

INTERACT INTEGRATE IMPACT

Proceedings of the 20th Annual Conference
of the Australasian Society for Computers in
Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE)

Adelaide, Australia
7–10 December 2003

Editors

Geoffrey Crisp, Di Thiele, Ingrid Scholten, Sandra Barker, Judi Baron

Citations of works should have the following format:

Author, A. & Writer B. (2003). Paper title: What it's called. In G.Crisp, D.Thiele, I.Scholten, S.Barker and J.Baron (Eds), *Interact, Integrate, Impact: Proceedings of the 20th Annual Conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education*. Adelaide, 7-10 December 2003.

ISBN CDROM 0-9751702-1-X WEB 0-9751702-2-8



Published by ASCILITE www.ascilite.org.au

MAINSTREAMING ONLINE DELIVERY: STAFF EXPERIENCE AND PERCEPTIONS

Linda Pannan and Jim McGovern

ASSETT Research Group (Advancing Scholarship and Science Education through Technology)
Faculty of Applied Science, RMIT University, AUSTRALIA
linda.pannan@rmit.edu.au, jim.mcgovern@rmit.edu.au

Abstract

If the benefits of online learning and flexibility of access are to be extended to all courses and students, then online development and delivery must become a sustainable mainstream activity for the majority of academic staff. This paper describes a teacher-centred approach to online course development where teaching staff own the process and the output. The intention of this strategy is not only to engage a wide range of staff in producing online material, but also to provide online resources that are appropriate for their students, their courses and their discipline.

A sample of university teachers involved to varying degrees in online development were surveyed to acquire feedback on the strategy, to provide a baseline for future assessment, and to help re-shape the strategy for the future. The response indicated that the strategy is appropriate. Major issues emphasised in the feedback are the view that for on-campus students, online delivery is best used to supplement face-to-face delivery, and the overwhelming view that more resources are needed to do the job well.

Keywords

Online development management, flexible delivery, staff development, online pedagogy

Introduction

Australian universities have been grappling with online education since the early 1990's when the Internet and the World-Wide-Web (Web) first emerged as a practical learning medium. Initially, 'early adopters' worked independently, but since the mid 1990's, institutional approaches, starting with distance education providers, have become commonplace. This has resulted in many Australian universities venturing into global markets, and the Web becoming the medium of choice for distance education. Online delivery is finding its way slowly into the mainstream of university education, as a new and valuable tool with its own place.

RMIT, like many universities, is aiming to provide an appropriate online presence for all of its programs and courses, and has provided significant investment in IT infrastructure and online development and delivery. Kenny (2001) provides a good description of some of the issues in the implementation of this project. It is not intended that all courses be fully online, rather that they have an online presence to supplement a primarily face-to-face teaching environment. Some courses may provide a mixed mode of face-to-face and online learning experiences, and a few, strategically important courses, will provide online only learning environments. A task of this scale requires 'mainstreaming' of online delivery consideration, and processes and infrastructure that support all academic staff in creating and using appropriate online presences for their courses.

This paper addresses issues surrounding academic involvement in online delivery, many identified by McDonald and Reushle (2002). It reports results of a survey, gauging staff experience and perceptions of

the issues and their importance, and considers how they may affect opportunities to establish use of online resources in course delivery as mainstream academic activity.

Issues in mainstreaming online delivery

Mainstreaming online delivery presents a number of challenges. As Richardson (2001) noted, most staff have not bought into online delivery, and it is very much a fringe activity undertaken by an enthusiastic minority. Staff have a wide variety of capabilities, in terms of technical literacy as well as ability to implement appropriate online pedagogy. They have different aspirations in terms of the courseware they produce. For some, 'web enhancing', where face-to-face courses are extended by online resources and activity, or 'web mounting' where the primary aim is to provide access to traditional printed notes, exercises and assignments via the web (Ellis and Phelps, 2000) will be achievable and appropriate. Others will be satisfied with nothing less than fully re-designed, student centred courseware that can operate in a fully online mode. These latter courses are likely to need a development team and project based approach. For all developments, however, some level of technical skill as well as instructional design skill is needed. Online pedagogy needs to be addressed, especially, if the courseware is to exploit the technology and support resource-based, and constructivist models, rather than the linear learning paths inherent in many online courses (Richardson, 2001).

User-friendly tools and support mechanisms, such as workshops and forums, are essential in supporting such a broad range of staff needs. Limiting choice by providing templates and standard tools are ways to simplify processes (Sheely, Veness and Rankine, 2001). Team-based approaches and use of staged models (Ellis and Phelps, 2000; Bennett, Priest and McPherson, 1999) help with variable entry point capabilities. Considering online development as a learning exercise for staff and using problem-based learning approaches have been used (Burns, 2002). Peer involvement and mentoring have an important role to play as well. Bennett et al. (1999) report that almost all of those involved in online projects continue to discuss these after the project is complete. As pointed out by Richardson (2001), online delivery needs to be built into the career structure of academics.

Benefits of online delivery cover a number of aspects. From an institutional view, they are seen as ways of reducing costs (Bennett et al., 1999; Richardson, 2001), or to 'do more with less' (Sheely et al., 2001). Fully online courses can increase revenue by reaching new off-campus students. From a teaching perspective, an open 'publishing' process can help produce better material (Sheely et al., 2001), and is claimed to improve face-to-face teaching (Richardson, 2001). From a student's perspective, access to online material provides more flexible access for a student body that is more likely to work at least part-time. Appropriately used, online material can provide improved learning (Richardson, 2001; Bennett et al., 1999).

The problems are often reported as lack of resources. Staff need time to learn the tools and how to develop online courses, time to develop courses, and time to deliver and evaluate their courses (Sumner and Hostetler, 1999). Time is an increasingly rare commodity in higher education. Staff need support, both pedagogical and technical.

The tension between university management and academic staff is an issue. Academic staff traditionally have distrusted central administration preferring collegial decision-making and academic freedom. In the post-Dawkins era of lower resources, many see higher education management adopting a corporate service industry model (for example, Taylor, Gough, Bundrock and Winter, 1998), and online delivery as a top-down technological solution to resource and funding issues. But, at least parts of online delivery will be best supported from a uniform centralised approach. Centralised provision of complex, reliable IT infrastructure, complex software, such as Learning Management Systems, and development of templates and processes are critical to the overall success of online delivery. For online approaches to enter mainstream teaching practice staff need to appreciate 'the motivation behind moves to online learning [since this] can bring a significant influence to bear on both the effectiveness of ... the learning design and outcomes that will result.' (Gunn, 2001). A major role in developing online delivery at the program level is to manage this tension between institutional imperatives and academic staff.

A Teacher-Centred Strategy

It has been argued that for online delivery to be effective, the teacher must be at the centre of development, with online development led by learning and teachers, and not by technology and technologists (Bennett et al., 1999; McGovern, Pannan and van der Craats, 2001; van der Craats, McGovern and Pannan, 2002). The role of the central group is to provide infrastructure, software and specialist expertise that can be used to enable development by those who understand the courses and their associated learning objectives.

For mainstream online development to be sustainable, it must be embedded in the every day working life and practices of academic staff, and it must be accommodated in academic workloads. This requires an attitudinal change, which is much harder than providing technical support and IT infrastructure (Burns, 2002). Our approach is based on ethical notions of dignity for staff, and on the tradition of academic freedom, or of the right of staff, not only to determine what they teach, but how to teach it. It is also good applied psychology and management practice; those who exert most control over their working life are happier, healthier and more productive.

Implementing the Strategy

The University has addressed online delivery of strategic programs through its Strategic Course Renewal (SCR) program. These are project-based and supported by central facilities. The Faculty has addressed support for the more routine development of online delivery as well as its SCR projects in two broad ways. In the first, we address application, technical, organisational and environmental factors that impact on development efficiency and delivery effectiveness, similar to those described by Sumner and Hostetler (1999), through provision of committees, structures, support groups, forum and workshops, and mentoring. These deal with motivation, sharing of goals, information flow to and from the central organisation, communication between developers, celebration of success, provision of resources, lobbying for resources, maintaining the development and delivery infrastructure, and interfacing with the central University system. The organisational and technical framework is more fully described by McGovern et al. (2001).

In the second, our development framework supports an iterative, or evolving, approach to creation of online resources and courses; this iterative approach differs from, and complements, the centralised project based approach. We offer 5 levels of development and recognises that not all courses need to use online resources completely, nor do they need to use every online delivery tool right from the start. Online resources can be developed incrementally. The level chosen for development may be determined to best match the subject context, student needs, and a teacher's individual requirements, experience and resources. Each level has its own particular demands and meets different outcomes. These levels can be traversed slowly, with several development iterations possible as the personal skills of the staff involved are enhanced, student demand increases and most importantly the learning needs of students are identified. As such, it supports a user-centred approach to online course design (Blythe, 2001), where the designer is able to develop their course in response to feedback from users. This development framework is more fully described by van der Craats et al. (2002).

Assessing the Strategy

The strategy has received some positive feedback. University-wide student experience questionnaires indicate that the Faculty's on-campus students enjoy a high degree of availability of online material, and by-and-large find it useful (Scarlett, 2001). While acknowledging that this is not due solely to the efforts of the Faculty, new students in Africa and Vietnam, nationally and internationally through OLA, have gained access to Australian higher education. There is still considerable potential for further online delivery. A cohort of new staff have been introduced to online development, following on from the early adopters or pathfinders, but there are still many more staff who have not embraced online learning.

How is the strategy working with staff, and how can it be improved? Through a survey of academic staff in the Faculty, it was aimed to gain an insight into the motivation for using online delivery; how are they engaged in online delivery, what are the perceived benefits, their ambitions for further work, and what are the barriers to this? The survey was not intended as a definitive study but, rather, to serve as a checkpoint on progress and an indicator of areas for more detailed investigation. The survey requested a mixture of qualitative and scored responses to questions about the identified issues. It was emailed to all academic staff of the Faculty and hardcopies were made available to those who visited the Faculty's Learning Resource Centre (FLRC) over a period of a week in November, 2002. Twenty-six academic staff responded, some anonymously by internal mail, others used email. The sample includes a random selection across each science discipline in the Faculty; it spans the spectrum from those with direct experience of our iterative framework while working on online delivery projects through to others who have never had contact with the FLRC. Although we cannot determine to what degree the sample is representative of all our staff it does provide a timely snapshot of staff reaction to online learning across the Faculty.

The questions presented in the survey required either a written response, selection of a suitable level on a given scale, or selection and ranking of suggested responses combined with staff volunteered responses. Written comments were encouraged throughout. The remainder of the paper presents the summarised results as tables of collated responses identified either

- preceded by an asterisk - indicating a survey suggested response
- enclosed in quotation marks - indicating a staff volunteered response

or as further described in text accompanying each table. The original questionnaire and the data are available from the authors.

Engaging with online delivery

In order to engage new staff, it is important to discover how staff were motivated to become involved in online activity. In aiming to engage staff, a Learning Technology Mentor (LTM) scheme was used, as well as a number of forums, workshops and small grants for action learning projects. In most cases LTMs were early adopters who had experimented with online delivery for some time. Table 1 shows that most staff were motivated by their colleagues. A similar trend was seen in their reported source of their initial awareness of the potential value of online delivery in their teaching. We would expect that both would primarily have occurred due to encouragement by the LTMs. It also reflects the low direct link between institutional imperatives and engagement in online delivery, and the importance of mediating this link.

<i>Source of Motivation</i>	<i>Score</i>
* Colleagues	14
* Self-motivation	8
* Forums and workshops	8
'Institutional expectations'	2
'Moved into pre-existing online courses/environment'	1
* Research literature	1
'Undertaking a project/formal course of study'	1

Table 1: Motivation for engaging in online delivery.

Tools used

Staff were asked to indicate their frequency of use of a range of tools and technology. Scores were derived from the frequency of use of the tool or technology (4 for used often, down to 0 for never used; the maximum possible score is 104, if all respondents indicate frequent use.). Table 2 shows a not unexpected weighting towards tools that staff were already using. This supports the view that easy to use software is critical (Bennett et al., 1999), and that effort toward building easy to use tools, as well as training in more complex tools will be worthwhile.

<i>Digital technology/online delivery tools used</i>	<i>Score</i>
Internet (existing sites)	91
e-mail	90
MS Word	90
MS PowerPoint	75
HTML	56
PDF files	55
Online quiz/tests	50
Learning Management Systems	50
Sound, graphics, image files	44
Discussion forums/newsgroups	41
Standalone web-site	37
Authoring tools (Front Page/Dreamweaver)	22
Animation tools (Flash)	14

Table 2. Usage of digital technology/online tools.

Purpose of online delivery

Staff were asked to indicate for what purpose they used the online technology in their teaching. They were able to select three from six suggested purposes and/or to specify any other, and the total has been derived from this data. Table 3 shows that most common usage was in fairly basic online delivery, with the overwhelming majority of use as an adjunct to face-to-face delivery.

<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Total</i>
* Distribute course notes (Web mounting)	20
* To provide additional resources (Web enhancing)	17
* To better monitor student learning	16
* To link to relevant web sites	16
* As a substitute for face-to-face teaching	7
* To help reflect on my teaching	6
'Better communication with and between students'	5
Other	3

Table 3. Major teaching purpose of online development.

Perceived effectiveness of online material

Staff were asked to rank their perceptions of the effectiveness of online learning. Table 4 shows their emphasis towards the use of online resources as an adjunct to face-to-face delivery.

<i>Effectiveness response</i>	<i>Total</i>
* Very effective if used to augment face-to-face learning	16
* Still learning how to use it more effectively	12
* It improves the student learning experience	10
* Only/more appropriate in some disciplines	4
* Moderately effective in limited teaching/learning situations	4
'What we do is only an electronic text book at best'	1
'The technology fails and frustrates students'	1
* It is not at all effective	1

Table 4: Perceptions of the effectiveness of online delivery.

Resourcing the development and delivery of online material

In a similar way staff were asked to indicate the ways they provided the time necessary to develop

their online material, and then manage its use in their student learning. The responses were totalled and are shown in Table 5. (Note that the hatch symbol, #, is used here to identify the survey supplied responses in the question about resourcing delivery of online materials.) In most cases, it reflects the traditional academic approach to workload peaks - with no official hours of work, they often do additional work out of hours, and at home. A greater volume and variation in responses to the question of resourcing development of their online materials indicates that staff have more options for assistance with this aspect, but appear to take virtually sole responsibility for delivery of the materials. The sample suggests that many staff consider online development and delivery to be a part of their normal academic work, however, although approximately a third of the sample reported that online materials saved them time, a smaller but significant number stated that they 'can't cope with the extra load'.

<i>Resourcing strategy</i>	<i>Development Total *</i>	<i>Delivery Total #</i>
*# I work many additional hours	19	12
*# It is part of my normal work	15	11
* Faculty multi-media people help me	5	-
*# Casual staff employed to help	5	0
* Department/School IT staff help me	4	-
'I use existing material from my colleagues'	2	-
*# Tutors develop material/ respond to students	1	1
'Other work, such as research, is displaced'	1	1
# It saves time	1	8
# I can't cope with the extra load	-	5

Table 5. Resourcing online development and use.

Skill development

Staff were asked to indicate skills that they had developed. The responses are totalled and shown in Table 6. The focus is clearly on student learning experience. The importance rating was very scattered in their responses, possibly reflecting adoption of the technology in a variety of areas as dictated by student learning needs in their particular subject areas.

<i>Skill</i>	<i>Total</i>
* Ways of integrating online material to enhance student learning	18
* Effective use of e-mail and/or discussion forums	17
* Ability to use a Learning Management System	16
* Download and use image, sounds and material from the Web	11
* Ability to provide flexible learning paths for students	9
* Evaluation of the effectiveness of my online material	5
Other	2

Table 6: Staff skills developed.

Hopes for the future in online learning, and barriers to achieving them

Staff were asked an open-ended question about their hopes for the future, and barriers to achieving these aims. They were also provided with space for general comments. The responses are grouped around some common themes.

Further Development of Online Pedagogy

Staff commonly expressed a wish to further develop their own abilities, primarily in support of student learning. It does provide some indication that the teacher-centred, iterative approach is successful in providing an entry path to an interest in more advanced tools. Typical responses:

- ‘I would like to develop more interactive & novel learning resources - good enough to make the online resource as useful as face-to-face teaching.’
- ‘Ability to create my own animations would be advantageous’
- ‘I would also like to make more use of discussion groups.’
- ‘That we learn to use it to generate student enthusiasm in learning by providing varied learning environments.’
- ‘That I learn how to use WebLearn for student quizzes to provide better feedback on learning achievements.’
- ‘Department/course material still establishing presence “online”, not much qualitative or quantitative measurement of specific learning outcomes [has] been performed.’
- ‘Significant further work will be required to develop online materials that approximate the interaction possible with a live teacher. I suspect that this will continue to be a goal for some time to come.’
- ‘Online learning resources do not solve every T[eaching] & L[earning] problem, but reasonably well presented material is appreciated by students.’
- ‘“Online resources”: OK...”Online delivery”: difficult to achieve high quality outcomes.’

Supplementing Face-to-Face Delivery

A strong theme in interaction with staff is the emphasis of staff on use of online material as a supplement to face-to-face learning. This may be in part a reaction to the initial emphasis on fully online courses for distance education and global markets. It seems that this is developing as the main use for online education. Both staff and students are adamant that the on-campus should not be replaced by fully online education, and that the option of face-to-face is important for some. Typical responses follow.

- ‘Best used when it supplements face-to-face not replaces it!’
- ‘I believe that it is important to avoid seeing online and CBT as a complete replacement for more conventional teaching methods.’
- ‘That it won’t take over, and [that it] eventually becomes an important & useful adjunct to other methods.’
- ‘I believe online learning will become a common practice and we shall give students the choice of attending face-to-face or remote (flexible) learning.’
- ‘I enjoyed using technology to complement my face-to-face teaching. I can’t imagine teaching without the aid of technology now.’
- ‘Students do not like online materials as substitutes for lectures.’
- ‘I believe that online materials help students to learn quicker and better, but it cannot totally replace face-to-face learning/teaching. I find that online alone is not motivating enough to learn. Better online tools, particularly interactive tools help to motivate the learning process.’
- ‘Online delivery must be considered realistically as a potentially valuable alternative to textbooks etc as a *resource*. Not as a potential alternative to classes, teaching, interaction with like-minded peers etc.’

Assistance and Resources of Online Development

Some staff expressed a desire for more assistance.

- ‘Staff should be free to choose methods they are comfortable with, but should be assisted in ways such as providing support staff with useful skills or offering templates so that everybody’s course pages can look cohesive.’
- ‘that the potential of online learning resources is realised via a more efficient/effective process than individuals having to develop them from scratch or seek them out of the infinite mire (WWW).’
- ‘Improvements beyond what already exists can be made only by having dedicated discipline-trained support staff who can lead the development of these materials.’
- ‘Development and publishing of online material is very time consuming and involves skills that are not necessarily the specialty of those expected to do it. Eg. Programming/graphic design/use of specialised software that takes time to become familiar with. (c.f writing your own textbook). Finding existing resources is also time consuming - there are MANY resources, most of which are poor quality substitutes for face-to-face teaching. Good quality resources take time to find and assess. Then their

mode of use must be designed.’

- ‘There does not seem to be an easy way of putting my material online where I am “in control” of the process. I have to be skilled in or find the time to learn how to use video clips, etc to enhance my learning material. I do not regard placing plain text in learning modules as part of “online learning” ‘.
- ‘My guesstimate is that developing *good* online materials will typically require 5-10 times as much time as is required to develop materials for conventional lecture presentation. If there is to be a major effort to develop these materials, then there will also need to be allowance for the effort required in developing them. Further, there will need to be allowance for the maintenance of the materials since they will become dated over time.’
- ‘It would be advantageous to have animators etc who were familiar with the discipline itself.’
- ‘Graphical material is particularly time consuming. Scanning of images produces much larger files than new drawings. This is significant given relatively slow download times for students from home.’

Concern about Over-Regulation

A common concern of early adopters, faced with centralised institutional approaches is that at best processes will create work, and at worst, a central group will dictate the overall approach. Some commented on this as follows.

- ‘That the thrill and the spontaneity of providing materials online is not destroyed by over-regulation.’
- ‘[The University] needs to provide tools, templates, support and training to help staff produce high quality online material, but it should not be mandating particular technology. Many times when a sweeping technology decision is made, (Novell, A[cademic] M[anagement] S[ystem], Blackboard, webboard, ...) it is made badly. Often HTML is just as easy and more effective.’
- ‘The time commitment to develop *good* online material is HUGE & not justifiable in current learning climate - need *real* technical support. ‘Teaching relief’ is NOT the answer; too many resources go into ‘management’ (unproductive!) and not enough into resources for staff developing material. What we *do* need: help with typing up material, html programming (by people familiar with science), software tools. What we *don’t* need: bureaucracy, restrictive ‘guidelines’, forms to fill in every time we want a new subject site on the [RMIT] D[istributed] L[earning] S[ystem].’

Barriers to achieving online courses

The answers to this question were dominated by the need for more time to develop online material.

- ‘Greatest barrier - TIME to do a thorough and first class standard.’
- ‘Biggest barrier is time to develop further use of online material.’
- ‘The main barrier is the time taken to develop suitable material.’
- ‘... but need time & resources.’
- ‘Even ...[with expert help], it is so time-consuming and very discouraging.’
- ‘The main barrier I see is academic time and workload.’
- ‘To do this type of thing properly requires time, and in computer science it requires time to frequently update it.’
- ‘Preparation of online materials should be counted as part of a teaching load.’
- ‘Barriers are my time and funds to resource this.’
- ‘Barriers - \$, time.’
- ‘I have barely started and time constraints are a definite hurdle.’
- ‘... but you need heaps of time to practice.’
- ‘Barrier: Time!!’
- ‘We need to allow for **more time** to further develop and maintain existing online courses.’
- ‘... on line is VERY VERY expensive to do well. What is needed is basic software, and lots of time!’
- ‘Barrier - time to find out how.’
- ‘The main barrier I face to the development of online materials is time.’

Other barriers include insufficient support staff, training, software and equipment. Some staff indicated that understanding of online pedagogy in general was a barrier, others disappointment at University and Department-level understanding of their efforts and direct support for their work.

Discussion

Most staff were motivated by colleagues, indicating that mentoring is important and that as more staff become involved this in itself may lead to greater interest in involvement. The quantitative responses suggest that most staff are engaging in a relatively low level use of technology, and that use of online pedagogy was relatively unsophisticated. The qualitative data indicates a desire to use more sophisticated tools, such as animation, and an increasing interest in online pedagogy.

Major uses at this point are web mounting and web enhancing as enhancements to face-to-face teaching, with only a few having fully online courses, or even wanting to have fully online courses. For most on-campus courses, the aim is not to provide fully online courses, but eventually to efficiently improve student learning through appropriate use of online material. The relatively low level of sophistication in the engagement in online delivery should not be a cause for major concern. Hopefully, it is the first entry for some and as their confidence, understanding and capability grows, and tools improve, they will engage at a more sophisticated level. The sample suggested that most staff had improved their ability to support student learning and to use tools, such as discussion forums that can accelerate learning.

A recurring theme through the responses is that online material is a useful adjunct to face-to-face teaching and should not replace face-to-face teaching entirely. This may reflect staff uncertainty in an environment of lower resources. It also does not reflect the University and Faculty views, both of which continually promote appropriate use to provide flexibility and enhance student learning. It may reflect early misconceptions that content would be a commodity and that online delivery would be the only option, to the obvious detriment of staff, but also to a perceived detriment to student learning and the overall campus experience. The aim of our teacher-centred approach is to make teaching staff central to online development and delivery and to let them guide appropriate use of online technology for their courses and area of study. It may be that this is, as yet, not clear to academics not directly in touch with the FLRC since the strategic courses still very visibly dominate the horizon as they attract the bulk of the funding and follow the SCR project based development approach. Since these courses are aimed at off-campus students and high demand fully online programs, it may be that the academics involved in these projects are seen to be mere content providers and as having lost control over the delivery and use of materials they develop.

A major theme is the resourcing of online development and delivery. Often, resources allocated are token amounts only, meant to provide some assistance and recognition. It may be that the total time and effort required is variable across courses and teachers and difficult to estimate. Success-fully moving from early adopters who pursue this from an interest perspective, to mainstreaming of online delivery, needs better estimates of resources, and adequate workload allocation to accommodate the additional work. This is of particular importance early in the transition when staff must develop new skills and appropriate strategies to manage the online workload that differs greatly to face-to-face (McDonald and Reushle, 2002). A key role of online development support is to further enhance staff skills, both in the technology and online pedagogy, so that they are better placed to become efficient in delivery, in particular, and in maintaining their online learning materials. Notably, however, to effect the mainstreaming conversion, the sample revealed that staff need to be convinced that their online efforts are effective in terms of student learning - and the potential for development of an ethos of regular evaluation in this context is encouraging.

Early adopters often expressed concern that the University, in 'discovering' the potential of online learning, would exert control and stifle innovation. The institutional approach, particularly for SCR projects has certainly introduced some processes and controls. While a few respondents expressed concern, it did not seem to be an issue for most of those sampled.

Finally, another commonly held view that was not clearly supported from the sample, is that online development leads to improvement in teaching as staff are forced to articulate and to question the pedagogy they have adopted and been comfortable with in face-to-face delivery. One or two respondents indicated some support for this, but overall, given the opportunity to make any comments about online delivery, this would not appear to be a major consideration.

Conclusion

An exploratory sampling of staff views on aspects of the work done to date on mainstreaming online delivery provides some useful feedback that the strategy is proceeding reasonably well. The qualitative responses to the survey questions, in particular, indicate an evolving practical approach, as well as an emphasis on issues around student learning. Support through further skill development, including awareness and application of online pedagogy, negotiation of workloads, accurate advice of institutional motives, and provision of simple access and Faculty processes appear to be necessary elements in establishing the use of online resources in teaching as a routine academic activity. The major issue highlighted is the need for resources to do this work well. In the current climate of tighter university budgets, it is hard to see where these will come from, but successful and sustainable mainstreaming of online delivery may be difficult without them.

References

- Bennett, S., Priest, A. and McPherson, C. (1999). Learning about online learning: An approach to staff development for university teachers. *Aust J Educational Technology*. 15(3), 207-221.
- Blythe, S. (2001). Designing online courses: user-centred practice. *Computers and Composition*, 18(4), 329-346.
- Burns, R. (2002). Models of Knowing, Learning, Delivering: An initiative using the application of Problem Based Learning for Staff Development to support the move to online learning in two contrasting departments in HE in Ireland. *Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association*. University of Exeter, England, 12-14 September 4.
- Ellis, A. and Phelps, R. (2000). Staff development for online delivery: A collaborative, team based action learning model. *Aust J Educational Technology*. 16(1), 26-44.
- Gunn, C. (2001). Effective online teaching - how far do the frameworks go? *Proceedings of 18th Annual Conference of ASCILITE*, Dec 9-11 2001, University of Melbourne, pp235-244.
- Kenny, J. (2001). Where Academia Meets Management: A Model for the Effective Development of Quality Learning Material Using New Technologies. *Proceedings of 18th Annual Conference of ASCILITE*, Dec 9-11 2001, University of Melbourne, pp327-334.
- McDonald, J. and Reushle, s. (2002). Charting the role of the online teacher in Higher Education: Winds of change. *Proceedings of 19th Annual Conference of ASCILITE*, Dec 8-11 2002, University of Melbourne, pp431-440.
- McGovern, J., Pannan L. and van der Craats, C. (2001). Large-Scale Delivery of Web-Based University Courses: The Experience of One Science Faculty, *Proceedings of 7th Australian World Wide Web Conference, AusWeb01*, 235-246.
- Richardson, J. (2001). Changes and challenges of academic lives through the introduction of virtual learning environments. *SCUTREA 31st Annual conference*. 3-5 July, Uni of East London
- Scarlett, S. (2002). *RMIT Program Experience Survey 2002 - University Wide Report* (pp 1-4) & *Faculty Report* (pp 1-4), Prepared for Student Feedback Project, by Quality Consultancy Unit, RMIT University.
- Sheely, S., Veness, D. and Rankine, L. (2001). Building the Web Interactive Study Environment: Mainstreaming online teaching and learning at the University of Western Sydney. *Aust J Educational Technology*. 17(1), 80-95.
- Sumner, M. and Hostetler, D. (1999). Factors influencing Adoption of Technology in Teaching. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*. 40(1), 81-87.
- Taylor, T., Gough, J., Bundrock, V. and Winter, R. (1998). A bleak outlook: Academic staff perceptions of change in core activities in Australian higher education, 1991-96. *Studies in Higher Education*. Abingdon; Oct.
- Van der Craats, C., McGovern, J. and Pannan. L (2002). A Five-level Approach to the Large-Scale Development of Online Programs. *Proceedings of 19th Annual Conference of ASCILITE*. December 8-11 2002, Unitec, Auckland, NZ, pp 681-690.

Copyright © 2003 Linda Pannan and Jim McGovern.

The author(s) assign to ASCILITE and educational non-profit institutions a non-exclusive licence to use this document for personal use and in courses of instruction provided that the article is used in full and this copyright statement is reproduced. The author(s) also grant a non-exclusive licence to ASCILITE to publish this document in full on the World Wide Web (prime sites and mirrors) and in printed form within the ASCILITE 2003 conference proceedings. Any other usage is prohibited without the express permission of the author(s).