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Abstract

Over the past decade higher education has undergone a pivotal transformation as enrollment in online class offerings has increased at a pace that has exceeded growth in traditional face-to-face offerings. The number of institutions offering online classes and degrees grows annually and will require more faculty to teach in this modality. Institutions that offer extensive online learning, struggle to provide faculty with the support and training necessary for them to be successful online instructors. This study examined an institution of higher education’s plan and progress in supporting faculty who teach online. A qualitative embedded case study design was used to investigate four units (central eLearning offices and three colleges) professional development offerings within a single university. This research design permitted a holistic look inside the institution’s infrastructure, processes, and professional development offerings in an effort to confirm alignment. Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design framed the study and an investigation of the five key tenets - strategy, structure, processes, rewards, and people practices were explored. A total of eleven academic leaders participated in semi-structured interviews offering insight to the operational practices regarding faculty professional development within their respective units. The participants revealed that the institution was going through a transition in leadership, both at the central and college levels, and that faculty representation in online governance needed to expand. Evidence of orientation and ongoing professional development for faculty transitioning to online instruction was prevalent in all units. However, the design, development, and delivery of professional development were not strategically collaborative or universally implemented. In essence, the units operated in silos. Participants also expressed the need to offer a scaffolded approach to faculty development through the offering of beginner, intermediate, and expert levels of training. A scaffolded
approach to professional development could lead to greater participation as faculty could attend training commiserate with their pedagogical and technological competence. Ultimately, faculty could benefit from a blueprint and toolbox of resources that would position them for success as online instructors. While a collective view of the institution’s strategic plan was evident, an aligned approach to faculty development could not be confirmed. These findings have implications for the faculty, students, and academic leaders of the institution examined. Additionally, this study’s findings have broader implications for faculty development, online education, and the research community at large. Ultimately, these findings may contribute to an intra-institutionally aligned approach to faculty development within institutions of higher education.
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Chapter One: Introduction to the Study

“Colleges and universities committed to high productivity and quality will be well advised to situate faculty development at the center of their institutional planning.”

- Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006, p.27)

Over the past decade higher education has undergone a pivotal transformation as enrollment in online class offerings has increased at a pace that has exceeded growth in traditional face-to-face offerings (Allen & Seaman, 2014, 2016; Romano, 2006). The shift in use of technology is evident in the expansion of online offerings and enrollment through this mode of delivery and is grounded in the annual growth rate of online enrollment (16.1%) above the overall higher education enrollment (2.5%) between 2002 and 2012. In their survey of 2,800 higher education academic leaders, Allen and Seaman (2016) shared that 33.5%, or more than 5.8 million college students, took at least one class online. Enrollment in online courses has tripled in the past thirteen years. Further, 90% of the academic leaders forecasted that it is “likely” or “very likely” that a majority of all higher education students will be taking at least one online course in five years’ time (Allen & Seaman, 2014).

Today, 2,100 institutions from 52 countries around the world offer more than 100,000 degrees or programs completely online (Allen & Seaman, 2016), or through a hybrid or blended approach (Ekstrand, 2014). The global offering of online programs and courses transcend space and time barriers making education accessible at any time of day (The Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2000). Bonk’s (2009) book, “The World is Open” asserted that like many 24 hour businesses, educational opportunities are available and ready to serve consumers any time, any place. The increase in online offerings can be attributed to the evolution of the Internet, coupled with student demand for more media and technologically rich learning activities (Garrison & Vaughn, 2008). Technology enhanced education has evolved into an
internationally accepted, high-quality course and program delivery option utilized by institutions of higher education (IHE) seeking to educate the masses in a competitive global economy (Roman, Kelsey, & Lin, 2010; Shea, Pickett, & Li, 2005; Taylor, & McQuiggan, 2008).

Many of today’s online learners are non-traditional contemporary students who “work full time, live away from campus, have families and belong to social groups not associated with their college” (Stavredes & Herder, 2013, p. 155). They are balancing academic and personal priorities and responsibilities, and want to attend college virtually or through the use of technology-rich platforms (Beetham & Sharpe, 2013). Needing to complete schoolwork at a time convenient for them, devoid of the restriction of “in-seat” instruction (Parker & Wassef, 2010), today’s students are instrumental in the dramatic shift toward the expansive delivery of technology hosted classrooms. The offering of technology-rich classrooms was in response to student desire for flexibility in tandem with the cultural shift toward media and technologically rich learning (MacFadden, Moore, Herie, & Schoech, 2005; The Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2000).

Academic leaders have responded to student interest in online offerings and have acknowledged that “the traditional model of college is changing, as demonstrated by the proliferation of colleges, hybrid class schedules with night and weekend meetings, and, most significantly, online learning” (Van Der Werf & Sabatier, 2009, p.3). The demand for increased levels of online offerings may require more instructors to teach in this modality (Allen & Seaman, 2010; Kolowich, 2009; Moore, 2013; Simpson, 2012). This trend in online educational options is expected to continue in an effort to meet student demand and interest (Allen & Seaman, 2016).
Problem Statement

As a growing number of higher education institutions offer online classes and degrees, (Allen & Seaman, 2010, 2016; Moore, 2013; Simpson, 2012) faculty are often confronted with teaching assignments that require a shift from teaching traditional, face-to-face classes to blended or fully online courses (Allen & Seaman, 2010, 2016; Moore, 2013; Simpson, 2012). While faculty of IHEs excel at delivering content in traditional face-to-face classes, often in lecture format, they struggle with the transition from traditional teaching methods to teaching in a web-based format (Lorenzetti, 2014; Palloff & Pratt, 2011). Research suggests that institutions are doing little to prepare faculty for the transition to teaching online (Allen & Seaman, 2009; Palloff & Pratt, 2011). The lack of institutional support for faculty transitioning to online instruction is often wrongly attributed to the idea that teaching online simply requires the digitization of content, predominantly lectures, for display on the internet with little additional training, support, or assistance for the faculty (Lindquist, 2004; Lorenzetti, 2014; Palloff & Pratt, 2011). The claim that faculty transition from face-to-face instructor to online instructor consists of digitizing in class lectures is not substantiated. The literature has demonstrated that faculty need training and assistance to successfully transition to online teaching (Abel, 2005; Ko & Rossen, 2010; Palloff & Pratt, 2011; Riedinger & Rosenberg, 2006).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative research case study was to examine an institution of higher education’s (IHE) plan and progress in supporting faculty with online teaching requirements. An investigation of one IHE’s faculty/professional development offerings was explored to identify faculty training and support. In particular, I examined three colleges. My objective was to investigate the physical, technological, pedagogical and administrative
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resources necessary for creating and sustaining eLearning, or electronic learning, operations. In essence, I wanted to study this phenomenon because I believed it is essential for institutions of higher education to create systems, infrastructure, and professional development training opportunities in support of faculty as they transition from face-to-face instructors to eLearning instructors. At the time this study was conducted, there was no literature available that examined institutional infrastructure, alignment to central mission, and coherence amongst academic units to offer online faculty development at Institutions of Higher Education.

**Research Questions**

The primary research question guiding this study was: *What professional development opportunities do three colleges afford faculty who teach online?* This overarching question was addressed via four additional research questions:

1) In what ways is one institution’s eLearning vision and mission actualized across multiple colleges?

2) In what ways do eLearning professional development offerings align with the institution’s eLearning vision and mission?

3) Do academic leaders know what professional development needs best serve faculty consumers?

4) What factors contribute to the selection of eLearning resources utilized in the eLearning enterprise at this institution?

There is a need to provide faculty/professional development orientation and ongoing training so faculty can obtain the necessary skills and competencies essential to be successful online instructors (Arabasz, Pirani, & Fawcett, 2003; Bailie, 2011; Darabi, Sikorski, & Harvey, 2006; Okojie, Olinzock, & Okojie-Boulder, 2006; Johnson, Adams-Becker, Estrada, & Freeman,
Further, there is a need to document the value and effectiveness of orientation programs (Janz, 2014) in developing faculty, and the impact on classroom design and interaction (Stoltz-Loike, 2013).

Definition of Key Terms

In order to establish an understanding of the concepts to be studied, it is necessary to establish common baseline definitions of the topics under review. Definitions for the following key terms follow: academic leadership, asynchronous and synchronous, blended/hybrid learning, distance learning, eLearning, faculty/professional development, institutional alignment, online learning, online pedagogy, and organization design.

**Academic leadership.** The academic leadership of an institution is comprised of individuals who ascend to administrative appointments because they have authority based on perceived expertise (administration, teaching, research, program development) and experiences, possess specific discipline knowledge, have achieved peer and professional recognition, and have certain personal qualities (Yielder & Codling, 2004). The academic leaders who were invited to participate in this study were Deans, Associate Deans, Vice-President/Directors/Coordinators of eLearning/online and Distance Learning, Chief Information Officer, and Senior Instructional Designers.

**Asynchronous and synchronous.** Asynchronous refers to learning activities and engagement that does not occur at exactly the same time (Boettcher & Conrad, 2010; Broadbent, 2002; Ko & Rossen, 2010; Stavredes, 2011). Students engage with the content at their convenience (Quinn, 2012). Students do not participate in these activities simultaneously with their peers; rather they engage with the course independently. Examples of asynchronous
eLearning activities include: posting to discussion boards, viewing recorded lectures, and sending emails. Conversely, synchronous activities refer to learning activities and engagement that occur at exactly the same time, or in real-time (Boettcher & Conrad, 2010; Broadbent, 2002; Ko & Rossen, 2010; Stavredes, 2011). Examples of synchronous eLearning activities include: participation in chat sessions and video conferencing with instructor or peers.

**Blended or hybrid learning.** Blended or hybrid learning courses are those that host 30 to 79 percent of the instruction online (Allen & Seaman, 2010) and require a “thoughtful blending of complementary face-to-face and online approaches to meet specific educational goals” (Garrison & Vaughn, 2008, p. x). These courses offer a “blend” of online technologies and face-to-face interaction (East, LaMendola & Alter 2014).

**Distance Learning (DL).** Distance learning, as defined by the Common Data Set (CDS), is an option for earning course credits or degrees at off-campus locations via cable television, internet, satellite classes, videotapes, correspondence courses, or other means. This definition was developed by data providers in the higher education community in collaboration with the College Board, Peterson's, and U.S. News & World Report. Programs, at the institution under review, that operate with this instructional modality are coded as “DL” to differentiate distance programs from traditional campus-based programs. Courses within the programs are coded “WB” to indicate that courses are hosted via web-based technology. Formalized distance learning at the institution dates back to 1984 when the College of Applied Science pioneered the Open Learning Fire Science program, in conjunction with the National Fire Academy, to help firefighters advance their careers. Distance learning programs have evolved into blended/hybrid or online learning programs (see blended/hybrid and online learning definitions).
eLearning (electronic learning). eLearning is “training, education, coaching, and information that is delivered digitally” (Broadbent, 2002, p.213). Further, eLearning is “electronically mediated asynchronous and synchronous communication for the purpose of constructing and confirming knowledge” (Garrison, 2011, p. 2). This technologically driven mode of education is grounded in the use of the internet and other technological applications and tools. ELearning resources refer to the technological, pedagogical, and personnel assets available to faculty, such as software, training, and instructional design support. ELearning resources are a part of the larger eLearning enterprise. The eLearning enterprise refers to the overarching institutional systems and structures that guide eLearning operation and best practice. This enterprise is governed by committees that review and recommend strategies, standards, technologies, and policies in support of eLearning initiatives within the university. The two primary applications of eLearning are online and blended/hybrid learning.

Faculty/professional development. This research study was grounded in the need to provide orientation and ongoing faculty/professional development opportunities to faculty as they transitioned to, and continued as, online instructors. Guskey (2000) defined professional development as “the processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators so that they might, in turn, improve the learning of students” (p. 16). Professional development should be offered in a phased approach in which faculty get involved in repetitive exposure to educational principles, take part in a number of training events, and participate in real-life application of content. Feedback from the training is incorporated into future activities. Upon completion of each faculty development training, faculty select topics of interest for ongoing faculty/professional development (Benor, 1998).
**Institutional alignment.** Institutional alignment refers to the coherence of individual college units’ mission, vision, and educational operations as they function in association with the institution’s academic plan, strategic plan and operations. According to East, LaMendola, and Alter (2014), alignment “relates to philosophy, policy, organizations, pedagogy and learning outcomes and how these fit together” (p. 22). When institutional alignment, or equilibrium, is present the independent units function in ways consistent with the central institutional strategic plan and overall vision and mission of the institution. The integration of a common set of core priorities and initiatives contributes to a unified central approach and fosters connections and collaboration amongst the college units. Further, “institutional alignment facilitates innovation, enables the flow of resources, creates an environment of learning, and makes change processes easier to administrate. Proper aligning of operations is critical for mission success” (Najoli, 2013). In this study, *intra-institutional alignment*, alignment within in one university, via review of central and unit online operations and faculty development will be examined.

**Online learning.** According to Allen and Seaman (2016) online learning is defined as instruction where at least 80 percent of the course content is delivered through online technology. Online courses are taught either partially or completely online (Ko & Rossen, 2010). These courses vary from traditional face-to-face courses, which usually do not use any online technology and take place in the traditional college classroom. In contrast, online learning courses are somewhat limited in the face-to-face interaction between students and the professor and are separated by physical space.

**Online pedagogy.** According to Pelz (2004) online pedagogy can be explained through the teaching and learning principles utilized to engage students who are experiencing the content from a distance. Examples of online pedagogical practice include student led discussions,
student searches for web resources to enhance the content, peer assistance, case study analysis, and collaborative research projects and portfolios. Effective online pedagogy is demonstrated in classrooms where students do (most of) the work; interactivity is the heart and soul of effective asynchronous learning, and where faculty strive for social, cognitive and teaching presence.

**Organization design.** According to Galbraith, Downey and Kates (2002) organization design is the “means for creating a community of collective effort that yields more than the sum of each individual’s efforts and results” (p. ix). Galbraith et al. (2002) explained that organization design is “the deliberate process of configuring structures, processes, reward systems, and people practices to create an effective organization capable of achieving the business strategy” (p. 2). An examination of the university and colleges’ eLearning enterprise and infrastructure will be examined for coherence with this model of organization design.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

This study was guided by the theoretical tenets of Vygotsky’s (1978) social constructivist approach and Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design. The integration of social constructivism and organization design contributed to the holistic approach and investigation of professional development afforded faculty who taught online. The incorporation of these two frameworks also provided the lens from which intra-institutional alignment was studied.

**Constructivism.** In order to begin a discussion regarding social constructivism, it is essential to first discuss constructivism; the foundation from which social constructivism evolved. Constructivism asserts that the meanings of experiences are constructed by those who participate in them, and are therefore subjective (Charmaz, 2006). Constructivism is universally linked to the work of Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget (1952) who studied learning theory as it related to the individual child. As the founder of constructivism, Piaget (1952) concluded that
each individual child constructs new knowledge through the processes of assimilation (incorporating new information, learning, and experiences into existing framework) and accommodation (reframing existing framework to incorporate new information, learning, and experiences). As children are exposed to new content they incorporate the new information into their existing cognitive structure, thereby expanding their existing framework of knowledge. At times, new information and learning contradict what the child already knows, thereby requiring the child to adapt their thinking about the topic or lesson. The two methods contribute to a child’s cognitive development and enhance opportunities for learning.

In line with Piaget’s (1952) concepts of assimilation and accommodation, this study sought to uncover and document each of the college’s strategic efforts and professional development in support of faculty as they assimilated to the online modality. Examples of how professional development provided faculty with new techniques and competencies were documented. Additionally, as faculty participated in professional development, focused around online education best practices, they made accommodations to their current practice. Through assimilation and accommodation, faculty generated knowledge and competencies that enhanced their existing instructional “toolbox.”

Piaget’s work also focused on the universal stages of cognitive development during the formative years of a child’s life. Specifically, Piaget (1952) developed four stages of cognitive development which occurred in progression as a child matured: 1) sensorimotor, birth – 2 years, understanding the idea that things existed even when they were not visible (object permanence); 2) preoperational, 2-7 years, ability to think symbolically; 3) concrete operational, 7-11 years, ability to work things out in their head in a logical manner; and 4) formal operational, 11 years-adulthood, ability to think abstractly and test what is known. Piaget noted that the age ranges
listed were not completely prescriptive but were indicative of the period of development the
majority of children encountered each stage (Piaget, 1952).

While Piaget’s (1952) work was not explicitly linked to educational practice, his work
has been expanded upon to establish linkages in teaching and learning. Piaget’s work also
served as the foundation for social constructivism, which integrated the importance of social
interaction into cognitive processes and educational practice. Piaget’s contributions paved the
way for Vygotsky (1978) to extrapolate upon constructivist principles in support of the social,
interactive nature of teaching and learning.

**Social Constructivism.** Within the social constructivist paradigm individuals bring to the
research their own set of unique experiences, understandings, and beliefs and “construct” new
meaning as a result of additional interactions and exploration with others (Creswell, 2007;
Vygotsky, 1978). The emphasis on the collaborative nature of learning contributes to the
optimal transference of knowledge when at least two people created it together. Research
endorsed Vygotsky as the pioneer of social constructivist theory (Creswell, 2007).

Lev Vygotsky, post-revolutionary Soviet psychologist, broadened Piaget’s constructivist
theory by shifting the focus from the individual to the group. Vygotsky developed a socio-
cultural approach to cognitive development. Vygotsky (1978) believed that learning, cognition,
and development needed to be examined beyond the individual’s assimilation and
accommodation of information to include the social context in which learning occurred.
Vygotsky argued that the social interactions between an individual child, their peers, and the
teacher are essential to a child’s cognitive development. In essence, Vygotsky asserted that
knowledge was not independently constructed, but rather constructed on a more social plane
between teacher and student. He also differed from Piaget (1952) in that he did not view development as occurring in a phased approach, rather as an ongoing continuous process.

Vygotsky (1978) referred to the area of learning with the greatest instructional impact as the **zone of proximal development (ZPD)**. ZPD referred to the zone where learning developed, or emerged, in the near (proximal) future. According to Vygotsky (1978), learners developed the most when they were in the “zone” and were assisted by a teacher, or more knowledgeable other (MKO), with a skill set more developed than their own (see Figure 1). Vygotsky (1978) referred to this optimal area of learning as the “zone” because he theorized that learning occurred on a continuum and not as single points of content absorption. While learners are in the zone, they construct knowledge and have opportunity to achieve greater understanding and maximize their potential. The ZPD was utilized in this study to examine the areas of opportunity for university stakeholders and academic leaders to contribute knowledge about how eLearning is operationalized throughout the institution. Application of the ZPD concept was in alignment

![Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)](https://www.simplypsychology.org/vygotsky.html)

**Figure 1.** Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Adapted from “Lev Vygotsky” by S. A. McLeod, 2014. Retrieved from [www.simplypsychology.org/vygotsky.html](http://www.simplypsychology.org/vygotsky.html).
with the goal to offer the most comprehensive competency-based training in support of faculty as they transitioned to eLearning instructors.

Vygotsky (1962) placed emphasis on the importance of language in cognitive development. According to Vygotsky (1962), language was the primary way that adults transmitted information to children. Language represented the avenue for teachers to share information, beyond a child’s individual thoughts to the context of the class, or community. Further, the social interactions that occurred within a classroom provided children with powerful tools of intellectual adaptation (Vygotsky, 1962). The tools helped children to adapt their beliefs and values to fit within the culture and social context of the classroom.

Contemporary views of social constructivism confirmed that this paradigm placed the researcher in a multifaceted, participatory role in which the researcher acknowledged that knowledge was generated, or constructed, by the contributions of the participants (Korol-Ljungberg, Yendol-Hoppey, Smith, & Hayes, 2009). Social constructivist principles are inherent in today’s educational practices and are consistent with the collaborative and cooperative approach substantiated by Vygotsky (1962, 1978).

The utilization of the social constructivist paradigm paired well with this study as it shed light on an institutional framework for the eLearning community at large. The research evolved through the social interactions and collaboration amongst those engaged in the study. This social constructivist (Vygotsky, 1978) worldview was particularly appropriate for the investigation of complex phenomena where participants with diverse expertise and experiences came together to create a new perspective on the phenomenon examined. It was through the uncovering of each college’s training and professional development resources and implementation strategies that a comprehensive professional development and offering of best
practices infrastructure was proposed. At the time of this study, each college’s eLearning program operated in a silo.

**Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model.** This research study was also informed by key principles of Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design. Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model provided a holistic framework of the five essential components of organization design: a) strategy, b) structure, c) processes, d) rewards, and e) people. This design has been applied in business corporate structures (Harrington & Voehl, 2011) and education. This framework was utilized in the analysis of the institution’s eLearning infrastructure in support of faculty who taught online. Figure 2 depicts the star created when all five components connect and align.

![Star framework of organization design](image)


**Strategy** referred to the overall direction of an organization, and was comprised of the organization’s vision, mission, and goals. Strategy served as the “cornerstone of the organization design process” (Galbraith, Downey, & Kates, 2002, p. 3). The strategy of an
organization provided a roadmap, or blueprint, for stakeholders of the organization to follow. Strategy provided a focus to the organizations’ mission and also identified variables and differentiators which gave the organization its competitive advantage. In terms of this study, the professional development strategy of one IHE was examined. As such, each subunit’s vision, mission, goals, and strategic plans were examined for coherence with the institution’s strategic plan. Evidence of such coherence contributed to the alignment of the institution’s blueprint and contributed to the competitive edge in the higher education online market.

*Structure* determined where the leadership power and administrative authority resided within an organization. It represented the hierarchy and relationships amongst stakeholders within the organization. The structure of an organization provided for role identification and responsibilities of departments, units, and individuals within the enterprise. In this study, the infrastructure of each of the subunits was explored. The hierarchical organization of the subunits was documented to demonstrate the depth of each subunit’s human resource capital. The technological and fiscal infrastructure of each of the subunits was also investigated for alignment within the IHE.

*Processes and lateral capability* represented the “interpersonal and technological networks, team and matrix relationships, lateral processes, and integrative roles that served as the ‘glue’ that bound the organization together” (Galbraith, et al., p.4). Processes cut across department boundaries and contributed to collaboration as the right people, regardless of where they fit into the structure, were brought together to “solve problems, create opportunities, and respond to challenges” (p.4). This research captured the online and eLearning systems and processes utilized throughout the IHE in support of faculty who taught online. An examination
of the collaborative effort and sharing of best practices and professional development tools was explored.

According to Galbraith (1995), *Reward systems* were set in place to capture metrics and outcomes deemed important to the organization. Employees who attained certain benchmarks were rewarded for effort and achievement. Rewards and recognition systems were used to demonstrate the outcomes valued by the organization. Evaluation techniques were deployed to assess if organizational goals were achieved. Examples of evaluation techniques included: scorecards, performance appraisals, and one-on-one constructive feedback. Sample evaluation strategies utilized in this study were: class enrollment, student evaluations, annual performance reviews (APR), and one-on-one constructive feedback. In some instances, faculty were also compensated for online course development and participation in specific professional development training initiatives.

The last component of Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design was people. *People practices* referred to the collective human resource practices that created an organization’s overall capability. Each of the roles within an organization required specific skills and competencies that contributed to the effectiveness of the structure and strategy. The organization’s ability to be nimble in the selection and development of the members of the organization was vital to the overall success of the organization. In this study, people practices were represented by the following: hiring and selection criteria, orientation, professional development offerings, and team approach to online instruction.

Organizations are most effective when all points of the star are in alignment (Galbraith, 1995). Misalignment occurs when one or more of the components are not contributing to the overall enterprise. Leaders within organizations need to be cognizant of the overall health of
the organization and be willing to make adjustments to regain alignment. As previously mentioned, the institution’s eLearning infrastructure and operations were examined for coherence with all components of the Star Model (Galbraith, 1995).

**Researcher Stance**

Conducting research at the doctoral level required a certain set of skills and preparation to navigate the journey. As such, my qualifications to conduct this study included the completion of: CITI certification, coursework in qualitative research methods, all doctoral level coursework, and pilot study (IRB Protocol: 2013-0409) regarding faculty perceptions of online orientation at the College of Nursing (CoN) at the institution studied. I have also benefited from the mentorship of numerous research faculty that have shared their wisdom regarding the pursuit of scholarly work. Learning from their research lens has provided invaluable expertise and insight.

Of additional significance is that I had more than a decade of research and personal experience and expertise in online learning: administration, operations, enrollment management, faculty engagement, and all facets of the student lifecycle (from potential student through to graduate). At the time of my study, I served as Director of Academic Affairs for the College of Nursing (CoN), and worked with the Senior Associate Dean of Academic Affairs in all matters related to the college’s 39 undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs and certificates. The CoN’s programs served a total of 2,747 (Spring 2016) students. This included 19 programs offered completely online or in a blended/hybrid format. In my leadership role, I was responsible for the college’s direction, oversight and overall operation of online programs and offerings in partnership with administration and faculty. The college’s student enrollment in online or blended programs represented 58% of the college’s total student population with 72% of graduate students enrolled in online or blended programs. Online enrollment stretched beyond
the online and blended programs to the college’s traditional in-seat campus programs where students had the option to enroll in courses in either the traditional, face-to-face classroom or in the online sections. Each term, traditional student enrollment in the online sections increased. The online modality has served the college and its students very well as graduates of the online master’s programs national certification exam rates exceeded national benchmarks. The college’s online graduate programs competed against 300+ other nursing colleges for the same students. The college’s online programs were recognized nationally and are ranked 8th in the nation (U.S. News & World Report, 2016).

As an invited member of the institution’s Online Learning Subcommittee and Online Learner Success project, my expertise in eLearning contributed to the institution’s overarching eLearning goals. University committee involvement provided an experiential lens to the study and was consistent with Maxwell’s (2012, 2013) approach to research. Maxwell acknowledged that researchers bring unique experiences and expertise to the study and should be able to incorporate these skills to the research. Experiential knowledge represented the “ideas and understandings that you have gained from your own experience with the types of people, settings, or problems you want to study” (Maxwell, 2012, p.87). Maxwell (2012) recognized the hesitation of using one’s experiences when conducting a study because they may not be deemed credible if not documented in the literature. Throughout the study, I was cognizant of the biases I had regarding my experiences in eLearning and kept a reflective account of these biases to maintain the trustworthiness and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 2009) of the study. Additionally, in an effort to further reduce or minimize bias, the college where I work was excluded from the study.
Delimitations and Limitations

Delimitations. This qualitative case study was designed to examine an institution’s plan and progress in helping higher education faculty teach online. An investigation of three colleges and overall institutional faculty/professional development offerings were explored to identify similarities and differences in faculty training and support. The examination of three colleges’ online and eLearning infrastructure and faculty professional development support represented a delimited view of professional development support as an in depth investigation of all thirteen academic colleges was not conducted. The decision to focus on only three colleges was made to bind the research to a reasonable population that would allow for the completion of the dissertation within the targeted timeline of my dissertation. Further, the study was conducted over three months during the spring semester of 2016. At the time the study was conducted, the three colleges had large online, distance learning programs at the university.

The study population was drawn from a snowball sample of administrators from three colleges and central administration that actively engaged in robust online and eLearning operations. As the institution and college organizational charts revealed, this sample had the potential to snowball into a much larger sample if limits to inclusion were not implemented, as there were other stakeholders immersed in the online enterprise. Additional participants categorized as “front line” staff could have contributed experiences and views regarding faculty acceptance of online learning strategies and implementation in course content to substantiate the vision and strategic plans of administration. It should be noted, that delimiting the sample population to eleven participants was congruent with qualitative research, which does not require a large sample size in the examination of phenomenon (Hatch, 2002). To this end, assumptions should not be made to suggest that the data collected was representative of all
facets of the online and eLearning enterprise. Additionally, while the institution’s eLearning infrastructure may be indicative of eLearning infrastructures at other institutions, and within other geographic areas, the findings of the study were unique to the institution under review.

Another delimited factor of the study was that participant interviews were only conducted once with each participant. The decision to conduct only one interview per participant emerged from scheduling difficulties. Several participants were senior level administrators with limited availability. Administrative commitments made second interviews difficult to arrange. Follow-up interviews would have extended the study beyond what was reasonably planned. It was also possible that one or more of the participants might not have been feeling well on the day of the interview, or encountered conflict with central or collegiate administrators, thereby affecting the data.

The Star Model (Galbraith, 1995) was chosen to frame this study due to the focus on organization design and infrastructural alignment. The outcomes of this study may not have been the same if a different framework had been used.

Addressing the infrastructural and professional development opportunities within the institution provided a top-down view of what existed at the institution. Other lenses could be examined to study this case, such as faculty perception of training offered and the training’s impact on instruction and student outcomes.

Limitations. This study had several limitations, or conditions that could not be controlled, that bound the study to the design. In qualitative research, personal bias and interpretation are factors that need to be considered. As an employee with extensive experience in online operations, I advocated for faculty professional development and was sensitive to my views and opinions regarding the phenomenon. Concerted effort was made to bracket personal
bias. Even with these considerations, it should be acknowledged that researcher bias and professional experience may be evident.

True to qualitative research, the “researcher as instrument” was also a limitation due to my personal interpretation of the data (Lofland, J., Snow, Anderson, & Lofland, L., 2006, p. 3). Interpretation of artifact data was also limited to the institutional data available which was not created by the researcher. The availability or lack of availability, of research data is not unique to this study. Rather, a common limitation inherent in all qualitative studies is the availability of research data.

The decision to omit the College of Nursing (CoN) from the study may be viewed as a limitation. While this college had the second largest online presence at the university, the CoN was omitted from inclusion in the study in earnest to reduce researcher bias. Therefore, the online operations of the unit were not considered for alignment and cohesion at the institution.

The racial and ethnic background of participants included in the study may also be viewed as a limitation. All of the participants in the study self-identified as white. The lack of racial diversity may have had an impact on the findings of the study and may not be representative of the national landscape of academic leaders who support faculty teaching in online programs. Perhaps a more racially diverse pool would have yielded different results.

Finally, due to the self-reporting testimonies of participants, the interviews might not fully reflect the complete state of eLearning at the institution, and broad assumptions should not be made. The interviews did capture each participant’s personal views of the eLearning enterprise and documented perceptions regarding institutional alignment.

**Significance of the Study**

Research has supported that Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) have expanded their
delivery of online instruction with more than one in four (28%) students taking at least one course at a distance (Allen & Seaman, 2016; Romano, 2006). While institutional plans favored this mode of instruction, support must be put in place for faculty to transition from the face-to-face format to that of computer mediated instruction (Abel, 2005; Ko & Rossen, 2010; Palloff & Pratt, 2011; Riedinger & Rosenberg, 2006; The Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2000). This transition required a unique set of skills that must be learned and applied (Arabasz, Pirani, & Fawcett, 2003; Bailie, 2011; Darabi, Sikorski, & Harvey, 2006; Okojie, Olinzock, & Okojie-Boulder, 2006; Johnson, Adams-Becker, Estrada, & Freeman, 2014; Orr, Williams, & Pennington, 2009; Palloff & Pratt, 2011; Ryan, Carlton, & Ali, 2004).

Institutions might benefit from the offering of ongoing professional development to faculty at all stages of the online instructional experience. Faculty begin their journey into online instruction at a point along a vast continuum ranging from beginner to expert. Institutions that are successful in supporting faculty will meet each faculty at the faculty’s individual point of entry. Professional development offerings have the potential to nurture and develop faculty competency and confidence in the online learning environment.

The professional development offered could benefit from alignment with Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design. To this end, institution’s might consider creating a well-defined strategy, structure, processes, rewards, and people system that align and support faculty in their development as online instructors. The successful application of the Star Model has the potential for other institutions to create professional development programs and offerings that support faculty as they transition to online instructors.

The findings of this study have the potential to generate new resources and information for each college to consider as they incorporate and assimilate best practices into the respective
college’s professional development portfolio. With the necessary tools required for successful
transition to eLearning, instructors can contribute to the advancement of the institution’s
eLearning mission. The outcomes of this study could be useful to IHE’s faculty, instructional
designers, researchers, and administrators who have a commitment to faculty development and
improvement of instruction in online courses.

As I further my interest in faculty professional development, instructional competencies,
faculty role, and intra-institutional alignment, a more critical look at institutional support will be
examined. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature related to eLearning, faculty
professional development in online learning, and organizational infrastructure and alignment.
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature

The national trend regarding the proliferation of online degrees, programs, certificates, and courses has grown a staggering 263% over the last twelve years (Online Learning Consortium, 2016). Despite such exponential growth, public institutions have made limited progress in providing strategic faculty development in technical and pedagogical training commiserate to online enrollment growth and adoption (Eliason & Holmes, 2010; Koehler, Mishra, Hershey, & Peruski, 2004; Koehler, Mishra, & Yahya, 2007; Koepke & O-Brien, 2012; Kosak, Manning, Dobson, Rogerson, Cotnam, Colaric, & McFadden, 2004; Kyei-Blankson & Keengwe, 2013; Orr, Williams, & Pennington, 2009; Roman, Kelsey, & Lin, 2010; Schoenfeld-Tacher & Persichitte, 2000; Shattuck, Dubins, & Zilberman, 2011; Taylor & McQuiggan, 2008). At the time this study was conducted, institutions provided some training for faculty who taught online, however, my search for empirical research did not yield any studies regarding the intra-institutional alignment of faculty development offerings afforded to faculty who taught online. Additionally, evidence of an institution-wide approach to competency development for faculty who teach online was sparse.

The explosion of online educational opportunities has removed the geographic requirement for students to sit in the physical classrooms of institutions to gain exposure to the most respected thought leaders in their field (Bonk, 2009). Johnson, Levine, Smith, and Stone (2010) pointed out that the Internet brings education to students whenever and wherever they are available to learn. This real-time classroom, through the use of information technology, has made education accessible to the masses. Further, research in higher education asserts that online learning is a critical part of the long-term strategic plan of institutions (Allen & Seaman, 2010, 2014, 2016; Van Der Werf & Sabatier, 2009). Institutions that offer extensive online
learning, struggle to provide faculty with the support and training necessary for them to be successful online instructors (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2006).

This review of literature focused on four areas requiring further investigation in support of faculty who taught online. First, a focus on the professional development opportunities offered to faculty as they transition from face-to-face instructor to online instructor was examined. A review of the research regarding the essential competencies required to be an effective online instructor was also investigated. Third, the review reported the published research regarding cases of institutional alignment within public IHEs as related to the offering of professional development for faculty who taught online. The review ends with a look at research that has been conducted regarding the utilization of the Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design.

This review of relevant empirical studies regarding faculty development offerings, competency development, institutional infrastructure, and Star Model research in support of faculty who taught online might challenge existing professional development practices and inform the development of a more systematic offering of training opportunities and supports.

**Methodology**

For this review of literature, I reviewed the research published over the past 15 years that examined faculty professional development offerings, competency development, institutional infrastructure, and Star Model of Organization Design research in support of faculty who teach online. The data for this review were derived from empirical studies that appeared in peer-reviewed journal articles from 2000-2016. This review does not include previously published meta-analyses or reviews of the literature (secondary resources) as only primary sources of the literature were included. Inclusion of articles was limited to only those published in English.
The following electronic search engines were utilized in the gathering of empirical studies: Academic Research Complete, Google Scholar, PsychInfo, ProQuest Research Library, and ERIC. The content search terms included: Online learning, eLearning, blended learning, hybrid learning, faculty development, professional development, online instructional competencies, pedagogical competencies, technical competencies, online competencies, institutional alignment, intra-institutional alignment, and inter-institutional alignment, institution infrastructure, Star Model, and Star Model of Organization Design. The population search terms included: higher education, post-secondary education, institutions of higher education (IHE), college, higher education faculty, university faculty, faculty, and higher education administrators. Additionally, as each study was selected for inclusion the corresponding reference list was screened for additional potential studies.

The following criteria were used in the selection of studies for inclusion in this review: studies with population samples, which included faculty, administration, and staff who taught at, or supported, IHEs online programming efforts. The included studies were data-driven (i.e., data sources were specified). Applying these criteria, the review was limited to studies of empirical research; no conceptual or opinion pieces were used. In total, 26 studies met the inclusion criteria.

A systematic analysis of the articles consisted of examining the empirical data according to the following: the research problem examined, theoretical framework utilized, methodologies used, and findings of the study. The findings gleaned from the research were organized into the four primary themes: professional development, online instructor competency and role, institutional alignment, and Star Model of Organization Design (Galbraith, 1995). A discussion of the significance of these findings and implications which lead to the selection of the topic
Foundations from this review of literature informed the design of the study. Specifically, gaps in the body of work demonstrated need for a scholarly investigation regarding institutional professional development progress to prepare faculty for online instruction. Additionally, findings suggested that a focus on the intra-institutional alignment of professional development offered to faculty who taught online may contribute to best practices in online instruction.

Professional Development

Several studies revealed institutional efforts to prepare faculty for online teaching (Eliason & Holmes, 2010; Koehler, Mishra, Hershey, & Peruski, 2004; Koehler, Mishra, & Yahya, 2007; Koepke & O-Brien, 2012; Kosak, Manning, Dobson, Rogerson, Cotnam, Colaric, & McFadden, 2004; Kyei-Blankson & Keengwe, 2013; Orr, Williams, & Pennington, 2009; Roman, Kelsey, & Lin, 2010; Schoenfeld-Tacher & Persichitte, 2000; Shattuck, Dubins, & Zilberman, 2011; Taylor & McQuiggan, 2008). The professional development opportunities were diverse in scope and duration as evidenced in the offering of the following: one-on-one sessions, peer mentoring, workshops, seminars, courses, institutes, yearlong courses, and certification programs (Eliason, & Holmes, 2010; Orr, Williams, & Pennington, 2009). Allen and Seaman (2009) reported that training opportunities tend to be offered as individual courses or through informal mentoring.

The review of literature regarding professional development for faculty who teach online is organized according to the duration of the professional development offerings. A review of studies focused on the on-campus versus off-campus professional development offerings will also be reviewed.
Multi-week and semester long courses. Several studies acknowledged that the depth of knowledge and skill acquisition required for faculty teaching online spanned beyond singular workshops or summer institutes (Koehler et al., 2004; Koehler et al., 2007; Koepke & O-Brien (2012). Workshops and seminar approaches were viewed as “ill-suited to develop deep understanding of the relationships between the technology and pedagogy that come together in effective practice” (Koehler et al., 2004, p. 28). Instead, IHEs have invested in the offering of multi-week and semester long courses aimed at enhancing faculty professional development.

Multi-week courses. Koepke and O-Brien (2012) examined the Online Instructor Training (OIT) offered to 67 faculty considering online instruction. The OIT program was a three week asynchronous training program focused on the design, delivery, and implementation of an online course. The OIT program was offered in three phases. Phases I and II utilized surveys from 20 faculty to gauge effectiveness of the online preparatory course, while Phase III involved interviews of eight of the participants. Survey results showed an increased comfort with technology, impact of how course objectives influenced course design, and an overall enhanced awareness of the importance of student-instructor interactions. Phase III themes revealed from the interviews that course objectives were carefully paired with activities in the course, more media would have been used if not restricted by time, and pedagogical strategies were enhanced as a result of participation in the course.

In their professional development case study Macdonald and Poniatowska (2011) set out to teach faculty how to use innovative online tools in support of students. They utilized both a cohort model and self-paced module for completion of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) Choices module. The module comprised 13 activities designed to encourage participants to use the tools in an authentic way. A total of 230 faculty (135 cohort route and 96 self-paced route)
participated in the study of implementation of innovative online tools such as discussion forums, wikis, journals/diaries, Elluminate, blogs, and audio recording tools. Participant perceptions of the faculty development module were assessed in a qualitative and quantitative exit questionnaire. The exit survey was completed by 107 participants. Prior to exposure to the module around 70% were dimly aware or familiar with how VLE tools would support student learning. At the conclusion around 60% were aware of the relevance of VLE tools on student learning. And the greatest percentage (43%) referred to the using the tools as being the most helpful component of the module.

**Semester long courses.** Koehler et al. (2004) studied six faculty who participated in a graduate educational technology course with their students. The course focused on the design of a course website. The faculty partnered with the graduate students in the design, development, and delivery of an online class. The semester long course provided for the convergence of the three essential components of online instruction: technology, content, and pedagogy (TCP). Faculty used the knowledge (K) they acquired during the course to inform the design and development of future courses. The faculty participants in this study were incentivized with a laptop computer and $1,000 stipend for their participation.

Koehler’s work with the TCPK Model continued in several follow-up studies. Koehler and Mishra (2005) studied the collaboration between four faculty members and fourteen students in the design and development of an online semester long class. Collectively, the group met for weekly computer lab training and large group discussions of relevant literature and topics. Additionally, they met to construct an online course as the culminating project of the class. Throughout the semester, participants completed four iterations of a survey to gauge their progress. The results captured an initial discomfort experienced by most participants in the
earliest weeks of the course. The discomfort was replaced by a great sense of accomplishment and recognition about the importance of collaboration in designing a learning space. In the semester long course, faculty learned online instruction pedagogical strategies such as: online engagement techniques, discussion board management, and authentic testing strategies.

In a third study, Koehler et al. (2007) examined the semester long collaborative course of six faculty that worked with 18 graduate students on a more in depth construction of a course – beyond the design of a web-site. At the onset of the study content, pedagogy, and technology were viewed by faculty as separate components of the learning experience. Through immersion in the course, faculty and students collaborated in the development of a syllabus, learning activities and assessments, and communication plan to encourage student engagement. Participants acknowledged the interconnectedness of the components as essential to successful instruction. The convergence and blending of TCPK components should exist in the design, development and execution of the course. These tenets cannot function in isolation if an optimum online class offering is to exist (Colella, Rota, & Beery, 2015).

Koehler et al. (2004) initial “learning by design” model of online instruction evolved from their research at Michigan State University. This formative research would serve as the foundation for their TPACK (Technology, Pedagogy, and Content, Knowledge) framework (see Figure 3) for effective online instruction. This framework identified the different areas of knowledge faculty needed to possess to teach effectively with technology. The TPACK model promoted the design of authentic learning environments through the integration and complex blending of all components. Authentic environments are those that do not cater to any one component at the expense of others.
The use of the TCPK model and incentives for participation will be examined at the institution under review in this study. Additionally, it should be known that this framework has grown in adoption and is revered as a best practice model in the collaboration and development of online courses.

**Faculty Certification.** Institutions at the forefront of online instruction have built upon the success of semester long courses and formalized faculty development through the offering of certification programs to teach online (Eliason & Holmes, 2010; Roman, Kelsey, & Lin, 2010). Certificate options vary in scope, duration, content, and requirement; with some institutions mandating completion of certification training prior to online instruction.

Roman, Kelsey, and Lin (2010) developed a six-week online certificate course where two cohorts of faculty (20 each) enrolled as students to engage in student-like behaviors, develop positive online teaching practices, and to learn classroom management strategies for this mode of
Learning. In an expanded offering of similar nature, Eliason and Holmes’ (2010) research was grounded in faculty professional development through an offering of an online teaching certificate centered in online pedagogy. This semester long course taught faculty how to integrate a variety of questioning strategies (open-ended, connective, relational, synthesizing, and application) into their online courses. They also participated in the course from the lens of a student through discussion board postings. Additionally, they learned effective facilitation techniques and strategies. Participant feedback and evaluation of the certification course indicated that faculty gained technological and pedagogical skills that have encouraged them to make changes to their teaching practice.

Eliason and Holmes (2010) and Roman, Kelsey, and Lin’s (2010) online certification courses were highly interactive as faculty were immersed in the construction of learning activities geared to promote high levels of engagement. Faculty led discussion board threads about netiquette, and online communication fostered interactivity.

**Comprehensive Yearlong Program.** Hinson and LaPrairie’s (2005) yearlong, five stage progressive faculty development program for 16 community college faculty was the most comprehensive professional development offering for faculty preparing to teach online. The five stages of professional development for this program were planning, instruction, implementation, refinement, and evaluation. In the first stage, faculty completed a needs assessment and set personal objectives for their journey. Stage two consisted of faculty learning basic online delivery skills such as converting text documents into electronic formats, learning the online platform, determining proper assessment protocols, outlining expectations for engagement and communication within courses, and creation of online lesson plans. Additionally, faculty learned about key tenets of adult learning theory to better relate to the non-traditional student population.
Implementation involved the transition from learning and practicing to job-embedded staff development in the form of collaborative projects, problem solving, and focus-group sessions. The faculty refined their skills through information sharing sessions where they highlighted successes and shortcomings of the experiences to inform future experiences. The professional development program’s evaluative focus was to assess the overall effectiveness of the program. Monthly meetings and bi-weekly online discussions amongst participants created a sense of community and safe space to share ideas. Faculty saw the transformation of the learning environment from faculty-centered to student-centered. Faculty participants received a $1,500 stipend for participation.

Pullen (2006) studied the effectiveness of pedagogical and instructional design courses in continuing professional education for 300 healthcare professionals, including faculty. They were interested in assessing the impact on learner achievement and satisfaction across 42 self-paced courses. Participants completed pre and post-test surveys to assess learning. They also completed a performance self-assessment survey to see the level of inclusion of learned materials into their clinical practice. Further, they completed a course evaluation survey to collect participant perceptions of course effectiveness. The course evaluation survey consisted of 39 Likert-scale questions, and one open-ended question to gather additional comments. This was the only qualitative component to the study. Researchers calculated Cronbach’s alpha (0.9221) to claim the survey was statistically reliable. Participant demographics were also tallied in the course evaluation survey. Post-test results showed an increase in learning (from 78.524 to 94.484). The majority of participants (87%) saw the benefit of instructional design principles. Qualitative comments focused on the convenience of online learning.
**Independent learning and mentoring.** In addition to the formalized training offerings reviewed, three studies focused on faculty independent learning and the importance and effectiveness of peer to peer mentoring. Mentoring, according to Savage, Karp, and Logue (2004), “is a process in which one person, usually of superior rank and outstanding achievement, guides the development of an entry-level individual” (p. 21). Taylor and McQuiggan (2008), Schoenfeld-Tacher and Persichitte (2000), and Kyei-Blankson and Keengwe’s (2013) research focused on self-directed faculty development enhanced by discourse with their peers.

Taylor and McQuiggan’s (2008) study of 68 Penn State University faculty revealed that faculty preferred self-paced online instruction that provided opportunities for the sharing of real-life experiences with their colleagues. They also favored a one-on-one mentoring approach to professional development. This provided them with individualized attention that increased their skills and confidence.

In Schoenfeld-Tacher and Persichitte’s (2000) examination of professional development provided to six university faculty they found that all professors did not receive formal professional development training in preparation of their teaching online. Two professors taught with the support of a private online vendor that provided assistance for some components of the online experience, but also created obstacles along the way. The vendor assisted in the process by providing technical support and troubleshooting for problems that arose but left the faculty to design an online environment that required an understanding of HTML code. In essence, the faculty taught themselves how to teach online as they received little design and development support from the vendor and no institutional support. They reported that this “trial by fire” approach was not conducive to sound teaching and learning or professional development.
Kyei-Blankson and Keengwe (2013) also explored faculty perceptions and training as they prepared to teach online. Faculty participants (n = 117) completed a single survey which contained closed and open-ended survey questions. The majority of participants (76%) indicated a moderate or very strong commitment to teaching online. Reasons cited were: convenience to teach wherever they wanted, financial incentives, time and cost efficiency, opportunity for expanding in class learning, and positive student and teacher experiences. The majority of faculty (80%) stated they would seek informal assistance from other faculty who taught online. Many stated they would use resources from professional development offices but did not prefer training in the face-to-face format (35%). Most also thought utilizing instructional design staff was beneficial (72%).

**On-campus versus off-campus.** Kosak, Manning, Dobson, Rogerson, Cotnam, Colaric, and McFadden (2004) conducted a study of 83 faculty members at twelve North Carolina universities to ascertain if faculty received adequate training in support of the transition to teach online. They examined both on-campus and off-campus training opportunities. The majority of faculty receiving off campus training did so in the form of conference attendance and web-based tutorials. These sessions spanned a few hours of training and exposure to online instructional strategies. Most on campus training was provided in the form of group sessions for an hour or two at a time. Only one third of respondents indicated any one-on-one training or mentoring with others, and in similar numbers were those who indicated having exposure to other faculty members courses to inform their development. Faculty indicated that the bulk of their training was grounded initially in technical training about the dynamics of teaching in a virtual learning environment followed by learning best practices for effective online instruction. The outcomes of this study revealed that retention of training was limited.
Pagliari et al. (2009) surveyed faculty at North Carolina community colleges preparing to teach online and had 22 participants in their study. Eleven of the 22 faculty did not attend any off-campus professional development opportunities; while 6 of the 22 attended conferences and referred to the literature to inform their teaching. Similarly, 12 of the 22 faculty did not attend any on-campus training; with 7 of the 22 faculty participating in on-campus training sessions regarding online instruction. The importance of learning about timely feedback to students, establishment of online protocols, and creation of effective assessment tools were key outcomes for most faculty. Of significance was faculty participation in regular discussion sessions with their peers.

Taylor and McQuiggan’s (2008) research also focused on self-directed faculty development enhanced by discourse with their peers. This study of 68 Penn State University faculty revealed that faculty preferred self-paced online instruction that provided opportunities for the sharing of real-life experiences with their colleagues. They also favored a one-on-one mentoring approach to professional development. This provided faculty with individualized attention that increased their skills and confidence.

**Faculty Perceptions.** Studies regarding faculty perception of the professional development afforded them to teach online are robust. While an examination of this dimension of the phenomenon will not be scrutinized in this research, there is relevance in sharing documented views. In a study of faculty from 21 colleges, universities, and community colleges in Pennsylvania, Ohio and West Virginia, Ray (2009) surveyed 111 higher education faculty and assessed the technological and pedagogical training received prior to teaching online. They found that while the majority of participants (86.5%) believed that formal technology and pedagogy training should be required prior to online instruction only 23.6% of faculty received
technology training; and 37.8% of faculty received online pedagogy training. While the type of preservice training varied amongst participants’ (with a preference towards small group face-to-face and web-based offerings) the perception of faculty was that the preparation had a positive effect on their perceived preparation to teach online. While the study did demonstrate inter-institutional alignment in the need to provide professional development for faculty who teach online, institutional alignment in infrastructure was not addressed.

**Conclusion.** Professional development opportunities and training for faculty who transition to online instructors are diverse (Eliason & Holmes, 2010; Koehler, Mishra, Hershey, & Peruski, 2004; Koehler, Mishra, & Yahya, 2007; Kosak, Manning, Dobson, Rogerson, Cotnam, Colaric, & McFadden, 2004; Orr, Williams, & Pennington, 2009; Roman, Kelsey, & Lin, 2010; Schoenfeld-Tacher & Persichitte, 2000; Taylor & McQuiggan, 2008). Allen and Seaman (2009) asserted that with a myriad of training opportunities, it is evident that “there is no single approach being taken by institutions in providing training for their teaching faculty. Most institutions use a combination of mentoring (59%) and training (65%) options” (p. 3). Of concern is that 19% of institutions reported that they do not offer professional development offerings for faculty preparing to teach online (Allen & Seaman, 2009).

While these studies are important to the field as they capture efforts to offer faculty development training to faculty preparing to teach online, they failed to examine an intra-institutional, intra-collegiate approach to eLearning and online professional development. A comprehensive approach to intra-institutional faculty development and focus on effective online instructional preparation should be researched. Inconsistencies with the delivery and scope of professional development afforded faculty who teach online have contributed to a fragmented acceptance of this teaching modality.
In my study, I will bridge this gap by examining several colleges’ online and eLearning onboarding and faculty professional development opportunities to ascertain impact on online instruction and faculty readiness to teach online. The extent of one-on-one mentoring and individual web-based tutorials will also be examined at the institution under review.

The following section will review the instructor competencies and role adjustments faculty must consider as they prepare to transition from traditional, face-to-face classroom instructors to instructors who teach online.

**Online Instructor Competency and Faculty Role**

**Instructor Competency.** Faculty and administrative perception may be that teaching online does not require a different set of pedagogical skills and competencies (Boettcher & Conrad, 2010). Practitioners, or online education experts, instructional designers, and education developers (Weaver, Robbie, & Borland, 2008) in the field know that different faculty competencies are necessary and essential to the overall online experience (Arabasz, Pirani, & Fawcett, 2003; Bailie, 2011; Darabi, Sikorski, & Harvey, 2006; Okojie, Olinzock, & Okojie-Boulder, 2006; Ragan, 2009; Smith, 2005; Varvel, 2007).

Several studies acknowledged the need for faculty to have certain competencies in order to be effective in the online learning environment (Bailie, 2011; Darabi, Sikorski, & Harvey, 2006; Kinuthia, 2005; Lewis & Abdul-Hamid, 2006; Ryan, Carlton, & Ali, 2004; Schoenfeld-Tacher and Persichitte’s, 2000). These studies involved utilization of surveys and interview techniques to determine the necessary competencies. Darabi, Sikorski, and Harvey (2006) conducted a study of 148 instructors to determine the essential competencies faculty should have as online instructors.
Darabi et al. (2006) research resulted in the identification of 20 core competencies faculty needed to acquire for effective online instruction to occur. The core competencies identified were: 1) employ appropriate presentation strategies, 2) exhibit effective communication skills, 3) facilitate productive discussions, 4) ensure appropriate communication, 5) provide learners with course level guidelines, 6) employ appropriate types of interaction, 7) provide timely and informative feedback, 8) assess learning based on stated goals, 9) stimulate learners critical thinking, 10) monitor learner progress, 11) evaluate effectiveness of course, 12) encourage learners to become self-directed, 13) manage logistical aspects of the course, 14) foster a learning community, 15) create friendly and open environment, 16) use various methods of distance education, 17) assist learners in becoming acclimated, 18) use relevant technology effectively, 19) accommodate problems with technology, and 20) improve own professional knowledge. All of these competencies are critical to the online learning environment and contribute to the student and faculty online experience. In my study, the intercollegiate approach to faculty development of these competencies will be explored. Instructional designers and eLearning administrators will be interviewed to discuss measures in place to assist faculty with competency development and growth.

In a similar study, Lewis and Abdul-Hamid (2006) interviewed 30 faculty identified as exemplary instructors to identify best practices in online instruction to inform professional development. The researchers used an Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI) and student feedback from course evaluations to identify competencies and attributes of successful online instructors. The results shed light on how the effective instructional practices were implemented in online classes. Key to the success of these instructors was their ability to foster interaction by hosting course conferences (discussion boards), study groups and group projects. Providing
meaningful and timely feedback to student work was also reflected in the use of grading rubrics. Facilitated and reflective learning also contributed to the effectiveness of the course. Faculty that maintained a high level of enthusiasm and presence in a well-organized course benefitted from increased student engagement. Faculty interaction, engagement, and presence contribute to the outcomes of courses. In my study, participants will be asked to provide examples of how these components are actualized in courses.

Kinuthia (2005) studied faculty development programs for web-based instruction (WBI) at historically black colleges and universities. Kinuthia was interested in identifying the proficiency needed in instructional development, motivation to attend training, and preferred mode of training for WBI. A survey was distributed to faculty and administrators (n= 1,125) with 152 valid responses. Most expressed they were somewhat or highly proficient with WBI tools: email (96.7%), internet surfing (92.6%), presentation software (81.8%), creating and uploading instructional content (75.9%). Participants ability to select web-based assessment techniques (56.4%), facilitate online discussions (52.3%), develop video (27.2%) and audio files (30.1%), and create graphics (43.3%) were much lower in proficiency. Faculty preferred one-on-one training with instructional designers to prepare them for teaching online. Kinuthia’s findings demonstrated that faculty were comfortable with basic electronic communications but needed guidance facilitating online forums and audio/video enhancements to courses. In my study, through focus group participation, I will examine technological competency and comfort with faculty.

Guasch, Alvarez, and Espasa (2010) study explored the methodological skills required of online faculty in a study of 12 faculty that taught in a virtual university. This study revealed that faculty teaching online needed to be able to design, plan, instruct, and demonstrate social
presence in the online environment. Additionally, they needed to be trained in the management of the online learning environment. The faculty participated in authentic tasks which were guided, collaborative, and constructive. Faculty also participated in a series of debates regarding best practices in the field and reflected on their interactions.

**Conclusion.** While these studies examined competency in presentation, communication, course logistics, and technology they failed to examine the convergence among them. In the research study, I utilized an institutional approach to eLearning competencies that contributed to the integration of competencies. I reviewed the eLearning offerings by the institution and assessed coherence with online instructor competencies. In addition to pedagogical and technological competency development and enhancement, faculty who shifted from face-to-face instructors to online instructors experienced a paradigm shift in faculty role. The studies that follow captured research regarding this shift.

**Faculty Role.** Research supports the need for a change in faculty role as teaching style and techniques need to adjust in support of online education (Boettcher & Conrad, 2010; Brabazon, 2002; Garrison, 2011; Ko & Rossen, 2010; Kostina & LaGanza, 2012; Morris & Finnegan, 2008-2009; Palloff & Pratt, 2011; Ryan, Carlton, & Ali, 2004). Faculty are given assignments that require a shift from teaching traditional, face-to-face classes to blended or fully online courses.

Ryan et al. (2004) conducted interviews and focus groups amongst 20 faculty from eight universities/colleges in the United States and found that faculty that were successful in this environment understood that adjustments to the faculty role from authority to facilitator would occur and that online teaching required them to collaborate with others on the redesign of courses. The online method would also require them to expand their communication processes
through relationship building and multiple instructional approaches. Successful online teaching also encouraged the fostering of partnerships and work groups to inform instruction (Ryan et al., 2004). Additionally, according to this study, teachers needed to prepare for the additional time commitment of managing electronic interaction with the class. Last, the study revealed that expectations should include the potential to learn new software and engage in technology (Ryan et al., 2004). Successful online instructors make the role transition to facilitators of learning. They serve as guides to instruction and encourage the co-creation of learning interactions. Evidence of this involvement will be pursued through the interviews with participants.

Palloff and Pratt (2011) documented the need for a change in faculty role as teaching style and techniques need to adjust in support of online education. In order for effective and successful online instruction to occur, Palloff and Pratt (2011) advocate for the following: (1) balance of power needs to change and faculty should be facilitators of learning, (2) function and delivery of content need to shift away from lecture format, (3) faculty role needs to change to have strong online presence and guide learning, (4) responsibility for learning should shift to students, and the (5) forms of assessment need to shift from traditional test and quiz evaluation.

As a student formerly enrolled in a number of online classes at the institution under review, it is my belief that a paradigm shift regarding faculty role and standards of instructional best practice may need to be explored. Opportunity may exist to expand online instructional practice to incorporate the standards for excellence above.

Morris and Finnegan (2008–2009) also explored the roles faculty assume as online instructors and found that novice online instructors took on more of a managerial role in the delivery of online courses. Faculty focus was on managing student interactions and ensuring course content was available. Faculty input and participation lacked a pedagogical lens while
more experienced online instructors "enacted multiple roles – social, managerial, and pedagogical – to engage students and increase student persistence and success" (p. 61).

**Conclusion.** Faculty who make that transition from face-to-face classroom instructors to online classroom instructors need to obtain additional competencies in support of the transition to online instructors (Arabasz, Pirani, & Fawcett, 2003; Bailie, 2011; Darabi, Sikorski, & Harvey, 2006; Okojie, Olinzock, & Okojie-Boulder, 2006; Ragan, 2009; Smith, 2005; Varvel, 2007). Navigating the physical space between instructor and students requires additional skills and competencies to fill the spatial separation. Additionally, successful online instruction necessitates a shift in faculty role from “sage on the stage” to a facilitative “guide on the side” (King, 1993, p. 30). It should be noted that this phrase is not meant to diminish the role or expertise of faculty. Rather, the role of teacher changes through different interactions as they become the conduit for learning. This is most often associated with a reduction in class lectures and a physical shift from teaching at the front of a classroom to the center of the learning space.

My study will focus on one institution’s efforts to leverage the technological and pedagogical skills essential to faculty success and satisfaction as they transition to online instructors. I will examine the student-centered instructional practice currently in practice and will seek to uncover the institutional supports essential for faculty as they make the transition.

The next section of the literature review regarding professional development for faculty transitioning to online instructors will discuss an examination of research regarding institutional alignment at IHEs.

**Institutional Alignment**

Institutional alignment referred to the coherence of individual college units’ mission, vision, and educational operations as they function in association with the institution’s academic
plan, strategic plan and operations. When institutional alignment, or equilibrium, is present the independent units function in ways consistent with the central institutional strategic plan and overall vision and mission of the institution. Consideration needs to be given to the development of strategic plans so processes are in place that position stakeholders for success and ensure the completion of objectives and realization of university strategic goals.

**Inter-Institutional Alignment.** The body of research regarding institutional alignment in IHEs was scarce. Studies regarding institutional alignment in higher education were heavily focused around the fields of academic and continuing education coherence (Hyams, 2000) and information technology (Lach-Smith, 2010; Vaughn, 2007). Research in these areas depicted an *inter-institutional* focus on institutional alignment among several universities. Only two studies (Orr, Williams, and Pennington (2009); Shattuck, Dubins, & Zilberman, 2011) documented inter-institutional alignment regarding higher education professional development for faculty who teach online.

Orr, Williams, and Pennington (2009) interviewed ten faculty members, and one administrator, from two North Carolina institutions to assess faculty perception of institutional support for professional development. Faculty reported that they were compensated appropriately for course development and delivery as part of their regular compensation and were given appropriate release time to build online courses. Both institutions offered summer development workshops that taught technological and pedagogical training. While specific areas of instruction were not elaborated on, faculty believed the workshops enhanced their online teaching experience but that training focused too much on technology.

Shattuck, Dubins, and Zilberman (2011) focused on the inter-institutional project of designing, developing, piloting, and evaluating an online course offered to adjunct faculty preparing to teach online in 37 institutions of higher education. This certificate course was
developed under the MarylandOnline (MOL) consortium of higher education institutions. The course was developed and offered in collaboration with faculty, administrators, and instructional designers at the participant institutions. The asynchronous course was called the Certificate for Online Adjunct Teaching (COAT). Emergent from this course was the Quality Matters peer review certification process to assess quality in online courses. This standard of peer-reviewed course development has evolved into the best practice in online instructional design. The COAT was a stand-alone certificate course offered to several institutions. The current offering of this certificate program has been extended to all academics in the online community.

**Intra-Institutional Alignment.** Scholarly work regarding *intra-institutional* studies, within a single university, were concentrated in the following areas: information technology (Albrecht, et al., 2004), general education standards (Fuess, & Mitchell, 2011), curriculum mapping and institutional learning outcomes (Bortman, 2013), and university brand (Pindar, 2014). Empirical studies regarding intra-institutional research of professional development for faculty who teach online were non-existent.

**Conclusion.** There is a dearth of research in the literature regarding inter and intra-institutional research regarding professional development for faculty who teach online. If IHEs are going to continue to offer online programs and courses they must prepare faculty to teach in this modality. Institutions could be well served to develop and offer professional development for faculty who teach online through the utilization of an aligned intra-institutional approach.

This review of literature regarding professional development for faculty transitioning from face-to-face instructors to online instructors will conclude with an examination of research regarding prior studies that utilized Galbraith’s (1995) Model of Organization Design as the framework.
Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design was developed to apply information and decision processes that could affect employee performance in effort to achieve organizational goals. In order to affect organizational change and make strides toward achieving strategic organizational goals, Galbraith acknowledged the need to “modify the performance measurement and reward system, the structure, and the skill sets and mind-sets of the people” (Galbraith, 2014, p. 16). Galbraith’s (1995) work was initially applied in the business sector to assist organizations in their efforts to align structure, processes, rewards, and people systems with the strategic vision of the organizations.

Business. The review of published literature regarding Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design have been documented in business practices. The search for empirical studies regarding the application of Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design only yielded one study for review (Ipsen, Gish, & Poulsen, 2015). In their study regarding the decentralization of teams, Lanaj, Hollenbeck, Ilgen, Barnes, and Harmon (2011) referenced the Star Model of Organization Design (Galbraith, 1995) but did not utilize the study as the framework. There were, however, practitioner articles regarding application of the model to business practices and strategic plans of organizations (Dunbar & Starbuck, 2006; Espinosa & Parada, 2014; Kesler & Kates, 2010; Malone, Laubacher & Dellarocas, 2010).

Ipsen, Gish, and Poulsen (2015) conducted a mixed methods case study regarding the impact of work related stress on employees. The study focused on a six month implementation of the PoWRS (Prevention of Work-Related Stress) program in four Danish organizations (two technology and two manufacturing). Ipsen et al. (2015) utilized observations, semi-structured interviews, surveys, and workshops as data sources for the study. The PoWRS program was
implemented in three phases and involved the completion of a needs assessment (Phase 1),
training sessions (Phase two), and implementation of action plans commiserate with the themes
uncovered (Phase three). The findings of the study revealed that three of the four organizations
were successful in implementing the PoWRS program. Successful implementation was
attributed to having internal facilitators who lead the program and the collaborative involvement
of both managers and employees. The one organization that did not deem the intervention as
successful attributed its lack of impact on insufficient time to integrate the model into the
organization and an over emphasis on daily operations.

**Higher Education.** The search for empirical studies regarding application of the Star
Model of Organization Design (Galbraith, 1995) in higher education did not produce any
empirical studies. Evidence of the model applied in higher education was documented in three
instances: 1) a master’s thesis regarding telecommunication service to stay competitive within
the digital transformation of the telecommunication industry strategy (Wiemker, 2015), 2) a
bachelor’s thesis regarding Swedish multinational companies ability to adapt to local conditions
when they establish subsidiaries in China (Larsson, 2012), and 3) a conceptual piece regarding
improvements to the complex analytical method used in theoretical physics (Fabac & Stepanic,
2008). In the cases of Wiemker (2015) and Larsson (2012), while scholarly projects, neither
conducted research with participants.

**Professional Development.** A search regarding application of the Star Model of
Organization Design (Galbraith, 1995) within the professional development community did not
yield any empirical studies from the literature. In Johnsen and Isenhour’s (2015) opinion paper
they utilized Galbraith’s (1995) model to frame their views regarding changes human resource
managers in virtual organizations should consider to affect organizational change. Similarly, the
Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), has utilized Galbraith’s (1995) model in professional development offerings; as evidenced by Wiengarden’s (2011) strategic human resource management instructional manual. This guide was developed to assist managers with “human capital strategies” (p. 1) to remain competitive.

**Conclusion.** The research regarding application of Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design was limited. This may be attributed to the notion that the model was more broadly utilized in the corporate sector to document processes and inform strategic planning. There was opportunity to conduct research using the model as tenets of the model could be applied across organizations in the public and private sectors.

**Concluding Remarks**

Throughout my study, I embarked on an investigation of one IHEs plan and progress in supporting faculty who taught online. In the next chapter, I will discuss the methodology, methods, and data analysis of this qualitative case study. The context, qualitative instruments and research design will be explained. The chapter will conclude with clarification of the qualitative validity measures employed in the study.
Chapter Three: Methods

This research study utilized a qualitative case study approach to examine the institutional infrastructure and professional development offerings afforded faculty who teach online. Case study, according to Yin (2009) is “empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (p. 18). The following sections will provide an overview of the methodology of the study and will include a restatement of the purpose and primary research question, an overview of the context of the study, and definitions of case study and embedded case study. The remaining sections of the chapter will share the methods utilized and include a background of prior research, an overview and diagram of the research design, a review of data collection and analysis and discussion regarding appropriate validity considerations.

Restatement of Purpose

In order to begin an explanation of the methodology utilized in the study, it is pertinent to reiterate the purpose and the research questions, which framed the overall design of the research conducted. The purpose of this qualitative research case study was to examine an institution’s plan and progress in helping higher education faculty teach online. An investigation of three colleges and overall institutional faculty/professional development offerings were explored to identify similarities and differences in faculty training and support. Further, an objective of the study was to investigate the physical, technological, pedagogical and administrative resources necessary for creating and sustaining online operations. In essence, I wanted to study this phenomenon because it is essential for institutions of higher education (IHE) to create systems, infrastructure, and professional development training opportunities in support of faculty as they
transition from face-to-face instructors to online instructors.

The primary research question, which guided this study, was: What professional development opportunities do three colleges afford faculty who teach online? This overarching question was addressed through several other related questions regarding the institutional and unit level support, infrastructure, and professional development afforded faculty who teach online. My interest in the professional development afforded faculty who teach online began with a pilot study regarding this phenomenon.

**Background**

I conducted a qualitative pilot study (IRB Protocol: 2013-0409 - Faculty Perceptions Regarding Participation in Faculty Online Orientation) within the College of Nursing (CoN) to examine higher education faculty perceptions regarding participation in faculty online orientation and how their perceptions might influence their own online instruction. The study included five participants who were teaching online for the first or second academic term. Prior to participating in the pilot, all participants completed a two-week online orientation which provided them with the tools and resources geared toward the development of essential competencies necessary to be an online instructor. The orientation also provided a “sand box” which encouraged faculty to “play” and test pedagogical and technological tools and strategies in a mock classroom environment.

Faculty participants were interviewed to gain insight to their perceptions and to assess whether or not skills learned in the online orientation were applied and transferred to their courses. The inductive review process uncovered eight major themes regarding faculty perceptions of online orientation. The faculty participants shared the following: 1) the design framework of the online orientation should serve as model for courses, 2) there was a need for
the integration of online pedagogical strategies, 3) course content and structure must be in alignment with the learning outcomes, 4) teaching online is time intensive, 5) teaching online required technical proficiency, 6) teaching online required an expansion of the faculty role, 7) skill development as an online instructor required training and support, and 8) faculty development was essential for successful immersion to online learning.

The findings of the pilot study laid the foundation for the development of my dissertation proposal, which led to a broader, intra-institutional investigation regarding professional development opportunities afforded faculty who taught online.

**Context**

The setting for this study was a large, urban, public Research I (very high research activity) institution located in the Midwest. This institution was examined because of the extensive offering of online programs, certificates, and courses coupled with the 16 years of experience delivering structured online programs. The institution was also selected because I am employed within a different college at the institution and work extensively with online programming. As such, I am familiar with the landscape and network of professionals involved in online operations at the IHE. My research interests are focused on professional development in support of faculty who teach online and my scholarly work will be dedicated to efforts that help faculty teach in this modality. The study was conducted from January – March of 2016.

At the time the study was conducted, the institution was nearing its third century (1819) and offered more than 400 undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs spanning thirteen academic colleges in service to a population of 44,251 (Fall 2015) students. The institution’s academic infrastructure also included The Graduate School and extensive Library system. The majority (51%) of students were from the local metropolitan area. The university had an overall
undergraduate degree completion rate (completers within 150%) of 59% and granted nearly 10,000 degrees in 2015. There were approximately 6,032 faculty members, 2,717 of who were full-time. Faculty participated in the education and research endeavors of the university on three campuses. The university and its faculty had a collective bargaining agreement, sponsored by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

In order to have a comprehensive view of the online operations at the IHE, I deemed it was important to examine the institution’s online presence and demographic overview of those served by the online enterprise. The next sections provide an overview of the online portfolio offered at the institution and the composition of the student population served.

**Institution’s Online Presence**

The institution was immersed in online offerings with 5,594 students, or roughly 13% of the student population, enrolled in 74 online degrees and certificates taught by more than 260 faculty in nine of the thirteen colleges (Office of Institutional Research, 2015). Student enrollment in formal online programs was unevenly distributed with 92%, or 5,141 students, enrolled in three of the nine colleges that hosted online programs (Office of Institutional Research, 2015).

Institutional enrollment data represented the students formally enrolled in degree or certificate programs and represented a portion of the students that were enrolled in at least one course online. The Office of Institutional Research does not formally report student enrollment in online or blended courses for students enrolled in campus, in-seat programs. An informal review of the institution’s registration portal, and conversations with faculty, staff and administrators in colleges that hosted online courses confirmed enrollment in online courses by students enrolled in the majority of each unit’s programs (in-seat and online).
The IHE’s strategic plan has accounted for continuous, sustainable, growth in online course offerings and programs. The institution’s forecasted growth in online education is consistent with national enrollment trends. More than one in four students (28%) took some of their courses online with 67% of students at public institutions enrolled in at least one online course (Allen & Seaman, 2016).

**Demographic profile of online students.** The demographic composition of those students enrolled in online programs was noteworthy. The majority of students enrolled in online courses/programs were female (81%) graduate students (62%) who were enrolled part-time (92%) or less than nine semester credits each term. The average age of online learners was 35 compared to 23 for non-online learners. The ethnicity of online learners was not very diverse with 72% White, 12% Black or African-American, 5% Hispanic/Latino, 3% Asian and 8% identified as other or unknown. The majority of online students (47% or 2,614 students) were residents from the institutions home state (Office of Institutional Research, 2015).

The representation of residents enrolled in fully online programs was consistent with national data as 84% of students who took exclusively online courses resided in the same state as the public institution they were attending (Allen & Seaman, 2016). While the majority of the institution’s online students were residents of the institutions home state, the institution had a national online presence with representation from all 50 states. The institution served a small population (0.2%) of military deployed overseas. Additionally, 45 international students from 18 countries participated in online programs or certificates with nearly half (21) of international students hailing from Canada (Student Fact book, 2015).
Gaining Access

To conduct my research, I needed to gain access to key participants within this university. In order to gain access, I sought approval from the university’s Institutional Research Board (IRB). The research study proposal was submitted to the IRB in October 2015, and was developed in accordance with the institution’s IRB standards for research with participants. Ethical considerations regarding the research purpose, researcher bias and participant risk were addressed via the university’s Institutional Research Board (IRB) approval process. The research study (IRB 2015-7812) was vetted through the expedited review process and approved in January 2016.

The study met the following IRB protocols: 1) provided for the proper treatment of participants, 2) no known ethical concerns or risks associated with participation in this study, 3) participant written consent was obtained prior to interviews being conducted, 4) participants were assigned pseudonyms (see Table 2) to safeguard identities and 5) researcher demonstrated respect and did not pressure or harm participants (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). All standards regarding proper treatment and participant risk were documented in the participant written consent form (see Appendix B). Further, the purpose of the research study was disclosed in the recruitment email (see Appendix A) and the participant’s written consent (see Appendix B).

Once the research study was approved by the IRB, and prior to commencement of recruitment activities, I identified academic leaders of the university community that contributed to the online infrastructure in support of faulty who taught online. As an employee of the IHE studied, and as the CoN’s representative on university-wide online/eLearning committees and initiatives, I had direct access to the participants. As such, I had frequent interaction with university eLearning/online learning stakeholders and faculty. Therefore, the identification of
potential participants was not difficult. The initial participant list was comprised of administrators and staff from central services and three colleges on campus. Collectively, these administrators and staff comprised the sample.

**Sampling Overview**

A single-case study approach was utilized in congruence with the typical case rationale (Yin, 2009). The selection of a purposive sampling technique, a non-probabilistic technique based upon researchers’ needs to select participants from which most can be learned (Merriam, 2009), was used throughout the course of the study. This strategy was conducive to the typical case, as academic leaders immersed in online learning at the IHE, were easily identifiable. Further, a purposive *snowball* sample was utilized. A purposeful snowball sample consisted of locating a few key participants believed to contribute to the study and then those participants refer you to other participants they believed could also contribute to the study (Merriam, 2009). Unit heads, or the senior most person involved in online and eLearning efforts, were interviewed first and asked to provide names of potential additional participants that could contribute to the study. This approach was essential as it provided administrative insight to individuals involved in online operations and faculty development. The use of this qualitative strategy yielded in-depth, rich data (Patton, 2002) and reduced the search of identifying individuals that could contribute to the phenomena.

**Case study sampling.** A single-case study sample (Yin, 2009) was selected to explore the professional development opportunities afforded faculty at a single IHE. Institutional program and enrollment data revealed that four of the thirteen academic colleges were immersed in online programming (Office of Institutional Research, 2015).
One of the colleges included in the “big four” was eliminated from the study due to my employment within the college. To provide a relative comparison of the online presence at this college, in the fall of 2015, the college offered nine online degrees (spanning all degree levels) and certificates to 1,865 (58%) students (Office of Institutional Research, 2015); thereby making it the second largest college, with an online presence, at the IHE. Since that time, the college has added six online doctorate programs and one online post-master’s certificate program with plans to launch three more online doctorate programs in spring of 2017.

The remaining three colleges and the university’s central online administrative offices were included in the case study. In addition to online enrollment, the three colleges were also selected based on longevity of online operations; two of the three colleges’ involvement in online programming spanned more than a decade. The third college was relatively new to online programming (less than five years) and was identified as the next college to join the ranks in the extensive offering and delivery of online programs at the IHE. An analysis of longevity of online programming was investigated to document trends and operational similarities and differences in support of the online enterprise. The three colleges included in this study were de-identified to protect the anonymity of participants. Herein, the colleges will be referred to as College A, College B, and College C.

College A has been offering online programs since 2000 and has online degrees and certificates at the master, bachelor, and associate levels. The infrastructure of College A is different than that of the other two colleges as it has four schools within the college. Each of the four schools operates independent of the others but share college-wide resources. All four schools offer online programs but vary in the depth of immersion and offerings. In the fall of 2015, College A had a total student enrollment of 5,528 students. The college offered 27 online
degrees and certificates to 1,837 (36%) students. The college had an additional 129 students identified as taking courses online that had not declared a specific major with the school (Office of Institutional Research, 2015).

College B has been offering online programs since 2004 and has online degrees and certificates at the master, bachelor, and associate levels. College B is comprised of five academic departments. Four of the five departments offer online programs; the fifth plans to offer a certificate in the near future. In the fall of 2015, College B had a total student enrollment of 2,887 students. The college offered 8 online degrees and certificates to 1,281 (44%) students. The college had an additional 29 students identified as taking courses online that had not declared a specific major with the school (Office of Institutional Research, 2015).

College C has been offering online programs since 2013 and has online master’s degrees and certificates. College C is comprised of six academic departments. Four of the six departments offer online programs with plans to expand in the future. Additionally, this college partner’s with College B in the offering of several online master’s degrees and certificates. In the fall of 2015, College C had a total student enrollment of 4,757 students. The college offered five master’s degrees and certificates to 160 (3%) students. (Office of Institutional Research, 2015).

Table 1 lists the total number of online programs and enrolled students within each of the three colleges, by degree type.
Table 1

*Number of Online Programs and Student Headcount by Degree Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participants**

A total of eleven academic leaders from central administration or collegiate levels were selected for participation in the study. A recruitment email invitation (see Appendix A) was sent to the academic leaders at each of the three colleges, as well as, academic leaders in the central online and eLearning offices in January of 2016. All participants replied to the email invitation and agreed to participate in the study. Participants of the study were asked to participate in interviews, verify interview transcripts, and provide data regarding online operations within their respective units. All participants signed a consent form (See Appendix B), which granted permission for the researcher to utilize the findings of the study. Electronic confirmation of each of the interviews was obtained via the Microsoft Outlook calendar system. Additional administrators and staff were not recruited beyond the eleven participants in the study.

Inclusion criteria for those to be interviewed during the study included individuals who were academic leaders at the college or university central administration levels that provided support to faculty who taught online. Invited participants held one of the following roles: Dean, Associate Dean, Vice-President, Director, or Coordinator of online or eLearning, Chief
Information Officer, Director of Instructional Innovation, Director of Information Technology, and Senior Instructional Designers. Due to the library’s offering of training and professional development resources for faculty, an academic leader from the university’s library was also invited to participate. Library representation respectfully declined as it was stated that participation would not impact the phenomenon studied.

Based on the inclusion criteria above, the sample consisted of a total of eleven participants: three from College A, three from College B, two from College C and three from central offices. Participants were issued pseudonyms to maintain the confidentiality of their testimonies and identity. Participants’ demographic data were gathered through participant completion of a demographics questionnaire (see Appendix E) and reported in Tables 2-4.

The first section of the demographics questionnaire, displayed in Table 2, documented the following participant demographic information, by university affiliation (central eLearning, or college A, B, or C): role in online and eLearning, highest degree attained, gender, age, and race.

Table 2

*Participants’ Pseudonyms and Demographic Characteristics by Affiliation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(pseudonym)</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Jones</td>
<td>Central eLearning</td>
<td>Assistant Vice-President</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Stevens</td>
<td>Central eLearning</td>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Cooper</td>
<td>Central eLearning</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camryn Frye</td>
<td>College A</td>
<td>Assistant Professor and Director</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rafferty</td>
<td>College A</td>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Smith</td>
<td>College A</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hall</td>
<td>College B</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(pseudonym)</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John West</td>
<td>College B</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kemper</td>
<td>College B</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Anders</td>
<td>College C</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NR^a</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Taylor</td>
<td>College C</td>
<td>Senior Instructional Designer</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. "NR = not reported

Five (45%) of the eleven participants were doctoral prepared academic leaders and the remaining six (55%) participants earned master’s degrees. Five of the six (55%) master’s prepared participants were at various stages of doctoral programs ranging from newly admitted student to candidacy. One participant opted to not report (NR) her age on the questionnaire. Based on what is known about the participant, it was assumed she was between 50-60 years of age. All respondents self-reported as being White.

The second section of the demographics questionnaire, displayed in Table 3, captured participants’ years of experience in higher education and at the institution studied. The questionnaire also asked for the number of years participants have been involved in higher education online operations and at the institution studied.
Table 3

Participants’ Higher Education and Online Learning Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(pseudonym) Participant</th>
<th>Higher Education</th>
<th>Higher Education at Institution Studied</th>
<th>Online in Higher Education</th>
<th>Online in Higher Education at Institution Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central eLearning Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Jones</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Stevens</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Cooper</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College A Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camryn Frye</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rafferty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Smith</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College B Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hall</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John West</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kemper</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College C Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Anders</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Taylor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collectively, the participants spent an average of 19 years at IHEs, 14 years at the IHE studied, and ten years in online learning at the institution studied. Five (45%) of the participants have been employed at the institution for more than 15 years. All participants were involved with online learning for ten or more years, with seven (64%) participants involved for 15 years or more.

The final optional section of the demographics questionnaire, displayed in Table 4, was completed by those participants who had experience teaching in higher education, teaching online and teaching online in higher education at the institution studied. The questionnaire captured the number of years of teaching experience for all categories.
Table 4  
Participants’ Higher Education and Online Teaching Experience  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(pseudonym) Participant</th>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Online in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central eLearning Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Jones</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Stevens</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Cooper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College A Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camryn Frye</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rafferty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Smith</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College B Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John West</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kemper</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College C Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Anders</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Taylor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All participants had faculty experience teaching in higher education and averaged twelve years amongst them. Average years of online teaching experience did not parallel overall teaching experience; as the average years of online instruction was six years. Online teaching experience at the institution averaged five years per participant. One participant was new to the institution (less than 1 year) and had not engaged in online teaching but previously taught online for one year at another institution. Another participant taught 20 years in the traditional classroom setting but had not taught online.

The following sections outline components of the study which contributed to the investigation of the phenomena. In this section, an overview of the qualitative case study design, and a review of qualitative data collection and analysis will be discussed.
Qualitative Research Overview

Qualitative research, as defined by Creswell (2013), is an “inquiry process of understanding based on a distinct methodological approach to inquiry that explores a social or human problem” (p. 300). Qualitative research is categorized by the following research qualities: a) conducted in a natural setting, b) captures participant perspectives, and c) researcher as data gathering instrument (Hatch, 2002). In qualitative research, a complex, holistic picture is built through analysis of data collected in a variety of ways.

A naturalistic case occurred as the study was conducted in a real-world setting as participants were observed and interviewed regarding institutional alignment and the phenomena of faculty development for faculty who taught online. Qualitative data was used to identify how colleges offering online learning were both similar and different in the resources, structure, and professional development in place to support online and eLearning operations. Participant perspectives were captured throughout the interview process and in follow-up conversations with participants (Hatch, 2002). Throughout the research project, I was the individual responsible for data collection. As such, the expansive amount of data collected contributed to the richness of the analysis and findings.

Consistent with qualitative research design, several tools (interviews, surveys, artifacts and memos) were used to document the professional development efforts of the IHE (Creswell et al., 2007; Hatch, 2002; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Rubin & Rubin, 2012; Yin, 2009). The products (transcriptions, questionnaire results, memos, and analysis) were utilized to generate themes in the holistic review of institutional alignment.
Research Design

This study utilized a qualitative single-case embedded case study design. Qualitative case study design was used to understand the physical, technological, pedagogical, and administrative resources necessary for creating and sustaining online operations. Case study design was selected as I sought to unveil an in-depth, contextual understanding regarding institutional alignment and support provided to faculty who teach online (Creswell, Hanson, Plano Clark, & Morales-Escoto, 2007; Hatch, 2002; Stake, 2006). This approach was used to provide richness to the data and generate descriptive narratives of the faculty professional development experience (Rubin & Rubin, 2012; Yin, 2009).

Case Study Definition. Creswell (2007) defined qualitative case study in the following way:

Case study research is a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and documents and reports), and reports a case description and case-based themes. (p.73)

Merriam (2009) contended that case studies were also “employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved” (p. 19). Merriam (1998) further affirmed that case studies were “an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single unit or bounded system” (p. 12). The use of a bounded systematic approach was encouraged by qualitative researchers and scholars who cautioned that qualitative research can become unwieldy if boundaries are not employed (Hatch, 2002; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Merriam, 2009; Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). The bounded system for this case study was the
professional development offerings afforded faculty who teach online at a single IHE. The study was also bounded in time, as data was collected from January – April 2016.

Yin (2009) noted that a single-case study approach was justified under several circumstances. He reported five rationales for this approach: a) a critical case used to test a theory; b) an extreme or unique case; c) a representative or typical case; d) a revelatory case, and e) a longitudinal case. The examination of one IHE denoted a representative or typical case, as it was designed to explore the customary professional development offerings of the case. Yin (2009) emphasized that single-case studies “can represent a significant contribution to knowledge and theory building. . . . and can help to refocus future investigations in an entire field” (p. 47).

**Embedded case study.** Yin (2009) contended that embedded case study design was utilized to investigate a single-case with more than one unit of analysis. The embedded units of analysis were three colleges and the central offices of eLearning. The subunits added “significant opportunities for extensive analysis, enhancing the insights into the single case” (p. 52). The selection of a holistic case study design would have narrowed the analysis to a single unit. Instead, the embedded approach and examination of all four subunits professional development provided for more extensive analysis.

This case study approach was appropriate for the investigation as it provided insight to the operation, resources, and support currently offered by the central enterprise and several colleges at one IHE. Further, this case study was designed to unveil the dearth of research regarding intra-institutional alignment of faculty development and generate new knowledge in support of the phenomenon.
**Case Study and Organization Design.** Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design was used to frame the research study. This model highlighted the need for the five primary components of organization design: strategy, structure, processes, rewards, and people to maintain alignment in order for the organization to be positioned for success. Each of the five components were interconnected and relied on the others for the overall operation and effectiveness of the organization.

Figure 4 provided a diagram of the qualitative embedded case study design utilized in the study. I designed this model in alignment with Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design. As such, the case was examined for coherence within the IHE regarding the strategy, structure, process, people, and rewards. The research design was a single-case study regarding one IHE’s approach to professional development for faculty who taught online. An examination and analysis of four key units (central services and three colleges) within the IHE were conducted to determine if institutional alignment existed.
Throughout the study, institutional policy and practice regarding online and eLearning faculty development was examined for congruence with Galbraith’s (1995) model. Namely, the institution and collegiate vision, mission and strategic direction of online and eLearning was investigated for consistency and coherence with eLearning operations and professional development afforded faculty who teach online. Similarly, the hierarchical administrative and support structures were explored. The collegiate infrastructure regarding online operations of the three colleges included in the case was also examined. The processes and operations of the eLearning enterprise were scrutinized to identify similarities, differences, and challenges faced at the institutional and collegiate levels. Gaps in the execution of the strategic plan were unveiled; while exemplary examples of the plan highlighted. Evidence of rewards systems for faculty who embarked in online instruction was documented. Congruent with the model, faculty should be rewarded and acknowledged for their successes and encouraged to share best practices with peers. An in depth review of the professional development orientation and ongoing training offerings afforded faculty who teach online was studied.

Insight to participant views, and intra-institutional support, regarding the professional development available at the IHE were captured via several data sources.

**Data Sources/Instruments**

Case study research involves the exploration of the phenomenon through the use of a variety of data collection tools (Creswell et al., 2007, Hatch, 2002; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Rubin & Rubin, 2012; Yin, 2009). The instruments selected for this research included: participant interviews, demographic questionnaires, and observations within each of the colleges and at the institution level. Secondary data sources such as artifacts, journal entries, and notes were also collected and maintained throughout the study.
The use of multiple qualitative data sources contributed to the case and provided a thick description and sound analysis of the contemporary phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). The use of multiple data sources also helped to uncover strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities of the eLearning infrastructure. The sections that follow provide a description of each of the data sources and instruments that were utilized throughout the study.

**Interviews.** The primary instrument was an interview that consisted of semi-structured interview questions (Merriam, 2009; Rubin & Rubin, 2012) for participant commentary. Two versions of the interview protocol were created; one for college academic leaders (See Appendix C) and one for institution academic leaders (See Appendix D). The interviews consisted of questions that encouraged participants to share their perceptions and experiences about the institutional resources and professional development preparation available to faculty in support of institution online and eLearning. Questions were positioned to examine alignment of university and unit mission, vision, online infrastructure and operations, process used for selection of faculty development offerings, and orientation offered in support of faculty as they transition to online instructors. Follow-up probes to the initial questions were used in search of deeper meaning and to unveil online and eLearning systems in place. This approach was useful as it uncovered rich data in support of the study’s primary research question (Rubin & Rubin, 2012; Merriam, 2009).

The interview protocol was designed in partnership with two peers that have been involved in online learning operations, instruction, and course design at the institution for more than five years. Both individuals were in pivotal leadership roles regarding online and eLearning at their respective colleges. Further, the interview protocol was approved by the Institutional Research Board (IRB) and the dissertation committee for this study.
The interviews took between 45-103 minutes to complete and were conducted in the setting of the participant’s choice, namely participants’ offices, during spring 2016. The interview consisted of questions that encouraged participants to share their perceptions and knowledge about online and eLearning systems, professional development afforded faculty, and infrastructure at the institution. The protocol consisted of semi-structured open-ended interview questions (Merriam, 2009) that were digitally captured using the *Speak Write* audio recorder app.

**Demographics Questionnaire.** Participants completed a demographics questionnaire (See Appendix E) just prior to their participation in the recorded interview. The demographics questionnaire provided self-reported information regarding each participant in the sample. The demographics questionnaire was divided into three sections and was developed by the researcher. The questionnaire documented the following participant demographic information: university affiliation (central eLearning, or college A, B, or C), role in online and eLearning at the IHE reviewed, highest degree attained, gender, age, and race. The questionnaire also documented participants’ years of operational and instructional experience both in higher education and at the IHE studied.

**Observations.** Throughout the study I observed university online and eLearning stakeholders at university-wide meetings and gained additional insight into the thoughts and perceptions regarding online and eLearning infrastructure and professional development. The observations were naturalistic, as I observed behavior as it occurred naturally in the real world (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). Table 5 represents the campus meetings attended and the focus of each meeting. Participation in meetings shed light on the behavioral patterns and beliefs academic leaders held regarding online and eLearning.
Table 5

Participation in Online and Professional Development Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Focus of Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/26</td>
<td>Online Learner Success Committee</td>
<td>Collaborated on new online student readiness assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>Meeting with the Dean</td>
<td>Partnered with the Dean regarding a presentation she gave to the Council of Deans’s regarding best practices in online program launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>Online Learner Success Committee</td>
<td>Smarter Measures readiness demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>Speaker Series Training</td>
<td>Attended session regarding teaching strategies to improve active learning and increase engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>eLearning Governance – Online Learning Subcommittee</td>
<td>Collaborated with online faculty and administrators in the development of university template for new program submission to Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>eLearning Focus Group</td>
<td>Participated in strategic planning session to inform future faculty development offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28</td>
<td>Faculty Governance</td>
<td>Attended meeting where faculty discussed online pedagogical training needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>IT Governance eLearning Committee</td>
<td>Attended meeting regarding process for selecting new technological tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>eLearning Governance – Instructional Design/Pedagogy Subcommittee</td>
<td>Attended meeting regarding training documentation and development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Artifacts.** Artifacts were utilized as evidence in support of the online and eLearning infrastructure and faculty professional development opportunities at the institution. Artifacts are objects that have been intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose (Hilpinnen, 2011). Schwartz and Jacobs (as cited in Hatch, 2002) explained that artifacts were “indicators and non-reactive measures” of the phenomenon studied (p. 25). Consistent with Galbraith’s Star Model (1995) of organization design, artifacts of the institution and unit online and eLearning infrastructures were studied (See Appendix F for a list of artifacts). The artifacts provided
documentation of the strategies, structures, processes, rewards and people resources in existence at the institution. The availability of institution artifacts varied amongst the units in the case. A discussion of each follows.

**Institutional artifacts.** At the institution level, artifacts were obtained from the following offices: Office of the President, Office of the Provost, Office of Institutional Research (IR), Offices of eLearning, Faculty Professional Development, and Information Technology, university chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Faculty Senate and various university online and eLearning task forces and committees. The artifact data obtained from these websites provided an overview of the online and eLearning infrastructure at the institution and contributed to the trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of the study.

Institutional artifacts were gathered from the corresponding websites for each of the entities above. Additionally, participants and staff from each area in the central administration provided documentation, which filled gaps in what was published on the websites (i.e. comprehensive list of professional development offerings and enrollment and evaluation of professional development). Documents and reports provided the following data: institution mission, vision, strategic plans, organization charts, annual reports, attendance logs from professional development trainings, minutes from meetings, ad hoc reports, faculty AAUP bargaining contract, enrollment reports, the range of class offerings, technological resources, and the training and resources in place supporting online and eLearning operations.

**College Artifacts.** College, or unit, artifacts were gathered from each of the three colleges’ primary websites, as well as, subdomain websites (i.e. Office of the Dean, Administration, instructional design, information technology, Office of Student Affairs, and Faculty Governance). Additionally, participants and staff from each college provided
documentation, which filled gaps in what was published on the websites (i.e. self-study reports, lists of online courses offered each term, faculty assignments, list of professional development offerings, enrollment and evaluation of professional development). Documents and reports provided the following data: college mission, vision, strategic plans, organization charts, annual reports, attendance logs from professional development trainings, minutes from college-wide meetings, enrollment reports, the range of class offerings, technological resources, and the training and resources in place supporting online and eLearning operations.

Memoing. Memos were written throughout the research experience to document my thoughts, concerns, and experiences regarding the phenomenon. Specifically, memos were noted during the following phases of the study: development of the literature review, participant interviews, post-interview reflections, during data collection of artifacts, and throughout data analysis. Bogdan and Biklen (2007) encouraged researchers to take memo field notes that captured the subjective side of the research journey. Memoing allowed me to account for speculation, bias, feelings, and problems relative to the study. Memos were also a data source that allowed for the documentation of potential revisions to the design and were a way to capture my thoughts about potential theme development.

Memos were created and integrated into the study to assist in the development of themes and to contribute to the analysis of data (Charmaz, 2006). Memos did not provide details within a structure or framework. Instead, memos consisted of the sporadic capturing of researcher’s thoughts and ideas about the phenomenon studied. While the content of the memos were relevant to the study, a verbatim translation was not always incorporated.
Table 6 represents the way data sources and instruments were used to support the research questions addressed throughout the study. Overall, an examination of academic leadership’s efforts to provide a collegial, supportive environment that provided opportunities for development was explored.

Table 6

Data Sources for a Qualitative Case Study at one IHE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Question 1:** In what ways is one institution’s eLearning vision and mission actualized across multiple colleges? | • Formal semi-structured interviews  
| | • Informal telephone and in-person follow-up conversations  
| | • Observations of administrators, faculty, and staff at university and college level meetings regarding online learning, eLearning, and faculty development  
| | • Artifacts – Institution and college websites, minutes from meetings, institutional reports (i.e., eLearning, enrollment reports, class offerings, training, resources) and email communications  
| | • Memos or reflective journals |
| **Question 2:** In what ways do eLearning professional development offerings align with the institution’s eLearning vision and mission? | • Formal semi-structured interviews  
| | • Informal telephone and in-person follow-up conversations  
| | • Observations of administrators, faculty, and staff at university and college level meetings regarding online learning, eLearning, and faculty development  
| | • Artifacts – Institution and college websites, minutes from meetings, institutional reports (i.e., eLearning, enrollment reports, class offerings, training, resources) and email communications  
| | • Memos or reflective journals |
## Data Sources for a Qualitative Case Study at one IHE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Question 3:** In what ways do administrators know what faculty professional development (PD) needs best serve faculty consumers? | • Formal semi-structured interviews  
• Informal telephone and in-person follow-up conversations regarding faculty satisfaction and application of PD tools and strategies  
• Observations of administrators, faculty, and staff at university and college level meetings regarding application and usefulness of online and eLearning pedagogies and strategies  
• Artifacts – minutes from faculty governance meetings, college professional development reports and evaluations  
• Memos or reflective journals |
| **Question 4:** What factors contribute to the selection of eLearning resources utilized in the eLearning enterprise? | • Formal semi-structured interviews  
• Informal telephone and in-person conversations with administrators, faculty and staff regarding innovative best practices and solutions  
• Observations of administrators, faculty, and staff at university and college level meetings regarding selection of online and eLearning pedagogical and technological resources  
• Artifacts – Institution and college websites, institutional reports, eLearning and technology committee minutes, and email communications |

### Data Collection – Procedure

Collecting qualitative data involves “asking, watching, and reviewing” the data (Merriam, 2009, p. 85). The data examined in this way consisted of: interviews, demographic questionnaires, observations and artifacts conducted or obtained within each of the colleges and at the institution level. Memos and journal reflections were maintained throughout the study.

Data collection took place concurrently through the documentation of researcher notes and reflections, as well as, during the gathering of subunit data.
The primary instrument utilized in the study was a semi-structured interview protocol. The use of interviews in qualitative studies helps the researcher to examine the case from the perspectives of others (Patton, 2002). In person, recorded interviews took place in each of the participants’ offices in February and March 2016. Interviews were recorded on two devices, an iPad and iPhone using the *Speak Write* app. A back-up recording was available in case one device failed to properly record the interviews. Prior to the start of each interview, participants signed a consent form (see Appendix B), which authorized the recording of the session. At the same time, participants also completed a brief questionnaire (see Appendix E), which captured demographic information such as: race, level of degree, and years of experience in higher education and online and eLearning. It should be noted that none of the participants expressed discomfort and they had the ability to opt out of the study at any time.

Artifacts were also gathered from the websites and staff of the three colleges, the Office of the President, Office of the Provost, Office of Institutional Research (IR), Offices of eLearning, Faculty Professional Development, and Information Technology, university chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Faculty Senate and various university online and eLearning task forces and committees. The gathering of institution and collegiate artifacts facilitated a holistic review of the online and eLearning landscape at the institution studied.

**Data Management**

Extra care was given to the privacy of participants and the storage of research data. To maintain confidentiality, participants’ were assigned a pseudonym (see Table 2). Participants’ real names were separated from their interview responses so that no particular response could be linked to any particular individual. Only my faculty advisor and I were allowed to de-identify...
the data and respond to participants questions regarding the research interview. I maintained a master list of participants with corresponding pseudonyms, which was secured, in a locked drawer in my office. Electronic records of the data were also saved on an external hard drive securely locked in my home office. Additionally, personally identifiable data was masked so participants were not easily identifiable.

The research data will be kept until the completion of my dissertation and defense. It is my expectation that I will complete my dissertation by the end of summer 2016. The data will be stored in a locked secure file cabinet in my office. Five years after the conclusion of the study the data will be shredded and destroyed.

Data Analysis

The data consisted of participant interviews, a demographic survey, artifacts, notes regarding informal conversations and observations, and researcher memoing. The data was collected and analyzed concurrently using the constant comparative cyclical method. This method involved gathering data, looking for key issues or reoccurring events, collecting more data, analyzing emergent categories, generating codes, gathering more data and so on (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Creswell’s model for conducting qualitative analysis (as cited in Plano Clark, 2014) is depicted in Figure 5: Constant Comparison Data Collection and Analysis. This approach to data analysis required the ongoing review of data as it was gathered; rather than a cumulative review once all data was collected. This iterative process allowed for the emergence of themes (Hatch, 2002), which informed next steps in data collection. The utilization of this process provided for the organization of data in a streamlined methodical way.
In preparation of data analysis, the interviews were transcribed by the *Casting Words* professional transcription service. Each interview was checked for transcription accuracy and quality by comparing the transcription document with the audio recording. Further, the audio from each interview was replayed while reading the printed transcript. During the accuracy checks, I edited the transcriptions to ensure the precise accounting of the interviews. Member checks (Merriam, 2009) were conducted with participants to confirm the transcriptions were correct.

During the transcription reviews, memos or notes were documented in the margins (Merriam, 2009) to capture the emphasis and emotion of the participants, as well as, reflections of the researcher. The memos and notes were utilized in coding and data analysis. The memos also provided content regarding emergent themes and topics of interest that were included in the findings of Chapter 4 and the discussion in Chapter 5.
Throughout the study, I utilized a typological descriptive open-coding approach (Creswell et al., 2007; Hatch, 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2012) to interpret all data sources (interview transcriptions, observations, artifacts and reflective memos) using professional development as the typology and the five components of Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design as themes. This approach to data analysis was congruent with the social constructivist paradigm which supported thematic generation (Charmaz, 2006). Specifically, the data was broken into the following typologies, or categories: strategy (institutional eLearning vision and mission), structure (administrative leadership and support), processes (analyses of eLearning systems and operations), rewards (incentives and recognition), and people (hiring and selection, online learning preparation, professional development, and institutional resources).

All the data was reviewed multiple times to familiarize myself with the content and form conceptual patterns in the data. The data was hand-coded to allow for immersion in the data and to capture emergent categories and themes (Hatch, 2002). All data was systematically reviewed and organized. The data was broken down into smaller units or categories by relevance to Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design. The data was coded and synthesized, as I searched for patterns within the data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). I utilized this system of coding in my analysis and interpretation of the data. A code table summarizing the primary themes and subthemes is provided in Table 7: Qualitative Typological Interview Codes.
### Qualitative Typological Interview Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Code</th>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Vision and Mission Alignment</td>
<td>“Our mission is to provide faculty with the most innovative instructional design and instructional technology services.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Our goal, now, is to reach even more faculty per department.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“create a brand.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“it [college design team mission] supports the third century mission directly.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Competitive Edge</td>
<td>“I think because we are in such a competitive environment….they are very goal-driven and results-oriented ...and want to be the best!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“need for value add… and differentiation in the market.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>“How are we going to get to that next level of innovation?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We want to add more visual imagery to our courses.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“…things we did 15 years ago, we don’t do any more.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Commitment to Quality</td>
<td>“Our faculty want to be the best at their craft.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Quality goes up, faculty confidence goes up, and then we can justify why we spend money on stipends or incentives.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>“We have three teams….the most prominent team is our ID team.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We have a Steering Committee.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We stood up an E-technology Steering Committee with three arms – communication, research, and teaching and learning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Silos</td>
<td>“We are still siloed. We need to break down those walls and partner on projects.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualitative Typological Interview Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Code</th>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Transitional Period</td>
<td>“…recently had a change of leadership within the college.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“the university is in a transitional phase right now.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>“Technology is an enabler for online learning, but not a driver of it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We know that a one-size solution doesn’t fit everything.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Scalability</td>
<td>“I think the biggest challenge for us is growing the infrastructure as our programs grow.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We’re trying to launch new programs according to market need, according to the growth we think is sustainable, and refine our existing programs as needed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“There are some systems that probably need to be supported at the enterprise level so that as a university we get economies of scale.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Central Leadership</td>
<td>“There is uncertainty that if we leave faculty development to the central team…we worry if it will be supported.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Financial Investment</td>
<td>“The university…doesn’t always scale up the amount of resources that we need to be successful.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We’re pulling together ID resources for both groups, in-seat and online…requiring greater investment in the college”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“…the resources at the university level are very limited.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“sometimes the colleges need something the university can’t offer.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualitative Typological Interview Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Code</th>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resource Allocation</strong></td>
<td>“I don’t have the funding to be able to do some of the things we need to in support of the faculty.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“…there are the ‘haves’ and the ‘have nots’.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Course Design and Standardization</strong></td>
<td>“The TPACK model basically incorporates technology experts, instructional design experts, and the content knowledge experts [faculty] and or pedagogical experts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We developed an online template that looks consistent from one course to another.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“the layout is exactly the same in all course.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Duplication</strong></td>
<td>“We can’t do it [help desk support] as well...need to concentrate on our resources and the things we can do well without being duplicative.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“You can’t release a new technology to 13 different colleges…and have each college develop training tools.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intellectual Property</strong></td>
<td>“We do not pay for content development, we pay for intellectual property.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“This is intellectual property. You can’t just take it and use it as your own.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Networks</strong></td>
<td>“I think developing relationships is key with similar people across the university.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We offer our two week orientation program to another college on campus.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scaffolding</strong></td>
<td>“We do it [professional development] in baby steps. It’s like crawl, walk, run!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We provide beginning, intermediate, and advanced Blackboard training for all our faculty.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualitative Typological Interview Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Code</th>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td>Best Practices</td>
<td>“We require all our faculty to have their course content ready to go day one.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We recommend that they either take the Quality Matters program or receive training in the course development process.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“…weekend office hours.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>“We launched a new website loaded with tools …and we are trying to drive faculty to the website so they see what is available to them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Students…want a different level of feedback and different level of responsiveness.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“communication is always a challenge.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of Professional Development</td>
<td>“We do a customer service survey”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We have done formal evaluations with our institutes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rewards</strong></td>
<td>Inter-collegiate collaboration</td>
<td>“The benefit of having a university is having subject matter experts available to enhance courses and programs.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We’re partnering with four other colleges.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rewards</strong></td>
<td>Compensation and Incentives</td>
<td>“We compensate faculty for course development and we pay them for instruction…increasing the cost of online delivery.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“…usually have to pay a stipend, or give some type of reward.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The faculty earned either a laptop, or some other piece of technology equipment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rewards</strong></td>
<td>Peer Support</td>
<td>“They [faculty] decided to set up a Faculty Forum.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“we try to get them a mentor who is experienced in online teaching.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Qualitative Typological Interview Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Code</th>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
<td>“I tell faculty to look at student satisfaction data. Based on my feedback every semester, I usually make a tweak to my class.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>Faculty Buy-in and Acceptance</td>
<td>“We have technology champions...that don’t just teach online. But, they set up all their classes in Blackboard so they can maximize the use of class time.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We’re having conversations around how we can get non-adopters onboard.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Practices</td>
<td>Training, Development, and Documentation</td>
<td>“We [the university] spent lots of money and rolled out this product, but provided zero training.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“[central] told us that it’s the units’ responsibility to train and support all the centrally deployed tools.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“everyone is developing their tools separately.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Practices</td>
<td>Faculty Development at the College Level</td>
<td>“My responsibility is to my faculty.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Practices</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>“Faculty participate in a two-week course where we give them all the basics of designing an online course and provide methods for being successful online.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We also have self-paced tools that are functional based...tips, guides, tutorials.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Practices</td>
<td>Team Approach and Trust</td>
<td>“We’ll trust you to build the content. Give us the content, and trust us to present it in a pedagogically sound way”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We need to help them [faculty] ... because they are busy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“…we all work together.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“it wasn’t about them, it was with them.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Typological Interview Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Code</th>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People Practices</td>
<td>Instructional Improvement</td>
<td>“We have to improve the quality of teaching of everybody, not just our online faculty.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“...develop a depth of faculty skills in online.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Practices</td>
<td>Community of Practice</td>
<td>“Integration of our instructional design team with other instructional designers across the campus is critical.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We need to have a recognized community of practice where we can share our processes...so faculty have options to choose from.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“...we create more advanced resources and share them with everybody”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The identified themes will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4. Interview excerpts will provide additional clarity regarding the level of intra-institutional alignment that exists in support of faculty who teach online at the IHE.

The last section of this chapter addresses the trustworthiness of the study.

Trustworthiness

In order to prohibit possible threats to the validity of this study, triangulation strategies (Creswell, 2011) were also utilized to contribute to the trustworthiness of the data and analysis. Triangulation techniques are often used by qualitative researchers to substantiate evidence obtained from multiple data sources (Creswell, 2011). Miles and Huberman (1994) defined triangulation as “a way to get to the finding in the first place – by seeing or hearing multiple instances of it from different sources by using different methods and by squaring the finding with others it needs to be squared with” (p. 267). Further triangulation is employed by qualitative researchers whose work is framed with a constructivist lens (Merriam, 2009).
Triangulation strategies were substantiated through the integration and coherence of data obtained from participant interviews, institutional artifacts, and memos. Specifically, Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) methods of determining trustworthiness of qualitative studies was integrated with this study.

In Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) seminal work on qualitative evaluative methods they introduced criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of a study. In order for a study to be deemed trustworthy the study should have established credibility (confidence in the truth), transferability (applicable in other contexts), dependability (consistent and replicable), and confirmability (researcher neutrality). The study was conducted and analyzed in accordance with Lincoln and Guba’s evaluative criteria.

**Credibility.** Credibility was established through the accurate and true representation of facts revealed by participants and via institutional artifacts throughout the study. Accuracy of participant testimonies was obtained through participant feedback and agreement regarding the identified codes. Accuracy of findings was verified through the member checks (Maxwell, 2013; Merriam, 2009) process. Member checking referred to the “verification or extension of information developed by the researcher” (Hatch, 2002, p. 92). The verification of information took place as interviewees were asked to review the transcript of their interview and provide feedback and edits as appropriate. Feedback and comments were collected via e-mail and in some instances the narrative was modified to correctly represent participant views. This extra step ensured the accurate account of interviewees’ statements and contributions. Participants were also sent a summary of codes and related responses to review. Substantive feedback was reviewed and modifications to the coding were not necessary.
**Transferability.** The research design used in the study might be *transferable* to other higher education contexts and settings where faculty transition to new modes of teaching and where online instruction is prevalent. Due to the unique contextual nature of each IHE, it is unlikely that the findings of this study will hold true for other IHEs. Some of the themes uncovered in the findings of other studies may be similar; however the findings of this study were specific to the institution examined.

Other IHEs could conduct similar investigations of intra-institutional alignment of professional development offerings in support of faculty who teach online. The research study was also designed in a way that might be transferrable to preparation and professional development offerings in support of teacher’s transitioning to online instruction at elementary and secondary levels.

**Dependability.** The research design and analysis were *dependable* as the framework was integrated consistently through the study. The study could be replicated and implemented in different settings and at other IHEs. In addition to the framework utilized throughout the study, a second qualitative researcher was used to add to the dependability of the research. Peer assistance, or consultation with experts (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Merriam, 2009), was used in the research process as a measure to ensure internal validity. A doctoral prepared colleague with experience in qualitative research served as an additional reviewer. I provided my peer reviewer with a description of Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model, which included a description of each component of the theory. I also provided a framework for typological coding. We discussed the theory to ensure understanding of each of the components. The peer randomly selected two interviews and independently coded them according to the five components of Galbraith’s (1995) Star model of organization design. We compared the themes and codes each derived from the
data and confirmed inter-coder reliability (Bernard & Ryan, 2010). The utilization of an additional coder provided credibility, dependability, and confirmability that the analysis was consistent and that the same major themes were revealed (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Merriam, 2009). This approach increased the reliability and confidence of the identified themes.

**Confirmability.** Extra effort was taken to ensure *confirmability* throughout the study as I worked to ensure the study was researcher neutral and that bias was limited, identified, and documented in the researcher memos, reflective journals, and in the margins of interview transcripts. Notations were made throughout the data collection and analysis processes to identify bias as it occurred. Bracketing techniques were used to document my thoughts and assumptions as I navigated the process of discovery.

The utilization of Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) strategies in qualitative research provided for triangulation amongst the data and increased the overall trustworthiness of the findings (Creswell & Miller, 2000, Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 2009).

**Concluding Remarks**

This qualitative embedded case study examined an institution’s plan and progress in helping higher education faculty teach online. The chapter provided definitions of qualitative research and case and embedded case study. Rationale for the selection of this methodology was provided. An outline of the case study design was provided along with a depiction of the model. Qualitative data analysis was conducted using typological themes and codes (Creswell et al., 2007; Hatch, 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Additional qualitative components of the dissertation including ethical considerations and trustworthiness were discussed.
The next chapter will provide a holistic and descriptive narrative of the findings and results gleaned from the research study. The findings will be interpreted as related to the research questions. Analyses and interpretation of all data sources will be documented to display the qualitative themes.
Chapter 4: Findings

Throughout the qualitative single-case embedded study, three colleges and central institutional eLearning offices were examined to identify similarities and differences in faculty training and support. Further, an objective of the study was to investigate the physical, technological, pedagogical and administrative resources necessary for creating and sustaining online operations. A review of intra-institutional support and systems helped to identify best-practices occurring on campus in an effort to understand the professional development training opportunities in support of faculty as they transition from face-to-face instructors to online instructors.

The findings of the study provide a “look inside” one institution’s systems and processes in support of faculty who taught online. The data collected during this investigation provided insight to the primary research question: What professional development opportunities do three colleges afford faculty who teach online? Interviews with institution and collegiate level academic leaders, a review of institutional artifacts, observations of eLearning meetings, and researcher memos cast a light on the institutional alignments with Galbraith’s Star Model of Organization Design (1995).

Throughout the chapter, an intra-institutional analysis of themes and sub-themes will be explained. The findings from all data sources revealed an overlap of some institutional infrastructural components while coherence in other areas related to the professional development offerings available to faculty were sparse.

The findings of the study were organized in alignment with Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design, which asserts that successful organizations are those in which
strategic, structural, process, reward, and people systems operate in alignment. Below are my findings in correlation to Galbraith’s Model.

**Strategy**

The first category of findings involves strategy. Strategy refers to the overall direction of an organization, and is comprised of the organization’s vision, mission, and goals (Galbraith, 1995). Relative to this component, I constructed five sub-themes/categories from the data: 1) vision and mission alignment, 2) competitive edge, 3) innovation, 4) collegiality, and 5) commitment to quality. Evidence of these sub-themes is included in the sections that follow.

**Vision and Mission Alignment.** In the examination of institutional and individual unit missions, academic leaders’ were interviewed to ascertain how professional development offerings were meeting the needs of faculty while a review of institutional artifacts was also conducted.

At the time of the study, the institution was nearing its third century of operation and a number of strategic committees and task forces were created to re-envision the focus of the institution as it moved forward. The result of these efforts was a new vision:

The [insert university name] serves the people of [insert state], the nation, and the world as a premier, public, urban research university dedicated to undergraduate, graduate, and professional education, experience-based learning, and research. We are committed to excellence and diversity in our students, faculty, staff, and all of our activities. We provide an inclusive environment where innovation and freedom of intellectual inquiry flourish. Through scholarship, service, partnerships, and leadership, we create opportunity, develop educated and engaged citizens, enhance the economy and enrich our university, city, state and global community.
To this end, the university developed a strategic plan to actualize the vision and identified five pillars of excellence required to achieve and support the vision; Excellence in eLearning was identified as one of the five pillars. Acknowledgement of the work required to achieve such excellence was investment in a unified vision, strategy, organization and business model; innovative, collaborative and student-centered ecosystem; enhanced infrastructure to support and enable innovation; and innovative faculty development and partnerships (Creating our third century, 2012). As part of the plan, the institution committed to the allocation of $3.32M in support of faculty hiring and professional development.

In concert, the Faculty Development Review Committee (FDRC) published a report outlining institutional effort required to achieve professional development outcomes (2012). According to the report, successful faculty development programs

- inspire faculty to higher levels of achievement in teaching, scholarship, and leadership, and require and support continuing education in these professional development areas
- provide the means to meet the demands of all phases of career development
- implement the vision of the faculty, the unit, and the university
- promote constructive and innovative projects
- encourage risk-taking
- assess performance
- reward fulfillment and success

To achieve these outcomes, a successful faculty development program would need to support institutional priorities as well as those that are unique to individuals, academic programs, and colleges (FDRC, 2012, p. 3). Further, the university’s collective bargaining agreement (AAUP,
2013-2016, Article 24, Section 24.1, p. 123) supported professional development to improve the quality of teaching, service, scholarship and leadership in support of faculty as they aimed to reach their full potential. This section of the contract did not require faculty to engage in professional development. The intent of the section was to make funding available for faculty to attend professional conferences, trainings, and workshops. Per the agreement, the institution provided a minimum of $225,000 annually, in support of centrally sponsored faculty development.

The Faculty Senate also developed a task force that generated recommendations regarding best practices in online education. Key findings were as follows:

1. Faculty must be integrally involved in decisions related to online teaching (i.e., IT/ID personnel, work load policies, faculty development, etc.);
2. Units must work to align curricular, workload, and other relevant expectations (e.g., Intellectual Property and FERPA);
3. Institution and its various units need to continue to provide needed support commensurate with the expectations of online teaching and to increase that support where necessary;
4. Faculty and administrators at all levels must work to clarify practices and policies relating to online learning and to document them where appropriate;
5. A Faculty Senate committee, or subcommittee, focused on online education must be formed to insure that the recommendations of the Task Force are promoted (Faculty Senate report, 2014-15, p. 21).
In addition to the task force report, the Faculty Senate issued a resolution (May, 2015) which charged unit level administration and faculty to develop a policy for distance learning courses and programs that met the following guidelines:

1. Ensure adequate training of all faculty prior to teaching distance learning courses;
2. Provide appropriate support of faculty with the unit, division, or college;
3. Clarify workload expectations for DL courses, including relative obligations of faculty and facilitators within large enrollment classes;
4. Identify faculty as having primary control of course content;
5. Ensure protection of faculty Intellectual Property;
6. Clarify the role of ID/IT support personnel;
7. Identify the criteria for determining the creation of DL courses;
8. Identify the maximum students per instructor/facilitator in DL courses;
9. Align, where appropriate, DL course/program expectations with face-to-face course/program.
10. Identify how DL courses/programs will be assessed and improved on an ongoing basis.

In support of the Faculty Senate resolution and task force report, Aaron Jones, Assistant Vice-President for eLearning, declared that central services would be addressing the concerns that faculty outlined in the report. “Those 10, that's a focus area for us. Those are barriers for us to move forward with faculty in a significant way. If we can address those 10, I think we can move along faster than we are now”.

Commiserate with the institution’s central mission and vision related to online learning,
the central eLearning offices and units have implemented strategic plans and initiatives, at the
instructional design levels, in support of the institution’s plan. Participant testimonies and
review of individual college websites did not reflect a formalized unit level mission and vision
related to online learning and support of faculty. Dr. Smith, Dean of College A, shared that due
to being a college with four schools, the college didn’t have a formalized vision or mission
statement related to online learning or faculty development; however, the college operated with
the following values: “commitment to innovation and being ahead of the curve, pursuit of
partnerships, embracing diversity, need to be leaders, and need to create a supportive
environment.”

Concurrently, the central eLearning offices were immersed in strategic planning and
mission, vision development. The primary central office was created two years earlier and the
primary faculty development office was being reorganized under new leadership. As such, the
primary central office did not have a formalized mission or vision statement regarding online
learning in support of the institution’s third century goals. The university’s primary faculty
development office operated with the following mission, “To provide support for excellent
teaching & learning, assessment, and career development for faculty and university initiatives
that result in more effective teaching & research, stronger student learning, and higher
satisfaction among all faculty” (Annual Report, 2012). There was also concern, at the college
level, that central offices were not making effective strides toward achieving the institution’s
third century goals. Elizabeth, Associate Director of Online Learning from College B, shared,
“This is why I say that Third century goals are there. I think they're good goals. But, I think
they're very much in theory and not in practice right now. The central units do not see
themselves as serving the college units.”
The three colleges included in the study all had collegiate level mission statements which guided the operations of the college. For example, College A’s mission statement was:

The [insert college name] is committed to the pursuit of discovery and excellence in research, teaching, and service that addresses real world challenges and opportunities to create positive social change. We prepare students to maximize their ability to have a positive impact and to be contributing members to society.

While the mission statement provided context to the college’s strategic plan, the mission statement did not specifically include a charge regarding online or eLearning. However, one of the school’s in College A did, have the following IT vision and mission statement:

The vision was, ‘to advance society through the discovery and integration of applied computing technologies that leverage the power of information’. The mission was to ‘empower individuals to become passionate, solution-minded Information Technology professionals by fostering: continuous innovation, research, leadership development, interdisciplinary problem solving, and real-world experience’.

The three colleges did not have unit level mission or vision statements related to online learning. However, two of the instructional design (ID) teams within the colleges had vision and mission statements related to online learning in support of faculty. College A did not have such a vision or mission. Elizabeth, from College B, shared the college’s instructional design vision statement:

To strategically prepare, motivate, and empower faculty and administrators to create and deliver innovative student centered learning experiences, resulting in students meeting learning outcomes while positioning the (insert college name) to embrace change in a rapidly evolving field.
Similarly, Carol, Senior Instructional Designer from College C, shared:

Our mission is to provide faculty with the most innovative instructional design and instructional technology services. We're devoted to supporting faculty in the design and development of instructional resources for both online and hybrid courses.

Both of these mission and vision statements were in alignment and support the institution’s goal toward eLearning excellence. Elizabeth added, “I think it does support this third century mission very directly, but I think it's more at the college level in practice, where at the university third century level, it feels more theory.” Further, Harry Stevens, Vice-President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, shared:

You have to connect it to the core mission of programs, departments, and the university.

You have to connect it to learning outcomes with students, and you have to connect it to faculty success, faculty engagement. If you're not doing those things and all the other things are for naught.

The alignment of institutional vision, mission, and strategic plans were indicators viewed valuable by the participants. Coherence amongst the units regarding the institution’s commitment to eLearning excellence was prevalent. All units were aware of the institution’s focus and commitment to online programming and the infusion of technology in all classrooms.

Due to the expansive nature and ongoing emergence of online programs, academic leaders expressed the importance of the institution to maintain a competitive edge that differentiates the institution from others.

**Competitive Edge.** The data revealed that the current landscape in IHEs had become increasingly competitive as prospective college students “shop” for degrees at hundreds of IHEs in search of the one that meets their educational needs, offers the program in a way that
suits their learning preferences, and correlates to the demands of their lives (Stavredes & Herder, 2013). Dr. Stevens, Vice-President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer for the university asserted “That's where you have to make it meaningful for students because they have more choice. You are not the only game in town anymore.” In order for the institution to remain competitive it needed to be willing to change and needed to provide added value to the field. Dr. Kemper, Dean from College B stated, “The minute you say, “We’ve got the market and we are going to just rest on our laurels - you're not going to have it for very long.” Similarly, John, Director of Educational Technology and Instructional Support in College B, shared that a key accomplishment of his college was its “willingness to change according to need.” College B academic leaders acknowledged that programs that have been in existence for a long time needed to be refreshed and updated to maintain their competitive edge. John added:

We evolve with the times. Things that we do great today, we may have to change tomorrow. Because everything we knew has completely changed and evolved in different ways. So, just be flexible.

Dr. Anders, Associate Dean of Online Learning at College C, affirmed, “ Figure out what the value add is and how your program will be differentiated in the market – then provide it, and do it well.” She further added that “students are choosing to align with those schools that may also have reputations for their face-to-face programs, and those reputations carry forward.”

To maintain its competitive edge, the institution also needed to be good at forecasting which programs would be in demand; and to do so in a cohesive manner. Dr. Stevens, Chief Innovation Officer, touted that “students want an Amazon-like experience and have very high standards for what they think their education should provide.” Aaron, Assistant Vice-President
for eLearning, continued, part of that plan could involve “developing an experience for online learners that are individualized for their needs.”

Carol, from College C, shared that faculty in her college were very goal-driven, results-oriented, and enjoyed friendly competition amongst their peers to be the best, and do their best. Faculty did not like getting below par evaluation scores and proactively asked “what do I need to do to make this better?” Faculty knew that students had a choice when it comes to selecting an institution, program, or instructor, and wanted to be the first choice.

**Innovation.** Academic leaders at the institutional level recognized the need for the institution to remain at the forefront of online learning best practices and adjust strategic efforts according to changes in the higher education landscape. Dr. Stevens, Vice-President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer for the university, encouraged academic leaders to remain informed and stay abreast of online trends and shared, “This is constantly changing. This is dynamic. What worked two years ago is going to change.” The need to adjust instructional practices according to educational advancement was further supported by consumers. Camryn, Assistant Professor and eLearning Director from College A, also confirmed, “We have to listen to the public and deliver programs in ways consistent with their expectations….We'll start getting obsolete real quick if we are not responsive to the wider community and what they expect higher education to be.”

In alignment with innovative efforts was the idea that institutions would be well-served to design content for mobile devices. Students wanted to access course materials whenever and wherever they were. Students wanted to engage with the content on their cell phones and tablets. John, Director of Educational Technology and Instructional Support from College B, affirmed:
This is the primary way that students get their information and the way they want to learn. They don’t want to be in front of a desktop computer or laptop. They want to be able to pull out an assignment and do it completely on their phone.

To this end, academic leaders at the institution supported the need to be “cutting edge” while maintaining appropriate levels of support for faculty. Dr. Stevens continued:

It's really about transformation and change. But you can only go where the resources and the faculty want to go. You have to have reasonable incremental steps, otherwise you stress out the whole ecosystem that's learning. It's not easy because the culture and the needs and the expectations of faculty in all the programs differ tremendously.

Participants shared that technological innovations had the potential to enhance the student experience and expand faculty teaching strategies. Curriculum could be elevated through the immersion of innovative digital technologies and course delivery tools. Carol, Senior Instructional Designer from College C, shared:

We want to add more imaging in our courses…. We also need more video. I do think it's time to maybe do some conceptual videos like with GoAnimate or Articulate, also maybe some interactive videos like some branched scenarios or things like that to create and stimulate more complex activities in problem solving.

Similarly, Dr. Smith, Dean from College A, shared his college’s strategic effort to enrich engagement with content. At the time of the study, College A recently hired a digital designer to implement augmentative texts into the learning environment. Augmentative text application involved the embedding of code into pictures so that when students used their mobile devices to click on an image, it would bring the image to life. This innovative strategy could be used in both face-to-face and online courses. This technology could be utilized in most disciplines and was aimed at enriching content and application of concepts. Dr. Smith shared, “We are always
pushing the envelope in this college to see what we can do differently with instruction. I want to be on the front end of it - not having something happen to us – rather intentionally shaping it.”

In addition to strategic innovative efforts, participants emphasized the importance of the institution hosting online academic programs and professional development training of the highest quality.

**Commitment to Quality.** Central to the university’s strategic plan was a focus to offer quality education programs to students learning in all instructional modalities. This commitment to quality was evident throughout the university. Carol Taylor, Senior Instructional Designer in College C commented:

> Our philosophy is we're not going to do it if we're not going to do it right, and that's how it is across the board. If it's not going to be strategic and it's not going to be done to the best of the ability that we can do it, then we're not going to do it.

According to John West, Director Educational Technology and Instructional Support from College B, in order for the college to maintain quality, a number of online programs were “going through a refinement phase.” This process involved a thorough review of all courses and commitment to refreshing them in alignment with professional standards and online instructional best practices. Through this process, John continued, “quality goes up, faculty confidence goes up, and then we can justify why we spend money on stipends or incentives.” Evidence of this investment in refreshing courses was demonstrated in graduates’ success when sitting for their national certification exams. Elizabeth, also from College B, offered:

> Two of our online programs lead to certification exams afterwards. Graduates sit for their cert exams and pass with flying colors - the first time. That tells me that we're doing
something right for that to happen, and that we are supporting our students through their educational paths.

This sentiment was echoed by Mike Rafferty, Assistant Dean for Innovative Technology in College A, who asserted, “If students go from one quality course to another course, and all of a sudden quality dips, it just reflects on the university and the college.” To this end colleges are compelled to deliver top-notch educational experiences for students. Dr. Kemper, Dean of College B, added “you need to make sure that the program that you're offering has the best, most comprehensive, applicable information that the students need to be successful in their endeavors.” One measure of evidence of instructional quality in online programming was documented through individual student enrollment in more than one online academic program. Camryn Frye, Assistant Professor and eLearning Director in College A maintained “Since we offer an associate's, bachelor's, and master's degree online, we're starting to get students who have gone through the whole pipeline and completed all three degrees online with us.” Through this overarching commitment to quality, programs invested in personnel, technology, and professional development resources in support of faculty and the online learning environment.

This effort also aligns with the strategic commitment to maintain the college’s competitive edge. By periodically updating courses with pedagogical and content improvements, the courses and programs tended to stay ahead of the curve and benefited from respectable national rankings. The institution’s commitment to offering quality online programs was infused in new program launches. The institution put strategic efforts in place to ensure that each knew program or course would be launched only when it withstood the rigor and quality standards of the university. Dr. Stevens, Vice-President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer for the university, declared:
We need to help and encourage all of our programs that join to realize that they will be under the microscope. That they will always have to demonstrate the efficacy, outcomes, and successes commiserate with the institution’s standards of excellence in online education. This means continuous assessment, continuous improvement, continuous reporting, and actually tremendous opportunities to publish research, and to talk about and publish on our expertise, and our values, and our commitments. This field is emerging. The whole field is emerging in real time, and we are leading the charge.

The perceived importance of having a strategic plan that guided online instructional practice was evident at the central and collegiate levels. In spite of the eLearning strategic vision for the institution, variance in the infrastructure supporting the strategy existed within each of the units. In the section that follows, each unit’s structure was examined for coherence with Galbraith’s Star Model (1995).

**Structure**

According to Galbraith (1995) structure determined where the leadership power and administrative authority resided within an organization. Each organization’s structure should be examined to ensure its infrastructure supports the strategic plan of the enterprise. Inherent in the composition of the central offices and college units was an infrastructure responsible for the selection of eLearning resources. An investigation of the structural and procedural decisions made within each of the sub-units in the study provided answers to the following research question: *What factors contribute to the selection of eLearning resources utilized in the eLearning enterprise?* Evidence of unit level governance systems revealed that resource selection was a collaborative process. The structural subthemes uncovered throughout the study were hierarchy, central leadership, silos, transition, information technology, economies of scale, and resource allocation.
Hierarchy. The university’s formalized online infrastructure was in its infancy at the time of the study. Formal central support began roughly two years prior with the formation of the Center for Excellence in eLearning (CEeL). Before that, distance learning support at the central level consisted of an academic leader in the Provost’s Office whose responsibilities were split between distance learning and continuing education functions. Therefore, the institution had a half-time position dedicated to the central leadership of online programs in support of several thousand distance learning students and faculty who teach online. This administrator also served as the institution’s liaison for distance learning on local, state, and national levels. Three years ago, the institution hired a full-time staff resource that was responsible for institutional compliance with state Departments of Education in the offering of online programs. As mentioned previously, at the time the study was conducted, the institution’s formal eLearning infrastructure was less than two years old. Aaron, Assistant Vice-President for eLearning agreed, “eLearning was largely a college level conversation until a couple years ago. There really wasn't much happening at the enterprise level.”

In the short time since, the institution’s central eLearning office grew from two distance learning staff members to a team of 17 eLearning staff professionals. The two staff from the Provost’s Office were transferred to the CEeL team. The CEeL department, in the central information technology (IT) division of the institution, was comprised of technology, design and creative teams. Red and Black productions, a digital and video production team, were also absorbed into the new structure. Additional team members were dedicated to analytics. IT support personnel contributed to the CEeL infrastructure. In total, 24 staff professionals and four student workers provided direct support to the eLearning enterprise. Figure 6 depicts the organization chart of the Center for Excellence in eLearning.
Figure 6. Organization chart of the Center for Excellence in eLearning.
In an attempt to create synergy and increase collaboration between central services and the individual college units, CEeL introduced a liaison role whereby a member of CEeL partnered with unit level stakeholders to serve as an extension to the unit team. Aaron Jones, Vice-President of eLearning confessed:

We've tried to roll out a liaison role, met with mixed results. But I think over time this will be one of our biggest accomplishments. There's talk about gaps in support. This is one of the strategies to help fix that. This role will provide a constant communication channel between enterprise and local units.

In addition to the CEeL team that was developed, the eLearning division formulated an eLearning Governance structure comprised of faculty and staff into five sub-committees: Accessibility, Instructional Design/Pedagogy, Learning Management System (LMS), Multimedia, and Online Learning. According to Dr. Stevens, Vice-President for IT, confirmed, “There have been as many as 200 people involved in eLearning and instructional technology governance.” Together the eLearning governance structure supported the development of a university-wide strategic plan for eLearning in alignment with the Third Century priorities of the president of the university. The subcommittees reviewed and recommended – the adoption of new and emerging technologies and the development and implementation of eLearning strategies, standards, and policy.

The central faculty professional development office did not have an organization chart delineating its structure, but Dr. Linda Cooper, Assistant Director of the office, shared that the unit is comprised of a team of eleven staff: a director, three assistant directors, one program manager, four instructional designers and two graduate assistants. In alignment with the
institution’s mission and vision for eLearning, this team partnered with the staff of CEeL in the operation of the eLearning enterprise.

Each of the three colleges included in the study also had hierarchical structures in place to support the eLearning efforts within the respective units.

The eLearning structure in College A was developed in support of the online programs offered in the four independent schools. All three participants from College A were aligned in the explanation of the College’s eLearning structure. Unlike central services, College A did not have a specific individual responsible for eLearning operations. Rather, the college had a collaborative facilitator that worked closely with the instructional designers (ID) embedded in all four schools. Each ID reported directly to the corresponding school’s director. The college also had a central Office of Innovative Technology and Learning Design with instructional design and IT staff and systems lead by Mike Rafferty. This team had the following staff roles: video expert, multimedia expert, senior instructional designer, and instructional designer. The team also benefited from the added support of a few student workers. All four schools benefited from the resources provided by this team. In this structure, College A’s central office combined IT and ID teams; with the ID team responsible for professional development of faculty. Figure 7 depicts the organization chart of College A’s Learning Design Collaborative (LDC).

According to Camryn Frye, Assistant Professor and Director of eLearning for one of the schools in College A, the college also had an Academic Technology Instructional Design Council that “made college level decisions around technology needs and disseminated information about technology issues. This council also served as a communication venue and a decision-making body.”
Figure 7. Organization Chart of College A’s Learning Design Collaborative.
College B’s hierarchical structure supporting online programs was comprised of a newly appointed faculty Director of Online Learning who provided operational oversight and helped programs launch online versions of campus programs. According to Dr. Mary Kemper, Dean of College B, about five years ago the college merged IT and ID into the Center for Educational Technology and Instructional Support (CETIS). CETIS led by John West, Director of Educational Technology and Instructional Support, provided leadership and oversight of the instructional design, information technology and marketing teams. Figure 8 depicts the organization chart of College B’s Center for Educational Technology and Instructional Support (CETIS).

The Dean acknowledged that in line with the institution’s robust IT support system, the college’s efforts would focus on investment in ID staff. She shared, “in the direction that eTechnology and eLearning was going, we needed more instructional designers and less instructional technicians.” In the explanation of those who comprised the CETIS team, John reported:

We have three teams. Probably the most prominent team in eLearning is our instructional design group. Those are people who design courses for faculty, help faculty integrate technology in courses. Everything from basic consultation to new program launch to actually building courses. The ID team consists of an Associate Director, a Senior Instructional Designer, and two other IDs….They really are our frontline support for anything related to how we do eLearning. In our IT group, which they provide more of the faculty support for computers, software, and all that, we have three full time staff members and two co-op students. Our third part is relatively new for us. That is our
Figure 8. College B’s Center for Educational Technology and Instructional Support (CETIS) Organization Chart.
marketing piece. This marketing staff doesn't market distance education exclusively. She markets the college as a whole.

The Dean and Elizabeth Hall, Associate Director of Online Learning and leader of the college’s ID team, corroborated John’s description of the structure of the eLearning team. Elizabeth further shared that it was the ID team that lead most of the faculty development initiatives pertaining to teaching and learning at the college.

The three participants also mentioned the existence of an E-technology Steering Committee comprised of administration, faculty, and staff that vetted decisions to use or change eLearning and eTechnologies within the college. According to the Dean, the committee had “three arms -- one for communication, one for research, and another for teaching and learning. They're like task groups that work when they need to.”

College C has been involved in online learning for five years and its infrastructure is modest compared to the other colleges and central online services. Both Dr. Alyssa Anders, Associate Dean of Online Education, and Carol Taylor, Senior Instructional Designer, described the infrastructure in similar ways. The online operations consisted of the two of them and an instructional technologist. The instructional technologist reported to Carol and worked more closely with faculty who taught predominantly face-to-face; while Carol worked with faculty who taught mostly online. She shared that she hired him [because]:

I'm a curriculum background person, and he has more of a technological background. I think we're the perfect team in reality. It couldn't have gotten any better than that. I think as we look forward to the future the next person we bring in we really need a media person to grow us to that next level, because really we can't get much better than we are.

We can only go down.
While not structurally tied together, Carol shared that the college had a team of three IT staff that provided support with the Help Desk, servers, and software tools. Carol shared that she collaborated with the IT team in support of faculty. In a memo dated February 3, 2016, I noted that despite College C’s modest infrastructure, the college’s instructional design team (IDT) was able to generate many resources and tools in support of faculty who taught online. I wondered if this level of support would be able to continue if additional support staff were not added in alignment with the college’s enrollment growth.

**Silos.** The colleges all host nationally ranked online programs; while execution of eLearning operations operated in a silo. Nearly all participants made reference to this fact during the interview process. Within the institution the thirteen academic colleges operated as independent entities with separate business models and systems. Camryn, Mike, and Harry, institutional administrators all referred to campus operations as the “wild, wild west.” Camryn shared, “Every program was running independently. Every college was running independently doing their own thing.”

This was also the practice implemented regarding online programming until just prior to the study. Dr. Stevens agreed, “We have a lot of silos. Sometimes they’re departmental silos, college silos, sometimes just central silos. Building the “we” into the conversation, the direction, the strategic vision, requires constant diligence and attention.” Academic leaders saw the benefit of collaboration as Dean Kemper shared, “There are so many resources here. We just have to give ourselves permission to collaborate with others.” Mike noted:

We are siloed. But I think Central IT needs to be the bridge to creating a true community.

Far too often they come across as trying to take over or break down the silos by force
instead of the olive branch. Silo IT, silo ID, and silo professional development exists because of the lack of support at a Central level.

Prior to the formation of CEeL, staff within each of the colleges organically sought each other out to develop a network and share best practices. Elizabeth and Dr. Kemper, both from College B, shared that silos occurred within colleges as well. Dean Kemper declared, “We are still siloed. We need to break down those walls and partner on projects.” Elizabeth added:

Until very recently it was a very siloed vision for and within our team, because it was just something that the college as a whole didn’t speak a lot about. Some of the college programs were focusing on eLearning but it wasn't necessarily a college-wide focus. In the last year two things began to happen which started to remove the silos.

**Transitional Period.** Of significance within one of the colleges and central services offices, was the notion that the units were undergoing a period of transition. The current administration in College B and the CEeL infrastructure had been in place for two years. In both cases, strategic planning and infrastructure were underway as both areas establish operations. Dr. Stevens reported that in CEeL, “They’ve barely hired the people. Everything else has been pieced together the last 18 months.”

As Dr. Kemper analyzed the new central structure, and expressed concern about the success of the central system, she contemplated the functions of eLearning that would remain in the college and those that would be supported by the central enterprise:

Because for those colleges that started early, we had to basically put everything we needed together on the local front. Now we're going to more enterprise solutions. There are still things that we can't just turn over. We're at that transitional phase now.
Dr. Cooper, from the central professional development office, also shared that the central professional development office was also under new leadership. The team hired a new director and several staff:

We're still going through our infancy and figuring out what it is we should be doing. As I said, training was not actually a part of the original mandate for the CEeL area. It really is like starting off fresh there as well. We're hoping that all of this falls together, so come summer we'll be able to offer a solid program.

In a memo dated January 26, 2016, I noted that despite the amount of transition occurring throughout the university with regard to online education, the institution benefitted from national recognition in rankings.

**Information Technology (IT).** The need for the institution to have reliable information technology resources and infrastructure was expressed by many of the participants. The university built a web-based technology infrastructure that hosted the Blackboard LMS, and served as a repository of training tools for all users. The central team acknowledged that while the website had lots of resources end users often did not know what tools were available to them. Dr. Stevens shared, “Unless we get this fully digitized with a very portal experience for people to find these things quickly, it doesn't matter, because people don't find these things by themselves.” Dr. Stevens also acknowledged the challenges that the central team faced as it tried to support all faculty. He shared that, hands down, the number one complaint faculty faced with regard to technology was at times they were confronted with situations when the technology prohibited instruction. He shared that he heard accounts where faculty stated, “I can't teach. I'm in the classroom, and I'm in Blackboard, and I can't teach.” Dr. Stevens affirmed, technology should not be a barrier to instruction. Some of the instructional designers expressed concern that
the technologies that were deployed by central services were not well supported. Elizabeth emphasized:

You don't just push out tools. You support tools that you push out as a central unit….In the meantime; I have faculty that need to use these tools. I have students that need to use these tools and get the benefit of these tools.

Carol, mirrored Elizabeth’s frustration and stated, “We have first-rate tools with third-rate services.”

Scalability. A challenge to the university’s infrastructure and systems was the ability to scale the enterprise as new programs moved to the online modality and as faculty weave new technologies in all classrooms. The institution has thousands of faculty teaching, many of them teaching online. The ability to reach all of them and provide them with the appropriate pedagogical and technological tools has been met with mixed results. Dr. Stevens discussed the backpack project where faculty were given approximately 10,000 worth of technological tools aimed at enhancing teaching practices. While the project has been successful, Dr. Stevens shared:

Even the Backpack Project…has had three cohorts and maybe 110 people have been through that experience. We still have a whole lot more people to serve. It's been phenomenal. But, how do we scale? The question is, are we investing in the right places and is it training that can scale? Do the people who take the time to do this, are they also bringing their resources back to their departments, to their colleges? Is that a reasonable expectation?
When Aaron Jones discussed the issue of scale, he noted that quality faculty development was achieved when it was delivered via the institute model; working side-by-side with faculty to teach them about innovative eLearning strategies and technologies. He explained:

E-learning isn't hard if you're going to work with a small group of faculty. I could take a group of faculty and really pour into them. We can move the dial. We can do cool things, and we can make their courses really engaging. But, working with small groups over several days at a time would take an army of staff to reach all faculty.

Aaron also discussed the review of a select group of technological tools to deploy for all faculty. There were a number of tools related to web conferencing and test integrity that individual units were purchasing independently. Aaron acknowledged the benefit of having enterprise licenses that were negotiated at an institutional level to drive the cost of each tool down. Having a core set of tools would also reduce the amount of training and duplication required by central services:

We said, ‘Look, this is a fundamental e-learning tool that everybody, no matter what college or discipline you're in, they need this tool.’ We began the journey to identify and license that at the enterprise level, which allowed the units to not license the six or half a dozen products they were. We began to build community around the use of a single tool.

As colleges, or the university, looked at opportunities for growth in enrollment, the strategy has turned to online programming because we can’t physically grow our buildings. John expanded on this idea, “That's not sustainable as you grow a program or even a college because typically as you're growing these programs, your IT infrastructure stays the same. You may be offering 25 more courses but you're still only using four staff.”
Central Leadership. As previously mentioned, at the time the study was conducted, the central eLearning office was only in operation for approximately two years and the central professional development office was completely restructured and under new leadership within the year. These factors contributed to uncertainty and lack of confidence in central services because the units had been offering online programs for some time. Dr. Kemper, Dean of College B shared:

I do think that for some of the colleges that started early, it’s hard. I don't think it's a matter of giving up control. It's just a matter of feeling sure that it's going to go. That it's going to work and be done well. I think people still have a lot of trepidation about some of the central support. Whether they can really count on the central support when they really need to count on them. That kind of uncertainty – if they leave important things like faculty development to those folks, and then there's no support there. It puts us in a difficult place.

Dr. Todd Smith, Dean of College A, agreed, “We do eLearning in spite of them. They are trying to tell me how it can be done better, when they've never done this work before or shown that they can be successful.” Mike Rafferty shared the Dean’s sentiment and contended:

On the surface they're very willing and eager to partner, support, and create new solutions. On the other side of that coin there are times where it feels like they're just kind of going their own way and telling us what we should or shouldn't be doing.

Mike also shared that he thought the lack of confidence faculty were expressing toward central services was due to the fact that central eLearning offices were a non-academic unit. He affirmed, “When faculty know a non-academic unit is trying to tell them how to do something, teach in particular, or conduct research, it does not go well. I've only ever been in an academic
unit, so I know this very well.” Dr. Stevens acknowledged the work of the college units as key indicators of institutional success in online learning:

We would not have been as successful without the leadership of the college and departmental instructional designers and technology leaders. They did that work because we didn't have a central presence yet. There was a lot of goodwill, a lot of collegiality. This was built on the efforts of the distributed eLearning staff. I have no doubt about that.

**Financial Investment.** A key theme that emerged from the data was the financial commitment that the institution and respective units dedicated to the eLearning enterprise. Offering online programs and courses required an infrastructure of human, fiscal, technological, and operational resources. Aaron shared, “There's not enough funding to realize the vision.” Dr. Stevens also shared that the university was trying to build out the infrastructure in support of other colleges on campus that wanted to embark on online programming. “More recently, in the last two years, the Deans and the Provost's Office started realizing that we needed a much more substantive investment for those groups that had not started moving along the implementation continuum.” Later in his interview, Dr. Stevens revisited the topic and shared, “We also need to find a way to put additional resources in so that it's not always just built on the backs of the IDs and the colleges. There needs to be more central investment.”

The college units utilized their individual operating budgets to fund online operations at the unit level. Colleges also benefited from a portion of the per term technology fee (ITIE) assessed all students. This revenue could only be used for technology related purchases and salaries supporting the technological infrastructure. The remaining revenue collected from this fee was split between central eLearning offices and university administration.

As part of the university’s tuition and fee structure, all students enrolled in Distance Learning (DL) programs (5,594 students, Fall 2015) were also assessed a per term fee for
distance learning related services. Table 8 displays the fee structure (obtained from the Bursar’s website) for the participating colleges in the study. All revenue generated from the collection of distance learning fees were maintained by central services. The distribution of fees was a topic of contention amongst participants.

Table 8

*University Distance Learning Fees by College and Degree Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Credit</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Per Credit</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$26.20</td>
<td>$257</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$26.20</td>
<td>$257</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$26.20</td>
<td>$257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Full-time status equated to 10 or 12 credits (or more) respectively for graduate and undergraduate students.*

Carol shared:

> I have one-fifth of the technology that they have over there, and I reach way more people than they reach on a regular basis. I don't have the funding that they have to be able to do some of those things in my office.

The distribution of DL fees was also a topic of concern at the Dean’s level. Dr. Smith, Dean of College A, expressed concern with the strategic way the DL revenue was being utilized. He shared that a more collaborative approach would have been for central services to approach the units for input. His preference would have been for a conversation to have occurred where the deans would have been asked, “With these distance learning fees, how can we support your colleges?” Finally, Mike also weighed in on this contentious subject and stated, “Our students pay a DL fee. We expect certain levels of central support for that.”
Financial investment in specific technologies was also important. The units were appreciative of having enterprise solutions for a number of tools. Elizabeth contended:

Prior to us having central unit tools, if we wanted to use a tool, our college was buying that tool. It just didn't really make sense because our college would buy it, and [insert college name] would buy it, and [insert college name] would buy it. Everybody's buying their own separate licenses of tools. For them to pull that together and truly have an enterprise-level license for these tools is a huge support.

In a memo dated March 3, 2016 I noted opportunity for campus leaders to collaborate on a resolution to the distribution of distance learning funds.

**Resource Allocation.** In alignment with the need for more funding to support the online enterprise was discussion regarding how resources were allocated throughout the university. Several participants referred to the “have and have nots” when discussing the infrastructure within each of the colleges. Those colleges involved in online programming, for a decade or more, had built their infrastructure to support online programming. Colleges, including College C in the study, that were relatively new to online learning, or haven’t begun their journey with online programming were not resourced to incorporate new technologies and corresponding training into their systems. Therefore, reliance on central services was significant. Elizabeth asserted:

We have a lot of haves and have not's. There are a lot of colleges that don't have instructional design and these kinds of support structures. You need to support these units. Part of support is training. Part of support, is supporting the tools when there are problems.
Dr. Cooper, from central offices, agreed that much of central supports services were focused on colleges entering the online environment. “We work with faculty from a variety of colleges, mainly colleges that don't have instructional designers, basically providing them with instructional design and then when needed, creative team member, animations or videos and things, and then the technical support.”

The current belief expressed by all the instructional designers (ID) in the study was that individual colleges had significantly less staff dedicated to eLearning than central services. They also believed that since central services deployed new technological tools, the accompanying training should be developed and delivered by central services staff. In practice, the staff in the units were developing tools and resources for faculty. Central tools were being deployed without training. IDs were fielding calls from faculty about how to operate the technology. The units developed the training and tools to assist faculty and reduce frustration; thereby increasing the workload and burden on the units. John, from College B, elaborated:

That's a very, very contentious issue right now for some of us. We provide you with tools….You have to provide your own training. Problem with that is we're not the experts of those tools yet, so you can't release them to faculty. For example, I'm just going to use WebEx, because that's the newest one. You can't release WebEx today and expect colleges to be an expert tomorrow. That gap has got to be bridged somehow.

Dr. Stevens, from central IT, confessed:

Change causes stress, and so that's an area of focus that we will continue to do more and more work in. How do we get the balance of resources, central and local, so that the start-up time is better, and that the frustrations are less, and that people know where to go for help? When you're the instructional designer, or program coordinator for a program, and
we do something new, no matter how cool everyone thought it was, it is work to get everyone up to speed. There are always rough spots in the road.

Processes

Processes and lateral capability represented the “interpersonal and technological networks, team and matrix relationships, lateral processes, and integrative roles that served as the ‘glue’ that bound the organization together” (Galbraith, Downey & Gates, 2002, p.4). The data collected allowed me to construct the following process sub-themes: 1) course design and standardization, 2) duplication, 3) intellectual property, 4) networks, 5) community of practice, 6) scaffolding, 7) best practices, 8) communication, and 9) evaluation of professional development. Each sub-theme will be addressed in the sections the follow.

Course design and standardization. In an effort to deliver a consistent online student experience at the institution, colleges began using independently created college course design templates which provided standardization within the Blackboard LMS. The course design templates were built using the Quality Matters framework. The use of course templates and Quality Matters principles contributed to a streamlined process.

Course design. The course design process implemented organically at the university involved the utilization of the TPACK (Technology, Pedagogy, and Content, Knowledge) framework for effective online instruction. This framework, introduced in Chapter 2, identified the different areas of knowledge faculty needed to possess to teach effectively with technology. The framework was not mandated or instituted by the central offices; rather the individual colleges’ instructional design teams implemented the framework in an effort to partner with faculty in the design of online courses. The TPACK framework was later adopted by central services and served as a guide for new online programs and courses. Figure 9 displays a sign
located outside one of the central eLearning offices depicting this partnership. Aaron Jones and Mike Rafferty both discussed the importance of the TPACK model in eLearning.

![Center for Excellence in eLearning (CEeL) welcome sign.](image)

*Figure 9. Center for Excellence in eLearning (CEeL) welcome sign.*

It was important to note that instructional designers (IDs) expertise was in online pedagogy. IDs were not content experts in the specific academic disciplines for the courses they built. Content expertise rested with the faculty of the course.

*Quality Matters (QM).* In addition to the integration of the TPACK model, all units developed online courses using the *Quality Matters (QM)* design principles. QM is a research-
supported, faculty-centered, peer review process designed to certify the quality of online courses (MarylandOnline, Inc., 2011). Colleges and universities across the country use the tool in the development, maintenance, and review of online courses to meet their institutional quality assurance requirements. In order for a course to be branded with the QM seal, each course was measured against the QM rubric used in the peer review process. The QM rubric measured eight general standards: 1) course overview and introduction, 2) learning objectives/competencies, 3) assessment and measurement, 4) instructional materials, 5) learner interaction and engagement, 6) course technology, 7) learner support, and 8) accessibility. As a collegial process, QM acknowledged faculty as subject matter experts with the selection and delivery of content to the faculty’s discretion. The QM process was focused on the design of an online course; not on the delivery or the content.

Evidence of the informal implementation of QM principles existed within all the colleges. Due to the cost intensive nature of having courses reviewed through the official QM process, colleges implemented a modified internal peer-review process. Mike Rafferty, College A, referenced the use QM principles within his college:

Quality Matters is fantastic! True Quality Matters and peer review is very difficult to achieve. It's too expensive. We've come to terms with that in the college and we implemented our own version. But, we see the value in standardizing the course design. If I'm a student and I'm registered in four classes and if all of the classes are built in the learning management system using Quality Matters best practices, a student doesn't have to learn how to take the class. The student just learns.

John West and Elizabeth Hall, from College B, both discussed the implementation of QM within their college. John shared:
We build courses using the Quality Matters design principles. We work with faculty to help them develop the courses. Very few faculty are handed a course and told, ‘Here, develop this.’ We'll sit down with them and say, ‘OK, here's the course, here's the content. Let me walk you through what an online course looks like.’ They can choose, because they are faculty, to not follow those recommendations but typically they do.

Elizabeth corroborated John’s view on the college’s immersion with QM. “We literally sit down with the faculty, and the rubric side-by-side, and we see whether it actually meets the rubric. If it doesn't, we work together to make strides to have it meet the rubric.”

Aaron Jones, shared the institution’s vision for expanding the utilization of QM standards at the institution, “We're going to formalize the quality matters program at the University. We will create a group of informal course reviewers that will give colleges the option to have courses reviewed with the guidelines of the QM standard.”

Course templates. In line with QM principles, the colleges each built a standard course design template that was automatically loaded into all college courses. The use of a template created a streamlined learning experience for students. The look and feel of all courses was the same. The approach faculty took to building out each of their courses varied. Carol, from College C shared:

We have a mandatory college template for our Blackboard courses. We built it with several options for our instructors. They can do option one, where they do it by week and they just do a content dump where the materials they need for each week are there. Or, they can actually build out a course where they can do objectives by week and create a task list. There are a variety of ways for them to approach it. We show them how. We also have things that we recommend that every instructor does like putting their syllabus online, including their contact information, and providing certain policies like academic
integrity, student accessibility, and plagiarism. We encourage everyone to use the
gradebook, and conduct assessments and collect assignments through Blackboard just to
provide those cookie-crumble trails.

John, from College B, also confirmed the use of standardized templates:

Students can say, ‘I'm in this course. Here's how it's laid down. I'm in the next course and
the layout is exactly the same.’ This is also easier on the faculty since they don’t have to
learn anything knew about the look of the course.

**Duplication.** Duplication or the creation of similar documents and training, regarding
technological tools and online pedagogy was a process concern addressed by numerous academic
leaders. The collective view by college academic leaders was that central eLearning offices
should design, develop, and deliver professional development to faculty and staff regarding
centrally deployed eLearning initiatives, tools, and technologies.

Elizabeth expressed concerns regarding the process of developing and training
stakeholders with new technological tools:

We're very happy about having Kaltura. However, there is zero training with this
product. We spent lots of money, we rolled out this product, but we provided zero
training. When I say ‘we,’ I mean the university. We raised this concern in governance
and were told that it's the unit's responsibility to train and support on all tools.

Since technological tools were deployed without central documentation or training, the units felt
compelled to create documentation and offer training to faculty so the tools could be utilized.
Dr. Kemper also shared, “Sometimes, maybe we're duplicating things more than we need to.
But, truly, it's all about trust and whether or not things are going to be done to our standards at
the enterprise level.” Mike also added:
It defeats the purpose, of having a Central ID group. The expectation we have is that they are our service provider. When a new tool launches, we need them to listen to the academic units about the documentation that is needed and then create that documentation. I do think it's a tremendous waste of resources for all the colleges to create all their own documentation.

Camryn, from College A, added, “Everybody is developing their tutorials separately. We don't always know what the other people are building.” In response to unit requests for training documentation and professional development offerings, Dr. Cooper, Director of Instructional Innovation, addressed:

The colleges all have quite different needs. Some of them may decide that they are happy to just go with the documentation that we provide. Some of them may decide that the topics that we'd come up with are not going to fit their needs.

**Intellectual Property (IP).** A key concern raised by academic leaders in the study was regarding intellectual property (IP) of content loaded in online courses. The issue of ownership does not regularly come up in conversations regarding traditional classes as faculty practice has been to build courses independent of their peers. Dr. Cooper implied, “Faculty are struggling with that because their concept of what IP might be is different for an online course.” Dr. Kemper, Dean of College B declared, “There's a lot of worry and concern about how to manage that.” Unified in approach, all participants who commented about the subject were aligned that colleges needed to have a written policy regarding IP and content ownership. College C had a very explicit policy which Carol articulated:

We are a little different in the fact that we pay for intellectual property. We do not pay for content development. Instructors can teach in the program and choose to develop the courses for free. Then, they own the courses and we cannot reuse them. If they choose
to get paid for the development, we're paying for their intellectual property. So, that means if tomorrow they leave, we own that course and can have anyone, at any time, step in and teach that course. We do that to protect ourselves because we can't at the last minute develop a course.

Dr. Todd Smith, Dean of College A, shared:

When we first got into DL, I paid people to develop the courses and then made it clear that if I'm paying you, the college owns it. Then, some, we actually pay extra for teaching the course. In some cases, someone else might teach it. I don't have too much trouble with that. Every once in a while, we have somebody who says, "These are my materials, and I don't want to let you use it.

Elizabeth Hall, Associate Director of Online Learning in College B revealed, “We are getting a process vetted through legal right now. Moving forward, faculty will sign documentation as part of their contract that that content now resides and lives with the college. It's owned by the college.” Camryn, eLearning Director from College A, emphasized:

These are actually all [insert university name] courses and students’ courses. Nobody owns a course, no faculty member. The faculty, as a group, should own all these courses, and make sure that they all make sense, together, as a unit, as a piece of curriculum.

Dr. Cooper, from central offices, contended that the issue of IP was significant and was a contributing factor to more faculty and college’s resistance to entering the university’s online portfolio of programs. Based on conversations with academic leaders, matters of IP should be considered in earnest with the faculty, if strides toward the institution’s strategic vision for eLearning excellence were to be realized.
Networks. The participants shared common views regarding the importance of having inter-personal and technological networks within the university. Camryn, from College A, supported the idea of networks and shared, “We started making informal networks because we thought many of us were working on instructional design, student advising, and program management issues and felt like it didn't make sense for us all to be working independently.”

Aaron, Assistant Vice-President of eLearning, shared that for faculty and students to be supported in the utilization of technologies deployed by the university, the technological network of services needed to be comprehensive. He shared that his team was struggling with providing this level of service because they were still building their team and faced contextual issues when fielding specific college related inquiries. He maintained:

It starts with the service desk. We have to provide 24/7 experience. That's one of the reasons we put 24/7 support in the chat support. It's got to be immediate for online learners [and faculty]. We've been working very hard but it’s not enough. It's having a well-trained service desk when they answer the phone. If the technician who answers the call cannot help the person on the phone, the help stops. There's no formal escalation back to the college or unit. It's all very informal, relationship based, this person who's helping knowing who to call in the college. They don't, so it breaks down there because there's no hand off between the enterprise and the unit.

Relative to the ability to assist callers, Aaron shared that even though the university has deployed a robust amount of technological resources with widespread use; his team is experiencing a decline in service calls. He offered:

We're getting these anecdotal reports from the colleges that they're getting slammed.

Instead of taking advantage of the enterprise resource, faculty just walk down the hall. I
think there's a big gap in getting people into channels where they can get help, and it's putting pressures on the system in unintended ways.

Dr. Stevens shared, “We have a lot of work to do to build out our capacity, our systems, our communication and supporting each other so that we all row together.”

**Scaffolding.** Central to the process of providing meaningful, retainable, and applicable faculty professional development was the offering of training through a scaffolded approach. Similar to a structural scaffold used by construction crews, a scaffolded approach to faculty development referred to the gradual layering and building of skills over time. This resonated with the notion that faulty began their instructional journey as online instructors at different levels of technological, pedagogical and content expertise. As such, the units discussed the need to offer professional development at the beginner, intermediate, and expert levels. Dr. Kemper, Dean of College B stated, “We had to meet people where they were and some people were a little further along and a little more independent.” Carol, Senior Instructional Designer from College C agreed, “We did it in baby steps. It's like crawl, walk, run. We wanted our faculty to incorporate tools that they could master and become very good at; rather than taking on the whole world at once and being overwhelmed.” Dr. Stevens, Vice-President for Information Technology, added additional insight:

People are beginning to realize that we really need to help each other get up to speed on the basics and the more advanced tools. What if we all agreed to be very proficient in that baseline and we'd add something each year or maybe every second year?

Each of the units shared that an instructional designer, or online expert, would sit with each new faculty member and assess their ability and willingness to assimilate or accommodate their existing teaching practice with the online instructional environment. The decision to lump
faculty, at various levels of online immersion and expertise, into one class or session was not fruitful in terms of faculty satisfaction and knowledge acquisition. Dr. Cooper argued, “Having them all in one group was holding some faculty back and kept us from providing the right level of support to others.” Elizabeth added another dimension to the discussion when she asserted, “You need certain qualifications and a mindset to be able to do this well. If faculty are not of the mindset to embrace this modality, we shouldn’t force them. It is not for everyone.”

An additional consideration in favor of the scaffolded approach to professional development was an appreciation of the time intensive nature and commitment required for training. Faculty workload was often comprised of instruction, scholarship, and service activities. The academic leaders in the study were cognizant of competing priorities faculty balance in their roles. As such, participants deemed it important to expose faculty to training sessions according to level of expertise with the tool or topic addressed. Elizabeth contended, “Our faculty don’t have time to waste. The worse thing I could do is have them attend training that they don’t need. They would never come to another training after that.”

**Best Practices.** Throughout the data collection process, it was evident that the academic leaders in the units had exemplary eLearning and online learning expertise and were staunch supporters of faculty who taught online. Most of the academic leaders in the study had been involved with online instruction, as faculty, administrators, or staff, for more than a decade. As such, alongside their peers, standards of excellence were created regarding professional development orientation, ongoing training and support, course design, and pedagogical strategies.

**Getting oriented.** One of the initial best practice tips faculty were encouraged to do, time permitting, was take an online class as a student. Elizabeth professed, “Being in an online class,
as a student, gives you a totally different view and lens into the online classroom environment. Having this experience created empathy, and faculty tended to incorporate meaningful activities and assignments in their courses.”

New faculty were also encouraged to, “work side-by- side, and walk the path with an instructional designer to develop a course. Take the time. Understand the time that's needed to make it strong” Elizabeth explained.

**Course design.** All of the instructional designers in the study agreed that best practice for course building was to have the entire course built prior to the start of the term. According to Carol, from College C:

> The development has to be done up front. You cannot be developing content and facilitating the course at the same time. This tends to be very different than in a face-to-face classroom, because faculty make adjustments in real-time. The online course is more of a production where everything is written or produced. The facilitation piece is so much more time-consuming in an online class.

Carol continued, “We talk about best practices for online course delivery. I design the template and then I help them stage their content and show them how it could look.”

**Online pedagogical strategies.** Many of the academic leaders in the study had been deeply immersed with online course delivery for many years. All were eager to share their knowledge and inform best practices for their peers. They were forthcoming and shared many online pedagogical instructional strategies and “tricks of the trade.” Some of their online instructional strategies transcended the online environment and were recommended for traditional classes. Carol explained, “We talk about interactive approaches, differentiation of
learning, quality matters, and how accommodations for students should look, and then we design it together.”

Camryn, from College A, reported the use of online quizzing, as a pre-activity to in-class lecture in the Blackboard LMS prior to each traditional class. The goal was to assess their grasp of textbook content, so the class time could be used for application and expansion of content. She explained:

We do a lot of activities when I teach in the classroom. So, I'm not going to have time to lecture and cover the whole chapter(s). I need students to have read the material beforehand, so we can implement the material and use it in our activities in the classroom.

Just-in-time resources. Camryn shared that her team has built a lot of Just-in-time resources, tutorials, materials. The materials are presented in two ways: in courses and on a faculty focused website:

We actually have a button pre-loaded into all of our courses automatically. It's just resources for instructors on how to use different tools and how to do different things in their class. It's a hidden button in their class, so students don’t see it. This way training tools and tips are always available to address online course management.

Camryn expanded, “We have a website dedicated to faculty. It’s full of resource materials, tutorials, videos, having them access Lynda.com resources. It’s another layer to the just-in-time materials.”

Another example of Just-in-time best practices was the implementation of the Design Time radio show hosted by the instructional design team (IDT) from College B. For nearly a
year, the IDT has been hosting a monthly, 15-minute show, or tutorial in WebEx. “Each show is different,” Elizabeth shared:

We pick one topic each month and it's usually something functional or tech-related. It's a 15-minute quick discussion on a topic; usually around the most frequently asked questions we get. Things like, how to make a banner in your class? Or, how do you offer different test options for students with different disabilities? Some of the sessions are timely. Like, how to submit grades to the registrar through Blackboard? We hosted that the first week of December before grades were due. Our next one will be about discussion board strategies. We invite the faculty. Even if nobody comes, we record it. Then we post it on our team’s YouTube channel. Faculty can view it on their own time, or as needed.

In a memo dated February 8, 2016, I noted the tremendous efforts happening all over campus regarding online best practices. I also noted the extraordinary opportunity available for the institution to collaborate and share this information across campus.

**Communication.** A theme uncovered throughout the study was the emphasis placed on frequent, effective, and meaningful communication. “Communication is always a challenge,” said John. Participants of the study mentioned the importance of being invited to and attending eLearning meetings on campus and at the unit level. The importance of “having a seat at the table” was referenced by both John and Elizabeth from College B. “Some of the things that are happening on campus can be missed. You have to be at the table to get the information. That’s been a key to our success.” Participants acknowledged that they couldn’t be everywhere at all at once. Elizabeth shared, that within her college, members of her team were also invited to attend regularly scheduled faculty meetings:
We are going to be going to a few faculty program meetings where we will have a standing 15 minute slot and will provide training on a new topic. One of the topics was ‘what's the difference between an online and traditional student.’ By bringing us into their faculty meetings we get to have real conversations and develop more relationships.

Instructional design (ID) participants also shared that they were disseminating monthly newsletters and email communication plans to advertise their services and provide small doses of training to faculty and students. IDs shared that a concern was that faculty who taught predominantly in the traditional format did not realize that the scope of ID went beyond online instruction. ID staff embraced the challenge of enhancing communication about their services and how they could help impact quality instruction for all faculty, in all classes. Elizabeth reported, “A big struggle for us in our evolution was that faculty thought, ‘those people just help the online people.’ That's not true.”

Emphasis was placed on increasing communication regarding online best practices and tips to engage more faculty with online strategies. The ID teams in all three colleges shared that they had websites, newsletters, and announcements designed to help faculty. Carol emphasized, “We launched a new website loaded with tools …and we are trying to drive faculty to the website so they see what is available to them.” In addition to having websites, Elizabeth and Carol both shared that their teams had newsletters that they distributed. Elizabeth explained:

The newsletter tells you about upcoming things, things you want to know. We also are trying to bring in instructional design articles, links to what's happening in-field, links to upcoming things, challenging things, things to just get your mind moving a little bit.
Carol shared, “We also do a monthly newsletter called the ‘Faculty Tech Times’ that comes out of our office. It's an e-newsletter loaded with tips, tricks, and shortcuts for successful online navigation. The faculty love it!”

In shifting focus to the communication strategies deployed by central services, Dr. Smith, Dean from College A expressed concern about how university eLearning initiatives were communicated. In speaking with central administration he contended, “You never asked if that was a problem in this college. You never asked me once, what we need help with to support our online efforts.” He shared that he has been in meetings with central leaders where they talked about things faculty needed to do, and requirements that might be put in place, for faculty to be successful online instructors. Dr. Smith inquired, "Are you going to ask faculty what they think?” He wanted to ensure that communication lines between administration and faculty were open and that faculty had a voice in decisions regarding instructional practice.

Dr. Stevens, Vice-President for Information Technology, acknowledged that more communication was needed:

We need to have good communication about how folks can get the remediation and education they need. We need to do a better job marketing our resources. It’s discouraging when you talk about a faculty member who maybe two or three years into their time here and they haven't discovered these resources. The notion that ‘if you build it, they will come’ holds for a certain number of people. But, there's a lot of tribal knowledge here that needs to be shared with the new folks and folks who are engaging in this work. They really need to be guided and almost a concierge service to these resources. We know you cannot communicate enough.

**Evaluation of Professional Development.** The data collected at the college level regarding evaluation of professional development was predominantly captured and assessed via
anecdotal feedback. John, Director of Educational Technology and Instructional Support from College B, confirmed that with regard to support provided, “We do a customer service survey after every IT related ticket is closed so we gather our responses that way. From the ID efforts feedback tends to be in the form of informal feedback.” Elizabeth agreed that additional effort could be made to capture more formal evaluation of services provided and training received. “We have done formal evaluations with our institutes. Faculty provided feedback regarding the components that were most helpful and those they needed more guidance with. We need to do more of this.”

Another way academic leaders gauged whether or not they were meeting faculty needs was through a review of analytic data. Sometimes faculty participation in training sessions was less than optimal; but follow-up review of content was evident. In the case of College B, the staff were able to review analytics from their YouTube channel and saw that while the in-person attendance was lower than anticipated, faculty were visiting the website afterwards to review the content. Elizabeth shared, “The analytics show that faculty were viewing the radio show afterwards. Since we started analyzing presence on the website we've gotten feedback and comments that people are really enjoying those quick tips.”

A strategy that College C implemented in an effort to meet faculty needs was the addition of extended office hours. Many of the faculty that taught in their online programs were adjuncts who worked full-time day jobs and taught online in the evenings. The ID staff realized that working traditional day-time hours meant they were not available to this population of faculty. Carol Taylor, Senior Instructional Designer, shared feedback regarding the effort of her staff, “He has been hosting evening sessions and weekends by appointment. This is when our adjuncts can meet with us. So, we make ourselves available to assist them with the support they need.”
She shared that her team has received email confirmations thanking them for their time and expertise.

**Rewards**

According to Galbraith (1995), reward systems were set in place to capture metrics and outcomes deemed important to the organization. In a rewards structure, employees who attained certain benchmarks, or standards of excellence, were rewarded for effort and achievement. In essence, rewards and recognition systems were used to demonstrate the outcomes valued by the organization.

Further, rewards were not always recognized in traditional, extrinsic ways, such as: ceremonies, trophies, certificates, or monetary gain. Rewards could be of an intrinsic nature, and impact the overall contributions to the organization or institution in less overt ways. Namely, rewards for implementing best practices in online education could be: increased class enrollment, positive student evaluations, successful annual performance reviews (APR), and one-on-one constructive feedback. In this study, the rewards from impactful faculty professional development were: inter-collegiate collaboration, compensation, peer support, student evaluations, and faculty buy-in.

**Inter-collegiate collaboration.** Participants shared that evidence of an inter-collegial approach to online programing and professional development was a key differentiator in faculty immersion to online teaching. Numerous participants cited the importance and collaborative benefit of bridging programs in an inter-disciplinary way in the offering of the highest quality programs. Dr. Alyssa Anders, Associate Dean of Online Learning in College B shared, “If you look at other programs of that nature, they often try to teach all in-house, which I think it doesn't allow you to leverage the expertise that you have in the university of our size.” Dr. Anders
shared, “if we are offering programs that span two or more disciplines, we should rely on the content experts within the university versus looking to hire an external expert or consultant.”

Dr. Kemper, Dean of College B, added:

   It's all [insert university name]. That makes sense to me. Why should I have to go out and hire a data analytics person to teach one of those courses when we've got a great business program? The benefit of having a university is having subject matter experts available to enhance courses and programs.

Dr. Mary Kemper, Dean of College B, and Dr. Alyssa Anders, Associate Dean of online education from College C, also agreed that inter-collegiate collaboration broadened faculty expertise. Dr. Harry Stevens, Vice-President for IT, also referenced the collegial spirit that existed on campus in the formation and delivery of online programs. He offered:

   In typical higher ed. fashion, that group was the first group to go online. Then, they worked with the next group. Then, both of those colleges worked with the next group. It was a sharing of the wealth of the experiences. We provided great peer-to-peer assistance.

   Evidence of the inter-collegial approach trickled down from the administrative level to the staff that supported faculty teaching online. Elizabeth, from College B, commented:

   Today, I was invited to sit on a committee in one of the schools that is starting to think about online. Great, now I get to sit on that committee and help another program work through its start-up. It’s a way to give back and develop relationships on campus.

Camryn, from College A, echoed Elizabeth’s sentiments and acknowledged the importance of having partnerships and colleagues across the university to rely on for support and collaboration:
You might be the only person that supports online programs and you might feel a little isolated. So, I think developing these relationships is important. Many times, if I have a problem or an issue, I may not call somebody in my college first. I may call another college. I'll get on the phone and talk to somebody in the other college to see how they solve a similar problem.

Aaron, from central services, also emphasized the importance of university-wide collaboration and stated, “Joan (pseudonym) and I worked really closely together, and had a similar approach and philosophy that training for faculty has to start with the pedagogy.”

**Compensation and incentives.** In the general sense, compensation is a common form of reward. People tend to respond to monetary acknowledgements or incentives for quality outputs. In some higher education instances, faculty were compensated for participation in specific professional development training initiatives and online course development. One such training opportunity was through the offering of a summer institute aimed at faculty preparation for online instruction.

College B offered a summer institute for faculty planning on teaching online for the first time. To entice faculty to participate in the training, they were offered technology tools in support of online instruction. John shared, “You usually have to pay a stipend, or give them some kind of reward.” Dr. Mary Kemper corroborated John’s sentiment and stated, “The faculty earned either a laptop, or some other piece of technology equipment. “ It made sense to incentivize them with technology versus money because the technology was what they needed to make the leap to online instructor. Asking them to take the leap without providing the tools would not have been as successful. Central services were also developing an online institute for
faculty transitioning to the modality. “We provide faculty with an incentive for doing the full institute. They don't receive the full incentive until they've completed their course design.”

In all three colleges included in the study, faculty were compensated for online course development in various ways. The transition from face-to-face instruction to online required different preparation and pedagogical application of instructional principles. Therefore, faculty preparing for a new online course were compensated for their development time.

Mike, Assistant Dean for Innovative Technology from College A, shared “We have paid faculty to develop the course and then we have partnered them with an instructional designer. What that gives you is a high quality online course that the faculty member owns and the school owns.” Camryn, eLearning Director from College A endorsed this approach and agreed, “If a faculty member is going to develop a course that's going to be shared with other faculty members, then there does need to be some level of compensation for developing that course.”

Dr. Kemper, Dean of College B confirmed, “we offered incentives to faculty who had an existing course that they wanted to convert to an online fashion.” Elizabeth, also from College B confirmed, “It's a per-credit based, and it's a flat fee that they get paid during the development time. Then they get paid when they teach, so it's two separate payments.” Dr. Smith, Dean of College A, affirmed:

In general, without the incentives there wouldn't have been a whole lot of people to get started in this. Everything we do incentivizes people to do this. The faculty chose to do it or don't do it. We try to make very public the rewards of the people who are doing and chose to do it.

Dean Smith did also share that he thought this perspective was changing as more faculty saw the value and equivalence of online instruction. He shared that somewhat organically, “We had one
of our programs go completely online without telling us. They just kept making their courses online, one at a time. They did that without incentives. They just did it.”

Compensation was also referenced as being related to faculty workload. Participants acknowledged the additional time and effort required to develop and instruct online. Camryn, from College A, mentioned that workload should also be considered for faculty developing online courses. “Whether it's a course release, paid compensation, or extra travel money, there needs to be a realization that developing that course and then sharing it with other faculty members is accounted for in workload.” Dean Kemper, from College B, added, “Workload should be considered because we came to that through the back door….Having some standard of how that should be done is important. It needs to be in their workload so it’s equitable.” Dr. Stevens agreed with Dean Kemper and shared:

In a world where probably RPT (reappointment, promotion and tenure) and how we measure and value faculty work, has not stretched and grown to reflect those new demands on faculty. I think people don't fully appreciate there is a difference in workload. It's real work! I would argue, between delivering high-quality online eLearning and hybrid courses, as opposed to classroom instruction, the work is much greater online. I'm not saying that there is a difference qualitatively; but just the sheer amount of time it takes to develop those courses, and think your way through the methodologies, the heuristics, the tools, to do it, to learn new ones, is a huge commitment.

In addition to compensation and incentive rewards, the impact of peer support influenced faculty involvement in online instruction and participation in professional development.

**Peer Support.** Faculty new to online instruction may find that soliciting the help and support of their peers may ease the transition into this teaching modality. Dr. Kemper, Dean of
College B shared, “The idea of having been a faculty just makes you have empathy for what they need to do.” College B formalized the peer network and established the *Faculty Forum* where faculty could share ideas, raise concerns, and provide support for one another. Dr. Stevens endorsed this faculty support structure and contended:

> When one program begins its journey into online offerings, it really helps to talk to your own folks and find out what their experience was like when they entered the space. It's that peer-to-peer ecosystem of support that is so powerful.

Dr. Cooper, from central services, shared that from a professional development lens for faculty teaching online, “the faculty said the most useful thing to them was talking with other faculty members.” Mike, from College A, supported the notion of assisting other faculty as they transitioned to online instructors and shared that he would open his course up to his peers to let them see an example of how it could be done. He shared:

> This is how I set it up the first time. I really didn't know what I was doing. Then, I finally met with one of our instructional designers and learned from them. Now, this is how I'm doing it. It was an iterative process. It was baby steps. It was small changes every semester.

Carol, Senior Instructional Designer from College C also agreed with the idea of showing faculty what other successful online instructors were doing as exemplars and how they could build their courses and navigate the online environment. “Once they take a look they can clearly see the deficiencies and see that somebody else has done something a little bit better.” She shared that once faculty see the differences and what is possible online, they ask her what they can do to improve.
**Student evaluations.** Another positive reward for faculty was feedback generated from student evaluations. In supporting his peers, Mike shared, “I tell faculty to look at student satisfaction data. Based on my feedback every semester, I usually make a tweak to my class. I don't know that there's ever been a semester I haven't. I think that's really important.” Carol confirmed this strategy and shared that at the end of each term she reviewed adjunct evaluations to highlight successes and uncover areas for improvement.

**Faculty buy-in and acceptance.** A factor that had some bearing on faculty participation in professional development and willingness to teach online was level of acceptance and buy-in regarding the effectiveness of online learning. The academic leaders in the study acknowledged that faculty entered online teaching at diverse levels of readiness and acceptance. Dr. Smith, Dean of College A, shared:

> In any initiative you do, you have early adopters. Go to the early adopters first and have some quick wins. Then, have them show other people how to be successful. Don't guilt anybody that they have to do this. Make this a plus and celebrate who's doing it well.

Dr. Cooper, from central services, agreed, “The faculty members who are the innovators and the early adopters are making things work. They're making things work because they play.” Dr. Mary Kemper, Dean of College B, agreed with Dean Smith and Dr. Cooper’s philosophy and added, “We have technology champions in the college that are not necessarily just teaching online. Almost all of our face-to-face courses have blended components. So faculty set up their classes in order to maximize the use of class time.” With the fear of technology removed, faculty were able to take their syllabus from a face-to-face course and convert it for the online environment. They did this with the help of training, a faculty mentor, and instructional design support. Dr. Cooper encouraged academic leaders to identify the barriers limiting buy in and acceptance. “Here are the barriers that can be controlled and those that can’t be controlled.
Identify how you can target those you can influence and minimize those barriers to encourage participation.”

Contrary to the supportive nature of faculty helping one another in online classes, Dean Smith shared a conversation he had with a junior faculty who recently began teaching online. The dean asked the faculty what he could do to ensure his success teaching online. The faculty responded:

You know how you can help me? Keep the silver-backs off of me. All the older faculty are telling me I sold out. That this is not quality instruction. That I won't get tenure. So, I have to sneak in my online stuff for them not to think that I sold out or that I no longer care about instruction. So, you can protect me if I teach online?

From this conversation, Dean Smith realized, “you have to protect your innovators and risk takers.” If faculty were willing to try new instructional approaches, their stability and futures within the university needed to be protected.

Academic leaders in the study contended that faculty acceptance and buy in regarding online education and eLearning at the institution has evolved over time. Dr. Stevens offered, “It took the village, because everyone was deeply suspicious of eLearning.” Mike Rafferty asserted:

It's an ongoing process. Slowly but surely we're getting a lot of buy in. I think part of it is vocabulary. It's educating people about the language. A lot of people think that online is like a correspondence course. Here’s a list of things to do – once you are done, you are finished with the course. That was how online courses and programs may have been 20 years ago. Online, today is nothing like that. We have to educate people and partner with the faculty.
Aaron, Vice-President of eLearning also shared that faculty resistance to teaching online was partially rooted in their fear that if they taught online they would “have 500 students in class, and not be able to manage that.”

Dr. Smith, Dean of College A, provided some concluding remarks regarding the need for the institution to reward faculty for teaching online:

Continue to celebrate who's doing it right. If you got people that are willing to try this mode of teaching, support them for trying it. If they fail, make sure that they don't feel like they failed. Help them see that it was a move towards teaching online. That it was a positive attempt. The focus is on seeing the best side of people instead of the worst side of people. If you support their efforts, they will try again and their expertise will grow.

People Practices

People practices referred to the collective human resource practices that created an organization’s overall capability (Galbraith, 1995). By committing to the development of human resources, organizations had the opportunity to produce talent that was aligned with the institution’s goals and strategic plans. The following sub-themes emerged from the data in support of people practices: 1) training, development, and documentation, 2) faculty development at the college level, 3) orientation, 4) team approach and trust, 5) instructional improvement, and 6) community of practice.

Training, Development, and Documentation. Prior to the creation of CEEl, individual colleges were primarily responsible for the training, development and documentation for all technology and tools used by that college. With the establishment of CEEl, came an opportunity to unite the technology across the university and provide enterprise level tools that all faculty, staff, and students could access. While many of the technological tools have been centrally
deployed, the training to support those tools has been sparse. Camryn, Assistant Professor, Educator and eLearning Director from College A, stated:

One of the things were lacking, that we still want, is more documentation and training around the centrally managed systems. We find that they get rolled out without a lot of detailed documentation, or at least the level of documentation that's needed for faculty.

There was disagreement as to how the central unit would support colleges. Carol, Senior Instructional Designer for College C, argued:

The whole goal, we thought as instructional designers, was that the central team of designers were going to be liaisons to us and provide support so we would cut down on the amount of trainings and resource guides that we had to create.

The responsibility of training and documentation development in support of enterprise tools was discussed at the eLearning governance committee meeting. The outcome of the committee meeting was that central services be held responsible for training and support of all enterprise level tools. Frustration remained as, according to Elizabeth, Associate Director of Online Learning from College B, “many months later very little training has been developed. I really think training and support should be embedded into the system as part of the central structure.” She continued to share that staff from central offices advised the group that they viewed their role in providing support to consist of documentation of knowledge-based articles.

Dr. Cooper, Director of Instructional Innovation, expressed concern regarding the role and responsibilities of the central team. She shared, “We're still muddling through that a bit because training was not originally my team's responsibility.” The development and documentation of training materials remained a topic to be addressed by all stakeholders.
Aaron, Assistant Vice-President for eLearning envisioned training support in the following way:

We do the implementation and run a pilot. Then we do a train-the-trainer series and hand it off to the colleges and units. That’s where we have some disagreement and conflict - around the hand-off. I get that it’s putting a lot of pressure on the colleges and units.

There was opportunity for university eLearning stakeholders to find a solution that was going to resolve ownership of training documentation and development. Participants all agreed that the roles, responsibilities, and ownership of training tools were not clear; that the campus eLearning community was struggling with how to resource and support training on enterprise level technology.

Camryn, Assistant Professor, Educator and eLearning Director for College A, explained that other colleges on campus did not have eLearning resources and were operating at a deficit:

We are lucky because we have instructional designers who can fill in the gaps and create tools. Some of the units do not have instructional designers. I have no idea how those other units are providing training for faculty. I think the only way to guarantee there is equity across the institution, regarding training, is if we centralize it.

**Faculty development at the college level.** College participants all shared their commitment to faculty development within their own units. Both College A and B shared that they have developed trainings and workshops for two enterprise level tools, Kaltura and WebEx. Elizabeth from College B stated, “My responsibility is to my faculty. When the training doesn’t come from central we have to answer the call to make sure faculty have what they need to be successful. So, we built interactive web-based training.”
In addition to the tools and training offered in support of central technology solutions, units designed, developed, and delivered faculty professional development in the following areas: 1) faculty presence in the online classroom, 2) course development strategies, 3) classroom management strategies, 4) Blackboard, 5) differences between online and face-to-face instruction, and 6) feedback strategies in an online class. College participants expressed passion for supporting faculty, in all teaching modalities. The impact of resource constraints limited their reach and they were hopeful that infrastructural improvements would be made.

**Orientation.** The process of preparing faculty to teach online was a responsibility of IHEs and was reflected in the faculty new hire process. Colleges’ recruitment and hiring strategies have evolved as units seek faculty whose philosophies embrace technology. Dr. Smith, Dean of College A stated, “I have been hiring new, young faculty that want to be engaged in technology.” Participants also shared that, while not the current practice in any of the units, consideration should be given to the offering of mandatory faculty training for online instruction. Camryn, from College A, described this idea in detail:

It would make a huge difference if there is a way to mandate, at least basic training for faculty who are making the transition to online. There needs to be, at least, some very basic levels of competency that we know everybody has. Should we have faculty teaching a course that doesn't know how to post an announcement? Or, doesn't know how to use the rubrics for grading? There has to be some basic competencies that we all feel good about. I think administrators could support the implementation of some basic required training; even for tenured faculty members, to make sure everybody has the basics down.
As more traditional courses were offered in a hybrid or blended format, the discussion regarding basic eLearning competencies for all faculty ensued.

Elizabeth offered, that in College B, they tried to orient faculty to online learning in a few different ways. “We worked one-on-one, side-by-side, with faculty as they developed their courses from scratch. We acted as partners in course development and encouraged faculty to use instructional design best practices to align their objectives and assessment strategies.” The ID team also developed a self-paced blackboard orientation that familiarize faculty with the LMS.

The college also designed, developed, and delivered a two-week long, facilitated online course called Online Teaching Strategies (OTS). OTS provided faculty with the basics of designing an online course and provided methods for being a successful online instructor. A faculty member in College B provided Elizabeth with the following feedback:

It was a really great experience for many of our faculty. OTS is what got her started in online teaching and it was the orientation that made her feel comfortable. That she was able to take this two week class and feel like she had her footing before she dove in.

John, also from College B, also discussed the impact of the OTS course as he shared that, for the past three or four years, his team offered this training to colleges that did not have ID support. The training has become so popular that the college recently began charging other colleges a per participant registration fee. He shared, the fee came to be, “because of the work it took to refresh and facilitate it each term. It was really a win-win for both colleges.”

Elizabeth described College B’s ongoing commitment toward formalizing onboarding for all faculty:

It's going to have an online component to it, but it's going to focus more on teaching and learning. It's going to have a new hire focus with emphasis on getting faculty started. It
will also include logistical things like ‘how do I get a key to my office?’ or ‘how do I help my student make sure they have their textbooks?’ Also, ‘how do I use this thing called Blackboard?’ and ‘Where can I find things I will need; and who do I go to for help?’ We have done a gap analysis of our current services and support; and we are trying to fill those gaps with training we're building now. It's also going to include HR, advising, and all these other folks. It will be a comprehensive a new hire orientation.

Other colleges also provided Blackboard training, course development resources, and support for orienting their faculty. This was done through the development and posting of resources on college websites and through the hosting of face-to-face training workshops. College A also hosted a summer orientation for their incoming faculty. Camryn stated that, “We have a two-week, self-paced, online course that has assignments (graded by a facilitator), about how to teach online and getting started online. We put all of our new adjuncts and new to online faculty in that class.”

Participants all shared the opinion that orienting faculty to online instruction was an important factor that contributed to faculty satisfaction and success teaching online. Camryn, from College A, explained:

I do think that training does shape their pedagogy and shape how they teach. We hear a lot of our online faculty talk about how it changes their face-to-face teaching. Though we teach online, it forces you, many times, to be much more organized in your teaching.

Central services also supported the need to provide faculty orientation and were heavily involved in campus-based, live faculty onboarding. Dr. Stevens, Vice-President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, stated:
I will tell you that the eLearning group has infiltrated faculty orientation and comes in force…and they have half a dozen tables set up. They host a de facto orientation to eLearning resources which includes: pedagogy resources, classroom resources, getting them on the listservs, and getting them engaged - peer-to-peer.

**Team Approach and Trust.** It was acknowledged by the participants that it took a team to design, develop, and implement online courses successfully. In addition to having a strong team. It was important that team members were able to foster trust in their relationships with faculty.

**Team approach.** As previously discussed, building a successful online program involved the delivery of well-crafted courses supported by the expertise of multiple people. In some traditional classrooms, courses are built solely by the instructor. In the face-to-face modality, this instructional approach can be successful. On the contrary, successful online courses are often supported through a team approach. Elizabeth explained that, to her, the ideal team often consisted of three people:

The team consists of the faculty member, the instructional designer and the subject matter expert (SME). Many times the faculty member and SME are the same person. However, if an adjunct faculty member is hired as an SME and they don’t have a lot of teaching experience the faculty member on the team can act as mentor to the adjunct.

Dr. Mary Kemper, Dean of College B, described an example in this way:

We’re trying to get a new faculty orientation around just how to be a good teacher because a lot of our people come out of [insert profession]. They’re great practitioners. They have lots of content expertise; but, they don’t know how to teach. Then, the IDs
support the design and development process of the course. They are versed in teaching theory, technology, and best practices for student and instructor success online.

The college participants expressed the importance of building a quality team comprised of professionals who were experts in the roles. In building her team, Elizabeth described the importance of building a dynamic team with diversified talent:

Our team consists of me who has been a faculty member and ID for more than ten years, a Senior Instructional Designer that has been a faculty member for 25 years and Instructional Designer for the last 5 years, an Instructional Designer that specializes in Multi-media production, and an Instructional technologist that has Blackboard expertise. All of us have such different techniques and expertise that together we make this really dynamic team.

Carol, from College C, agreed with this strategic approach when adding to her team. In the first few years of the college’s online operations, Carol was the sole support. It became evident that it was time to add an additional resource to support the growing operations:

When I hired him, I strategically selected him because I knew that there were areas where I was deficient. I recognized that he had the talents to fill those gaps. I think he would agree the areas maybe he's deficient in I make up for. So we're a great team in that sense.

Trust. According to the academic leaders in the study, trust was identified as being an integral part of a team dynamic. Dr. Stevens referred to this when he stated:

To create a community of subject-matter expertise, a consultative community, a group of people who listen to each other, who filter information, to build the ecosystem…it takes trust. It’s not just one central group saying ‘this is the way it's going to be, and this is the
toolkit we are going to use.’ It’s brokering the resources, creating the right forums and places for people to come together, so issues, concerns, can filter up very quickly.

There was acknowledgement that faculty spent their careers developing content that had great meaning to them. During the course build process, faculty were engaged with other education experts and were asked to share their content in the collaborative process. This meant IDs were involved in discussing new ways for faculty to present their content. Faculty were introduced to new teaching strategies and ideas. Ideas were offered by individuals who might not be faculty. So, building trust and relationships was important to the process. Mike, Assistant Dean for Innovative Technology from College A shared, “It has to be a partnership between instructional designers and faculty. This is why having embedded instructional designers in the college units are important. They develop relationships that create trust.” Elizabeth supported Mike’s position and agreed, “It’s important for faculty to know that there are people to support them. They develop confidence in those people, because those are the folks that will get them through online challenges. They lean on them.”

**Instructional Improvement.** Participants expressed that it was important for faculty to recognize that continuous instructional improvement was essential to maintain relevance in their field. Additionally, participants expressed the need for faculty to remain relevant in their technological prowess. The resounding philosophy was that content should always drive the technology. That being stated, participants shared the belief that faculty should make an effort to incorporate technological enhancements into their course delivery.

Dr. Stevens described the idea in this way, “eLearning and technology are changing all of our learning paradigms and the meaning of faculty work on the academic side of the equation. What follows is a need for faculty to continually self-improve, not just in technology but also
teaching.” Elizabeth, from College B confirmed, “We’re actually starting to do a lot more work and service for our non-online faculty. This effort is intentional.”

Dr. Smith, Dean of College A, also believed that faculty needed to have strong technological skills. That they “…needed to understand what the tools could do before they could ever be expected to be creative with those tools. This understanding of technical acquisition was not a one-time thing, but involved continuous improvement.”

**Community of Practice (CoP).** Part of the expectation for faculty and instructional designers was to keep up with advances in the fields of instructional theory, learning theory, and technology. Many professionals attend national conferences or network with peers in their field to build a sense of community. At the local level, this could be accomplished through an institutional community of practice (CoP). Participants believed a community of practice for faculty and IDs would be beneficial and could contribute to the team approach previously discussed. Aaron, Vice-President for eLearning, commented:

> To me, that is where the magic happens. Everything else that we do is in support of trying to get that community of practice to form. It is like a unicorn, though. Because technologies change so much. And faculty leave the university and new ones come. So trying to get a community of practice to form is stinking hard.

Elizabeth, from College B, agreed with Aaron’s sentiments and expanded on the need for a CoP:

> Something difficult that we're starting to do is form a community of practice where we can share our processes. It doesn't necessarily mean that we all need to be doing the same thing. In fact, I believe you should always do what’s best for your faculty. But there might be places where we can be more effective if I just had an idea of how someone else is doing something. You know, not reinventing the wheel. Instead, we
would figure things out amongst fellow colleagues that are doing similar work. We've started a community of practice, but it hasn't really come together.

The development of a CoP could create opportunities where stakeholders agreed to share, grow, and support each other in an effort to excel online.

Discussion

The findings of this chapter provide insight to the professional development structure and support systems in place at one institution in support of faculty who teach online. The data collected from participant interviews, a demographic survey, observations, institutional and collegiate artifacts, observations and researcher memos paint a picture of the professional development opportunities three colleges afford faculty who teach online. In the sections that follow, a discussion regarding key findings related to Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization will be addressed.

All of the units in the study had an accurate, cohesive view regarding the institution’s strategic commitment to eLearning excellence. Academic leaders understood the charge and were all dedicated to advancing the institution as it prepared for its third century. Research in the field (Arabasz, Pirani, & Fawcett, 2003; Bailie, 2011; Darabi, Sikorski, & Harvey, 2006; Okojie, Olinzock, & Okojie-Boulder, 2006; Johnson, Adams-Becker, Estrada, & Freeman, 2014; Orr, Williams, & Pennington, 2009; Palloff & Pratt, 2011; Ryan, Carlton, & Ali, 2004) corroborated the institution’s vision to excel in online programming and integration of eLearning technologies in classrooms. Additionally, the university’s Faculty Senate and Faculty Development Review Committee issued guidance regarding professional development and online learning standards of practice.
Participants were acutely aware of the competitive nature and emergence of new online programs vying for a finite pool of applicants. The academic leaders in the study saw the value of embracing innovative teaching and learning strategies and committed to the offering of quality programs. A clear sentiment prevailed, “As soon as you take your eyes off the prize, the prize may be taken from you”. The ever present sense of competition encouraged units to work diligently to maintain their position in the landscape.

The infrastructure and hierarchy of the enterprise team was comprehensive. College units had a fraction of the financial, technological, and people resources to run online operations. This fact proved to be very contentious amongst the units. Tremendous opportunity exists to level the field so individual colleges can support online operations. This notion of the “haves” and the “have nots” contributed to the silos that existed on campus. As other colleges plan to enter the university’s online portfolio, the availability of resources mentioned above must be addressed. Without a proper infrastructure colleges entering the market may struggle to properly support faculty.

All units referenced the importance of having standards of practice for online courses. While varied in implementation and adoption, all units utilized the Quality Matters Instructional Design framework in the design of online courses. The colleges also utilized the TPACK team approach to course design and course building. The units acknowledged the importance of technological, pedagogical, and content expertise in the development of online courses.

Conversations regarding intellectual property (IP) and ownership of course content were addressed. Some colleges paid faculty for the development of online courses. In this model, one college paid faculty for developing the course so the college maintained ownership of the course and its content. Another college shared that it did not pay faculty for course development. The
rationale was since they did not pay faculty for the development of face-to-face classes, online course development was an expectation of workload (for all classes). A unified policy regarding IP could be explored to prevent disparities amongst the units.

The importance of implementing a scaffolded approach to professional development was discussed. Such an approach was consistent with Vygotsky’s (1978) social constructivist principles. Faculty, like students, arrive at education’s door at varying stages of readiness and competency. Professional development providers might consider training at various stages to maximize faculty time in training.

While there are opportunities for improvement regarding professional development, it must be stated that exceptional examples of training and support exist in support of faculty transitioning to online instruction. Best practices were abundant regarding orientation, just-in-time tutorials, 1-on-1 consultative sessions, knowledge-based articles, and web-based quick tips. The opportunity exists in the sharing of best practices through the formation of a community of practice. Professional development staff could collaborate in the development of a PD catalog of services shared amongst all groups. Through collective practice and collaboration, a strategic blueprint could emerge that informs the professional development and online best practices at the institution. This solution could reduce the individual unit development, occurring in all colleges, and provide consistency regarding the essentials of online instruction.

Additionally, there was a strong belief by the ID participants that training regarding enterprise tools should be built at the central level in collaboration from experts at the unit levels. The view, offered by the college units, was that this approach would provide a collaborative comprehensive set of tools deployed universally. Central support believed, due to the contextual nature and discipline specific needs of each college, training should be offered through the
college units. In favor of collaboration, and in support of the idea of a blueprint informing faculty professional developmental initiatives, central team members throughout the university should be included in the conversation. At the conclusion of the study, PD professionals at both the central and college units were working in partnership toward a resolve.

A final thought regarding formalized professional development opportunities for faculty who teach online was the offering of a *Leadership in Online Learning Certificate*. This certificate program consisted of the following five courses: 1) Tools for Online Learning Creation and Assessment, 2) Design of Blended Online Learning Environments, 3) Legal and Ethical Issues in Online Education, 4) Collaboration and Support in Online Education, and 5) Leadership and Administration in Online Education. The content of the certificate program moved beyond instructional design and established connections between design, methods, pedagogy, legal/ethical issues, and leadership. While the content would be very beneficial to faculty transitioning to online instruction very few faculty participated in the offering.

**Conclusion**

The descriptive narrative discussed in this chapter documents the findings in support of an intra-institutional alignment approach to professional development in support of faculty who teach online at one Institution of Higher Education (IHE). The results of the study will inform the development of an online or eLearning infrastructure for institutions that have not yet entered the online landscape. So long as the eLearning infrastructure and organization design of the institution are followed and implemented consistently with Galbraith’s (1995) Star model, faculty would be supported and would develop skills and competencies that contribute to their success and satisfaction as online instructors.
In the final chapter of this dissertation: answers to my research questions will be discussed, implications of the study will be shared, and recommendations for future research will be proposed.
Chapter 5: Discussion

This study sought to understand how an institution of higher education’s (IHE) strategic plan and professional development offerings were implemented in support of faculty with online teaching assignments. This “look inside” the university was accomplished by investigating four inter-related questions in search of how the institution’s eLearning vision and mission was actualized across multiple colleges. The investigation involved a review of the faculty needs assessment process, as well as, the method used in the selection of professional development training and resources. Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design was used as a framework to assess the intra-institutional alignment of the physical, technological, pedagogical and administrative resources necessary for creating and sustaining online operations. The research phenomenon was selected because of my belief that IHEs that offer online programs and courses should create systems, infrastructure, and professional development training opportunities in support of faculty as they transition from face-to-face instructors to online instructors.

This chapter presents answers to my research questions drawn from the data reported in Chapter Four. I also discuss the implications of this research study based on data obtained for each research question and offer suggestions for future research.

Research Questions

The following section provides the answers to the questions that guided my research. The study focused on the primary research question: What professional development opportunities do three colleges afford faculty who teach online? Four supporting questions of the research will be addressed first as a way of leading to the answer of the guiding question.

Research Question 1: In what ways is one institution’s eLearning vision and mission actualized across multiple colleges? Each unit at the institution was able to articulate the
institution’s central mission and vision as relates to online and eLearning priorities. Despite the shared understanding of the institution’s overarching vision and mission, each unit implemented different strategies and systems toward achieving the mission, thereby resulting in a lack of intra-institutional alignment. This premise was substantiated throughout the data collection and analysis processes and emerged from participant interviews, artifacts, observations, and researcher memos regarding professional development. The analysis of findings did not reveal a collective approach toward the mission and vision; rather evidence of a siloed approach remained.

Each of the units had established governance structures dedicated to the vetting of policies and practices in support of the online enterprise. The college units utilized a collaborative approach which included faculty, staff and administration; while the central unit’s governance structure was weighted toward administrative and staff inclusion. The inclusive approach employed at the college level may have contributed to greater participation in professional development offerings as faculty could have influenced the training agenda. Effort toward the inclusion of more faculty in central decision making may aid in faculty transition to online instructors.

Evidence of improved lines of communication were documented throughout the study. The establishment of CEeL created a forum for institution stakeholders, involved in online learning, to engage in discourse regarding online best practices, professional development, technological innovation, and instructional improvement. Additional effort to advance communication strategies should be considered.

Organically, informal networks amongst instructional designers and online operations staff evolved out of the need to support faculty who taught online. Academic leaders relied on
one another for guidance, support, and information sharing. Informal conversations, regarding
design solutions or interactive tools occurred regularly. Collegiality and collaboration provided
a foundation for the development of a community of practice. Institutional leaders would be
well-served to harness the collective intelligence on campus so more faculty would have
exposure to the network of professionals available.

With the exception of the OTS training provided by College B to faculty outside the
college, each of the college units’ online operations and professional development offerings
continued as they did prior to the establishment of the central enterprise. In essence, each unit
designed, developed, and delivered training devoid of collaboration with other units. The lack of
collaboration amongst units perpetuated the duplication of training documents and proliferated
inefficiencies. In essence, as many as a dozen unique sets of resources were created by each of
the colleges in support of each training initiative and in the launch of new technologies. The
collaborative design, development, and delivery of a comprehensive toolkit of resources has the
potential to maximize staff resources and elevate instructional practice. In comparison to central
staff resources, staff within the college units were limited, and team members were struggling in
their effort to find time to create the training and tools essential to ensure faculty success.

Research Question 2: In what ways do eLearning professional development (PD)
offerings align with the institution’s eLearning vision and mission? The units were also able
to articulate how the respective units’ organizational practices were aligned with the central
eLearning mission. Specific examples of alignment with the institution’s third century
eLearning vision were mostly obtained from participant interviews with those academic leaders
in instructional design roles and through an examination of university and college websites.
The importance of the institution utilizing a team-based approach to teaching and learning was significant. All participants confirmed that the intersection of technology, pedagogy, and content knowledge contributed to faculty success in the online environment. This finding was consistent with previous research regarding the importance of the TPACK model of instructional design (Koehler et al., 2004). The TPACK model confirms the need for a team-based approach when building online courses. Colella, Rota and Beery (2015) contended, “Teaching is not an activity that is done in isolation. It takes colleagues with diverse talents and skills to create and build effective learning tools that improve student learning outcomes (p. 64).

The role of Instructional designers (IDs) in building quality online courses and providing professional development to faculty who teach online cannot be overstated. All academic leaders in the study stressed the importance of building trusted relationships between faculty and ID staff. The one-on-one consultations and the multi-day institutes hosted by ID staff were the professional development offerings that participants believed garnered impact and influence over faculty enhancements to online instructional practice. The ID professionals were the individuals who provided for the online technology and pedagogy training. The ID teams partnered with faculty in the use of best practice principles of Quality Matters to build courses in alignment with eLearning design strategies (Shattuck, Dubins, & Zilberman, 2011). Evidence of the integration of Quality Matters was documented in participant interviews, institutional artifacts, and in the review of college websites.

Professional development (PD) offerings at the unit level were provided through a number of formal and informal trainings. Formal training took place in orientation and targeted topical sessions; while informal PD occurred in the one-on-one consultations and through interaction with web-based resources and communications.
The units all provided face-to-face orientation sessions for faculty. Central services involvement in faculty orientation was in the form of representation at university-wide new hire faculty orientation and in the offering of consultations regarding technological tools. College units’ orientation was two-fold: Faculty were invited to attend the college’s new hire orientation and the orientation for faculty transitioning to online instruction.

Ongoing PD exists at all levels within the institution. The two central eLearning offices provide continuous training for faculty. The IT division of the university provides training regarding technological tools services while the professional development office hosts training sessions regarding the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) which includes the integration of eLearning technological and pedagogical tools to inform instructional practice. Both central offices host websites that house knowledge-based articles and links to faculty resources; including web-based tools like Lynda.com, a technology training portal with just-in-time training videos aimed at skill acquisition. At the college unit level, all three ID teams also hosted websites that served as training repositories for faculty. The websites contained training manuals, one-sheet snapshots of tips, tricks, and shortcuts, documents explaining online best practices, and videos from web-based training sessions. The college units all had mechanisms in place to share timely academic deadlines and events. Monthly newsletters to both faculty and students provided tips for successful online navigation.

While professional development efforts within all four units were commendable, the intra-institutional alignment of PD offerings could be strengthened. As previously mentioned, silos still remain at the institution, and have been a barrier to an aligned approach to PD. The institution’s ability to bring stakeholders together in the collaboration and sharing of successful PD offerings may impact the pace and acceptance of colleges who have not been involved in
online learning. The institution would be well-served to create a community of practice that could encourage such collaboration.

**Research Question 3: In what ways do academic leaders know what professional development needs best serve faculty consumers?** Overall, based on best practice, experience, and expertise in online learning, participants had an admirable gauge on the PD needs of faculty. Participants knew that prior to teaching online faculty needed PD in the following areas: 1) faculty presence in the online classroom, 2) course development strategies, 3) classroom management strategies, 4) Blackboard, 5) differences between online and face-to-face instruction, and 6) feedback strategies in an online class. Participants views regarding successful online classes and instructional approaches were confirmed in the literature (Eliason, & Holmes, 2010; Orr, Williams, & Pennington, 2009; Palloff & Pratt, 2011).

Academic leaders rely on faculty evaluations (from professional development sessions and student course evaluations) and satisfaction data, other institutions and colleges, eLearning professionals, and best practices from the online learning community to inform the ongoing professional development offerings at the institution. Ideas for PD are generated from participation at: professional conferences, university and college-wide meetings, and in the collegial exchange of innovative instructional strategies.

Academic leaders also relied on direct, informal feedback regarding faculty instructional needs. Many of the participants shared that their understanding was derived from anecdotal conversations regarding essential tools needed for successful online instruction. Faculty would ask for tools or solutions that could help with test integrity, video or audio capture and interactive learning activities, to name a few. Instructional designers, in some colleges, have requested a standing block of time at monthly college and department meetings to slowly
integrate additional tools into the operations of the college. Other colleges could benefit from this approach.

Opportunity exists for the institution to implement a more formalized system for assessing faculty needs. Similar to course evaluations completed by students at the end of each class, the units could include evaluation of all structured PD offerings to provide more documented feedback about the application and relevance of training offerings to instruction. Perhaps an annual Faculty Needs Assessment Survey would capture gaps in the institutional and professional development support structures.

**Research Question 4: What factors contribute to the selection of eLearning resources utilized in the eLearning enterprise?** Academic leaders utilized the governance structure to vet new professional development topics in support of continuous development and delivery. Stakeholders from colleges involved in online learning served on eLearning committees and made recommendations regarding the selection of technological enhancements and systems. Faculty were also represented on college and university-wide eLearning and strategic committees. In some instances, faculty representation was limited. Effort to expand faculty involvement in eLearning governance and decision making could be encouraged. Such effort would show commitment to the Faculty Senate Task Force’s (2014-15, p. 21) charge to include faculty representation in decisions regarding online education.

Cost was a significant factor in the selection of eLearning resources purchased at the enterprise level. While they often support the enhancement of instruction, innovative technologies can be expensive. To this end, progress has been made at the university to vet new technological solutions through governance. Stakeholders research new tools and present options, with associated cost, to the governance community. A collective decision is made to
purchase the new tool at the enterprise level. In the formative years of online learning at the institution, colleges purchased individual college licenses for solutions. This independent approach often resulted in higher costs and multiple products deployed across campus. New enterprise solutions are funded using the distance learning fees collected each term.

The utilization and distribution of Distance Learning (DL) monies collected from students in online programs needs to be examined further. It has been approximated that $2M in student DL fees are collected annually at the institution. While the technological infrastructure and distance learning higher education compliance efforts of the institution are supported by the central enterprise unit, the faculty, staff, advisors, instructional designers, and administrators who are responsible for the daily operation of online programs at the college level do not directly benefit from the distance learning fees collected from the students they serve. The exorbitant cost of operating online programs is absorbed at the unit level. In an effort to increase intra-institutional alignment, the institution would be well-served to address the inequity of distribution of DL fees.

Of significance was the notion that in order for faculty professional development to have a positive effect on instruction, opportunities for increased faculty participation could be investigated. A challenge shared by many participants and documented numerous times in my researcher notes, was the fact that faculty faced time constraints in their effort to fulfill the primary functions of their role: teaching and scholarship, research, and service. Active participation in each area limited the amount of time available for professional development. Institutions may need to consider adjustments to workload policies and expectations so faculty have the opportunity to participate in professional development sessions.
Additionally, it was discussed that many higher education faculty have not received professional training in instruction. For many, faculty are hired based on subject matter expertise. Assuredly, practitioner experience is of tremendous value and contributes to faculty depth and breadth of content knowledge. Without professional training in instruction, some faculty may find themselves teaching the way they were taught many years ago. Specifically, faculty may stand at the front of the room, as the “sage on the stage” (King, 1993, p. 30), lecturing to students as they passively listen. While this method may be appropriate in some instructional settings, in online classrooms the front of the classroom does not exist and students are learning at life-speed. Online instructors are challenged to adjust the dynamics of the teaching and learning experience. To this end, institutions could make strides supporting faculty with educational expertise. If the academy is to support its members, perhaps professional development could be supported formally.

**Discussion of the Guiding Question**

At the time the study was conducted, the institution was in a period of a transition with recently appointed university and college leaders immersed in strategic planning for its third century. In taking the lead from the findings of this study, a concerted effort to build each of the units’ overall structures, processes, rewards and people practices might be considered as the institution readies itself for the future.

The university’s online learning community faced challenges that emerged from the Faculty Senate’s work regarding the necessary systems, structures, and policies requisite for the offering of online programs. Central to the conversations was the need for greater faculty involvement in the formation of online policies and programs. Additionally, the Faculty Senate charged the units with providing professional development in support of educators as they
transitioned to this instructional modality. Each of the college units in this study built web-based tools and offered face-to-face training sessions and consultations aimed at technological and pedagogical skill acquisition for faculty. The units all offered orientation sessions, and continuous PD in support of faculty. The units were also working toward the offering of scaffolded PD at the beginner, intermediate, and expert levels. The utilization of a scaffolded approach to PD would meet each faculty at their current level of competency. Consistent with Vygotsky’s (1978) ZPD social constructivist principle, faculty would partner with PD and ID professionals to elevate instructional competency in the delivery of online courses. Admittedly by all units, additional effort in this area was needed. Challenges to the development of scaffolded training were funding, need for more staff, and availability of time.

The units also encouraged participation in external professional development opportunities with the funding committed through the university’s AAUP Bargaining Agreement. As such, faculty were encouraged to nurture their craft by participating or presenting at local, state, national, and international conferences. Additionally, through the formation of inter-collegiate online programs, faculty were partnering with peers from other colleges in the offering of inter-disciplinary courses and degrees. Through collective practice and discourse regarding online learning, faculty taught and learned from one another in a collegial community through the creation of online instructional best practices. This collaborative instructional approach contributed to the enhancement of faculty knowledge and forged networking relationships.

The primary research question, “What professional development opportunities do three colleges afford faculty who teach online?” was investigated through the lens of Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design. Insight to the question required a look inside the
institution’s physical, technological, pedagogical and administrative support structures. Evidence of the institution’s faculty development strategy, structures, processes, rewards, and people systems were prevalent; although not comprehensive nor intra-institutionally aligned. While organically implemented within the corporate or business sector, the key tenets of Galbraith’s (1995) Star Model of Organization Design can inform the strategic vision and decision making processes of any type of organization, including institutions’ of higher education.

It is my belief that in the absence of infrastructure, training, and support faculty risk successful immersion in this teaching modality. With a blueprint and a toolbox at their disposal, faculty would find themselves at the doorstep of online learning armed with the essential skills and competencies to be successful instructors. Confident in their competency as online instructors, faculty may choose to champion this instructional mode and embrace the journey.

Implications

The goal of this study was to examine how an institution of higher education’s (IHE’s) professional development offerings were implemented in support of faculty who taught online. Due to the dearth in research regarding intra-institutional alignment, a review of the IHE’s strategies, structures, processes, rewards and people systems supporting faculty professional development were studied. The findings from this research study have implications for the following primary stakeholders: faculty, academic leaders (administrators, instructional designers, and directors of online/eLearning operations), and students. In addition, this study may also have broader implications for the online learning, professional development, and research communities. Ultimately, in line with national efforts aimed at continuous instructional improvement, these findings may lead to the formation of a community of practice comprised of educational experts committed to instructional excellence.
**Faculty.** The findings of this study have implications for faculty who are currently teaching online and those entertaining a change from traditional to contemporary modes of instruction. Depending on the individual faculty’s online pedagogical and technological expertise at the time of immersion, faculty may need to participate in a variety of PD offerings to increase their level of comfort and proficiency with online instruction.

Faculty would be well-served to familiarize themselves with the professional development offerings and resources at the institution. Knowing where to go, who to reach out to, and where to look for professional development resources could set faculty up for success. Faculty who have never taught online, and are situated in colleges without an online infrastructure may struggle to make the transition. Participants shared feedback regarding the importance of available professional support in earnest to reduce faculty frustration and challenges in the online environment. Faculty considering online instruction may also find themselves faced with a shift in faculty role and instructional philosophy. Simply put, online instruction is different than face-to-face instruction.

Online instruction often involves a change from an instructor led approach to one of facilitation. Methods of communication, feedback, interaction, assessment and delivery vary. The amount of pre-planning, preparation, and time also varies as best practice in online education is for courses to be built in entirety prior to the first day of class. Faculty need to consider these factors when accepting an online teaching assignment. Online instruction may not be a viable or desired option for some who do not embrace the shifts in instructional practice.

**Academic leaders.** The academic leaders at the institution can also benefit from the outcomes gleaned from this study as they make strategic decisions to remain competitive in the online higher education landscape. With an earnest focus on teaching, learning, and skill
enhancement, academic leaders might benefit from an increase in faculty acceptance of online learning. A collective executive level approach to faculty development has the potential to increase faculty immersion and acceptance of online instruction, enhance scholarly instruction, improve student learning outcomes, and elevate national rankings. The three groups of academic leaders considered in this study were administrators, instructional designers, and directors of online learning.

**Administrators.** IHE administrators responsible for the offering of online programs and courses will be able to use the findings to inform decisions regarding the implementation of faculty professional development offerings and preparation for faculty considering the online mode of instruction. Administrators have the opportunity to learn from the collegial efforts of their peers from different units within the IHE. Regularly scheduled meetings attended by institution leaders could incorporate a standing portion of the meeting for the sharing of best practices to inform the community of practice.

Senior level academic administrators have opportunity to partner in the discussion regarding equitable distribution of distance learning (DL) fees. The current process has been a barrier to institutional progress. Passionate discourse regarding college level need for additional funding in support of online programming was prevalent in the testimonies of college level participants. College opinion reflected the desire to have some portion of DL fees returned to the units that incurred the expenses associated with operating online programs. DL revenue could be used to launch additional programs within the college and help with the costs associated with online operations. Additionally, college academic leaders with documented success in the delivery of online programs were hesitant to rely on new, untested strategies offered by central
offices. Preference was to invest in the internal infrastructure and continue the precedent regarding the approach to professional development within the unit.

Central opinion supported the need to utilize DL fees in support of the enterprise infrastructure. DL fees were utilized in support of colleges preparing to enter the university’s online portfolio. Opportunity to increase confidence and trust in enterprise solutions exists. Potential for senior level central and unit administrators to collaborate on a fruitful solution is paramount.

**eLearning/online learning directors.** The academic leaders entrusted with executing the institutional and collegiate strategic eLearning plans would be well-served to partner with colleagues within the university. The liaison model offered by central services could serve as the catalyst and bridge for collaboration.

**Instructional Designers (IDs).** The three instructional designers that participated in this study provided rich, specific guidance that informed instructional practice. As such, their contributions have the potential to significantly impact the professional development trajectory and training supports for faculty. The three IDs spoke with respect, passion, and dedication towards faculty regarding their scholarly teaching efforts. Many best practice tools were shared regarding the strategic, structural, process, rewards, and people systems that contributed to the partnership with faculty.

IDs would be well-served to focus their time and talent on building relationships and trust with the faculty they serve. The findings uncovered the significance that faculty chose to receive professional development from those they trusted and with whom they built a rapport. To this end, their preference was to attend unit level trainings and institutes over centrally sponsored offerings. Central ID staff might consider partnering more with local ID staff in the delivery of
professional development. Over time, this association may foster improved relationships and trust.

Additionally, colleges that do not have dedicated instructional designers and online experts may be operating at a deficit. As enterprise tools are deployed, faculty from colleges without ID professionals, may be in a difficult position when asked to utilize technological tools in the classroom (face-to-face and online) without the requisite support. As colleges plan to launch online programs, serious consideration should be given to the strategy, infrastructure, processes, rewards, and people practices essential for the transition. Without the proper training and resources required for effective online teaching and learning, faculty may find themselves ill-equipped to embrace this instructional modality.

**Students.** Students are both the consumers and the products of our educational programs and instructional practices. Therefore, the depth and breadth of online and eLearning instructional knowledge and application faculty employ may directly impact student learning, satisfaction, and enrollment. Work-force expectations require students to enter their careers equipped with the skillset commiserate with 21st century competencies. As such, the instructional practice used 30 years ago, or even 10 years ago, may not prepare them for their futures. John Dewey, education pioneer and reformer, reminded us, “If we teach today’s students as we taught yesterday’s, we rob them of tomorrow” (1944, p. 167). Therefore, in order to remain competitive, as a school of choice, IHEs would be well-served to model innovative standards of instructional excellence.

**Online Learning.** The findings of this study have significance for the online learning community at large. Other institutions that have online programming can learn from the
outcomes of the study and establish protocols that encourage collaboration amongst units in the design, development, and delivery of professional development at home institutions.

Each year, the online learning education market continues to grow as more and more institutions enter the competitive landscape vying for the same pool of applicants (Allen & Seaman, 2016). Institutions that invest in faculty development may benefit from increased enrollment by digital natives as training efforts may translate to instructional excellence (Van Der Werf & Sabatier, 2009). The colleges included in the study all hosted nationally ranked programs. A concerted, collaborative institutional approach to professional development may elevate program rankings further and increase enrollment if programs exist at the forefront of the innovation curve.

The results of the study suggest that an investment in faculty scholarly and professional development activities may contribute to the quality of online programs and student satisfaction.

**Professional Development (PD).** The findings of the study provide a call to action for professional development providers. The call encourages PD professionals to collaborate in the development and delivery of training opportunities to increase efficiencies, reduce duplication, and enhance the overall quality of trainings and resources. Embracing and engaging professionals in the development of tools and resources will also provide consistency in PD content delivery and scope.

**Researchers.** As previously mentioned, there is a dearth of research regarding intra-institutional alignment of faculty development at IHEs. In essence published research has only focused on studies that have been conducted at the central administrative levels of online and e-learning. A gap exists in documented research regarding unit level or college-level professional development and support a faculty who teach online.
It is my hope that the exposure of such a chasm in the field will promote scholars and practitioners to engage in research to advance the body of literature. Educational researchers can use the findings of this study to inform future research agendas and help shape professional development efforts within universities. In the section that follows, additional topics of interest are proposed for examination by the research community.

**Future Research**

Research regarding a scholarly phenomenon is an ongoing, never ending process. As the answer to a particular question becomes clear, additional questions emerge. Intellectual curiosity and obligation to the advancement of the body of knowledge help to fuel additional scholarly effort. As I consider next steps in my research journey, a laser-focused commitment will remain in support of professional development programs for higher education faculty. At the center of the research agenda will be an investigation of higher education instructional best practices that transcend instructional modality. In essence, a scholarly focus will be applied to the improvement of instruction – *all instruction*, not just online instruction. It is my belief that many of the instructional best practices used in online education are applicable in traditional face-to-face classrooms. To this end, I envision the “e” in “eLearning” will be dropped in favor of effective teaching and learning. Research efforts will continue within my institution, as well as, to other IHEs.

Initial next steps will be to conduct a comprehensive study of the intra-institutional alignment of faculty development within the IHE. Such a study would capture the total institutional progress as it would be inclusive of all thirteen academic colleges. At the time of this study, only six of the thirteen colleges were immersed in the offering online programs and courses. Therefore, a review of what is, and is not happening, within the other seven colleges
could be explored. The inclusion of all academic colleges could generate a deeper contextual picture of the professional development systems at the IHE.

This study was approached from the lens of academic leadership. Future research would be well-served to engage in conversations with faculty to assess perceptions regarding the professional development they participate in and the benefit of training to instructional practice. Studies regarding faculty experience and perceptions could provide insight as to whether or not the professional development they participate in aligns with the institutional mission. A study of the faculty could also confirm whether or not the IHE actually implemented the professional development plan it declared in its strategic plan.

In an effort to substantiate the impact of professional development for faculty, future studies could also include students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of instructional best practices to their learning. A mixed methods approach could be used to differentiate student outcomes in classes (traditional and contemporary) where faculty have been trained in, and have employed, instructional best practices in all classroom settings.

Interview findings from this study unveiled that faculty participation in professional development (PD) offerings was not substantive and that faculty preferred to attend unit level training over central enterprise level training. Future studies could address the following questions: Why do faculty prefer to attend unit level PD? Why do such small numbers of faculty actually engage in professional development? What factors or barriers contribute to low levels of faculty participation? Are there vulnerability factors which contribute to non-participation? Is there hesitancy to participate in PD sessions regarding online education because experts in online course development and delivery are often staff?
Additionally, institutions might consider a multi-tiered professional development program that differentiates faculty competency to teach in this format (Ali, Hodson-Carlton, Ryan, Flowers, Rose, & Wayda, 2005; Green, Alejandro, & Brown, 2009). Faculty arrive at the threshold of online teaching at all levels ranging from beginner to expert. Professional development opportunities could be more impactful if they met each faculty where they were in their journey. This method to PD is consistent with Vygotsky’s (1978) social constructivist methodology to learning. Specifically, with regard to online instruction, each faculty exists at a unique position on the zone of proximal development (ZPD) continuum. Online experts and professional development professionals can provide the guidance and encouragement to assist faculty as they move along the continuum toward a position of knowing. Armed with the necessary supports, faculty would have the potential to enhance their instructional “toolbox” and gain confidence with online instruction.

With the growing acceptance of online programming and student demand for inclusion of digital technologies, additional research questions become evident: Why aren’t all colleges embracing online or blended education instructional models? If colleges’ persist in their resistance to offer online instruction, will these IHEs experience a decline in overall student enrollment? Will IHE’s level of technological and innovative learning strategies be a determining factor in student selection of an IHE? The questions posed above are just some of the many research questions that could be addressed by the higher education research community.

A recommendation institutions may consider as they offer online courses or programs, is conducting an institutional readiness assessment and review of organizational design factors (strategy, structures, processes, rewards and people practices) in support of faculty as they
transition to online instruction. In addition to the infrastructural systems and processes necessary to launch online programs, a review of faculty eLearning competencies and preparedness to teach in this modality could be explored. As Orr, Williams and Pennington (2009) asserted, “The success of online teaching is closely tied to the ability of the institution to overcome barriers faculty members face in creating and teaching online courses” (p. 258). Institutions would be well-served to establish systems and processes targeted at the removal of barriers to ameliorate gaps in pedagogical and technological competency.

**Conclusion**

This qualitative case study found the institution at a crossroads with regard to the professional development offered faculty as they transitioned to online instructors. While robust offerings of professional development were evident throughout the institution, the approach to delivering professional development to faculty was not comprehensive.

At the time the study was conducted, the institution was poised to offer exceptional online educational experiences through the offering of student-centered, innovative, engaging experiences in support of lifelong learning. The opportunity to create such a learning environment was jeopardized by the lack of cohesion in faculty preparation and professional development opportunities. In order to effectively provide students with the optimum learning experience, the institution should invest in faculty preparation to advance the imperative. Successful implementation would contribute to universal support of faculty who transition to the online instructional modality.

The institution’s strategic vision for eLearning and online education was well articulated and interpreted; however, evidence of an aligned intra-institutional approach to professional development in support of faculty transitioning to online instruction could not be confirmed. Online operations and the offering of professional development for faculty who teach online
continued to operate in silos. Opportunity exists for an institution-wide investment in communication strategies to foster intra-institutional collaboration and alignment.

Intentional and strategic effort to align professional development could be fostered through the implementation of a community of practice where faculty, staff and administration collaborate and share best practices of instruction, operations, and course design. Frequent and consistent collaboration promotes conversations about best practices and evidenced-based teaching and learning strategies. The investment in a community of practice could contribute to a collective approach to the design, development, and delivery of professional development for faculty. In turn, faculty readiness to teach online could be expedited and more faculty would be prepared to teach in this modality. These collaborative efforts could fuel faculty acceptance, increase the pool of professionally trained faculty, and contribute to the institution’s ability to meet future demand for online programs.

Each year, online enrollment at the institution continues to rise with ten percent average annual growth. Institution enrollment management leaders anticipate this trend to continue as more colleges, or units, enter the online portfolio, interest in existing programs expands in correlational with improved national rankings, and in an effort to meet the diverse educational needs of students. This trend is consistent with national enrollment forecasts as IHEs continue to enter the online landscape in an effort to “meet the demand of residential students, address classroom space shortages, provide for scheduling flexibility, and/or provide extra sections (Allen & Seaman, 2016).

Despite the university’s existing professional development resources, the institution may consider additional professional development investment in technological, pedagogical, and
people resources in support of faculty. Ideally, the additional faculty professional development should occur in advance of, or at least in partnership with the launch of new online programs.

A driving force fueling professional development efforts is the societal imperative for institutions to offer education programs taught by faculty whose instructional methods and content expertise support the 21st century skills required in the workplace. If institutions are going to make strides toward meeting this imperative, they will need to prepare faculty and arm them with the requisite skills to be successful. A step in this direction would be for institutions to have a defined professional development blueprint aligned with the strategic plan. This approach would set faculty up for a successful and effective online teaching experience.
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Appendix A

Participant Recruitment Email

Email to Academic leaders

Dear [Insert participant name]:

I am a doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction here at the [Insert university name and college], under the advisement of [Insert faculty advisor name]. I’m excited to be conducting a dissertation study on our institution’s plan and progress in helping higher education faculty prepare for online instruction. Because of your experience as [insert role or title], your insights and perspectives are valuable parts of this project. I am contacting you to request that you take part in the study by participating in a face-to-face interview. Would you be willing to do this?

The interview will take approximately one hour and can take place at a location of your choice. I plan to conduct recorded interviews during the weeks of February 1st and February 15th. Please respond with a few meeting times that will work with your availability. I will confirm the interview via Outlook meeting invite.

My study is focused on exploring how the [Insert university name] eLearning enterprise supports faculty as they transition to online instructors. I plan to answer this overarching question by investigating the following questions:

   How is an institution’s eLearning vision and mission actualized across multiple colleges?

   1) How do eLearning professional development offerings align with the institution’s eLearning vision and mission?
   2) How does administration know that faculty professional development needs are being met by the current professional development offerings?
   3) What factors contribute to the selection of eLearning resources utilized in the eLearning enterprise?

It is my hope that you will volunteer to participate in this research. If you are interested in participating in this research please contact me at [insert Stacey Janz contact information] to confirm your availability.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Stacey Janz
Appendix B

Adult Consent Form for Research
[Insert Institution Name]
Department: College of Education
Principal Investigator: Stacey P. Janz, MEd
Faculty Advisor: [insert faculty name], PhD

Title of Study: A look Inside: An Investigation of Intra-Institutional Alignment in Support of Faculty Who Teach Online

Introduction:
You are being asked to take part in a research study. Please read this paper carefully and ask questions about anything that you do not understand.

Who is doing this research study?
The person in charge of this research study is Stacey Janz, doctoral student of the [insert university and program]. She is being guided in this research by [insert faculty name].

What is the purpose of this research study?
The purpose of this research study is to examine an institution’s plan and progress in helping higher education faculty prepare for online instruction.

Who will be in this research study?
Up to twenty people will take part in this study. You may be in this study if you are an administrator, faculty, or staff engaged in eLearning.

What if you are an employee where the research study is done?
Taking part in this research study is not part of your job. Refusing to be in the study will not affect your job. You will not be offered any special work-related benefits if you take part in this study.

What will you be asked to do in this research study, and how long will it take?
You will be asked to participate in an interview. It will take about 45 minutes to complete. With your permission, the interview will be audiotaped to ensure accuracy of participant responses and comments. Participants can request that the recording end at any time during the interview process. The research will take place in your office or other location designated by the participant.

Are there any risks to being in this research study? There are no known risks to participation in this study.
**Are there any benefits from being in this research study?** You will probably not get any direct benefit as a result of participation in this study. But, being in this study may have an impact on faculty orientation programs or eLearning initiatives at the institution. The outcomes of the study could lead to enhancements in pedagogy and teaching strategies, integration of interactive learning activities, enhanced technology and social media tools, and overall increase in faculty and student engagement in online courses.

**What will you get because of being in this research study?** There are no tangible gains for being in the study other than gratitude and appreciation from the investigator.

**Do you have choices about taking part in this research study?**

If you do not want to take part in this research study you may choose not to participate, opt out, or end the interview at any time during the interview period. You have a choice whether or not to take part in the audiotaping of the interview. Should you opt not to have the session recorded the PI will take manual field notes of the interview. Please note: There is a place at the end of this consent form to indicate your choice.

**How will your research information be kept confidential?**

Information about you will be kept private by the investigator and will be kept in a locked file cabinet. Only the investigator will have access to the interview notes and audio recordings; participants will be assigned pseudonyms to which only the researcher will have access. Participants’ real names will be separated from interview responses, prior to data analysis, so that no particular response can be linked to any particular individual. The PI will maintain a master list of participants with corresponding pseudonyms to be secured in a locked drawer separated from all other research data. Only the student PI will be allowed to de-identify the data and respond to participants questions regarding the research interview. Additionally, personally identifiable data will be masked as participants may be otherwise easily identifiable.

All data will be held in the strictest confidence and analyzed into findings for purposes of submission in the dissertation. Your recorded interview will be kept by Stacey Janz until transcription is complete. Hand written notes taken during the interview will be shredded by the student PI five years after completion of the study.

Agents of the [insert university name] may inspect study records for audit or quality assurance purposes.

**What are your legal rights in this research study?**

Nothing in this consent form waives any legal rights you may have. This consent form also does not release the investigator, the institution, or its agents from liability for negligence.
What if you have questions about this research study?

If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, you should contact Stacey Janz at [email] or XXX-XXX-XXXX.

The Institutional Review Board reviews all research projects that involve human participants to be sure the rights and welfare of participants are protected.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant or complaints about the study, you may contact the IRB at XXX-XXX-XXXX. Or, you may call the [insert university IRB Office contact information].

Do you HAVE to take part in this research study?

No one has to be in this research study. Refusing to take part will NOT cause any penalty or loss of benefits that you would otherwise have. You may start and then change your mind and stop at any time. To stop being in the study, you should tell the investigator who will immediately end your participation.

Agreement:

I have read this information and have received answers to any questions I asked. I give my consent to participate in this research study. I will receive a copy of this signed and dated consent form to keep.

__ YES, you may audiotape my interview

__ NO, I do NOT want you to audiotape my interview

Participant Name (please print) ____________________________________________

Participant Signature ______________________________________ Date _________

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent ________________________ Date _________
Appendix C
Interview Protocol

Academic leaders from the colleges

A look Inside: An Investigation of Intra-Institutional Alignment in Support of Faculty Who Teach Online

Pseudonym: ____________________________________

Interviewer: ____________________________________

Date: _________________________________________

Time: __________________________________________

Location: _______________________________________

Introduction:

Hello [insert name]. Thanks so much for agreeing to be part of this study and for taking the time to talk to me today about eLearning. Before we begin, I want to remind you that this interview is being conducted as a component of the requirements of my doctoral program and to inform faculty professional development for those who teach online. Therefore, your responses will be used in my doctoral research. I want you to know that to maintain confidentiality of your identity; I will assign a pseudonym to your interview responses. All data will be de-identified and aggregated to either staff or administrative groups.

With your permission I’d like to record this interview to be sure I obtain an accurate account of your responses. Do I have your permission to record our conversation?

[Note response]

I will be asking you a number of questions so please feel free to discuss your ideas and views. Are you ready to begin?

1. First, I’d like to understand your background - tell me a little about your experience with eLearning as it relates to higher education.

2. Please describe for me the launch and growth of eLearning efforts within your college.
3. Can you describe the eLearning infrastructure within your college? (Follow-ups: how many faculty teaching online, how many programs, how many IDs, IT supports, admin support.)

4. What is the college’s/department’s mission and vision as it relates to eLearning? How does that support the university vision/mission? (Follow-up: How was that conceived?)

5. How would you describe the college’s/department’s strategy for achieving that vision? (Follow-up: What short-term goals did you set to benchmark your progress?)

6. Can you explain the process your college/department uses to onboard and prepare faculty who are making the transition from face-to-face to online instructors? (Follow-up: Is preservice training mandatory? If so, what form does it take?)

7. Can you explain the process used for determining the selection of professional development offerings?

8. Is there a process for continuing and ongoing professional development in eLearning? Please describe.

9. How do you know that the professional development offerings are meeting the needs of faculty who teach online?

10. Can you explain the process used for determining the selection and implementation of technological resources in support of the eLearning enterprise?

11. Can you share your (administrative or instructional design) approach to providing support to faculty who teach online?

12. Can you discuss how faculty participation in professional development shape faculty online pedagogy and teaching?

13. Are there examples within the day-to-day operations at the college/department that demonstrate faculty feel supported in their journey as online instructors?

14. What are the college’s greatest eLearning accomplishments to date?

15. Can you share in which ways your college is supported by central eLearning professional development, support, and resources?

16. If you could have additional support from the university to achieve your college’s eLearning mission, what would that look like?

17. What are your views about instructional approaches or teaching strategies used in traditional face-to-face classes vs. online classes?
18. How has your perception of eLearning changed since you began supporting online instruction?

19. In your eLearning strategic plan, what initiatives will you focus on in the near future?

20. Where is there an opportunity for growth when it comes to online teaching?

21. What advice would you give to _________(insert role) that is considering online courses/programs? (Follow-up: What is your number 1 tip you would share with faculty as they shift to online?)

22. What else can you share about your views regarding the college’s plan and progress in helping faculty prepare for online instruction?

I’d like to review any documents you might have pertaining to the eLearning initiatives within your college. Specifically, may I access a copy of eLearning: course lists, enrollment reports/metrics, calendar of eLearning PD, evaluation/survey results, directory, strategic plan, and organization chart/hierarchy?

Thank you very much for your time today. I appreciate your comments and insights regarding participation in online orientation.
Appendix D

Interview Protocol

Academic leaders from central administration

A look Inside: An Investigation of Intra-Institutional Alignment in Support of Faculty Who Teach Online

Pseudonym: ________________________________

Interviewer: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

Time: ________________________________

Location: ________________________________

Introduction:

Hello [insert name]. Thanks so much for agreeing to be part of this study and for taking the time to talk to me today about eLearning. Before we begin, I want to remind you that this interview is being conducted as a component of the requirements of my doctoral program and to inform faculty professional development for those who teach online. Therefore, your responses will be used in my doctoral research. I want you to know that to maintain confidentiality of your identity; I will assign a pseudonym to your interview responses. All data will be de-identified and aggregated to either staff or administrative groups.

With your permission I’d like to record this interview to be sure I obtain an accurate account of your responses. Do I have your permission to record our conversation?

[Note response]

I will be asking you a number of questions so please feel free to discuss your ideas and views. Are you ready to begin?

1. First, I’d like to understand your background - tell me a little about your experience with eLearning as it relates to higher education.

2. Please describe for me the launch and growth of eLearning efforts within the institution.
3. Can you describe the eLearning infrastructure within the institution? (Follow-ups: how many faculty teaching online, how many programs, how many IDs, IT supports, admin support.)

4. What is the institution’s mission and vision as it relates to eLearning? (Follow-up: How was that conceived?)

5. How would you describe the institution’s strategy for achieving that vision? (Follow-up: What short-term goals did you set to benchmark your progress?)

6. Can you explain the process the institution uses to onboard and prepare faculty who are making the transition from face-to-face to online instructors? (Follow-up: Is preservice training mandatory? If so, what form does it take?)

7. Can you explain the process used for determining the selection of professional development offerings?

8. Is there a process for continuing and ongoing professional development in eLearning? Please describe.

9. How do you know that the professional development offerings are meeting the needs of faculty who teach online?

10. Can you explain the process used for determining the selection and implementation of technological resources in support of the eLearning enterprise? (Follow-up: Is training provided at the institutional or collegiate level?)

11. Can you share how the institution partners with the colleges in the delivery of online learning?

12. Can you share your (administrative or instructional design) approach to providing support to faculty who teach online?

13. Can you discuss how faculty participation in professional development shape faculty online pedagogy and teaching?

14. Are there examples within the day-to-day operations at the institution that demonstrate faculty feel supported in their journey as online instructors?

15. What are the institution’s greatest eLearning accomplishments to date?

16. Can you share how central eLearning professional development, support, and resources align with college eLearning efforts?

17. What are your views about instructional approaches or teaching strategies used in traditional face-to-face classes vs. online classes?
18. How has your perception of eLearning changed since you began supporting the online enterprise?

19. In your eLearning strategic plan, what initiatives will you focus on in the near future?

20. Where is there an opportunity for growth when it comes to online teaching?

21. What advice would you give to _________(insert role) that is considering online courses/programs? (Follow-up: What is your number 1 tip you would share with faculty as they shift to online?)

22. What else can you share about your views regarding the institution’s plan and progress in helping faculty prepare for online instruction?

I’d like to review any documents you might have pertaining to the eLearning initiatives within your college. Specifically, may I access a copy of eLearning: course lists, enrollment reports/metrics, calendar of eLearning PD, evaluation/survey results, directory, strategic plan, and organization chart/hierarchy??

Thank you very much for your time today. I appreciate your comments and insights regarding participation in online orientation.
Appendix E
Demographics Questionnaire

A look Inside: An Investigation of Intra-Institutional Alignment in Support of Faculty Who Teach Online

Participant Pseudonym: _________________________
Gender: _____M _____F
Age: _____
Race: ____White ____Black/African American _____American Indian _____Asian _____Other
Education: _____Associate’s _____Bachelor’s _____Master’s _____Doctorate
Position/Role: __________________________________________________________

Years of experience in higher education: _____
Years of experience at the current institution: _____
Years of experience in eLearning: _____
Years of experience in eLearning at the current institution: _____

Years of experience teaching in higher education: _____
Years of experience teaching online courses: _____
Years of experience teaching online courses at [insert university name]: _____
Appendix F

List of Institution and College Artifacts

Institutional Artifacts

**American Association of University Professors (AAUP)**

1. AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement, July 2013
2. AAUP Website: [http://www.uc.edu/hr/labor-relations-policy-development/collective-bargaining-agreements/aaup.html](http://www.uc.edu/hr/labor-relations-policy-development/collective-bargaining-agreements/aaup.html)

**Central Excellence in eLearning Office (CEeL)**

1. CEeL Committee and Subcommittee Membership, March 2016
2. CEeL Organization Chart
3. CEeL Welcome Sign
4. CEeL Website: [http://www.uc.edu/provost/priorities/elearning/about/excellence.html](http://www.uc.edu/provost/priorities/elearning/about/excellence.html)
6. University Distance Learning Fact Sheet, 2015

**Center for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning (CET&L) Faculty Professional Development Office**

1. CET&L Annual Report, 2012-2013
3. CET&L Faculty Development OneStop Website: [http://www.uc.edu/facdev/home.aspx](http://www.uc.edu/facdev/home.aspx)
4. CET&L Faculty Professional Development Offerings, 2015
5. CET&L Website: [http://www.uc.edu/cetl.html](http://www.uc.edu/cetl.html)

**Central Information Technology Office (ITO)**

1. Central ITO Website: [http://www.uc.edu/ucit/about/itatuc.html](http://www.uc.edu/ucit/about/itatuc.html)
2. Cyberinfrastructure Plan, 2014-2019
4. Information Technology Governance Council with Committees Chart, September 2015
5. Information Technology Governance Council with Committees Chart, September 2015
Faculty Senate

1. Faculty Senate Annual Report, 2014-2015
2. Faculty Senate Task Force on Online Learning Report, January 2015
3. Faculty Senate Task Force on Online Learning Summary, March 2015
4. Faculty Senate Website: [http://www.uc.edu/facultysenate.html](http://www.uc.edu/facultysenate.html)
5. Resolution Charging Units to Develop Policy for Distance Learning Courses and Programs

Central Administrative Offices

2. Criteria, Guidelines and Policies Regarding Article 24 Faculty Development Funds, July 2014
5. University Academic Master Plan, Phase 1: Defining and Amplifying the Vision, March 2011
8. University Creating Our Third Century Presentation
10. University Enrollment by College, Major, and Level, Fall 2015
11. University Enrollment by College, Major, and Level, Fall 2015
12. University Fall-to-Fall Retention by Cohort, Fall 2015
13. University Graduation Rates, 2015-16
15. University Mission Website: [http://www.uc.edu/about/mission.html](http://www.uc.edu/about/mission.html)
16. University Student Fact Book, Fall 2015
19. Student Fact Book, Fall 2015

College Artifacts

College A

1. College A Website: [http://cech.uc.edu/](http://cech.uc.edu/)
3. College A Professional Development Site: [http://cech.uc.edu/programs/professional_development.html](http://cech.uc.edu/programs/professional_development.html)
4. Department of Information Technology Strategic Plan 2013 to 2019
5. IT Support “welcome” mousepad with ID/IT contact information, 2016
6. Learning Design Collaborative Organization Chart

College B

1. College B Website:  http://www.cahs.uc.edu/home
2. Center for Educational Technology and Instructional Support (CETIS) Organization Chart
3. Center for Educational Technology and Instructional Support (CETIS) Service Catalog, 2015
5. Center for Educational Technology and Instructional Support (CETIS) Website:  http://www.cahs.uc.edu/faculty-staff/cetis/center-for-educational-technology-instructional-support
7. Welcome to CETIS Design Overview

College C

1. College C Website:  http://business.uc.edu/
2. College C Center for Instructional Design Website:  http://business.uc.edu/technology/InstructionalDesign/knowledgebase.html
3. Center for Instructional Design Annual Report, 2015
5. Center for Instructional Design and Online Learning Online Course Revision Policy, February 2015
6. Center for Instructional Design and Online Learning Instructional Technology Services Policy, January 2015
7. Center for Instructional Design and Online Learning Online Course Revision Policy, February 2015
9. Faculty Development Training website:
10. Keys to Successful Online Instruction” Primer, November 2014
11. College “Keys to Successful Online Instruction” Primer, November 2014
12. College Strategic Plan, 2006
13. College Strategic Plan Update, 2010
14. College “Success in Online Programs” Primer, December 2015
15. Tech Times Newsletter, April 2015