



2010-2011

The President's Task Force for John Jay Online

Final Report

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
2010-2011

Final Report

Table of Contents

1.	Overview.....	1
	1.1 Summary of Recommendations.....	1
2.	Background: The President's Task Force for John Jay Online	
	2.1 Introduction.....	2
	2.1.1 Charge.....	2
	2.1.2 Membership.....	2
	2.1.3 Process.....	3
3.	Findings and Recommendations.....	4
	3.1 Contexts and Approaches.....	4
	3.1.1 Marketing.....	5
	3.1.2 Support Services.....	5
	3.1.3 Planning/Cost Assessment.....	6
	3.1.4 Faculty.....	8
	3.1.5 Course Design.....	12
	3.1.6 Course Content.....	12
	3.1.7 Course Delivery.....	12
	3.1.8 Assessment of Learning.....	12
	3.1.9 Infrastructure.....	13
	3.1.10 Implementation.....	13
	3.2 College Programs	
	3.2.1 Graduate Degree Programs.....	13
	3.2.2 Certificate Programs.....	15
	3.2.3 Undergraduate Programs.....	15
	3.3 Phase Approach to Expansion	
	3.3.1 Phase One.....	16
	3.3.2 Phase Two.....	17
	3.3.3 Phase Three.....	17
4.	Additional Considerations from the Models.....	17

5. Budget.....17
 5.1 Cost recovery Projections.....18
6. Conclusion.....18
7. Selected References.....19

Appendix 1 Charge to the Task Force
Appendix 2 Task Force Agendas
Appendix 3 Distance Learning Task Force Testimony and MPA-IG
Information
Appendix 4 Readiness Characteristics
Appendix 5 Reports on Testing and Student Identity
Appendix 6 Report on Enrollment Mangement Preparedness
Appendix 7 Report on Marketing and Outsourcing
Appendix 8 Faculty Survey Data
Appendix 9 Draft Introductory Course for Faculty Development
Appendix 10 Report on Academic Services
Appendix 11 Diverse Models--Interviews Notes



Report of the Task Force for John Jay Online

March 1, 2011

Updated phase 1 budget March 14, 2011

1. Overview

The Task Force for John Jay Online convened over a five month period between the end of September 2010 and the end of February 2011 to develop a multi-year plan to expand online offerings at John Jay College. By building on the earlier, comprehensive effort of the Task Force for Distance Learning Policy and Practice, which issued its final report in August 2007, and on the experience of the MPA-IG program, which recently completed its first year and issued an assessment report in the fall 2010,¹ the task force aimed to contribute to the College's history of innovation for student success.

The work of the task force has revealed that a number of graduate and certificate programs may be excellent candidates for successful online delivery. At the same time, the findings and recommendations of the task force show that significant institutional investments in strategic planning, seasoned leadership, professional staffing, faculty development and incentives will be needed to position the College for success in the highly competitive educational arena of online learning. Cost recovery and net revenue gains are projected to follow program growth over time and are related to the specific models of planning, implementation and delivery that are selected.

1.1 Summary of Recommendations

The following summarizes the task force's recommendations.

1. Use a three phase approach to guide planning, resource development and launch sequencing
2. Conduct comprehensive market analyses for each program
3. Consider the outsourcing of marketing
4. Develop a staffing plan for expansion
5. Hire a director for online and distance learning
6. Constitute a cross functional committee to aid the director in strategic planning
7. Establish a faculty leadership position
8. Hire a director of instructional design
9. Hire professional instructional technologists as needed
10. Establish choice in faculty incentives
11. Establish attractive and sustainable faculty incentives
12. Institute clear policies for course development materials
13. Conduct comprehensive planning for faculty development
14. Institutionalize best practices for course development
15. Ensure programs are designed and delivered according to Middle States guidelines

¹ See the "Report of the Task Force on Distance Learning Policy and Practice," August 2007, and also see the "AY 2009 Evaluation of the National Online Master of Public Administration Inspector General Program" [fall 2010].

16. Identify and address technological expansion issues
17. Institutionalize best practices for program development
18. Determine program launch sequence for graduate programs and tie to phase-in plan
19. Recruit specific certificate program faculty for development activities during phase-in
20. Practice continuous assessment and improvement

2. Background: The President's Task Force for John Jay Online

2.1 Introduction

The following section describes the task force's charge, identifies its membership and details its process.

2.1.1 Charge

The President's Task Force for John Jay Online was charged by President Travis at its first meeting on September 22, 2010 according to specifications set forth in the President's May 27, 2010 memorandum to his executive staff ([Appendix 1](#)). The goals are summarized below.

- Develop a multi-year plan to expand online programming to other graduate programs, certificate programs and undergraduate courses based on the success of the MPA-IG program
- Consider levels of readiness for all master's and certificate programs (including those in the planning stages) and propose a sequence of launches for those programs
- Consider the expansion of online courses for undergraduates, especially for degree completion
- Identify best ways to promote faculty development, including incentives, student support and effective marketing
- Provide a cost recovery model

2.1.2 Membership

The task force provided a rare opportunity for a fully cross functional group of faculty members, directors and deans to engage in assessment and preliminary planning activities, an experience that is often limited to the College's vice presidents or to periods when the College is engaged in master planning or assessment activities for reaccreditation. Task force members were struck by the depth of expertise colleagues brought to the committee, by the in-depth view that took shape because of the spectrum of our vantage points, and by the central role everyone played in planning, data gathering and the formulation of recommendations.

The President appointed Dean Jannette Domingo, Professor Adam Wandt, Director William Pangburn, Director Meghan Duffy, Director Virginia Moreno, Director Marisol Marrero, Director Christine Godeck, Director Paul Wyatt and Dean Anne Lopes (chair) to the committee. The committee also recruited Professor Ellen Sexton, Professor Norman Groner, Professor Staci Strobl, Professor Robert Garot, Director Emily Karp, Director Daniel Auld, Director Kathy Killoran and Director Ben Rohdin to join its membership. Professor Anthony Carpi and Professor Bonnie R. Nelson also were recruited; they were unable to continue their participation beyond the task force's early meetings. The chair consulted with Professor Karen Kaplowitz in constituting the committee.

2.1.3 Process

The task force held ten ninety minute meetings on the following dates: September 22, October 7, October 28, November 8, November 17, December 13, 2010, January 11, January 23, February 8 and February 22, 2011 ([Appendix 2](#)). It began its work by learning about the history of online and distance learning at the College. The task force benefitted greatly from a careful review of the *Report of the Task Force on Distance Learning Policy and Practice*, from a presentation to the Online Task Force by the Distance Learning Task Force's chair, Professor Patrick O'Hara, and from discussions with the chair of the MPA-IG program, Professor Ned Benton. Discussions with Professor Jay Hamilton, a faculty member in the MPA-IG program, who acts as the key faculty program advisor, provided very helpful detail to the committee about the MPA-IG program, especially its concierge advisement model ([Appendix 3](#)). Professor Adam Wandt, a member of the task force, was invaluable in familiarizing the committee with current instructional design and technology practices and current capacity at the College.

The task force broke into two working groups. The first group, led by Director of Assessment, Virginia Moreno, sought to identify the elements of readiness ([Appendix 4](#)). The other group, facilitated by Anne Lopes, explored distance learning models at CUNY ([Appendix 11](#)) and elsewhere.² To learn about the successes and challenges of distance learning at CUNY and to explore potential models, the task force interviewed George Otte, University Director of Online Technology--CUNY, Janey S. Flanagan, Director of E-learning at Borough of Manhattan Community College, and Robert Whittaker, Associate Provost of Undergraduate Studies and Online Education at Lehman College, each of whom shared their experiences, insights and expertise with the task force. Professor Edward LaTessa, Director of the School of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati, provided extremely helpful information about building a successful and competitive graduate distance learning program in criminal justice. Information from the working groups was shared with the larger task force, which discussed findings and developed recommendations.

Individuals and small groups also conducted research and shared findings. The task force greatly benefitted from a group meeting and from individual discussions with John Jay College's graduate program directors, including Professor James Wulach, Professor Margaret Wallace, Professor Richard Lovely, Professor Robert Till, Professor Rosemary Barberet, Professor William Heffernan, Professor Diana Falkenbach, and Professor Ned Benton. A meeting with faculty teaching in the International Criminal Justice program and informal conversations with faculty throughout the College were illuminating. Norman Groner communicated task force activities and findings to the Faculty Senate's Technology Committee and provided the task force with feedback and insights from that critical group. Staci Strobl and Robert Garot researched student identification and exam proctoring, a concern of some graduate program directors and faculty ([Appendix 5A](#) and [Appendix 5B](#)). Marisol Marrero assessed the readiness of Enrollment Management for distance learning ([Appendix 6](#)). Christine Godeck examined the potential outsourcing of marketing for the graduate programs ([Appendix 7](#)). Daniel Auld, in consultation with Virginia Moreno and the College's Office of Institutional Research, drafted a survey for faculty teaching

² See sections 4 and 7 below.

in graduate programs ([Appendix 8](#)). Meghan Duffy and Anne Lopes drafted recommendations for faculty development ([Appendix 9](#)). Jannette Domingo, Staci Strobl, Norman Groner, Ellen Sexton, and Daniel Auld researched academic services ([Appendix 10](#)). Paul Wyatt discussed planning for student development services and a shared study about online learning by Student Development. William Pangburn, Adam Wandt and Anne Lopes worked on staffing models for the phases. Meghan Duffy, William Pangburn, Norman Groner, Adam Wandt and Anne Lopes provided expertise for the crafting of phase one. Throughout William Pangburn's know-how eased our work. Emily Karp and Ben Rohdin worked on a cost recovery model for the task force.

3. Findings and Recommendations

3.1 Contexts and Approaches

Although the task force's investigations generated excitement about the possibilities for expanding online programming, the task force cautions the College about the considerable challenges it will face in designing and delivering revenue generating online programs of high quality. While the findings and recommendations below have been formulated to address many of these barriers, some historical and institutional context issues need to be factored into the College's considerations as it moves forward. In the larger world, external funding opportunities for online program expansion are more limited than they were in the 1990s, when the thrill of computer-mediated and web-enhanced learning fueled private foundation and government spending for distance learning initiatives. At the College, most of the elements of readiness that the task force has established, based on the Middle States Commission on Higher Education's standards and on best practices for successful online and distance learning programs,³ are not yet in place. The task force also is concerned about risks to the John Jay "brand" as the College moves toward the expansion and institutionalization of online programming.

Recommendation 1 To balance these risks, to work through the challenges, and to learn from the experiences of our sister institutions, especially at a time when resources are constrained, the task force recommends that the College adopt a three phase plan for the development of online and distance learning. Phase one would focus on staffing, infrastructure, faculty development and on institutionalizing standards and best practices. In phase two, (a) selected graduate program/s would develop online and distance programming. Phase three would extend the activities of phase two into additional graduate and certificate programs. The phase plan is more fully outlined in section 3.3 of this report.

³ See [Appendix 4](#); also see the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, "Distance Education Programs: Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education (Online Learning)", (Philadelphia, PA: Middle States Commission on Higher Education, February 2011); Kaye Shelton and George Saltsman, *An Administrators Guide to Online Education*, USDLA Book Series on Distance Education, (Charlotte, NC: IAP Information Age Publishing, 2005); John D. Meyer and Amanda Barefield, *Developing and Sustaining Online Education: An Administrators Guide to Designing an Online Teaching Program*, (Saarbrücken, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 2009); Anymir Orellana, Terry Hudgins and Michael Simonson, Eds., *The Perfect Online Course: Best Practices for Designing and Teaching*, (Charlotte, NC: IAP Information Age Publishing, 2009).

The following discusses the key elements of readiness that were identified by the task force; it provides the context and rationale for the three phase plan that is detailed in section 3.3 below. Specific recommendations for each area of readiness are specified in each sub-section.

3.1.1 Marketing

A key impetus behind the development of online and distance learning at John Jay is the penetration of the College into new and emerging global student markets. The College has had very little experience with the complexities of marketing distance programs, and there is not a comprehensive marketing plan in place for online and distance learning. Based on the University of Cincinnati's experience launching a graduate, online criminal justice program,⁴ careful, targeted, international marketing is critical to program growth and profitability. The University of Cincinnati was able to increase its program by 250 students in three years, rapidly transforming it into a revenue generating enterprise, through effective, expert marketing. The key to the University of Cincinnati's swift success was outsourcing marketing to Compass Knowledge, a boutique marketing company in a highly competitive field. In contrast, the three CUNY programs we consulted did not outsource marketing and also did not experience such accelerated growth.⁵ The College needs to consider differences in hybrid and fully online programs when it projects growth and/or the possibility of entry into new markets.

Recommendation 2 The task force recommends that the College conduct a market analysis for each program that it considers for online development. Such an assessment would identify the extent to which niche markets exist for specialized programs. The task believes such study is important because of the level of investment that is needed to successfully bring a revenue generating program online.

Recommendation 3 The task force also recommends that the College further explore the possibility of outsourcing marketing. We have identified some of the major firms, all of which offer comprehensive services that include marketing ([Appendix 7](#)). Costs of these services are high, ranging from a several hundred thousand dollar initial cost for comprehensive services to revenue sharing plans.

3.1.2 Support Services (Enrollment, Academic Services and Student Development)

The College has not yet considered a virtual campus model, although it appears to be on the cusp of providing one within the next two years. CUNY First and a host of online services in Enrollment Management ([Appendix 6](#)) will make it possible for students to access enrollment, academic and development services ([Appendix 10](#)) anytime and anywhere over the web. A skillfully designed John Jay Online portal, which would include direct access to academic advisement, admissions, registration, social support (networking), testing/proctoring services (if needed), ADA compliance services for students with disabilities, career services, counseling, orientation services, library services, and student financial aid services, is recommended by the task force. Such a portal is critical to our ability to

⁴ See section 4 below.

⁵ See section 3.3 below for a summary of the Cincinnati model.

compete internationally, to provide services to distance learning students that are equal to face-to-face services, and to retain the students we enroll.

A concern in all areas, however, about online services is the provision of sufficient staffing to support any program expansion. The library faculty and Enrollment Management staff do not believe that their areas can withstand the stress of enrollment expansion, having recently experienced significant budget cuts. There have been considerable reductions in the library's faculty and staff in recent years, and Enrollment Management has cut staff and curtailed hours of operation for some services during this academic year.

Recommendation 4 The task force recommends that the College develop a staffing plan for the expansion of online programs over time. As the College begins the next stage of its planning for distance learning, it needs to carefully consider the impact of online programming on college-wide staffing in order to be in compliance with 2011 Middle States Commission on Higher Education standards for distance education.⁶ It must provide adequate staffing for enrollment and academic and student services to meet the needs of its online students. Additionally, it is required to offer online students 24/7 technological support. The College will need to assess if it can best provide these services in-house or if it should outsource such services. Online tutoring services in math and writing will require similar assessments.

3.1.3 Planning/Cost Assessment

Leadership for distance learning is not in place. The College has not yet invested in a college-wide Director for Online and Distance Learning who can bring sophisticated and up-to-the-minute knowledge of best practices for distance and online learning to the College. These include: immersion and short term programming models, constructivist approaches, learning outcome driven program and course design, in-class assessment techniques, among the many other best and promising practices for both student and program success.

The need for experienced and knowledgeable leadership cannot be overstated. The history of distance learning in the digital age offers the College a plethora of instructive cues about the opportunities and challenges it may face as it moves John Jay Online forward. It is noteworthy that after millions of dollars of investments, NYU disbanded NYU ONLINE, Columbia University discontinued Fathom, and Temple University's turn of the 21st century online program succumbed under red ink. A host of institutional barriers, market issues, and a lack of strategic change management undergirded these costly failures. Because John Jay is a decidedly late starter to the development of online degree programs and online degree completion initiatives, it can learn from these attempts and identify the challenges it will face as it moves forward. The College can benefit from the extensive research in online program development, student learning online, and teaching that has been conducted over the last twenty years. To do so, it needs the management savvy and expertise in online program development that a seasoned Director for Online and Distance Learning would bring to the College.

⁶ Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 2011.

Recommendation 5 The College needs to hire a Director for Online and Distance Learning who reports to the Office of the Provost. Ideally, the position would carry faculty status, which would facilitate the director's work. A candidate should bring a significant and successful track record in online and distance program development and management. Knowledge of student learning, assessment, accreditation standards and best practices for online and distance learning are important qualifications for the position. Experience teaching online and a history of successful and collaborative work with faculty are among the characteristics a position description might specify.

Strategic planning for distance learning and coordination of resources Despite the considerable work that has been done by the faculty's online and distance learning pioneers and administrators since the late 1990s, strategic planning for distance learning has not been on-going. Continuity in college-wide planning would positively impact the delivery and expansion of online courses and programs; without it the College has moved at a slow pace in developing online and distance learning environments at both the course and program levels. Although the College received an Asynchronous Learning Network grant from the Sloan Foundation in 1999, only between 1% and 2% of all courses are currently delivered online. This is considerably slower than the growth at other institutions.⁷ Without experienced, college-wide leadership for distance learning, which includes pedagogical and administrative expertise in designing and developing distance learning programs, it does not appear that the College will be able to gather and sustain the momentum it needs to appropriately plan, develop and launch multiple online and distance programs. In addition, the scarce resources that the College may consider allocating to online and distance learning need careful coordination in order to serve the needs of students and faculty across all programs. College-wide leadership can ensure that resources for online and distance learning are maximized toward achieving specific Master Plan goals.

Recommendation 6 The task force recommends that a committee with cross functional expertise be constituted to assist the Director of Online and Distance Learning in addressing issues of planning, implementation, assessment and the continuous improvement of distance learning at the College.

Staffing for online and distance learning program development is not yet adequate Currently, an instructional design team composed of two part-time college assistants who work as educational technologists and a part-time programmer, staff the instructional design center. The instructional design center is overseen by a volunteer faculty member and funded by grants and tech fee allocations. The lack of a full-time, professional, expert director of instructional design, however, does not provide faculty members with the seasoned pedagogical and administrative expertise they need to learn about online and distance program standards in the larger academic community and to learn about best practices for program and course development, all of which would could accelerate the pace of program development, course design and delivery, and contribute to increased student success.

⁷ See I. Elaine Allan and Jeff Seaman, "Learning on Demand: Online Education in the United States, 2009," (Babson Survey Research Group, 2010) available at <http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/pdf/learningondemand.pdf>

Additionally, minimum funding for new program start-ups is not in place, and the College has not issued guidelines for programs that would help support and sustain programming, including enrollment guidelines. Standards for the review of online courses have not been established on the graduate or undergraduate levels.

Recommendation 7 A faculty leadership position also needs to be established in the Center for Instructional Design. The faculty director needs to receive sufficient release time so that s/he can act as a mentor to other faculty and contribute his/her experience to the development and growth of John Jay's Center for Instructional Design. Professor Adam Wandt should be asked to assume this important position. His many contributions to the Center and his leadership have distinguished the Center as an outstanding facility among CUNY institutions. Having an active faculty director in the Center for Instructional Design is a key to the growth of online learning at the College. Benefits include gaining and keeping faculty confidence in instructional design, promoting the Center as a model to CUNY, and conducting research and development initiatives. In addition, the Center has received considerable funding from CUNY over the years, and a strong Academic Director will help secure additional funding. The faculty director should be engaged in strategic planning for the Center with the Director and a cross functional group. A member of the task force suggested that the faculty director should be involved in budgeting and oversight of the Center.

Recommendation 8 The College needs to hire a Director of Instructional Design. Professional instructional designers apply instructional theory to develop course content and delivery systems. The position needs to report to the Director for Online and Distance Learning. The director would manage the work of the Office for Instructional Design, including that of the instructional technologists. The College should hire a trained professional with substantial experience. Such a position would maximize resources by providing the College with the knowledge and expertise it needs to develop competitive and high quality, accredited programs.

Recommendation 9 The College needs to hire additional professional instructional technologists, as online programming expands, who evaluate technology and conduct faculty development in how to use the technologies. Depending on the models for development and instruction the College and/or individual programs adopt, the instructional technologists will help faculty effectively use technology in building their course sites. They may even build the sites for faculty.

3.1.4 Faculty

Faculty Interest A faculty driven model is critical to the success of any online program. To explore the extent of faculty interest, the task force surveyed faculty teaching in all the graduate programs ([Appendix 8](#)) and spoke to graduate program directors and some graduate program faculty. The task force emailed 194 faculty who teach in the Graduate Programs, 160 of whom are full-time faculty and 34 of whom are adjunct faculty. Responses were received from 69 faculty (34%); 51 full-time (31.9% of full-time contacted); 18 adjuncts (52.9% of adjuncts contacted). The Task Force is pleased with these numbers given that institutional surveys are often ignored; the timing was not optimal, and the response time was short. Many individuals were favorable to distance education, but this majority of opinion may

reflect a self-selection bias where those most interested in distance learning were eager to share their opinions. Indeed 42% of respondents had previously taught an online course.

The survey revealed that an overwhelming majority of faculty (85.5%) who responded is willing to engage in development activities and to teach online. Fewer faculty members (77%) are willing to teach courses that others developed or to develop courses for other faculty members to teach (65%). An overwhelming majority (90%) is willing to attend faculty development sessions about online teaching and learning. Departments that stood out regarding their willingness to develop and teach online include: Law and Police Science, Criminal Justice Administration and Public Management. Protection Management also indicated very strong interest. Faculty in psychology were more evenly distributed with 3 faculty members indicating that they are *not at all willing* and 12 faculty members stating that they are *somewhat to very willing* to participate.

Although the College has clearly defined pockets of faculty experience and activity in online teaching--such as the MPA-IG faculty, faculty members who were engaged in the College's Sloan Asynchronous Learning Network (ALN) grant, and newly hired faculty who have taught online at other institutions--there does not appear to be widespread knowledge of online and distance learning pedagogies, especially constructivist approaches, outside of these groups. Thus far the College has relied on faculty champions who have increased interest in online programming across the graduate programs. While the committee has identified considerable interest among graduate faculty members and a number of graduate and certificate program directors, there are considerations with regard to faculty workload and the number of faculty who are available to participate in development activities across all programs.

Faculty Availability This issue emerged most clearly during the chair of the task force's discussions with the graduate program directors. The task force identified the interest and support of a graduate program's leadership as a critical component of online program development; therefore, the chair conducted conversations to preliminarily ascertain the extent to which each program was appropriate and/or ready for online development. Almost all program directors who are interested in online program development indicated that there is an insufficient number of full-time faculty who are available to engage in online program and course development. Many also stated that the opportunity costs might outweigh the gains: if graduate faculty are engaged in learning new pedagogical approaches and developing new programs and courses, they would not have sufficient time for their research and might publish less.

Faculty Incentives The task force recognized that there is consensus among faculty that developing and teaching online courses requires more work and warrants additional compensation. Those who are not prone to develop and teach online, we thought, might do so for significant compensation, while those who are interested may do it for less compensation. Therefore, we asked faculty members if the amount of compensation would have an impact on their willingness to teach online. One-third (33.3%) said additional compensation would have "no effect" on their willingness to participate. 30.4 % would be more willing and 36.2% would be much more willing to teach online for additional compensation.

When asked to elaborate, a significant number of respondents (13) stated that compensation for developing and teaching one online course should be equivalent to approximately double the cost for one traditional course. Others (5) cited course release time for two traditional courses to develop and teach one online course. An additional number (3) stated that either would be sufficient. Finally, 13 individuals stated that developing and teaching online courses is more work and requires more time, but they did not add what type of compensation they expected. Of the 18 who were specific about compensation type, some were quite adamant that their preference constituted the only compensation that they would find valuable; some want only release time, while others only want additional wages.

In conversations with faculty teaching in the graduate programs, we also learned that faculty members want a clear and upfront plan on release time and or monetary compensation. Faculty members want compensation to commence in the development phase and to continue through implementation.

Recommendation 10 Faculty members need to be appropriately compensated for engaging in course and program development activities and for teaching online. Given the range of responses, the task force recommends that faculty members be given a choice about the form of compensation (release time or stipend).

When determining the amount of compensation, the College needs to consider practices at other institutions, the specific experience at CUNY and faculty expectations. Almost all institutions incentivize faculty to develop online programs and courses.

At CUNY, faculty were initially compensated the equivalent of a teaching course for participating in development activities. When grant funding ran out, the amount was no longer sustainable. A switch to lower funding made it difficult to recruit faculty. Other institutions use the one course release model for development and tie it to purchasing the rights to the course. This means that the institution may use the syllabus and materials that a faculty member has developed; other members of the faculty may teach the course. The School of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati⁸ has developed a particularly innovative model; it compensates graduate faculty to develop a "jumbo" and to oversee a group of graduate teaching assistants who conduct the day to day teaching activities of the course. While the faculty member remains the instructor, s/he spends most of the time working with the graduate students once the course materials have been developed.

Recommendation 11 The amount of compensation needs to be sufficient to incentivize faculty to participate, and it needs to be sustainable over time.

Faculty development of course materials Many faculty at the College state that syllabi and materials are their intellectual property, and that they may not be used by other faculty or by the institution, may not be "leased" by the institution, and/or may not be purchased by the institution. Many colleges factor the cost of "purchase" or "lease" into the incentives they pay faculty to develop courses, since multiple sections of courses need to be offered. Such master syllabi and course materials are adapted by others

⁸ See section 3 below.

who teach the course. If syllabi and course materials are not shared across sections, the costs of scaling up may become prohibitive to the institution over time. This has been a challenge for the expansion of other CUNY online initiatives. In institutions with somewhat different institutional cultures, purchase or leasing is the implicit or explicit basis for the incentive. Some institutions pay faculty for development only when the faculty member “gives,” “sells, or “leases” the materials to the institution. Faculty may offer courses that meet College standards, but they are not additionally compensated or incentivized for development, if the institution is not permitted to use the materials. Other institutions work predominantly with adjunct faculty and have moved online degree programs to schools of continuing education and professional studies in order to do so. This does not always allow the institution to capitalize on the strengths and appeal of its fulltime faculty. In still other institutions, open source materials, freeware and public syllabi predominate.

Recommendation 12 The College needs to carefully work through issues related to course development and materials, and to develop clear policies, which meet both the faculty’s and the institution’s needs. Collaboration with faculty in policy development is critical.

A comprehensive program of faculty development for online and distance teaching and learning is not yet in place The College does not yet offer a strategic and comprehensive program for faculty development in online and distance learning program development, student learning, teaching tools, methods and strategies ([Appendix 9](#)). As the research indicates, teaching and learning in online environments differ markedly from how we go about teaching and learning in face-to-face environments.⁹ While both begin with the same emphasis on curriculum development based on clear program goals, student learning outcomes, and assessments that are mapped to course content and assignments, a specialized knowledge base and a very clear skill set are needed to use web based interfaces as the primary communication tool for teaching and learning. The web itself is an extremely dynamic environment in which new learning and teaching tools emerge out of last year’s innovations. We need only to think about the birth of the blog and the wiki and the decline in use of the discussion board or the use of mobile technologies in online courses to understand how quickly teaching and learning tools change.

Recommendation 13 The Director of Online Learning in consultation with the Director for the Advancement of Teaching and the Faculty Director of the Center for Instructional Design should develop a comprehensive plan for faculty development that corresponds to the John Jay Online’s three phase strategy. Phase one ought to offer broad and incentivized opportunities to at least 50 faculty members (full-time and adjunct) who are recruited primarily from those teaching graduate courses. Opportunities for learning should include workshops and courses in fully online and hybrid program and course design and delivery approaches. Both synchronous and asynchronous platforms need to be introduced. Workshops need to be offered in assessment, backward design principles and constructivist approaches to student learning. Online syllabi development using learning outcomes as the centerpiece, the

⁹ For a summary of these difference, see for instance, Susan Ko and Steve Rosen, *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide*, (New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2009), Part II.

integration of the web and other best practice methods and strategies should round out the program. Specialized workshops in aspects of student learning and in online facilitation, in-class assessment and feedback strategies should also be offered. Finally, advanced courses in various web tools and technologies should be offered for faculty who have been teaching online and want to master the tools of new teaching and learning strategies.

3.1.5 Course Design

How the College invests funding in online program development has not been sufficiently addressed.

Recommendation 14 Standards based on best practices for course development need to be agreed upon before programs launch. Courses in John Jay ONLINE need to have a common “look and feel;” that generally means that all will include John Jay ONLINE branding through a banner; faculty will use the same basic platforms for delivery (with standardized course shells; a minimum number navigation buttons, which are specified for particular kinds of activities), a common online vernacular (a discussion board is always referred to as a discussion board; a blog is referred to as a blog, etc.), a standard netiquette that will be followed with some minor program and course specific modifications, and web 2.0 common look and feel practices for a web site.¹⁰ There will be great variety among courses based on how faculty want to teach them in accordance with Middle Standards and generally good practices that program faculty establish for themselves as they learn more about the tools and strategies that are possible.

3.1.6 Course Content

Not all the graduate programs have goals and learning outcomes on the program and course levels to guide content, design of learning activities and assessment of student learning. These are standard for Middle States accreditation and essential to the design of any online course.

Recommendation 15 Program goals, learning outcomes, curriculum mapping and assessment plans for programs should be in place before the college invests in putting a program online.

3.1.7 Course delivery

In order to comply with accreditation standards, face-to-face and online sections need to share outcomes. Since outcomes have not yet been explicitly established in all the graduate programs, the task force cannot assess if they are shared. We understand that this work is currently underway in a number of the graduate programs and will be completed in at least one graduate program this academic year.

3.1.8 Assessment of Learning

¹⁰ See John Bourne and Janet C. Moore, “Elements of Quality Online Practice and Direction,” The Sloan C-Series, Vol. 4., 2003

In order to comply with accreditation standards, face-to-face and online courses need to share assessments or learning outcomes. Since outcomes have not yet been explicitly established in the graduate programs, the corresponding assessments are not in place. Therefore the task force cannot assess if the assessments are shared.

3.1.9 Infrastructure

Strategic planning for infrastructure and online growth has not yet taken place. Blackboard appears to be reliable; Elluminate has not yet been widely tested at the college; plans for the expanded use of both platforms are in the formative stages, although it is not anticipated that expansion would pose difficulties in the foreseeable future. Helpdesk services are not available around the clock; this is a critical component of distance programming that will need to be in place before John Jay commits to further online development.¹¹

Recommendation 16 Identify and address any expansion issues and increased licensure costs for Blackboard and Elluminate. Investigate helpdesk outsourcing.

3.1.10 Implementation

Implementation planning has not yet been regularized. Courses and programs have been launched without being fully developed.

Institutionalization of best practices Best practices in online education and distance learning programming need to provide the foundation for all online programs in order to optimize student learning, increase revenue from programs and ensure success, especially given the costs of mounting and launching online and distance programs.¹²

Recommendation 17 Online learning and teaching involves technological and faculty development costs that exceed the initial investment costs of face-to-face programs. To recover these costs, best practices that support retention need to be put in place, such as specialized distance learning scheduling (immersion programming; split course five or seven week course terms, etc.) and online academic and student support services. These programs also need to be standardized and scalable in order to increase their cost effectiveness.

3.2 College Programs

3.2.1 Graduate Degree Programs

Not all of the graduate programs are suited to or interested in exploring online program development.

¹¹ See section 3.3.1 below.

¹² See Rob Abel, *Achieving Success in Internet Supported Learning in Higher Education: Case Studies Illuminate Success factors, Challenges and Future Directions*, 2005, http://www.a-hec.org/research/study_reports/IsL0205/TOC.html

- The Master of Arts in Forensic Health Counseling, Professor James Wulach, Program Director

The program is built around the development of counseling skills, which need to be taught face-to-face. Since these skills are taught across the curriculum and NYS requires face-to-face programming, the Master of Arts in Forensic Health Counseling is not suited to fully online or hybrid development. Some individual courses are currently being adapted to an online environment.

- Forensic Science, Professor Margaret Wallace, Program Director

Most courses cannot be offered online because they require lab components. Virtual lab facilities would not be appropriate.

- The Master of Science in Forensic Computing, Professor Richard Lovely, Program Director

Professor Lovely did not think it would be possible to launch an online program at this time. He voiced concerns about the readiness of the institutional culture to support a high tech program and about the availability of faculty. He thought it might be possible in several years to develop a certificate program in Computer Science for Digital Forensics, but he cautioned that it would be very difficult to develop such a program.

Other programs have indicated interest and appear suited to either fully online or hybrid adaptations.

- Protection Management, Professor Robert Till, Program Director

The program director and five faculty members have indicated strong interest in developing online programming. Sufficient faculty was a concern that was voiced, but interest is strong.

- International Criminal Justice, Professor Rosemary Barberet, Program Director

The task force chair was invited to meet with the program director and to attend a program faculty meeting. The program director and the faculty present at the meeting indicated interest in exploring the possibility of online or hybrid program development. There were concerns voiced about opportunity costs with regard to faculty publication rates and about the number of faculty available to develop fully online or hybrid courses. It is very difficult for the program to find appropriate adjunct faculty to teach courses. There were also concerns about the lack of administrative support for the graduate program and about how possible budget cuts might further impede program development. Concerns about intellectual property rights for faculty and appropriate compensation were also discussed.

- The Master of Arts in Criminal Justice, Professor William Heffernan, Program Director

The program director and some faculty with whom the task force consulted would like to learn more about fully online and hybrid programming. There is some preliminary concern that there is an insufficient number of faculty available to engage in faculty development and program and course development activities. The program director specified concerns about online testing and about verifying the identity of students. The program will discuss online and hybrid program development possibilities at its April faculty meeting.

- The Master of Arts in Forensic Psychology, Professor Diana Falkenbach, Program Director

Dr. Falkenbach is interested in exploring the possibility of a hybrid program and or hybrid course offerings with the faculty. Some courses in the program require face-to-face contact, but some courses could be offered online.

Public Administration, Professor Marilyn Rubin, Program Director

Professor Rubin is on sabbatical. The chair of the task force discussed the possibility of putting the program online with the department's chair, Professor Ned Benton. The MPA's IG track is already online. Professor Benton is interested and believes that there is faculty interest as well.

Recommendation 18 The Director of Online and Distance Learning needs to work with graduate program directors and faculty to determine the fully online and hybrid program development roster and the launch sequence for programs, which are identified as ready during phase one. Faculty in Protection Management, International Criminal Justice, Criminal Justice, Forensic Psychology and Public Administration should be recruited for possible participation in faculty development activities during phase one.

3.2.2 Certificate Programs

A criterion for readiness for online program development is that a program has been certified by the New York State Department of Education. Two of our current certificate programs meet this criterion:

- 1) Dispute Resolution; Professor Maria Volpe, the Program Director, is very interested in exploring the possibility of a fully online or hybrid program using synchronous and asynchronous tools.
- 2) Post Graduate Certificate in Forensic Psychology; Professor Wulach, the Program Director, does not believe the program is suited to an online environment.

A new program in Terrorism is currently being developed. Professor William Heffernan is the Program Director. Once the program has been accredited by New York State, the program's potential for adaptation to an online environment can be explored.

Recommendation 19 Faculty teaching courses in the Dispute Resolution Program should be recruited for possible participation in faculty development activities during phase one.

3.2.3 Undergraduate Programs

The undergraduate dean is interested in supporting the development of undergraduate courses in fully online and hybrid environments to foster information literacy skills' development and degree completion. General education and selected majors might be considered after policies, procedures and systems are in place that can optimize undergraduate learning. She will work with the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee to develop clear standards for online course development and delivery in conjunction with John Jay Online.

3.3 Phase Approach to Expansion

Because of the task force's findings with regard to readiness described in sections 3.1 and 3.2 above, the majority of the task force recommends a three phase approach to expansion. The duration of phase one would be 12-18 months, depending on resources, the pace of hiring a director and faculty development activities. Specific milestones need to be developed by the new director and the strategic planning committee for movement through each phase. Phase two would last for approximately two years as would the primary activities of phase three. Some members believe that program expansion can begin more quickly and that elements of phase two can be collapsed into phase one. Others emphasize student success outcomes and the impact of appropriate leadership on strategic planning for expansion.

3.3.1 Phase One

The first phase aims to ensure that the College has a basic, online learning infrastructure that will support the development and delivery of high quality and competitive distance learning programming. Based on the research the task force has conducted, some of the non-personnel elements of an infrastructure that will support online and distance learning--such as facilities for operation, equipment, supplies and synchronous and asynchronous e-learning environments/platforms and tools--are or will be made available (e.g. ITSS, the allocation of tech fee funds and possible external funding awards for distance learning). Decisions need to be made about incentives and about the use of faculty developed course materials at the start of phase one or even in an earlier "pre-phase one" stage.

Leadership for online and distance learning needs to be put in place by the start of phase one. Lines for the Director of Online and Distance Learning, the Director of Instructional Design, and release time for the Faculty Director need to be established. An adequate faculty development budget needs to be established. A revenue sharing plan for programs needs to be developed to further incentivize participation and to provide a means for faculty to get the technology they need to further their interest and deepen their skills in online technologies. External foundation and grant funding sources need to be identified, and a fundraising plan that makes online technologies less dependent on Tech Fee resources needs to be put in place and implemented.

In order to prepare to deliver increased distance programming in phases two and three of the task force's distance learning plan, 24/7 technical support for students needs to be put in place. It is a specified Middle States requirement. Tutoring services also need to be made available online almost around the clock. It is a fundamental element for the accreditation of distance learning programs: students need to have access to adequate services, which are defined as services that are comparable to those for students on campus. A pilot, which explores differences in delivery for math and writing tutoring between in house online tutoring using TutorTrac or outsourced services using Smarthinking needs to take place so that the College is positioned to select the most cost effective approach that stimulates student learning when it is ready to expand its distance programming, especially at the undergraduate level. Plans for online advisement and for student support services that are scalable across programs also need to be developed.

Faculty development is a critical focus of phase one. A faculty development program should begin with an introduction to best practices for online program development. Faculty teaching in programs that

have voiced an interest in online program development should be targeted for participation in short hybrid courses using blended technologies.

Additionally our current online classes should be supported so that they continue to be developed and enhanced in order to support faculty interest and engagement. Faculty should be offered mini-grants for media assets, technological innovations, research and other enhancements.

After a core group of faculty in the first selected masters and certificate program has participated in sufficient development activities, planning for program development and course design should commence.

Preliminary plans for phases two and three are sketched below.

3.3.2 Phase Two

During the second stage faculty development activities need to continue. A certificate program and a new program would be brought online, assuming that it was possible to begin development work on both during the last third of phase one.

A half-time instructional technologist would be added to the team along with a half-time college assistant, who would conduct clerical activities for the Center for Instructional Design.

3.3.3 Phase Three

In phase 3 two degree programs and one certificate program could be added, if the half-time instructional technologist position is converted to a full-time position or another half time instructional technologist joined the team. The college assistant half time position would become a full-time position as the clerical support needs of the instructional design center mushroom.

Recommendation 20 The phases should be guided by a practice of ongoing assessment and continuous improvements. Milestones should mark the transition to the next phase and adjustments should be undertaken in response to assessment results.

4. Additional Considerations from the Models

Interviews with George Otte, Janey Flanagan, Robert Whitaker and Edward LaTessa raised some additional issues for consideration and highlighted some that have been previously discussed ([Appendix 11](#)). Chief among them are the following: the importance of faculty engagement; sustainability with regard to incentives; sufficient incentives; the need for intrusive academic advisement models; the development of fully online academic, enrollment and support services; course and materials use; sufficient technological support for faculty; ease of course development and delivery for faculty; student retention strategies; the importance of online programs for revenue generation and entry into new markets rather than the use of resources to develop individual online courses; the need for appropriate investments at the start of development.

5. Budget

Because a phase model was selected as the best way to develop John Jay Online, a full budget with cost recovery projections could not be developed.¹³ In its place the Task Force chair has inserted the following itemization of expenses for Phase One.

(1) Salary for a Director of Online and Distance Learning	\$90,756.
Fringe @33%	29,949.
(2) Salary for a full-time, expert Instructional Designer	71,073.
Fringe @33%	23,454.
(3) 2 Part time apprentice educational technologists	
1@ \$17. per hour X 20 hours per week	17,680.
1@ \$21.34 per hour x 20 hours per week ¹⁴	22,194.
(4) Two courses faculty release time per year	7,000.
(5) Comprehensive Faculty Development Program	<u>30,000.</u>
<u>Totals</u>	\$292,106.¹⁵

5.1 Cost Recovery Projections to be completed

6. Conclusion

The task force's research reveals that there is sufficient interest to further explore the development of online graduate and certificate programming at the College. The aim of initial efforts should be to increase general knowledge about distance learning at John Jay and to put in place an infrastructure that can both develop, sustain and grow online programming. Key to this effort will be strategic planning across all units of the College, the cultivation of expertise in online pedagogies, and systematic, dedicated leadership in online learning among other factors.

Members of the task force appreciate the opportunity they have had to serve College, to learn more about how it works, and to imagine how online learning could work to expand and enrich our community.

¹³ Inserted revised budget for phase 1 on March 14, 2011.

¹⁴ Required position would also assume some reception and clerical functions.

¹⁵ Planning for clerical support and some part time programming should be addressed with existing college resources until staffing expansion is possible.

7. References

Selected References

- Ajadi, Timothy Olugbenga. "Organisation and Management of Open and Distance Education in Nigeria: A Case of National Open University of Nigeria (Noun)." *European Journal of Scientific Research* 38, no. 4 (December 30, 2009): 577-582.
- Allan, I. Elaine and Jeff Seaman Learning on Demand: Online Education in the United States, 2009. (Babson Survey Research Group, 2010).
<http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/pdf/learningondemand.pdf>
- Andrea Watson, et al. "An Exploration of African American Students' Attitudes Toward Online Learning." *Urban Education* 46, no. 2 (March 2011): 241-250.
- AP. "'If You Build It, They Will Come' for Blended Online Learning, Butler Finds." *Community College Week* 20 Oct. 2008: 18.
- Auh, Yoon-il. "Developing Online Instructors Requires More Than Workshops." *Distance Education Report* 8.21 (2004): 4, 7.
- AY 2009 Evaluation of the National Online Master of Public Administration Inspector General Program (John Jay College of Criminal Justice, [fall 2010]).
- Barrett, Bob. "Virtual Teaching And Strategies: Transitioning From Teaching Traditional Classes To Online Classes." *Contemporary Issues in Education Research* 3, no. 12 (December 2010): 17-20.
- Bliuc, Ana-Maria, Robert A. Ellis, Peter Goodyear, and Leanne Piggott. 2011. "A blended learning Approach to teaching foreign policy: Student experiences of learning through face-to-face and online discussion and their relationship to academic performance." *Computers & Education* 56, no. 3: 856-864.
- Bourne, John and Janet C. Moore, "Elements of Quality Online Practice and Direction." The Sloan C-Series 4 (2003).
- Brunner, Daniel L. "The Potential of the Hybrid Course Vis-à-Vis Online and Traditional Courses." *Teaching Theology and Religion* 9.4 (2006): 229-235.
- Buzzetto-More, Nicole A., and Retta Sweat-Guy. "Incorporating the Hybrid Learning Model into Minority Education at a Historically Black University." *Journal of Information Technology Education* 5 (2006): 153-164.
- Charles Miller, et al. "Using the Technological, Pedagogical, and Content Knowledge Framework to Design Online Learning Environments and Professional Development." *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 41, no. 3 (December 15, 2009): 319-346.

- Cherng-Jyh, Yen, and Liu Simon. "Learner Autonomy as a Predictor of Course Success and Final Grades in Community College Online Courses." *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 41, no. 3 (December 15, 2009): 347-367.
- Cooper, Thomas E. "A Study of Student Interactions during Asynchronous Mathematical Problem Solving." *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 41, no. 3 (December 15, 2009): 271-285.
- Davis, Hazel M. "Copyright in the Online Course Environment." *Journal of Library Administration* 45.3 (2006): 513-515.
- El Mansour, Bassou, and Davison M. Mupinga. "Students' Positive and Negative Experiences in Hybrid and Online Classes." *College Student Journal* 41.1 (2007): 242-248. *Education Research Complete*. Web. 30 Mar. 2010.
- Garza Mitchell, Regina L. "Ethics in an Online Environment." *New Directions for Community Colleges* 148 (2009): 63-70.
- Glenn, David. "How Students Can Improve by Studying Themselves: Researchers at CUNY's Graduate Center push 'self-regulated learning'." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 7 Feb. 2010, sec. The Faculty: A1, A10, A12, A14.
- Golden, Daniel. "Online Colleges Surge with Marketing to Military." *BusinessWeek.com* (December 16, 2009): 20.
- Jackson, Mary Jo, and Marilyn M. Helms. "Student Perceptions of Hybrid Courses: Measuring and Interpreting Quality." *Journal of Education for Business* 84.1 (2008): 7-12.
- Joseph, Diana. "Hybrid Design Enables Individualized Learning Experience." *Distance Education Report* 9 (2005): 6.
- Kaleta, Robert, Karen Skibba, and Tanya Joosten. "Discovering, Designing, and Delivering Hybrid Courses." *Blended Learning: Research Perspectives*. Needham, MA: The Sloan Consortium, 0. 111-143.
- Klisc, Chris, Tanya McGill, and Valerie Hobbs. "The effect of assessment on the outcomes of asynchronous online discussion as perceived by instructors." *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology* 25, no. 5 (December 2009): 666-682.
- Ko, Susan and Steve Rosen. *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide*. (New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2009).
- Lee, Silvia Wen-Yu, and Chin-Chung Tsai. "Students' perceptions of collaboration, self-regulated learning, and information seeking in the context of Internet-based learning and traditional learning." *Computers in Human Behavior* 27, no. 2 (March 2011): 905-914.

- Lorenzetti, Jennifer Patterson. "For Quality and Cost Effectiveness, Build a Hybrid Program." *Distance Education Report* 8.21 (2004): 1-2, 7.
- Meyer, John D. and Amanda Barefield. *Developing and Sustaining Online Education: An Administrators Guide to Designing an Online Teaching Program*. (LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, Saarbrücken, Germany, 2009).
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education. *Distance Education Programs: Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education (Online Learning)*. (Middle States Commission on Higher Education, Philadelphia, PA, February 2011).
- Moon, Debi, Virginia Michelich, and Susan McKinnon. "Blow Away the Competition: Explosive Best Practices for Cost-Effective Excellence in Distance Learning." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 29 (2005): 621-622.
- Ng, Connie Siew Ling, Cheung Wing Sum, and Hew Khe Foon. "Sustaining Asynchronous Online Discussions: Contributing Factors and Peer Facilitation Techniques." *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 41, no. 4 (December 20, 2009): 477-511.
- Niemic, Mary, and George Otte. "An Administrative Guide to the Whys and Hows of Blended Learning." *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks* 13.1 (2009): 19-30.
- Orellana, Anymir, Terry Hudgins and Michael Simonson, eds. *The Perfect Online Course: Best Practices for Designing and Teaching*. (IAP Information Age Publishing, Charlotte, NC, 2009).
- Osborne, Randall E., Paul Kriese, Heather Tobey, and Emily Johnson. "And Never the Two Shall Meet?: Student vs. Faculty Perceptions of Online Courses." *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 40.2 (2009): 171-182.
- Report of the Task Force on Distance Learning Policy and Practice (John Jay College of Criminal Justice, August 2007).
- Reasons, Saxon G. "Hybrid Courses - Hidden Dangers?." *Distance Education Report* 8.21 (2004): 3, 6, 7.
- Rogers, Patrick R., and Kimberly McNeil. "Student Learning Styles and Online Course Performance: An Empirical Examination of Student Success in Web-Based Management Courses." *Business Education Digest* no. 18 (December 2009): 1-15.
- "Rubric for Online Instruction PDF." *Rubric for Online Instruction*. California State University, Chico, n.d. Web. 30 Mar. 2010. www.csuchico.edu/tlp/resources/rubric/rubric.pdf
- "Rubric for Online Instruction Self-Assessment Form." *Rubric for Online Instruction*. California State University, Chico, n.d. Web. 30 Mar. 2010. www.csuchico.edu/tlp/resources/rubric/selfAssessForm.pdf.

- Shea, Peter, and Temi Bidjerano. "Learning presence: Towards a theory of self-efficacy, self-regulation, and the development of a communities of inquiry in online and blended learning environments." *Computers & Education* 55, no. 4 (December 2010): 1721-1731.
- Shelton, Kaye and George Saltsman. *An Administrators Guide to Online Education*, USDLA Book Series on Distance Education, (IAP Information Age Publishing, Charlotte, NC, 2005).
- Sprinkle, Julie E. "Student Perceptions of Educator Effectiveness: A Follow-up Study." *College Student Journal* 43, no. 4 (December 15, 2009): 1341-1358.
- "Teaching and Learning Online: Communication, Community, and Assessment." *Center for Teaching*. University of Massachusetts, n.d. Web. 30 Mar. 2010.
www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/publications/online_handbooks/Teaching_and_Learning_Online_Handbook.pdf
- Tobin, Thomas J. "Best Practices for Administrative Evaluation of Online Faculty." *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration* 7.2 (2004): n. pag. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*. Web. 30 Mar. 2010.
- Toth, Meredith, Teresa S. Foulger, and Audrey Amrein-Beardsley. "Post-Implementation Insights about a Hybrid Degree Program." *Tech Trends* 52.3 (2008): 76-80.
- Twigg, Carol A. "Using Asynchronous Learning in Redesign: Reaching and Retaining the At-Risk Student." *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks* 8.1 (2004): 7-15.
- Wong, James J. "Traditional Versus Hybrid Courses: A Comparative Analysis." *International Journal of Learning* 13.8 (2006): 163-170.
- Young, Jeffrey R. "'Hybrid' Teaching Seeks to End the Divide Between Traditional and Online Instruction." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 22 Mar. 2002: A33. *Education Research Complete*. Web. 30 Mar. 2010.
- Zhan, Zehui, Fuyin Xu, and Huiwen Ye. "Effects of an online learning community on active and reflective learners' learning performance and attitudes in a face-to-face undergraduate course." *Computers & Education* 56, no. 4 (May 2011): 961-968. *Academic Search Complete*, EBSCOhost (accessed February 17, 2011).