The Institutional Policy Presence: From Policy to Practice

By

Jason Maitland

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In

LEARNING AND TECHNOLOGY

We accept the thesis as conforming
to the required standard

…….
Dr. Mary Kennedy, Thesis Supervisor
Royal Roads University

…….
Dr. Robert Sochowski

……..
Dr. Alice MacGillivray, Committee Chair
Program Head

ROYAL ROADS UNIVERSITY

September 03, 2013

Abstract

This inquiry explored the effect of policy on faculty practice and pedagogy in e-learning in higher education. This study was framed by descriptive policy analysis which would lead to a better understanding of the way policies work – or do not work. It sought to identify the effect of educational/administrative policy by triangulating policy directives and their effect on faculty practice. The descriptive case study method was used to tell the story of the faculty who teach using e-learning. Qualitative data were gathered through on-site interviews, document analysis and a survey questionnaire. There was a blend of forced-choice and open-ended questions which were later thematically analyzed.

The findings indicated that policy is viewed by teaching faculty as being important to move e-learning/blended learning toward an institutional strategic plan or vision and those policies affect e-learning teaching practice. As well, the findings in this study suggested overall low diffusion of policy for e-learning/blended learning within this case study. The findings also suggested that policy, or lack thereof, had an affect on teaching practice in e-learning/blended learning. The study concludes with recommendations for future research.

Keywords: e-learning, blended learning, policy, post-secondary, polytechnic

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, Cathy. Her encouragement, understanding, support, and tolerance of the constant intrusion of my research on our family made this journey possible. This thesis is also dedicated to my parents, Ernie and Ethel Maitland, whose example of unconditional love has been an inspirational part of my life. A special thank you goes out to my thesis supervisor Dr. Mary Kennedy whose unending patience and guidance made this thesis possible. I would be remiss if I didn't thank Dr. Martha Burkle. She was my shepherd through the politics of a large and complex bureaucracy.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Background to the Study

Introduction

A number of forces have increased the need for more flexible access to education. The forces affecting this change are the economic pressures to compete within a global knowledge economy (Advisory Committee for Online Learning, 2001; Brown, Anderson, & Murray, 2007; Canadian Council on Learning, 2009; Fowler, Pont, Werquin, Miyamoto, & Tergeist, 2004; Gidleya, Hampsona, Wheelera, & Bereded-Samuelb, 2010; Huisman, & Van der Wende, 2004), the nature of the affordances offered by digital technologies (Brown, Anderson, & Murray, 2007; O'Neill, Singh, & O'Donoghue, 2004), the commoditization of education and increasing involvement of private sector (Fowler, Pont, Werquin, Miyamoto, & Tergeist, 2004), as well as the expectations of a new generation of learners (Conole, 2002). In part the impetus for the move is a changing demographic with expectations for anytime, anywhere access to information. Other factors influencing the move are the need for flexible market-driven curricula, the impact of globalization, international competition, and the economic reality that it is often cheaper to deliver courses on-line (Doughty, Dunlap, Parrish, Rusnak, & Shank, 2002; Tucker & Gentry, 2009). As a result, institutions are currently experiencing an enormous transformation when making the move to an e-learning environment. E-learning policy and policy implementation are increasingly affecting how higher education institutions operate, and how they are structured and organized (DfES, 2003). E-learning policy first leads to organizational redevelopment, and then this is expressed through the changed pedagogic practices of staff (de Freitas & Oliver, 2005). As a result, e-learning policy is beginning to take on a more significant role within the context of

educational policy (de Freitas & Oliver, 2005). For this reason, it is becoming increasingly important to establish what effect such policies might have on practice.

As post-secondary institutions strive to provide quality e-learning instructional delivery and to enter the increasingly competitive search for new students, an area that often receives little attention is policy development (Gellman-Danley & Fetzner, 1998). When setting the stage for e-learning innovation it is important to understand the influences of post-secondary institutional online learning policies and their effects on achieving best practice. It is by asking the tough policy questions in advance that future problems might be alleviated (Gellman-Danley & Fetzner, 1998). Although reviews have been undertaken of policies within this area, there has been relatively little attention paid to how e-learning policies have influenced practice (Conole, 2002). This researcher seeks to make this thesis the basis for a pragmatic debate about how online learning policy relates to practice.

Significance of the Study

This research makes an original contribution by expanding understanding of the use and implementation of e-learning in an area of post-secondary professional practice. The use of e-learning in post-secondary education is a recent phenomenon and relatively little is known about how educators are implementing e-learning in their programs and what affects their teaching practice. Few policy analysis studies exist regarding e-learning policy in post-secondary education. This study sought to elucidate the current condition of e-learning policy at a Canadian polytechnic and investigate the effect of policy on teaching practice. This study fills that gap with an analysis of policies affecting teaching practice, generating a new understanding about the challenges facing educators who are implementing e-learning. This research concludes by

offering recommendations regarding the creation of policies where gaps exist or where no policy exists. The research findings are relevant to Canadian polytechnic educators and to policy administrators.

Research Questions

1. Does educational/administrative policy affect faculty practice and pedagogy in e-learning in higher education?

2. How does educational/administrative policy affect faculty practice and pedagogy in e-learning in higher education?

Research sub-questions:

1. Which policies affect how faculty delivers their courses?
2. Do faculty have input on how policies are shaped within the institution?
3. How does policy affect faculty workload?
4. Does policy provide for incentive or reward for increased workload?
5. Does policy provide for training for faculty?
6. Does policy deal with intellectual property and copyright issues?
7. Do policies address the quality of e-learning and/or blended learning?

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, and to ensure clarity, commonly used terms are defined below:

- Blended Learning: Blended learning is a combination of face-to-face instruction with some form of e-learning (web-based, online, computer-mediated instruction)

(Bonk & Graham, 2006; Dziuban, Hartman, & Moskal, 2004; Hofmann & Dunkling, 2002; Garrison & Kanuka, 2004; Sands, 2002)

- Case Study: for methodological purposes of this thesis a case study is best defined as an in-depth study of a single phenomenon (a relatively bounded phenomenon) within its real life context where the aim is to elucidate features of a larger class of similar phenomena (Gerring, 2004; Yin, 2009)
- Copyright: ‘copyright’ means "the right to copy." In general, only the copyright owner, often the creator of the work, is allowed to produce or reproduce the work or to permit anyone else to do so (Canadian Intellectual Property Office, 2011).
- E-learning: the Canadian Council on Learning (CCL, 2009) defines e-learning as the development of knowledge and skills through the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) (and/or web-based technology) particularly to support interactions for learning—interactions with content, with learning activities and tools, and with other people.
- Faculty workload: For academic staff members who are instructors, workload is considered as the class contact hours. The workloads of individual instructors in a department are assigned by the Dean or his designee, after consultation with the instructor (SAFA Collective Agreement 2007-2010, 2007).
- Guideline: A guideline is a suggested way of doing something with a product or service scope. It is visible to those using or supporting the use of a particular product or service, has no rigorous approval mechanism, and there are no

sanctions if the guideline is not followed (Information Services and Technology Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2012)

- Intellectual Property: Legal rights that result from intellectual activity in the industrial, scientific, literary and artistic fields. Intellectual property establishes a right and identifies ownership of intellectual creativity which enables its owner to profit from the creative endeavour and to exclude others from making, selling or using that property without the necessary authorization (Canadian Intellectual Property Office, 2011).
- Online Learning: "the use of the Internet to access learning materials; to interact with the content, instructor, and other learners; and to obtain support during the learning process, in order to acquire knowledge, to construct personal meaning, and to grow from the learning experience" (Anderson, 2008 p. 5).
- Organizational Culture: Culture in organizations is defined as "the deeply seated (and often subconscious) values and beliefs shared by employees at all levels, and it is manifested in the characteristics (call them traits) of the organization" (Dobni, 2008, p. 544). It epitomizes the expressive character of employees and it is communicated and reinforced through symbolism, feelings, relationships, language, behaviors, physical settings, artifacts, and the like (Schein, 1984).
- Pedagogy: Pedagogy is defined as both the act of teaching and the discourse in which it is embedded (Alexander, 2001). Pedagogy embodies knowledge and skills, classroom management, and overall effective teaching practices. It is a complex blend of professional knowledge and practitioner skills (Lovat, 2003).

- Pedagogical quality: In this work the term pedagogic quality is used to refer to the quality of learning and teaching activity using technology-based resources and tools (Anderson, 2005).
- Policy: Policies are tools that an institution uses to define its position on how it intends to operate and its stand on a subject. They are considered to be compulsory in adherence and to provide a framework for decision-making (SAIT.ca - Policies and Procedures, 2011).
- Policy Analysis: policy analysis embodies two main aims: to understand and to improve policies. These two aims can be summarized under two broad categories of 'policy analysis': the analysis 'for' policy (practical, focused on improving policies) versus the analysis 'of' policy (academic, focused on understanding policies and how they emerged) (Versluis, van Keulen, & Stephenson, 2010). For the purpose of this research policy analysis refers to the analysis of existing policy using a descriptive approach which attempts to explain policies and their development. Case studies are frequently used in analysis *of* policy (Majchrzak, 1984; Morra & Friedlander, 1999).
- Policy Initiatives: Policies are developed in response to the existence of a perceived problem or an opportunity and this context is extremely important because it will shape the kinds of actions considered. Policy initiatives are focused strategies, projects and programs undertaken to achieve specific policies that have significant impact by virtue of the fact that the work is focused (Slack, 2012).

- Quality: For the purpose of the following questions quality in e- learning refers to high level of mastery of curricular outcomes together with excellent performance (Ehlers, Goertz, Hildebrandt, & Pawlowski, 2005).

Chapter 2

Review of the Related Literature

Introduction - The Policy Environment for E-Learning

This chapter outlines the policy background which is driving the adoption of a number of strategies for modernization in Canadian universities, of which e-learning and blended learning are two elements. To better understand the current state of e-learning/blended learning and policy within higher education, a literature search was conducted. The strategy involved selecting search terms related to the definition of e-learning presented by the Canadian Council on Learning (CCL, 2009) or online learning presented by Anderson (2008), and additional terms that were closely aligned with these definitions so as to make them complementary, and these were used as key words. For example where researchers used the terms e-learning, online learning, distance education or distance learning, and these terms as defined by the researcher were so closely linked to e-learning in meaning as to be indistinguishable, they were included in the keyword search terms.

A variety of broad terms related to policies of e-learning in higher education were used. These include e-learning, elearning, blended learning, distance education, distance learning, online instruction, multimedia instruction, online courses, web-based learning, virtual classrooms, computer mediated instruction, computer-based instruction, and computer-assisted instruction. Each of the search results began to clarify the current state of online learning policy in higher education. Policies specific to the application of technology (e.g., learning objects, digital portfolios and specific instructional software applications) were not used as keywords or descriptors within individual searches, as this would have significantly widened the scope of

retrieval and not have been directly relevant to the research. Note, however, that in some cases retrieved items did describe specific applications of technology.

The literature indicates that policy analysis efforts study fundamental social problems (Majchrzak, 1984). Policy analysis strives to solve real world problems by informing the often messy, arcane process of policy making (Hearn, 1998; Majchrzak, 1984). Policy analysis can be divided into two areas of study. Analysis for policy is prescriptive and involves the formulation of policies. Or in cases where the complex social problem is not precisely defined enough to search for causes and solutions, policy analysis will focus on definition of the problem rather than problem resolution (Majchrzak, 1984). This involves the analysis of policy and it is both analytical and descriptive, attempting to explain policies and their development. Descriptive policy analysis refers to either the historical analysis of past policies or the evaluation of a new policy as it is implemented (Patton & Sawicki, 1993, p. 14). Descriptive policy analysis is concerned not so much with designing better policies, but rather on improving our understanding of the way policies work – or do not work. Therefore, policy studies and analysis have been increasingly important in providing information to decision-makers as they confront complex, modern problems across a spectrum of public goods and services, including higher education (Hird, 2005; Majchrzak, 1984). This study is one of descriptive policy analysis. It seeks to identify the effect of educational/administrative policy by triangulating policy directives and their effect on faculty practice.

There are policy challenges when moving from a face-to-face learning environment to an online environment. Conole, (2004) indicates that there is a tension between the needs of policy makers/senior managers and academic/support staff. She explains the “former being more

interested in potential efficiency gains and cost effectiveness,… whilst the later are concerned with how the technologies can be used to improve the student learning experience" (p. 6). Policy makers often seize on the potential of e-learning to generate efficiencies through powerful methods of delivering information (de Freitas & Mayes, 2004).

The following literature review focuses on e-learning and blended learning in relation to institutional policy development. However, due to the ubiquitous nature of e-learning, any conversation is also about cross-border education, whether crossing provincial borders within Canada, crossing international borders, or crossing borders between traditional and non-traditional higher education, as represented by the movement toward blended learning. To better understand the complex interplay of public policy drivers regulating e-learning it is important to understand the emergent needs, trends, challenges, and pressures both external to and within the institution. The driving forces for making the transition from on-site learning to an e-learning/blended learning model are important because policies are developed in response to the existence of a perceived problem or an opportunity; they never exist in a vacuum. Therefore, this literature review investigates both Canadian and international perspectives, as well as internal organizational forces, for their potential to enable or limit adoption of e-learning initiatives into the practice of teaching and learning.

E-Learning in Perspective

Cross (2004) claims to have coined the word e-learning in 1998. It is more likely that Moore, Dickson-Deane, and Galyen, (2011) are correct when they indicate that the origins of the term e-learning are not certain. They suggested that the term most likely originated during the 1980s, within the similar time frame as online delivery of learning materials.

As learning technology and its associated fields continue to evolve, practitioners and researchers have yet to agree on common definitions and terminologies (Lowenthal & Wilson, 2010). For example the Canadian Council on Learning (CCL) defines e-learning as the development of knowledge and skills through the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) (and/or web-based technology) particularly to support interactions for learning—interactions with content, with learning activities and tools, and with other people (Abrami et al., 2006). While Frazee (2003) indicates that e-learning can be thought of as any learning that is done utilizing an internet or intranet connection, wherein delivery can be asynchronous (allowing learners to go through learning materials at their own pace within broad time constraints) or synchronous (participants attend the on-line learning session at a scheduled time, allowing for live interaction with the instructor and other students).

Defining e-learning as being associated with the internet is also supported by Nichols (2003) who conceives of e-learning as the use of various technological tools that are either Web-based, Web-distributed or Web-capable for the purposes of education. He states that “Purely online learning is essentially the use of e-learning tools in a distance education mode using the Web as the sole medium for all student learning and contact," (Nichols, 2003, p.2). The dissemination of educational material through the Internet, an intranet, or extranet is also supported as a definition of e-learning by Wesley (2002) and Zemsky & Massy (2004).

Yet e-learning is also broadly defined as all forms of electronic-supported learning and teaching that aim to effect the construction of knowledge, whether networked or not (Grui-Rosenblit & Gros, 2011; Tavangarian, Leypold, Nölting, Röser, & Voigt, 2004). Essentially the term e-learning means using computers in a learning environment. Trying to unearth anything

more specific can be frustrating. E-learning is an extremely vague term and can encompass many different forms of learning. It is not merely content-related, not limited to a particular technology and can be a component of blended or hybrid learning (Rossiter, 2002). E-learning has become the general term encompassing the application of computer technologies to education, whether it occurs in face-to-face classrooms, in blended and hybrid courses, in mediated distance education contexts or in e-learning learning environments.

Terms are often interchanged without meaningful definitions. The Advisory Committee for Online Learning (2001) uses the terms “online learning” and “e-learning” interchangeably. In either case, they equate both to distance learning and the provision of technology enhanced learning within a traditional classroom, lecture hall or laboratory.

Some authors will provide either no clear definition or a very vague reference to other terms such as online course/learning, web-based learning, web-based training, learning objects or distance learning believing that these terms can be used synonymously (Dringus & Cohen, 2005; Triacca, Bolchini, Botturi, & Inversini, 2004). In the policy documents, the conception of e-learning is very broad and in many cases no explicit definition was provided (Brown, Anderson, & Murray, 2007). This point is illustrated clearly by the many variations of spelling (e-learning, elearning, eLearning) and the way e-learning, online learning and distance learning seem to be synonymous. E-learning is a concept in search of consistent definition. For the purpose of this thesis this researcher will consider e-learning to be an umbrella term defined by the Canadian Council on Learning (CCL) as the development of knowledge and skills through the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) (and/or web-based technology) particularly

to support interactions for learning—interactions with content, with learning activities and tools, and with other people (Abrami et al., 2006).

The history of e-learning is short, and it can be characterized by rapid changes in technological development. This has also been the biggest problem in e-learning. Tynjala and Hakkinen (2005) indicate that in the history of this field, the dominance of technology-driven approaches is illustrated by the existence of various terms such as CAI (computer-assisted/aided instruction), e-learning, distance learning, blended learning and mobile learning. What changes rapidly is the technology, not the basic processes of learning. It is rather worrying that e-learning is sometimes interpreted in a narrow sense as referring to the process of delivering digital information and study materials to people through the electronic media (Tynjala & Hakkinen, 2005).

Some have called e-learning a paradigm shift in itself (Bauerova & Sein-Echaluce, 2008; Heinecke, Dawson, & Willis, 2001; Kurkela, 2006). These researchers focus on the transformative nature of the medium. However, this researcher believes that although e-learning has the potential to shift the teaching paradigm, it is the natural manifestation of the complex interplay/relationship between society, the institution, and the learner and is part of the evolutionary process to distribute learning.

Blended Learning and Pedagogy

Distance is no longer the primary descriptor for explaining the educational use of technology in post-secondary education. Instead, e-learning allows learning to be differentiated according to learner needs, as well as distributed in time and space regardless of where or when the learner and provider are located. With the more recent on-campus emphasis of e-learning, yet

another set of labels has appeared, including hybrid learning, blended learning, and mixed-mode instruction. The mere existence of so many names for what is essentially a single concept suggests that no dominant model has yet been accepted as a definition of standard practice (Dziuban, Hartman & Moskal 2004). In 1998 the term blended learning was popularized to refer to the mixture of e-learning and face-to-face instruction (Masie, 2006). Although this may seem like a relatively new term, the idea has been around for a long time and has always been a part of the educational landscape. A typical example of blended learning methodology would be the use of a combination of technology-based materials and face-to-face sessions to present content. An instructor can begin a course with a well-structured introductory lesson in the classroom, and then proceed with follow-up materials online. Each technology for electronic delivery of information has subsequently been used as a blend and for distance learning: the telephone; radio; broadcast, cable, and satellite television; audiotapes, videotapes, and videodisks; audio- and videoconferencing; timesharing on mainframe computers; PC software and CD-ROMs; and now the Internet. Blended learning can involve any union of delivery mechanisms combined with conventional lecture in a face-to-face setting (Sahare, & Thampi, 2010).

What is new is the ongoing convergence of two learning environments and the recognition of their potential to help fundamentally redesign the learning experience and to enhance and sustain communities of enquiry (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). On the one hand, there is the traditional face-to-face learning environment that has been around for centuries. On the other hand, e-learning learning environments have begun to grow and expand as new technologies have enhanced the possibilities for communication and interaction (Sahare & Thampi, 2010). Technological innovation is expanding the range of possible solutions that can

be brought to bear on teaching and learning. Whether we are primarily interested in creating more effective learning experiences, increasing access and flexibility, or reducing the cost of learning, it is likely that most learning systems will provide a blend of face-to-face learning and e-learning. Hofmann (2006) indicates that new conventional wisdom and years of academic research tell us that the best programs are a blend of technologies and that mixing the best blend of learning technologies is a critical success factor in creating effective learning. As a result future learning systems will likely be differentiated not based on whether they blend, but rather on how they blend to enhance learning (Sahare & Thampi, 2010).

Central to the new interest in blended learning and the development of new models of course delivery has been the Internet. The Internet has become the vehicle through which technology can easily be incorporated into instruction. Any Web browser can become a delivery medium for e-learning by allowing instruction that can be accessed anytime, anywhere and in any setting. The Internet, as an enabling technology, offers prospects for improving instructional quality, increasing educational access, and potentially reducing costs for both on-campus classes and distance learning (Baer, 1998). Previous educational technologies, such as radio, film and instructional television, have tended to replicate the classroom environment and its traditional teaching methods (Dziuban, Hartman, & Moskal 2004). The Internet has created new opportunities for students to interact with their peers, faculty, and content, inside and outside of the classroom.

Two distinct models guide current efforts to make use of the Internet in higher education. Baers (1998) indicates that the first approach seeks to improve existing forms and structures of post-secondary instruction to create better, faster, cheaper versions of today's courses and

curricula by means of the Internet. He further emphasizes that this model stresses building an on-campus information infrastructure that provides high-speed Internet connectivity to all students, faculty, administrators, and staff. Faculty then can use this infrastructure to improve and supplement traditional courses and degree programs. Learning objects are created and reused in courses. Books, course materials and library holdings can be digitized and made available both on-and off-campus.

A second belief is that blended learning does not constitute more of the same. Blended learning, when thoughtfully designed, provides learning opportunities that are active, intentional, authentic and collaborative. This represents a model which envisions the Internet as instrumental to fundamentally change the processes and organizational structure of post-secondary teaching and learning wherein the Internet can transform higher education into student-centered learning rather than institution and faculty-centered instruction (Baers, 1998). In this view, blended learning inherently is about rethinking and redesigning the teaching and learning relationship.

In either case early blended learning experiences were often permeated with long sequences of page-turning content and point-and-click quizzes. This new generation of blended learning is giving rise to the realization that a single mode of instructional delivery may not provide sufficient choices, engagement, social contact, relevance, and context needed to facilitate successful learning and performance (Sahare & Thampi, 2010). Blended learning is based on the concept that each learner is unique with different learning needs, and that learning is a continuous process. When educational environments provide rich sources of stimulation, novelty, challenge, and/or aesthetic value for the individual within a context of autonomy, learning is likely to flourish (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The Internet offers the chance to differentiate

instruction based on the construct that students have different skills, abilities, interests, backgrounds and ways of taking in and making sense of information and ideas. The Internet delivers mixed media content in a way that can best meet the needs of these differing learning styles and flexibly accommodate these differences so that each student has the best chance to learn and succeed. The appropriate blending of technologies seems to lend itself to better participant retention and appeals to more learning styles (Hofmann & Dunkling, 2002). The emerging instructional milieu is one that results in a blended learning model with the best practices of e-learning and face-to-face formats (Bonk & Graham, 2005).

Osguthorpe and Graham (2003) suggest that the aim of those using blended learning approaches is to find a balance between e-learning access to knowledge and face-to-face human interaction. As well, they say that the balance between e-learning and face-to-face components will vary for every course. Some blended courses, because of the nature of their instructional goals, student characteristics, instructor background, and e-learning resources will include more face-to-face than e-learning strategies. Other courses will tip the balance in favor of e-learning strategies, using face-to-face contact infrequently. Still others will mix the two forms of instruction somewhat equally. The important consideration is to ensure that the blend involves the strengths of each type of learning environment (Osguthorpe & Graham, 2003). The appropriate blending of technologies seems to lend itself to better participant retention and appeals to more learning styles (Hofmann & Dunkling, 2002).

As with any approach to teaching and learning, there are positive and negative possibilities. Blended learning has been used in innovative ways to increase student learning outcomes. As well, it also benefits the institution by decreasing instructional delivery costs,

improving the efficiency of classroom use and reducing on-campus traffic and the associated need for parking spaces (Dziuban, Hartman, & Moskal, 2004). However, this restructuring and replacing traditional class contact hours brings new operational challenges. For most institutions it is difficult to optimize the classroom scheduling process to capture all classroom hours left unused by blended courses (Dziuban, Hartman, & Moskal 2004). Other operational challenges include the provision of appropriately formatted materials to be posted online. Learning technology enables the instructor to create course materials in different formats including printed textbooks, online textbooks, online lecture notes, QuickTime movies, CDRoms, PowerPoint Presentations, streaming media, animations, simulations and videotapes of lectures and demonstrations (Franks, 2002). However, the creation of these media formats can be time consuming and the initial cost prohibitive.

Administrators must confront important operational issues in blended learning. A predominant consideration in this area is financial effectiveness, where the post-secondary institution must weigh the costs of faculty and student support, versus the opportunity to expand capacity while reducing the demands on brick-and-mortar infrastructure. In addition, because instructors report that teaching in the blended format is more time intensive than in face-to-face classes, especially in the conversion phase, institutions must deal with the costs of faculty involvement in this format (Dziuban, Hartman, & Moskal 2004). As much as faculty and students are experiencing changes and innovation in teaching and learning so too are administrators. The lack of e-learning policy, collaborative organizational structure and internal partnerships can pose a formidable barrier to blended learning initiatives (Cho & Berge, 2002).

Although we are able to describe the basic elements and processes, post-secondary institutions are still challenged to design the conditions that seamlessly integrate face-to-face learning and e-learning to engage students in a deep and meaningful way (Garrison & Vaughan 2008). The resulting implications are that blended learning in higher education is an evolving phenomenon that offers promise for addressing challenges such as access, cost, efficiency, and timely degree completion, as well as providing the best of both face-to-face and e-learning environments from a pedagogical perspective. Blended learning reflects the blended nature of our world, our workforce and the natural processes of how people really learn (Masie, 2006). In addition, this approach will impact aspects of the institution such as faculty development and rewards, student retention, college and department structure, as well as the notion of lifelong learning (Dziuban, Hartman, & Moskal 2004).

Once the benefits and challenges are weighed one against the other, it is important to note that in a recent comprehensive meta-analysis of 23 studies contrasting blends of e-learning and face-to-face instruction with conventional face-to-face classes, blended instruction proved to be more effective, thus providing a rationale for the effort required to design and implement blended approaches (Means, Toyama, Murphy, Bakia, & Jones, 2010). Williams (2002) contends that the literature on the potential of Internet information and communication technology to support meaningful educational experiences has been well documented. Furthermore, blended learning fosters continuous learning experiences and is “particularly effective in its ability to facilitate a community of inquiry, achieved through the effective integration of Internet communication technology” (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004, p. 97).

What are Policies and Are They Needed?

Dye (1995) states that policy is whatever institutions choose to do or not do. Policies are the institution's stated position on a particular internal or external issue. They provide in writing the basis for the institution's operations and are the means by which strategy is converted into front-line action. Policies provide guidance so that each time a question arises about how to implement a broad decision, there are some parameters to inform the response. Policies articulate the how of an institution's overall mission and aspirations. As well, policies answer questions for individuals within an organization. For example, faculty who teach in an e-learning or blended learning environment might ask "What is the institution's policy regarding working from home?"

Policies also help to create an internal control framework. It is this internal control framework that management will rely upon to ensure the institution's objectives are being met (von Solmsa & von Solmsa, 2004). Well written policies allow employees to understand their roles and responsibilities within predefined limits. Furthermore, policies identify the key activities and provide a strategy for decision-makers on how to handle issues as they arise. This is accomplished by providing the reader with limits and a choice of alternatives that can be used to guide their decision-making process as they attempt to overcome problems.

The question that arises is how the intent of top management can be manifest in the actions of the employees? Management normally communicates formal company direction, rules and regulations, as well as collective values, norms and knowledge, using policies (von Solmsa & von Solmsa, 2004). These policies and procedures should reflect the underlying assumptions and beliefs of management. Polices and procedures can help to protect the organization, its staff,

volunteers and beneficiaries by highlighting issues or principles and outlining the organization's exact response.

Arising out of policies are strategies and initiatives. These are processes that support but are not articulated in the same clear manner as policies (White, Davis, & Eales, 2007). They are mechanisms by which policies are implemented through outlining the how to instructions for implementing an area of policy.

Policy Origins and Post-Secondary Governance

Faculty involvement has its roots within the educational structure in Canadian higher education governance model. The Canadian constitution assigns responsibility for educational matters to the provinces (Constitution Acts, 1867 to 1982) while allowing the federal government to retain a coordinating policy function by channeling extra funds in order to achieve the desired change (Feldon, 2008). The federal government of Canada has only an indirect influence on educational matters through grants and the transfer of tax credits, as well as through support of a number of research granting agencies and the provision of some student financial support. Institutions of higher education in Alberta operate under the laws of the Government of Alberta Post-Secondary Learning Act (2003). The institutions (within the context of their mandate) are free to choose how they will discharge their educational mandates. Therefore, faculty involvement in policy decisions within higher education is entrenched within the governance model of the institution.

Although there are many interpretations of governance, Edgar, Marshall and Bassett (2006) summarize the common elements as being concerned with the structures and procedures for decision-making, accountability, control and codes of conduct. It is expressed through

legislation, policies and by-laws, and informal norms. The goal of effective governance is a robust organization that is effective, accountable and transparent to the people it serves. The model of shared governance is most often used to refer to the style of governance used. However, there is a lack of agreement on what shared governance is (Allen & Glickman, 1992; Mims & Newbill, 1995). Having a basic understanding of the shared governance models adapted by higher education institutions can be an asset in understanding the process of policy decision-making. Guffey and Rampp (1997) define shared governance as "a process that includes all institutional stakeholders making decisions affecting themselves and the institution where they work" (p. 2). Alfred (1998) remarks that it can either be viewed as (a) a system of self-government in which board members, administrators, faculty and students share responsibility in the governance, and cooperate in the operation of the institution or (b) all personnel have a share in the governance. Hogan (2006) provides an overview of the four models of shared governance:

Table 1

Models of Shared Governance

Model	Description
(a) Unicameral Governance	One body governs the institution's administrative and academic duties. Often bicameral governance operates within the internal, unicameral governance structure.
(b) Bicameral Governance	The Corporate Charter delegates authority over institutional decision-making to two legislative bodies: (a) a governing board which usually appoints

	the president and is responsible for the administrative and financial elements of the university (areas of property, revenue, expenditure, business, and other matters within the context of process and duties accorded it), and (b) an academic senate or a university/education council with responsibility for academic matters of an educational/academic nature that affect the university or college as a whole.
(c) Tri-cameral Governance	The Corporate Charter delegates authority over institutional decision making to three legislative bodies: (a) a governing board [of trustees] which usually appoints the president and is responsible for the administrative and financial elements of the university, (b) an academic senate with responsibility (in some cases on a purely advisory nature but often with specific duties assigned under the charter) for academic matters, and (c) a university or educational council.
(d) Hybrid Governance	Hybrid governance is a structure of governance wherein the president and faculty (with some student representation) take on leading roles in university

	governance (Shale, 2002). It consists of a Board or Academic Council or Faculty Council established by Academic Council. It exists today in higher education because of trends in universities and colleges to reflect a growing convergence between conventional and distance learning modes or technology modes.

In each case shared governance is used to convey the idea that a lot of conversation takes place within and among various campus groups (board, administration, faculty, staff and students) before the individuals in power make the final decision on policies and procedures. The resulting communication is reflected by management committees as they develop policies in order to implement the strategic aims and priorities of the institution.

An underlying theme of the literature is that without effective policies, structures and processes, the selection, deployment, and ongoing performance of an e-learning system will prove challenging, and perhaps unsuccessful (Davis, Little, & Stewart, 2008). Key barriers remain, including infrastructure, funding and staffing issues, and resistance by faculty (because of increased workload and intellectual property issues, among others) (CCL, 2009). Cullen, Hadjivassiliou, Junge, and Fischer (2007) indicate that current policy instruments lack specificity – they embody a prevalence of general principles rather than concrete actions. As well, faculties continue to express protectiveness about sharing learning resources (Becta 2010). E-learning has the capacity to alter an institution's administrative decision-making processes and structures, as well as its methods and modes of teaching and learning. As with any large-scale change—

especially one that requires the enthusiastic engagement of faculty—a critical and ongoing task for campus leaders is to provide effective leadership and communication of institutional plans and decisions (APLU, 2009). How an institution addresses the underlying policy decisions have far-reaching implications but we know little about the actual impact of this on teaching in higher education (Conole, 2002).

E-Learning/Blended Learning Policy

The literature indicates that policy analysis efforts study fundamental social problems (Majchrzak, 1984). Or in cases where the complex social problem is not precisely defined enough to search for causes and solutions, policy analysis will focus on definition of the problem rather than problem resolution (Majchrzak, 1984). Such is the case of this policy analysis. This study seeks to identify the effect of educational/administrative policy by triangulating policy directives in relation to faculty practice. Therefore, policy studies and analysis have been increasingly important in providing information to decision-makers as they confront complex, modern problems across a spectrum of public goods and services, including higher education (Hird, 2005; Majchrzak, 1984).

Descriptive policy analysis should try and shed light on policies and their developments. The approach of this researcher is descriptive rather than prescriptive and is employed to examine activities of a post-secondary institution and those actions that the post-secondary institution is undertaking to promote its vision of e-learning. This helps in discovering the reasons behind failures on certain decisions or actions, and why an

institution succeeds in executing particular e-learning initiatives. Descriptive policy analysis is useful for capturing the history of a policy.

An observation of this researcher is that a gap exits in the literature regarding policy evaluation. It is common for large institutions and even countries to have active policy-driven programs to develop e-learning. However, there are few models or theoretical approaches for evaluating e-learning policy (Attwell, 2006). Given the policy challenges when moving from a face-to-face learning environment to an e-learning environment, how do we know which policy approaches are working and which are not?

There are policy challenges when moving from a face-to-face learning environment to an e-learning environment. Conole, (2004) indicates that there is a tension between the needs of policy makers/senior managers and academic/support staff. Policy makers, inspired by market-driven forces to get courses online, seize on the potential of e-learning to generate efficiencies through powerful methods of delivering information (de Freitas & Mayes 2004). The cost effectiveness of e-learning and its presence in policy was a theme that ran through the literature (Smith, 2005).

E-Learning may provide opportunities for widening access and study possibilities. Exploiting fully the pedagogical possibilities of new learning technology may help in the conferring of skills needed in the rapidly changing information society, thus contributing to a more diversified learning experience. However, depending on the implementation of higher education policies and the role of e-learning in them, there may be the accompanying problems. The literature divides policy challenges affecting faculty into five categories (King, Nugent, Russell, Eich & Lacy, 2000; Gellman-Danley & Fetzner, 1998). These categories are as follows:

- compensation and workload (e.g., stipends, promotion and tenure, merit increases);
- development incentives; faculty training;
- opportunities to learn about technology and new applications (e.g., release time, training);
- congruence with existing union contracts, class monitoring, faculty support, faculty evaluation;
- intellectual property (e.g., ownership of materials, copyright).

Gellman-Danley and Fetzner (1998) published a framework of policy issues for distance learning. They suggested that "Asking the tough policy questions in advance can mitigate future bureaucratic problems and roadblocks" (para. 3). They group policy issues in seven operational areas: academic, fiscal, geographic service area, governance, labor-management, legal and student support services. To the extent that barriers to teaching using e-learning can be identified, analyzed, and policies changed where necessary to mitigate them, this framework should be useful to administrators and teachers in developing an e-learning environment.

The majority of the research in e-learning has focused on the introduction and effectiveness of technologies, student outcomes, student attitudes and satisfaction (Phipps & Merisotis, 1999; Berge & Mrozowski, 2001). Bates (2007b) indicated European e-learning research encompassed (a) policies and strategies: 10%; (b) teaching and learning: 30%; (c) the use of technology: 60%. Of 71 research papers investigated by Tallent-Runnels et al. (2006) course environment, learners' outcomes, learners' characteristics, and institutional and administrative factors emerged as the predominant themes. There is a need to contribute to understanding the experience of faculty participating in e-learning. Investigating the experience

of faculty has provided context for viewing the faculty as central in the successful implementation and expansion of distance education within higher education.

Maguire (2005) specifically investigated the experience of faculty participating in e-learning, and of thirteen research studies she found that concerns of faculty included a lack of standards for an e-learning courses, the threat of fewer jobs, and a decline in usage of full-time faculty, which faculty believe results in a decline in quality of faculty. Maguire (2005) found that the research indicated that faculty noted a lack of time, a lack of institutional support, a lack of scholarly respect in the areas of promotion and tenure, and a lack of training as other obstacles to participating in e-learning.

Other researchers (Barr, Gower, & Clayton, 2010; Carroll-Barefield & Nnazor (1998); Smith, Prince, & Campbell, 2005; Woolcott & Betts, 1999) also found that time was a consistent element. Time and effort was required in preparing instruction, converting a traditional course to an e-learning format creating materials for a new medium, and managing distance students, as well as the time and effort to learn new technologies to make the course content fit the e-learning environment. Therefore educators who use e-learning need to be competent in using technology as a means for effective instruction. Teaching an online course is more time intensive than that of a traditional course. Faculty who teach using e-learning have commented on the time necessary to develop and teach courses and refer to this as hidden workload (Woolcott & Betts, 1999). A professor noted the impact of information technology:

> “It takes a lot of extra time and I’m not sure that most people realize how much extra time it does take, and with the advent now of multiple technologies being involved, you

know, to stay up to date … you spend a lot more time communicating with those folks than you may have done a couple of years ago" (Woolcott & Betts, 1999, p. 35).

In a study by Tomai (2006) researching the impact of teaching using e-learning on faculty workload, the author noted that this method of teaching demanded a minimum of 14% more time than traditional instruction, most of which was spent presenting instructional content. The weekly impact on teaching load also varied considerably between the two formats. Traditional teaching was more stable across the semester while teaching using e-learning fluctuated greatly during periods of advisement and assessment.

Nnazor (1998) also explored the use of information technology in teaching at a major university. He found the faculty members' attitude to be generally positive but noted that despite this there was relatively little implementation. The hindering factors that emerged from his interviews were: (1) perceived or experienced pedagogical limitations of technology, (2) lack of time needed to learn or use the technology, (3) lack of professional reward for teaching with technology, (4) lack of appropriate skills, (5) lack of resources and equipment. He also identified three key organizational weaknesses: a lack of coordination of various initiatives, a neglect of faculty members' motivational needs, and the lack of policy-making authority in the units responsible for technology integration.

Organizations that are considering their undergraduate experience and drafting policy to guide technological innovation face considerable challenges. Post-secondary institutions are resisters to change and the path of change is never linear. Within this process post-secondary institutions are drafting policy to cautiously develop prototypes that will not only preserve the traditional values of higher education but will guide technological innovation. Garrison and

Kanuka (2004) indicate that the organizational and leadership issues for the successful adoption of a blended learning approach to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of teaching and learning will require the following:

- creation of clear institutional direction and policy;
- framing the potential, increasing awareness, and commitment;
- establishment of a single point of support, quality assurance and project management;
- creation of an innovation fund to provide the financial support and incentives to faculty and departments to initiate blended learning course transformations;
- investment in establishing a reliable and accessible, technology infrastructure;
- strategic selection of prototype projects that prove to be exceptionally successful exemplars of effective learning;
- development of formal instructional design support available through a blended format;
- systematic evaluation of satisfaction and success of the teaching, learning, technology and administration of new course;
- creation of a task group to address issues, challenges and opportunities as well as communicate and recommend new directions to the institutional community.

Richard and Gross (2002) indicate that possibly the most complex aspect of preparing the campus information policy environment for e-business is the set of policy issues surrounding the ownership and management of intellectual property generated on the campus. They go on to say that post-secondary institutions have developed robust policies for the ownership and management of intellectual property protected by patents; however the rights to intellectual

property developed by faculty members and protected by copyright have traditionally remained with individual faculty members. Pioneering faculty members are investing considerable time and energy to Web-enable their courses and institutions, in many cases, are partnering with these faculty members by providing release time from other obligations and by placing a variety of technical tools at the faculty members' disposal. This suggests the need for new policies regarding the ownership and management of rights to faculty course materials and clearly distinguishing between work-for-hire and other works produced in the discharge of the employees' work-related role(s). Richard and Gross (2002) indicate that the ownership of a work-for-hire is generally assumed to be the property of the institution and the information policy framework should make explicit reference to the institution's assumptions about what works are considered to be works-for-hire and what ownership rights the institution wishes to assert. This policy should also specify what rights individuals creating works-for-hire may have and what the process is for securing individual access to such works.

E-learning technologies will most certainly play a strong role in the strategic plan for the institutions of the future. Policies have the chance to position institutions for the transformational changes that are very difficult to predict but are certain to disrupt the traditional structure and operational dynamic of higher education. This represents a considerable challenge to the administrators and academic faculty of higher education institutions. Husmann and Miller (2001) report that administrators' perceptions of how to improve success in e-learning was to provide faculty with sufficient planning timelines and release time, as well as to provide additional support. Parker (2003) reports that although extrinsic motivators such as special stipends,

reduced class loads, and increased development time would be most appealing to faculty who teach using e-learning, it is often not possible because of the costs to the institution.

An important factor that encourages faculty to teach using e-learning is the intrinsic satisfaction that they derive from doing their job more effectively and efficiently (Woolcott & Betts, 1999). Woolcott and Betts (1999) report that although intrinsic factors may affect initial involvement, a faculty member's motivation and subsequent response to incentives may change following the experience of teaching a distance education course. Furthermore, faculty need to understand how technology integration can enhance collaborative knowledge-building, critical thinking, creativity, and student responsibility.

There are general recommendations for including faculty in policy development through shared governance and participatory policy creation (Fish, 2007; Haché, 1998; Hearn, 1998; Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Majchrzak, 1984). These studies indicate that faculty can impact e-learning education policy by sharing their experiences and having greater involvement in policy development (Maguire, 2005). Maguire (2005) also indicates that greater faculty involvement in e-learning policy development will lead to clarification of current and/or conflicting policies and addition of potential policies that faculty note are missing and needed. Other results of faculty involvement is a sense of empowerment (Alfred, 1998), as well as a sense of ownership in e-learning programming, and a sense of enthusiasm for teaching using e-learning (Maguire, 2005).

E-Learning Policy Statements

A well written e-learning policy statement can provide a unifying vision that will guide the actions of an institution's employees, management, students, and suppliers. It clearly outlines

for all stakeholders where the institution stands on e-learning matters. Policies also reflect the rules governing the implementation of campus processes. They provide the tools needed to effectively move decision-making to more appropriate levels within the organization, help streamline campus administrative processes, and provide a basis for individual and departmental accountability. Policies should be easily understood by a diverse audience of faculty, staff, and students. Furthermore, policy provisions need to be general enough and clear enough to be applied to unanticipated circumstances.

E-learning policy statements generally fall into three categories. Global policies are high-level policy statements that define the intent of e-learning and its scope within the organization. It also assigns responsibilities for implementation and compliance with the policy. Topic-specific policies refer to key component areas of e-learning. Unlike global policies, the topic-specific policies narrow the focus to one issue at a time. Typical topics are e-mail response time, hours of work when teaching using e-learning, assignment policies, network access, electronic discussions, and intellectual property rights. System- and application-specific policies are policies that focus on one specific system or application. Typical subjects for application-specific policies include software standards, e-mail usage, Internet usage and anti-virus programs. The overall goal for any policy document is for the design to be simple, consistent, and easy to use.

The Relationship between E-Learning Policy and Practice

The relationship between e-learning policy and practice is wide ranging. For some faculty their choice to engage in a change of practice is purely a pragmatic reaction to policy edicts that require teaching and learning material be migrated to the institutions

learning management system. There are others who have made the conscious choice to explore the use of new technologies in their teaching and embrace the move to e-learning. Furthermore, there are those who are resistant to any change in practice. How people behave is determined by many factors and is deeply embedded in personal biases, social situations, institutional contexts and cultural norms. Yet sound policy and providing clear direction can be a central vehicle through which e-learning program planning can be standardized and evaluated throughout the campus. If policies are accompanied by measurable goals and accountability processes, then relationship to practice is more visible and more likely to be supported (Middlehurst, 2001). Policies hold the potential to address the primary need of migration of print to electronic format, specialized and targeted training and support, as well as workload allocations (Birch & Burnett, 2009). Furthermore, policies can create the conditions for new ideas and social innovations to be developed, nurtured and diffused across an institution (Knott, 2008).

Policies can drive change, both in terms of organizational divisions of labour and of pedagogic practice (de Freitas, & Oliver, 2005). However, resistance to change may be built into the fabric of an organization's culture making the move to e-learning difficult. When this is the case, policy can be an effective tool to facilitate behavioral change. Many institutional policies have the clear goal of influencing faculty behavior (Knott, 2008). The result is a change in teaching practice that occurs as faculty settle into new ways of acting and behaving. Knott (2008) states that this processes of change requires a sustained and long-term approach to policymaking.

The provision of e-learning policy for tertiary education is relatively immature (Anderson, Brown, Murray, Simpson, & Mentis, 2006). The result is that the embedded institutional structures, policies and support systems may be at odds with the evolving strategic goals for e-learning. Despite the strategic intent to support teaching enhancement through e-learning, many instances were found where the gap between policy and practice was considerable (Conole, 2008; Gunn, 2010). Policies must be responsive to emerging conditions such as those brought about by e-learning (Meyer et al., 2002). Addressing this issue may be the key to success: as a report on one major area of e-learning notes "policies can drive forward an agenda for change, but the real test comes at the point of use" (Joint Information Systems Committee [JISC] 2008, p. 5).

Birch and Burnett (2009) found that when institutional policy supports the creation of multi-modal learning objects faculty perceived this approach as critical in delivering a more equitable and inclusive learning opportunity. Faculty also found that the provision of multi-modal e-learning material provided for multiple representations for different learning styles and provided repetition and redundancy so as to maximize the impact of the teaching materials.

Post-secondary policy affects class size yet there is little agreement on the number of students who should be enrolled in an e-learning or blended learning course. As a result, existing policies about faculty load (the amount of work normally expected of a faculty member) fail to reflect adequately the new reality of e-learning (Varvel, Montague, & Estabrook, 2007).

Change of teaching practice can be directly affected by the supports available to change faculty pedagogy (Zhao & Frank, 2003). Green (1999) indicates that assisting faculty to integrate technology into instruction is one of the biggest challenges of post-secondary institutions. User

support and the instructional integration of technology are important issues as post-secondary institutions that are engaged in e-learning make major investments in faculty development (Green, 2010). For example, Smerdon et al (2000) report that the two most significant barriers to change of practice are access to computers and release time for teachers to learn how to use them. Browne et al. (2010) in their Survey of Technology Enhanced Learning for higher education in the UK identified teacher skill levels, a lack of professional development and training, workload and curriculum pressures, time, and funding as the most frequently given reasons for the lack of success of e-learning. The primary remedies are seen as staff development, improved policies and the provision of support staff (Browne et al., 2010). This researcher could locate only two distinct evaluations of policy initiatives – an evaluation of the Saskatchewan Technology Enhanced Learning Action Plan (Ekos Research Associates, 2005) and an evaluation of the Australian Flexible Learning Framework 2000-2004 (ANTA, 2000). The main findings from these evaluations are:

- Professional development for staff and the development of high quality digital content are seen as central to the success of e-learning approaches to education
- Policy alignment is essential to ensure a mature e-learning environment
- Buy-in by staff is slow and considerable investment in time and people is essential. Time is needed to realize the investments that are made. At the same time, it is important to ensure that e-learning is sustainable and that e-learning policies include a strong accountability focus

Additionally, funding for e-learning has been a critical element for long term sustainability. Yet, funding for e-learning has been traditionally short term. Thus allowing for

faculty to experiment with the development and use of e-learning, as well as to illustrate what can be achieved, during what timescales and who can perform the work (Oliver & Conole, 2003). However, it does not allow for long-term sustainability, embedding e-learning into current practice, or reflection of e-learning and the impact it has on learning (Conole, Smith, & White, 2007). The funding policy associated with e-learning fundamentally and radically impacts on practice (Conole, Smith, & White, 2007).

What Drives Policy Decisions?

Post-secondary institutions do not exist in a vacuum, but as part of the changing global, national and provincial environment. Over the last decade there is not an institution that has not felt the influence of being a part of that larger global community and the heightened competition introduced by the potential global market (de Freitas & Oliver, 2005). The emergence of an institutional level response to the growing demand for e-learning/blended learning is part of a wider context of change in higher education and society at large. The interest in implementing e-learning and developing e-learning policy in post-secondary education throughout the world has been influenced by a number of pressures and drivers. According to Hammond (2003) and Young (2002) the drivers shaping policy and practice can be demonstrated under three headings: economic and business dynamics; cultural, social, intellectual, and technological developments; and political - changes in government policy. In reality, these categories overlap, creating even greater impact. Furthermore, over the past decade, two key factors have immerged – increased student numbers and the increasing costs of higher education – driving new developments in higher education in an attempt to meet the changing demands (Middlehurst, 2001).

Within this context Hammond (2003) posits that the main drivers for e-learning policy at the post-secondary institutional level are national policies and priorities with regard to economic and social development, beliefs and expectations of the role of education in terms of supporting those priorities, and developments in educational technologies which have the potential to enable the system to achieve these objectives. This is supported in a review of national e-learning strategies by Anderson, Brown, Murray, Simpson, and Mentis (2006) in which they found the key drivers underlying the adoption of e-learning policy are the need to improve the skills of the population to meet the challenge of the information and knowledge society. Furthermore, the Commission Of The European Communities (CEC) has identified e-learning as an essential approach to transforming education and training systems to meet the Lisbon objectives - to "make Europe the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustained economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion" (CEC, 2003, p. 2). Moreover, the CEC in May 2008 invited Member States to establish e-learning and distance learning opportunities to support a culture of lifelong learning (CEC 2008).

The knowledge economy is viewed as a powerful force in contemporary society and education and training are crucial to economic and social change. Lifelong learning supports creativity and innovation and enables full economic and social participation. The flexibility and security needed to achieve more and better jobs depend on ensuring that all citizens acquire key competences and update their skills throughout their lives. E-learning is seen as a way to meet the need for accessible and flexible access to post-secondary education, as well as to meet the changing learning needs of society (Anderson, Brown, Murray, Simpson, & Mentis, 2006; Bates, 2000). The flexibility offered by e-learning is seen as a major reason for engaging in e-learning

(de Boer & Collis, 2005). Blended programs are seen by many universities as a way of harnessing this flexibility in a way that is close to their current practice. Blended programs can make small programs viable by enlarging the catchment area and/or attracting a higher quality student (MacKeogh & Fox, 2009). The opportunity to reconfigure delivery and support without compromising the quality of learning, e-learning has made a major impact on the flexibility of teaching and learning processes. Arbaugh (2010) indicates that flexibility for students was a considerable policy driver.

Higher education systems, even in economically prosperous countries such as Canada, are under severe financial strain. There are growing student numbers, increased competition and a chronic shortage of public funds (Bates, 2000; MacKeogh & Fox, 2008; Tilak, 2008). Therefore, one of the crucial policy drivers for e-learning development in higher education is tuition and pricing policy. The economic rationale for investing in e-learning is particularly evident in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, United Kingdom and the European Union where the common goal is to create a competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy through the adoption of new digital technologies (Brown, Anderson, & Murray, 2007). Bates, (2000) indicates that e-learning is at least in part a response to government cutbacks in funding. In Canada most provincial governments have required post-secondary institutions to take on more students while maintaining or even reducing levels of funding. The need to do more with less has stimulated the growth of e-learning where it is seen as a solution or as a cost cutting measure.

The integration of e-learning is driven not only in response to external forces such as the changing social and economic conditions; it is also driven by internal forces to increase administrative efficiencies and to advance the vision of the post-secondary institutions (Haughey,

2007). In the current educational climate the promises of technology for teaching and learning are widespread. It was not uncommon for heads of post-secondary institutions to talk about the revolutionary impact of the Internet and e-learning (Roffe, 2005). E-learning is seen as having an affect on teaching and learning as well as the ability to improve the quality of learning for on-campus students (Bates, 2000; OECD, 2005b; MacKeogh & Fox, 2009). This rhetoric can lead to e-learning policy decisions about technology adoption being based on assumptions about the effectiveness of technology (Price & Oliver, 2007). In addition, the rapid advancement and changing potential of technology further complicates the value of such assumptions. Such policy decisions have far reaching implications but we know little about the actual impact of this on teaching and learning in higher education (Conole, 2007). The pressure to adopt e-learning should also be seen in the context of the societal pressure on post-secondary education systems to reform and modernize the curricula (Littlejohn & Pegler, 2007; MacKeogh & Fox, 2009).

Berge (1998) indicates that in traditional post-secondary institutions, policies are changed with regard to e-learning when someone trying to implement a course or program meets a barrier and through persuasion causes the policy to be changed. Additionally, e-learning policies are driven by the culture of an institution and these cultural barriers have widespread policy implications (Berge, 1998). Resistance to change can be seen as one such driver for e-learning policy.

Global Picture, Local Lessons

E-Learning in the United Kingdom.

The United Kingdom, having a long tradition of innovation in education, took a lead role in defining e-learning. The Open University was a model for many other open and distance

learning institutions. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES. 2005) was a United Kingdom government department between 2001 and 2007. It was responsible for the education system and children's services in England. The DfES (2005) published the national e-strategy entitled “Harnessing technology: transforming learning and children’s services”, issued in March 2005. It provides the roadmap to promote e-learning and ICT in all areas of education and children’s services in the UK. From this consultation emerged a national e-learning policy strategy. UK States have detailed policy strategies and action plans to support e-learning in education. Ireland proposed The Education Technology Strategy of Northern Ireland (1997), which set out a strategy for e-learning in schools in Northern Ireland (Education Technology Strategy Coordinator, 2005). These were strategies which focused on the role of technology in enhancing and transforming education in the schools. Included were standards for reporting to the Minister, milestones to be met and school self-evaluation. Similar government policy initiatives were developed throughout the UK. The National Grid for Learning initiative was initiated in Scotland (NGfL, 2006) and Wales launched an e-learning strategy in 2001 (DfTE, 2004). Realizing the needs to coordinate and share knowledge among States’ initiatives, Becta, the British Educational Communications and Technology agency (2010) created in 1998, saw its purpose redefined in 2003 to support all four UK education departments in their strategic e-learning developments, facilitating policy formation as well as knowledge transfer, in order to encourage innovation and improvement. Becta’s purpose was to bring coherence and synergy to a UK-wide e-learning strategy. Some 92% of colleges had an e-learning management system in 2008–09, having risen steadily from 58% in 2003–04 (Sero, 2009).

E-Learning in the United Kingdom – Summary.

In summary, the UK appears to be entering a second phase of its e-learning policy development and implementation wherein there is less emphasis on infrastructure and more on connecting pedagogy with technology in a new blended approach to learning and teaching (Anderson, Brown, Murray, Simpson, & Mentis, 2006). Policy continues to drive e-learning growth, however it puts more emphasis on a learner-centered model for education while acknowledging the importance of the institution in developing its own policy and strategy for e-learning.

E-Learning in the European Union.

To better understand how the policy for e-learning arose between member states of the EU it is important to understand the process of the Bologna Declaration. The Bologna Process is the product of a series of meetings of Ministers responsible for higher education at which policy decisions have been taken in order to establish a European Higher Education Area by 2010. The basic precepts of the Bologna Process date back to the Sorbonne Joint Declaration on Harmonization of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System, signed in May 1998 by the education ministers of four countries: France, Germany, Italy and United Kingdom (Eurydice, 2009). The Bologna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area, largely inspired by the Sorbonne Declaration, was signed in June 1999 by ministers responsible for higher education in 29 European countries (Eurydice, 2009). This declaration became the primary document used by the signatory countries to establish the general framework and policy guidelines for the modernization and reform of European higher education; the process of reform came to be called the Bologna Process. The signatory countries included the then 15 EU Member States, three EFTA countries (Iceland, Norway and Switzerland) and 11 EU candidate countries

(Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia). International institutions such as the European Commission, the Council of Europe and associations of universities, as well European students also participated in drafting the declaration. E-Learning policy has at its roots a consortium of trans-national partners engaged in a common educational venture.

Eurydice (2009) drafted a publication presenting an overview of the progress made in the ten years since the Bologna Declaration was signed. The report is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the Bologna Process the year before its official culmination. The Bologna structural reforms identified the European Higher Education Area as a shared objective for universities. It was conceived as a process of harmonizing degree structures, and at the same time the process of moving towards a comprehensible three-cycle system (undergraduate, graduate, doctorate) throughout Europe. This involved a highly complex cultural and social transformation. This document provides evidence from each country, and a clear comparative view of how policy issues have been addressed at a national level. Great emphasis was placed on developments in information and communication technologies (ICTs), not only to ensure that individuals acquire the specific skills which they will need in the Information Age, but also because of the important direct effects of e-learning on education. What emerged was policy imperatives emphasizing such things as digital literacy for all in the information age, lifelong learning, and providing/acquiring the required skills for employment in the information society (Eurydice, 2009).

E-learning policy has been coordinated on an extremely large scale through the auspices of the European Commission. A most striking characteristic of the e-learning strategies is their

diversity, and inherent characteristic of adaptability in use and flexibility in application (Learnovation, 2008). Fundamental to the policies that were undertaken was the perception that improving and implementing pedagogical approaches which support self-organized learning and utilize the potential provided by e-learning in lifelong learning are seen as concrete means of contributing to the Bologna strategy (Learnovation, 2008).

E-Learning in the European Union – Summary.

European countries, as well as the supra-governments of the European Union, recognizing that economic competitiveness was at stake and that e-learning was the path of transition to a knowledge economy, channeled their e-learning policy efforts mainly through education ministries and institutions responsible for vocational/professional/skill training. The European Union e-learning policy approach has always been subsumed within the goals of the Information Society strategy that has been a consistent policy theme since the Bologna Declaration. The resulting e-learning policy initiatives have been comprehensive and government ministry based. The European focus on adult education, a term used in the sense of lifelong learning, has provided a broad social context for the development of e-learning at post-secondary levels.

E-Learning in Australia.

E-learning policy in Australia has its origins in a very long history of post-secondary distance education, with the first print-based distance education program offered to university students in 1911 (Department of Employment, Education and Training, 1993). In 1996 the government established the Online Council to address issues that required joint Commonwealth, state and local government action. This resulted in the establishment in 1997 of the National

Office for the Information Economy. This office represented a whole-of-government approach to e-learning policy development. It was also charged with over-seeing the legal and regulatory environment for domestic e-learning activities, national participation in major international forums for global governance of e-learning services, and the implementation of online technology for government services. In 1998 the government launched its policy initiatives for bringing Australia into the information age (Misko, Choi, Hong, & Lee, 2004). E-learning was seen as the main driver of change as well as meeting the needs of a competitive knowledge economy (Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, 2004).

Two main sets of drivers have been influential in changes in policy direction. The first was a shift from government support to government assistance and from tight to loose regulation, encouraging universities to be more responsive to varying student needs and to diversifying their course offerings so as to widen user choice. The second were factors that sought to change the demand for higher education. While domestic student demand had leveled out, international student demand continued to increase. Associated with this at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels has been demand for further course diversification with the growth of the knowledge economy, facilitated by the expanding capacity of communications and information technology on a global basis. These substantial reforms in government policy led to financial rewards being available from the commodification of knowledge and the commercialization of academic work (Department of Employment, Education and Training, 1993). As well, these reforms resulted in fundamental move towards competition as the basic policy rationale, a more competitive approach to funding and policies to allow universities to charge overseas students on a full cost recovery basis (Department of Employment, Education and Training, 1993).

E-Learning in Australia – Summary.

The involvement of the Australian government in e-learning policy has resulted in a deep penetration of e-learning and e-training in the vocational education and training sector (Contact North, 2010). Of particular note in relation to e-learning policy are three factors: the belief that post-secondary is a commodifiable industry, the considerable emphasis on the development of people capable of teaching and leading development in the area of e-learning; and the extent of work involved in developing content and tools for e-learning (Anderson, Brown, Murray, Simpson, & Mentis, 2006).

E-Learning in Korea.

The Korean government follows Australia closely in promoting the importance of e-learning. Government policy initiatives have been crucial for the promotion of e-learning as well as its fast penetration in all economic sectors. Misko, Choi, Hong, and Lee (2004) indicate that policy initiatives resulted in six major government programs aimed at improving the status of e-learning in Korea in the past 15 years. The rapid diffusion and growth of e-learning in Korea is attributable to specific government policies to boost e-learning. Two specific Korean Government Ministries, the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MEHRD) and the Ministry of Labor (MoL) have been most influential in the development of e-learning. Among Korea governmental e-learning initiatives, it is worth mentioning:

The first initiative, KUACE (Korean University Alliance for Cyber Education) created in 2001 to promote the advancement of e-learning in higher education. The alliance promotes the development of online/cyber universities. In 2004, there were 16 cyber universities created, not

counting the 151 traditional colleges and universities (of the 376 Korean institutions) offering e-learning courses and programs (Misko, Choi, Hong, & Lee, 2004).

The second initiative, KRIVET (Korea Research Institute for Vocational Education and Training) through its centre for e-learning advises the MoL regarding e-learning. The MoL subsidizes part of the training expenses to the employers for employees taking e-learning courses (Misko, Choi, Hong, & Lee, 2004).

Beside the national e-learning strategy and action plans developed in Korea, there are supra-national organizations which are also helping with programs and funding to support the transition to a knowledge economy and develop coordination processes (Charpentier, Lafrance, & Paquette, 2006).

E-Learning in Korea – Summary.

Asian countries also realized the importance of e-learning in post-secondary as a strategic means to adapt and extend education for lifelong learning, a prerequisite in a knowledge economy. In these countries, government support for e-learning was not the unique prerogative of Education Ministries. The Ministries of Industry or Labor were often initiators of e-learning (Charpentier, Lafrance, & Paquette, 2006). Korea has a mature government-initiated policy development processes in place to support the growth of e-learning in post-secondary education. Not only does Korea have a comprehensive e-learning policy framework, but also implementation strategies and mechanisms, measurement indicators, and it has committed resources to such matters as infrastructure access and connectivity, training and learning software development (Anderson, Brown, Murray, Simpson, & Mentis, 2006).

E-Learning in the USA.

European, Australian and Asian countries' e-learning policies and action plans are government initiated, whether through ministries/departments, public funding councils or multi-ministerial committees, but that is not the case in the USA. The dynamic e-learning market is a direct reflection of the innovation potential that comes from the historical proximity of private universities and corporations supporting programs and research (Charpentier, Lafrance, & Paquette, 2006). This close relationship translated into US education and the private sectors becoming the initiators and early adopters of learning technologies and tools, helping the transformation to a knowledge economy. Although the primary growth of e-learning has been privately funded there are several e-learning policies that have been proposed by central/national bodies, such as the National Education Technology Plan (2010). The first plan was produced in 2000, with the current revision in 2010. It represents broad policy statements for States to use multiple strategies to expand their post-secondary e-learning, to develop delivery systems for e-learning, and to promote access to e-learning through infrastructure investments. Thomson, Ganzglass, Simon, Krause, Bruno, Ducat, and Jewett (2001) present a State patchwork of initiatives which support broader Federal e-learning policy statements. The result being that for post-secondary education each state is responsible for their own e-learning policy initiatives and there is no direct overall federal policy (Anderson, Brown, Murray, Simpson, & Mentis, 2006).

What differentiates the United States e-learning initiatives from other countries is the capacity of non-governmental organizations – private organizations, university consortia and others – to develop and implement e-learning programs and activities on their own and with private funding. In terms of strategy, contrary to the situation observed in most other countries

where the approach could be qualified as top-down, in the USA there are many bottom-up e-learning initiatives.

What the for-profits have shown is that there is a market in the USA for students who need more flexibility, in both admission and courses, than is offered through the state-funded universities. In particular, the for-profit e-learning programs can provide teaching at a lower cost per student than state universities, who have a wider and more comprehensive mission and mandate.

E-Learning in the USA – Summary.

The policy for post-secondary e-learning falls within the higher education plans for each state. As the primary responsibility for education lies with individual states, no two states are alike in meeting their obligation to educate their residents (Anderson, Brown, Murray, Simpson, & Mentis, 2006). Although states are engaged in facilitating new e-learning delivery systems, expanding capacity, upgrading infrastructure and instructor skills, promoting access, and shaping the regulatory environment the primary growth of e-learning has arisen from the private sector. Anderson, Brown, Murray, Simpson, and Mentis (2006) report that there is currently the perception that if the full potential for e-learning is to be realized, there is a need for renewed interest from federal leaders to create new e-learning policies and programs that will transform the United States into a nation of learners.

E-learning in Canada.

E-learning policy, leading to strategies and actions plans in most countries is government initiated. Countries most active in the development of e-learning tools and content have post-secondary policies that were initiated by government, whether through ministries/departments,

public funding councils or multi-ministerial committees. These wide ranging government e-learning policies translate into initiatives, programs and projects financially supported by significant public funding (Charpentier, Lafrance, & Paquette, 2006). This is true for most countries except Canada and the United States.

In Canada unprecedented demand has made education a viable industry, sustaining both a proliferation of private providers and a range of new entrepreneurial activities within public institutions (Fisher, Rubenson, Jones, & Shanahan, 2008). The influence of the federal government on access to post-secondary education is indirect and exercised through transfer payments, loans, scholarships and fellowships. The sharp decline over the last two decades in federal transfers to post-secondary education has severely affected the provincial resources for post-secondary education (Fisher, Rubenson, Jones, & Shanahan, 2008). With funding not keeping up with enrolment, total government spending as a share of university operating revenue between 1994 and 2004 declined in all provinces (Fisher, Rubenson, Jones, Shanahan, 2008).

The issue of access to the Internet was pursued most visibly through the federal 'Connecting Canadians' agenda, led by Industry Canada. The goal was to make Canada the most 'connected nation on Earth' by the year 2000, notably through its SchoolNet, Community Access (CAP), and LibraryNet programs. The strategy was to make Canada the world leader in developing and using an advanced information infrastructure to achieve our social and economic goals in the knowledge economy (Manley, 1998). E-Learning is an attractive solution given that Canada covers a vast territory and has a relatively low population density. Isolated communities, as well as a new demographic of adult learners, can benefit from experienced instructors living at locations often thousands of kilometers away.

To date, Canada does not have a coordinated, clearly articulated national vision (Anderson, Brown, Murray, Simpson, & Mentis, 2006). Instead, e-learning in Canada consists of loosely connected provincial, territorial and federal e-learning networks, educational providers (public and private) and targeted initiatives. The consequences of this approach include duplicated efforts, fragmented goals and objectives, and sporadic and short-term initiatives (CCL 2009). Post-secondary education is the responsibility of ten provinces and three territories in Canada and each has different e-learning policy (OECD, 2005a). Therefore it is not possible to highlight all the provincial/territorial initiatives on e-learning in post-secondary education. It would be of great help to have a detailed portrait of Canadian provincial e-learning policies or statements and of initiatives supported by provincial and federal governments to better understand where Canada stands compared to other countries. What sets other countries apart from Canada is their extensive use of monitoring and benchmarking tools to report on the state of e-learning. Unfortunately, such documents do not exist for Canada, except from partial data contained in ministerial reports or study reports (Charpentier, Lafrance, & Paquette, 2006). To this researcher's knowledge, there are no recent studies which have reviewed statements, policies and actions taken, or activities supported by the federal government and provincial ministries/departments with respect to e-learning policy in post-secondary education, or to ICT in education and other related sectors. Neither is there an up-to-date compendium of existing ongoing e-learning initiatives and e-learning related research, with a description of activities (Charpentier, Lafrance, & Paquette, 2006). The report State of E-Learning in Canada published by the Canadian Council on Learning (CCL, 2009) explicitly states that e-learning "holds tremendous promise and potential, yet it remains a largely unexplored field" (p. 9). Furthermore,

Fournier (2006) indicates that there is a lack of relevant Canadian empirical and longitudinal research related to e-learning. This lack of Canadian research, the trend towards e-learning world-wide, as well as a deficiency of Canadian government-initiated e-learning policies amount to worrying signs of a nation without a clear vision for e-learning (Fournier, 2006).

Canada has taken a tempered approach towards e-learning and has not rushed to adopt widespread applications of e-learning across domains and institutions. However, few will remain unaffected by the continued growth of e-learning. If Canada does nothing, e-learning will still come to post-secondary education in Canada. But it will increasingly be provided to Canadian learners by off-shore institutions and corporations that will be responsive only to global market forces and their own domestic pressures (Advisory Committee for Online Learning, 2001). In Canada, levels of adoption of e-learning have been significantly slower than anticipated. In the 1990s Canada was considered a leader in e-learning (Bates, 2010). However, the OECD (2005a) study suggests that Canadian post-secondary institutions have been slower than post-secondary institutions in many other countries to incorporate significant online components into their programs. Canada also provides a lower proportion of web-dependent courses than many other countries. Canada is starting to trail behind the efforts of other countries in this very important sector.

An indicator of the adaption of e-learning is the use of information communication technologies (ICT). Internet access is expanding rapidly across the globe, with 5.1 billion mobile subscribers and 1.6 billion Internet users (UNESCO, 2010). Yet, the growth of Internet use has not significantly altered the way in which Canada's post-secondary institutions organize or deliver learning (CCL, 2009). As the OECD (2005a) reported e-learning has not revolutionized

learning and teaching in Canada to date and the high expectations for far-reaching, novel ways of teaching and learning, facilitated by ICTs, remain elusive or still to be invented. It is difficult to point to any significant innovative e-learning initiatives in Canada over the last 10 years (Bates, 2010). Whereas, countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom, Europe and South Korea are harnessing e-learning's potential contributions to economic and social development through the development of national e-learning policy. Collaboration across jurisdictions and among public and private agencies and organizations is a hallmark of these countries' e-learning policy frameworks (CCL, 2009). Anderson (2009) terms this "Canada's lost e-learning decade".

Much of the Canadian context for e-learning comes from extensive benchmarking that exists in the USA. However, it is difficult to transfer these findings from the USA to Canada, especially since much of the growth in the USA came from the for-profit sector (Bates, 2011). The message for Canadian post-secondary institutions is that there is a market that is not currently well served by campus-based education, and that market is growing. Although Canadian public universities and colleges are moving into online distance learning, they are not doing it fast enough to meet market demand. If public institutions here do not improve access to e-learning, then the corporate for-profit sector will (Bates, 2011).

One of the few position papers which have a vision and scope of a Canadian e-learning strategy was prepared by Canada's Advanced Network for Research, Education and Innovation (CANARIE), Industry Canada and other stakeholders such as The Conference Board of Canada. This vision is directly in line with other countries visions. The four areas or steps proposed by CCL for the pan-Canadian e-learning strategy are each associated with core activities, proposed actions and identified stakeholders (CCL, 2009). These four areas are:

- oriented research, to develop the Canadian expertise in all the related fields of e-learning and to contribute in the international innovation process
- tools, standards and infrastructure development deployment related to e-learning
- content development at all educational levels and in all workplace sectors or community organizations
- dissemination, training and community awareness, which comprise the development of professional communities as well as e-learning training for authors, designers, teachers and trainers

Canadian e-learning research exists within the universities that promote e-learning such as Athabasca University. Athabasca University fills the same niche for e-learning in Canada as the for-profits do in the USA (although Athabasca is a public, not-for-profit university). From 1997 to 2007, total course enrolment at Athabasca University increased by 415% (Madrell, 2008). The provincial government remains a major force behind Athabasca University. In 2007, the Province of Alberta provided $31,064,000 (CAD) in grant funding which represented over 30% of the university's operating revenue.

E-Learning in Canada – Summary.

We need to know more about e-learning policy in post-secondary education in Canada if there is to be a framework for advancement. Canada has lost some of its competitive advantage as a leader in e-learning, because of the lack of a national policy or strategy for e-learning (Bates, 2010). Currently, Federal and Provincial governments demonstrate a collage of initiatives within the public and private sectors but there appear to be gaps in communication and coordination among the various stakeholders. McGreal and Anderson (2007) explain that Canada's e-learning

programming can be viewed as a patchwork quilt made up of interesting projects, programs, and initiatives. They go on to say that in the worst sense, it is a set of disparate and uncoordinated activities constantly struggling with and reinventing solutions to problems solved elsewhere.

Abrami et al. (2006) indicate that this low level of collaboration across and among jurisdictions results in the duplication of efforts and unnecessary costs. If a coherent e-learning policy framework is to shape e-learning's development, and its relevance to social and economic policy development and implementation within Canada, it must be premised on four key conditions favorable to learning: generating multi-sectoral momentum; developing a shared vision for e-learning across Canada; harnessing the potential of technology to meet the needs of learners; and filling gaps in research (CCL, 2009). As Abrami et al. (2006) note, post-secondary institutions in particular would benefit from a national plan to assess the impact of e-learning initiatives.

Bates (2011) points out that it is particularly problematic that there are no national or even provincial surveys in Canada comparable to those conducted by the Sloan Commission, Eduventures and the Campus Computing Project in the USA (Allen, & Seaman, 2010; Garrett, 2009; Green, 2010). Furthermore, surveys conducted by the Australian Flexible Learning Framework, the British Educational Communications and Technology Agency and the European commission have revealed a wealth of information regarding the state of e-learning in the respective countries (I. & J. Management Services, 2010; Becta, 2010). Bates (2011) reports that few provinces in Canada require institutions to report on their methods of course delivery and there is even less information about quality assurance processes or learning outcomes associated with e-learning in Canada. He goes on to say that without reliable data on enrolments in e-

learning, it is impossible to measure whether or not e-learning is growing, declining or remaining stable in Canada. What we do know is that Canada was not represented among any of the worlds leading e-learning nations (Charpentier, Lafrance, & Paquette, 2006).

Conclusions and Implications from the Literature

E-learning is many things to many people. It is a vague term and can encompass many different forms of learning. E-learning has become a general term encompassing the application of computer technologies to education whether it occurs in face-to-face classrooms, in blended and hybrid courses, in mediated distance education contexts or in online learning environments. For the purpose of this thesis the researcher will consider e-learning to be an umbrella term which the Canadian Council on Learning (CCL) defines as the development of knowledge and skills through the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) and/or web-based technology particularly to support interactions for learning—interactions with content, with learning activities and tools, and with other people.

The history of e-learning is short, and the models of e-learning in post-secondary education today find their roots in the more conventional distance education. Distance education was initially introduced to allow individuals in remote and rural areas to gain access to education. However distance learning has evolved significantly over time and technological advancement has been the major inspiration for change.

The Internet has enabled tremendous innovation in the delivery of post-secondary education. The trend toward more and more people gaining access to the Internet, the cost of computer ownership decreasing and overall computer literacy increasing has provided educational institutions an ideal opportunity for the delivery of educational content. The first

generation of e-learning focused on presenting physical classroom-based instructional content over the Internet and tended to be a compilation of online versions of classroom-based courses. The experience gained from the first-generation of e-learning is giving rise to the provision of choice, engagement, social contact, relevance, and context needed to facilitate successful learning and performance.

In 1998 the term *blended learning* was popularized to refer to the mixture of e-learning and face-to-face instruction. Although this may seem like a relatively new term, the idea has been around for a long time and has always been a part of the educational landscape. Furthermore, there are as many blended learning models as there are organizational challenges; however, today it has come to be associated with the integration of e-learning. There two distinct beliefs that prevail regarding the benefits of blended learning. The first is to improve and supplement traditional courses and degree programs, wherein, learning objects are created and reused in courses. Books, course materials and library holdings can be digitized and made available both on and off campus. The second belief is that blended learning does not constitute more of the same. Blended learning, when thoughtfully designed, provides learning opportunities that are active, intentional, authentic and collaborative. This represents a model which envisions the Internet as instrumental to fundamentally change the processes and organizational structure of postsecondary teaching and learning wherein the Internet can transform higher education into student-centered learning rather than institution and faculty-centered instruction (Baers, 1998). In this view, blended learning inherently is about rethinking and redesigning the teaching and learning relationship and e-learning is central to this change in paradigm.

There are many drivers affecting the movement toward the provision of e-learning and e-learning policies. The global marketplace presents increased opportunity as well as increased competition. Being a part of the global community results in drivers which move post-secondary institutions to develop e-learning policy. The drivers affecting this change include the economic pressures to compete within a global knowledge economy, the nature of the affordances offered by digital technologies, the commoditization of education and increasing involvement of private sector, the potential e-learning has to shift the teaching paradigm, and the expectations of a new generation of learners for anytime, anywhere access to information. Other factors influencing the move are the need for flexible market-driven curricula, the impact of globalization, international competition, and because of decreased funding, the economic reality that it is often cheaper to deliver e-learning than traditional face-to-face instruction. With the limited capacity of existing classrooms at academic institutions to cope with increasing student numbers and the prohibitive cost of building new facilities, e-learning is an attractive alternative. The Southern Alberta Institute of Technology (SAIT) is one such post-secondary institution that considers e-learning as a way to meet increased market demand, as well as to increase overall student numbers, without the full cost of additional physical facilities. Furthermore, e-learning is seen as a supplement to classroom teaching, as a method to enhance learning, and does not replace the traditional face-to-face experience.

Furthermore, in an effort to remain competitive and maintain their market share, many traditional higher education institutions have expanded their offerings to include e-learning courses to compete with the growing number of virtual higher education institutions. In addition, post-secondary institutions are faced with internal drivers to implement e-learning policies.

These internal drivers are: the desire to improve the institutional image, to improve the quality of learning, to modernize the curriculum and/or as a response to the culture of the organization. The resulting policy environment is complex due to the inter-related nature of each of these drivers. As a result of these demands, institutions are currently experiencing enormous transformational pressures to move to e-learning.

A number of international bodies such as the OECD, Council of Europe, and, especially, the European Union have developed e-learning strategies. As well, a number of countries, for example, Europe, New Zealand, Australia and the UK, have developed national e-learning policy strategies which in turn have stimulated e-learning policy initiatives in their higher education institutions. Australian, European and Asian countries' e-learning policies and action plans are government initiated, whether through ministries/departments, public funding councils or multi-ministerial committees. However, that is not the case in the USA. The dynamic e-learning market in the USA is due to the relationship that exists between private universities and corporations supporting programs and research.

Currently there is no national e-learning strategy in Canada. There exists a patchwork of initiatives at the provincial and institutional level across Canada and there appear to be gaps in communication and coordination among the various stakeholders. Presently there is a set of disparate and uncoordinated activities constantly struggling with and reinventing solutions to problems solved elsewhere. This low level of collaboration across and among jurisdictions results in the duplication of efforts and unnecessary costs. If a coherent framework is to shape e-learning development, and its relevance to social and economic policy development and implementation within Canada, it must be premised on four key conditions favorable to learning:

generating multi-sectorial momentum; developing a shared vision for e-learning across Canada; harnessing the potential of technology to meet the needs of learners; and filling gaps in research (CCL, 2009). Post-secondary education in Canada would benefit from a national plan to assess the impact of e-learning initiatives. Canada was not represented among the world's leading e-learning nations.

As investments in time and financial resources for e-learning continue to rise, so should the interest in its policies, effectiveness, quality, barriers faced, and best practices. The rates of change in the world necessitates that post-secondary institutions first plan and then adapt models for planning that are less linear and more responsive. E-learning technologies will most certainly play a strong role in the strategic plan for post-secondary institutions. Gellman-Danley and Fetzner (1998) argue that advanced planning and policy development is the key to a well-run e-learning program. They suggested that:

> "Asking the tough policy questions in advance can mitigate future bureaucratic problems and roadblocks. Most educators know that even a minor mid-stream policy skirmish can draw the focus away from their most critical concern - teaching and learning. Policies can provide a framework for operation, an agreed-upon set of rules that explain all participants' roles and responsibilities" (para. 3).

A post-secondary institution's motivation to engage in e-learning is multi-faceted and complex. Once decided, e-learning policies articulate how an institution's overall mission and aspirations are to be pursued. Management will rely upon e-learning policy to ensure the institution's objectives are being met. Furthermore, policies identify the key initiatives and

provide a strategy for decision-makers on how to handle issues and answer questions for employees. This is accomplished by providing a set of limits and a choice of alternatives that can be used to guide their decision-making process as they attempt to overcome problems. Policies have the chance to position institutions for the transformational changes that are very difficult to predict but are certain to disrupt the traditional structure and operational dynamic of higher education. E-learning and the resulting policy creation process represents a considerable challenge to the administrators and academic faculty of higher education institutions.

Faculty involvement in policy decisions within higher education is entrenched within the governance model of the institution. Although there are many interpretations of governance, the common elements are concerned with the structures and procedures for decision-making, accountability, control and codes of conduct. It is expressed through legislation, policies and by-laws, and informal norms. The goal of effective governance is a robust organization that is effective, accountable and transparent to the people it serves. Shared governance is used to convey the idea that a lot of conversation takes place within and among various campus groups (board, administration, faculty, staff and students) before the individuals in power make the final decision on policies and procedures. Having a basic understanding of the shared governance models adopted by higher education institutions can be an asset in understanding the process of policy decision making.

An underlying theme of the literature is that without effective structures and processes, the selection, deployment, and ongoing performance of an e-learning system will prove challenging, and perhaps unsuccessful. How an institution provides effective leadership and

communication of institutional plans and decisions, then addresses the underlying policy decisions is a critical and ongoing task for campus leaders.

Depending on the implementation of higher education policies and the role of e-learning in them, there may be the accompanying problems. The literature divides policy challenges affecting faculty into five categories. These categories are as follows:

- compensation and workload
- development incentives; faculty training
- opportunities to learn about technology and new applications
- congruence with existing union contracts, class monitoring, faculty support, and faculty evaluation
- intellectual property

These are critical organizational and leadership issues for the adoption of an e-learning/blended learning strategy to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of teaching and learning. Successful implementation will require the creation of clear institutional direction and e-learning policy.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to conduct a descriptive policy analysis to determine if policy has any effect on faculty at a post-secondary institution who teach using e-learning, and if so how does policy affect faculty. The intent was to analyze three levels of evidence; policy documentation, surveys and in-depth interviews, and report on themes that were developed in each. This chapter details the assumptions, limitations and research rationale for the study - to analyze if policy has an effect and how policy affects faculty who use e-learning. This chapter presents the case, the research methods and procedures used to conduct the study and describes data collection protocols. In addition, the chapter provides a detailed explanation of data collection approaches used in selecting participants, and institutional policy documents. Chapter 3 culminates with a discussion of the threats to validity and the measures adopted to reduce the impact of these threats.

The Case Selected for the Study

The Southern Alberta Institute of Technology (SAIT) has been selected as the institution in which the research will take place because SAIT has a reputation for developing flexible, apprenticeship trades, technical and technology-based workplace training and certification for job entry and career development. As well, SAIT is aggressively reshaping itself to become part of a select class as a premier degree granting polytechnic. Recognizing the need for leadership and support in the e-learning arena, SAIT

currently has more than 160 courses using Desire2Learn (D2L) (formerly using WebCT) across campus, and employs multiple use of e-learning technologies, such as virtual simulations (used in the departments of Transportation and Automation), and GIS virtual systems (used at the Department of Construction). SAIT is currently in transition to a new learning management system, during which time consideration will be given to policy changes to enhance e-learning. In the distance education arena, SAIT is a member of e-Campus Alberta, one of the largest distance education consortia in Canada. Furthermore the faculty who teach in the e-learning environment have considerable experience to draw on for their contribution to the study. Other considerations in the selection of SAIT as the institution in which the research will take place were the proximity to the researcher and SAIT's willingness to participate in research.

The Case: The Southern Alberta Institute of Technology (SAIT)

Polytechnics are integral to enhancing the country's global competitive position and the strength of Canada's economy (Smith, 2007). The information as summarized in this section is available at the SAIT website (sait.ca). SAIT, established in 1916, is one of eight members of Polytechnics Canada and was the first Canadian publicly funded technical institute. SAIT, with over 1,600 full-time and 700 part-time employees, provides training to 77,000 course and program registrants per year with a graduate employment rate of 91% (SAIT, 2009).

Located in Calgary, Canada, the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology (SAIT) is a public, board-governed polytechnic institute operating as a technical institution in accordance with the Government of Alberta Post-Secondary Learning Act (2003). SAIT Polytechnic became a Board-governed Institute April 1, 1982. The Board of Governors includes:

- 10 public members
- 2 students
- 2 faculty
- 1 non-academic staff member
- SAIT's President and CEO

SAIT operates under the unicameral shared governance model wherein one body governs the institution's administrative and academic duties. The Board is the permanent governing body of SAIT and makes and administers policy for the Institute. The Board sets the mission for the Institute in its pursuit of educational excellence, is accountable and responsible for the educational and financial governance of SAIT, and is responsive to the needs of the communities SAIT serves.

SAIT offers eight different programs to day-time students in the areas of Business, Construction, Energy, Health and Public Safety, Information Technologies, Manufacturing, Apprenticeship Trades and Automation, and Transportation. SAIT has a reputation for developing flexible, technical and technology-based workplace training and certification for job entry and career development. As well, SAIT is aggressively reshaping itself to become part of a select class as a premier degree granting polytechnic (http://citd.sait.ca). Recognizing the need for leadership and support in the e-learning arena, SAIT currently has more than 160 courses using D2L across campus, and employs multiple use of e-learning technologies, such as virtual simulations (used in the departments of Transportation and Automation), and GIS virtual

systems (used at the Department of Construction). In the distance education arena, SAIT is a member of e-Campus Alberta, one of the largest distance education consortia in Canada.

SAIT's vision is sharply focused: to be recognized as Canada's premier polytechnic, one of the world's finest, setting the standard in education, training, apprenticeship trades and innovation. SAIT Polytechnic is committed to providing a unique and rich learning environment characterized by innovation, quality and results. SAIT is also committed to creating a learning environment that is transformative: it enables learners to convert information into knowledge, and knowledge into action. Faculty and staff play a critical role in meeting these commitments.

Learner success and learner achievement are supported by pedagogical approaches that are highly interactive, practical, experiential, and technologically advanced. The learning experience is further enhanced by partnerships with business and industry, collaboration with other post-secondary institutions, participation in applied research, and involvement in international education and training.

E-Learning from the SAIT Perspective

SAIT first introduced e-learning in 1997 in the form of laptop programs (Bates, 2007a). Bates indicates that in 2007 laptops were used in four of seven academic departments (Information and Communications Technology, Transportation, Business and Tourism, and Construction) representing 26% of the institution’s full-time learners (Bates, 2007a). Bates (2007a) reports that a detailed rationale for moving to e-learning was identified as (p. 53):

- to meet the needs of today’s students
- to increase access to SAIT’s programming
- to enhance teaching and learning

- to better prepare students of business and industry
- to develop independent learning skills through exposure to online programming
- to better accommodate the differing learning styles of SAIT's students

SAIT representatives took a lead role in establishing eCampus Alberta. Supported by other campuses and the Alberta Government, a portal was created through which all existing e-learning courses from each college could be accessed and taken for credit by any student registered at another college. However, SAIT's laptop programs were not fully online and could not be moved into eCampus Alberta. To this day SAIT is predominantly campus based, using traditional classroom and lab-based teaching.

SAIT's executive management committee's aim is to establish SAIT as Canada's premier polytechnic and e-learning was determined to be one strategy that would move them toward their overall vision (Southern Alberta Institution of Technology, 2006). In response to this vision an e-learning strategic plan was developed by the Cisco Chair for e-Learning and approved by the strategy development committee for e-learning; and signed off by SAIT's executive management committee as providing a means through which SAIT could meet increased market demand, as well as increase overall student numbers, without the full cost of additional physical facilities (Bates, 2007a). However, e-learning is seen as a supplement to classroom teaching as evidenced by SAIT's Strategic Plan, which states that "while e-Learning is part of SAIT's plan, it enhances learning and does not replace the traditional face-to-face experience" (Southern Alberta Institution of Technology, 2006, p. 14). The SAIT Strategic Plan (2006, p. 14) also recognizes the obstacles that are faced as an institution. SAIT (SAIT Strategic Plan, 2006, p. 14) "faces two

main obstacles: lack of operational funding to open new seats for learners and lack of appropriate space, technology and equipment".

Bates (2007a) indicated that there was strong support for e-learning from most deans and directors although many students and instructors were more cautious. He noted that few objected to e-learning in principle and many wanted there to be resources and time made available to ensure good quality e-learning be developed.

Assumptions

This researcher's assumptions about post-secondary policy and e-learning frame this study. Specifically, this researcher assumes that faculty who teach at post-secondary institutions will continue to integrate e-learning into their programs, that e-learning policy will be a factor affecting faculty and that policy issues raised may be unique to those faculty. There is also the assumption that the institution under investigation is active and expanding e-learning.

Limitations of the Study

The ways in which decisions 'emerge' rather than taking place at a single point in time, and which are often unobservable to the researcher, can be particularly difficult to unpack and explain (Exworthy, 2008). On the practical level, there are often many hurdles to analyzing policies due to the many different actors, individuals, groups and networks involved in the policy processes. Decision-making processes are often opaque, and obtaining relevant documents and papers can be problematic. Further limitations to the study are as follows:

1. The results of this investigation are limited by the design and methodology utilized. The research was limited by this researcher's ability to represent and articulate the

perspectives of participants, interpret and generate concepts and meaning from the data, and generate understanding and recommendations from the findings.

2. The focus of the study was to gain understanding of the effect policies have on faculty practice using e-learning and to build knowledge that may be relevant for policy makers in SAIT and post-secondary institutions. Transferability is limited by the contextual nature of the findings.
3. Limited research in the area of e-learning policy in post-secondary education limits how findings can be compared to other research and theory.
4. The decision to limit the study to a single case involving faculty at SAIT Polytechnic may reduce the transferability of the findings to other disciplines and settings.
5. This researcher is investigating a combination of e-learning and blended learning (the case under investigation has very limited full e-learning) wherein the institution and the faculty do not have a long history of e-learning experience.
6. The research is limited by issues of access to information, as well as access to faculty and policy administrators.
7. The research focuses the investigation on policy affect on six specific areas or sub-questions and is not inclusive of all policy areas that might affect faculty when using e-learning/blended learning.

Case Study Methodology and Rationale for Choice of the Methodology

Héritier and Schmidt (2009) indicate the methods of empirical analysis applied in comparative policy analysis widely diverge and that the method applied will be closely linked to the question and the level of analysis. They suggest that when the researcher's interest focuses on

policy outcomes and, even more so, policy effect, then this will require qualitative methods of process analysis. This thesis focuses on the evidence provided by the descriptive analysis of the effect that policies have on post-secondary faculty who teach using e-learning, rather than for the creation of new policies, and being descriptive in nature, one research method that works well and is frequently used is case study research (Majchrzak, 1984). As an interpretive, inductive form of research, case studies explore the details and meanings of experience and do not usually attempt to test a hypothesis (Yin, 1994). Thus, the case study is a research strategy that explains the occurrence of a phenomenon in its natural setting. Yin (1994) defines the case study research method as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used" (p. 23). This emphasis on understanding the interaction between context and a real-life phenomenon involves a reduction in capacity to isolate the independent effects of specific factors. The descriptive case study method is particularly pertinent in education when addressing descriptive questions and theory (Creswell, 2007; Yin, 2009). The descriptive case study method can tell the story of the faculty who teach using e-learning, if institutional policies affect their teaching, and how those policies affect their teaching.

The advantage is that the researcher is able to observe events directly as they occur in real-life situations and can provide for a more complete understanding of a situation's complexity by examining behavior in context (Yin, 2009). Also, case studies are relatively quick, cost efficient and allow for generalized analysis of a situation. Although this researcher is motivated by the ease of evidence gathering there is also a concern with the triangulation of

evidence. Triangulation refers to an approach to data collection in which evidence is deliberately sought from a range of different, independent sources and often by different means - for instance, comparing surveys and interviews with written policy records (Stake, 2010; Yin, 2009). The case study provides an analytical perspective wherein a variety of methods of data collections should be used. Surveys, in-depth interviewing, and document analysis are methods that can be applied within the case study. According to Yin (2009) a case study design should be considered when: (a) the focus of the study is to answer "how" and "why" questions; (b) you cannot manipulate the behavior of those involved in the study; (c) you want to cover contextual conditions because you believe they are relevant to the phenomenon under study; or (d) the boundaries are not clear between the phenomenon and context. Case study is very suitable for understanding policy initiatives especially in areas where the policy research is lacking (Gerring, 2004). Furthermore, case studies are useful for developing recommendations concerning the future implementation of policies and policy options (Majchrzak, 1984).

The process of policy development is not simple or one way. It is a complex mix of negotiated evolving changes (de Freitas & Oliver, 2005). Qualitative methods attempt to make sense of, or interpret, any phenomenon in terms of the meanings people bring to them in context-specific settings (Creswell 2007; Hoepfl, 1997). Within the framework proposed it is about exploring the complex issues surround policy creation and their affect on faculty teaching practice using e-learning that are difficult to study using a quantitative approach.

This descriptive policy analysis will be conducted through the lens of the multiple-streams policy development model and will use the methodology of a qualitative case study. The multiple streams model is a lens through which policy makers are perceived to create policy

under conditions of ambiguity (Sabatier, 2007). Kingdon (1995) began to consider how an issue is placed on a political agenda and is eventually translated into a public policy. As Kingdon (1995) noted, under certain circumstances, a window of opportunity is created and, "a problem is recognized, a solution is available, the political climate makes the time right for change, and the constraints do not prohibit action" (p. 96). Kingdon designated three "streams" that created such a window of opportunity during which policy makers are willing to seriously consider legislation aimed at improving a situation or solving a problem. The first stream, termed the problem stream, consists of indicators that support the existence of a problem. Problem streams may comprise research that establishes there is a problem. Or, a well-publicized occurrence may bring the issue to the attention of policymakers. The second stream, designated the policy stream, relates to input from specialists in the area under consideration. For instance, in terms of e-learning the reporting from faculty and support staff, are all potential contributors to information in the policy stream. The final stream, the political stream, considers political input into the matter. The political stream typically looks at "mood" surrounding the identified issue, changes in administration, and political opponents and proponents of an issue. Sabatier (2007) indicates that the "multiple-streams framework is not always as clear and internally consistent as one might like; it appears to be applicable to a wide variety of policy arenas" (p. 9).

This policy analysis will be undertaken through the lens of the multiple streams policy development model (Sabatier, 2007) and within the following framework:

Table 2

Focus and Description Outlining Multiple Streams Policy Development Model

Focus	Description
Conceptual	What are the core concepts under discussion? How are they defined? What are their outcomes?
Normative	What "ought to be" true in regard to the policy? How the current views of key people or groups involved in e-learning within the selected higher education institution are different from what "ought to be"?
Theoretical	Within what theoretical framework(s) does the policy fit? How would different parties involved in e-learning within the selected higher education institution define the policy in theoretical terms?
Empirical	Are there research studies in the literature which could prove helpful in illuminating the issues? What important facts do we glean from these studies? Are these really facts or assertions?
Assumptive	Are there key assumptions being made by the various parties involved in or affected by the policy issue? What are the assumptions made by those on both sides of the issue? Have these assumptions been made explicit? Are these assumptions known and understood by all policy decision-makers?

(modified from Musick, 1998, Appendix A)

This study attempted to identify important patterns and themes in the data. The methodological approach for the research was based on three lines of evidence. The first aspect of the research drew largely from existing official policy documents and involved developing a template to support a document analysis of e-learning policy. The second aspect consisted of a web-based survey and interviews with policy administrators to thematically analyze the intent of the e-learning policies. The third aspect consisted of a web-based survey and interviews with faculty who were teaching within the e-learning environment to thematically analyze the effect of the policies.

Data collection methods

The data collection process consisted of a structured web-based survey followed by a semi-structured interview. The survey was sent to teaching faculty, staff and administrators of which 157 individuals responded (twenty-three administrators, 127 teaching faculty and seven support staff). Interviews were conducted with nine individuals (three administrators and six teaching faculty) who volunteered from the web-based survey. The advantage of web-based surveys is that they can draw from a large number of respondents (Stake, 2010). The purpose of this survey was to elicit background information on each participant and to gather information on the effect policies have on those who teach using e-learning. These questions served as an introduction to the study in the final report, as well as a guide to the interview questions. The questions inquired into basic demographic information such as work experience, roles and responsibilities and teaching experience using e-learning. As well, the questionnaire sought to gain an understanding of the participants experience with policies surrounding academic quality, labour relations and legal issues and how those policies affect teaching using e-learning.

The responses were used to devise questions for the second phase of the data collection process. Phase two of the data collection process involved a semi-structured interview designed to provide an opportunity for each participant to elaborate on responses given in the questionnaire and to describe their experiences in e-learning and to elaborate on institutional positions which affect their pedagogy.

An effective tool for qualitative research is document analysis (Hoepfl, 1997). This thesis gathered existing e-learning related policy documentation from the selected higher education institution and thematically analyzed the documents using the qualitative data analysis tools of QSR NVIVO9 (Appendix B). Qualitative research software allowed the collection and classification of large volumes of policy documents. The built-in tools allowed thematic analysis, as well as sorting and arranging the information. Based on a preliminary model of the connections between policy and thematic representation, the researcher created a coding scheme for organizing the data. The purpose was to conduct a normative analysis of the policies affecting e-learning. In order to conduct a normative analysis, a norm must be identified. This normative analysis was based on document analysis, research, theory, and faculty practice (Amason, 2007). Drawing from existing official institutional e-learning policy documents and the literature, a gap analysis template was developed to support document analysis. By doing this the study examined the current condition of e-learning policy within the selected higher educational institution. This study traced the connection between the dominant e-learning policies and their effect on teaching practice that have occurred over time in the higher education system as system indicators. Given the complexities of system dynamics whereby multiple variables are operating and influencing

the system, it would be difficult, and methodically unwise, to make causal claims without inviting more research.

Interviews and surveys are two additional ways to determine how people make meaning of their world and constitute a rich and valuable source of information for this study. Participants were selected based on two primary criteria. Policy administrators had some involvement with policy creation and faculty had taught within the e-learning environment either full-time or part-time. Policy administrators and faculty participants were to be given a self-administered web-based questionnaire with fixed choices (Bickman & Rog, 2009).

Selection of Participants

Unlike quantitative sampling approaches, wherein studying a random sample provides the best opportunity to generalize the results to the population, this is not the most effective way of developing an understanding of complex issues relating to human behavior (Marshall, 1996). The purpose of qualitative research is not to establish a random or representative sample drawn from a population but rather to identify specific groups of people who possess characteristics or experience circumstances relevant to the phenomenon being studied (Mays & Pope, 1995). Qualitative researchers recognize that some informants are more likely to provide insight and understanding than will others, thus having an effect on the quality of the research. Purposeful selection of participants is a key aspect of qualitative research (Creswell, 2007; Mason, 1996). Purposeful sampling is the most common sampling technique and will allow this researcher to actively select the most productive sample to answer the research question. This approach to sampling

allowed deliberate inclusion of a wide range of participants and to selection of key participants with access to important sources of knowledge.

An appropriate sample size for a qualitative study is one that adequately answers the research question (Marshall, 1996). To do this, some researchers argue for a research design in which the number of participants in not selected ahead of time (Seidman, 2006). However, new participants are added as new dimensions of the issues are more clearly understood. Seidman (2006) indicates that there are two criteria for determining when a researcher has enough participants. The first is sufficiency. The number of participants reflects the range of individuals that make up the population. In this way others outside the sample may connect to the experiences of those in it. The second criterion is data saturation wherein the number of required subjects usually becomes obvious as the study progresses, as new categories, themes or explanations stop emerging from the information gathered. Morse (2000) indicates that estimating the number of participants in a study required to reach saturation depends on a number of factors, including the quality of data, the scope of the study, the nature of the topic, the amount of useful information obtained from each participant, the number of interviews per participant and the qualitative method and study design used.

Given such theoretical underpinnings of qualitative research the researcher would be hesitant to place a number on “enough” if it weren’t for such practical constraints as time, money and the tolerance and resources of the host institution. Therefore, the target

number of participants for the study was 25, which included both faculty and administration. This researcher then used descriptive statistics to illuminate the findings.

Ethics and Protection of Participants

Candid responses to the web-based questionnaire are critical to data analysis. As a result, consideration was given to confidentiality and anonymity. To protect participants anonymity participants receive unique keys to the survey tool in an email link, so they go straight to the survey. Following the survey the IP address (computer-identifying numeric address) is discarded from the response set and cannot be associated with the participants' responses. As well, any key, link, or invitation which led to the survey would have no correlation with the actual responses and cannot be associated with the participants' responses. Furthermore survey results are available only to the survey owner and only via a secure (SSL) connection. As a final check on protecting the participants' confidentiality and anonymity this researcher was bound ethically to respect participants' anonymity and not seek personal identities or information. It is possible through professionally designed survey software and the ethical guidelines that bind this researcher to so limit its likelihood that there is no way of identifying who has taken the survey and who has not and to maintain confidentiality and anonymity.

The web-based survey tool that was used is LimeSurvey. It is open source software that can be used to quickly create intuitive, powerful, online question-and-answer surveys. The survey software itself is self-guiding for the respondents who are participating. The survey tool participants will receive unique keys in an email link. They go straight to the survey. Following the survey code numbers to identify the results obtained from individual subjects were used to protect participants' anonymity. Furthermore survey results were available only to the survey

owner and only via a secure (SSL) connection. As a final check on protecting the participants' confidentiality and anonymity this researcher was bound ethically to respect respondents' anonymity and not seek personal identities or information. It is possible through this professionally designed survey software and the ethical guidelines that bind this researcher to so limit its likelihood that there is no way of identifying who has taken the survey and who has not and to maintain confidentiality and anonymity.

In the case of both the QSR NVIVO9 and LimeSurvey software they were housed on computers that are password protected and reside in Canada and hence not subject to foreign confiscation of the data.

The web based survey was preceded by an email letter. This letter provided the participant with the title of the research as well as what qualified them to participate. The participants were 18 years of age or older and either a policy administrator or teaching within the online environment at SAIT to participate in this study. The purpose of the study was clearly stated and it was noted that participation involved filling out a questionnaire, which should take about 15 minutes. The participants were given the opportunity to have the results of the study sent to them via email.

The participants' decision to participate in this study was entirely voluntary and they could decide at any time to withdraw from the study. If they choose to participate, they could skip any items they do not wish to answer. If the participant did not wish to submit their responses, they simply clicked the browser page closed. Responses made by individual participants on the questionnaire remained confidential, and their names would not appear on the questionnaire or be associated with their responses in any way. Only the researcher associated

with the project had access to the completed questionnaires. Once the participant read the letter the last item provided secure link to the questionnaire and by clicking on it the participant provided evidence of free and informed consent. The letter can be found in Appendix C and statement at the beginning of the survey can be found in Appendix D. A sample of the survey questions can be found in Appendix E.

Participants were contacted following the web-based survey and could elect to be involved in both the web-based survey and a follow-up interview. The interview was based on the use of a semi-structured instrument, in which each respondent was asked the same questions (Yin, & Gwaltney, 1982). However, the interviews could incorporate additional questions that emerged as the interviews progressed. Every interview started with a brief introduction. Using the open-ended interview approach, participants were free to address any significant higher education issues related to policy and practice. The researcher chose to do the web-based survey first as it takes the least amount of the participants' time and begins the process of pre-thinking that will assist in answering the open-ended questions of the interview.

A letter of invitation preceded each of the personal interviews. This letter was similar to the email letter preceding the web-based survey. It provided the participant with the title of the research, a brief overview and purpose of the research as well as what qualified them to participate. The purpose of the study was then clearly stated and that participation involved being interviewed at their convenience, which should take approximately one hour. The participants were given the opportunity to have the results of the study sent to them via email.

Only the researcher associated with the project had access to the interview data. Once the participant had read the letter and signed and dated the bottom, this indicated the provision of

free and informed consent. An example of the letter can be found in Appendix F. A sample of the field guide questions can be found in Appendix G. The interview process used pseudonyms for each of the participants and these were also used in reporting each of the interviews in the study. As well, all comments remained confidential. If participants' wanted to review drafts or transcripts of their interviews or a copy of the final report, they were provided by email. All interview participants were asked for feedback on interview summaries as developed by the researcher as a form of member checks. A summary of the results would be posted when the research is complete and the participants will receive an email notification when this occurs. Participants may obtain a full copy of the report by e-mailing the researcher. No individual result will be released; only grouped (aggregate) data will be presented. The data will be securely stored by Jason Maitland for two years on a computer with password protected access, after which the data will be destroyed.

Validity and Reliability (Credibility and Dependability)

Typically, the criteria for judging the rigor of inquiry within a positivist, quantitative paradigm are validity (internal and external) and reliability. Guba & Lincoln (1989) set out to provide a parallel criteria for the constructivist, qualitative paradigm, The credibility criterion is parallel to internal validity in that the focus has moved from what is presumed to be real to establishing a match between the constructed realities of participants and those realities as represented by the researcher and attributed to the participants (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). There are several techniques for increasing the probability that such relationships will be verified. The technique this researcher employed is member checks. Member checks involve collecting data and making analyses, interpretations, and conclusions that are brought back to the participant for

verification of the account (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Creswell, 1998). Member checks can be formal or informal. This researcher conducted a member check after interviews were conducted in order to verify that what was written down was what was actually intended to be communicated. In this study, member checks provided research participants with an opportunity to validate the information gathered in interviews, to offer additional information and to be put "on the record" as having said certain things and having agreed with the interviewer (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 239). The researcher used electronic mail to send transcripts of interviews to the participants who were then asked for feedback regarding their credibility.

The dependability criterion is parallel to reliability and is the technique for documenting the logic process and methods (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Guba and Lincoln (1989) indicate that dependability relies on confirmability. Confirmability being the assurance that the data collected, interpretations and outcomes of the inquiry are rooted in persons apart from the researcher. This researcher used policy documents specific to the case as well as surveys and interviews conducted with faculty who teach using e-learning and policy administrators who are employed by this post-secondary institution.

As well, qualitative researchers give attention to the validity of their findings through the use of triangulation. Triangulation refers to an approach to data collection in which evidence is deliberately sought from a range of different, independent sources and often by different means - for instance, comparing surveys and interviews with written policy records (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 2010; Yin, 2009). In this study, triangulation was applied to surveys since themes from the survey results were compared to the document analysis of policy and the interviews.

Furthermore, in qualitative research, the issues of validity and reliability (credibility and dependability) will be addressed by the researcher through employing purposeful sampling. Merriam (1998) has described purposeful sampling, or purposive sampling, as a type of non-probability sampling that is "based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (p. 61). Creswell (2007) has pointed out the importance of selecting respondents who have diverse perspectives on the problem, process, or event being explored. Purposeful sampling was used to obtain all resources for this descriptive study. There were three levels of purposeful sampling. The first level of purposeful sampling was site selection. SAIT was chosen because of the openness to research and their involvement with e-learning/blended learning. The second level of purposeful sampling involved selecting the participants. Participants were selected for their involvement in teaching using e-learning/blended learning or because the have input on policy making decisions. The third level of purposeful sampling involved selecting policy documents. The only policy documents chosen for analysis were those that might affect faculty who taught using e-learning. The policy documents focused on workload, training, intellectual and copyright, as well as, policies that address quality of e-learning/blended learning.

Threats to Validity and Reliability (Credibility and Dependability)

There are threats to validity and reliability (credibility and dependability). Web-based surveys may cause participants to feel a perceived lack of confidentiality and anonymity. However, perceived lack of confidentiality and anonymity are not the only concerns of web-based surveys. There are other perceived disadvantages; the participants' motivation to serious thoughtful responses may come into question. The validity of any research methodology relying

on volunteers is contingent on the ability and willingness of volunteers to provide meaningful responses and is an important one for both traditional and web-based methods (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004). Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, and John (2004) found that the "Web-questionnaire data were not especially affected by random or otherwise unreliable responses, nor by attempts to self-enhance for the sake of receiving positive feedback" (p. 101). Although further research is indicated, the use of web-based surveys is supported by Buchanan and Smith (1999) and Johnson (2000).

Summary

Case study research is one of many approaches to conducting social science research. Yin (2009) describes an effective case study as one that is more than just a description but offers insights into human or social processes. It is information arranged in such a way that brings a phenomenon to life for audiences and helps researchers understand the issues being investigated. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to investigate the affect that policies have on post-secondary faculty who teach using e-learning.

The methodology chosen for this case study emulated Yin's (2009) approach to designing case studies. Yin (2009) identified five key components: (a) the study's research questions; (b) its propositions, if any; (c) the unit(s) of analysis; (d) the logic; (e) the criteria for interpreting the findings. The researcher's design of this case study connected data to be collected with the proposed research questions. The identified population was staff involved in e-learning at a post-secondary institution. SAIT a polytechnic in Calgary, Alberta was the selected institution. Purposeful sampling was chosen because it a common sampling technique and allowed this researcher to actively select the most productive sample to answer the research question.

This approach to sampling allowed deliberate inclusion of a wide range of participants and to selection of key participants with access to important sources of knowledge. The data was collected in accordance with Yin's five key components and included documentation (policy documents, program directives), survey data and interviews. The variety of data collection methods served to triangulate sources corroborating (or not corroborating) findings and offsetting the pitfalls of any one given method (Mertens, 2005). Data analysis consisted of thematically analyzing the interviews using QSR NVIVO9 as the primary data management tool. This process involved the identification of themes through careful reading and re-reading of the data wherein emerging themes become the categories for analysis. QSR NVIVO9 allowed for the collection and coding of related themes. Construct, internal and external validity were considered along with reliability by using triangulation of data and member-checking. Finally, any ethical issues were taken into consideration.

Chapter 4

Results

Introduction and Purpose

Chapter 4 provides a systematic description of how data was carefully collected and analyzed for this qualitative case study. The purpose of the study was to conduct a descriptive policy analysis that investigated the questions: Does educational/administrative policy affect faculty practice and pedagogy in e-learning in higher education? How does educational/administrative policy affect faculty practice and pedagogy in e-learning in higher education? To accomplish the analysis, the study compared policy directives as well as faculty and administration perception of the effect of those policies on faculty teaching practice. Furthermore, the goal of the study was to determine the degree to which policies affect how faculty deliver their courses, are shaped within the institution, affect faculty workload, provide for incentives, and provide for training, as well as address intellectual property, copyright and quality issues.

Chapter 4 describes the formulation of the survey questions and the data collected on each participant in the study. Next, the researcher presents brief descriptions of the participants and the process of data collection, including the interviews. Finally, Chapter 4 concludes with an in-depth analysis of the data collected using NVIVO9, a well-known qualitative data management tool. This section describes how codes were developed, lists codes in an appendix and explains findings that emerged from the analysis.

Over the course of a two week period, pilot testing of the survey questions occurred with four individuals; two individuals internal to SAIT and two external to the polytechnic. The

experience revealed some issues with the initial survey questions, established the time requirements needed to conduct the survey and uncovered some technical and procedural issues with the approach outlined in Chapter 3.

Once testing was complete, the web-based survey invitations were distributed through the office of the Academic Vice President (AVP) to all teaching faculty, academic administrators, and support staff. This method of distribution carried the risk of including over a hundred instructors whose access to e-learning was limited. A reminder notice was sent to all faculty and administrators one week after the original contact, so as to encourage participation. This action increased the response rate. The Cisco E-Learning Chair at SAIT also made phone calls to colleagues to encourage participation.

Following the survey the researcher used semi-structured interviews as recommended by Yin (2009) to expand the depth of data gathering, and to increase the number of sources of information. All survey participants were invited to participate in a semi-structured interview within two weeks of the survey closing. Thirty individuals volunteered for the interview by including contact information on the survey form. Of the thirty individuals who volunteered, thirteen individuals were invited to participate in the interview process. These individuals were chosen in accordance with the purposeful sampling technique and allowed the researcher to actively select the most productive sample to participate in the interview questions. When making the choice the researcher considered years of service (over three years of service), position (teaching faculty and administrators) and considerable involvement with e-learning/blended learning as criteria for involvement. However, due to scheduling conflicts just nine participants accepted the invitation. Of the participants that accepted, three were

administrators and six were full-time teaching faculty. All nine participants were available at the scheduled time and participants responded to the questions asked. It is unlikely that nine participants would reach data saturation, wherein this researcher would record similar instances over and over again (Glaser & Straus, 2009). Finally, each interview took between 45 to 50 minutes.

Data Analysis

Yin (2009) suggested that every investigation should have a general analytic strategy to guide the decision regarding what will be analyzed and for what reason. He indicated that “the preferred strategy is to follow the theoretical propositions that led to your case study” (Yin, 2009, p. 130). If theoretical propositions are not present, then the researcher could consider developing a descriptive framework around which the case study is organized. In general, this analysis relied on the theoretical propositions that led to the case study. That being, that e-learning policy or lack thereof affects pedagogical practice of those faculty who teach using e-learning/blended learning. Within this general analytic strategy Yin (2009) presented some possible analytic techniques: pattern-matching, explanation-building, and time-series analysis. Trochim and Cook (1992) considered pattern-matching as one of the most desirable strategies for analysis. This technique compares an empirically-based pattern with a predicted one. If the patterns match, the internal reliability of the study is enhanced. The actual comparison between the predicted and actual pattern might not have any quantitative criteria. The discretion of the researcher is therefore required for interpretations.

"Data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating, or otherwise recombining the evidence to address the initial propositions of a study" (Yin, 2009, p. 126). Data analysis

also involves "working with data, organizing it, breaking it into manageable units, synthesizing it, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others" (Bogdan & Biklen, 2006, p. 159). The data analysis strategies this researcher used involved coding of the interview data within QSR NVIVO9 then identifying themes that immerged. Coding is the sorting of all data sets according to topics, themes and issues important to the study, then assigning some sort of short-hand designation to various aspects of the data so that it can easily be retrieved (Stake, 2010). QSR NVIVO9 has the ability to node and code data imported from the data collection methods (documents, surveys and interviews). A node is a term used by QSR NVIVO9 to represent a code, a theme or an idea about the data to be included in the analysis. The researcher used free nodes. Free nodes are not associated with a structured framework. The coding of the data is consistent with pattern matching and linking data to propositions (Yin, 2009).

Demographics

Table 3

Basic Demographic Information

Position	Full-Time	Part-Time	No Response	Total
Administration	20		3	23
Teaching Faculty	103	24		127
Support	5	2		7
Total all Positions				157

As can be seen in Table 3 the majority of respondents were teaching faculty and in all categories the majority were also full-time faculty, as opposed to part-time.

Table 4

Level of Experience – Years in Role

Position	< 1 year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	>15 years
Administration	3	10	4	3	3
Teaching Faculty	7	30	34	28	28
Support	2	2	2	1	0
Total All Positions	12	42	40	32	31

Table 4 indicates that the participants in the survey had a lot of experience, generally. The majority in the teaching category had considerably more than six years of experience in their current roles or similar roles at other institutions, and nearly half of the other two participant groups had six or more years of similar experience as well. Survey participants have considerable experience in their positions. Sixty-five percent of the participants had six years in their positions or above.

Table 5

Level of Experience – Years Using E-learning/Blended Learning

Position	Never	< 1 year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	>15 years
Administration	3	2	11	3	4	0
Teaching Faculty	17	14	62	20	12	2
Support	1	2	2	0	2	0
Total All Positions	21	18	75	23	18	2

Table 5 demonstrates that 74% of participants in the survey had experience using e-learning/blended learning. Although the majority in the teaching category had between one and five years of experience teaching using e-learning/blended learning at SAIT or other institutions, a further 21% in the teaching category had considerably more than six years of experience and

the other two participant groups had similar experience. Generally, survey participants have experience using e-learning/blended learning.

The following is a presentation of the resulting interview themes that were coded and compared to survey results, policy documents and program directives. The themes discussed in this chapter formed a framework for examining pedagogical and policy issues in implementing e-learning in a polytechnic. The resulting themes are organized into categories ranging from main themes to subthemes. Table 6 below outlines the main themes and subthemes.

Table 6

Major Themes and Subthemes

Theme	Sub-Theme
1. Belief about E-Learning/Faculty Buy-In	
2. Copyright and Intellectual Property	
3. Course Review	3a Indicators used to measure course quality
	3b Standards
4. Faculty Evaluation	4a Student satisfaction surveys
5. Culture	
6. Hours of Work/Time	
7. Institution Vision/Mission	
8. E-learning Policy	8a Availability of policy information
	8b Instructional hours and compensation
	8c E-learning specific policies
	8d Course evaluation
	8e Process – Faculty involvement in policy process
9. Support	9a. Faculty learning
	9b. Budget/funding
	9c. Academic course development
	9d. Off-loading
	9e. Technical
	9f. General

The themes are presented in broad groupings, within which there is some diversity in how the themes related to each person, given that each participant's experience was personal.

Each theme is discussed by referring to the original data. This approach is in alignment with the literature where Halling (2002) indicated that by including well-chosen examples and quotes in the analysis of the phenomenon, the researcher can effectively bring the reader into a more intimate and insightful relationship with the phenomenon.

Theme 1: Belief about E-Learning/Faculty Buy-In

Table 7

E-learning as a Facilitator of Skills

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided
Administration	9	11	2	0	1
Teaching Faculty	31	80	6	2	8
Support	1	5	0	0	1
Total All Positions	41	96	8	2	10
Percent of total	26%	62%	5%	1%	6%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): …the experience I had integrating my courses into D2L was challenging and rewarding. The courses are much more stream lined and all objectives are clear and accessible to the students.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): E-learning still has limited usefulness in developing character and attitudes of students, the tools they really need to be successful in a career.

Interview Comments

- Participant #9 - I think it's great because I don't think that every student learns the same way. …if I was a student and I missed a class I'd be able to catch up because everything's online.

Table 7 demonstrates that 88% of participants in the survey supported e-learning's use to develop skills through expanded use of information and interactive technology. It is noteworthy that support for e-learning was across all positions. Comments from the survey and interview were minimal on this topic with no strong comments coming out for or against e-learning. Only one comment expressed doubts about the how effective it would be at teaching the whole student.

Table 8

Potential of E-learning to Improve Education Program

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided
Administration	9	11	2	0	1
Teaching Faculty	28	73	14	3	9
Support	1	5	0	0	1
Total All Positions	38	89	16	3	11
Percent of total	24%	57%	10%	2%	7%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): I know that e-learning is an important component for studies in educational institutions at this period of time.

Table 8 reveals that 81% believe that e-learning would improve the education program at SAIT. This represents a strong majority of respondents

Table 9

Faculty (Instructors) View E-learning Favorably

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided
Administration	1	10	10	0	2
Teaching Faculty	2	47	39	9	30
Support	0	6	0	0	1
Total All Positions	3	63	49	9	33
Percent of total	2%	43%	31%	6%	21%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): Faculty may buy-in more if PD was to show them how they can teach "math" or whatever subject, integrating technology rather than leaving it very general.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): I believe e-learning has a place. At a polytechnic like SAIT most courses will involve a lot of 'hands on' training as well. The e-learning compliments the hands on and is a way to give students backup material and review on D2L.

Interview Comments

- Participant #4 - I think a lot of faculty is excited about it.
- Participant #8 - It’s sometimes difficult to engage some instructors.
- Participant #3 - as a group, instructors haven’t embraced e-learning. They’ve done it begrudgingly because that’s the mandate that’s come down, but it’s not something that they’ve really embraced. Some of the faculty is a little older and they do have their challenges with technology at times.

Although Table 8 demonstrates an individual's belief that e-learning would improve education, Table 9 reveals that less than half of all survey participants believe that teaching faculty generally had a favourable view of e-learning/blended learning. The majority of responses fell into one of three categories: undecided, disagree or agree that e-learning/blended learning is viewed favourably by teaching faculty. Interview responses ranged from staff willingly engaging in e-learning/blended learning to those who had begrudgingly moved to e-learning/blended learning since it has been mandated.

Table 10

Academic Chairs/Program Coordinators View E-learning Favorably

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	0	13	9	0	1	0
Teaching Faculty	19	72	7	0	28	1
Support	1	4	0	0	2	0
Total All Positions	20	89	16	0	31	1
Percent of total	13%	56%	10%	0	20%	1%

Interview Comments

- Participant #9 - I'm really interested in the blended learning. So that's blended online. So there's an e-learning component.

Survey results indicated the majority of all staff (69%) believed that Academic Chairs/Program Coordinators viewed e-learning/blended learning favourably. Twenty percent of those surveyed did not know how Academic Chairs/Program Coordinators view e-learning/blended learning.

Table 11

E-learning/Blended Learning a Positive Experience

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided
Administration	0	13	9	0	1
Teaching Faculty	17	72	16	6	16
Support	1	4	0	0	2
Total All Positions	18	89	25	6	19
Percent of total	11%	57%	16%	4%	12%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): The experience I had to integrate into D2L was challenging and rewarding.

Interview Comments

- Participant #1 - Teaching using e-learning is wonderful. It makes communication with students so much better. I'm able to work at home so that compensates a lot.
- Participant #4 - I loved my e-learning curriculum development; I loved my e-learning teaching. I would love to do e-learning in the future when I'm not at SAIT full time anymore. I would love to do distance ed.
- Participant #6 - I really enjoy it.
- Participant #5 - I struggle a little bit with the e-learning environment… because it takes so much time to prepare activities,
- Participant #9 - I'm really interested in the blended learning. So that's blended online. So there's an e-learning component.

The majority of research participants had a positive experience in an e-learning/blended learning environment. Benefits included increased flexibility, enhanced communication,

enjoyment of curriculum development and potential for sessional employment during retirement. Twenty percent of survey participants did not have a positive experience in an e-learning/blended learning environment. The time required to prepare materials was a factor for one interviewee. Twelve percent were undecided or did not comment on their e-learning/blended learning experience.

Table 12

Faculty Demonstrate Buy-in to E-learning

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided
Administration	1	13	8	0	1
Teaching Faculty	7	45	38	7	30
Support	1	5	0	0	1
Total All Positions	9	63	46	7	32
Percent of total	6%	40%	29%	4%	20%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): I think blended/e-learning is a great asset to student and instructors.

Interview Comments

- Participant #3 - There really hasn't been a huge embracing of e-learning
- Participant #9 – Now we have tremendous buy-in generally. …getting people to buy-in to copyright was onerous.
- Participant #8 - I haven't seen resistance to it. …I have seen is lots of openness and willingness to do some things differently and improved.
- Participant #6 - The older faculty didn't really want to get involved.

- Participant #5 - Getting overall staff buy-in… The buy-in is quite high. …I would say almost everybody in our department is quite enthusiastic about e-learning and knows the technology very well.
- Participant #7 - I'd say sixty/forty. When I say sixty/forty I think we, we do very well with the people who are coming in and who are willing to address a change, but I have a very big percentage that is not willing to even look at that.
- Participant #2 - I think that online teaching is probably the best way to go – as long as there's like some sort of interaction as well going on – whether it be online or not

Acceptance of the e-learning environment was mixed. Results indicated that staff buy-in to e-learning was low (46%). Barriers to staff buy-in included: adopting copyright policies, the top-down method of implementation of e-learning, and instructor openness and willingness to do things differently particularly among older staff members.

Theme 2: Copyright and Intellectual Property

Table 13

Intellectual Property Issues and D2L Course Development

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided
Administration	7	11	4	0	1
Teaching Faculty	9	59	15	17	27
Support	1	5	0	1	0
Total All Positions	17	75	19	18	28
Percent of total	11%	48%	12%	11%	18%

Interview comments

- Participant #9 - Intellectual property... So, you know it took us awhile, you know you have to get lawyers involved with this stuff. And it became pretty straight forward. Either

you, want to put this in and so here's a form that says you have no intellectual property rights to it, or you don't put it in. … at most universities, most traditional universities, the curriculum is owned by the instructors. I think SAIT is one of the only institutes that I know of that actually the instructors do not own the materials.

Survey data indicated that intellectual property issues were discussed as D2L courses were developed (59%). Among those surveyed 18% did not know or did not have an opinion regarding the discussion of intellectual property issues. Out of nine interview participants one administrator discussed the ownership of intellectual property.

Table 14

Existence of Policies Regarding Copyright in E-learning

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	13	9	1	0	0	0
Teaching Faculty	32	82	0	2	10	1
Support	3	4	0	0	0	0
Total All Positions	48	95	1	2	10	1
Percent of total	31%	61%	1%	1%	6%	1%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): At present we are faced with revising old material with copyrighted material, keeping course information up to date, and then transferring it to D2L.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): The copyright issues we are currently facing affect blended learning.

- Teaching faculty (instructor): There are policies on Copyright, but minimal support for faculty in overcoming copyright issues.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): The constraints of copyright make it difficult and confusing to offer current information, or to adapt my courses quickly and in a responsive way.

Interview Comments

- Participant #2 – copyright would be the biggest inhibitor to us doing anything online… If I compare two institutions that I've worked in there are different standards for copyright. …at one institution if material is referenced and cited and as it is referenced you can use it. Here they won't let you use anything unless it's formally copyrighted and they have a formal approval from the person that did that and you have to have all this stuff, which I find almost extreme.
- Participant #5 - …it's been a very aggressive move in the recent years is to make sure that all of our materials have copyright and because of that we've been getting rid of a lot of stuff. SAIT used to invest a lot in writing modules, but at the time that those modules were written, nobody was really caring about copyright. So a lot of the modules had problematical material in them. So we've had to stop using those all together.
- Participant #9 - copyright rules are very straightforward. Unless we've got the proper sign offs it can't go in. It's that simple.

A strong majority (92%) of SAIT staff were aware of copyright policies in the e-learning environment. Survey and interview comments revealed issues arising from copyright policies. Increased paperwork, creating online course materials that adhere to copyright policy and inconsistent application of copyright between traditional and e-learning teaching environments

pose barriers to the development of e-learning courses. A lack of support when resolving copyright issues was reported by one participant. Copyright was sited as the biggest inhibitor to e-learning course development by a second participant. Another participant felt getting faculty to buy-in to copyright was onerous. Copyright was summed up nicely by participant #9 “we did do a lot of work on copyright and it became much more black and white because we ended up saying if we don’t have it, and it’s clear, it’s not in”.

Theme 3 Course Review – 3a: Indicators Used to Measure Course Quality

Table 15

Advantages of Using Indicators to Measure Course Quality

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	10	12	0	0	0	1
Teaching Faculty	14	87	10	2	14	0
Support	6	0	0	0	1	0
Total All Positions	30	99	10	2	5	1
Percent of total	19%	63%	6%	1%	3%	1%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): I am not aware of any quality issues that have been addressed in online education at SAIT, as it is unknown if there are any indicators gathered and studied.

Interview Comments

- Participant #3 - I feel that’s the piece that’s been missing because we did a bunch of stuff on line… and that’s never really been evaluated. Is the stuff that we put on line working? …we just haven’t had the time to do a proper end evaluation of all the work that’s

happened. I would definitely have an evaluation piece added that would be clear for faculty about what's being evaluated, how to go about doing a proper evaluation of not only the instructional time, but the curriculum itself and is the curriculum actually working in an e-learning format?

- Participant #4 - I've never been asked for feedback….to this day I've never been asked for feedback. a faculty member just can't say this needs to be changed. It has to go through three or four signatures….
- Participant #5 - every course that's developed does have at least one other instructor whose job it was just to evaluate the website and make sure it's got all the components in there. …all these materials also go through our curriculum development team and it's evaluated in that sense too. And evaluated on fairly, quite rigorous criterion. But once that's released into the classroom, I would say there's very little or no evaluation of how it's being implemented. …the next leap to really become a truly blended institution, measurement has to come into play somewhere – assessment and measurement of course quality.
- Participant #7 - We've spent a lot of time in defining what the standards need to look like, learning outcomes and objectives and how they need to be aligning, what the industry requirements are, the accreditation requirements are and we spent a lot of resources going through the development. But we've never, once the course is finished, we've never paused to see….based on the student feedback or the customer feedback as to if there are any gaps there.

A strong majority of survey respondents agree that indicators used to measure course quality would advance e-learning. There was a wide range of survey and interview responses. One participant was not aware of any standards to measure e-learning course quality and a second interviewee felt that it was a piece that was missing. Another interviewee stated that at least two instructors and the curriculum development team were involved in developing and vetting e-learning courses. Furthermore, e-learning/blended learning course objectives and outcomes were aligned to industry/accreditation requirements. Measurement and assessment of e-learning/blended course quality were deemed to be important. The quality process of delivering a course was based not on a policy, or a manual, or a standard, but in the expertise of every member in the team. Yet insufficient time limits the development and implementation of e-learning course quality indicators. The institution has not sought student feedback regarding course quality.

Theme 3 Course Review – 3b: Standards

Table 16

Standards Have Been Set for E-learning

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	4	7	9	1	2	0
Teaching Faculty	6	43	41	27	10	0
Support	0	3	3	0	1	0
Total All Positions	10	53	53	28	13	0
Percent of total	6%	34%	34%	18%	8%	

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): I would be curious to discuss how the 'standard' for on-line course management can be benchmarked, since I also observe a wide variety of instructors' definitions of blended on-line learning.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): There can be a very significant difference between the way one instructor uses technology compared to another, even in the same program. These differences don't appear to be monitored and I have not seen specific efforts to create a more unified experience for the student.

Participant Comments

- Participant #3 - A lot of the curriculum that has been put on line from a perspective of …we'll take the paper stuff, we'll PDF it and we'll upload it. However, PDF's on line, it's not really e-learning.
- Participant #4 - I was never given the opportunity to see, here's what the standard design will look like.
- Participant #5 - I would say there are standards. And whether or not those are official standards or it's sort of unspoken that – well I imagine there is a policy somewhere that instructors will use e-learning in some manner.
- Participant #6 - You have a template to follow then it is checked to make sure everything is down properly.
- Participant #7 - As the course is getting developed, the instruction designers are accountable to ensure that those course standards are being, integrated. And if they're not they're being flagged.

Just over half of survey respondents (52%) felt that SAIT did not have set standards (performance measures, core competencies, targets) for e-learning. Forty percent agreed or strongly agreed that SAIT had set standards (performance measures, core competencies, targets) for e-learning. One survey comment revealed an interest in standardizing layout and design. Comments from interview participants indicated a range of opinions regarding standards. A few stated no standards were in place, thereby preventing a unified and consistent learning experience for the students. Two interviewees commented that instruction designers used templates to ensure course standards were being integrated. E-learning was deemed to be more than uploading PDFs to the template.

Theme 4: Faculty Evaluation

Table 17

Appropriate Indicators Exist to Measure Faculty Success

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	3	5	12	1	2	0
Teaching Faculty	1	14	48	25	39	0
Support	0	2	2	0	3	0
Total All Positions	4	21	62	26	44	0
Percent of total	3%	13%	39%	17%	28%	0%

Table 17 demonstrates that a majority (56%) of participants disagreed that the indicators used to measure the success of faculty were appropriate for e-learning. There were a large number of participants who either did not know or were undecided (28%).

Theme 4 Faculty Evaluation – 4a: Student Satisfaction Surveys

Each semester, SAIT students are asked to fill out Student Instructional Reports (SIR II) to give feedback on their instructors. The SIR II evaluation form is given to students who have completed at least 60 per cent of their coursework, and consists of 45 questions concerning their instructor's performance.

Table 18

Student Satisfaction Surveys Optimal for E-learning Faculty Evaluation

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	4	5	12	2	0	0
Teaching Faculty	4	23	49	32	18	1
Support	0	5	1	0	1	0
Total All Positions	8	33	62	34	19	1
Percent of total	5%	21%	39%	22%	12%	1%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): Additional methods of evaluating teaching performance beyond student surveys are needed
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Currently faculty are evaluated by the SIR II instrument. It would not be appropriate for e-learning. And because the SIR II is heavily linked to performance review, it is important to consider the appropriate way to evaluate course content and the learning experience.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): I don't think the current tools (SIR II) used to assess instructional effectiveness fits all modes of delivery...
- Teaching faculty (instructor): SIRS - as one student said to me, they are a means to be

kind (if they like the instructor) or destroy or diss an instructor that they didn't like. Go figure.

- Teaching faculty (instructor): Unclear policies, poor training, and invalid feedback tools hamper the development of e-learning environments at SAIT.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Student surveys are not used for development; they feel like the results are arbitrarily set to force (punish) faculty to develop unrealistic plans for improvement.

Interview Comments

- Participant #2 - I've got something to add regarding the evaluation of instructors. A lot of our performance is based on the students' reviews and it actually makes the workplace very difficult to work in. If you bring up student reviews to any instructor – their blood pressure goes up.
- Participant #3 - Administration always says that oh, it's not punitive… but you know you always hear the rumors. I've heard that it has been used in a punitive measure because you know a low SIR means that there's a problem with the course or it's usually focused a problem with the instructor. …students don't evaluate the e-learning. SIR is focused on the face to face piece.
- Participant #5 - almost entirely evaluated by our student SIRS, our student instructor evaluations. …and that's really the only tool that the administration can use to evaluate us. It's an inaccurate tool. …we were always troubled by the SIRS to begin with because they don't properly reflect …what we think we SHOULD be evaluated on.

- Participant #6 - The big thing is administration looks at student evaluation. That's what they base the evaluation on.
- Participant #8 - at the moment, the SIR is not applied to those courses online.

Twenty-five percent of survey respondents believed student satisfaction surveys were the optimal method to gauge faculty performance in an e-learning environment. Sixty-one percent of survey respondents did not feel student satisfaction surveys were the optimal method to gauge faculty performance in an e-learning environment. Numerous survey and interviewee comments revealed that the current evaluation methods were not deemed appropriate for e-learning. Several participants stated that the student survey (SIR II) was an evaluative process perceived to be punitive and inaccurate.

Theme 5: Culture

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): SAIT pushes D2L quite a bit but I haven't had an opportunity to have it explained extensively to me. I feel there is a lot of expectation without explanation.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): If you would like to do something different or inventive in your classroom, it falls on the instructors shoulders - without compensation or recognition. What seems to be recognized is the old style of sage on the stage.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): SAIT needs to communicate that e-learning is a must.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Blended and fully on-line class management requires a lot of upfront and ongoing maintenance that I'm not sure is recognized yet, here at SAIT.

Interview Comments

- Participant #1 - We fight like crazy, then we do things the way we wanted to. … A lot of it comes from instructor initiatives. …a lot of the instructors avoid the development process simply because it gets very complicated. …you're free to say what you want and there are, there are no repercussions. …it's really good. It's really healthy that way.
- Participant #2 - A lot of instructors don't want to change the way that they're doing things.
- Participant #5 - I would say there are standards. And whether or not those are official standards or, or it's sort of unspoken …I imagine there is a policy somewhere that instructors will use e-learning in some manner. ...I'm not actually familiar with that policy existing. It's more of a corporate culture. …I suspect anyone who doesn't follow that corporate culture would not be welcome after a time. …it's fairly explicit that the expectation IS that you will,

Survey and interview comments revealed that there was an expectation to follow corporate culture. The underlying corporate culture is one of instructor independence and initiative. There was no recognition or compensation for innovation in the classroom. Course development requires a lot of time and is complicated. There was an expectation without explanation. There was a lot of up-front work expected without guidance.

Theme 6: Hours of Work/Time

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): Two critical issues are staff loading. I have heard from one faculty member that she has concerns regarding increasing load hours if e-learning is

embraced more formally. There is the perception that SAIT leadership sees e-learning as being lighter.

- Teaching faculty (instructor): Blended learning (specifically, e-learning combined with in-class delivery) seem to be increasing the workload and stress on instructors.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Finally, I think blended/e-learning is a great asset to student and instructors; however, the ratio that management uses of one hour of prep/marking to one hour classroom delivery is inadequate.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): The wildly unrealistic and uncompensated workload in my school doesn't allow development in this area except at great personal cost.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): While there is support for the creation of content for D2L, there is no support for instructors who modify, alter or add additional information.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): As faculty, we are loaded so heavily with classes that we do not have time to get the training or the help during hours of operation.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Regarding compensation: There is adequate compensation, if you have face-to-face hours, but there is not the appreciation of how much time is involved in online components (emails, discussion, setting up quizzes, etc...)

Interview Comments

- Participant #1 - most people that work here, faculty, that I know, mainly in this department, have the attitude that well, here's what we've [got to] do and we just [because] do it. You have to ignore the union. So there's no benefit to saying well, that's not in my contract and I'm not gonna work seventy hours this week just 'cause we have to get this big project done. We just go ahead and do it. Quite frankly you put aside things

like policies and so on. You just don't tell anybody. …People are starting to burn out a little bit. Not so they're quitting, but their level of enthusiasm as mine has… dropped off a lot, I'm feeling worn out.

- Participant #2 - You get a certain amount of hours...I think it depends on your teaching hours is what they refer to it. I don't know…because I haven't taught a formally hundred percent online course… but I believe that you get fewer teaching hours if you're teaching an online course than if you were teaching a face to face. Which just means that they'll just say …here's more courses for you to fill in those hours, which would mean …instead of teaching six courses a semester, suddenly you're teaching seven or eight.
- Participant #5 - They would love to be able to claim that we are a world leader in e-learning. I'm not sure if we'll get there …unless the working hours are addressed somehow. …I think generally we are overworked and that gets in the way very much of trying to implement a really world class e-learning environment.
- Participant #7 - Creating the resources for blended learning… it's the time commitment, the workload that starts to become an issue.
- Participant #8 - the main challenge is the allocation of time for the instructors.

Time is a critical factor in developing and maintaining e-learning courses. There is the perception that SAIT leadership sees e-learning as being lighter. The majority of survey respondents and interviewees stated that SAIT did not provide the time and support for instructors to develop and update e-learning course material. There is an unrealistic and uncompensated workload. Teachers in face-to-face learning environments were adequately

compensated. Respondents felt that this was not the case for e-learning. Consequently level of instructor enthusiasm has declined.

Theme 7: Institution Vision/Mission

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): SAIT has not put forth a strong statement, one with conviction that indicates we are an institute highly dedicated to online/e-learning.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Many schools appear to be putting out their own version of distance education/online education materials/approaches; there does not appear to be a strong advocate for a centralized effort.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Course development is seen as something that is done so that we can continue to do what we do...not so much as something exciting and challenging that will improve our delivery and ability to engage our students further.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): There is not a main focus to move to e-learning. There is little focus in our school as to what things e-learning is most suited for.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): There can be a very significant difference between the way one instructor uses technology compared to another, even in the same program. These differences don't appear to be monitored and I have not seen specific efforts to create a more unified experience for the student.

Interview Comments

- Participant #2 - I think that e-learning does fit SAIT's vision, but I think the problem is that they don't know it fits and they're not working towards that. I find that kind of disappointing.

- Participant #3 – …e-learning is almost contradictory, they're promoting online curriculum… in an e-learning forum, yet we're an institute that promotes hands on learning. …I think some of the people pushing it don't understand quite why they're pushing it.
- Participant #5 - I think it's central to it. …I mean SAIT has made a really big push …since the last decade, to make sure that you've got laptops in almost every student's hands. …because we're a technological institute it really works with our marketing. I think e-learning is a central vision that they have to make us leaders in e-learning. …I think we're getting there. However, I still have doubts as to whether we're doing it completely effectively, and… maybe that there isn't uh yet, an effective institution wide model for this. …I think generally we are overworked and that gets in the way very much… trying to implement a really world class e-learning environment. Which I think is what SAIT would love to be able to do. They would love to be able to claim that we are a world leader in e-learning. I'm not sure if we'll get there unless the working hours are addressed somehow
- Participant #7 – e-learning ended up being one of the priorities for not only the strategic plan – at one point three year – and the academic excellence does say e-learning…..so e-learning has been one of the strategic priorities, it showed up in the curriculum excellence too, whether we have a very well defined e-learning plan and a strategy, over the years there's been a very aggressive move in that direction, but I should say we still don't have something that we run with. …I think we felt that in order for us to be exceptionally good in whatever we do, we have to go slow. We can't have too many things start at the same

time. So e-learning has happened, despite choice and just by interest and just by people wanting to do new things.

Some survey and interviewee comments indicated that SAIT has not clearly articulated their commitment to a vision of e-learning. Consequently, the implementation of e-learning has been haphazard and decentralized. Some commented on the irony of creating e-learning in a hands-on environment. Others stated that the current vision is to make SAIT a leader in e-learning. E-learning has been one of the strategic priorities.

Theme 8 E-learning Policy – 8a: Availability of Policy Information

Table 19

Availability of Policy Information

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	4	16	2	1	0	0
Teaching Faculty	6	63	28	6	21	1
Support	1	2	1	0	3	0
Total All Positions	11	81	31	7	24	1
Percent of total	7%	52%	20%	4%	15%	1%

Table 19 demonstrates that 59% of respondents felt that policy information was readily available.

Theme 8 E-learning Policy – 8b: Instructional Hours and Compensation

Table 20

Policy Dictates Instructional Hours for E-learning/Blended Learning

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	1	7	8	4	3	0
Teaching Faculty	0	16	35	15	61	0
Support	0	1	1	0	5	0
Total All Positions	1	24	44	19	69	0
Percent of total	1%	15%	28%	12%	44%	0%

Table 20 demonstrates that 40% of survey respondents disagreed that instructional hours for e-learning/blended learning instructors were clearly outlined in the policies. Those who did not know or were undecided reflected 44% of respondents.

Theme 8 E-learning Policy – 8c: E-learning Specific Policies

Table 21

Policies Affect E-learning Teaching Practice

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	7	14	0	0	2	0
Teaching Faculty	25	79	7	0	15	1
Support	1	5	0	0	1	0
Total All Positions	33	98	7	0	18	1
Percent of total	23%	62%	4%	0%	11%	1%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): E-Learning policies are in place, but are rarely discussed.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): There is no policy to govern the use of the Internet while in a blended environment.

- Teaching faculty (instructor): I have not seen any policies concerning this issue...
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Policies can be a detriment to innovation if they are too restrictive.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Unclear policies, poor training, and invalid feedback tools hamper the development of e-learning environments at SAIT
- Administrator: The creation of policies for blended or e-learning, the promotion and education about those policies, and the evaluation of achievement of those policies by students DOES NOT reflect a management commitment to blended learning.

Interview Comments

- Participant #1 – [I] think one of the things …first is people who develop policies have to be educators as well. And that's NOT the case now.
- Participant #2 – They don't really seem to say much about e-learning policy…. now it seems like the expectation – there's no real policy, but there's the expectation that you have things online for the students. …I don't know if it's the students pushing that expectation or if it's management pushing that expectation. …When the expectation becomes a standard – then it becomes a policy. … There is a lack of communication if there is e-learning policy or not.
- Participant #3 - , I really don't know much about the policies for e-learning, and maybe that just goes to show the lack of policies [for] e-learning,
- Participant #5 – I don't know of any e-learning policies. It's still more like guidelines at this point that we use D2L. …it's highly encouraged, but I think SAIT's approach to that is to encourage through training… There was a policy that everyone should have a laptop

however I don't know pedagogy to put it in place. …we're playing catch up with that now if the policy was to introduce the technology first and then … sort of now where we're beginning to figure out how to use it. ...I think they've struck a pretty good balance. I'd never in some ways really thought about policy as a major driving force in this. I think by having the kind of cultural buy-in that we have… it's a much more effective approach than hitting everybody over the head with policy.

- Participant #7 - I feel… the importance of a policy is immense in ensuring that we do align our realities with the vision that we have. If there is no policy in place for us to communicate and explain and understand a vision to the stakeholders, sometimes we can be going on tangents and just you know, just not getting to the vision and the goal that we have here. Having said that, if those polices are created in a vacuum, in an isolated way without engaging all the stakeholders at all levels, those policies don't mean much. …Are there any e-learning policies? I don't think I can pick one and say …that there is one that is really solid. I think it's left to the institutions to see what is, what e-learning means to them. …it becomes even hard in the absence of those policies here. And then it starts to set frustrations.
- Participant #8 - policies for e-learning learning are not really in place. …sometimes policies are a detriment to innovation. They can be a handicap to innovation. But if you have a policy that supports innovation, that supports creativity, teamwork, all of that, it's fantastic.
- Participant #9 - if e-learning programs are successful – currently they're operating under the standard policies, but the blended learning and the online learning would require a

> traditional institute to introduce some different policies. …I don't think there's enough understanding of how e-learning is going to work to make policy now. Nor is there enough mass to warrant the investment in policy right now. I don't think we've bumped up against enough problems yet to warrant another look. I mean most of the problems we've bumped up against we've found solutions to within the existing policy. Why would you create policy over something you don't even know where it's [going to] go?

Table 21 demonstrates that 85% of survey respondents agree that policies affect e-learning teaching practice while only 4% disagreed. Numerous survey and interviewees stated that they were no e-learning policies in existence. Others stated that standard policies applied to e-learning. Some indicated positive effects of e-learning policies. Policies ensured that current realities aligned with the SAIT vision. One interviewee stated that policies supporting innovation, creativity and teamwork were beneficial. Some commented that e-learning policies could be detrimental to innovation and could lead to frustration. Some questioned the value of creating e-learning policy given the novelty of e-learning. One interviewee stated that all problems in e-learning had been solved under the existing policy framework.

Theme 8 E-learning Policy – 8d: Course Evaluation

Table 22

Policies Exist to Ensure High Quality of E-learning Instruction

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	3	7	8	1	4	0
Teaching Faculty	2	41	30	13	41	0
Support	0	4	1	0	2	0
Total All Positions	5	52	39	14	45	0
Percent of total	3%	33%	25%	9%	29%	0

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): I am not aware of any quality issues that have been addressed in online education at SAIT, as it is unknown if there are any indicators gathered and studied.

The survey demonstrated that 36% of respondents agreed that current policies ensured a high quality of e-earning instruction at SAIT. Yet, 34% of respondents disagreed with this statement. Twenty nine percent either did not know or were undecided. One survey respondent stated that he/she was not aware of any policy that guided quality e-learning instruction at SAIT.

Theme 8 E-learning Policy – 8e: Faculty Involvement in Policy Process

Table 23

New Faculty Directed to Policy Information

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	4	13	2	1	4	0
Teaching Faculty	4	34	33	9	46	1
Support	1	3	0	0	3	0
Total All Positions	9	50	35	10	53	1
Percent of total	6%	32%	22%	6%	34%	1%

Table 23 demonstrates some new faculty have been directed to policy information (38%) while others were not (28%). The remaining survey participants (34%) did not know if new faculty were directed to policy information.

Table 24

E-learning Policies Reviewed With Faculty.

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	1	9	7	2	4	0
Teaching Faculty	1	20	59	22	25	0
Support	1	1	0	2	3	0
Total All Positions	3	30	66	26	32	0
Percent of total	2%	19%	42%	17%	20%	0%

Table 24 indicates that e-learning policy was not reviewed with faculty (59%). Twenty-one percent of those surveyed agreed that e-learning policies were reviewed with faculty, while twenty percent were unsure or were undecided on this matter.

Table 25

Need for Faculty Input on the Creation of Policies that Affect E-learning.

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	9	14	0	0	0	0
Teaching Faculty	57	65	2	0	3	0
Support	1	6	0	0	0	0
Total All Positions	67	85	2	0	3	0
Percent of total	43%	54%	1%	0%	2%	0%

Interview comments

- Participant #1 - We don't have enough push to be very effective. …We can respond to the policies as they come up
- Participant #3 – There isn't a process in place for faculty involvement in the creation of policies that I'm aware of.
- Participant #4 - I have never been asked if I would like to give input onto some policy development – EVER. …So if I went into SAIT now and looked at curriculum development policy, all I would find is real generic, general policy. I don't see anything in detail about e-learning. So that leaves me to question are those policies even in existence? I don't know.
- Participant #5 - SAIT's quite a top down kind of organization and I think most policies will come from the higher administration. So the staff has relatively little influence in policy and there's a great expectation that we will follow policy without questioning it. In this way we are, I suspect, different from the university in that, we are treated more like

employees and it is assumed that we will do what is best for the business or what the business mandates. ...and that has been a struggle for people over the last decade or so.

- Participant #9 - Faculties sit on all of our policy committees… as well as deans and associate deans and managers and VP's and the rest. All of our policies are broadly based. So there is input at every stage on the creation of the policy… so they're not created by dictate.
- Participant #9 - Not everybody in the institute gets to have a say, but there is a consultation process and people do use it.

A strong majority of those surveyed (97%) felt that faculty should have input on the creation of policies that affect e-learning. Many teaching faculty interviewees stated that no processes are in place for faculty involvement in the creation of policies within this top down organization. Yet administrators stated that all stakeholders have input at every stage of policy creation through a committee driven consultative process.

Theme 9 Support – 9a: Faculty Learning

Table 26

Participation in Discussions on Improving Student Success Through E-learning

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	10	9	2	1	1	0
Teaching Faculty	12	66	26	16	6	1
Support	1	3	3	0	0	0
Total All Positions	23	78	31	17	7	1
Percent of total	15%	50%	20%	11%	4%	1%

Table 26 demonstrates that 65% of survey respondents participated in discussions on topics related to improving student success through e-learning, while 31% did not participated in any such discussions.

Table 27

Faculty Knowledge of D2L

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	3	12	6	1	1	0
Teaching Faculty	5	27	63	15	17	0
Support	1	4	2	0	0	0
Total All Positions	9	43	71	16	18	0
Percent of total	6%	27%	45%	10%	11%	0%

Table 27 indicates that over half of the survey respondents felt that faculty did not have comprehensive knowledge of D2L. A minority of thirty-three of the survey respondents believed the faculty had a comprehensive knowledge of D2L.

Table 28

Regular Availability of D2L Training

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	12	9	2	0	0	0
Teaching Faculty	33	77	10	2	5	0
Support	2	4	0	0	1	0
Total All Positions	47	90	12	2	6	0
Percent of total	30%	57%	8%	1%	4%	0%

Table 28 suggests that the strong majority of respondents felt that D2L training was available to faculty on a regular basis.

Table 29

Faculty Ability to Avail of D2L Training

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	6	11	5	0	1	0
Teaching Faculty	32	68	17	8	2	0
Support	3	3	1	0	0	0
Total All Positions	41	82	23	8	3	0
Percent of total	26%	52%	15%	5%	2%	0%

Seventy-eight percent of those surveyed were able to take advantage of D2L training. Twenty percent of survey respondents had not taken advantage of D2L training.

Table 30

Access to D2L Training by Other Faculty

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	2	17	1	0	3	0
Teaching Faculty	12	71	6	0	38	0
Support	1	5	0	0	1	0
Total All Positions	15	93	7	0	42	0
Percent of total	10	59	4	0	27	0

Sixty-nine percent of those surveyed believed that other faculty participated in D2L training. A minority (27%) did not know if other faculty accessed such training opportubnities.

Table 31

Sufficiency of Faculty Training for E-learning

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	2	11	8	0	2	0
Teaching Faculty	1	51	37	12	26	0
Support	0	4	1	0	2	0
Total All Positions	3	66	46	12	30	0
Percent of total	2%	42%	29%	8%	19%	0%

Forty-four percent of those surveyed felt that faculty training for e-learning was sufficient. A majority disagreed, with thirty seven percent feeling that faculty training for e-learning was insufficient and nineteen percent not knowing or were undecided.

Table 32

Availability of D2L Training Staff on Demand

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	5	14	4	0	0	0
Teaching Faculty	22	58	15	7	25	0
Support	1	4	0	0	2	0
Total All Positions	28	76	19	7	27	0
Percent of total	18%	48%	12%	4%	17%	0

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): We have little training in the use of Respondus which makes setting up assignments and exams laborious.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): There is little training on effective teaching methods for e-learning.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): There is rudimentary training on how to use D2L.

- Teaching faculty (instructor): There is a need to …provide computer training, and THEN provide the D2L training.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Training for faculty to transition to e-learning/blended learning should be more subject-focused.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): It's also interesting that most in-house training sessions on Blended Learning consist of a PowerPoint presentation. Maybe have more technology integration in all PD offerings related to Blended/e-learning.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Generally the e-learning environment strikes me as somewhat Spartan and the training doesn't follow any kind of process so [it] is difficult to fix in your mind.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Support is very important. Support from D2L was better than the support from ETS. ETS staff is too busy to provide the required support.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Unclear policies, poor training, and invalid feedback tools hamper the development of e-learning environments at SAIT
- Teaching faculty (instructor): As an on-line instructor for SAIT I have felt very supported by the Business Chair and her admins.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): I am also grateful that our support offers weekly "tips" to make our experience as instructors positive and [we are] always learning to keep pace with the changing demands in education.

Interview Comments

- Participant #1 - There's a whole department here... There are courses on campus… in use of technologies mainly. …There is support for us to go and take professional development. A LOT of support in D2L. The training is pretty good… how do I put this without… it's just not relative enough to what we're actually doing. It's very surface. Here's what D2L does, go through the manual yourself, write the little test, and so on. We are supported and they do their best to support us… but not all of the courses are as effective as they should be. …Like I say SAIT has a whole suite of introductory and advanced courses on how to do…..it's all on electronic but I like printing it off...
- Participant #2 - They don't actually have the D2L training to be honest. They do have some courses available for us to go to – which we never have time to because we're very loaded – heavily loaded with teaching.

Sixty-six percent of survey respondents felt that D2L training staff were accessible when needed. Seventeen percent did not know or were undecided. Survey comments revealed that D2L training was readily available yet the content of the training sessions and the process by which the content was delivered was not aligned to teaching faculty needs. For instance, the tool used to deliver training content is PowerPoint rather than D2L. The content of educational sessions was broad based, not subject area specific. A few interview participants indicated that they were grateful for receiving weekly technology tips from support staff. Others indicated that they received more support from the D2L team than the Educational Technology Services (ETS).

Theme 9 Support – 9b: Budget/Funding.

Table 33

Funding is Dedicated to Support E-learning Curriculum Development

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	7	6	8	1	1	0
Teaching Faculty	9	38	11	10	59	0
Support	0	5	1	0	1	0
Total All Positions	16	49	20	11	61	0
Percent of total	10	31	13	7	39	0

Interview Comments

- Participant #1 - The institute's not abandoning instruction in terms of technologies because e-learning is so extraordinary expensive and time consuming to develop, we just haven't got the resources to do that.
- Participant #8 – CITD (Centre for Instructional Technology and Development) has more or less …six million dollars a year [dedicated to e-learning curriculum development] …which is a lot compared to every institution that I have been [at] or interact with. It is really a huge allocation of money.

Survey results indicate that 39% of faculty did not know if funding dedicated to support e-learning curriculum development was available. Forty one percent of those surveyed were aware that funding was available to support e-learning curriculum development. In an interview an administrator commented that the Centre for Instructional Technology and Development (CITD) had approximately six million dollars a year for curriculum development. Yet teaching faculty felt that SAIT did not have the resources to support e-learning.

Theme 9 Support – 9c: Academic Course Development.

Table 34

Availability of Support Moving Face-To-Face Courses to D2L

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	7	14	2	0	0	0
Teaching Faculty	21	72	16	5	13	0
Support	1	6	0	0	0	0
Total All Positions	29	92	18	5	13	0
Percent of total	18%	59%	11%	3%	8%	0%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): The development of curriculum and e-learning materials is a bit of a mess right now. I can see that, if it is all set up properly it will be advantageous.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): At present we are faced with revising old material with copyrighted material, keeping course information up to date, and then transferring it to D2L.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): While there is support for the CREATION of content for D2L, there is no support for instructors who modify, alter or add additional information.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): All the work required is done on my own time, without remuneration or support, and must be done term after term
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Getting assistance for it is all but impossible.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): There needs to be more course design.
- Teaching faculty (instructor): Being involved with creating on-line material for our school and delivering the material to students, I must say the experience I had to integrate

into D2L was challenging and rewarding. The courses are much more streamlined and all objectives are clear and accessible to the students.

- Teaching faculty (instructor): Improvements are needed to improve overall efficiency and effectiveness of the course design process. Dealing with the department that helps us build and incorporate multimedia items is where most of our problems arise.

Interview Comments

- Participant #1 - the different schools do have some ability to develop on their own, but basically the development comes from big centers on campus which develops for everybody. …There's a lot of support here in terms of supporting instructors to develop their courses. …the curriculum people are trained ...in curriculum development. But they're not trained in educational instruction and so there's a bit of disconnect there sometimes.
- Participant #2 - there's a whole department in SAIT for just… course development in general. We can develop a course and have all the exams and submit it to them and they'll do everything for us, but that happens at their pace – and they spend most of the time on the phone with you trying to figure out what you're trying to do. …there's so many hierarchies of management and different departments dealing with different things, for example I can change something in a course and then that has to go through three more people just to get out of my department and then it has to go through three more people in different departments.

Survey results demonstrated that seventy-seven percent of staff believed that support was available to move from face-to-face courses to D2L. A smaller portion of staff (14%) felt support

was not available to transition to D2L. Survey comments revealed a range of experiences and perceptions. Overall, staff members felt that the transition to e-learning had its rewards but was challenging. Barriers to the process included: effective and efficient collaboration with various teams in the creation and development of pedagogical sound student-centered e-learning courses, time required to develop e-learn courses, ongoing support once the course was developed and overcoming bureaucratic hurdles.

Theme 9 Support – 9d: Off-Loading.

Table 35

SAIT Support for Curriculum Development Through Payment or Off-Loading

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	10	12	0	0	0	1
Teaching	11	49	23	17	27	0
Faculty Support	0	2	0	0	5	0
Total All Positions	21	63	23	17	32	1
Percent of total	13%	40%	15%	11%	21%	1%

Interview comments

- Participant #5 - It's considered a little bit of [a] plum to have the time to do the course development when you are off-loaded. There are some people who really like to be offloaded and some who just aren't interested and they've never been forced to do it.

Survey responses indicate that fifty-three percent of staff felt that SAIT supported faculty in developing e-learning curriculum development. A smaller portion of the staff (26%) believed the contrary. One interviewee stated that having time built into their schedule to develop courses (off-loading) was a bonus.

Theme 9 Support – 9e: Technical.

Table 36

Availability of Technical Information for D2L Use

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	5	13	3	0	2	0
Teaching Faculty	21	72	14	5	15	0
Support	3	3	0	0	1	0
Total All Positions	29	88	17	5	18	0
Percent of total	18%	56%	11%	3%	11%	0%

Of those surveyed, 74% felt they had access to technical information to support their use of D2L. Only 14% of respondents stated that they did not have access to technical information required for D2L usage.

Table 37

Availability of D2L Technical Support Staff

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	5	16	2	0	0	0
Teaching Faculty	23	60	18	3	20	3
Support	2	4	0	0	1	0
Total All Positions	30	80	20	3	21	3
Percent of total	19%	51%	13%	2%	13%	2%

Survey Comments

- Teaching faculty (instructor): The largest obstacle has been actual internet access and the netbooks that students have been assigned to use in class.

Interview Comments

- Participant #4 - One of the problems we had with ETS was when we'd phone over there to get support let's say for Web CT, the first question was have you taken the course? Well, ...it doesn't matter whether I say yes or no, I still need help RIGHT NOW! …technical support was good at the beginning. When we got D2L, we could phone "D" in Toronto and we had support. This guy was really good. But then after we had to go back to our technician[s] I felt that I knew as much as they do so it's a little bit more difficult to get some help.
- Participant #8 – Technical support is very efficient and is very good. For example, if the website is down, or the learning management system is not accessible, then the instructors can call the help line and the help line will help them.
- Participant #9 - so there's …a very structured technical team that is supporting this.

Survey results indicated that a strong majority (70%) of staff felt that D2L support staff were accessible when needed. Only 15% of staff did not feel supported by the technical staff. A few interviewees stated that they were not happy with the support they received. Knowledgeable staff and timely support were perceived negatively. Administrators state that the structured technical team lent itself to efficient and timely support

Theme 9 Support – 9f: General Support.

Table 38

Staff Dedicated to E-learning Support

Position	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know/Undecided	No Answer
Administration	6	9	7	1	0	0
Teaching Faculty	22	66	16	7	16	0
Support	4	2	0	0	1	0
Total All Positions	32	77	23	8	17	0
Percent of total	20%	49%	15%	5%	11%	0%

Survey results show that sixty-nine percent of staff agreed that there were staff in SAIT dedicated to supporting e-learning initiative. Yet, twenty percent of staff disagreed with this statement, and indicated a lack of support for e-learning initiatives.

Chapter 5

Findings

Introduction

This researcher chose descriptive case study methodology to investigate the following questions. Does educational/administrative policy affect faculty practice and pedagogy in e-learning in higher education? If so how does educational/administrative policy affect faculty practice and pedagogy in e-learning in higher education? Further to this the following research sub-questions where also considered:

1. Which policies affect how faculty delivers their courses?
2. Do faculty have input on how policies are shaped within the institution?
3. How does policy affect faculty workload? Does policy provide for incentive or reward for increased workload?
4. Does policy provide for training for faculty?
5. Does policy deal with intellectual property and copyright issues?
6. Do policies address the quality of e-learning and/or blended learning?

To accomplish the case study, the study compared survey, interview, and existing policy data.

The findings at all levels of investigation provided insight into the state of e-learning/blended learning policy at SAIT. Beyond the patterns indicating existence of policy in relation to the research questions, instances occurred where absence of a pattern in the data may be seen as a pattern in itself. The findings are summarized and discussed below.

Finding 1: Findings Regarding Belief About E-Learning / Faculty Buy-In

There was no documented source of policies at SAIT that were set out to influence faculty belief about e-learning or faculty buy-in. However, document analysis revealed that the ten year plan clearly placed e-learning at the forefront of SAIT's strategic plan (SAIT, 2006). There was no evidence that there was a direct correlation between the prominence of e-learning in the strategic plan and faculty buy-in. However, patterns were identified in the resulting survey and interview evidence that buy-in did exist.

There is significant belief in e-learning to expand skills and that e-learning will improve the education program at SAIT. This represents a significant buy-in to e-learning. Nonetheless, less than half of respondents believed that other teaching faculty had a favorable view of e-learning. This would indicate that although the individual faculty member has a belief in e-learning there is not the corresponding recognition that other faculty shares the same belief.

This finding therefore suggested a lack of relationship between policy and faculty buy-in. However the prominence of e-learning in the SAIT strategic plan may be a significant factor resulting in higher buy-in by faculty and administration.

Finding 2: Findings Regarding Intellectual Property and Copyright Issues

There are policies covering copyright, AC.2.12 and intellectual property, AC.2.11, at SAIT (SAIT, 2012b) , as indicated through the document analysis. The majority of survey respondents (59%) indicated that these policies were discussed and a very strong majority (92%) indicated that they were aware of the policies. The interpretation of the intellectual property

rights policy by administration became very straight forward. If the material was included teaching faculty had to sign a form that indicted they had no intellectual property rights to it. If teaching faculty refused to sign the form the content would not be included in the course. With regard to faculty and institutional ownership issues, the issue appeared largely settled on the concept that materials created while in the employ of SAIT were the property of the SAIT. Teaching faculty accepted this condition willingly. However, use of copyrighted material in the e-learning environment continues to encounter challenges that frustrate faculty members. The interpretation of the copyright policy by administration was very rigid. Copyright rules are very straightforward. Unless there are the proper sign offs material is not permitted in the course. Copyright could have been the biggest inhibitor for staff creating their courses online. For administration and teaching faculty there was recognition that interpretation of these policies was different at SAIT than at many other post-secondary institutions. SAIT was singled out as one of the few institutions where the instructors did not own their materials and where the interpretation of the copyright laws were so stringent.

This finding therefore suggested a high level of policy diffusion in copyright and intellectual property issues in e-learning and that in the case of copyright, the interpretation of this policy had an adverse effect on teaching in an e-learning/blended learning environment. Furthermore, the rigid interpretation of the copyright law may be likely to operate as a barrier to faculty willingness to adapt to e-learning teaching (Woolcott, 2003).

Finding 3: Findings Regarding Course Review: Standards and Quality Indicators

SAIT has no policies regarding course review. As well, there are no policies regarding the measurement of course quality nor or are there policies regarding course standards. Yet the SAIT annual report (SAIT, 2011) has set e-learning as one of the key performance drivers to set the standard for academic excellence. As well, SAIT has indicated that performance measures and targets for e-learning should be judged by the increased number of learners experiencing e-learning and that e-learning methodologies should be addressed that enhance learner success and address industry needs (SAIT, 2011)

Survey respondents were evenly split when asked if SAIT had set standards (performance measures, core competencies, targets) for e-learning, with just over half (52%) answering either disagree or strongly disagree. However, there was a strong belief that indicators used to measure course quality would advance e-learning (82%). Furthermore, any standards that existed were at the point of course creation. Instructional designers were accountable to ensure that those course standards were being met. However, once the courses were created there was no assessment or measurement regarding course quality.

This finding therefore suggested a low level of policy diffusion for the review of courses that would measure course quality and standards in e-learning/blended learning. This finding also indicated that interview participants were aware of the lack of policy direction regarding course review and standards. These unresolved concerns about standards and indicators to measure course quality represent a potential obstacle to faculty becoming involved in e-learning/blended learning. They also represent an important area for policy clarification and development.

Finding 4: Faculty Evaluation

SAIT's policy regarding faculty is to employ an objective performance planning and review system which assists employees in improving their job performance by establishing performance objectives review, HR.1.3 - Performance Planning and Review (SAIT, 2012a). Guided by policy HR.1.3.1 supervisors are to make observation of the performance within laboratory and classroom settings, HR.1.3.1. – Performance Planning Cycle (SAIT, 2012a). However, SAIT has no policy regarding faculty evaluation for those who teach using e-learning/blended learning. Fifty-six percent of survey respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed that the indicators used to measure the success of faculty were appropriate for e-learning. There were also a large number of survey respondents (28%) who were either undecided on this issue or did not know. Also, there was a strong majority (61%) who either disagreed or strongly disagreed that student satisfaction surveys were the optimal method to gauge faculty performance in an e-learning environment. Without exception teaching faculty respondents from the survey and the interviews felt that in the current method of faculty evaluations "…invalid feedback tools hampered the development of e-learning environments at SAIT".

This finding, suggested a low level of policy diffusion for the review of courses that would measure course quality and standards in e-learning/blended learning. This finding also indicated that interview participants were aware of the lack of policy direction regarding course review and standards.

Finding 5: Culture

Responses from the survey and interview participants lay well outside of the expected policy areas and could best be described within the theme of culture. Organizational culture is the way collectively, things are done. Organizational norms influence how members perceive and interact with one another, approach decisions, and solve problems (Bettenhausen & Murnighan, 1991). In reference to e-learning there appeared to be a lot of expectation on the part of the organization, with little explanation or elaboration for teaching faculty

Norms are distinct from policies, which are formal, codified directives (Chatman & Cha, 2003). In the document analysis, no policies were found that would counter or influence organizational culture. Participants indicated that there was a reluctance to change on the part of older faculty, and hence the move to e-learning was occurring at a slow pace. Furthermore the existence of established institutional culture required a shift for faculty and everyone at SAIT to move into e-learning. As a result organizational culture was strongly represented in participant comments. Therefore this finding suggested that there is a low level of policy diffusion directed at influencing culture and promoting e-learning.

Finding 6: Hours of Work / Time

Teaching faculty hours of work are governed by the SAIT Academic Faculty Association (SAFA) Collective Agreement 2007-2010 (SAFA, 2007). This agreement indicates that if an instructor has different course preparation or has a special assignment which may include new course development, the Dean with the mutual agreement of the instructor shall decide on the variation of class contact hours. Although there is no policy per se, SAIT adheres closely to

release time for new e-learning courses. However neither policy nor the SAFA Collective Agreement take into account what instructors feel is the extra time it takes to teach in an e-learning/blended learning environment. Teaching faculty responded in the survey that the heavy teaching load prevented them from accessing training or help, and there was no appreciation of the time required for online course development and teaching. SAIT seeks to align its total compensation to all employees with regard to comparable positions in post-secondary education and private sectors and is subject to the terms and conditions of any applicable collective agreements and terms of employment, HR 1.2 – compensation policy (SAIT, 2012a). Yet, neither SAIT policies nor the SAFA Collective Agreement has any specific provision for teaching using e-learning.

The findings in this study suggested that there was consideration for the time to prepare courses for e-learning/blended learning but limited consideration at all levels for faculty workload management, compensation, and related factors to teaching in an e-learning/blended learning environment.

Finding 7: Institution Vision / Mission

SAIT's vision, "to be recognized as Canada's premier polytechnic, one of the world's finest, setting the standard in education, training and innovation" is clearly outlined in the 2006-2016 Strategic Plan (p. 11, SAIT, 2006). While e-Learning is part of SAIT's plan, it is seen as enhancing learning and does not replace the traditional face-to-face experience. SAIT plans to shift the focus to improved operational efficiencies and increased

productivity, thus increasing SAIT capabilities to world-class best practice standards in e-Learning.

Although SAIT has a clearly articulated vision there are no policy statements that attempt to take that vision and transform it into practice. Teaching faculty survey respondents noted that there did not seem to be a centralized effort for the move to e-learning and that a perceived lack of an institution-wide model. However, interview participants indicated that e-learning was part of SAIT's vision for the future.

The finding in this study suggested that policy statements are lacking which take the broad organizational vision and turn it into practice resulting in a lack of clarity about SAIT's commitment to e-learning.

Finding 8: E-learning Policy

Fifty-nine percent of survey respondents felt that policy information at SAIT was readily available. Yet, e-learning specific policy diffusion across all institutional factors regarding teaching faculty was non-existent. SAIT relied heavily on policy from traditional face-to-face instruction for any situations involving e-learning. However, a very strong majority of survey respondents (85%) either agreed or strongly agreed that policies would affect e-learning practice. Teaching faculty noted that the importance of e-learning policy is significant in ensuring that SAIT's vision is aligned with reality. As well, without good communication of those policies there is ample opportunity to not meet those targets. It was also noted that due to the lack of policies for blended or e-learning, their promotion,

and the evaluation of those policies, reflected a lack of management commitment to e-learning.

Although contact hours are outlined in the SAFA (SAFA, 2007) collective agreement, there was some confusion from survey respondents as to whether this applied to e-learning. Forty percent disagreed while forty-four percent were uncertain. Policy direction is unclear and as one teaching faculty survey respondent indicated it was rarely discussed. Further confusion existed around the existence of policies to ensure a high quality of e-learning. There was almost an even split between those who agreed, 36%, those who disagreed, 34% and those who were uncertain or did not know, 29%. There was also confusion regarding how employees were made aware of policy information. Thirty-eight percent of survey respondents felt that new employees were directed to policy information. Yet, 28% disagreed and 34% did not know or were undecided.

This finding therefore suggested no policy diffusion for e-learning specific policies. This finding also indicated that participants were unclear about the existence of policy direction. This finding demonstrated a clear pattern with regard to the understanding of participants of e-learning policy. Overall, while participants were supportive of adopting online learning in their programs, they felt there had not been adequate dialogue among colleagues and within their programs about implementing e-learning. The pattern, one of general uncertainty that existed regarding e-learning policies, was counter by a very strong belief (97%) that faculty should have input on the creation of policies that affect e-learning.

Finding 9: Support

This researcher identified four types of support that SAIT teaching faculty needed in implementing e-learning: funding, technical support, instructional design support and supports

related to pedagogy and the use of D2L to improve student learning. There is no policy documents related to faculty support for e-learning.

Participants were split on whether funding was available to support e-learning in their school or program. Yet, it was noted that the Centre for Instructional Technology and Development (CITD) has access to approximately six million dollars annually for e-learning curriculum development. As well, SAIT supports teaching faculty through offloading work during e-learning curriculum development. Fifty-three percent of survey respondents were aware of this support.

The data demonstrated that 87% of survey participants felt that D2L training was available to faculty on a regular basis and 78% had taken advantage of D2L training indicating a high level of awareness of e-learning training provided at SAIT. There was also an awareness of other faculty involvement (69%) in D2L training courses. Furthermore, 65% had taken advantage of organized discussions on topics related to improving student success through e-learning. However, just over half of survey participants felt that faculty in their school did not have a comprehensive knowledge of D2L. This information combined with 56% who disagreed or did not know/uncertain whether D2L training was sufficient, led this researcher to believe that more or different training may be required. The training seemed to centre on how to use D2L rather than teaching pedagogy. A representative comment from participants came from teaching faculty indicating that there was little emphasis on teaching methods for e-learning in the D2L training.

SAIT provides technical support to teaching faculty with 74% of respondents indicating they had access to technical support and 70% felt that the technical support was available when

teaching faculty needed it. As well, 69% of survey respondents agreed that staff dedicated to the support of e-learning initiatives were available.

The finding in this study suggested that policy statements are lacking with regard to support for e-learning initiatives. However, SAIT's commitment to e-learning is clear through the level of support provided. SAIT provides relief from teaching duties while e-learning courses are being developed, the technical support to ensure courses can be delivered and the supports to ensure e-learning initiatives are successful. The component that was lacking is the pedagogical understanding of how e-learning is different from face-to-face learning and how these differences will impact teaching and learning.

Conclusions

E-learning results in pedagogical challenges, role shifts and the need for new technical skills and attitudes. This has important implications for faculty and for the organization. Participants saw themselves as requiring a complex set of skills that include competency in the use of technology, a willingness to examine teaching methods and approaches, a willingness to take the initiative, flexibility, and a sense of safety and security to experiment with new approaches to teaching and learning. Participants also strongly endorsed e-learning/blended learning and the importance of sound policy in meeting SAIT's vision targets. An ongoing task for campus leaders is to provide effective leadership and communication of institutional plans and decisions (APLU, 2009). Organizational leaders should use every tool at their disposal to move such a game-changing and costly initiative forward. Policy is just such a tool.

Policies seek to ameliorate problems within an organization or to prevent problems from occurring (Majchrzak, 1984). As well, Dye (1995) states that policies are a means of translating

the organization's stated vision into front-line actions, thus answering specific questions from teaching faculty on the expectations moving forward on the organization's mission. Policies also help to create an internal framework that administrators will rely upon to ensure the institution's objectives are being met (von Solmsa & von Solmsa, 2004). Furthermore, policies allow teaching faculty to understand their roles and responsibilities within predefined limits. Policy falls within a spectrum of tools that an organization might use. Arising out of policies are processes that support but are not articulated in the same clear manner as policies (White, Davis, & Eales, 2007). The how-to instructions are strategies and initiatives by which policies are implemented.

Campus Alberta Planning Resource 2012 (2012) indicates that each publicly funded post-secondary institution is asked to respond to the priority directions by developing a comprehensive institutional plan. Despite the progress SAIT teaching faculty have made with e-learning, current SAIT policy efforts have not kept pace with the adoption of e-learning. The findings in this study suggested overall low diffusion of policy for e-learning/blended learning within SAIT. Wherein, policies have not been adapted to meet SAIT's strategic plan (SAIT, 2006) and do not address the quality of e-learning or blended learning courses. Furthermore, a review of the findings indicates a moderate degree of overall policy diffusion for copyright/intellectual property, hours of work and faculty rewards/incentives (off-loading). Given that there was such limited diffusion of e-learning policy, these were also the policies that had the greatest effect on how faculty deliver their courses. The interpretation of the copyright/intellectual property policy severely limited how faculty could deliver their courses. As well, there was a lack of attention to the extra time faculty spent in an e-learning/blended

learning course compared to a face-to-face course. Furthermore, while faculty appreciated the rewards/incentives of off-loading during course development there was a lack of commitment from SAIT to course maintenance.

There was a heavy reliance on pre-existing policy to meet policy objectives of e-learning. Driven by extremely limited findings of e-learning policy overall policy diffusion for the teaching faculty factors was low. The lack of policy is seen by this researcher as a failure to meaningfully support large scale change, the early adapters, pedagogical change, or to drive the innovation necessary to generate real increases in e-learning use.

Participants identified a number of faculty challenges involved in implementing e-learning. These included:

- workload concerns about time involved in developing and offering e-learning
- instructional concerns regarding the lack of support for the pedagogical shift and the resulting need for faculty development
- the lack of faculty input on policy decisions and the need for faculty dialogue about e-learning/blended learning issues

In particular, many participants felt there had been insufficient dialogue about a wide range of concerns that included workload policies, teaching expectations, faculty development, as well as program and strategic planning. Furthermore, faculty identified the interpretation of the copyright policy as affecting how faculty deliver their courses. The faculty challenges outlined above have important administrative and policy implications for programs implementing, or considering implementing e-learning.

The researcher recognizes the existence of SAIT policy related to aspects of teaching and learning generally, but the scope of the policy and the knowledge of its existence and application to e-learning is, for the most part, lacking to date.

Recommendations

Based on the data and its interpretation, the researcher suggests the following recommendations to improve policy development, specificity, and adherence at SAIT.

1. The relationship between e-learning policy, the institutional vision and core strategies should be examined further to determine the impact of differing policies (or lack thereof) as e-learning offerings continue to increase.

2. A more complete study of the strategic factors of e-learning policy related to educational quality should be undertaken. Further investigation would provide for comprehensive strategic guidance during implementation of e-learning initiatives.

3. The findings in this study suggested limited consideration for faculty workload management and compensation. Further investigation may wish to explore SAIT teaching faculty attitudes regarding workload policies in more detail to better understand the implications for adoption and success of e-learning at SAIT. Additionally, a study of faculty attitudes toward e-learning workloads may be helpful to administrators as they negotiate collective bargaining agreements. For example, future studies might examine which rewards and workload accommodations are most valued by faculty members, and the results of such a study could set the stage for productive negotiations between the parties.

4. This study did not investigate the relationship between policy and formal guidance documents such as strategic plans, budgets, and management and resource decisions for e-

learning. As a result, the absence of policy was not an indicator of lack of success for an e-learning initiative. For example SAIT provided what faculty felt to be good support for learning D2L and the technical support for day-by-day operations and yet there was no policy documentation. Researchers may wish to investigate the relationship between policies and guidelines at post-secondary institutions.

References

Abrami, P. C., Bernard, M. C., Wade, A., Schmid, R. F., Borokhovski, E., Tamim, R., …Peretiatkowicz, A. (2006). *A review of e-learning in Canada: A rough sketch of the evidence, gaps and promising directions*. Centre for the Study of Learning and Performance. Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec Retrieved from http://www.ccl-cca.ca/pdfs/StateOfField/SFRElearningConcordiaApr06.pdf

Advisory Committee for Online Learning. (Feb., 2001). *The E-Learning E-Volution in colleges and universities: A pan-Canadian challenge*. Ottawa: Industry Canada. Retrieved from http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/19/evolution.en.pdf

Alexander, R. J. (2001). Border crossings: Towards a comparative pedagogy. *Comparative Education, 37*(4), 507-523. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3099559

Alfred, R. L. (1998). *Policy paper: Shared governance in community colleges*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/24/c3.pdf

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2010). *Class differences: Online education in the United States, 2010* Babson Park MA: Babson Survey Research Group/Sloan-C. Retrieved from http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/class_differences

Allen, L. (1991). *Implementing shared governance: Models for empowering teachers*. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Allen, L., & Glickman, C. D. (1992). The elusive faces of shared governance. *NASSP Bulletin, 76*(542), 80-87. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Ally, M. (2008). Foundations of Educational Theory for Online Learning. In T. Anderson & F. Elloumi (Eds.), *Theory and practice of online learning* (pp. 15-44): Athabasca University & Creative Commons.

Ambient Insight. (2010). *WorldWide elearning market 2009-2014*. Retrieved from http://www.ambientinsight.com/Resources/Documents/AmbientInsight_2009_2014_WWeLearningMarket_ExecutiveOverview.pdf

Ambient Insight. (2011). *The US market for self-paced e-learning products and services: 2010-2015*. Retrieved April 5, 2011 from http://www.ambientinsight.com/Resources/Documents/Ambient_Insight_2010_2015_US_eLearningMarket_Executive_Overview.pdf

Altowjry, A. (2005). *Reforming higher education in Saudi Arabia: The use of telecommunications technology.* Retrieved from R.I.T. Digital Media Library. Retrieved from https://ritdml.rit.edu/handle/1850/926

Amudhavalli, A. (2007). *Knowledge a commodity in the new millennium*. Dostopno Prek. Retrieved from http://library.igcar.gov.in/readit2007/conpro/invite/I6.pdf

Anderson, B., Brown, M., Murray, F., Simpson, M., & Mentis, M. (2006). *Global picture, local lessons: E-learning policy and accessibility.* Ministry of Education, Wellington, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://cms.steo.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/C1EBB9EB-9122-4F82-94BB-A713CDEE9D02/0/AndersonFinalReport.pdf

Anderson, J. (2005). *A common framework for e-learning quality*. Oinsight, Observetory for New Technologies and Education. Retrieved from http://www.itslearning.net/Websites/itstest/Images/Documents/A_Common_Framework_for_E-Learning_Quality.pdf

Anderson, T. (2008). Towards a theory of online learning. Anderson, T. (Ed.). (2008). *Theory and practice of online learning*, (2nd Ed.). Athabaska University Press. Retrieved form http://cde.athabascau.ca/online_book/second_edition.html.

Anderson, T. (2009, May 25). *Canada's lost e-learning decade* [Web log message]. Retrieved March 26, 2011 from http://terrya.edublogs.org/2009/05/25/canadas-lost-e-learning-decade/

ANTA (2000). *Australian flexible learning framework for the national vocational education and training (VET) system 2000-2004*. Retrieved from http://www.flexiblelearning.net.au/aboutus/aflframework2000.pdf

APLU (Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities). (2009). *Online learning as a strategic asset. Volume 1: A resource for campus leaders*. Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=1877

Apollo Group Inc (2010). *Creating opportunities: Annual report 2009*. Phoenix: Apollo Group. Retrieved from http://www.apollogrp.edu/Annual-Reports/2009%20Apollo%20annual%20report.pdf

Arbaugh, J. B. (2010). Do Undergraduates and MBAs Differ Online?: Initial Conclusions From the Literature. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 17*, 129-142, doi:10.1177/1548051810364989

Attwell, G. (Ed.). (2006). Evaluating e-learning: A guide to the evaluation of e-learning. *Evaluate Europe Handbook Series Volume 2*. Retrieved from http://www.pontydysgu.org/wp-content/uploads/2007/11/eva_europe_vol2_prefinal.pdf

Baer, W. S. (1998). Will the internet transform higher education? *The emerging internet*, 81–108. Retrieved http://www.rand.org/pubs/reprints/RP685.html

Barr, H., Gower, B. & Clayton, J. (2010). Faculty response to the implementation of an open source learning management system in three tertiary institutions in New Zealand. *Computers in the Schools, 24*(3) 125-137. doi: 10.1300/J025v24n03_09

Bauerova, D., & Sein-Echaluce, M. L. (2008). Are we ready for the "paradigm 2.0" in education. In J. Luca & E. Weippl (Eds.), *Proceedings of World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications 2008*. 4025-4031. Chesapeake, VA: AACE. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org.ezproxy.royalroads.ca/p/28945

Bates, T. (2000). *Managing technological change: Strategies for college and university leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bates, T. (2007a). Strategic planning for e-learning in a polytechnic. In Bullen, M. & Janes, D. (Eds.) *Making the Transition to E-Learning: Strategies and Issues*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.

Bates, T. (2007b). *Review of European research in e-learning. The world of e-learning research: an overview*. Keynote address for Aprenred conference, Universidad de Guadalajara. Retrieved from http://www.tonybates.ca/resources/review-of-european-research-in-e-learning

Bates, T. (2010). *Strategic directions for e-learning in Canada*. Retrieved from http://www.contactnorth.ca/en/data/files/download/pdf/Strategic%20Directions%20for%20e-Learning%20in%20Canada.pdf

Bates, T. (2011). *2011 Outlook for online learning and distance education*. Contact North. elearnnetwork.ca. Retrieved from http://www.contactnorth.ca/en/data/files/download/Jan2011/2011%20Outlook.pdf

BECTA (British Educational Communications and Technology Agency). (2010). *Harnessing technology review 2009: The role of technology in education and skills*. Coventry, BECTA. Retrieved from http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20101102103713/http://publications.becta.org.uk/display.cfm?resID=41329

Berge, Z. L. (1998). Barriers to online teaching in post-secondary institutions: Can policy changes fix it? *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 1*(2). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/Berge12.html

Berge, Z. & Mrozowski, S. (2001). Review of research in distance education, 1990 to 1999. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 15*(3). 5-19. doi: 10.1080/08923640109527090

Bergmann, H. F. (2001). The "silent university": The society to encourage studies at home, 1873-1897 (Anna Eliot Ticknor's network of women teaching women by mail). *New England Quarterly-A Historical Review Of New England Life And Letters, 74(*3) ISSN: 0028-4866 447 – 477 Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3185427

Bettenhausen, K. L., & Murnighan, J. K. (1991). The development of an intragroup norm and the effects of interpersonal and structural challenges. *Administrative Science*

Quarterly, 36(1), 20. Retrieved from https://ezproxy.royalroads.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/203957988?accountid=8056

Birch, D. & Burnett, B. (2009). Advancing e-learning policy and practice: Influences on academics' adoption, integration and development of multimodal e-learning courses. In *Institutional transformation through best practices in virtual campus development: Advancing e-learning policies*. M. Stansfield, & T. Connolly (Eds.) Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.

Bloom, D., Channing, D., & Chan, K. (2005). *Higher education and economic development in Africa*. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079956815/HigherEd_Econ_Growth_Africa.pdf

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (2006). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bonk, C., & Graham, C. (2005). *Handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs.* San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer Publishing.

Brinkley, I. (2006). *Defining the knowledge economy. Knowledge economy programme report.* The Work Foundation. London. Retrieved from http://www.theworkfoundation.com/assets/docs/publications/65_defining%20knowledge%20economy.pdf

Briton, D., & Plumb, D. (1993). The commodification of adult education. In *Proceedings of the 34th. Annual Conference of the Adult Education Research Conference*. 31-36. University

Park, Pennsylvania: Penn State University. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2149/1587

Brown, B., Anderson, B., & Murray, F. (2007). *E-learning policy issues: Global trends, themes and tensions*. Proceedings ASCILITE Singapore 2007 Retrieved from http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/brown.pdf

Browne, T., Hewitt, R., Jenkins, M., Voce, J., Walker, R., & Yip, H. (2010). *Survey of technology enhanced learning for higher education in the UK*. Oxford: Universities and Colleges Information Systems Association. Retrieved from http://www.ucisa.ac.uk/groups/ssg/~/media/groups/ssg/surveys/TEL%20survey%202010_FINAL.ashx

Campbell, S., Benita, S., Coates, E., Davies, P., & Penn, G. (2007). *Government social research unit*, HM Treasury, London, Retrieved from http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/Assets/Analysis%20for%20Policy%20report_tcm6-4148.pdf

Canadian Intellectual Property Office (2011). Retrieved from http://www.cipo.ic.gc.ca/

Carpenter, G. (2010). *E-Learning in the Canadian post-secondary education system*. Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance. Retrieved from http://www.ousa.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/E-Learning.pdf

Carroll-Barefield, A., Smith, S. P., Prince, L. H., & Campbell, C. A. (2005). Transitioning from brick and mortar to online: A faculty perspective. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, VIII*(I). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring81/carroll81.htm

Casey, D. M. (2008). A journey to legitimacy: The historical development of distance education through technology. *TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning, 52*(2), 45-51. doi: 10.1007/s11528-008-0135-z

CCL - Canadian Council on Learning. (2009). *State of e-Learning in Canada.* Ottawa, Canadian Council on Learning. Retrieved from http://www.ccl-cca.ca/pdfs/E-learning/E-Learning_Report_FINAL-E.PDF

CEC – Commission of the European Communities. (2003). *Commission staff working paper: e-learning: Designing tomorrow's education. A mid-t*erm *repo*rt as requested by the Council *resolution of 13 July 2001*. SEC2003 905 Brussels. 30 July 2003. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/archive/e-learning/doc/mid_term_report_en.pdf

CEC – Commission of the European Communities. (2008). *Draft 2008 joint progress report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the 'Education & Training 2010' work programme 'Delivering lifelong learning for knowledge, creativity and innovation' - Adoption.* 5723/08 EDUC 29, SOC46 Retrieved from http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/08/st05/st05723.en08.pdf

Charpentier, M., Lafrance, C., & Paquette, G. (2006). *International e-learning strategies: Key findings relevant to the Canadian context*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Learning (COGIGRAPH/TÉLUQ). Retrieved from www.ccl-cca.ca

Chatman, J. A., & Cha, S. (2003). Leading by leveraging culture. *California Management Review, 45*(4), 20-34.

Commission of the European Communities. (2001). *The e-learning action plan designing tomorrow's education. Communication from the commission to the council and the*

European parliament. Brussels, COM (2001)172 final. Retrieved from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2001:0172:FIN:EN:PDF

Conole, G. (2002). The evolving landscape of learning technology research. *ALT-J Research in Learning Technology, (10)*3, 4–18. doi: 10.1080/0968776020100302

Conole, G. (2004). E- Learning: The hype and the reality. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education: Special Issue on Designing for the Disciplines, (12).* Retrieved from http://www-jime.open.ac.uk/2004/12/conole-2004-12.pdf

Conole, G. (2007). Relationship between policy and practice – the gap between rhetoric and reality. In R. Andrews and C. Haythornthwaite (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of e-Learning Research, E-learning Research Handbook,* (pp. 286-310), London: Sage

Conole, G, Smith, J., & White, S. (2007). A critique of the impact of policy and funding. In Conole, G. & Oliver, M. (Eds.), *Contemporary Perspectives in E-Learning Research: Themes, Methods and Impact on Practice.* (pp. 38-54). New York: Routledge

Conole, G. (2008). New schemas for mapping pedagogies and technologies. *Ariadne, (56).* Retrieved from http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue56/conole/.

Constitution Acts, 1867 to 1982. Department of Justice Canada. Retrieved from http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/const/Const_index.html

Contact North (2010). What Ontario can learn from the Australian online learning system. Retrieved from http://www.contactnorth.ca/en/data/files/download/downloads/What%20Ontario%20can%20learn%20from%20the%20Australian%20online%20learning%20system.pdf

Council for Trade in Services. (2010). *Report of the meeting held on 28 April 2010 - Note by the Secretariat World Trade Organization.* Retrieved from http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_home.asp?language=1&_=1#

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cross, J. 2004. An informal history of eLearning. *On the Horizon, 12*(3), 103-110. doi: 10.1108/10748120410555340

Cullen, J., Hadjivassiliou, K., Junge, K., & Fischer T. (2007). *Status of e-inclusion measurement, analysis and approaches for improvement*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/i2010/docs/studies/e_inclusion_handbook_0307.pdf

Davis, A., Little, P., & Stewart, B. (2008). Developing an infrastructure for online learning. In Anderson, T. (Ed.). *Theory and practice of online learning*, (2nd Ed.). Athabasca University Press. Retrieved from http://cde.athabascau.ca/online_book/second_edition.html.

De Boer, W., & Collis, B. (2005). Becoming more systematic about flexible learning: beyond time and distance. *ALT-J, 13* (1), 33-48. Retrieved from http://repository.alt.ac.uk/588/

de Freitas, S., & Oliver, M. (2005). Does e-learning policy drive change in higher education: A case study relating models of organizational change to e-learning implementation. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management, 27*(1), 81-95. doi:10.1080/1360080500046255.

de Freitas, S., & Mayes, T. (2004). Review of e-learning theories, frameworks and models. *JISC e-Learning Models Desk Study*. Retrieved from http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/Stage%202%20Learning%20Models%20%28Version%201%29.pdf

Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts. (2004). *Australia's strategic framework for the information economy 2004–2006: 'Opportunities and Challenges for the Information Age'*. Australian Government. Retrieved from http://www.dbcde.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/20457/New_SFIE_July_2004_final.pdf

Department of Employment, Education and Training. (1993). *National report on Australia's higher education sector*. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Department of Employment, Education and Training. (2001). *National report on higher education in Australia 2001*. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service. Retrieved from http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/DAE83EE1-53A8-4AE5-9D2A-AC11D4C78BCA/900/chapter1.pdf

Desire2Learn (D2L). Learning management system. Retrieved from http://www.desire2learn.com

DfES – Department for Education Services. (2005). *Harnessing technology: Transforming learning and children's services*. Nottingham, UK. DfES Publications. Retrieved from https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/1296-2005PDF-EN-01.pdf

DfTE - Department for Training and Education. (2004). *E-learning in Wales: Current developments and stakeholder views on future priorities.* Retrieved from http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dcells/publications/091102elearningwales.pdf

Dobni, C. B. (2008). Measuring innovation culture in organizations: The development of a generalized innovation culture construct using exploratory factor analysis. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 11*(4) 539 – 559. doi: 10.1108/14601060810911156

Downes, S. (2011). Five key questions. Retrieved March 20, 2011 from http://www.downes.ca/files/2011%2003%2016%20-%20Five%20Key%20Questions.pdf

Dringus, L. P., & Cohen, M. S. (2005). An adaptable usability heuristic checklist for online courses. 35th Annual FIE '05. Presented at the Frontiers in Education. Retrieved July 17, 2011 from http://fie-conference.org/fie2005/papers/1141.pdf

Dye, T., R. (1995). *Understanding public policy, (8th ed*.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall.

Dziuban C. D., Hartman J. L., & Moskal P. D. (2004). Blended Learning. *EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research Bulletin, (7),* 1-12. Retrieved from http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ERB0407.pdf

Edgar, L., Marshall, C., & Bassett, M. (2006). *Partnerships: Putting good governance principles in Practice*. Ottawa: Institute on Governance. Retrieved from http://iog.ca/en/publications

Education Technology Strategy Coordinator. (2005). EmPowering schools strategy. Retrieved from http://www.empoweringschools.com/download.asp

Ehlers, U., Goertz, L., Hildebrandt, B., & Pawlowski, J. M. (2005). *Quality in e-learning: Use and dissemination of quality approaches in European e-learning*. A study by the European Quality Observatory. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the

European Communities. Retrieved from http://www2.trainingvillage.gr/etv/publication/download/panorama/5162_en.pdf

Ekos Research Associates. (2005). *Review of the technology enhanced learning (TEL) action plan. Final report*. Retrieved from http://www.aee.gov.sk.ca/tel/pdf/final_report_review_tel_action_plan_mar_05.pdf

EURYDICE. (2009). *Higher education in Europe 2009: Developments in the Bologna process*. Retrieved from http://makingpolicy.org/pg/file/fnascimbeni/read/256/higher-education-in-europe-2009-developments-in-the-bologna-process

Farnes, N. C. (2000). Distance education for the information society: Policies, pedagogy and professional development. *UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies In Education.* Retrieved from http://www.iite.ru/pics/publications/en/files/3214594.doc

Feldon, J. (2008). Global trends in university governance. *Education Working Paper Series, 9* Washington D.C. The World Bank. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079956815/Global_Trends_University_Governance_webversion.pdf

Fish, S. (2007). Shared governance: Democracy is not an educational idea. *Change, 39*(2), 8-13. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Fisher, D., Rubenson, K., Jones, G., & Shanahan, T. (2008). The political economy of post-secondary education: A comparison of British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec. *Higher Education, 57*(5), 549-566, doi: 10.1007/s10734-008-9160-2

Foley, A. R. (2003). Distance, disability and the commodification of education: Web accessibility and the construction of knowledge. *Current Issues in Comparative Education, 6*(1). Retrieved from http://www.tc.columbia.edu/cice/Issues/06.01/61foley.pdf

Fournier, H. (2006). *A Review of the State of the Field of Adult Learning: E-Learning*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Learning. Retrieved from http://www.unb.ca/ALKCSymposium/documents/e-learningreport1_000.pdf

Feenberg, A. (2008). The online education controversy. *Conference on Technology for Learning, Teaching and the Institution.* JISC-CETIS, Birmingham, UK. Retrieved from http://www.sfu.ca/~andrewf/books/OnlineEdControversy_Birmingham.pdf

Frazee, B. (2003). Technology to enhance the learning experience. *Chief learning officer: Solutions for enterprise productivity* from http://clomedia.com/articles/view/technology_to_enhance_the_learning_experience

Garrett, R. (2009). Online higher education market ppdate, Boston MA: Eduventures Inc. DETC 84th Annual Conference. Retrieved from http://www.detc.org/84thannualconference/downloads/0413_00830_GARRETT.pdf

Garrison, R. D., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *Internet Higher Education, 7*(2):95-105. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6W4X-4CGMX78-3/2/f0f52711f3be52c39b4fea932a5dd1e5

Garrison R. D. and Vaughan N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principals and guidelines*. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.

Gellman-Danley, B., & Fetzner, M. (1998). Asking the really tough questions: Policy issues for distance learning. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 1*(1). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring11/danley11.pdf

Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for? *American Political Science Review, 98*(2), 341-354. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.royalroads.ca/stable/4145316

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (2009). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Government of Alberta post-secondary learning act. Queens Printer, Chapter P-19.5. Retrieved from http://www.canlii.org/en/ab/laws/stat/sa-2003-c-p-19.5/76373/

Green, K. C. (1999). *Survey of information technology planning.* Campus Computing. Retrieved from http://cclp.mior.ca/Reference%20Shelf/PDF_OISE/1999-CCP.pdf

Green, K. C. (2010). *The 2010 national survey of information technology in higher education*. Campus Computing Project. Retrieved from http://www.campuscomputing.net/

Guffey, J. & Rampp, L. (1997). *Shared governance: Balancing the euphoria*. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Grui-Rosenblit, S. & Gros, G. (2011). E-Learning: Confusing terminology, research gaps and inherent challenges. *The Journal of Distance Education, 25*(1). Retrieved from http://www.jofde.ca/index.php/jde/article/view/729/1206

Gunn, C. (2010). Sustainability factors for e-learning initiatives *ALT-J, Research in Learning Technology, 18*(2), pp. 89–103 doi: 10.1080/09687769.2010.492848

Haché, D. (1998). Strategic planning of distance education in the age of teleinformatics. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*. Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/Hache12.html

Halling, S. (2002). Making phenomenology accessible to a wider audience. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *33*(1), 19-38. doi: 10.1163/156916202320900400

Hammond, N. (2003). Learning technology in higher education in the UK: Trends, drivers and strategies. In M. Van der Wende and M. van de Ven (Eds.), *The use of ICT in Higher Education: A mirror of Europe.* Utrecht: Lemma Publishers, pp 109-122.

Hatchette, V. (2006). *Report of the Pan-Canadian committee on quality assurance of degree programming: Quality assurance of e-learning and private institutions.* Retrieved from http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/94/E-learning-report.en.pdf

Haughey, M. (2007). Organizational models for faculty support: The response of Canadian Universities. In Bullen, M. & Janes, D. (Eds.) *Making the transition to e-learning: strategies and issues*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.

Hawkins, B. L. (2000). Technology, education, and a very foggy crystal ball. *EDUCAUSE Review, 35*(6), 65–73. Retrieved from http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/erm0065.pdf

Hearn, J. C. (1998). If not us, who? Thoughts on policy-related work by higher education faculty. *Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education*, Miami, FL. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/17/58/34.pdf

Heinecke, W., Dawson, K., & Willis, J. (2001). Paradigms and frames for r&d in distance education: Toward collaborative electronic learning. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications, 7*(3), 293-322. Norfolk, VA: AACE. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org.ezproxy.royalroads.ca/p/9217

HELIOS. (2007). E-learning for innovation executive summary. *HELIOS Yearly Report 2007*. Brussels, MENON Network. Retrieved from http://www.menon.org/publications/HELIOS%20thematic%20report-%20Access.pdf

Hird, J. A. (2005). Policy analysis for what? The effectiveness of nonpartisan policy research organizations. *Policy Studies Journal, 33*(1), 83-105. doi:10.1111/j.1541-0072.2005.00093.x

Hodgson, V. E. (2002). The European Union and e-learning: An examination of rhetoric, theory and practice. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 18*(3) doi: 10.1046/j.0266-4909.2002.00236.x

Hofmann, J. (2006). Why blended learning hasn't (yet) fulfilled its promises. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.), *The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs* (pp. 22-26). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Hofmann, J. & Dunkling, G. (2002). Best practices in blended elearning. In M. Driscoll & T. Reeves (Eds.). *Proceedings of World Conference on E*-Learning *in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education.* (pp. 2491-2493). Chesapeake, VA: AACE. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org/p/9719

Hoepfl, M. C. (1997). Choosing qualitative research: A primer for technology education researchers. *Journal of Technology Education, 9*(1). Retrieved from

http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.78.6419&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=49

Hogan, E. (2006). *Governance models*. Unpublished manuscript, The Executive Vice President, Academic. Edmonton, AB: Grant MacEwan University.

Holmberg, B. (2005). *The evolution, principles and practices of distance education.* Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universitat Oldenburg. p. 13. Retrieved from http://www.mde.uni-oldenburg.de/download/asfvolume11_eBook.pdf

Husmann, D. E., & Miller, M. T. (2001). Improving distance education: Perceptions of program administrators. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, IV*(I). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring41/husmann41.html

Hutchinson J. R., & Huberman M. (2005). Knowledge dissemination and use in science and mathematics education: A literature review. *Journal of Science Education and Technology, 3*(1), 27-47. doi: 10.1007/BF01575814

i2010. (2009). *Benchmarking digital Europe 2011-2015: A conceptual framework.* European Commission, Information Society and Media. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/i2010/docs/benchmarking/benchmarking_digital_europe_2011-2015.pdf

I. & J. Management Services. (2010). *2010 E-learning benchmarking survey – Final report. Australian Flexible Learning Framework.* Australian Government, Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Learning. Retrieved from http://e-learningindicators.flexiblelearning.net.au/docs/10results/2010_E-learning_Benchmarking_Survey_Final_Report.pdf

Information Services and Technology Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (2012). *Writing policies, rules, and guidelines*. Retrieved from http://ist.mit.edu/about/policies/guidelines

International Telecommunication Union. (2009). *Measuring the information society: The ICT development index*. Geneva, Switzerland. Retrieved from http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/publications/idi/2009/material/IDI2009_w5.pdf

Joint Information Systems Committee. (2008). *Effective practice with eportfolios*. Retrieved from http://www.jisc.ac.uk/publications/publications/effectivepracticeeportfolios.aspx.

JISC. (2008). Exploring tangible benefits of e-learning: Does investment yield interest? *Association for Learning Technology/The Higher Education Academy/JISC InfoNet.* Retrieved from http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/publications/camel-tangible-benefits.pdf

Katz, R. N. (2002). The ICT infrastructure: A driver of change. *EDUCAUSE, 52*(60). Retrieved from http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ERM0243.pdf

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges. *Journal of Higher Education, 75*(4), 371-399. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

King, J., Nugent, G., Russell, E., Eich, J., & Lacy, D. (2000). Policy frameworks for distance education: Implications for decision makers. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 3*(2), Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/king32.html

Kingdon, J. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives and public policies.* New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Knott, D. (2008). *Achieving culture change: A policy framework*. Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, UK Cabinet Office. Retrieved from

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/strategy/assets/achieving_culture_change.pdf

Kurkela, L. (2006). Paradigm shifts and learning resources - Synergy enablers for elearning and blended learning. In E. Pearson & P. Bohman (Eds.), *Proceedings of World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications 2006* (pp. 2714-2719). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.

Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org.ezproxy.royalroads.ca/p/23390

Learnovation. (2008). *ICT, lifelong learning and innovation reports in ICT for learning in higher education*. Retrieved from http://www.elearningeuropa.info/files/lo/HE.pdf

Littlejohn, A., & Pegler, C. (2007). *Preparing for Blended E-Learning*. New York: Routledge.

Lovat., T., J. (2003). *The role of the 'teacher' coming of age?* Australian Council Deans of Education, Discussion Paper. Retrieved from http://www.acde.edu.au/pages/images/The%20Role%20of%20the%20Teacher%20Coming%20of%20Age%20%28413Kb%29.pdf

Lowenthal, P., & Wilson, B. G. (2010). Labels do matter! A critique of AECT's redefinition of the field. *TechTrends, 54*(1), 38−46. doi:10.1007/s11528-009-0362-y

MacKeogh, K., & Fox, S. (2008). *Strategies for embedding e-learning in traditional universities: drivers and barriers.* Roy Williams (Ed.). 7th European Conference on e-Learning. University of Cyprus, November 2008 Reading: Academic Publishing Ltd. Vol 2, pp. 135-141. Retrieved from http://doras.dcu.ie/2166/1/ecel_2008.pdf

Maddrell, J. (2008). System analysis of Athabasca University, Old Dominion University Retrieved March 22, 2011 from http://www.scribd.com/doc/3754192/Athabasca-University-System-Analysis

Majchrzak, A. (1984). *Methods for policy research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Maguire, L. L. (2005). Literature review—faculty participation in online distance education: Barriers and motivators. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 7*(1). Retrieved from www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring81/maguire81.htm

Manley, J. (1998). The digital economy in Canada. Presentation to the industry committee on bill C-54. Retrieved from http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/ecic-ceac.nsf/eng/gv00218.html

Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice, 13*(6) 522-525. Retrieved from http://fampra.oxfordjournals.org/content/13/6/522.full.pdf+html

Masie, E. (2006). *The blended learning imperative*. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.). The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs (pp. 22-26). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative researching*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Matthews, D. (1999). The origins of distance education and its use in the United States. *T.H.E. Journal*, *27*(2), 54-59. Retrieved from http://thejournal.com/Articles/1999/09/01/The-Origins-of-Distance-Education-and-its-use-in-the-United-States.aspx?p=1

Mays, N., & Pope, C. (1995). Rigour and qualitative research. *British Medical Journal, 311*(6997) 109-112. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2550154/pdf/bmj00600-0043.pdf

McGreal, R., & Anderson, T. (2007). E-Learning in Canada. *Journal of Distance Education Technologies, 5*(1), 1-6. Retrieved from http://auspace.athabascau.ca:8080/dspace/bitstream/2149/580/1/ELCanadaJET.pdf

McKeown, L., & Underhill, C. (2007). Learning online: Factors associated with use of the internet for education purposes. *Education Matters 4*(4). Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 81-004-XIE. Retrieved from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/bsolc/olc-cel/olc-cel?catno=81-004-x&lang=eng

Middlehurst, R. (2001). University challenges: Borderless higher education, Today and tomorrow. *Minerva: A Review of Science, Learning & Policy, 39*(1), 3-26. Available from: Academic Search Premier.

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2010). *Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies*. U.S. Department of Education Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development Policy and Program Studies Service. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyen, E. L., Aust, R., Gauch, J. M., Hinton, S. H., Isaacson, R. E., Smith, S. J., & Tee, M. Y. (2002). E-learning: A programmatic research construct for the future. *Journal of Special Education Technology, 17*(3) 37-46.

Mims, N. G., & Newbill, S. L. (1995). Cultivating attitudes for change. Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Conference of Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration. November 12-14, Memphis, TN. Retrieved from ERIC Clearinghouse.

Misko, J., Choi, J., Hong, S. Y., & Lee, S. (2004). *E-learning in Australia and Korea: Learning from practice*. National Centre for Vocational Education Research. Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED493966

Moe, M. T., & Blodget, H. (2000). *The knowledge web*. New York: Merrill Lynch. Retrieved from http://www.internettime.com/itimegroup/MOE1.PDF

Moore, J. L., Dickson-Deane, C., & Galyen, K. (2011). E-learning, online learning, and distance learning environments: Are they the same? *Internet and Higher Education 14*, 129–135. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.10.001

Morra L. G., & Friedlander A. C. (1999) *Case study evaluations*. Washington, DC: The World Bank. Retrieved January 6, 2012 from http://lnweb90.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/3DCA834E680B8E04852567F3004BAD27/$file/OED_WP1.pdf

Morse J. M. (2000). Determining sample size. *Quality Health Research, 10*(1) 3-5, doi:10.1177/104973200129118183

Musick D. W. (1998). Policy analysis in medical education: A structured approach. *Medical Education Online, 3*(2). Retrieved from http://med-ed-online.net/index.php/meo/article/viewArticle/4296

Naidoo, R. (2003). Repositioning higher education as a global commodity: Opportunities and challenges for future sociology of education work. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *24*(2), 249-259. doi:10.1080/0142569031000115057

National Education Technology Plan. (2010). *Transforming American education learning powered by technology.* U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Technology. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/netp2010.pdf

NGfL (*The National Grid for Learning Scotland Progress Report*). (2006). Retrieved from http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/06/21104027/15

Nichols, M. (2003). A theory of elearning. *Educational Technology & Society*, *6*(2), 1−10. Retrieved July 16, 2011 from http://ifets.ieee.org/periodical/6-2/1.html

Nnazor, R. (1998). *Understanding the advent of information technology in teaching at the university: A case study of the University of British Columbia (UBC).* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, BC. Retrieved from http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/obj/s4/f2/dsk2/ftp02/NQ34600.pdf

Nyiri, J. C. (1997). Open and distance learning in an historical perspective. *European Journal of Education*, *32*(4), 347-357. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Oblinger, D. (2000).The nature and purpose of distance education. *The Technology Source.* University of North Carolina. Retrieved from http://technologysource.org/article/nature_and_purpose_of_distance_education/

OECD. (1996). *The knowledge-based economy*. Paris. Retrieved February 27, 2011 from http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/51/8/1913021.pdf

OECD. (2005a). *E-Learning in tertiary education: Where do we stand?* Paris. OECD Publishing Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,2340,en_2649_37455_34900984_1_1_1_37455,00.html

OECD. (2005b). *Canada/Alberta conference on e-learning in post-secondary education: Policies, practices and research - Report on conference proceedings 2005.* Retrieved from http://www.education.gov.ab.ca/oecd2005/FinalReportEnglish.doc

Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive. White House. (2002). *Annual Report to Congress on Foreign Economic Collection and Industrial Espionage*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Retrieved from http://www.ncix.gov/publications/reports/fecie_all/fecie_2002.pdf

Oliver, M. & Conole, G. (2003). Evidence-based practice and e-learning in higher education: Can we and should we? *Research Papers in Education, 18*(4), 385-397. doi:10.1080/0267152032000176873

Osguthorpe, R., & Graham, C. (2003). Blended learning environments definitions and directions. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 4*(3), 227-233. Retrieved from EBSCO*host.*

Pirani, J. A. (2004). *Supporting e-learning in higher education.* Roadmap. Educause Center for Applied Research. Retrieved from http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ERS0303/ecm0303.pdf

Phillips, V. (1998). Virtual classrooms, real education. *Nation's Business, 86*(5) 41. Retrieved from https://ezproxy.royalroads.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.royalroads.ca/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=500939&site=ehost-live

Pannekoek, F. (1998). *Canadian memory institutions and the digital revolution: The last five years. How Canada communicates.* Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2003. pp. 71-94. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2149/27

Phipps, R. A., & Merisotis, J. P. (1999). *What's the difference? A review of contemporary research on the effectiveness of distance learning in higher education.* Washington, DC: The Institute for Higher Education Policy. Retrieved August 2, 2010 from http://www.ihep.org/publications/publications-detail.cfm?id=88

Porat, M., U. (1977). *The information economy: Definition and measurement* (nine volumes). U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED142205.pdf

Porat, M. U. (1978). Global implications of the information society. *Journal of Communication, 1*(28), 70–80, doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1978.tb01565.x

Price, S., & Oliver, M. (2007). A framework for conceptualising the impact of technology on teaching and learning. *Educational Technology & Society, 10* (1), 16-27. Retrieved from http://www.ifets.info/journals/10_1/3.pdf

QSR NVIVO9. Data management and analysis software. Retrieved from http://www.qsrinternational.com/

Reynolds, R., & Ioffe, Y. (2010). *Digital textbook sales in U. S. higher education: A five year projection*. Retrieved from http://blog.xplana.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/DigitalTextbooks_Report_04-19-10.pdf

Richard R. N., & Gross R. I. (2002). *The policy challenges. Web portals and higher education technologies to make IT personal*. A publication of EDUCAUSE and NACUBO. Retrieved from http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/pub5006m.pdf

Roffe, I. (2005). E-Learning in Europe: Divergent developments affecting higher education. *Continuing Higher Education Review 69*. Retrieved from http://www.upcea.org/pdfs/cher/2005CHER.pdf#page=83

Rohland-Heinrich, N., & Jensen, B. (2007). Library resources: A critical component to online learning. *MultiMedia & Internet@Schools, 14*(2), 8-12. Retrieved from EBSCO online database http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=24485559&site=ehost-live

Roth, W. D., & Mehta J. D. (2002). The Rashomon Effect combining positivist and interpretivist approaches in the analysis of contested events. *Sociological Methods & Research, 31*(2), 131-173. doi: 10.1177/004912402237292

SAFA Collective Agreement 2007-2010. *(2007) Collective agreement between the board of governors of the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology (SAIT) and The SAIT academic faculty association (SAFA)*. Retrieved January 3, 2012 from http://www.safacalgary.com/collective%20agreement%202007%20-%202010.pdf

Sahare, S., & Thampi, G. (2010). Blended learning: Current trends and issues. In Z. Abas et al. (Eds.). *Proceedings of Global Learn Asia Pacific 2010* (pp. 3970-3977). AACE. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org.ezproxy.royalroads.ca/p/34484

SAIT (Southern Alberta Institution of Technology). (2011). *Annual Report*. Retrieved from http://www.sait.ca/Documents/About%20SAIT/Publications/pdf/annualreport.pdf

SAIT (Southern Alberta Institution of Technology). (2012a). *Compensation and benefits* Retrieved from http://www.sait.ca/about-sait/policies-and-procedures/human-resources.php

SAIT (Southern Alberta Institution of Technology). (2012b). *Policies and procedures*. Retrieved from http://www.sait.ca/about-sait/policies-and-procedures.php

SAIT (Southern Alberta Institution of Technology). (2006). *The SAIT strategic plan 2006-2016*. Calgary, AB: SAIT.

Samli, A. C., & Jacobs, L. L. (2003). Counteracting global industrial espionage: A damage control strategy. *Business & Society Review (00453609)*, *108*(1), 95-113. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Sandelowski, M. (1995). Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing & Health, 18*: 179–183. doi: 10.1002/nur.4770180211

Sands, P. (2002). Inside outside, upside downside: Strategies for connecting online and face-to-face instruction in hybrid courses. *Teaching with Technology Today, 8*(6). Retrieved from http://www.wisconsin.edu/ttt/articles/sands2.htm

Schein, E. H. (1984). Coming to a new awareness of organizational culture, *Sloan Management Review, 25*, pp. 3-16. Retrieved from http://www.metapower.com/pdfs/Schein-New-Awareness-Org-Culture-1984.pdf

Schiffman, S., Vignare, K., & Geith, C. (2007). Why do higher education institutions pursue online education? *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 11*(2), pp 61-71. Retrieved from http://sloanconsortium.org/jaln/v11n2/why-do-higher-education-institutions-pursue-online-education

Schlosser, L. A., & Simonson, M. (2006). *Distance education: Definition and glossary of terms*. Bloomington, IN: Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Retrieved from http://www.fischlerschool.nova.edu/bpol/pdf/distancelearning_def.pdf

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in the social sciences.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Siemens, G. (2004). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. Retrieved from http://www.elearnspace.org/Articles/connectivism.htm

Sero Consulting (2009). Harnessing Technology: Annual Sector Survey of FE Colleges 2008/09 – Report, Coventry, BECTA (British Educational Communications and Technology Agency). Retrieved from http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/1668/2/becta_2009_fecollegesurvey_report.pdf

Shale, D. (2002). The hybridization of higher education in Canada. *International Review of Research in Open and Distant Learning, 2*(2). Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/64

Slack, B. (2012). *The policy process*. Retrieved from http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/Eng/methods/ch9c2en.html

Smerdon, B., Cronen, S., Lanahan, L., Anderson, J., Iannotti, N., & Angeles, J. (2000). *Teachers' tools for the 21st century: A report on teacher's use of technology.* (Statistical analysis

report No. NCES 2000-102). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2000102

Stake, R., E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying the way things work*. New York. Guilford Press.

Statistics Canada. (2000). *Household internet use survey*. Retrieved from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/010726/dq010726a-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. (2003). *The Daily*. Retrieved from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/031030/dq031030a-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. (2010). *Canadian internet use survey*. Retrieved from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/100510/dq100510a-eng.htm

Stuparich, J. (2001). *E-learning in Australia: Universities and the new distance education*. Paper presented on behalf of M Gallagher, First Assistant Secretary, Australian Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, at 7th OECD/ Tokyo, Japan. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/16/52/1854142.pdf

Tallent-Runnels, M. K., Thomas, J. A., Lan, W. Y., Cooper, S., Ahern, T. C. Shaw, S. M. & Liu, X. (2006). Teaching courses online: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 76.* 93-135. doi:10.3102/00346543076001093

Tam, S. W. (1999). Developing countries and the future of distance and open learning in the 21st century. *Electronic Journal of Instructional Science and Technology, 3*(1). Retrieved from http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/e-jist/docs/vol3no1/v3n1a3.pdf

Talik, J., B., G. (2008). Higher education: A public good or a commodity for trade? *Prospects, 38.* 449–466 DOI 10.1007/s11125-009-9093-2

Tavangarian, D., Leypold, M. E., Nölting, K., Röser, M., & Voigt, D. (2004). Is e-learning the solution for individual learning? *Learning*, *2*(2), 273-280. Retrieved July 16, 2011 from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.116.8017&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Taylor, J., C. (1999). The death of distance: The birth of the global higher education economy. *Electronic Journal of Instructional Science Technology (E-JIST), 3*(1). 6-11. Retrieved from http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/e-jist/docs/vol3no1/v3n1a1.pdf

Thomson, C., Ganzglass, E., Simon, M., Krause, K., Bruno, M. L., Ducat, M., & Jewett, C. (2001). *The state of e-learning in the States. National Board of Governors Association*. Retrieved from http://www.nga.org/cda/files/060601elearning.pdf

Tomei, D. L. (2006). The impact of online teaching on faculty load: Computing the ideal class size for online courses. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *14*(3), 531-541. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org.ezproxy.royalroads.ca/p/5626

Triacca, L., Bolchini, D., Botturi, L., & Inversini, A. (2004). MiLE: Systematic usability evaluation for e-Learning web applications. *AACE Journal, 12*(4). Retrieved July 17, 2011 from http://*citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.96.5918*

Trochim, W. & Cook, J. (1992). Pattern matching in theory-driven evaluation: A field example from psychiatric rehabilitation. In H. Chen and P. H. Rossi (Eds.) *Using Theory to Improve Program and Policy Evaluations*. New York: Greenwood Press, 49-69.

Tynjala, P. & Hakkinen, P. (2005). E-learning at work: Theoretical underpinnings and pedagogical challenges. *The Journal of Workplace Learning, 17*(5/6). 318-336 DOI 10.1108/13665620510606742. Retrieved from www.emeraldinsight.com/1366-5626.htm

UNESCO. (2010). *Reaching the Marginalized*. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/efareport/reports/2010-marginalization/

Varvel, V. E., Montague, R. & Estabrook L. S. (2007). Policy and e-learning. In R. Andrews and C. Haythornthwaite (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of e-Learning Research, E-learning Research Handbook*, pp. 270-285, London: Sage.

Versluis, E., van Keulen, M., & Stephenson P. (2010). Doing EU policy analysis. In *Analyzing the European Union policy process* (pp. 9-30) New York: Palgrave Macmillan, Retrieved from http://www.palgrave.com/PDFs/9780230246003.Pdf

von Solmsa, R., & von Solmsa, B. (2004). From policies to culture. *Computers & Security, 23*. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2004.01.013

WebCT. Learning management system. Retrieved from http://www.webct.com/

Wesley, D. (2002). A critical analysis on the evolution of e-learning. *International Journal on E-Learning, 1*(4), 41-48. Norfolk, VA: AACE. Retrieved from http://www.editlib.org.ezproxy.royalroads.ca/p/9168.

White, S., Davis, H. C. & Eales, S. (Eds.). (2007). Critical success factors for e-learning and institutional change – some organisational perspectives on campus-wide e-learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 38*(5), 840-850. http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/264129/1/BJET_CSFIC_saw_final.pdf

Williams, C. (2002). Learning on-line: A review of recent literature in a rapidly expanding field. *Journal of Further & Higher Education, 26*(3), 263-272. doi:10.1080/03098770220149620

Woolcott, L., & Betts, K. (1999). What's in it for me? Incentives for faculty participation in distance education. *Journal of Distance Education*, *14*(2), 34-49. Retrieved from http://www.jofde.ca/index.php/jde/article/view/156/340

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Young, S., J. (2002). The use of market mechanisms in higher education finance and state control: Ontario considered. [Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Funds] [Access to Opportunities Program]. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 32*(2). Retrieved from CBCA Education. (Document ID: 704975861).

Zemsky, R., & Massy, W. (2004). *Thwarted innovation: What happened to e-learning and why*. A Final Report for The Weatherstation Project of The Learning Alliance at the University of Pennsylvania in cooperation with the Thomson Corporation. University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved from http://www.irhe.upenn.edu/Docs/Jun2004/ThwartedInnovation.pdf

Zhao, Y. & Frank, K. A. (2003). Factors affecting technology uses in schools: An ecological perspective. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(4): 807-840, doi:10.3102/00028312040004807

Appendix A

Musick (1998) Analyzing Educational Policy

Musick (1998, p4) indicates that the process of analyzing a given educational policy within a medical school should focus on the following twelve ingredients of successful policy analysis:

A. Conceptual: What are the core concepts under discussion? How are they defined? What are their measurable outcomes?
B. Normative: What "ought to be" true in regard to the policy? How are the current views of key people or groups in the medical school different from what "ought to be"?
C. Theoretical: Within what theoretical framework(s) does the policy fit? How would different parties within the medical school define the policy in theoretical terms?
D. Empirical: Are there research studies in the literature which could prove helpful in illuminating the issues? What important facts do we glean from these studies? Are these really facts or assertions?
E. Economic: What impact would the adoption of the policy have on the institution's budgetary resources? What economic structures (either new or existing) would need to be in place in order to implement the policy?
F. Political: What impact(s) would the adoption of the policy have on the school's internal and external political constituencies? Is it politically feasible to implement the course of action which will result from the policy?
G. Cultural: How are different organizational, racial, gender and/or professional cultures within the medical school affected by the policy? Are proposed policies acceptable to various cultures, and why or why not? Is the policy based on a sense of fairness or equity to all cultural groups?
H. Ideological: How are the ideological and informational aspects of the policy interwoven? Do various parties participating in the policy development process bring strong ideological frameworks into the discussions? What role(s) does the self-interest of these various parties play in these discussions? Is there a potential or actual conflict of interest?
I. Historical: Does the proposed policy have a history within the institution? Have previous attempts been made to address the policy issue under consideration? If so, what was the result? What can be learned from these previous attempts?
J. Assumptive: Are there key assumptions being made by the various parties involved in or affected by the policy issue? What are the assumptions made by those on both sides of the issue? Have these assumptions been made explicit? Are these assumptions known and understood by all policy decision-makers?
K. Legal: What legalities or legal precedents may be involved in or have an effect on the proposed policy? What key legislation and/or other legal requirements are likely to have an impact on policy development?
L. Logical: Are statements made in the policy logically sound? Do they avoid illogical or faulty inferences? Can they withstand rigorous scrutiny by a "neutral" party?

Appendix B

QSR NVIVO9 Data Analysis

NVIVO9 and Qualitative Research

This qualitative researcher was interested in evaluating, interpreting and explaining the social phenomena of policy at a higher education institution. Interview transcripts were analyzed using this software. NVIVO9 helped to manage, explore and find patterns in the data.

The data on which this thesis was based was drawn from the researcher's research on the affect of policy on faculty practice and pedagogy in e-learning in higher education. This research consisted of both qualitative and quantitative parts. In the qualitative element 9 face-to-face interviews were carried out with administrators and teaching faculty at SAIT. The interviewees in this study were volunteers drawn from all administrators and teaching faculty who participated in an online survey regarding their experience at SAIT with e-learning or you have input on policy formation. Interviews lasted 1 hour and each interview was recorded and fully transcribed. Following the transcription of the interviews the data was imported into NVIVO9 and manually analyzed. This decision was made on the basis of volume of data to be analyzed and coded. NVIVO9 was chosen because it was easy to use and the ability of the software to aggregate thematically. NVIVO9 was chosen because is relatively simple to use. It is possible to import documents directly from a word processing package and code these documents thematically on screen. Furthermore, NVIVO9 allowed the aggregated data to be visualized in a separate window.

Thematically Coding

Once documents have been imported into NVIVO9 a coding theme was decided upon.

Table 39

Coding Themes and Subthemes

Theme	Sub-Theme
1. Belief about E-Learning/Faculty Buy-In	
2. Copyright and Intellectual Property	
3. Course Review	3a Indicators used to measure course quality
	3b Standards
4. Faculty Evaluation	4a Student satisfaction surveys
5. Culture	
6. Hours of Work/Time	
7. Institution Vision/Mission	
8. E-learning Policy	8a Availability of policy information
	8b Instructional hours and compensation
	8c E-learning specific policies
	8d Course evaluation
	8e Process – Faculty involvement in policy process
9. Support	9a. Faculty learning
	9b. Budget/funding

9c. Academic course development
9d. Off-loading
9e. Technical
9f. General

See What You Have Coded

The full power of the software comes in its ability to aggregate thematically coded data sets across multiple documents into one single viewing window. The result is labour and time saving as NVIVO9 pulls the highlighted text from each of the documents that has the same coding, putting it into a single viewing window. Once the data is in a single viewing window it is conveniently labeled with the document it came from and the code assigned to it. This is the most convenient and time effective way to move the data to a new location. However, should you prefer, to see what has been coded in a source document, you can: Turn on coding highlight—on the View tab in the Coding group, click Highlight, and then select a highlight option. The result would be to view the highlighted text segments within the original document. As well, an alternate visualization strategy is to turn on coding stripes—on the View tab in the Coding group, click Coding Stripes, and then select an option. Coding stripes are displayed on the right of the source. Coding stripes can refer to the colours you have assigned to themes.

Appendix C

Email Invitation to Participate in a Survey

Introduction

You are invited to participate in a research study titled: 'Institutional Policy Presence': From policy to practice. The study will provide policy administrators and leaders at post secondary institutions such as SAIT with information they need to make sound decisions on creating policies that support faculty who teach online.

You were selected as a possible participant because of your experience at SAIT with e-learning or you have input on policy formation. Please read this introductory letter and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to participate in this study.

Once you have completed the survey, in appreciation of the time you took, I would be pleased to enter you into a draw for 1 of 3 Chapters gift cards worth $15 each.

This study is being conducted by: Jason Maitland, Masters Degree student at Royal Roads University.

Background Information:

This study examines the affects your institutions policies have on faculty who teach in an online environment. There are three objectives to this study. First, I am interested in the current condition of e-learning policy within SAIT. Second, I am interested in the perceived intent of the policies from policy administrators on how/why these policies were created. Third I would like to better understand how these policies affect teaching practice in an online environment.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, your participation involves filling out a questionnaire based on an extensive literature review. This questionnaire should take about 15-30 minutes to complete depending on your comments. All questions are multiple choice with room at the end for comments. You will receive the opportunity to have the result of the study sent to you via email.

Risks:

Being a participant in this study has no foreseeable risks.

Benefits:

This research can potentially contribute to the advancement of our understanding of how higher education policy affects faculty who teach in an online environment. This may help institutions such as yours develop more effective support policies.

Confidentiality:

Your decision to participate in this study is entirely voluntary and you may decide at any time to withdraw from the study. If you choose to participate, you may skip any items you do not wish to answer. Once you have finished the survey you will not be able to re-enter to make changes. If you do not wish to submit your responses, simply click the browser page closed. Responses made by individual participants on the questionnaire will remain confidential, and your name will not appear on the questionnaire or be associated with your responses in any way. Research records will be kept in a secured file; only the primary researcher will have access to the records. A summary of the results will be posted when the research is complete and you will receive an email notification when this occurs. You may obtain a full copy of the report by e-mailing the researcher. The results of this study may be presented at scholarly conferences, published in professional journals, or presented in class lectures. No individual result will be released; only grouped (aggregate) data will be presented.

Note: Participants may be contacted for the interview portion of the study and will be compensated $20 for your time should you choose to participate.

Contact and Questions:

To participate, please click on the link below.
{SURVEYURL}

Sincerely,

Jason Maitland
Masters Student
Royal Roads University

If you do not want to participate in this survey and don't want to receive any more invitations please click the following link:
{OPTOUTURL}

Appendix D

Statement at Start of Survey

Confidentiality

Your privacy is more important to me than my research.

Your decision to participate in this study is entirely voluntary and you may decide at any time to withdraw from the study. If you choose to participate, you may skip any items you do not wish to answer. If you do not wish to submit your responses, simply click the browser page closed. Responses made by individual participants on the questionnaire will remain confidential, and your name will not appear on the questionnaire or be associated with your responses in any way. Only researchers associated with the project will have access to the questionnaires. A summary of the results will be posted when the research is complete and you will receive an email notification when this occurs. You may obtain a full copy of the report by e-mailing the researcher. The results of this study may be presented at scholarly conferences, published in professional journals, or presented in class lectures. No individual result will be released; only grouped (aggregate) data will be presented. The data will be securely stored by Jason Maitland for a minimum of two years.

Contact and Questions

The following Web site provides a secure and anonymous link to the questionnaire. Although you will be able to save your answers and complete it at a later time, you will only be able to submit it once.

There are 3 buttons below:

1. **Next:** By clicking on this button, you will indicate your willingness to participate in this study.
2. **Exit and clear survey:** This button will exit you from the survey.
3. **Load unfinished survey:** At anytime while doing the survey you may save your answers. This button allows you to return and complete the survey.

Appendix E

Survey

Role
1 [DEM-POS]
Which of the following best describes your role?
Please choose only one of the following:
- ○ Dean
- ○ Academic Chair
- ○ Teaching faculty (Instructor)
- ○ Instructional designer
- ○ Media developer
- ○ Technical support services

Demographics
2 [DEM_FT-PT]
Are you full-time or part-time Faculty member?
Please choose only one of the following:
- ○ Full-time
- ○ Part-time

3 [DEM-HLAI]
How long have you held this role (please include years at other institutions as well as SAIT)?
Please choose only one of the following:
- ○ Less than one year
- ○ 1-5 years
- ○ 6-10 years
- ○ 11-15 years
- ○ More than 15 years

4 [DEM-LTAP]
How long have you taught (now or in the past) using e-learning/blended learning in any institution?
Please choose only one of the following:
- ○ Never taught using e-learning/blended learning
- ○ Less than one year
- ○ 1-5 years
- ○ 6-10 years
- ○ 11-15 years
- ○ More than 15 years

Academic Policy Development (questions 8-18)

For the purpose of this study academic policy development will be understood to include policies, guidelines and best practices documents relating to academic and course quality
5 [AC-XUSE]
E-learning facilitates the development of skills through expanded use of information and interactive technology.
Please choose only one of the following:
○Strongly Agree
○Agree
○Disagree
○Strongly Disagree
○Do Not Know/Undecided

E-learning – is the use of various technological tools that Web-based for the purposes of education. Delivery can be asynchronous (allowing learners to go through learning materials at their own pace within broad time constraints) or synchronous (participants attend the on-line learning session at a scheduled time, allowing for live interaction with the instructor and other students).
Blended Learning – Blended learning combines face-to-face instruction with e-learning (web-based. online, computer mediated) instruction.
For the purposes of this study e-learning and blended learning are synonymous.

6 [AC-IMPAC]
E-learning will improve the education program at my institution.
Please choose only one of the following:
○Strongly Agree
○Agree
○Disagree
○Strongly Disagree
○Do Not Know/Undecided

7 [AC-POL]
Policies affect e-learning teaching practice.
Please choose only one of the following:
○Strongly Agree
○Agree
○Disagree
○Strongly Disagree
○Do Not Know/Undecided

8 [AC-STAND]
My institution has set standards (performance measures, core competencies, targets) for e-learning.
Please choose only one of the following:

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

9 [AC-SSCQ]
Student satisfaction surveys are the optimal method to gauge course quality in an e-learning environment.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

10 [AC-INDCQ]
The indicators used to measure course quality would advance e-learning practice.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided
Quality - 'quality' e-learning means different things to each of us. For the purpose of the this study quality in e- learning refers to high level of mastery of curricular outcomes together with excellent performance on the part of learners.

11 [AC-POLQ]
Policies are in place to ensure a high quality of e-learning instruction at my institution.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

12 [AC-SUPD2LT]
Support is available to move my face-to-face courses to D2L.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree

Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided
D2L - Desire 2 Learn is the learning management system chosen by SAIT as the method of course delivery.

13 [AC-FACPER]
E-learning/blended learning is viewed favourably by teaching faculty (instructors) throughout my institution.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

14 [AC-ADMINPER]
E-learning/blended learning is viewed favourably by Academic Chairs/Program coordinators throughout my institution.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

15 [AC-PARDISC]
I have participated in organized discussions on topics related to improving student success through e-learning.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided
Labour Management Policy Development (questions 19-36)
For the purpose of this study labour management policy development will focus on: compensation and workload, development incentives, intellectual property and faculty training.

16 [LM-POLINF]
Policy information is readily available.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree

Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

17 [LM-NFPOLINF]
New faculty are directed to policy information.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided
18 [LM-EPOL]
E-learning policies are reviewed with faculty.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

19 [LM-POLIP]
Intellectual property issues are discussed as D2L courses are developed.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided
Intellectual Property - Intellectual property establishes a right and identifies ownership of intellectual creativity which enables its owner to profit from the creative endeavour and to exclude others from making, selling or using that property without the necessary authorization.

20 [LM-COPYR]
There are policies at SAIT regarding copyright in an e-learning environment.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

Copyright – ‘copyright’ means "the right to copy." In general, only the copyright owner, often the creator of the work, is allowed to produce or reproduce the work or to permit anyone else to do so.

21 [LM-CURDEVR]
SAIT supports faculty through payment or offloading work during e-learning curriculum development.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

22 [LM-FACINP]
Faculty should have input on the creation of policies that affect e-learning.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

23 [LM-ELEXP]
Overall, my experience teaching in an e-learning/blended learning environment has been positive.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

24 [LM-COMPK]
The faculty in my school have a comprehensive knowledge of D2L.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

25 [LM-EBUYIN]

Faculty at SAIT have demonstrated buy-in to e-learning.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

26 [LM-TRAIN1]
D2L training is available to faculty on a regular basis.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

27 [LM-TRAIN2]
I have been able to take advantage of D2L training.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

28 [LM-TRAIN3]
Other faculty participate in D2L training sessions.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

29 [LM-TRAIN4]
Faculty training for e-learning is sufficient.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

30 [LM-POL2]
Instructional hours for e-learning/blended learning instructors are clearly outlined in the policies.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

31 [LM-FUND]
Currently funding is dedicated to support e-learning curriculum development in my school.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

32 [LM-SSAT]
Student satisfaction surveys are the optimal method to gauge faculty performance in an e-learning environment.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

33 [LM-SUCCIND]
The indicators used to measure the success of faculty are appropriate for e-learning.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided
Technical Policy Development
For the purpose of this study technical policy development will focus on infrastructure and technical support.

34 [TECH-STF]
I have access to technical information I need to support my use of D2L.

Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

35 [TECH-SSTEACH]
Currently there are staff at SAIT dedicated to support e-learning initiatives.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided

36 [TECH-D2LTSS]
D2L training staff members are accessible when needed.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided
The D2L training staff members teach you how to use D2L and what teaching techniques are effective using e-learning.
37 [TECH-D2LTECHSS]
D2L technical support staff members are accessible when needed.
Please choose only one of the following:
Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Do Not Know/Undecided
Technical support staff members are those individuals who fix the computers and make sure the network and servers are performing optimally.

38 Should you wish to participate in the interview portion of the study
Please enter your name, email address and phone number here if you would be willing to participate in a further 60 minute interview about this research. You will be compensated $20 for your time and will be eligible for further random prize draw should you choose to participate in the interview part of this study.

Summary Comments
39 [SUMM]
Please make any additional comments regarding the absence of policy at SAIT, or the affect SAIT's current policies have on faculty who teach using e-learning (i.e. the current condition of e-learning policy, the intent of the policies or how these policies affect teaching practice in an online environment).
Please write your answer here:

Closing

Thank you for participating in this research.

Your input will contribute to a better understanding of the affects SAITs policies on faculty who teach using e-learning.

In appreciation of the time you took to participate in the study I would be pleased to enter you into a draw for 1 of 3 Chapters gift cards worth $15 each. If you would like to be entered into the draw to receive this small token of my appreciation please email Jason Maitland with information on where it might be sent.

** Please note: Complete anonymity is assured. In no way is your name or contact information associated with your survey responses so, please accept my offer of a gift card in gratitude of the time you spent on the survey.

Warmest regards,
Jason Maitland

Appendix F

The Face-to-Face Interview Letter of Invitation

Letter to participants:

I am Jason Maitland, a professional who has been involved in education technology for over 25 years. One of my primary areas of interest is e-learning policy development. I am also a graduate student in Learning and Technology at Royal Roads University.

For my M. A. I am conducting a qualitative study of e-learning education policy development and its affect on faculty pedagogy. I am researching policy development to better understand the components of policy that are most impactful on teaching practice. My goal is to understand the institutional perspective, as well as the faculty perspective but not to judge evaluate or defend current practice or policies. I do not anticipate right or wrong answers, but multiple perspectives and insights that can inform policy development to support best practice. Although reviews have been undertaken of policies within this area, there has been relatively little attention paid to how these have influenced practice. With the results of this study, I hope to improve policy-making processes and implementation at the system level as it responds to faculty needs. It is by asking the tough policy questions in advance that future problems and roadblocks might be mitigated.

You are invited to participate in a research study, The 'Institutional Policy Presence': From policy to practice. I would like to call you to arrange a time to interview you at your convenience. The interview will be scheduled for one hour. I would travel to your institution for the interview. While there will be some structured questions, most of the interview will be open-ended to allow you time to talk freely about your views and suggestions. I will take notes of your comments throughout the interview; with your permission I would also like to tape record the interviews for transcription. Should you wish not to be recorded you can still participate in the interview relying solely on my interview notes for accuracy and/or you are free to do the questionnaire only.

The only foreseeable inconvenience associated with this research is the amount of time required to participate in the interview. I do not anticipate any risks to participants. Pseudonyms will be used in reporting the study and all comments will remain confidential. If you would like to review drafts or transcripts of your interviews, or a copy of the final report, I would be happy to provide them.

Participation in this study is, of course, strictly voluntary and should you decline to participate it will have no effect on your employment or advancement. You may also withdraw from the study at any time without effect upon your employment or advancement. Should you withdraw during the study all interview data will be destroyed and not used in the final analysis. A summary of the results will be posted when the research is complete and you will receive an email notification when this occurs. You may obtain a full copy of the report by e-mailing the researcher. The results of this study may be presented at scholarly conferences, published in professional journals, or presented in class lectures. No individual result will be released; only grouped (aggregate) data will be presented. The data will be securely stored by Jason Maitland

for two years on a computer with password protected access after which the data will be destroyed.

I appreciate your consideration of this matter and I hope that you will be able to participate in the study. Your participation will benefit policy administrators and faculty alike as we move forward in the field of e-learning.

Should you have any questions I can be contacted at… By signing below, you will indicate your willingness to participate in this study and to be audio taped during the interview.

Signature of Participant Date

Appendix G

Face-to-Face Interview Field Guide

Listed below are topics to be addressed in each interview. All questions will be open-ended and non-dichotomous. Briefly restate cover story concerning the purpose of the study, the topic to be researched, confidentiality, and use of findings.

1. In your opinion how does e-learning fit with the institutions vision?
2. From your perspective how does the faculty feel about teaching online?
3. Can you describe the e-learning policy creation process?
4. What forces internal to the institution have influenced e-learning policy creation?
5. What forces external the institution have influenced e-learning policy creation?
6. What policies are in place to support faculty in an e-learning environment?
7. Can you describe the effectiveness of the above e-learning policies?
8. What attributes of the policies have been ineffective?
9. How would you compare the process for creating policies for e-learning compared to traditional face-to-face instruction?
10. What e-learning policies support optimal student learning?
11. Describe the impact e-learning policies have on teaching online.
12. How are e-learning policies shared with faculty?
13. What procedures or process in place to evaluate e-learning policies?
14. What can System Administration do to develop more effective e-learning policies?
15. Anything not covered that you would like to discuss?