional faculty believed that it was very likely and extremely important that they quality of faculty would decline as their

roles changed from creating content to managing information. By contrast, distance learning faculty members believed that it was somewhat likely yet very important that the quality of faculty would decline. The data suggested that traditional faculty members appeared to be more fearful that the quality of faculty would decline because of distance learning.

Both traditional and distance learning faculty members believed that it was very likely that distance learning would result in more work for the same amount of pay and that they would not be compensated for their intellectual property. However, traditional faculty members believed that these concerns were extremely important, while distance learning faculty members believed they were very important. Traditional faculty members appeared more fearful that they would not be fully compensated for teaching or for their intellectual property in distance learning.

In summary, traditional faculty members expressed more concern and appeared to be more fearful than distance learning faculty members almost every parameter in distance learning including teaching loads, student cheating, job security, retaining their rights to intellectual property, quality of education and course control. The data suggested that traditional faculty members fear the unknowns of distance learning, and look at the "worst case" scenarios about the discipline, compared to distance learning faculty who have experienced firsthand the issues of compensation, intellectual property, faculty workload, and quality issues of courses. These results are compared in Table 60.

Table 60. Comparison of mean scores regarding likelihood and importance of possible concerns of distance learning reported by traditional and distance learning faculty members.

	Traditional Faculty (Mean)		Distance Learning Faculty (Mean)	
Concerns about Distance Learning	Likely	Important	Likely	Important
f. The quality of education for students will decline.	2.61	1.55	3.05	1.80
g. Distance learning will decrease the need for trained faculty and result in fewer faculty jobs.	3.17	2.61	3.96	3.07
h. Professors will have less control over the content, perspective, and approaches in teaching their courses.	2.93	2.14	3.63	2.28
i. Distance learning faculty will lose control over their intellectual property.	3.12	2.03	3.14	2.66
j. Faculty will be less candid in the classroom, because comments in a classroom can be taken out of context when recorded and used in other settings.	2.46	2.26	3.00	2.54
k. Each teacher will be responsible for more students	2.01	2.07	2.65	2.19
l. More students will cheat and get credit for work they did not do.	2.29	1.77	2.86	2.19
m. The quality of faculty will decline as their roles change from creating content to managing information and students.	2.59	1.88	3.36	2.36
n. Distance learning will result in more work for the same amount of pay.	2.19	1.94	2.54	2.14
o. Faculty will not be fairly compensated for their intellectual property.	2.15	1.88	2.50	2.15

Faculty Preparation

Most traditional and distance learning faculty members volunteered to teach a distance learning course, although 25% of distance learning faculty members were assigned to teach the course. The overwhelming majority of both groups of faculty members

reported that they did not receive a reduction in workload in exchange for preparing or teaching a distance learning course. Most faculty members of both groups reported teaching one distance learning course, although over 40% of distance learning faculty members reported having taught three or more different courses. For the majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members, less than 25% of their assigned courses were distance learning courses. Less than half the traditional faculty members reported participating in a workshop or training session in preparation for teaching via distance learning, compared to over two thirds of distance learning faculty members. Even fewer faculty members from both groups reported that training sessions and workshops on teaching distance learning courses were available on a regular basis. Neither traditional nor distance learning faculty members reported receiving professional assistance in choosing materials for the distance learning or developing course materials, even though the majority of both groups of faculty members have taught their courses multiple times. In addition, not only did the overwhelming majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members design the content of their distance learning courses, they also managed the information with their students. However, almost half of all faculty members reported that they did not own the intellectual property rights to the materials they developed.

The overwhelming majority of traditional and distance learning faculty members reported that they required more time to prepare and deliver a distance learning course compared to a traditional course. More traditional faculty members reported spending 1-2 hours more per week preparing and delivering distance learning courses compared to distance learning faculty members who reported spending 3-5 hours more per week

preparing and delivering distance learning courses. Only 11 faculty members reported spending less time preparing and delivering distance learning courses. One distance learning faculty member commented that "Distance learning instruction required better teacher preparation and hence may therefore produce better quality instruction."

These data suggested that both groups of faculty members participated in distance learning courses as an experiment, with little initial training or ongoing support. Despite the increased time required to prepare and deliver the course, few faculty reported receiving a reduction in workload.

Faculty Opinion about Distance Learning Course Outcomes

Even though both traditional and distance learning faculty members believed that through distance learning technologies more students would actively participate in class, the two groups differed in how well distance learning developed students' interactivity. An almost equal number of distance learning faculty members reported that distance learning courses were much better, somewhat better, the same, or much worse as traditional courses in developing student interactivity, while traditional faculty members indicated that they were the same or much worse. By contrast, both faculty groups agreed on other outcomes of distance learning. Both groups indicated that distance learning courses provided the same access to information as traditional courses; that assessing the educational effectiveness of the course was the same as traditional courses; and that providing students with high quality course materials was the same as traditional courses. Although both faculty groups believed that distance learning courses were about the same as traditional courses in improving students' verbal skills, traditional faculty members believed that distance learning courses were about the same as traditional

courses in assessing the variety of students learning styles, while distance learning faculty members believed they were somewhat better. Both groups believed distance learning courses were about the same as traditional courses in helping students master the subject matter, but distance learning faculty believed that they were somewhat worse than traditional courses in helping students deliver better oral presentations. Both groups believed that distance learning courses were also about the same as traditional courses in improving quantitative skills. In fact, one traditional faculty member commented "It depends on the kind of courses. I teach foreign languages. I do not think distance learning is viable for the service courses (101-202)." Another remarked that "I see distance learning as appropriate for fact-based courses; much less so for skill-based and discussion-based courses." Another traditional faculty member remarked that "I have deep reservations about the implications of distance learning in my field and see very few real benefits associated with it. Although I do use tech./ Internet , etc, in my courses."

In summary, traditional faculty members recognized the possibility of achieving many of the same course outcomes as in traditional courses, but were more skeptical than distance learning faculty of achieving all the learning outcomes of traditional courses.

Faculty Compensation

Current faculty compensation plans for teaching distance learning courses differed between the two groups. Traditional faculty members reported an almost equal split between fixed dollar amount compensation and compensation as part of the normal teaching assignment for distance learning courses. By contrast, almost twice as many distance learning faculty members were paid for their distance learning courses as part of their normal teaching assignments, compared to those who were paid with a fixed dollar

amount plan. However, when asked how they would prefer to be compensated for their distance learning courses, traditional and distance learning faculty members were almost equally split between three payment plans-- payments with royalties, fixed dollar amount, and as part of the normal teaching assignment.

Policy Development Regarding Distance Learning

Traditional faculty members reported that the most forceful proponents of distance learning were individual faculty members, followed by the administration. By contrast, distance learning faculty members reported that the administration was the most forceful proponent of distance learning followed by individual faculty members. The majority of traditional faculty members reported that their institutions had not developed policies for distance learning courses; by contrast, the majority of distance learning faculty members reported that their institutions had developed policies. Traditional and distance learning faculty members reported that policies regarding distance learning were developed by either the administration, or by the faculty senate and administration equally; in addition, distance learning faculty members added that policies were also developed by individual faculty members and administration equally. Finally, the majority of traditional faculty members reported that they were unsure about the curriculum review process for distance learning courses, whereas distance learning faculty members reported that distance learning courses underwent the same curriculum review process as other courses offered by the institution. These data suggested that traditional faculty members viewed the process of developing distance learning programs as a "ground- up" process, whereas distance learning faculty viewed the process as a "top- down" process.

Profile of Students in Distance Learning Courses

Three quarters of traditional faculty members reported that their distance learning courses were offered at the undergraduate level, while distance learning faculty members reported an almost even split between undergraduate and graduate level courses. In addition, the majority of students enrolled in distance learning courses are part time students. Both groups of faculty reported that students enrolled in distance learning courses were enrolled at another campus of the institution or were enrolled at the same institution. Student enrollment in distance learning courses were small, meaning less than 20 students, although most traditional and distance learning faculty member reported a limit on the number of students who could enroll in the distance learning course; few non-credit students were enrolled in distance learning courses. Faculty in both groups reported that the overwhelming majority of all students completed the distance learning course. Distance learning faculty members provided several comments about students in distance learning courses. One remarked that "Our greatest problem seems to be enrolling students who have the necessary expertise and equipment to use the Internet-based classes. Students' expectations do not square with the harsh realities of the Internet as delivery systems. The video-delivery classes probably don't have this problem." Another stated that "Many students don't have the discipline or skills to do well in distance courses, especially undergraduates. Scientific and engineering disciplines aren't very amenable to distance learning." Others echoed these comments by writing "Distance learning doesn't work as well with undergraduates as graduates. This course I'm teaching offers dual mode—one week, chapter via distance learning; next week, chapter via traditional classroom," and "I find that those individuals who are prepared via

DL are consistently unprepared for the rigors of graduate work at the levels we require. I have begun to discount DL graduate credits by half or two thirds in my evaluations because of the problems I have encountered over the last four years. Even large, quality institutions with excellent reputations are producing very poorly prepared individuals, and graduates of pure virtual campuses are almost non competitive," and finally, "My first experience teaching an online class was great because I had a group of highly motivated and engaged students. Second time around has not been as satisfying because students are not as engaged in the threaded discussions and I can't seem to get them there. Ergo, this delivery method is great for some students, but is not for all." In an opposite view, other distance learning faculty members remarked that "I find students engage with course content earlier and intensely," and "Online students do not attend any live sessions, yet they interact more than they would in the classroom where only a percentage of students speak in each session. All our online students must participate each week."

Profile of Distance Learning Courses

The overwhelming majority of courses offered via distance learning fulfilled an academic requirement; only 10% were offered as elective courses. The majority of courses taught via distance learning were first taught as traditional place based courses. Traditional faculty members reported that their distance learning courses were either an addition to a place-based course or a replacement for a place-based course. By contrast, distance learning faculty reported that their distance learning courses were a replacement to place-based courses, and only one-third reported that they were an addition to place-based courses. The overwhelming majority of traditional faculty members reported that

their distance learning courses were online web-based courses compared to only two-thirds of distance learning faculty members. Most traditional and distance learning faculty members reported using threaded discussions most often, followed by chat rooms and one-way prerecorded video as technologies for their courses. The most common personal interaction reported by traditional and distance learning faculty member was through e-mail. Distance learning faculty members reported never using face-to face student meetings. Both traditional and distance learning faculty members reported receiving good technical, library and laboratory facilities for their distance learning courses. Finally, distance learning courses offered by either traditional or distance learning faculty members were most often evaluated by students, followed by administration. Few faculty members reported peer evaluation for distance learning courses.

Summary

This study provided information and data about the opinions, perceptions and concerns that faculty members at private four-year institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools had regarding distance learning. Not only did it provide baseline information about the extent that faculty members participate in distance learning programs, the technology used in the courses, and the students who participate in them, it also gave voice to traditional and distance learning faculty members regarding their opinions, perceptions and beliefs about distance learning. The results addressed the research questions of the study.

Traditional faculty members reported neutral or slightly negative feelings toward distance learning, while distance learning faculty members reported more positive

feelings. What was notable, however, was that more distance learning faculty members were slightly negative or very negative toward distance learning than traditional faculty members who reported somewhat positive or very positive feelings toward distance learning. This suggested that inexperienced traditional faculty members reported an overly optimistic view of the potentials distance learning, and that distance learning faculty members reported an overly realistic view of the perils of distance learning.

The data revealed that not all distance learning faculty members surveyed actually taught in distance learning programs. Even though a program was offered via distance learning, not all faculty members in that program taught via distance learning. This finding suggested that there was a primary core of faculty in each institution who taught via distance learning.

Faculty members who taught in distance learning overwhelmingly reported concerns about quality of instruction, student cheating, control over courseware and teaching methods, job security, and increased workload without appropriate compensation. They agreed on their needs for more release time to allow them to adequately prepare distance learning courses, and ongoing training programs in distance learning. Faculty identified preferred payment schemes for distance learning courses, and identified their preferences for technology to support teaching and student interaction. What was notable in the findings, however, was that traditional faculty members believed that each potential outcome was less likely to happen than did distance learning faculty members. Conversely, distance learning faculty members reported that each potential concern was less likely to happen than traditional faculty members did. These findings reflected both the skepticism of traditional faculty members, who believed that the potential outcomes

of distance learning were less likely and the concerns about distance learning were more likely to happen, and the experiences of distance learning faculty members, who reported that the outcomes of distance learning were more likely and the concerns about distance learning were less likely than traditional faculty members did.

Both groups of faculty members reported that distance learning courses took much more time than place-based courses to prepare and to deliver; however, few faculty members received release time to prepare and deliver distance learning courses. Traditional faculty members reported that most of their distance learning courses were taught at the undergraduate level as an addition to place-based courses. By contrast, distance learning faculty members reported that their distance learning courses were taught at both the undergraduate and graduate levels as a replacement of place-based courses.

While most faculty members who teach via distance learning were volunteers, few reported participating in a faculty development program that helped them prepare for the distance learning course. Even though faculty members are compensated for teaching distance learning courses with a fixed payment or as part of the normal teaching assignment, faculty members would prefer a payment plan that include royalties for distance learning courses. In addition, fven though faculty members are compensated for teaching distance learning courses with a fixed payment or as part of the normal teaching assignment, faculty members would prefer a payment plan that include royalties for distance learning courses.

This results of this study indicated that distance learning courses did not attract new enrollments from students from outside the institution; faculty members reported

that enrollments in distance learning courses were from current students already enrolled in the institution. Moreover, the data suggest that distance learning courses do not attract large enrollments; enrollment in distance learning courses was less than 20 students. Finally, faculty members from both groups reported that most students completed the distance learning courses.

This study investigated the research questions from the perspective of higher education administrators charged with setting policy on distance learning at private institutions. The study examined the expressed opinions and attitudes of faculty members toward distance learning, and solicited information about technology, curriculum development, financing, and pedagogy used in distance learning at private institutions throughout the Southeast. The information gathered in this study can assist higher education administrators and others as they evaluate and shape policy on distance education initiatives at private institutions in the Southeast.

Higher Education Administrators

The data generated from this study provided an additional parameter—the opinions, beliefs, perceptions, fears, and concerns of faculty members—to evaluate when higher education administrators consider distance learning programs. The results of this study can benefit institution-wide higher education administration including presidents, provosts, finance officers, senior administrators, boards of trustees, and the faculty senate, as well as heads of departments, units, schools, and degree programs as they evaluate and set policy regarding distance learning programs. As distance learning policies are developed, approved, and adopted by institutions, faculty opinions and perceptions about distance learning reported in this study can be incorporated.

In particular, faculty members' opinions related to outcomes and concerns about distance learning might be most important to academic higher education administrators. CHEA recommended that policies be created that allow faculty to continue to provide stewardship for curriculum and quality standards by using electronic tools to improve academic work. (Eaton, 2000). The results of this study made clear for university administrators faculty members' opinions about educational outcomes and concerns about course control. Moreover, the study made clear faculty members' concerns about the "business" end of faculty involvement in distance learning, especially job security, intellectual property rights, and workload compensation. Both the educational and administrative concerns expressed by faculty members were identified in this study, and would benefit administrators as they set policy regarding distance learning on an institutional, departmental or program level with in an institution.

These data will be especially beneficial to administrators at institutions whose traditional faculty members expressed hesitation and confusion regarding establishing distance learning programs while maintaining a mission of a traditional liberal arts institution. The results of this study will assist administrators at all institutional levels to set policy regarding distance learning in light of a traditional liberal arts mission.

Faculty Members

The results of this study will benefit all faculty members who feel that distance education has challenged their traditional roles and responsibilities. The results can help open a discussion with institutional administrators regarding faculty members' opinions, perceptions, beliefs and concerns about institutional mission as well as the educational outcomes and control, and business concerns about distance learning. In addition, the

results of this study may provide faculty members baseline data about what other faculty members at private institutions are doing in distance learning throughout the region; these results may create benchmarking data on which to build short term and long term plans for distance learning programs throughout the region. Moreover, these results may help open dialogue between and among faculty members to share teaching and learning techniques and strategies as well as teaching tools for distance learning.

National and Statewide Higher Education Associations

While these data cannot be generalized to private higher education institutions nationwide, national and statewide associations of might benefit from knowing the opinions of faculty members in private institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. At the national level, these results might assist associations prepare for the increase in distance learning programs offered by higher education consortia, virtual universities, and contracted or brokered arrangements in higher education, while at the state level these results might assist in statewide faculty and curriculum development.

Regional Accrediting Associations

These results of this study may provide regional accrediting associations baseline data about what members at private institutions are doing in distance learning throughout one region; these results may create benchmarking data on which to compare and contrast short term and long term accreditation policies for distance learning programs regarding education quality, curricular outcomes, and faculty workload.

Distance Learning Course Providers

For-profit distance learning course providers, distance learning course management companies, and technology providers that develop and host distance learning management systems, infrastructure and platforms on which institutions host distance learning courses can also benefit from the data from this study. These data from this study suggested that faculty members feared they may lose control of distance learning courses because they may have spent more time managing information rather than developing course content. The results indicated that faculty members wanted distance learning courses that met rigorous educational goals, enhanced student access to high quality course information, and that increased student interactivity and participation. They suggested that faculty members were looking for learning management systems that improved the assessment of the educational effectiveness of distance learning courses, that addressed a variety of learning styles to assist students in mastering the subject matter, and eliminated the possibilities of cheating.

Distance learning course providers, course management companies, and technology providers can use these data to create courses, systems, and infrastructure that meets the needs of traditional and distance learning faculty members. Course providers can create programs and services that will allow faculty to easily create and manage course information and content, so that faculty remain in full control of their course materials. The technology platform must accommodate faculty members' needs for courses and programs based on sound pedagogy, provide the opportunity for a variety of educational assessments of course effectiveness, and must provide the opportunity for instruction to students with a variety of learning styles. In addition, for-profit technology providers

should assure faculty members that the technology used to support distance learning courses facilitates and enhances interaction and participation between and among students and faculty. Finally, technology providers should continually upgrade the security technology used in distance learning to eliminate the possibility of cheating.

Improvements to Current Research Study

The survey instrument used in this study was complete and comprehensive; however, for future projects, the survey questions should be rearranged so that questions on a similar topic are grouped together. For example, questions on student enrollment, enrollment caps, student persistence and completion, should be grouped together, and questions on course preparation and development should be grouped together; it is recommended that these questions should not be commingled.

Suggestions for Future Research

While this study provided information on the extent faculty members participate in distance learning programs, what faculty members think about possible outcomes distance learning programs, and what concerns faculty members have about distance learning, there are three main areas for future research based on the results this study. The first area of future research is to repeat this survey in the same population to compare and contrast the opinions, perceptions, beliefs and concerns that faculty have about distance learning over time. Another area for future research would address the financing of distance learning programs, and the payment and compensation of faculty who teach in distance learning programs. As institutions create and implement different compensation models for faculty who teach in distance learning, more information is needed on how faculty are compensated for their efforts in distance learning.

In addition, faculty development programs to prepare faculty to participate in distance learning, as well as for faculty currently involved in distance learning programs should be explored in more detail. This study reported that faculty need additional time in preparing and delivering distance learning courses; research on preparing faculty to maximize teaching in distance learning, especially accommodating learning styles, developing education materials, and assessing educational outcomes of distance learning is needed. In addition, research on student learning, including successful strategies that enhance interactivity, and verbal and quantitative skills through distance learning is also needed.

In conclusion, traditional faculty members see distance learning as a "worst case" scenario for higher education on many different levels, including job security, teaching loads, course control, intellectual property, and quality of education. The data suggest that traditional faculty members are cautious and skeptical about

- accepting the perspective and expectation that distance learning will increase access to higher education for students;
- accepting the idea that there would be new teaching opportunities for faculty through distance learning;
- accepting the idea that students could take courses offered by faculty at different institutions; and
- accepting the idea that there would be new opportunities for curriculum enhancement and development with distance learning.

In fact, the data suggest that traditional faculty members fear that

- they will not be fully compensated for their intellectual property;
- that the quality of faculty will decline because of distance learning;

- that they will have increased teaching loads because they will be responsible for more students in distance learning courses; and

- their jobs will be replaced by distance learning courses.

Moreover, comments from traditional faculty members suggest that they do not understand how distance learning can support, help fulfill, or even be in concert with their institutions' missions as traditional liberal arts institutions.

By contrast, distance learning faculty members reported that

- they see new opportunities to reach new students through distance learning courses and

- they did not experience an increase in student enrollment in distance learning courses.

Both traditional and distance learning faculty members reported that

- they are looking for new ways to increase student participation in courses through technology;

- they believe that course control should be maintained by the professor;

- they believe that faculty might be encouraged to become entrepreneurs and market their distance learning courses;

- they are concerned about the quality of distance learning courses; and

- they are concerned about student cheating in distance learning courses.

These key faculty opinions, perceptions, and beliefs should be evaluated when decision makers adopt and set internal and external policies regarding distance learning in higher education.

REFERENCES

Analytical Software. (1998). Statistix. Tallahassee, FL: Analytical Software.

Aune, Betty P. (1995). The human dimension of organizational change. Review of Higher Education, 18(2), 149-173.

Baldridge, J. V. & Tierney, M. L. (1979). New approaches to management: Creating practical systems of management information and management by objectives. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bannister, G. & Bacon, P. A. (1999). From competitive to collaborative governance. Trusteeship, 7(2), 8-13.

Baume, D. (1995). Moving into the open. In D. Thomas (Ed.), Flexible learning strategies in higher and further education. (pp. 40-51). New York, NY: Cassell.

Beaudoin, Michael, (1990). The instructor=s changing role in distance education. American Journal of Distance Education, 4(2), 21-29.

Benjamin, R. A look at campus decision-making. Trusteeship, 7(2), 29-31.

Berge, A. L. & Schrumm, L. (1998). Linking strategic planning with program implementation of distance education. Cause/Effect, 21(3), 31-38.

Berge, Z. (1997). Characteristics of online teaching in post-secondary formal education. Educational Technology, 37(3), 35-47.

Cardenas, Karen. (1998). Technology in today=s classroom: It slices and it dices, but does it serve us well? Academe, 84(3), 27-29.

Carey, D. A. (1996). Distancing your college courses. Planning for Higher Education, 24, 5-13.

Carr, Sarah. (2000). Cornell creates a for-profit subsidiary to market distance-education programs. Chronicle of Higher Education, March 24.

Clark, E. (1995). Open learning: Educational opportunity or convenient solution to practical problems in higher education? In D. Thomas (Ed.), Flexible learning strategies in higher and further education. (pp. 26-39). New York, NY: Cassell.

Clark, T. (1993). Attitudes of higher education faculty toward distance education: A national survey. American Journal of Distance Education 7(2), 19-33.

Commission on Colleges (1997). A policy statement. Distance education: Definition and principles. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Decatur, GA.

Connick, G. P. (1997). Issues and trends. In T. E. Cyrs (Ed.). Teaching and Learning at a Distance: What it Takes to Effectively Design, Deliver, and Evaluate Programs. (pp. 7-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass Publishers.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (1999). Distance learning in higher education. CHEA Update (2): Washington, D. C.: CHEA.

Cyrs, T. E. (1997). Editors notes. In T.E. Cyrs (Ed.). Teaching and Learning at a Distance: What it Takes to Effectively Design, Deliver, and Evaluate Programs. (pp. 1-4). San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass Publishers.

Dasher-Alston, Robin M., & Patton, Gerald W. (1998). Evaluation criteria for distance learning. Planning for Higher Education, 27, 11-17.

Dunn, John A. (1998). Planning is not a management substitute. Planning for Higher Education, 26, 10-18.

Eaton, J. S. (2000). Core academic values, quality, and regional accreditation: The challenge of distance learning. CHEA Monograph Series.

Eaton, J. S. (2001). Distance learning: Academic and political challenges for higher education accreditation. CHEA Monograph Series,1.

Edwards, R. and Rinick, E. (1998). Faculty compensation and support issues in distance education. Washington, D. C. : Institutional Telecommucations Council.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (1990). How to design and evaluate research in education. (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Froke, Marlowe. (1994). A vision and a promise: Distance education at Penn State. Part 2B Policy and organization. The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 42(3), 16-23.

Garrison, D. R. & Shale, D. (Eds.). (1990). Education at a distance: From issues to practice. Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company.

Holmberg, B. (1989). Theory and practice of distance education. New York City, NY: Routledge.

Holznagel, D. C. & Olsen, T. (1989). A study of distance education policies in state education agencies. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Kashner, J. B. (1990). Changing the corporate culture. In D. W. Steeples (Ed.). Strategies for change. (19-28). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Keegan, Desmond. (1990). Foundations of Distance Education, Second Edition. New York, NY: Routledge.

Keller, George. (1997-1998). Planning, decisions, and human nature. Planning for Higher Education, 26, 18-23.

Kingery, D. W., Bryant, L. D., Palmer, L. K., and Araghi, F. A. (1989). A handbook of survey research. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Survey Research Center, Institute for Behavioral Research.

Layer, G. (1995). Working in partnership. In D. Thomas (Ed.), Flexible learning strategies in higher and further education. New York, NY: Cassell.

Lookatch, R. P. (1996). Collaborative Learning and Multimedia: Are Two Heads Still Better Than One? Techtrends, 41(4), 27-31.

Moore, Michael G. (1994). Administrative barriers to the adoption of distance education. American Journal of Distance Education, 8(3), 1-4.

Moore, M. G. (1997). The study guide: Foundation of the course. American Journal of Distance Education, 11(2).

Moore, Michael G. (1995). The 1995 distance education research symposium: A research agenda. The American Journal of Distance Education, 9(2), 1-6.

Moss, Phil. (1997). Evolution of policy and practice: Telecommunications-based instruction in Oklahoma. T.H.E. Journal, 24(9), 58-60.

Muniz, Barry, (1995). Wanted: New leadership for higher education. Planning for Higher Education, 24, 9-16.

Muniz, Barry; Erlich, Thomas, & Wellman, Jane. (1998). Leveraging change in a time of fundamental transformation. Planning for Higher Education, 26, 1-7.

National Education Association (2000). A survey of traditional and distance learning higher education members. Washington, D. C.: The National Education Association.

Nelson, Charles A. (1982). Policy vs. administration. AGB Rport, 24(5), 16-19.

Newman, F. & Couturier, L. K. (2001). The new competitive arena: Market forces invade the academy. Change, 33(5), 10-17.

Olcott, D. J. (1991). Bridging the gap: Distance learning and academic policy. Continuing Higher Education Review, 55 (1&2), 49-60.

Olcott, Donald J. & Wright, Stephen J. (1995). An institutional support framework for increasing faculty participation in post-secondary distance education. American Journal of Distance Education, 9(3), 5-17.

Olcott, Donald J. (1996). Aligning distance education practice and academic policy: A framework for institutional change. Continuing Higher Education Review, 60(1), 27-41.

Phipps, R. A., Wellman, J.A., & Merisotis, J. P. (1998). Assuring quality in distance learning: A preliminary review. Washington, D.C.: Council on Higher Education Accreditation.

Reichel, A., & Preble, J. (1989). Planning for institution of higher education: How to analyze the environment. Higher Education Management, 1(3), 227-237.

Robinson, Evan T. (2000). Strategic planning for technological change: The human component. Syllabus, 54, 55, 65.

Scott, Joyce, A. (1984). Compensating faculty members in non-traditional programs: A new approach. Educational Record, 65, 6-10.

Sherron, G. T. & Boettcher, J. V. (1997). Distance learning: The shift to interactivity. Boulder, CO: CAUSE.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges. (1997). Policy Statement on Distance Education. Decatur, GA.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (2000). Accreditation review project: Draft statements. Decatur, GA: SACS.

Suskie, Linda A. (1996). Questionnaire survey research: What works (2nd ed.). Tallahassee, FL: The Association for Institutional Research.

Swann, Joanna. (1997). How can we make better plans? Higher Education Review, 3(1), 37-55.

U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Distance Education in Higher Education Institutions, NCES 98-062, by Laurie Lewis, Debbie Alexander, and Elizabeth Farris. Bernie Greene, project officer. Washington, DC: 1997.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Distance education at postsecondary educational institutions: 1997-1998. NCES 2000-013, by Laurie Lewis, Kyle Snow, Elizabeth Farris, Douglas Levin. Bernie Greene, project officer. Washington, DC: 1999.

Willis, B. (1993). Distance education: A practical guide. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Wolcott, Linda L. (1993). Faculty planning for distance teaching. American Journal of Distance Education, 7(1), 26-36.

Wolcott, Linda. L. (1995). Faculty incentives and rewards for distance teaching. In Duning, B. S. & Pittman, V. V. (Eds.), Distance Education Symposium 3: Policy and Administration. State College, PA: Pennsylvania State University.

Wolcott, Linda L. (1997). Tenure, promotions, and distance education: Examining the culture of faculty rewards. American Journal of Distance Education, 11(2), 3-18.

Wouldstra, Andrew & Powell, Richard. (1989). Value chain analysis: A framework for management of distance education. American Journal of Distance Education, 3(3), 7-21.

Yong, Yanyan & Wang, Shiping. (1996). Faculty perceptions in a new approach to distance learningB Teletechnet. Journal of Instructional Delivery Systems, 10(2), 3-5.

Zeller, Nancy. (1995). Distance education and public policy. The Review of Higher Education, 18 (2), 123-148.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A-- SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Survey of Traditional and Distance Learning Faculty Members at Private Institutions in the Southeast: Implications for Policy Development

Please indicate your responses to the following questions-- only one response per question, please. Thank you.

Q1. Are distance learning courses being **taught** at your institution?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not Sure

Q2. Are distance learning courses being **considered** at your institution?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not Sure

Q3. In general, what are your feelings toward distance learning courses?
1. Very Positive
2. Somewhat positive
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat negative
5. Very negative
6. Not sure

Q4. Listed below are some **possible outcomes** of distance learning. In your opinion, **how likely** is each possible outcome as a result of distance learning – extremely likely, very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not at all likely to happen?

Outcomes	Extremely Likely	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Too Likely	Not at all Likely	Don't Know
a. Distance learning courses will reach many students who could not take traditional college courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Distance learning will encourage teachers who design such courses to be entrepreneurs and market their courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Distance learning will allow students to learn from the best teachers in the country.	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Through distance learning tools such as chat rooms, more students will participate actively in class.	1	2	3	4	5	6

e. Smaller institutions will be able to offer a richer curriculum. 1 2 3 4 5 6

(over, please)

Q5.In your opinion, **how important** is each of these **possible outcomes** of distance learning--extremely important, very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important to you?

Outcomes	Extremely Important	Very Impt.	Somewhat Important	Not Too Impt.	Not at all Important	Don't Know
a. Distance learning courses will reach many students who could not take traditional college courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Distance learning will encourage teachers who design such courses to be entrepreneurs and market their courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Distance learning will allow students to learn from the best teachers in the country.	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Through distance learning tools such as chat rooms, students will participate actively in class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. Small institutions will be able to offer a richer curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5	6

(over, please)

Q6. Listed below are **concerns** some people have about distance learning. In your opinion, **how likely** is each possible concern-- extremely likely, very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not at all likely to happen?

Concern	Extremely Likely	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Too Likely	Not at all likely	Don't Know
f. The quality of education for students will decline.	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Distance learning will decrease the need for trained faculty and result in fewer faculty jobs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Professors will have less control over the content, perspective, and approaches in teaching their courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6

i. Distance learning faculty will lose control over their intellectual property.	1	2	3	4	5	6
j. Faculty will be less candid in the classroom, because comments in a classroom can be taken out of context when recorded and used in other settings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
k. Each teacher will be responsible for more students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
l. More students will cheat and get credit for work they did not do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
m. The quality of faculty will decline as their roles change from creating content to managing information and students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
n. Distance learning will result in more work for the same amount of pay.	1	2	3	4	5	6
o. Faculty will not be fairly compensated for their intellectual property.	1	2	3	4	5	6

(over, please)

Q7.**How important** is each of these **concerns** about distance learning-- extremely important, very important, somewhat important, not too important, not at all important?

Concern	Extremely Important	Very Impt.	Somewhat Important	Not too Important	Not at all imp	Don't Know
f. The quality of education for students will decline.	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Distance learning will decrease the need for trained faculty and result in fewer faculty jobs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Professors will have less control over the content, perspective, and approaches to teaching their courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6

i. Distance learning faculty will lose control over their intellectual property.	1	2	3	4	5	6
j. Faculty will be less candid in the classroom, because comments in a classroom can be taken out of context when recorded and used in other settings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
k. Student to teacher ratios will increase.	1	2	3	4	5	6
l. More students will cheat and get credit for work they did not do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
m. The quality of faculty will decline as their roles change from creating content to managing information and students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
n. Distance learning will result in more work for the same amount of pay.	1	2	3	4	5	6
o. Faculty will not be fairly compensated for their intellectual property.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Q8.Who is the most forceful proponent of distance learning at your institution?

1. Individual faculty
2. Your administration
3. Your governing board
4. Outside companies

Q9. Has your institution developed a set of policies for distance learning courses?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Q10. Who makes policy related to distance learning courses at your institution?

1. Administration
2. Faculty senate and administration together
3. Individual faculty member and administration together
4. Not sure

Q11. Are distance learning courses approved through the same curriculum review process as other courses at your institution?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not Sure

Q12. Have you taught a distance learning course in the last 3 years, including this year, where more than half of the instruction takes place when you and your students are at different locations and is delivered through audio, video or computer technologies?

1. Yes
2. No (Skip to Question 46)
3. Not Sure

Q13. If yes, how many <u>different</u> courses - that is courses with different titles - have you taught in the last 3 years, including this year, where more than half of the instruction takes place when you and your students are at different locations?

1. One course
2. Two courses
3. Three courses
4. Four courses
5. Five courses
6. More than 5 courses
7. No distance learning courses
8. Don't know

Q14. In a typical year, what proportion of your assigned courses are distance learning courses?

1. Less than 25%
2. 25% to less than 50%
3. 50% to less than 75%
4. 75% to less than 100%
5. 100% of courses
6. Not sure

Q15. Did you participate in a workshop or training session on how to teach distance learning courses?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure (over, please)

Q16. Are there workshops and training sessions on teaching distance learning courses that are available to you on a regular basis?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Q17. How are you currently being paid for teaching your distance learning courses?

1. Payment with royalties
2. Fixed dollar amount
3. Part of normal assignment
4. Not sure

Q18. In general how would you prefer to be compensated for the materials you prepare for distance learning courses?

1. Payment with royalties
2. Fixed dollar amount
3. Part of your normal assignment
4. Not sure

The rest of the questions will be about the distance learning course that you have taught most often. (If no course is taught more than others, use the course taught most recently).

Q19. In your opinion, rank this particular distance learning course on how well it meets these educational goals compared with a traditional course on the subject.

Goals	Much Better	Somewhat Better	Same	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse	Don't Know
a. Developing student interactivity	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Giving students access to information	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Assessing the educational effectiveness of the course	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Providing students with high quality course materials	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. Improving verbal skills	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. Addressing the variety of student learning styles	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Helping students master the subject matter	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Helping students deliver better oral presentations	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. Improving quantitative skills	1	2	3	4	5	6

(over, please)

Q20. Does this particular course fulfill a requirement to complete the major or to graduate, or is it an elective?

1. Fulfill requirement
2. Elective
3. Don't Know

Q21. At what level is this course offered?

1. Graduate
2. Undergraduate
3. Not sure

Q22. What percentage of this course would you estimate consisted of full-time students?
1. Less than 25%
2. 25% to less than 50%
3. 50% to less than 75%
4. 75% to less than 100%
5. 100%
6. Not sure

Q23. In some instances the teacher of the distance learning course designs the content of the course and has assistants or other teachers manage the information with the students. For your course, would you say you were more the designer of the content or the manager of the information?
1. Designer of content
2. Manager of information (Skip to Question 27)
3. Both
4. Neither(Skip to Question 27)
5. Not sure

Q24. Did you develop original course content or did you mostly use pre-packaged materials?
1. Developed content
2. Used pre-packaged materials
3. Not sure
4. Both

Q25. If you developed the course content, do you own the property rights to the materials you developed for the course?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Q26. Did you have professional assistance in choosing materials or developing the course material?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Q27. How many times have you taught this particular course?
1. Once
2. Twice
3. Three times
4. Four times
5. Five times
6. Six times
7. Seven times
8. Eight or more times
9. Don't Know(over, please)

Q28. Did you teach this course as a traditional course before it was a distance learning course?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't Know

Q29. Is the distance learning component of your course an **addition** to a traditional version or does it **replace** all or part of the traditional course?
1. Addition
2. Replace all or part
3. Not sure

Q30. Were most of the distance students enrolled in another campus of your institution or enrolled at a different institution?
1. Another campus
2. Different institution
3. Not sure

Q31. Which one of the following technologies did you use in this course?
1. Two-way interactive video
2. One way live video
3. One way pre-recorded video
4. Chat rooms
5. Threaded discussion groups
6. Other_____

Q32. Was your course an online web-based course?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Q33.How frequently do you have the following types of personal interaction with your distance learning students about this course? Only indicate interactions that are over and above the normal instruction time

.

Interaction	More than 1/wk	1x/wk	2x/mo	1-2x/term	Never	Don't Know
a. Face to face meeting with distance students in the same room	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. E-mail	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Chat rooms	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Telephone	1	2	3	4	5	6

Q34. In your opinion, is the time required for preparing and delivering this distance learning course is less, more, or about the same as for your traditional courses?
1. More time (see question 35)
2. Less time (see question 36)
3. About the same (see question 37)

Q35. **If more time -**Roughly how much more time did you spend preparing and delivering your distance learning course?
1. 1-2 hours more per week
2. 3-5 hours more per week
3. 6-10 hours more per week
4. over 10 hours more per week(over, please)

Q36. **If less time -** Roughly, how much less time did you spend preparing and delivering your distance learning course?
1. 1-2 hours less per week
2. 3-5 hours less per week
3. 6-10 hours less per week
4. over 10 hours less per week

Q37. Did you get a reduction in the number of courses you were required to teach or in any other work requirements in exchange for teaching or preparing your distance learning course?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Q38. About how many students were enrolled for credit in your course at the beginning of the term?
1. 1 - 20 Students
2. 21 - 40 Students
3. Over 41 Students
4. Not Sure

Q39. About how many non-credit students were enrolled in your course at the beginning of the term?
1. 1-20 students
2. 21-40 students
3. Over 41 Students
4. Not sure

Q40. What percentage of your students finished the course, including both credit and non-credit students?
1. Less than 25%
2. 25% to less than 50%
3. 50% to less than 70%
4. 70% to less than 80%
5. 80% to less than 90%
6. 90% or more
7. Not sure

Q41. Was there a limit to the number of students who could enroll in your course?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Q42. How would you describe the technical support available to you and your students during the course?
1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Not so good
4. Poor
5. No technical support needed
6. Not sure

Q43. How would you describe the library and laboratory facilities available to you and your students during this course?

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Not so good
4. Poor
5. None required
6. Not sure(over, please)

Q44. Was your teaching in this course evaluated by any of the following groups?

	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Students	A	B	C
2. Peers	A	B	C
3. Administration	A	B	C
4. Other _____	A	B	C

Q45. Did you volunteer to teach this course or was it assigned to you?

1. Volunteered
2. Assigned
3. Both
4. Not Sure

Q46. What is your age?

1. 25-35
2. 36-45
3. 46-55
4. 56-65
5. 66 or older

Q47. What is your gender?

1. Male
2. Female

Q48. All total, how many years have you worked in a full-time or part-time capacity in post-secondary institutions?_____

Q49. About how many years have you worked in a full-time or part-time capacity at your current institution?_____

Q50. If less than 10 years of teaching at your current institution: When you were interviewing for your job at your current institution, were you asked about your ability or willingness to teach a distance learning course?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Q51. Is your institution part of a statewide system with multiple campuses, a district system with 3 or more campuses, or is it primarily one main campus?

1. Statewide system w/multiple campuses
2. District system with 3+ campuses
3. Primarily one main campus
4. Not sure

Q52. State where you are employed.

1. Alabama
2. Florida
3. Georgia
4. Kentucky
5. Louisiana
6. Mississippi
7. North Carolina
8. South Carolina
9. Tennessee
10. Texas
11. Virginia

Q53. Type of Institution

1. Four-year college
2. University with Graduate Program
3. Not Sure

Q54. For the current academic year, are you a full-time or part-time employee? If you are part-time, are you less than half-time?

1. Full-time
2. Part-time, half-time or more
3. Less than half-time
4. Not sure

Q55. Are you tenured, or on a tenure track but not yet tenured?

1. Tenured
2. Tenure track/not yet tenured
3. Not sure

Q56. What is your academic rank?

1. Assistant professor
2. Associate professor
3. Full professor
4. Not sure

Q57. About how many students are enrolled at your institution, including both full-time and part-time students?

1. Under 1000
2. 1000 to under 2500
3. 2500 to under 5000
4. 5000 to under 10,000
5. 10,000 to under 20,000
6. 20,000 or over

Q58. What is your highest level of education?

1. Masters degree or more but not a doctorate or professional degree
2. 2-year post-graduate professional degree (e.g. MBA, nursing)
3. Doctoral of philosophy or education
4. Graduate of other professional schools (e.g. MD, JD)
5. Other_____

Q59.Please recommend another faculty member in your institution who should also respond to this survey.

Q60.Please feel free to submit additional comments about your experiences with distance learning at your institution.

Thank you for participating in this survey. If you would like a copy of the executive summary of the study, please return a business card with this survey.

APPENDIX B-- FIRST SURVEY COVER LETTER

October 15, 2001

Dear Faculty Member:

Are you currently teaching a distance learning course? Or do colleagues in your department offer distance learning courses? Are you planning to offer a distance learning course in the future? No matter what the answer to these questions, I am interesting in knowing:

- your opinions about the advantages and disadvantages of distance learning;
- your concerns about distance learning; and
- what support for teaching distance learning courses is available at your institution.

In order to answer these questions efficiently and effectively, please:

- Complete the attached survey.
- Return it in the enclosed envelope to my attention.

If you would like a copy of the executive summary of the study, return a business card with this survey; or if you prefer, send it separately to the same return address. Returning a business card is completely optional; cards will be stored separately from the returned surveys.

Your responses are confidential. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire or on any report of the research results. The data will be aggregated, and summarized with the responses of other faculty who will participate in the study. Your name was selected scientifically to achieve a balance of faculty representation. Your prompt reply is appreciated

This is a doctoral research study under the direction of Sylvia M. Hutchinson, Ph.D., Professor in the Institute of Higher Education; her phone number is (706) 542-0620 and her e-mail is smchutch@arches.uga.edu. The results of this research, conducted at the University of Georgia will be used for my doctoral dissertation in summary form, and will be shared with the Commission on Colleges at the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) to enhance their baseline data of distance learning in private institutions in the region.

If you have questions about the survey, please contact me at 678.547.6187 or via e-mail at horner_e@mercer.edu. Many thanks in advance for your opinions and input.

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write: Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-6514; e-mail address IRB@uga.edu.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Simonetti Horner
Doctoral Candidate
University of Georgia Institute of Higher Education

APPENDIX C-- REMINDER POSTCARD

Reminder Postcard
Sent to all participants on 10.31.2001

Two weeks ago a survey on distance learning was mailed to you. Your name was selected scientifically to achieve a balance of faculty representation. If you have not completed and returned the survey, please do so today. It is extremely important that your opinions are included in the study if the results are to represent the opinions of faculty at private institutions regarding distance learning.

If you did not receive the survey, or if it's misplaced, please call me at 678.547.6187 or e-mail horner_e@mercer.edu and I will mail you another. Many thanks for your input.

APPENDIX D-- SECOND SURVEY COVER LETTER

November 16, 2001

Dear Faculty Member:

Are you currently teaching a distance learning course? Or do colleagues in your department offer distance learning courses? Are you planning to offer a distance learning course in the future? No matter what the answer to these questions, I am interesting in knowing:

- your opinions about the advantages and disadvantages of distance learning;
- your concerns about distance learning; and
- what support for teaching distance learning courses is available at your institution.

In order to answer these questions efficiently and effectively, please:

- Complete the attached survey.
- Return it in the enclosed envelope to my attention.

If you would like a copy of the executive summary of the study, return a business card with this survey; or if you prefer, send it separately to the same return address. Returning a business card is completely optional; cards will be stored separately from the returned surveys.

Your responses are confidential. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire or on any report of the research results. The data will be aggregated, and summarized with the responses of other faculty who will participate in the study. Your name was selected scientifically to achieve a balance of faculty representation. Your prompt reply is appreciated

This is a doctoral research study under the direction of Sylvia M. Hutchinson, Ph.D., Professor in the Institute of Higher Education; her phone number is (706) 542-0620 and her e-mail is smchutch@arches.uga.edu. The results of this research, conducted at the University of Georgia will be used for my doctoral dissertation in summary form, and will be shared with the Commission on Colleges at the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) to enhance their baseline data of distance learning in private institutions in the region.

If you have questions about the survey, please contact me at 678.547.6187 or via e-mail at horner_e@mercer.edu. Many thanks in advance for your opinions and input.

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write: Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-6514; e-mail address IRB@uga.edu.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Simonetti Horner
Doctoral Candidate
University of Georgia Institute of Higher Education

APPENDIX E-- IRB APPROVAL FORMS

The University of Georgia

Office of The Vice President for Research
DHHS Assurance ID No. : M1047

Institutional Review Board
Human Subjects Office
606A Graduate Studies Research Center
Athens, Georgia 30602-7411
(706) 542-6514; 542-3199
Fax No. (706) 542-5638

APPROVAL OF RENEWALS / CHANGES

Request Date: 2001-10-30 **Project Number:** H2002-10040-1

Name	Title	SS Number	Dept/Phone	Address	Email
Ms. Elizabeth Simonetti Horner	MI	043627364	Institute of Higher Educaiton Meigs Hall 678-547-6187	222 Waterford Cove Drive Suwanee GA 30024 770-513-4878	horner_e@mercer.edu
Dr. Sylvia M. Hutchinson	CO	252564442	Institute of Higher Education 106 Meigs Hall +1772 542-0620		

Title of Study: Survey of Traditional and Distance Learning Faculty at Private Institutions in the Southeast: Implications for Policy Development

45 CFD Category: Continuing Review **Renew :** Yes **Change(s) :**

RENEWAL OF APPROVAL PERIOD WITH NO CHANGES:

Approved : 2001-10-30 Begin date : 2001-12-01 Expiration date : 2001-12-31

NOTE: Any research conducted before the approval date or after the end data collection date shown above is not covered by IRB approval, and cannot be retroactively approved.

Number Assigned by Sponsored Programs: **Funding Agency:**

Form 310 Provided: No

Your request for approval of renewal and/or changes has been approved as indicated under IRB action above. If you will need to extend your approval period again or to make additional changes to your study please follow the same procedures as before.

You must report any adverse events or unanticipated risk to the IRB within 24 to 72 hours. Refer to the IRB Guidelines for addtional information.

For your convenience in obtaining approval of changes, extending the approval period, or closing your file we are providing you with blue Researcher Request form. Detach this blue form, complete the form as appropriate, sign and date it, then return it to the IRB office. Keep this original approval form for your records.

Copy:
Dr. Cameron Fincher

Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Institutional Review Board

The University of Georgia

Office of The Vice President for Research
DHHS Assurance ID No. : M1047

Institutional Review Board
Human Subjects Office
606A Graduate Studies Research Center
Athens, Georgia 30602-7411
(706) 542-6514; 542-3199
Fax No. (706) 542-5638

RESEARCHER REQUEST FORM

Request Date: 2001-10-30 **Project Number:** H2002-10040-1

Name	Title	SS Number	Dept/Phone	Address	Email
Ms. Elizabeth Simonetti Horner	MI	043627364	Institute of Higher Educaiton Meigs Hall 678-547-6187	222 Waterford Cove Drive Suwanee GA 30024 770-513-4878	horner_e@mercer.edu
Dr. Sylvia M. Hutchinson	CO	252564442	Institute of Higher Education 106 Meigs Hall +1772 542-0620		

Title of Study: Survey of Traditional and Distance Learning Faculty at Private Institutions in the Southeast: Implications for Policy Development

45 CFD Category: Continuing Review **Renew :** Yes **Change(s) :**

Approved : 2001-10-30 **Begin date : 2001-12-01** **Expiration date : 2001-12-31**

NOTE: Any research conducted before the approval date or after the end data collection date shown above is not covered by IRB approval, and cannot be retroactively approved.

Number Assigned by Sponsored Programs: **Funding Agency:**

Form 310 Provided: No

Attention, Principal Investigator!
The major investigator must complete and return this form
on or before the approval end date shown above.

1. See Reverse	For approval of changes you must complete and sign the back of this form. (Also attach a copy of any revised instruments or consent forms, with changes highlighted, where applicable.)
2. See Reverse	For an extension of the approval period you must complete and sign the back of this form.
3. See Reverse	Data collection has been completed as approved by the IRB, and this file can now be closed. Federal laws & UGA policies require notification of completion of data collection.

CONTINUING REVIEW OF APPROVED RESEARCH PROJECT

Federal Policy requires that IRBs continue to review approved projects at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk but not less than once a year. Please complete the following questionnaire and return it as soon as possible. The IRB must have this form signed and completed to approve changes or the continuation of this study.

1. Is this research still being conducted?
   YES — If yes, please answer the following questions.

   NO — If No, please sign below.

2. Have there been any changes in your subject population (numbers, age, gender, race, etc.)?
   YES — If yes, provide complete information on changes.

   NO

3. How many subjects have been accrued? _____.

4. Have any participants dropped out of the study?
   YES — If yes, what reasons were given?

   NO

5. Have there been any adverse events or unanticipated risks to the subjects or others?
   YES — If yes, explain in detail.

   NO

6. Have there been any complaints about the research?
   YES — If yes, provide complete information on complaints made.

   NO

7. Have the procedures, materials or consent document(s) changed in any way from the protocol that was last approved by the IRB?
   YES — If yes, provide complete information on changes in the form of an addendum and provide a copy of the revised document(s).

   NO

8. Is contact information on the front of this sheet correct?
   YES — If no, provide current information by correcting the front of this form.

   NO

9. I wish to extend my approval period through _____.

10. Consent form attached? It is federally required to submit current consent forms for continuing review even if there have been no changes.
    YES

    NO — If no, please explain.

Researcher's Signature _____ Date _____

INCOMPLETE SUBMISSIONS MAY BE INACTIVATED BY THE IRB

APPENDIX F-- SACS COVER LETTER

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS
COMMISSION ON COLLEGES
1866 Southern Lane • Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097
Telephone 404/679-4500 Fax 404/679-4558

October 9, 2001

Dear Faculty Member:

Within the next week, you will receive a **comprehensive survey on distance learning** from Elizabeth Simonetti Horner, Doctoral Candidate at the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia. Elizabeth has worked in distance learning for several years, and has even completed an internship with the Commission on Colleges at SACS. The survey will solicit your opinions, perceptions, and support for teaching distance learning courses at their institutions. Questions about demographic data round out the survey.

I strongly encourage you to **complete the survey** and return it to her at your earliest convenience. Your participation in the study will enhance SACS baseline data of distance learning in private institutions in the region and give a clear picture of faculty's views of distance learning in private institutions in the Southeast. We look forward to sharing the results with you in the near future.

Your responses will represent a small group of faculty that can have a large impact on distance learning in the Southeast. I appreciate your participation in this study.

Sincerely,

James T. Rogers
Executive Director
Commission on Colleges

JTR/ESH:rb