2002

Administrators' And Adult Students' Perceptions Of Quality Indicators For Off -Campus Programs

Connie Sue Butler
Indiana State University

CONNIE S. BUTLER

Education:

Ph.D. Educational Administration in Higher Education
Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana
Completed coursework Summer 2000
Completed preliminary exams Fall 2001
Anticipated graduation Fall 2002

M.S. Guidance and Counseling, Fall 1996
Concentration: Student Personnel Services in Higher Education
Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois

B.A. Board of Governors Bachelor of Arts Degree, Spring 1995
Course emphasis: Psychology
Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois

Employment:

Consultant Eastern Illinois University, School of Adult and Continuing Education, Charleston, Illinois August 1999-August 2000

Coordinator of Sponsored Credit Programs. Eastern Illinois University, School of Adult and Continuing Education, Charleston, Illinois
October 1994-August 1999

Teaching Experience:

Fall 1996: EDF 4998, "Trends in Adult Education," Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois

Summer 1999: EDF 3985, "Process, Procedures and Practices for the Adult Learner," Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois

Fall 1999 and Spring 2000: EDU 100, "Introduction to Education," and PSY 274, "Child Development," Lake Land College, Mattoon, Illinois

Spring 2001: CSD 5750, "Governance and Finance in Higher Education," Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois

ADMINISTRATORS' AND ADULT STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF QUALITY INDICATORS FOR OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The School of Graduate Studies

Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Connie S. Butler

December 2002

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation of Connie S. Butler, Contribution to the School of Graduate Studies, Indiana State University, Series III, Number 930, under the title *Administrators' and Adult Students' Perceptions of Quality Indicators for Off-Campus Programs* is approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree.

11-8-02
Date

Committee Chairperson

Committee Member

Committee Member

12/17/02
Date

For the School of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. The focus of the research was based on the perceptions of two distinct groups: administrators at Eastern Illinois University and adult students enrolled in off-campus courses at Eastern Illinois University. The study also sought to provide a list of designated quality indicators to be used by Eastern Illinois University and other higher education institutions with similar characteristics to evaluate off-campus programs. There are twenty-six quality indicators that this research identified grouped in 5 categories:

1. Institution
2. Administrative Function
3. Program Strategies
4. Student Services
5. Instructional Strategies

A further outcome was to determine any significant difference in administrators and administrators with faculty status in their perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs. The study found 19.3 percent of quality indicators rated had a significant difference for the comparison of adult students and administrators. The highest significant difference was found in Recruitment. In all three rounds indicators showing a significant difference received a higher overall mean rating from

administrators. This indicated that administrators were in higher agreement with them as quality indicators for off-campus programs compared to adult students.

Significant difference was found in 22.8 percent for the comparison of administrator and administrator with faculty status. The highest significant difference was found in Mission of Institution. In all three rounds indicators showing a significant difference received a higher overall mean rating from administrators with faculty status. This indicated that administrators with faculty status were in higher agreement with them as quality indicators for off-campus programs compared to administrators. A total of 57 quality indicators were rated during this study with 26 designated as quality indicators for off-campus programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation committee for their help in the completion of this study. Dr. Gregory Ulm, Chair of my dissertation committee, helped me with the overall format for the study and its development in final form. I appreciate his patience and understanding. I appreciate the mentorship of Dr. William C. Hine in administering adult programs. His inspiration has prompted me to conduct this study to better understand development of adult programs. Dr. Dale Findley provided encouragement and challenged me to do my best in developing and conducting this study. I am also grateful to Dr. Bill Gibbs for developing and hosting the web survey and providing results at a distance. Finally, I am indebted to my family for their support and spurring me on through my years of coursework as an adult student.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

American society is undergoing changes that impact us personally and professionally. The population is growing, living longer and healthier lives. Traditional patterns of family life and work are changing. Women, notably mothers, many divorced, are joining the work force in unprecedented numbers. There are more single women supporting families today than ever before. The notion of a single career line no longer holds. Job changing in mid-career has reached an all-time high. Many adults are completing degrees to find better jobs, receive a promotion or an increase in pay. The pace of technology is exponentially rising, facilitating a knowledge explosion. Employers are seeking to employ those that are trained in the use of this new technology and further expect that higher education institutions will produce capable working adults for them to hire. Downsizing and layoffs cause competition for new jobs and adults need training to compete. Due to these changes in society and the desire for increased job satisfaction, self-esteem and quality of life, institutions all over our country have had an influx of the older student population. This spectacular increase of older adult students in colleges and universities is already being called an adult revolution.

There are many changes in life that may cause adults to return to school. Aslanian and Brickell (1980), proposed a "triggers and transitions" theory that related the adult's decision to return to school to developmental issues and crises faced during mid-

life. Transitions may include changes related to career, marital status or family situation, leisure, or other life roles. Transitions require new knowledge, skills, and/or credentials that often lead people back to college (Benshoff, 1993). According to Gordon (1992), the highest rated factor for returning to school is professional advancement.

Older students now constitute a larger fraction of educational enrollment than ever before. The proportion of traditional college-age students has declined while the proportion of older people returning to school has grown steadily. The total enrollment for students aged 24 or younger grew 25.1 percent between 1970 and 1990, compared with 154.5 percent for students 25 and older. In 1970, students aged 25 and over composed just over one-quarter of all enrolled students (27.8 percent) and just one-tenth (11.0 percent) of full-time students. By 1990, these figures had grown to 43.9 percent of all students and 21.6 percent of full-time students (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 1996).

According to goal five of the National Education Goals, by the year 2000, every adult American will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. Based on this, should higher education promote the acquisition of education among older students? Adult education has become too important a source of educational investment to ignore. If increasing the educational levels of the population is a national goal, evidence from the recent past suggests that adult education is an important source for training and development. Policies designed to promote educational acquisition by the general population should include adult students as one of the target populations. Changes in

social policies such as welfare reform should be designed to facilitate rather than inhibit the lifelong acquisition of additional education (Jacobs and Stoner-Eby, 1998).

Adult students now account for nearly half of all college enrollments. Harvard, Johns Hopkins, New York University, and the University of California at San Diego are profiting handsomely from the trend. This explosion of interest in extended learning is like manna from heaven for educators. It's a gift that will keep on giving, thanks to the characteristics of the back-to-school crowd. The fastest-growing segment happens to be among the nation's most affluent and fastest-growing age group. Nearly half of 35-54-year olds took adult-education courses in 1995, up from just 17 percent in 1984. Older people are hitting the books, too; one in five people aged 55 and older took at least one class in 1995 (Speer, 1996). Adult education classes tend to be profitable for colleges because they are often taught by adjunct faculty members, and because instruction occurs when classroom buildings would otherwise be empty, at night, over the weekends, and during the summer. Many institutions use revenue from adult programs to subsidize other areas, such as graduate-student research or undergraduate programs (Gose, 1999).

Boom times in adult education can translate into a bonanza for struggling colleges and universities, but it is not a given. "Whatever the national trends are for people going back to school, some education providers will win, and others will lose," says Dorothy Durkin, Associate Dean of New York University's School of Continuing Education (Speer, 1996). Students purchase their education as they do other products by shopping around. With the use of technology to deliver courses, students have more choices than ever. Some universities compete fiercely for adult students. Educators have learned that

the right adult learning product can trigger a virtual stampede. This trend toward customizing adult education is certain to continue (Speer, 1996).

Statement of the Problem

Adult education consumers are applying pressure on institutions for better services and quality adult education programs. Higher education administrators are reexamining how to provide a quality program to meet the needs of this older student population. What indicates quality to the adult student? What indicates quality to administrators? These are important questions that need to be answered. Due to the growth of nontraditional course offerings, the revenue produced, and the competition for students, administrators need to provide high quality nontraditional programs for adult students. An assessment of administrators' and adult students' perceptions is designed to answer one research question: Is there a difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for adult education programs at Eastern Illinois University?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this survey study was to determine if there is a significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. This study was based upon research guided by the perceptions of two distinct groups: administrators at Eastern Illinois University and adult students enrolled in off-campus courses at Eastern Illinois University. This comparative method was designed to answer one research question: Is

there a difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for adult education programs at Eastern Illinois University? This study also provided a list of quality indicators for use at Eastern Illinois University and other higher education institutions with similar characteristics as EIU to evaluate off-campus programs. A further outcome was to determine any significant difference between administrators and administrators with faculty status concerning their perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of better understanding this research, the following terms have been clarified.

Adult Students are students 25 years and older (Jacobs and Stoner-Eby, 1998). Cross (1980) defines the non-traditional student as an adult who returns to school full- or part-time while maintaining responsibilities such as employment, family, and other responsibilities of adult life. Students age 24 years and younger are referred to as traditional students (Jacobs and Stoner-Eby, 1998).

Continuing Education is further learning in adults as a result of re-diagnosis of learning needs (Knowles, 1988).

Non-Traditional Programs are external degrees and other nontraditional approaches such as distance education for strategies for expanding access to education. These programs develop alternative methods of delivering quality programs at times and places convenient to students (Peterson, 1979). Courses are usually offered evenings, weekends, or distance learning.

Off-Campus Programs or Adult Education Programs are programs that provide courses to students at locations that are convenient and accessible to the non-traditional student.

Quality Indicators are terms or statements used to describe measurable elements, methods, or procedures whose presence or absence indicates quality. Quality indicator is a term used to describe a characteristic of an effective program (Eichhorn, 1994).

Delimitations

This study was confined to administrators and adult students at Eastern Illinois University. Other universities with similar characteristics as EIU may use the results of this study as a means of identifying quality indicators that may apply to their off-campus programs or using the instrument as an evaluation of quality.

Limitations

Administrators were limited on their views according to their academic areas, interaction within departments, and personal experiences with adult students and off-campus programs. Students were limited on their views according to their personal experiences with faculty, student services and off-campus programs.

Assumptions

In this research the following was assumed:

Administrators and adult students have the knowledge and experience to accurately identify measurable elements, methods, and procedures in off-campus program development whose presence or absence indicates quality.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to identify quality indicators, gleaned from the literature, for off-campus programs and their importance. This chapter also gives the reader a better understanding of non-traditional programming and its importance in higher education. The chapter is divided into 3 areas. The first area provides a history of adult education as reference for an understanding of how we got where we are. The second area identifies quality indicators found in the literature. These indicators were the source of listing of quality indicators in our first round of the Delphi survey. The final area includes research supporting the importance of quality indicators as they relate to assessment and measuring quality of adult programs.

History

Consumers of adult education are applying pressure on institutions for quality programs. The choices these consumers make in meeting their educational needs will impact the decisions administrators make in providing quality programs. Institutions experience some inner conflict from a lack of agreement on goals of adult education and its place in the mission of the institution. These differences sometimes produce emotional blocks to cooperation. Ultimately when adult education is as lucrative as

traditional education it will become a central focus in the mission of the institution. The key is making it lucrative. Administrators need to provide the quality programs adult students seek. By examining what has impacted adult learning we may be better able to identify the unique qualities of adult education.

During the period from 1600-1779 America was the land of opportunity. The motivation of coming to the new world created an initiative for readiness for learning. Everyone should be able to read in order to understand the Bible's guide to salvation. The Puritans insisted on education. They believed that ignorance led to idleness, which was a waste of God's precious time, one of the worst sins. So religion played a very important role in adult learning. Apprenticeships prepared colonists for vocational life and were designed primarily for the poor. During this period education for adults was almost non-existent but seeds for adult education had been planted (Knowles, 1962).

The time between the American Revolution and the Civil War, 1780-1865, the United States emerged as an independent self-governing nation. During this period the notion that only the rich and propertied should participate in government gave way to the idea of universal suffrage. Westward expansion operated as a leveler of social classes and provided opportunities for individualism. The era marked the beginning of the industrial revolution, urbanization, immigration of cheap labor, and the beginning of labor unions. The principle of separation of church and state became fixed, and freedom of worship became a constitutional guarantee. The adult education process was to transform a people being governed to a people able to govern themselves in a democracy. Instruments of adult education were books, speeches, pamphlets and other material that explored issues and ideas of democracy. The Lyceum Movement in 1826 (named after a

school in Athens were Aristotle lectured) provided areas used for lecture and debate. This helped promote the establishment of libraries, museums, and evening schools. The idea that adults needed education too began to dimly be perceived (Knowles, 1962).

Between the Civil War and World War I, 1866-1920, the country expanded to shores of both oceans and from Canada to Mexico. There was a large number of immigrants and this became one of the great adult educational challenges. New institutional forms for adult education were developed including correspondence schools, junior colleges, social service agencies and parks and recreation. In 1874 the Chautauqua Movement began as a training program for teachers, which led to summer schools and extension programs. The idea of a summer educational program proved so popular that Chautauqua began broadening its program. In 1878 the first integrated core program of adult education organized in the country. New instructional methods were short courses, home study, conferences, and demonstrations by Cooperative Extension Service. Specific areas of emphasis for adult education were vocational education, citizenship and Americanization, education of women, civic and social reform, leisure, and health. These areas of emphasis were in response to the needs of the era. Those needs were industrialization, immigration from every part of the world, the Women's Rights movement, and people living longer (Knowles, 1962).

The years 1921 to 1961 were the era of changing patterns that moved from crisis to crisis. There was an increase in population, technology, economic conditions, international relations, social arrangements, communications, philosophical and religious ideas and government. The impact of two world wars, the Great Depression, and a rapidly accelerating pace of change in technological, economic, political and cultural

affairs provided a means for adult education to become a major part of the American Way of Life. During this period activities surrounding the education of adults began to coalesce into an adult educational field. This field was impacted by the need for a more skillful labor market and industry getting involved in providing educational opportunities for its employees. The passage of the G. I. Bill in 1944 enabled veterans to attend college, which produced an influx of adults into higher education. This bill provided financial assistance for veterans to attend college. It caused higher education institutions to examine how they could incorporate past self-education into the curriculum and methodologies geared toward the unique character of adult learners (Knowles, 1962).

By the early 1960s, Malcolm S. Knowles was becoming known as an expert on adult education. His impact on the field has been magnified by many students who studied under him during his years as a professor of education at Boston University, from 1960 to 1974, and professor of adult and community education at North Carolina State University in Raleigh, from 1974 until 1979. By the mid-1960s a rough outline of a theoretical framework of adult learning had evolved in his mind, and in 1967 he discovered his theory had a name. A Yugoslavian adult educator who participated in a summer session that Knowles was conducting at Boston University introduced the term "androgogy" to him. Knowles discovered that "andragogy" had been coined by a German teacher in 1833, was reintroduced by a German social scientist in the 1920s, and then was more or less forgotten until 1957, when it was picked up by adult educators in Europe. Knowles felt it made great sense to have a term that would enable us to discuss the growing body of knowledge about adult learners in parallel with the pedagogical model of childhood learning. Malcolm S. Knowles became known as the father of adult

education. He was known for his warmth, humility and influence on the careers of his students and colleagues. His name is often associated with andragogy, a term he used to focus on the characteristics of adult learners and set of assumptions for most effectively teaching adults. He also advocated assumptions on adult learners that differentiated them from children. Malcolm S. Knowles authored almost 20 books, which include "The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species," The Making of an Adult Educator: An Autobiographical Journey," "The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy Versus Pedagogy," and "Andragogy in Action: Applying Modern Principles of Adult Learning." He died on November 27, 1997 at the age of 84 (Lee, 1998).

From 1962 to the present some major changes have impacted adult education. The pace of technology is exponentially rising causing a knowledge explosion. More adults are continuing their education to be able to compete in the changing labor market. The changing roles of women who have careers outside the home are impacting adult education. Over half of mothers with children less than one year old work outside the home and as the children get older the percentage increases. Women are taking on non-traditional roles in professions such as police officers, firefighters, doctors, electricians, and lawyers. Women must complete education requirements for these types of professions. The family structure is changing and impacting women's roles. There are more single women supporting families today than ever before. Downsizing and layoffs in organizations and industry cause competition for jobs. Individuals that have completed degrees or have additional training are more competitive for new jobs. Early retirement and longer life expectancy have also impacted adult education. The delivery

of instruction has expanded and includes evening classes, weekend classes, working adult programs such as cohorts, and all forms of distance learning.

Community colleges have provided a means for the adult students to receive training and complete degrees. In the year 2001, with the endorsement of the American Association of Community Colleges and the Association of Community College Trustees, the centennial of the American community college was observed (Pedersen, 2001). While there has been some disagreement over dates and details, from the historians perspective in 1901, J. Stanley Brown, the superintendent of Joliet Township High School in Illinois, began adding higher-level science and math courses to the secondary curriculum and bargaining with universities to win college credit for students in advanced classes. Brown eventually expanded the advanced offerings at Joliet. In 1901, six students entered the program. In 1916, the "postgraduate" program had officially become known as Joliet Junior College (Manzo, 2001). The community college largely fulfilled its essential purpose by 1950. Principal barriers to access, academic prerequisites, distance and cost, were removed. By the mid-1960s the Illinois Legislature created specific community college districts. State legislatures awoke to the implications of the baby boom cohort for higher education and state treasuries. Rather than expanding expensive, residential state colleges and universities, states quickly saw the value in "adopting" the community college. State governments supported the construction of new colleges, even entire new systems, and actively encouraged open admissions policies, including reduced tuition and minimal admissions requirements. State governments created entire systems of community colleges with the expressed purpose of ensuring universal access to higher education. Attesting to their

purposefulness, 90 percent of Americans lived within commuting distance of a community college by the end of the decade (Pedersen, 2001). Although, according to Pedersen, 2001, community colleges had fulfilled their essential purpose by 1950, their purpose is still evolving today. Adult students attend community colleges for specialized training, workforce development, and transfer programs. These colleges provide a means of personal and professional development. The community college has taken its place as an essential player in American higher education, one that continues to play an essential role in boosting the rate of college enrollment. The community college continues to evolve, but not without continued debate over its role and its mission. (Manzo, 2001).

The present anticipated growth of lifelong learning can be attributed to three influences. First are the demographic factors that result in larger numbers of adults in the population. The second influence is social change and the third is technological change and the knowledge explosion. Almost any worker in the society has the problem of keeping up with new knowledge, but technological change is so fast and powerful that it wipes out entire industries and creates new ones in a single decade. The combined impact of demographic, social, and technological change is enormous, and it will almost certainly encourage the growth of the learning society (Cross, 1981).

The spectacular increase of older students in colleges and universities is already being called an adult revolution. The education of older men and women, however, is still regarded with suspicion and often considered extraneous to the real business of higher education—research and the education of the young. The history of adult education in America and its traditional roles in higher education demonstrates the importance of lifelong learning in a society that requires information about the entire

range of adult education activities. The most important recommendation for the future is that adult education should be recognized as part of the central task of higher education, not as a marginal or second-class activity (Harrington, 1977).

Indicators of Quality

When most colleges and universities begin to recruit adult learners they often overlook the fact that adults have different needs, desires, and goals than their 18-24 year old counterparts. How can colleges and universities make higher education attractive to the adult learner?

A major factor in attracting adult learners is the need to feel important by the institution. The population must be defined, a working definition established, and the group included in the mission and objectives of the university. Adults must feel they matter to the institution. They need to be noticed, appreciated and welcomed (Mooney, 1994).

This supportive atmosphere is also important with fellow adult students. Cohorts are established with this in mind. A cohort is defined as a group of students who engage in a program of studies together and generally share a common set of classes and experiences (Hresko, 1998). Cohort groups can help novices overcome the feeling of isolation that accompanies a career change. Mentors provide an opportunity to vent and acquire coping skills. Cohort members can provide empathy, a sense that one is not alone in an overwhelming entanglement of changes, surprises, and shortcomings. Working with one's peers allows interchange of ideas and methodologies resulting in more refined pedagogical skills (Eifler & Potthoff, 1998).

Administrators must shift their mind-set in order to accommodate the adult learner. There must be flexibility in the administrative aspects of college life for adults. Nontraditional programs require nontraditional operating hours (Merritt, 1995). This would include advising, registration, and providing books and materials for nontraditional students. There may be increased work for staff such as the financial aid office. Adult students generally acquire some type of aid such as loans or grants that may increase the amount of work. Library systems must be networked to provide accessibility for the student that cannot travel to campus. Computer labs should be available for use in nontraditional programming. Access to computers is vital for the adult student. All of these services are impacted by administrators' decisions in providing for the needs of the nontraditional student.

Flexibility in course scheduling and location is vital to the adult student. Most adults work full-time, have a family, and other obligations that conflict with traditional educational offerings. Administrators must be willing to provide courses where and when adult students are able to attend.

Administrators must be advocates for the adult learner. However, some administrators will never be open to the adult learner concept. They do not view adult learner programs as vital to the mission of the college or university (Merritt, 1995).

Programs should draw upon adults' life experiences and tie them in with their coursework (Powell, 1992 & Sapin-Piane, 1993). Professors must adapt their teaching style to accommodate for the knowledge and life experiences of the adult student. Adult learners tend to be achievement oriented, highly motivated, and relatively independent with special needs for flexible schedules and instruction appropriate for their

development level (Cross, 1980). Adults generally prefer more active approaches to learning and value opportunities to integrate academic learning with their life and work experience (Benshoff, 1991).

According to Hine (1994), the following points must be factored into our classroom teaching practices for adult students to better enhance their learning.

1. A climate of openness and respect in the classroom is helpful in identifying what the adult learner wants and needs to know.
2. Adults always enjoy planning and carrying out their own learning experiences. Due to age, experience, etc., adult students want to, and many times can, contribute more to the learning experience than the traditional student.
3. Adults need to be involved in evaluating their own progress toward self-chosen goals.
4. There needs to be less use of transmittal teaching techniques, "lectures," and more experiential techniques (e.g., small and large group work).
5. Discovery learning is the key to self-development in adults. If a professor rejects an adult student's experiences or comments in a classroom, the professor rejects that adult student. In addition, an adult student will verbalize and defend his/her perspective (don't expect to lecture on events of the 1960's to a 45-year-old-student without receiving some comments).
6. Adult student activities in the classroom need to be more problem-centered, rather than theoretically centered. Practical knowledge is very important.

7. Adult students appreciate the opportunity to apply their learning, both in the classroom and outside the classroom.
8. Adult students are very appreciative and respectful of their professors and are highly motivated students.

Since women comprised the largest group of returning adult students in the 1970s, Mary O'Keeffe, 1984, decided to conduct a study to examine factors affecting overall growth of adult degree programs in Catholic women's colleges. Methods used in the data collection process included the administration of a 73-item survey instrument to 42 Catholic women's colleges. An analysis of continuing education in these colleges revealed the following quality indictors:

1. Innovative leadership in program initiation.
2. Reputation of the college.
3. Flexibility of admissions, scheduling, and creative programming.
4. Programs in early response to identified educational needs.
5. Personalized academic and support services.

In 1992 Joan Lund conducted a study of 111 students from four private institutions in the state of Illinois. They were asked to identify and rank order critical factors of quality for their off-campus classes. Instructor Expertise was ranked highest and as the most relevant to the quality of the class. The other critical factors identified were Learning Environment, Curriculum Relevance, Instructor Enthusiasm, Instructional Methodology, Physical Parameters, and Resource Materials.

A study conducted by Helen Moore, 1994, examined customer perceptions of quality in a university continuing education setting. The study gives clear direction to the

continuing education organization to reevaluate the customer perspective regarding quality. Five dimensions of service factors were identified. They are:

1. Credibility and access.
2. Understanding the customer.
3. Reliability.
4. Attention to tangibles.
5. Competence.

In 1994 Connie Eichhorn conducted a study in Nebraska to determine the quality indicators in adult basic education programs as perceived by Nebraska ABE practitioners. Data were categorized into recurrent themes to develop the list of quality indicators. The final categories were:

1. Program management.
2. Qualified staff.
3. Non-management issues.
4. Staff development.
5. Recruitment/retention.
6. Student orientation.
7. Assessment.

If higher education administrators expect to compete for the adult student they must adjust their management approach. In a study conducted by Janice Lohmann, 1988, the state of marketing orientation in four-year public and private institutions was accessed. Based on indicators of performance there was no significant difference. Marketing was identified as a quality indicator. However, the presence of a marketing

director significantly influenced the number of programs canceled due to insufficient enrollments. Further, the data identified conditions in a department that indicate a strong marketing orientation. If universities are serious about expanding access to adult students, they must overcome antipathy to marketing. Continuing higher education is one of the most market-sensitive units of activity in American higher education (Roopchand, 1997). Many potential adult learners do not realize what higher education has to offer or they are deterred by past experiences of schooling (Marks, 1999).

Various practitioners of adult education have multiple perspectives on how programs should be improved. Instructors tend to focus on staff development, training and program allocation. Directors point to the dedication and commitment of staff (Dirkx, 1993).

Rebecca Olson, 1995, conducted a study that took the issues of program quality directly to the adult student. Results were consistent across data collection methods and demographic groups. Adult students valued sensitive instructors, peer interaction, a combination of instructional delivery modes, frequent testing, attention to learner differences, variety in materials and equipment, and improved child care and transportation services.

A study was conducted by Roderick Roopchand, 1997, at five continuing higher education institutions. The study found that programs must move from a faculty-centered development perspective to a student-centered process. Administrative services must move from an institution-centered delivery system to a student-centered services delivery system. Barriers such as the absence of commitment, the lack of faculty support, the absence of a vision, the skepticism in applying a business-engineering paradigm to

education, the lack of an interdisciplinary curriculum, and the absence of a strategic plan must be recognized. The most successful continuing higher education programs will be those that meet customer needs.

In 1997 Hsin-Hwa Chen conducted a study to develop an internal evaluation model for university continuing education credit programs. Four essential program elements were identified; instruction, participants, curriculum, environment. Other factors included:

1. Teaching methods.
2. Instructional materials.
3. Communication.
4. Delivery system.
5. Ongoing evaluation.
6. Accessibility.

Linda Kersten, 1992, conducted a study of graduate students from six public institutions in the state of Illinois who have taken both on-campus and off-campus credit classes as part of their degree program. The participants were asked to identify critical factors of quality for their off-campus and on-campus credit classes. The seven critical factors identified for on-campus revealed a 74% commonality with those critical factors identified for off-campus. Instructor Expertise was ranked highest on both lists. The other critical factors identified are Adult Learning Environment, Curriculum Relevance, Instructional Methodology, Instructor Enthusiasm, Physical Parameters, and Resource Materials. Critical factors identified for off-campus had more relevance to the quality of the graduate students' credit class experiences than those they identified for on-campus.

In 1989 a study was conducted of selected continuing education programs in Dade County Florida. The primary purpose of the study was to examine the availability and quality of student services offered to adult learners. Indicators listed were:

1. Admissions information.
2. Convenient hours for registration.
3. Assistance in class registration.
4. Assistance in planning class schedules.
5. Access to the library during evening and weekends.
6. Parking and security.
7. Food services.
8. Bookstore.
9. Access to computers (Barragan, 1989).

Continuing education is about location, location, and location. More than half of adult part-time students surveyed by The College Board in 1986 reported that location was the primary factor influencing their choice of institution. Another 18 percent ranked it second. About 40 percent pointed to the curriculum as their first or second choice; 30 percent cited cost; and 20 percent singled out academic quality (Speer, 1996).

Research has shown that nontraditional students have needs that differ from those of traditional-age students. The willingness of institutions to modify existing programs and develop new services geared to adult populations will have a positive impact on their ability to attract, serve, and satisfy the educational needs of adult students (Benshoff & Lewis, 1992).

In summary, from the review of the literature five main categories emerged. The categories include Institution, Administrative Function, Program Strategies, Student Services, and Instructional Strategies. Quality indicators for each category are:

1. Institution:
    a. Reputation of institution.
    b. Vision of institution.
    c. Strategic plan.
    d. Adults feel they matter.
2. Administrative Function:
    a. Staff development.
    b. Faculty development.
    c. Marketing.
    d. Assessment.
    e. Program management.
    f. Strategic planning.
    g. Commitment to students.
3. Program Strategies:
    a. Weekend and evening course offerings.
    b. Course location.
    c. Cohort groups.
    d. Mentoring.
    e. Assessment.
    f. Credit for experiential learning.

g. Cost of program.

h. Faculty support.

4. Student Services:

a. Flexible operating hours.

b. Qualified staff.

c. Food services.

d. Greater availability and access to parking.

e. Security for late hours.

f. Orientation to university or class location.

g. Flexible payment plans.

5. Instructional Strategies:

a. Instructor expertise.

b. Use of knowledge already gained by adult students.

c. Small group activities.

d. Curriculum relevance.

e. Instructor enthusiasm.

f. Instructional methodology.

g. Assessment.

Importance of Quality

Education is big business. The U.S. alone spends $500-700,000,000,000 each year on education, while the world tab is around two trillion dollars. After health care, education is now the second largest civilian industry in the U.S. With so much of

America's resources committed to education, the product and the process is always under scrutiny. It is a subject of study and experimentation. In higher education, a great amount of money and time is spent working to improve the quality of our educational systems and getting education to the people who need it. The fundamental changes in society and the world economy are upping the ante and make education a more important commodity (Dunn, 2001).

Adult students are the fastest-growing market for colleges and universities. Adults are returning to school in droves for the education that will help them adapt to the changing demands of the workplace or change careers. To take full advantage of this market, higher education institutions need to position themselves to attract these students (Nordstrom, 1997).

According to Whitt, 1994, student affairs staff at colleges and universities that would like to convey the message that adult learners are valued should access the current institutional climate:

1. What is it like to be an adult learner at your institution?
2. How do adult students describe their experiences?
3. How do overall teaching techniques relate to adult learning styles?
4. In what ways does the institution tell adult learners they are valued or not valued? In what ways do adult learners feel they matter or do not matter?
5. What programs and services are needed to facilitate adult student involvement in learning? How do adult students evaluate current programs and services?

With colleges and universities moving from the "factory" university to the "virtual university," the boundaries of time and space are being eliminated (Dunn, 2001).

The market place for education is widening and adults are shopping around. Schools need to realize that adult learners have different educational needs due to their multiple roles as workers, parents, family members, and students (Nordstrom, 1997).

Administrators in higher education must manage nontraditional programs nontraditionally (Merritt, 1995). Adult students are looking for quality. Administrators must provide quality programs. What defines quality? For the purposes of this study, quality will be defined as characteristics of an effective program (Eichhorn, 1994). The debate over the definition of quality was solved simply by Deming when he argued that the customer determines what is quality. According to Deming, a product in the hands of a consumer is still in production. Thus, customer-focused organizations and education not only are more sensitive and responsive to customers' needs, but also essentially grant customers the final role of evaluation (Buchen, 1995). The most successful continuing higher education programs will be those that meet customer needs (Roopchand, 1997).

Current demands for accountability in education emphasize outcome-based program evaluation and tie program funding to individual student performance. As has been the case for elementary and secondary programs, demands for accountability have increased pressure on adult educators to show evidence of the benefits of their programs in order to justify their financial support. In Florida, recent legislation fundamentally changes the delivery of adult education in the state by establishing a performance-based funding system that is based on outcomes related to the retention, completion, and employment of program participants (Oroza, 1997).

A performance-based funding system requires an evaluation process that stresses outcome indictors over indicators that focus on program context or process. Although the

state has adopted indicators of program quality to evaluate its adult education programs, these indicators focus mostly on program processes rather than student outcomes. In addition, the indictors are not specifically tied to workforce development outcomes, a priority to federal and local funding agents. Improving the accountability of adult education programs and defining the role of these programs in Florida's Workforce Development System has become a priority to policy makers across the state. Another priority has been to involve adult education practitioners in every step of this process (Oroza, 1997).

In Britain all public sector organizations have experienced changes in funding as part of the government's drive to make them more accountable to the taxpayer. The development of performance indictors is seen as an essential step to ensure that such organizations provide value for money (Johns, 1996). This is not unlike our public educational institutions in the United States. Assessment and accountability plays a big role whether to the public or to ourselves.

Greater accountability is being demanded of all levels of education programs. States have developed federally-mandated Indicators of Program Quality as a first step to greater accountability and the measurement of program effectiveness (Olson, 1995).

Linda Kersten, 1992, conducted a study of graduate students from six public institutions in the state of Illinois who have taken both on-campus and off-campus credit cases as part of their degree program. The participants were asked to identify critical factors of quality for their off-campus and on-campus credit classes. The seven critical factors identified for on-campus revealed a 74% commonality with those critical factors identified for off-campus. Administrators of off-campus classes now have empirical data

from the primary stakeholders which supports off-campus programming. The students rated their off-campus programming as comparable to on-campus credit classes and conducive to learning. Some aspects of off-campus class experiences as perceived by the respondents are actually stronger than on-campus. This study provides insights for those who are attempting to defend comparability of their off-campus credit programs. This has become an urgent issue in the 1990s as dollars have become tighter and programs are more closely scrutinized.

Adult education is a large and amorphous field of practice. There are no neat boundaries such as age, as in the case of elementary and secondary education, or mission, as in the case of higher education. Adult education with myriad content areas, delivery systems, goals, and clienteles defies simple categorization, funding formulas, or understanding. Unlike pre-adult education, adult education has historically been largely a voluntary activity. There is a curiosity about who this volunteer is. What programs, services, instruction styles, and social interaction are they looking for? Providers of adult education need to know who is participating, why they are participating and what conditions are likely to promote greater participation (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991). Efforts for quality improvement will be more successfully focused through an understanding of what dimensions are most important to the customer and a measurement of how the organization is meeting customer expectations regarding these dimensions of quality (Moore, 1994). The growing market of adult learners offers an unprecedented opportunity to higher education institutions. The bottom line? It's a seller's market (Nordstrom, 1997). Money is a great motivator for providing a quality product. However some motivators may not be based on financial gain. Colleges and universities

who successfully pursue the adult learner path find well-deserved rewards, changed lives through education.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURE METHODS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to identify and describe methods used in identifying quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. This study was based upon research guided by the perceptions of two distinct groups: administrators at Eastern Illinois University and adult students enrolled in off-campus courses at Eastern Illinois University.

The chapter is divided into seven sections. The first section, Problem Statement, gives the research question to be answered from the results of the research. The second section, Evaluation Component, gives a thorough description of the Delphi Survey Method including a historical and operational context. The third section, Population and Sample, gives an overview of Eastern Illinois University and the School of Continuing Education. The School of Continuing Education administers off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. The fourth section, Research Design, explains the purpose and advantages of the research design used for this study. The fifth section, Description of Instruments Used, gives information about the instrument and development procedure prior to emailing surveys. The sixth section, Data Arrangement and Treatment, describes each round of the Delphi survey. The seventh section, Data Analysis, summarizes the steps to be used in analyzing the survey data.

Problem Statement

An assessment of these stakeholders' perceptions is designed to answer one research question: Is there a difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for adult education programs at Eastern Illinois University?

Evaluation Components

A Delphi Survey Method was used in this study. According to Turoff and Stiltz, (1996), this method was developed specifically for the purpose of forecasting and estimating unknown parameters in the absence of complete knowledge. Named after the Greek oracle at Delphi, to whom the Greeks visited for information about their future, the Delphi Method was created by Olaf Helmer and Norman Dalkey in 1953 at the RAND Corporation to address future military issues (Turoff and Stiltz, 1996). The Delphi Method recognizes human judgment as legitimate and useful in generating forecasts and was developed to overcome shortcomings of expressions of individual and group judgment.

The Delphi Survey Method is based on a structured process for collecting and distilling knowledge from a group of experts by means of a series of questionnaires interspersed with controlled opinion feedback (Turoff and Stiltz, 1996). Turoff and Stiltz (1996) described the Delphi Method as having four basic features: structured questioning, iteration, controlled feedback, and anonymity of responses. Structured questioning is achieved through the use of questionnaires. Questionnaires maintain a clear focus on the study and enable the moderator to control the process and channel it

into a compact product. Iteration is the process by which the questionnaire is presented over a number of rounds to enable participants to reconsider and refine their responses. Controlled feedback is achieved by feeding back to the panel members the responses of the whole group as well as their own response for their reconsideration. This means that all the responses of the panel are taken into account. Anonymity is achieved through the questionnaires ideally giving group members the freedom to express their opinions without feeling pressured by the wider group. The Delphi survey does not fix or limit responses but actually extends participant feedback giving a greater range of opinion.

Clare (1994) describes a typical Delphi sequence as follows:

1. Develop the Delphi question or initial broad concern.
2. Select and contact recognized experts.
3. Develop questionnaire #1 and distribute it.
4. Analyze responses to questionnaire #1.
5. Develop questionnaire #2 and distribute it.
6. Analyze responses to questionnaire #2.
7. Repeat rounds as necessary.
8. Prepare final report and distribute to survey participants.

Population and Sample

The site of this study was Eastern Illinois University, one of seven residential public universities in the state of Illinois, located in Charleston, Illinois. Charleston is a rural community of 20,000 that lies 50 miles south of Champaign and 125 miles east of St. Louis. More than 10,500 students attend Eastern Illinois University, about 78 percent

of whom are full-time undergraduates, attending EIU each fall and spring semester. The University offers a total of 43 undergraduate degrees. The Graduate School at Eastern Illinois University offers 25 master's degrees, two specialist's degrees, and three certificate programs. (Eastern Illinois University, 2002).

Off-campus courses are administered through the School of Continuing Education. Last year, the school sponsored over 300 off-campus programs and classes. More than 9,000 adults from Illinois and elsewhere were enrolled for instruction. Off-campus courses and programs are provided at locations that include:

Lake Land College, Mattoon, Illinois

Danville Area Community College, Danville, Illinois

Millikin University, Decatur, Illinois

Olney Central College, Olney, Illinois

Parkland College, Champaign, Illinois

Richland Community College, Decatur, Illinois

Lincoln Land Community College, Springfield, Illinois

Frontier Community College, Fairfield, Illinois

Centralia Junior High School, Centralia, Illinois

Selected locations in Mt. Vernon and Effingham, Illinois

Other cities and school districts in Illinois (School of Continuing Education, 2002)

Two separate mailing lists, administrators at EIU and adult students enrolled in off-campus classes at EIU, were provided by the School of Continuing Education. A total of 932 adult students were identified as enrolled in off-campus classes. Some of

those adult students identified were also enrolled in on-campus classes. A total of 75 administrators were identified. Administrators include:

1. President
2. Vice-Presidents
3. Associate Vice-Presidents
4. Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
5. Deans
6. Associate Deans
7. Department Chairpersons
8. Director of Admissions
9. Director of Academic Records
10. Director of Honors Program
11. Director of Minority Affairs
12. Director of Civil Rights and Diversity
13. Director of Financial Aid
14. Director of Textbook Rental Service
15. Director of Student Orientation
16. Director of Career Services
17. Director of Counseling Center
18. Director of Business Services and Treasurer
19. Director of BOT/BA Degree Program
20. Director of Off-Campus and Contract Credit Programs
21. Director for Academic Support and Achievement

22. Director of Alumni Services

23. Assistant Director of Academic Advising and Learning Assistance

24. Assistant Director of Learning Assistance Center

25. Assistant Director of Academic Assessment and Testing

26. Assistant Director of Disability Services

27. Student Judicial Officer

28. Coordinator Student Legal Services.

A lottery pool was developed for adult students numbered from one to 932. From the 932 numbers 274 were drawn randomly giving each number equal probability of being selected. This enabled the researcher to generalize the findings of the study to the entire population. Each number selected represented position on the mailing list. Each number position was invited to participate in the study. All 75 administrators were invited to participate in the study. According to Babbie, 1990, you need not worry about differential sampling sizes as long as you analyze the two samples separately or comparatively. Therefore, our sample sizes were appropriate. The sample size for both students and administrators was taken from information provided by the research division of the National Education Association. In an article "Small Sample Techniques," the National Education Association (1960) published a formula for determining sample size. Krejcie and Morgan, 1970, developed a table from this formula for indicating sample size for different population sizes. The researcher determined the sample size for this study from that table. A single-stage sampling process was used due to the researcher having access to the population and being able to sample the participants directly.

Research Design

A survey research design was used for this study. The purpose of this design is to generalize from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about some characteristic, attitude, or behavior of this population (Babbie, 1990). The advantages of a survey design are economy of design, the rapid turn-around in data collection, and the ability to identify attributes of a population from a small group of individuals (Babbie, 1990). The survey is longitudinal and will be collected over a period of time. The survey was e-mailed to respondents. This form of data collection was more cost efficient and provided convenience for response. Participants not having an e-mail address was replaced by the participant having the next highest number.

Description of Instruments Used

The research method selected for this study is a three-round Delphi Survey Method using e-mail and a web page designed to request, collect, and submit all survey responses electronically. A mailing list of administrators working at Eastern Illinois University and adult students presently taking off-campus classes was provided by the School of Continuing Education. A lottery pool was developed for adult students numbered from one to 932. From the 932 numbers 274 were drawn randomly giving each number equal probability of being selected. This enabled the researcher to generalize the findings of the study to the entire population. Each number selected represented position on the mailing list. Each number position was invited to participate in the study. All 75 administrators were invited to participate in the study. According to Babbie, 1990, you need not worry about differential sampling sizes as long as you

analyze the two samples separately or comparatively. Therefore, the samples sizes were appropriate. The researcher contacted all prospective respondents explaining the research project and requested their participation in the study (Appendixes A and B). All respondents were asked to signify their willingness to participate by returning an informed consent document in an enclosed addressed, stamped envelope with their signature and e-mail address for correspondence and completion of electronic surveys (Appendix C). If e-mail addresses were not available the next highest number was used as a replacement.

Data Arrangement and Treatment

In the first round of the electronic web survey, the participants were presented with a list of quality indicators gleaned from the review of literature. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each item as a quality indicator of off-campus programs using a 5-point Likert Scale. A confidence or validity scale was provided to help respondents select the numerical value that best represented their level of agreement with the item as a quality indicator (Appendix D). The participants were also asked to list additional categories and quality indicators they felt had not been identified for ratings during the second round. This was the only round participants were asked to list additional categories or indicators. Each quality indicator is a term or statement that describes measurable elements, methods, or procedures whose presence or absence indicates quality as they relate to off-campus programs. According to Eichhorn, 1994, quality indicator is a term used to describe a characteristic of an effective program.

The results from the first round were aggregated and analyzed, discarding any duplicate items, and adding new items as necessary. From the results of round one, means and standard deviations were calculated for each item and response frequencies were tallied (Appendix E). Quality indicators having lower than a 3.5 mean were not included in round two. The 3.5 level was determined from a numerical scale developed by the National Materials Advisory Board (1971). The 3.5 level is the beginning of the range for reliability. This range indicates a willingness to make a decision with some risk of being wrong based upon the numerical scale according to the National Materials Advisory Board (1971) (Appendix F).

The results of round one were distributed in the round two electronic web survey asking the participants to indicate their level of agreement with each item as a quality indicator of off-campus programs using a 5-point Likert Scale. A confidence or validity scale was provided to help the participants select the numerical value that best represents their level of agreement with the item as a quality indicator. A low score indicated a low level of agreement with each item as a quality indicator and a high score indicated a high level of agreement. From the results of round two, means and standard deviations were calculated for each item and response frequencies were tallied (Appendix G). Quality indicators having lower than 3.5 mean were not included in round three.

In round three, the participants were again asked to indicate their level of agreement with each item as a quality indicator. Once again a 5-point Likert Scale was used to indicate level of agreement. Descriptive statistics were indicated for round three as in the previous rounds (Appendix H).

Each round was completed over a 7-day period with reminders sent by e-mail to participants not responding within the first three days. All survey rounds were completed over a 45-day period. A timeline for dissertation research was developed to help the researcher monitor deadlines for each round and stay on task thru the completion of this study (Appendix I). During any of the rounds, general comments about quality indicators or the study could be made in a comment box on the web survey.

Data Analysis

All participants submitted their electronic web survey responses for each round to the web site established for the study. The number of returns and non-returns were indicated in table form. A response rate of at least 50 percent is generally considered adequate for analysis and reporting. A response rate of at least 60 percent is considered good, and a response rate of 70 percent or more is very good. You should bear in mind, however, that these are only rough guides; they have no statistical basis, and a demonstrated lack of response bias is far more important than a high response rate (Babbie, 1990). According to Alreck and Settle (1995), the single most serious limitation to direct mail data collection is the relatively low response rate. Mail surveys with a response rate over 30 percent are rare. Response rates are often only about 5 or 10 percent. This means that over 9 out of 10 people who are surveyed may not respond.

A wave analysis was done to indicate response bias (Leslie, 1972). This was done by e-mailing two participants to determine if their ratings of four on-going quality indicators changed from round 2 to round 3. There was no difference in their ratings from round 2 to round 3 so absence of response bias could be established. Response

bias is the effect of nonresponses on survey estimates (Fowler, 1988). This procedure examines whether nonrespondents had responded, whether their responses would have substantially changed the overall results of the survey. According to Cresswell, 1994, the wave analysis examines whether responses to selected items change from round to round. This procedure assumes that those who return surveys in the final rounds of the response period are almost nonrespondents. If their responses are not different from those of other rounds, a strong case for absence of response bias can be established.

A descriptive analysis was conducted indicating means, standard deviations, response frequencies. Items rated lower than 3.5 in rounds one and two were not included in the next round. Items rated with high levels of agreement, a mean of 4.0 and higher, after the final round represented validated quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. The 4.0 level was determined from a numerical scale developed by the National Materials Advisory Board (1971). The 4.0 level is the mean of the range for reliability. This range indicates a willingness to make a decision with some risk of being wrong based upon the numerical scale according to the National Materials Advisory Board (1971) (Appendix F).

Information from the descriptive analysis was used to conduct a statistical analysis to determine any significant difference between administrators' and students' perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. A further outcome was to determine any significant difference between the perceptions of quality indicators of administrators' and administrators' having faculty status for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the survey research used in identifying quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. The study was based upon research guided by the perceptions of two distinct groups: administrators at Eastern Illinois University and adult students enrolled in off-campus courses at Eastern Illinois University. This comparative method was designed to answer one research question: Is there a difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for adult education programs at Eastern Illinois University? The study also provided a list of quality indicators to be used by Eastern Illinois University and other higher education institutions with similar characteristics for evaluation of off-campus programs. A further outcome was to determine any significant difference between administrators and administrators with faculty status concerning their perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs.

The chapter is divided into five sections. The first section, Introduction, gives the purpose of the chapter, states the research question, and indicates outcomes of the study. The second section, Round 1 of the Delphi Survey Process, describes the process of random sampling, electronically mailing the survey, and reporting results of the study for round one. The results indicate the number of returns, categories added, indicators added

and indicators eliminated. Descriptive statistics are given indicating means and standard deviation. Indicators showing a significant difference in the perceptions of adult students and administrators are listed. Indicators showing a significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and administrators with faculty status are also given. The third section, Round 2 of the Delphi Survey Process, describes the process of revising the survey from results of round one, electronically mailing the survey, and reporting results of the study for round 2. The results indicate the number of returns, and indicators eliminated. Descriptive statistics are given indicating means and standard deviation. Indicators showing a significant difference in the perceptions of adult students and administrators are listed. Indicators showing a significant difference in the perceptions of administrators without faculty status and administrators with faculty status are also given. The fourth section, Round 3 of the Delphi Survey Process, describes the process of revising the survey from results of round two, electronically mailing the survey, and reporting results of the study for round 3. The results indicate the number of returns and indicators eliminated. Descriptive statistics are given indicating means and standard deviation. Indicators showing a significant difference in the perceptions of adult students and administrators are listed. Indicators showing a significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and administrators with faculty status are also given. The fifth section, Wave Analysis and Summary, gives a summary of the wave analysis for determining bias. This section also talks about quality indicators from all three rounds and comments made by participants.

A summary of invitations to participate in the study is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Invitation to Participate in Study

Participant	Accept	Reject	No Response	No Address	Return Insuff Address	Admin Position Vacant	Total
Admin	30	3	39			3	75
Student	51	2	176	31	9		269

Round 1 of the Delphi Survey Process

A total of 932 students were enrolled in off-campus classes and identified as the population of adult students for the study. Thirty-one of those students had no address listed leaving a population of 901 students. A random sample of 269 adult students was conducted from 901 adult students enrolled in off-campus classes. All 269 adult students were invited to participate in the study. Adult students were mailed invitations to participate along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope for their convenience. Direct mail was used to obtain informed consent documentation and e-mail addresses for electronic survey distribution. After nine days, students who had not responded were sent a second mailing inviting them to participate in the study. From the random sample of 269 adult students invited to participate, 9 invitations were returned for insufficient address leaving 260 adult students in the sample. From that sample, 51 adult students agreed to participate for a 20 percent participation rate.

A total of 75 administrators were invited to participate in the study. From those 75 administrators invited to participate, 3 positions were identified as vacant leaving 72 administrators in the population. After nine days administrators that had not responded were sent a second mailing inviting them to participate in the study. Out of the

population of 72 administrators, 30 administrators agreed to participate for a 42 percent participation rate. According to Alreck and Settle (1995), "the single most serious limitation to direct mail data collection is the relatively low response rate. Mail surveys with a response rate over 30 percent are rare. Response rates are often only about 5 or 10 percent. This means that over 9 out of 10 people who are surveyed may not respond." The response rate for adult students was 20 percent and for administrators was 42 percent. The overall total population was 344 with 81 of those agreeing to participate giving an overall response rate of 24 percent. This exceeded Alreck and Settle's response rates of 5 or 10 percent. Percentages for response rates of electronic mail was not located. The researcher relied on Alreck and Settle's percentages for direct mail.

In computing response rates, the accepted practice is to omit all questionnaires that could not be delivered. The initial sample size should be indicated and then subtract the number that could not be delivered due to bad addresses, death and the like. Do not count against yourself sample members you could not even contact (Babbie, 1990). Table 2 gives a summary of the returns.

Table 2

Number of Returns

Round	Administrators	Students	No Status Indicated	Total
Round 1	26	34	3	63
Round 2	25	35	6	66
Round 3	25	32	4	61

The process was tested by three different individuals at three different locations prior to the electronic survey instrument being forwarded to participants. Individuals conducting the testing were not participants of the study. Locations of testing were on-

campus, a city north of EIU campus, and a city west of EIU campus. Individuals conducting the test could not access the survey. As a result of the test, the site administrator discovered a new firewall was prohibiting access to the survey. Computer Services was contacted and they indicated efforts begin work on remedying the problem. However, after three weeks the survey still could not be accessed. Research participants were unable to access the survey. At this point the site administrator arranged access for the survey without going through Eastern Illinois University's firewall. A new website had to be established and the survey was reconstructed for this site. The testing process was successful and participants were able to access the survey. A blind mailing was conducted to provide anonymity for all participants.

The participants were e-mailed asking for completion of round 1 (Appendix J). Participants were presented with a survey for round one consisting of a list of quality indicators gleaned from the review of literature (Appendix K). Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each item as a quality indicator for off-campus programs using a 5-point Likert Scale. A confidence or validity scale was provided to help respondents select the numerical value that best represented their level of agreement with the item as a quality indicator (Appendix D). The participants were also asked to list additional categories and quality indicators they felt had not been identified for distribution and ratings during the second round. This was the only round participants were asked to list additional categories or indicators. A deadline for completion of the survey was indicated in the e-mail that accompanied the survey.

Three days after the electronic survey was sent to participants, a reminder notice was sent to all participants (Appendix L). Since anonymity of the participants had been

established the researcher had no way of knowing who had submitted their survey. The number of surveys submitted was known, but not who had submitted, so the reminder went to all participants.

Once the participants completed and submitted the survey they received feedback confirming what they had submitted (Appendix M). This indicated all fields checked, ratings for indicators, added quality indicators and categories, any comments about the survey or study and thanked them for completion of the survey.

The morning after the deadline for completion of the survey, the researcher contacted the web site administrator informing him of its completion. The site administrator then generated a report for round one indicating each anonymous student and administrator by number only. The report also indicated, whether an administrator had faculty status, their individual ratings of the quality indicators, added categories, added quality indicators, and any comments about the survey or study (Appendix N). The data was transferred to an Excel spreadsheet and analyzed for statistical significance. Participants who did not indicate their status of student or administrator were eliminated. Those remaining were sorted into administration and student categories. In round one 34 students and 26 administrators submitted surveys with 3 that were eliminated because they did not indicate their status for a total of 63 participants. Table 2 gives a summary of the number of participants.

In round one, participants had the opportunity to add new categories to existing ones, but none were added. Ratings from the participants for quality indicators listed within each category were indicated along with any quality indicators added to the category (Appendix N). The mean for each quality indicator was indicated separately by

student or administrator. The difference in the means, the overall mean, variance for adult students and administrators were indicated separately, and the difference in the variance was also indicated. Results of the t test were given (Appendix O).

A t test was conducted for each quality indicator to determine significant difference between adult students and administrators in their ratings of that indicator in round. Significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators was found in three quality indicators. Those indicators were Marketing in the Administrative Functions category, Course Location in the Program Strategies category, and Cohort Groups in the Program Strategies category. The highest significant difference was found in Marketing. All three quality indicators received a higher overall mean rating from administrators. This indicated administrators were in higher agreement with Marketing, Course Location, and Cohort Groups as quality indicators of off-campus programs compared to adult students. At a .05 level Table 3 lists the indicators showing significance difference. Categories showing no significant difference are not included.

Table 3

Indicators with Significant Difference in Administrators' and Adult Students' Perceptions in Round 1

Category	Quality Indicator	t score
Administrative Function	Marketing	2.485
Program Strategies	Course location	2.262
	Cohort groups	2.173

Adult students perceptions of Marketing (M=2.853, SD=1.617) showed a significant difference from Administrators perceptions of Marketing as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=3.731, SD=1.116), $t(58)$=2.49, p>.05, two-tailed.

Adult students' perceptions of Course location (M=3.971, SD=1.218) showed a significant difference from Administrators' perceptions of Course location as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.577, SD=0.857), $t(58)$=2.26, p>.05, two-tailed.

Adult students' perceptions of Cohort groups (M=3.412, SD=1.158) showed a significant difference from Administrators' perceptions of Cohort groups as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.000, SD=0.938), t(58)=2.17, p>.05, two-tailed.

A t test was conducted for each quality indicator to determine significant difference between administrators and administrators having faculty status in their ratings of that indicator in round 1. Significant difference between administrators' and administrators' with faculty status perceptions of quality indicators was found in three quality indicators. Those indicators were Program Management in the Administrative Function category, Small Group Activities in the Instructional Strategies category, and Curriculum Relevance in the Instructional Strategies category. The highest significant difference was found in Curriculum Relevance. All three quality indicators received a higher overall mean rating from Administrators with faculty status. This indicated administrators with faculty status were in higher agreement with Program Management, Small Group Activities, and Curriculum Relevance as quality indicators of off-campus programs compared to administrators. At a .05 level Table 4 lists quality indicators showing a significant difference. Categories showing no significant difference are not included.

Table 4

Indicators with Significant Difference in Administrators and Administrators with Faculty Status Perceptions in Round 1

Category	Quality Indicator	t score
Administrative Function	Program management	2.440
Instructional Strategies	Small group activities	2.180
	Curriculum relevance	2.907

Administrators' perceptions of Program management (M=3.429, SD=0.535) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Program management as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.211, SD=1.084), t(24)=2.44, p>.05, two-tailed.

Administrators' perceptions of Small group activities (M=3.429, SD=0.976) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Small group activities as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.316, SD=0.749), t(24)=2.18, p>.05, two-tailed.

Administrators perceptions of Curriculum relevance (M=4.000, SD=0.577) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Curriculum relevance as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.737, SD=0.562), t(24)=2.91, p>.05, two-tailed.

During round 1 adult students and administrators had the opportunity to add new categories and quality indicators to the survey. No new categories were added, however, several quality indicators were added. Quality indicators with an overall mean lower than 3.5 were eliminated from the survey in round 2. The 3.5 level is the beginning of the range for reliability. Used as a guide, this range indicates a willingness to make a decision with some risk of being wrong. This range is based on the numerical scale according to the National Materials Advisory Board (1971) (Appendix F). Indicators were eliminated from all categories except the Instructional Strategies category. The range of mean for those eliminated was 2.60 to 3.41. Even though "credit for experiential learning" was eliminated, it was very close with an overall mean of 3.41. Table 5 gives a summary of indicators eliminated and new ones added.

Table 5

Quality Indicators Added and Those Eliminated having an Overall Mean Lower than 3.5 in Round One

Category	Indicator Eliminated	Mean	Indicator Added
Institution	Strategic plan	3.30	
			Outreach efforts
			High national ranking among public universities
			Mission of institution
			History of graduate success on certification tests
			Job placement rates following graduation
			Quality of Technology
			Enrollments, full-time equivalence, & semester hours
Administrative Function	Marketing	3.23	
	Assessment	3.38	
	Strategic planning	3.23	
			Recruitment
			Delivery of courses in timely manner
			Service to university
Program Strategies	Mentoring	3.40	
	Credit for experiential learning	3.41	
			Peer interaction
			Teaching excellence
			Technology supported delivery methods
			Good textbooks
			Learner-driven course scheduling

Table 5 continued on next page.

Category	Indicator Eliminated	Mean	Indicator Added
			Sufficient number of graduate and undergraduate courses
Student Services	Food services	2.60	
	Greater availability and access to parking	3.25	
			Computer access
			Technology enhancements
			Network that will support internet courses
			Facilities are handicapped accessible
Instructional Strategies			Environment conducive to learning
			Student assessment of instructors
			Instructional technologies
			Internet courses

Participants were able to make general comments at the end of each round. These comments could pertain to categories, quality indicators, or the study. Appendix P gives a listing of the comments by round.

Round 2 of the Delphi Survey Process

The survey process was tested by three different individuals at three different locations prior to the electronic survey instrument being forwarded to participants. Individuals conducting the testing were not participants of the study. Locations of testing were on-campus, a city north of EIU campus, and a city west of EIU campus. Testing

was successful and participants were able to access the survey. A blind mailing was conducted to provide anonymity for all participants.

Participants were sent an e-mail requesting completion of round 2 (Appendix Q). The participants were presented with a survey for round two consisting of a list of quality indicators, by category, having a mean of 3.5 or higher carried over from round one. Indicators added by administrators or adult students during the first round were also included (Appendix R). The 3.5 level is the beginning of the range for reliability. Used as a guide, this range indicates a willingness to make a decision with some risk of being wrong. This range is based on the numerical scale according to the National Materials Advisory Board (1971) (Appendix F). Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each item as a quality indicator of off-campus programs using a 5-point Likert Scale. A confidence or validity scale was provided to help respondents select the numerical value that best represented their level of agreement with the item as a quality indicator (Appendix D). Participants were not able to add categories or indicators in this round. A deadline for completion of the survey was indicated in the e-mail that accompanied the survey.

Three days after the electronic survey was sent to participants, a reminder notice was sent to all participants emphasizing the deadline date (Appendix S). Since anonymity of the participants had been established the researcher had no way of knowing who had submitted their survey. The number of surveys submitted was known, but not who had submitted, so the reminder went to all participants.

Once the participants completed and submitted the survey they received feedback confirming what they had submitted (Appendix M). This indicated all fields checked,

ratings for indicators, any comments about the survey or study and thanked them for completion of the survey.

The morning after the deadline for completion of the survey, the researcher contacted the web site administrator informing him of its completion. The site administrator then generated a report indicating each anonymous student and administrator by number only. The report also indicated whether an administrator had faculty status, their individual ratings of the quality indicators, and any comments about the survey or study (Appendix N). The data was transferred to an Excel spreadsheet and analyzed for statistical significance. Participants who did not indicate their status of student or administrator were eliminated. Those remaining were sorted into administration and student categories. In round two 35 students and 25 administrators submitted surveys with 6 that had to be eliminated because there was no indication of their status for a total of 66 participants. Table 2 gives a summary of the returns.

The mean of students and administrators were indicated separately for each quality indicator. The difference in the means, the overall mean, variance for adult students and administrators, and the difference in the variance were also indicated. Results of a t test were given (Appendix T).

A t test was conducted for each quality indicator to determine significant difference between adult students and administrators in their ratings of that indicator in round 2. Significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators was found in three quality indicators. Those indicators were Outreach Efforts in the Institution category, Recruitment in the Administrative Function category, and Delivery of Courses in a Timely Manner, in the Administrative Function

category. The highest significance was found in Delivery of Courses in a Timely Manner. All three quality indicators received a higher overall mean rating from administrators. This indicated administrators were in higher agreement with Outreach Efforts, Recruitment, and Delivery of Courses in a Timely Manner as quality indicators for off-campus programs compared to adult students. At a .05 level Table 6 lists the indicators showing significance difference. Categories showing no significant difference are not included.

Table 6

Indicators with Significant Difference in Administrators' and Adult Students' Perceptions in Round Two

Category	Quality Indicator	t score
Institution	Outreach efforts	2.196
Administrative Function	Recruitment	2.470
	Delivery of courses in timely manner	2.582

Adult students' perceptions of Outreach efforts (M=3.829, SD=0.923) showed a significant difference from Administrators perceptions of Outreach efforts as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.320, SD=0.802), $t(58)$=2.20, p>.05, two-tailed.

Adult students' perceptions of Recruitment (M=3.400, SD=1.168) showed a significant difference from Administrators' perceptions of Recruitment as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.000, SD=0.707), $t(58)$=2.47, p>.05, two-tailed.

Adult students' perceptions of Delivery of courses in timely manner (M=3.743, SD=1.314) showed a significant difference from Administrators' perceptions of Delivery of courses in timely manner as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.440, SD=0.768), $t(58)$=2.58, p>.05, two-tailed.

A t test was conducted for each quality indicator to determine significant difference between administrators and administrators having faculty status in their ratings of that indicator in round 2. Significant difference between administrators' and administrators' with faculty status perceptions of quality indicators was found in only one

quality indicator. The indicator was Small Group Activities in the Instructional Strategies category. Administrators with faculty status gave a higher overall mean rating for Small Group Activities. This indicated administrators with faculty status were in higher agreement with Small Group Activities as a quality indicator of off-campus programs compared to administrators. At a .05 level Table 7 lists quality indicators showing significance difference. Categories showing no significant difference are not included.

Table 7

Indicators with Significant Difference in Administrators and Administrators with Faculty Status Perceptions in Round Two

Category	Quality Indicator	t score
Instructional Strategies	Small group activities	2.512

Administrators' perceptions of Small group activities (M=3.286, SD=0.488) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Small group activities as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.231, SD=0.599), $t(25)$=2.51, p>.05, two-tailed.

Quality indicators with an overall mean lower than 3.5 mean were eliminated from the survey in round 3. The 3.5 level is the beginning of the range for reliability. Used as a guide, this range indicates a willingness to make a decision with some risk of being wrong. This range is based on the numerical scale according to the national Materials Advisory Board (1971) (Appendix F). The only quality indicator with an overall mean lower than 3.5 was "Service to the University" from the Administrative Function category. Even though Service to the University was eliminated it was very close with an overall mean of 3.48. New categories or quality indicators could not be added during round 2.

Round 3 of the Delphi Survey Process

The survey process was tested by three different individuals at three different locations prior to the electronic survey instrument being forwarded to participants. Individuals conducting the testing were not participants of the study. Locations of testing were on-campus, a city north of EIU campus, and a city west of EIU campus. Testing was successful and participants were able to access the survey. A blind mailing was conducted to provide anonymity for all participants.

Participants were e-mailed a request to submit round 3 (Appendix U). The participants were presented with a survey consisting of a list of quality indicators, by category, having a mean of 3.5 or higher, carried over from round two, for additional ratings (Appendix V). The 3.5 level is the beginning of the range for reliability. Used as a guide, this range indicates a willingness to make a decision with some risk of being wrong. This range is based on the numerical scale according to the National Materials Advisory Board (1971) (Appendix F). Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each item as a quality indicator of off-campus programs using a 5-point Likert Scale. A confidence or validity scale was provided to help respondents select the numerical value that best represented their level of agreement with the item as a quality indicator (Appendix E). A deadline for completion of the survey was indicated in the e-mail accompanying the survey.

Three days after the electronic survey was sent to participants, a reminder notice was sent to all participants (Appendix W). Since anonymity of the participants had been established the researcher had no way of knowing who had submitted their survey. The

number of surveys submitted was known, but not who had submitted, so the reminder went to all participants.

Once the participants completed and submitted the survey they received feedback confirming what they had submitted (Appendix M). This indicated all fields checked, ratings for indicators, any comments about the survey or study and thanked them for completion of the survey.

The morning after the deadline for completion of the survey, the researcher contacted the web site administrator informing him of its completion. The site administrator then generated a report indicating each anonymous student and administrator by number only. The report also indicated whether an administrator had faculty status, their individual ratings of the quality indicators, and any comments about the survey or study (Appendix N). The data was transferred to an Excel spreadsheet and analyzed for statistical significance. Participants who did not indicate their status of student or administrator were eliminated. Those remaining were sorted into administration and student categories. In round three 32 students and 25 administrators submitted surveys with 4 that had to be eliminated because they did not indicate which status they were for a total of 61 participants. Table 2 gives a summary of the returns.

The mean for each quality indicator was indicated separately by student or administrator. The difference in the means, the overall mean, variance for adult students and administrators, and the difference in the variance were also indicated. Results of a t test were given (Appendix X).

A t test was conducted for each quality indicator to determine significant difference between adult students and administrators in their ratings of that indicator in

round 3. Significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators was found in five quality indicators. Those indicators were Recruitment in the Administrative Function category, Delivery of Courses in a Timely Manner in the Administrative Function category, Program Management in the Administrative Function category, Course Location in the Program Strategies category, and Orientation to University or Class Location in the Student Services category. The highest significant difference was found in Recruitment. All five quality indicators received a higher overall mean rating from Administrators. This indicated administrators were in higher agreement with Recruitment, Delivery of Courses in a Timely Manner, Program Management, Course Location, and Orientation to University or Class Location as quality indicators of off-campus programs compared to adult students. At a .05 level Table 8 lists quality indicators showing significant difference. Categories showing no significant difference are not included.

Table 8

Indicators with Significant Difference in Administrators' and Adult Students' Perceptions in Round Three

Category	Quality Indicator	t score
Administrative Function	Recruitment	3.593
	Delivery of courses in timely manner	2.899
	Program management	2.399
Program Strategies	Course location	2.118
Student Services	Orientation to university or class location	2.863

Adult students' perceptions of Recruitment (M=3.281, SD=1.085) showed a significant difference from Administrators perceptions of Recruitment as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.120, SD=0.666), $t(55)=3.59$, $p>.05$, two-tailed.

Adult students' perceptions of Delivery of courses in timely manner (M=3.969, SD=1.332) showed a significant difference from Administrators' perceptions of Delivery of courses in timely manner as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.720, SD=0.542), t(55)=2.90, p>.05, two-tailed.

Adult students' perceptions of Program management (M=3.781, SD=1.263) showed a significant difference from Administrators' perceptions of Program management in timely manner as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.400, SD=0.645), t(55)=2.40, p>.05, two-tailed.

Adult students' perceptions of Course location (M=4.313, SD=0.821) showed a significant difference from Administrators' perceptions of Course location in timely manner as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.680, SD=0.476), t(55)=2.19, p>.05, two-tailed.

Adult students' perceptions of Orientation to university or class location (M=3.219, SD=1.099) showed a significant difference from Administrators' perceptions of Orientation to university or class location as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.000, SD=0.957), t(55)=2.86, p>.05, two-tailed.

A t test was conducted for each quality indicator to determine significant difference between administrators and administrators having faculty status in their ratings of that indicator in round 3. Significant difference between administrators' and administrators' with faculty status perceptions of quality indicators was found in nine quality indicator. Those indicators were Reputation of Institution in the Institution category, Vision of Institution in the Institution category, Mission of Institution in the Institution category, Weekend and Evening Course Offerings in the Program Strategies category, Course Location in the Program Strategies category, Qualified Staff in the Student Services category, Technology Enhancements, in the Student Services category, Orientation to University or Class Location in the Student Services category, and Instructional Methodology in the Instructional Strategies category. The highest significant difference was found in Mission of Institution. All nine quality indicators received a higher overall mean rating from Administrators with faculty status. This

indicated administrators with faculty status were in higher agreement with all nine as a quality indicators of off-campus programs compared to administrators. At a .05 level Table 9 lists quality indicators showing significant difference. Categories showing no significant difference are not included.

Table 9

Indicators with Significant Difference in Administrators and Administrators with Faculty Status Perceptions in Round Three

Category	Quality Indicator	t score
Institution	Reputation of institution	2.623
	Vision of institution	2.299
	Mission of institution	3.493
Program Strategies	Weekend and evening course offerings	3.382
	Course location	2.328
Student Services	Qualified staff	2.838
	Technology enhancements	2.313
	Orientation to university or class location	3.166
Instructional Strategies	Instructional methodology	2.102

Administrators' perceptions of Reputation of institution (M=3.750, SD=0.707) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Reputation of institution as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.500, SD=0.519), $t(20)$=2.62, p>.05, two-tailed.

Administrators' perceptions of Vision of institution (M=3.250, SD=0.707) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Vision of institution as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.000, SD=0.784), $t(20)$=2.30, p>.05, two-tailed.

Administrators perceptions of Mission of institution (M=3.125, SD=0.641) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Mission of institution as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.214, SD=0.802), $t(20)$=3.49, p>.05, two-tailed.

Administrators perceptions of Weekend and evening course offerings (M=4.125, SD=0.641) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with

faculty status of Weekend and evening course offerings as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.929, SD=0.267), t(20)=3.38, p>.05, two-tailed.

Administrators perceptions of Course location (M=4.375, SD=0.518) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Course location as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.857, SD=0.363), t(20)=2.33, p>.05, two-tailed.

Administrators perceptions of Qualified staff (M=4.125, SD=0.354) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Qualified staff as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.643, SD=0.497), t(20)=2.84, p>.05, two-tailed.

Administrators perceptions of Technology enhancements (M=3.500, SD=0.756) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Technology enhancements as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.214, SD=0.579), t(20)=2.31, p>.05, two-tailed.

Administrators perceptions of Orientation to university or class location (M=3.125, SD=0.991) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Orientation to university or class location as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.357, SD=0.633), t(20)=3.17, p>.05, two-tailed.

Administrators perceptions of Instructional methodology (M=3.750, SD=1.035) showed a significant difference from perceptions of Administrators' with faculty status of Instructional methodology as a quality indicator for off-campus programs (M=4.571, SD=0.514), t(20)=2.10, p>.05, two-tailed.

Quality indicators with an overall mean lower than 4.0 were eliminated. The 4.0 level was determined from a numerical scale developed by the national Materials Advisory Board (1971). The 4.0 level is the median level indicated for range of reliability (Appendix F). Previous rounds used 3.5, the beginning level of reliability. A higher level of reliability, 4.0, was used for development of the final list of designated quality indicators. Table 10 lists quality indicators eliminated.

Table 10

Quality Indicators Eliminated having an Overall Mean Lower than 4.0 in Round Three

Category	Quality Indicator	Mean
Institution	Vision of institution	3.84
	High national ranking among public universities	3.98
	Mission of institution	3.87
	Enrollments, full-time equivalency & semester hours	3.82
Administrative function	Staff development	3.68
	Faculty development	3.91
	Recruitment	3.64
Program Strategies	Cohort groups	3.73
	Peer interaction	3.98
	Assessment	3.86
	Technology supported delivery methods	3.98
	Good textbooks	3.80
Student Services	Technology enhancements	3.96
	Security for late hours	3.87
	Orientation to university or class location	3.56
	Flexible payment plans	3.98
	Network that will support internet courses	3.87
	Facilities are handicapped accessible	3.78
Instructional Strategies	Small group activities	3.80
	Assessment	3.84
	Student assessment of instructors	3.87
	Internet courses	3.89

The range of mean for those eliminated was 3.56 to 3.98. The importance of these indicators should not be minimized even though they were eliminated. All of them still rate in the reliable stage according to the National Materials Advisory Board (1971) (Appendix F).

Those indicators remaining with a 4.0 or higher were identified as quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. Table 11 gives the final list of quality indicators.

Table 11

Quality Indicators with 4.0 or Higher Mean after Final Round of Survey

Category	Quality Indicator	Mean
Institution	Reputation of institution	4.26
	Outreach efforts	4.10
	Adults feel they matter	4.36
	History of graduate success on certification tests	4.08
	Job placement rates following graduation	4.08
	Quality of technology	4.01
Administrative Function	Delivery of courses in timely manner	4.29
	Program management	4.05
	Commitment to students	4.42
Program Strategies	Weekend and evening course offerings	4.49
	Course location	4.47
	Teaching excellence	4.47
	Cost of program	4.05
	Faculty support	4.31
	Learner-driven course scheduling	4.01
	Sufficient number of graduate and undergraduate courses	4.17
Student Services	Flexible operating hours	4.17
	Qualified staff	4.42
	Computer access	4.14
Instructional Strategies	Instructor expertise	4.61
	Use of knowledge already gained by adult students	4.07
	Curriculum relevance	4.47
	Instructor enthusiasm	4.47
	Instructional methodology	4.19
	Environment conducive to learning	4.40
	Instructional technologies	4.08

Fifty-seven quality indicators were evaluated during this research. Of those 57 indicators, 26 were identified as quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University.

Wave Analysis and Summary

A total of 57 quality indicators were rated in this study. A summary of the quality indicators from all three rounds were listed giving their category, comments in that category, and means for each round (Appendix P).

A wave analysis was done to indicate response bias (Leslie, 1972). This was done by e-mailing two participants to determine if their ratings of four on-going quality indicators changed from round 2 to round 3. They were asked to refer to their feedback sheets received when submitting each round of the study. There was no difference in their ratings from round to round so absence of response bias could be established. Response bias is the effect of nonresponses on survey estimates (Fowler, 1988). Table 12 gives a summary of the wave analysis.

Table 12

Wave Analysis to Establish Bias

Participant	Quality Indicator	Response R2	Response R3
1	Adults feel they matter	5	5
	Commitment to students	5	5
	Qualified staff	4	4
	Instructor methodology	4	4
2	Adults feel they matter	5	5
	Commitment to students	5	5
	Qualified staff	4	4
	Instructor methodology	5	5

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings of this study used in identifying quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. The study was based upon research guided by the perceptions of two distinct groups: administrators at Eastern Illinois University and adult students enrolled in off-campus courses at Eastern Illinois.

The chapter is divided into 5 sections. The first section, Introduction, gives an introduction about the chapter and study. It lists the 5 sections in the chapter with an overview of each. The purpose of the study is also given. The second section, Delphi Web Survey Process, talks about the Delphi Web Survey Process. It includes a discussion of the problems encountered and the advantages in using an electronic survey process. The third section, Conclusions, gives the significant findings concerning the quality indicators developed during this study. The fourth section, Discussion, gives possibilities of why significant differences were found between administrators and adult students. It also discusses possibilities of why significant differences were found between administrators and administrators with faculty status. The fifth section, Recommendations, talks about the designated quality indicators and how universities

might incorporate them into the different administrative functions of the university. Research recommendations are also given.

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. The study also provided a list of quality indicators to be used by Eastern Illinois University and other higher education institutions with similar characteristics to evaluate off-campus programs. A further outcome was to determine any significant difference between administrators and administrators with faculty status concerning their perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University.

Delphi Web Survey Process

The electronic survey was an efficient way to conduct the study in terms of convenience for response, cost efficiency, and speed of return. The data collection method proved efficient allowing for ease of transfer through electronic means for analysis. It provided figures that could be transferred to Excel so the results could be analyzed electronically, rather than by hand. However, problems were encountered related to the medium of electronic delivery.

Two regular mailings were conducted asking for participation in the study. Those agreeing to participate provided their preferred e-mail address. A blind mailing list was developed from the e-mail addresses of all participants. The survey process was tested by three different individuals at three different locations prior to the electronic survey instrument being forwarded to participants. Individuals conducting the test were not

participants in the study. The survey could not be accessed. As a result of the test, the site administrator discovered a new firewall at Eastern Illinois University was prohibiting access. Computer Services was contacted and they indicated efforts would begin to remedy the problem. However, after three weeks the survey still could not be accessed. At this point the site administrator arranged access for the survey without going through Eastern Illinois University's firewall. A new website had to be established and the survey was reconstructed for this site. The testing process was successful and participants were able to access the survey.

After the completion of Round one the site administrator forwarded the results for analysis. There was a problem in the general comments area. This area had been limited to 54 characters and needed to be expanded to allow for additional text. The 54-character limit was changed to accommodate any length for the additional two rounds.

Quality indicators could be deleted without any problems but adding new indicators took more time and effort than expected when revising the survey. Also in order for the site administrator to provide results, each quality indicator and areas of comments or additions to indicators had to be identified with a number. Round 1 quality indicators were identified as Q1 thru Q40. Round 2 quality indicators were identified as R2Q1 thru R2Q50. Round 3 quality indicators were identified as R3Q1 thru R3Q50. See Appendix Y for a list of quality indicators by round and how they were identified on the Excel spreadsheet.

Some of the comments received, indicated participants needed more explanation of specific indicators. Placement of the indicators in categories should have helped participants determine the context the quality indicator was being used. Conducting the

survey electronically did not allow for additional space for explanation. Some adult students e-mailed questions concerning the quality indicators. Being able to receive and send communication immediately was invaluable. Participants could e-mail questions, receive an answer, and resume completion of the survey immediately. Some participants phoned to get clarification. If participants didn't communicate their questions, the only way to get clarification was through the category the indicator was placed in.

While some difficulties were encountered while conducting the research electronically, this researcher believes the overall process worked well. Once the study began it went very quickly. Some participants complimented the survey and others thanked the researcher for conducting the study.

Technology has impacted our world in many ways. The technology used in this research saved time and money. It was also convenient in sending and receiving information. While some problems were encountered, once the process started it progressed quickly. Research is changing because of the use of technology.

Findings

In round 1 significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators was found in three quality indicators. Those indicators were Marketing in the Administrative Functions category, Course Location in the Program Strategies category, and Cohort Groups in the Program Strategies category. The highest significant difference was found in Marketing. All three quality indicators received a higher overall mean rating from administrators. This indicated administrators

were in higher agreement with Marketing, Course Location, and Cohort Groups as quality indicators of off-campus programs compared to adult students.

In round 1 significant difference between administrators' and administrators' with faculty status perceptions of quality indicators was found in three quality indicators. Those indicators were Program Management in the Administrative Function category, Small Group Activities in the Instructional Strategies category, and Curriculum Relevance in the Instructional Strategies category. The highest significant difference was found in Curriculum Relevance. All three quality indicators received a higher overall mean rating from Administrators with faculty status. This indicated administrators with faculty status were in higher agreement with Program Management, Small Group Activities, and Curriculum Relevance as quality indicators of off-campus programs compared to administrators.

In round 2 significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators was found in three quality indicators. Those indicators were Outreach Efforts in the Institution category, Recruitment in the Administrative Function category, and Delivery of Courses in a Timely Manner, in the Administrative Function category. The highest significance was found in Delivery of Courses in a Timely Manner. All three quality indicators received a higher overall mean rating from administrators. This indicated administrators were in higher agreement with Outreach Efforts, Recruitment, and Delivery of Courses in a Timely Manner as quality indicators for off-campus programs compared to adult students.

In round 2 significant difference between administrators' and administrators' with faculty status perceptions of quality indicators was found in only one quality indicator.

The indicator was Small Group Activities in the Instructional Strategies category. Administrators with faculty status gave a higher overall mean rating for Small Group Activities. This indicated administrators with faculty status were in higher agreement with Small Group Activities as a quality indicator of off-campus programs compared to administrators.

In round 3 significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators was found in five quality indicators. Those indicators were Recruitment in the Administrative Function category, Delivery of Courses in a Timely Manner in the Administrative Function category, Program Management in the Administrative Function category, Course Location in the Program Strategies category, and Orientation to University or Class Location in the Student Services category. The highest significant difference was found in Recruitment. All five quality indicators received a higher overall mean rating from Administrators. This indicated administrators were in higher agreement with Recruitment, Delivery of Courses in a Timely Manner, Program Management, Course Location, and Orientation to University or Class Location as quality indicators of off-campus programs compared to adult students.

In round 3 significant difference between administrators' and administrators' with faculty status perceptions of quality indicators was found in nine quality indicator. Those indicators were Reputation of Institution in the Institution category, Vision of Institution in the Institution category, Mission of Institution in the Institution category, Weekend and Evening Course Offerings in the Program Strategies category, Course Location in the Program Strategies category, Qualified Staff in the Student Services category, Technology Enhancements, in the Student Services category, Orientation to University or

Class Location in the Student Services category, and Instructional Methodology in the Instructional Strategies category. The highest significant difference was found in Mission of Institution. All nine quality indicators received a higher overall mean rating from Administrators with faculty status. This indicated administrators with faculty status were in higher agreement with all nine as a quality indicators of off-campus programs compared to administrators.

Conclusions

During the process of completing the 3-round electronic survey, 57 quality indicators were evaluated, rated, and analyzed for the purpose of answering one main question: Is there a difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for adult education programs at Eastern Illinois University?

Of the 57 indicators evaluated by administrators versus adult students only 11 or 19.3 percent were rejected at the .05 level. This indicates that 46 or 80.7 percent of the indicators provided no significant difference at the .05 level. At this level of agreement it would be appropriate to say that administrators and adult students at Eastern Illinois University tend to agree on the quality indicators needed for an effective off-campus program.

Of those quality indicators showing a significant difference the highest level of significant difference for administrators versus adult students was found in the Administrative Function category with the "recruitment" indicator. It had a t score of 3.59. Second place went to "delivery of courses in timely manner" in the Administrative Function category with t score of 2.90 and "orientation to university or class location" in

the Student Services category was third with t score of 2.86. A summary of indicators with significant differences is provided in Chapter Four in Tables 3, 6, and 8.

Another outcome of this study, the electronic survey sought to identify administrators versus administrators with faculty status. With this data the researcher could determine if a significant difference existed between administrators and administrators with faculty status regarding their perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs.

Of the 57 indicators evaluated by administrators versus administrators with faculty status only thirteen or 22.8 percent were significant at the .05 level. This indicates that 44 or 77.2 percent of the indicators provided no significant difference at the .05 level. There was a higher level of rejection for this group, 22.8 percent compared to the administrator versus adult student group at 19.3 percent for a 3.5% increase. Even with this increase it would be appropriate to interpret that administrators and administrators with faculty status at Eastern Illinois University tend to agree on the quality indicators needed for an effective off-campus program.

Of those quality indicators showing a significant difference the highest level of significant difference for administrators versus administrators with faculty status was found in the Administrative Function category with the "staff development" indicator. It had a t score of 3.49. Second place went to "assessment" in the Program Strategies category with t score of 3.38 and "instructor enthusiasm" in the Instructional Strategies category was third with t score of 3.17. A summary of indicators with a significant difference is provided in Chapter 4 in Tables 4, 7, and 9.

This study also sought to provide a list of quality indicators for use at Eastern Illinois University and other higher education institutions with similar characteristics. After review of the literature an electronic survey instrument was prepared with five categories and 33 quality indicators for participants to rate using a 5-point Likert scale. Participants were encouraged to add additional quality indicators for each category and make comments at the end of the survey.

Quality indicators with an overall mean lower than 3.5 were eliminated for distribution in round 2. Eight of the 33 indicators were eliminated. Participants added 24 indicators that were included in round 2.

Round 2 consisted of forty-nine quality indicators to be evaluated by the participants. Only one indicator, "service to the university," was eliminated for distribution in the third round with an overall mean less than 3.5.

The third round provided 48 quality indicators for a final rating. Indicators having an overall mean lower than 4.0 were eliminated as quality indicators for off-campus programs. The importance of these indicators should not be minimized even though they were eliminated. All of them still rate in the reliable stage according to the National Materials Advisory Board (1971) (Appendix F).

Those indicators with an overall mean of 4.0 or better were determined to be reliable indicators from ratings of adult students and administrators at Eastern Illinois University. Appendix Z gives a list of indicators giving the highest and lowest ratings by categories of "adult students" and "administrators". A final list of designated quality indicators determined by this study is given in Appendix AA.

Discussion

When comparing perceptions of administrators and adult students, all indicators having significant difference received a higher overall mean rating from administrators. This was consistent all three rounds. This may be due to all but one indicator relating more to administration. Categories of significant indicators included: Administrative Function, Program Strategies, Institution, and Student Services. Of these categories, adult students may have a better understanding of student services since they interact with this area directly. Adult students may not be as aware or concerned about administrative functions in adult programs. Therefore they may not have ranked them as high. For example, marketing is the function of administrators. Administrators may have been able to identify more with the process and the impact it has on enrollments, semester hours, and head count.

When comparing perceptions of administrators and administrators with faculty status, all indicators having significant difference received a higher overall mean rating from administrators with faculty status. This was consistent all three rounds. This may be due to the personal contact faculty members have with students. Administrators with faculty status have exposure in the classroom. This may provide awareness of student needs for successful off-campus programming. Teaching adults provides a more intrinsic view of adult students and meeting their needs.

Recommendations

Quality indicators having a significant difference between adult students' and administrators' perceptions should be examined to determine implications for

improvement. Further, quality indicators having a significant difference between administrators' and administrators' with faculty status perceptions should be examined to determine implications for improvement. A summary of focus areas developed from the quality indicators having significant difference might include:

1. Adult student orientation to bring about awareness of policy, procedures, and services.
2. Administration/faculty development program for professional development in adult learning theory and processes in off-campus programming.
3. Provide a lecture series or brown-bag session on current topics related to design, development, and delivery of adult education programs.
4. Develop a Dean's Student Advisory Committee for feedback on current or future course offerings and processes in off-campus programming.
5. Provide web links on the off-campus web page to student services and information areas identified.
6. Encourage chairs, deans, and other administrators to be a guest speaker or visit an off-campus class at least once a semester.
7. Develop a web resource site for adult education resources. These resources might include professional organizations, information on grants and research, and topic information such as "Adult Learning Theory."
8. Make budgetary decisions in regards to improvement of significant differences.

The 26, designated quality indicators provided by this study, can be used by off-campus programs for planning, developing, and delivery of adult programs. A summary of focus areas developed from the designated quality indicators might include:

1. Institutional awareness of its reputation and outreach efforts.
2. Adult students need to feel valued. The university needs to show adult students they matter and provide job placement data.
3. Administrative function should provide delivery of courses in a timely manner through program management committed to students.
4. Program strategies should include flexible scheduling and course location driven by the learners needs. They should provide faculty support and teaching excellence.
5. Student services should maintain flexible operating hours, with qualified staff and open access to computers.
6. Instructional strategies need to focus on instructional expertise, which scored the highest overall mean of the 26 indicators. In addition the classroom environment should be conducive to learning using relevant curriculum. The university should also pursue instructional technologies and methods that emphasize the use of knowledge already gained by adult students.
7. Development of a survey instrument made up of designated quality indicators to design, develop and deliver effective adult programs.
8. Identify areas of improvement for staff and faculty development to provide effective adult education programming and services.
9. Make budgetary decision in regards to categories and quality indicators identified as most crucial in delivery of adult programs.

10. Develop adult student advisory groups to gain feedback on categories and indicators identified by students as most important. This should be an on-going process for improvement.
11. Develop an advisory council of community, business, industry and pre-k-12 educational leaders to provide feedback for meeting their educational needs.

According to The Higher Learning Commission (2002), the organization engages other groups, as called by its mission, and collaborates with and serves them in ways both value. According to Criterion Five: Engagement and Service, from Document B: Proposed New Criteria for Accreditation with Patterns of Evidence developed by The Higher Learning Commission (2002) evidence should indicate the following:

1. The organization learns and analyzes the needs and expectations of the communities it serves.
2. The organization has the capacity and demonstrates the commitment to engage the communities it serves.
3. The organization connects with and engages those communities that depend on it for service.
4. Internal and external constituencies value the service the organization provides.

The development of an adult student advisory council and community, business, industry, and pre-K-12 advisory council would help provide criteria for accreditation and improvement.

It is not the intention of this researcher to indicate that the list of designated quality indicators is exclusive. It can easily be seen that many of the quality indicators rejected at the 4.0 level were reliable at the 3.5 level. Some indicators that fell just below

the 4.0 level may have failed to make the designated list because of lack of understanding of the indicator itself. Indicators related to technology, for example, may lack the exposure to or understanding of some adult students or administrators to place a higher value. Some indicators may have scored higher if participants had a better understanding of utilizing them in the educational process.

The end results of producing a list of quality indicators for examination should provide a framework for evaluating off-campus programs and dealing with adult students. If institutions are truly motivated to provide adult programming, these quality indicators should be valuable in the development of those programs.

This researcher believes the information provided can be used by Eastern Illinois University and similar higher education institutions to ensure quality nontraditional programs through measured indicators. These designated quality indicators have proven to be valuable and need to be developed into a survey instrument for measuring the effectiveness of universities in providing quality adult programs. This study provided a list of quality indicators for measurement to determine "what to do," the instrument developed from these indicators would provide a measurement of "how universities are doing."

This research could be conducted at other universities as a comparison to validate findings at Eastern Illinois University. Further studies could be done statewide or nationally for comparisons. A study would be helpful to examine the differences within the student category. Some possibilities might be by gender or location of residence.

Another area of research could focus on the facilitation of the online Delphi survey research process. Increasingly researchers are using the web to conduct surveys

and more must be understood about the facilitation and accommodating responses and dialogue through a web survey interface. It would be important to better understand the process of electronic research, specifically through a Delphi survey process, to better foster the electronic survey process rather than inhibit it.

REFERENCES CITED

Alreck, P. & Settle, R. (1995). The survey research handbook (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Aslanian, C. & Brickell, H. (1980). Americans in transition: Life changes as reasons for adult learning. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Babbie, E. (1990). Survey research methods (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Barragan, R. (1989). Examining the needs for student services of adult learners in continuing higher education (Doctoral dissertation, Florida International University, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 12A.

Benshoff, J. M. (1991). Nontraditional college students: A developmental look at the needs of women and men returning to school. Journal of Young Adulthood and Middle Age, 3, 47-61.

Benshoff, J. M. (1993). Educational opportunities, developmental challenges: Understanding nontraditional college students. 5-6.

Benshoff, J. & Lewis, H. (1992). Nontraditional college students. Ann Arbor, MI: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. EDD00036).

Buchen, I. (1995). Continuous quality improvement and adult education. Adult Learning, 7, (1), 11-12.

Chen, H. (1997). An internal evaluation model for university continuing education credit programs (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 08A.

Clare, M. (1994). Adapted from Working with or publics, module 7 [On-line]. Available: .

Cross, K. P. (1980). Our changing students and their impact on colleges: Prospects for a true learning society. Phi Delta Kappan, May, 630-632.

Cross, K. P. (1981). Growth of the learning society. Adult learners (pp.2-3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dirkx, J. (1993). In the eye of the beholder: Perceptions of quality in program renewal and improvement. Adult Learning,4 (6), 23-25.

Dunn, S. L. (2001, January). Fuel for the future. USA Today, 129, 28.

Eastern Illinois University (2002). Background and history of Eastern Illinois University [On-Line]. Available: http://www.eiu.edu/~eiupres/text/history.html.

Eichhorn, C. D. (1994). Quality indicators in Nebraska adult basic education programs as perceived by Nebraska ABE practitioners (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55, 09A.

Eifler, K. & Potthoff, D. (1998). Nontraditional teacher education students: A synthesis of the literature. Journal of Teacher Education, 4 (3), 187-196.

Fowler, F. J. (1988). How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Gordon, H. R. D. (1992). Comparison of the motivational orientations of adult education graduates and vocational education graduates in off-campus programs. East

Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 490).

Gose, B. (1999). Surge in continuing education brings profits for universities. Chronical of Higher Education, 45 (24), A51-A52.

Harrington, F. H. (1977). The future of adult education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hresko, A. (1998). A descriptive study of cohort programs in educational administrative preparation programs (Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, 1998). Dissertation Abstracts International, 60, 01A.

Hine, W. C. (1994). Teaching the adult student. Unpublished paper.

Jacobs, J. & Stoner-Eby, S. (1998). Adult enrollment and educational attainment. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 559, 91-109.

Johns, J. (1996). Performance assessment in higher education in Britain. European Journal of Operational Research, 89(1), 18-33.

Kersten, L. A. (1992). Identifying critical factors of perceptions of quality: Responses of continuing education students who have taken both on-campus and off-campus credit classes at four-year public institutions (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 07A.

Knowles, M. S. (1962). The adult education movement in the United States. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Knowles, M. S. (1988). The adult learner a neglected species (3rd ed.). Houston: Gulf.

Krejcie, R. & Morgan, D. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.

Lee, C. (1998). The adult learner: Neglected no more. Training, 35(3), 47-50.

Leslie, L. L. (1972). Are high response rates essential to valid surveys? Social Science Research, 1, 323-334.

Lohmann, J. (1988). A study of marketing orientation as applied to continuing education in four-year institutions of higher education (Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 10A.

Lund, J. T. (1992). Identifying critical factors of quality: Perceptions of continuing education students who have taken both on-campus and off-campus credit classes at four-year private institutions (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, 01A.

Manzo, K. (2001). History in the making. Community College Week, 13(15), 6.

Marks, A. (1999). Taking the water to the horse. Adults Learning, 10(7), 11-13.

Merriam, S. B. & Caffarella, R. S. (1991). Characteristics and objectives of learners. Learning in adulthood. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merritt, R. (1995). The adult learner challenge: Instructionally and administratively. Education, 115(3), 426-433.

Mooney, L. (1994). The non-traditional student at Henderson State university: A study of the quality of programs for adult learners at a state supported higher education institution (Arkansas) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56, 03A.

Moore, H. (1994). Customer perceptions of quality in continuing education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56, 03A.

National Center for Education Statistics (1996). Digest of education statistics. Washington, DC: Department of Education.

National Education Association (1960, December). Small-sample techniques. The NEA Research Bulletin, 38, 99.

National Materials Advisory Board (1971). A Delphi exploration of the U. S. ferroalloy and steel industries. Springfield, Virginia: National Technical Information Service.

Nordstrom, A. (1997, September 15). Adult students a valuable market to target. Marketing News, 31, 19.

O'Keeffe, M. D. (1984). Factors affecting the growth of adult degree programs in Catholic women's colleges (continuing education) (Doctoral dissertation, Boston College, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 03A.

Olson, R. (1995). Adult basic education student perceptions of quality indicators Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56, 03A.

Oroza, L. (1997). Adult education directors' perceptions of performance indicators for adult education programs in the state of Florida (Doctoral dissertation, Florida International University, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 10A.

Pedersen, R. P. (2001). How we got here: It's not how you think. Community College Week, 13(15), 4.

Peterson, R. E. (1979). Lifelong learning in America. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Powell, R. (1992). Acquisition and use of pedagogical knowledge among career-change preservice teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 13 (4), 17-24.

Roopchand, R. S. (1997). The critical analysis of total quality management in continuing higher education (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 12A.

Sapin-Piane, B. M. (1993). Mature adults becoming teachers: Sailing towards Ithaka. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

School of Continuing Education Website (2002). Lifelong learning [On-line]. Available: http://www.eiu.edu/~adulted/lifelong.html.

Speer, T. L. (1996). A nation of students. American Demographics, 18(8), 32-38.

The Higher Learning Commission (2002, June). Document B: Proposed new criteria for accreditation with patterns of evidence [On-line}. Available: www.ncahigherlearningcommission.org.

Turoff, M. & Stiltz, S. R. (1996). Computer based Delphi processes [On-line]. Available: http://eeies.njit.edu/~turoff/papers/delphi3.html.

Whitt, E. J. (1994). Encouraging adult learner involvement. NASPA Journal, 31, 309-318.

APPENDIX A

September 4, 2002

Dear EIU Administrator:

I am currently a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations at Indiana State University. I am conducting a survey research project for the completion of my dissertation, Administrators' and Adult Students' Perceptions of Quality Indicators for Off-Campus Programs. The purpose of the study will be to determine if there is a significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. The method of study and the rights of the participants are explained in the Informed Consent Documentation. When the study is completed, I will provide you with a description of the results.

Approval for this study at EIU has been granted by the Institutional Review Board; William C. Hine, Dean , School of Continuing Education; and Blair M. Lord, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Also the Review Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at Indiana State University has granted permission for this study. The School of Continuing Education at EIU is cooperating in the research process.

If you have further questions, please feel free to e-mail me at conniesb67@hotmail.com or call me at [redacted]. You may also contact the chairperson of my dissertation committee, Dr. Gregory Ulm at [redacted]. If you agree to participate, please sign the enclosed Informed Consent Documentation along with your preferred e-mail address and return to Connie Butler in the School of Continuing Education no later than September 12.

Sincerely,

Connie S. Butler

APPENDIX B

September 4, 2002

Dear EIU Student:

I am currently a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations at Indiana State University. I am conducting a survey research project for the completion of my dissertation, Administrators' and Adult Students' Perceptions of Quality Indicators for Off-Campus Programs. The purpose of the study will be to determine if there is a significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. The method of study and the rights of the participants are explained in the Informed Consent Documentation. When the study is completed, I will provide you with a description of the results.

Approval for this study at EIU has been granted by the Institutional Review Board; William C. Hine, Dean , School of Continuing Education; and Blair M. Lord, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Also the Review Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at Indiana State University has granted permission for this study. The School of Continuing Education at EIU is cooperating in the research process.

If you have further questions, please feel free to e-mail me at conniesb67@hotmail.com or call me at [redacted]. You may also contact the chairperson of my dissertation committee, Dr. Gregory Ulm at [redacted]. If you agree to participate, please sign the enclosed Informed Consent Documentation along with your preferred e-mail address and return to Connie Butler in the School of Continuing Education no later than September 12. A self-addressed, stamped envelope has been provided for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Connie S. Butler

APPENDIX C

Informed Consent Documentation

I have agreed to be a participant in the survey research project by Connie Butler for completion of her dissertation, Administrators' and Adult Students' Perceptions of Quality Indicators for Off-Campus Programs. I understand that the purpose of this study will be to determine if there is a significant difference between administrators' and adult students' perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University.

I further understand that a Delphi survey method will be used and will require three rounds of response. I understand each round will be completed over a 10-day period with reminders sent by e-mail to participants that have not responded within the first 5 days and that all survey rounds should be completed within a 5-6 week time span. The first round will take approximately 15 minutes with each additional round requiring less time to complete. Furthermore, I understand that the survey will be conducted electronically and will require my providing an e-mail address for distribution of each round. I understand that the possible benefits are good. Eastern Illinois University will have an understanding whether or not EIU administrators differ from adult students in their perceptions of quality indicators for off-campus programs. I understand that little or no risks are anticipated.

Furthermore, I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and my refusal to participate will not result in a loss of benefits to which I am entitled or any other penalties. I also understand that it is my right to discontinue my participation at any time and that such a decision will not result in the loss of benefits to which I am entitled or any other penalties. I understand that results of the survey will be reported anonymously and will be used for the purpose of the previously mentioned research only.

I understand that I may contact Connie Butler at [redacted] or conniesb67@hotmail.com for information concerning this research project. I may also contact her dissertation chairperson, Dr. Gregory Ulm at [redacted] for information concerning this research.

I have reviewed this information and agree to participate.

_____

Signature of Participant

_____

Participant E-mail Address

_____

Signature of Researcher

APPENDIX D

LIKERT-SCALE
Showing levels of agreement with the item as a quality indicator

High level of agreement 5 4 3 2 1 Low level of agreement

APPENDIX E

Descriptive Statistics for Quality Indicators from Results of Round 1 (N=59; Students 34, Administrators 25)

Quality Indicator	Mean			Standard Deviation	
	Stu	Adm	Overall	Student	Admin
Reputation of institution	4.176	4.346	4.250	0.626	0.892
Vision of institution	3.588	3.654	3.617	1.019	1.056
Strategic plan	3.500	3.038	3.300	1.022	0.999
Adults feel they matter	3.971	4.423	4.167	1.114	0.809
Staff development	3.353	3.692	3.500	1.515	0.928
Faculty development	3.500	3.846	3.650	1.600	1.156
Marketing	2.853	3.731	3.233	1.617	1.116
Assessment	3.147	3.692	3.383	1.560	0.970
Program management	3.559	4.000	3.750	1.561	1.020
Strategic planning	3.206	3.269	3.233	1.647	0.919
Commitment to students	3.853	4.462	4.117	1.579	0.989
Weekend and evening course offerings	4.118	4.500	4.283	1.094	0.860
Course location	3.971	4.577	4.233	1.218	0.857
Cohort groups	3.412	4.000	4.233	1.158	0.938
Mentoring	3.265	3.577	3.400	1.238	0.902
Assessment (Program Strategies) category)	3.706	3.423	3.583	1.031	0.987
Credit for experiential learning	3.618	3.154	3.417	1.256	1.190
Cost of program	4.176	3.885	4.050	0.834	1.143
Faculty support	4.324	4.231	4.283	0.768	1.177
Flexible operating hours	4.029	4.231	4.117	1.114	1.070
Qualified staff	4.471	4.500	4.483	0.706	0.860

Appendix E continued on next page.

Quality Indicator	Mean			Standard Deviation	
	Stu	Adm	Overall	Student	Admin
Food services	2.618	2.577	2.600	1.477	1.332
Greater availability and access to parking	3.324	3.154	3.250	1.319	1.377
Security for late hours	3.559	3.692	3.617	1.353	1.350
Orientation to university or class location	3.441	3.577	3.500	1.236	1.238
Flexible payment plans	3.882	3.462	3.700	1.066	1.421
Instructor expertise	4.618	4.692	4.650	0.922	0.471
Use of knowledge already gained by adult students	4.206	3.808	4.033	0.770	1.201
Small group activities	3.618	4.077	3.817	0.985	0.891
Curriculum relevance	4.294	4.538	4.400	0.799	0.647
Instructor enthusiasm	4.441	4.385	4.417	0.705	0.852
Instructor methodology	4.029	4.038	4.033	0.969	0.871
Assessment (Instructional Strategies category)	3.912	3.654	3.800	1.083	1.018

APPENDIX F

NUMERICAL SCALE
NATIONAL MATERIALS ADVISORY BOARD

Directions: (The scale on this page is designed to assist you in arriving at a Numerical value on the items in the subsequent listing.)

VALIDITY OR CONFIDENCE SCALE

Numerical Scale

BLANK NO JUDGMENT
- No knowledge to judge this item, but the appropriate individual (expert, decision-maker) should be able to provide an evaluation I would respect.

1 UNRELIABLE (Average of 1 to 1.5)
- Great risk of being wrong.
- Worthless as a decision basis.
- The converse, if it exists, is possibly CERTAIN

2 RISKY (Average of 1.6 to 2.5)
- Substantial risk of being wrong.
- Not willing to make a decision based upon this alone.
- Many incorrect inferences can be drawn.
- The converse, if it exists, is possibly RELIABLE

3 NOT DETERMINABLE (at this time) (Average of 2.6 to 3.5)
- The information or knowledge to evaluate the validity of this assertion is not available to anyone—expert or decision-maker.

4 RELIABLE (Average of 3.6 to 4.5)
- Some risk of being wrong.
- Willingness to make a decision based upon this.
- Assuming this to be true, but recognizing some chance of error.
- Some incorrect inferences can be drawn.

5 CERTAIN (Average of 4.6 to 5)
- Low risk of being wrong.
- Decision based upon this will not be wrong because of this "fact."
- Most inferences drawn from this will be true.

This form is adapted from: National Materials Advisory Board. A Delphi Exploration of the U. S. Ferroalloy and Steel Industries. Springfield, Virginia: National Technical Information Service, 1971.

APPENDIX G

Descriptive Statistics for Quality Indicators from Results of Round 2 (N=59; Students, 33, Administrators, 26)

Quality Indicator	Mean			Standard Deviation	
	Stu	Adm	Overall	Student	Admin
Reputation of institution	4.257	4.240	4.250	0.657	0.723
Vision of institution	3.886	3.600	3.767	0.900	0.764
Outreach efforts	3.829	4.320	4.033	0.923	0.802
Adults feel they matter	4.086	4.360	4.200	0.887	0.810
High national ranking among public universities	4.000	3.760	3.900	0.874	0.663
Mission of institution	3.714	3.680	3.700	0.860	0.690
History of graduate success on certification tests	3.886	3.920	3.900	0.963	0.954
Job placement rates following graduation	4.000	4.080	4.033	0.840	0.862
Quality of technology	3.829	3.800	3.817	1.200	0.913
Enrollments, full-time equivalency, & semester hours	3.971	3.520	3.783	0.891	1.085
Staff development	3.543	3.720	3.617	1.146	0.678
Faculty development	3.686	4.040	3.833	1.255	0.676
Recruitment	3.400	4.000	3.650	1.168	0.707
Delivery of courses in timely manner	3.743	4.440	4.033	1.314	0.768
Program management	3.743	4.240	3.950	1.245	0.779
Service to university	3.514	3.440	3.483	1.269	1.158

Appendix G continued on next page.

Quality Indicator	Mean			Standard Deviation	
	Stu	Adm	Overall	Student	Admin
Commitment to students	4.029	4.440	4.200	1.339	1.121
Weekend and evening course offerings	4.257	4.520	4.367	1.268	0.714
Course location	4.486	4.320	4.417	0.818	0.852
Cohort groups	3.714	3.800	3.750	0.926	0.913
Peer Interaction	4.086	4.000	4.050	0.887	0.764
Assessment (Program Strategies category)	3.943	3.520	3.767	0.802	1.005
Teaching excellence	4.457	4.360	4.417	0.701	0.638
Cost of program	4.200	3.800	4.033	0.759	1.155
Faculty support	4.200	4.120	4.167	0.719	0.833
Technology supported delivery programs	3.914	3.760	3.850	0.887	1.052
Good textbooks	3.771	3.800	3.783	1.060	0.707
Learner-driven course scheduling	3.943	4.000	3.967	0.998	0.816
Sufficient number of graduate and undergraduate courses	4.200	4.160	4.183	0.868	0.898
Flexible operating hours	4.286	4.200	4.250	0.860	0.913
Qualified staff	4.429	4.400	4.417	0.558	0.707
Computer access	4.314	4.080	4.217	0.676	0.954
Technology enhancements	4.114	3.840	4.000	0.718	0.850
Security for late hours	3.657	3.880	3.750	1.162	1.054
Orientation to university or class location	3.514	3.600	3.550	1.095	0.866
Flexible payment plans	3.943	4.080	4.000	0.873	0.812
Network that will support internet courses	3.686	4.080	3.850	1.367	0.997

Appendix G continued on next page.

Quality Indicator	Mean			Standard Deviation	
	Stu	Adm	Overall	Student	Admin
Facilities are handicapped accessible	4.000	3.880	3.950	0.804	1.092
Instructor expertise	4.629	4.600	4.617	0.547	0.577
Use of knowledge already gained by adult students	4.143	4.120	4.133	0.845	0.666
Small group activities	3.743	3.840	3.783	1.146	0.688
Curriculum relevance	4.314	4.440	4.367	0.932	0.768
Instructor enthusiasm	4.571	4.400	4.500	0.655	0.645
Instructor methodology	4.143	4.160	4.150	0.879	0.624
Assessment (Instructional Strategies category)	3.857	3.680	3.783	0.912	0.748
Environment conducive to learning	4.371	4.200	4.300	0.598	0.645
Student assessment of instructors	4.086	3.840	3.983	0.887	0.943
Instructional technologies	3.971	3.920	3.950	0.891	0.759
Internet courses	3.714	3.560	3.650	0.987	1.158

APPENDIX H

Descriptive Statistics for Quality Indicators from Results of Round 3 (N=56; Students, 35; Administrators, 20)

Quality Indicator	Mean			Standard Deviation	
	Stu	Adm	Overall	Student	Admin
Reputation of institution	4.219	4.320	4.263	0.608	0.690
Vision of institution	3.875	3.800	3.842	0.707	0.816
Outreach efforts	3.969	4.280	4.368	0.695	0.737
Adults feel they matter	4.313	4.440	4.368	0.821	0.583
High national ranking among public universities	4.031	3.920	3.982	0.897	0.997
Mission of institution	3.844	3.920	3.877	0.847	0.909
History of graduate success on certification tests	3.969	4.240	4.088	0.695	0.879
Job placement rates following graduation	4.000	4.200	4.088	0.842	0.707
Quality of technology	4.031	4.000	4.018	0.933	0.816
Enrollments, full-time equivalency, & semester hours	3.875	3.760	3.825	0.833	0.879
Staff development	3.688	3.680	3.684	1.176	0.852
Faculty development	3.813	4.040	3.912	1.203	0.735
Recruitment	3.281	4.120	3.649	1.085	0.666
Delivery of courses in timely manner	3.969	4.720	4.298	1.332	0.542
Program management	3.781	4.400	4.053	1.263	0.645
Commitment to students	4.219	4.680	4.421	1.313	0.557

Appendix H continued on next page.

Quality Indicator	Mean			Standard Deviation	
	Stu	Adm	Overall	Student	Admin
Weekend and evening course offerings	4.406	4.600	4.491	0.798	0.645
Course location	4.313	4.680	4.474	0.821	0.476
Cohort groups	3.531	4.000	3.737	1.164	0.816
Peer interaction	3.875	4.120	3.982	0.871	0.781
Assessment (Program Strategies category)	3.969	3.720	3.860	0.999	0.980
Teaching excellence	4.375	4.600	4.474	0.707	0.577
Cost of program	4.156	3.920	4.053	0.884	0.909
Faculty support	4.406	4.200	4.316	0.560	0.913
Technology supported delivery programs	3.906	4.080	3.982	0.893	0.759
Good textbooks	3.719	3.920	3.807	1.170	0.702
Learner-driven course scheduling	3.875	4.200	4.018	0.942	0.707
Sufficient number of graduate and undergraduate courses	4.063	4.320	4.175	0.982	0.852
Flexible operating hours	4.188	4.160	4.175	0.859	1.143
Qualified staff	4.344	4.520	4.421	0.745	0.510
Computer access	4.063	4.240	4.140	0.914	0.831
Technology enhancements	3.906	4.040	3.965	1.058	0.735
Security for late hours	3.844	3.920	3.877	0.954	1.115
Orientation to university or class location	3.219	4.000	3.561	1.099	0.957
Flexible payment plans	4.031	3.920	3.982	0.967	1.038
Network that will support internet courses	3.719	4.080	3.877	1.301	0.997
Facilities are handicapped accessible	3.688	3.920	3.789	1.030	1.222

Appendix H continued on next page.

Quality Indicator	Mean			Standard Deviation	
	Stu	Adm	Overall	Student	Admin
Instructor expertise	4.500	4.760	4.614	0.984	0.436
Use of knowledge already gained by adult students	4.094	4.040	4.070	0.818	0.676
Small group activities	3.719	3.920	3.807	0.924	0.702
Curriculum relevance	4.344	4.640	4.474	0.865	0.490
Instructor enthusiasm	4.438	4.520	4.474	0.716	1.046
Instructor methodology	4.125	4.280	4.193	0.793	0.792
Assessment (Instructional Strategies category)	3.938	3.720	3.842	0.878	1.021
Environment conducive to learning	4.406	4.400	4.404	0.615	0.707
Student assessment of instructors	3.938	3.800	3.877	0.914	0.866
Instructional technologies	4.156	4.000	4.088	0.767	0.816
Internet courses	4.000	3.760	3.895	0.880	0.926

APPENDIX I

Timeline for Dissertation Research

July 22	Mailing lists requested
July 29	Random sample of students drawn
September 4	Letter of invitation sent
September 13	Second letter of invitation for no response
September 30	Round 1 sent to participants
October 3	Reminder for no response
October 4	Last day to submit
October 7	Calculations of Round 1
October 8	Survey revisions for Round 2
October 14	Round 2 send to participants
October 16	Reminder for no response
October 17	Last day to submit Round 2
October 18	Calculations of Round 2
October 18	Survey revisions for Round 3
October 18	Round 3 sent to participants
October 23	Reminder for no response
October 23	Last day to submit Round 3
October 24	Calculations of Round 3
October 25	Wave analysis completed to determine bias
October 25	Write results and summary
November 8	Defense

APPENDIX J

From : "Connie Butler" <conniesb67@hotmail.com>
To : conniesb67@hotmail.com
Date : Mon, 30 Sep 2002 15:28:32 -0500

Hello Participants:

First of all I want to thank all of you for agreeing to participate in my research project. We are finally able to begin the first round. Please access the survey at your earliest convenience and complete the survey at that time. The site is listed below.

The survey is divided into categories with quality indicators listed for each category. Information on rating the indicators is included on the survey. This will be the only round you will be able to add new quality indicators or categories. If you add a new category, quality indicators for that category should be included in the "additional categories box" with the new category.

If you have problems with access, keep trying. If after several attempts you are still not able to access, please let me know and I will contact the site administrator to alleviate any problems. Keep in mind that the last day to submit round one is Friday, October 4. You may communicate with me by e-mail at conniesb67@hotmail.com or phone at [redacted].

Please access the survey at http://cats.eiu.edu/butler/index.cfm

Connie

APPENDIX K

SURVEY
ROUND 1

Please check one of the following:

○ STUDENT
○ ADMINSTRATOR
As an administrator, do you have faculty status? ○ Yes ○ No

Survey Instrument

The following is a list of quality indicators for off-campus programs gleaned from the literature. Please rate these quality indicators on a 5-point Likert scale showing your level of agreement with the item as a quality indicator for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. After ratings are complete, please list additional categories and/or quality indicators that you feel have not been identified and submit them by October 4. Quality indicators are terms or statements that describe measurable elements, methods, and procedures whose presence or absence indicates quality Quality indicator is a term used to describe a characteristic of an effective program (Eichhorn, 1994).

INSTITUTION

	High level of agreement				**Low Level of agreement**
Reputation of institution	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Vision of institution	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Strategic Plan	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Adults feel they matter	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○

List additional quality indicators to Institution

ADMINSTRATIVE FUNCTION

	High level of agreement				**Low Level of agreement**
Staff development	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Faculty development	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Marketing	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Assessment	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Program management	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Strategic planning	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Committment to students	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○

List additional quality indicators to Administrative Function

PROGRAM STRATEGIES

	High level of agreement					Low Level of agreement
Weekend and evening course offerings	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Course location	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Cohort groups	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Mentoring	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Assessment	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Credit for experiential learning	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Cost of program	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Faculty support	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	

List additional quality indicators to Program Strategies

STUDENT SERVICES

	High level of agreement					Low Level of agreement
Flexible operating hours	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Qualified staff	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Food services	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Greater availability and access to parking	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Security for late hours	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Orientation to university or class location	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	
Flexible payment plans	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O	

List additional quality indicators to Student Services

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

	High level of agreement				Low Level of agreement
Instructor expertise	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Use of knowledge already gained by adult students	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Small group activities	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Curriculum relevance	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Instructor enthusiasm	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Instructional methodology	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○
Assessment	5 ○	4 ○	3 ○	2 ○	1 ○

List additional quality indicators to Instructional Strategies

List additional categories

General comments about quality indicators or study

Submit Response

APPENDIX L

From : "Connie Butler" <conniesb67@hotmail.com>
To : conniesb67@hotmail.com
Subject : survey
Date : Thu, 03 Oct 2002 19:22:01 -0500

Participants that have not submitted round one:

This is a reminder that the last day to submit round one is Friday, October 4. You may communicate with me by e-mail at conniesb67@hotmail.com or phone at [redacted].

You may access the survey at http://cats.eiu.edu/butler/index.cfm

Connie

APPENDIX M

SURVEY COMPLETION CONFIRMATION

The following information (see below) has been submitted.
Thank you for participating.

Status	ADMINSTRATOR
Faculty Status	yes
Survey Item	Rating and comments
Reputation of institution:	4
Vision of institution:	4
Strategic Plan:	5
Adults feel they matter:	5
Additional indicators to Institution:	Outreach efforts
Staff development:	4
Faculty development:	4
Marketing:	4
Assessment:	4
Program management:	5
Strategic planning:	5
Committment to students:	5
Additional indicators to Administrative Function:	Recruitment
Weekend and evening course offerings:	5
Course location:	5
Cohort groups:	3
Mentoring:	3
Assessment:	3
Credit for experiential learning:	4
Cost of program:	5
Faculty support:	4
Additional quality indicators to Program Strategies:	Peer interaction
Flexible of operating hours:	5
Qualified staff:	5
Food services:	4
Greater availability and access to parking:	4
Security for late hours:	4
Orientation to university or class location:	4
Flexible payment plans:	4

APPENDIX N

	Status	FacStatus	q1	q2	q3	q4	q5	
107	ADMINSTRA	yes		1	1	1	1	111111111
110	STUDENT	0		0	0	0	0	
111	0	0		5	0	0	0	ert
112	ADMINSTRA	yes		4	4	5	5	Outreach ef
113	ADMINSTRA	No		5	5	4	3	
114	STUDENT	0		5	4	4	5	
115	STUDENT	0		3	3	3	2	
116	ADMINSTRA	No		3	5	3	5	Enrollments
117	ADMINSTRA	yes		5	5	3	5	
118	ADMINSTRA	yes		5	5	5	5	Scheduling
119	ADMINSTRA	No		4	3	3	4	
120	ADMINSTRA	yes		5	5	4	4	High nation
121	STUDENT	0		5	2	3	3	
122	ADMINSTRA	yes		5	2	2	5	
123	STUDENT	0		5	4	4	4	
124	STUDENT	0		4	4	3	2	
125	STUDENT	0		4	2	2	5	Job attainm
126	ADMINSTRA	No		4	5	4	5	
127	STUDENT	No		4	0	0	3	
128	STUDENT	0		5	4	4	5	
129	STUDENT	0		4	4	5	5	Has the off-
130	STUDENT	0		3	4	4	4	
131	STUDENT	0		4	4	4	4	
132	STUDENT	0		4	4	4	4	
133	STUDENT	0		3	3	3	4	
134	ADMINSTRA	yes		4	4	4	4	
135	STUDENT	0		4	4	4	5	
136	STUDENT	0		4	4	4	5	
137	ADMINSTRA	yes		5	5	3	4	
138	ADMINSTRA	yes		4	4	3	5	
139	STUDENT	0		4	3	4	3	
140	STUDENT	No		5	4	3	5	
141	STUDENT	0		4	4	4	5	
142	ADMINSTRA	yes		5	3	3	5	
143	STUDENT	0		5	5	5	5	
144	STUDENT	0		4	3	3	5	Some of the
145	ADMINSTRA	No		5	4	3	4	
146	STUDENT	0		5	3	3	5	Availability
147	ADMINSTRA	yes		5	4	4	5	
148	STUDENT	0		4	4	4	3	Quality of in
149	STUDENT	0		4	5	4	3	
150	ADMINSTRA	yes		5	3	3	5	
151	0	yes		4	4	4	5	
152	ADMINSTRA	yes		4	4	4	5	
153	STUDENT	0		5	4	4	4	

APPENDIX O

EXCEL STATISTIC REPORT
ROUND 1

Institution

Round 1 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	q1	q2	q3	q4
Mean Adm (a)	4.346	3.654	3.038	4.423
Mean Student (b)	4.176	3.588	3.500	3.971
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.170	0.066	-0.462	0.452
Overall Mean	4.250	3.617	3.300	4.167
Var Adm (c)	0.795	1.115	0.998	0.654
Var Student (d)	0.392	1.037	1.045	1.242
Var Dif. (c - d)	0.403	0.078	-0.047	-0.588
STDEV Adm (e)	0.892	1.056	0.999	0.809
STDEV Student (f)	0.626	1.019	1.022	1.114
STDEV Dif (e - f)	0.266	0.038	-0.023	-0.306
t test	0.827	0.242	-1.755	1.822
df	58	58	58	58
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	q1	q2	q3	q4
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.474	3.579	3.000	4.526
Mean Adm. (g)	4.000	3.857	3.143	4.143
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.474	-0.278	-0.143	0.383
Overall Mean (a)	4.346	3.654	3.038	4.423
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.930	1.146	1.000	0.596
VAR Adm. (n)	0.333	1.143	1.143	0.810
VAR dif (m - n)	0.596	0.003	-0.143	-0.213
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.964	1.071	1.000	0.772
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.577	1.069	1.069	0.900
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.387	0.002	-0.069	-0.127
t test	1.524	-0.588	-0.307	1.000
df	24	24	24	24
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept

Comments

Administration

Outreach efforts
Scheduling of sufficient number of grad. and UG c
High national ranking among public universities
Mission of the institution, Academic reputation of institution
Enrollments, Full-time equivalency, semester hours

Student

Job attainment following graduation from the institution
Has the off-campus program enriched or enhanced
Some of these categories I have no knowledge. If
Availability of Visitor/part-time Parking Available
Quality of instructors (it seems some weekend teach)
Off campus course availability. Amount of courses
Rank of Institution from reputable sources

Administration Function Round 1 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	q6	q7	q8	q9	q10	q11	q12
Mean Adm (a)	3.692	3.846	3.731	3.692	4.000	3.269	4.462
Mean Student (b)	3.353	3.500	2.853	3.147	3.559	3.206	3.853
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.339	0.346	0.878	0.545	0.441	0.063	0.609
Overall Mean	3.500	3.650	3.233	3.383	3.750	3.233	4.117
Var Adm (c)	0.862	1.335	1.245	0.942	1.040	0.845	0.978
Var Student (d)	2.296	2.561	2.614	2.432	2.436	2.714	2.493
Var Dif. (c - d)	-1.434	-1.225	-1.369	-1.491	-1.396	-1.869	-1.514
STDEV Adm (e)	0.928	1.156	1.116	0.970	1.020	0.919	0.989
STDEV Student (f)	1.515	1.600	1.617	1.560	1.561	1.647	1.579
STDEV Dif (e - f)	-0.587	-0.445	-0.501	-0.589	-0.541	-0.728	-0.590
t test	1.070	0.973	2.485	1.661	1.320	0.189	1.827
df	58	58	58	58	58	58.	58
Result	accept	accept	reject	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	q6	q7	q8	q9	q10	q11	q12
Mean A/Fac. (h)	3.789	4.053	3.789	3.737	4.211	3.211	4.579
Mean Adm. (g)	3.429	3.286	3.571	3.571	3.429	3.429	4.143
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.361	0.767	0.218	0.165	0.782	-0.218	0.436
Overall Mean (a)	3.692	3.846	3.731	3.692	4.000	3.269	4.462
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.953	1.275	1.398	1.205	1.175	1.064	1.035
VAR Adm. (n)	0.619	1.238	0.952	0.286	0.286	0.286	0.810
VAR dif (m - n)	0.334	0.037	0.445	0.919	0.890	0.779	0.226
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.976	1.129	1.182	1.098	1.084	1.032	1.017
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.787	1.113	0.976	0.535	0.535	0.535	0.900
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.190	0.016	0.206	0.563	0.550	0.497	0.118
t test	0.969	1.553	0.476	0.512	2.440	-0.701	1.057
df	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	reject	accept	accept

Comments

Administration
Recruitment
Service to the university (college and university)
Delivery of courses in timely manner

Student
Administration is knowledgeable about their own program
Not being an administrator, I can't rate these.
I can only mark average for most of these. As a student
Stop outreaching to high crime areas,

Program Strategies Round 1 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	q14	q15	q16	q17	q18	q19	q20	q21
Mean Adm (a)	4.500	4.577	4.000	3.577	3.423	3.154	3.885	4.231
Mean Student (b)	4.118	3.971	3.412	3.265	3.706	3.618	4.176	4.324
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.382	0.606	0.588	0.312	-0.283	-0.464	-0.292	-0.093
Overall Mean	4.283	4.233	3.667	3.400	3.583	3.417	4.050	4.283
Var Adm (c)	0.740	0.734	0.880	0.814	0.974	1.415	1.306	1.385
Var Student (d)	1.198	1.484	1.340	1.534	1.062	1.577	0.695	0.589
Var Dif. (c - d)	-0.458	-0.750	-0.460	-0.720	-0.089	-0.161	0.611	0.795
STDEV Adm (e)	0.860	0.857	0.938	0.902	0.987	1.190	1.143	1.177
STDEV Student (f)	1.094	1.218	1.158	1.238	1.031	1.256	0.834	0.768
STDEV Dif (e - f)	-0.234	-0.362	-0.220	-0.336	-0.044	-0.066	0.309	0.409
t test	1.515	2.262	2.173	1.129	-1.079	-1.461	-1.098	-0.349
df	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
Result	accept	reject	reject	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	q14	q15	q16	q17	q18	q19	q20	q21
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.737	4.737	4.158	3.684	3.474	3.000	4.000	4.579
Mean Adm. (g)	3.857	4.143	3.571	3.286	3.286	3.571	3.571	3.286
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.880	0.594	0.586	0.398	0.188	-0.571	0.429	1.293
Overall Mean (a)	4.500	4.577	4.000	3.577	3.423	3.154	3.885	4.231
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.316	0.427	0.918	0.895	1.263	1.667	1.333	0.480
VAR Adm. (n)	1.476	1.476	0.619	0.571	0.238	0.619	1.286	2.905
VAR dif (m - n)	-1.160	-1.049	0.299	0.323	1.025	1.048	0.048	-2.425
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.562	0.653	0.958	0.946	1.124	1.291	1.155	0.692
STDEV Adm. (p)	1.215	1.215	0.787	0.756	0.488	0.787	1.134	1.704
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	-0.653	-0.562	0.171	0.190	0.636	0.504	0.021	-1.012
t test	1.844	1.230	1.586	1.111	0.593	-1.361	0.851	1.949
df	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Comments

Administration
Peer interaction
Teaching excellence
Technology supported delivery methods
Learner-driven course scheduling would be a better
Good textbooks for course of study

Student
Offer more courses
Though EIU Art building is now under construction

Student Services

Round 1 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	q23	q24	q25	q26	q27	q28	q29
Mean Adm (a)	4.231	4.500	2.577	3.154	3.692	3.577	3.462
Mean Student (b)	4.029	4.471	2.618	3.324	3.559	3.441	3.882
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.201	0.029	-0.041	-0.170	0.133	0.136	-0.421
Overall Mean	4.117	4.483	2.600	3.250	3.617	3.500	3.700
Var Adm (c)	1.145	0.740	1.774	1.895	1.822	1.534	2.018
Var Student (d)	1.242	0.499	2.183	1.741	1.830	1.527	1.137
Var Dif. (c - d)	-0.097	0.241	-0.409	0.155	-0.008	0.007	0.881
STDEV Adm (e)	1.070	0.860	1.332	1.377	1.350	1.238	1.421
STDEV Student (f)	1.114	0.706	1.477	1.319	1.353	1.236	1.066
STDEV Dif (e - f)	-0.044	0.154	-0.146	0.057	-0.003	0.003	0.354
t test	0.710	0.142	-0.112	-0.482	0.379	0.421	-1.263
df	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	q23	q24	q25	q26	q27	q28	q29
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.368	4.526	2.421	3.263	3.789	3.789	3.421
Mean Adm. (g)	3.857	4.429	3.000	2.857	3.429	3.000	3.571
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.511	0.098	-0.579	0.406	0.361	0.789	-0.150
Overall Mean (a)	4.231	4.500	2.577	3.154	3.692	3.577	3.462
VAR A/Fac. (m)	1.023	0.930	1.591	1.982	1.953	1.398	2.368
VAR Adm. (n)	1.476	0.286	2.333	1.810	1.619	1.667	1.286
VAR dif (m - n)	-0.453	0.644	-0.743	0.173	0.334	-0.269	1.083
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	1.012	0.964	1.261	1.408	1.398	1.182	1.539
STDEV Adm. (p)	1.215	0.535	1.528	1.345	1.272	1.291	1.134
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	-0.203	0.430	-0.266	0.063	0.125	-0.109	0.405
t test	0.994	0.326	-0.896	0.674	0.624	1.414	-0.271
df	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Comments

Administration
Computer access
Technology enhancements
Network that will support

Student
Facilities are handicapped accessible
More Visitor parking locations
Parking for part-time students
The food service on campus is no where near

Instructional Strategies Round 1 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	q31	q32	q33	q34	q35	q36	q37
Mean Adm (a)	4.692	3.808	4.077	4.538	4.385	4.038	3.654
Mean Student (b)	4.618	4.206	3.618	4.294	4.441	4.029	3.912
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.075	-0.398	0.459	0.244	-0.057	0.009	-0.258
Overall Mean	4.650	4.033	3.817	4.400	4.417	4.033	3.800
Var Adm (c)	0.222	1.442	0.794	0.418	0.726	0.758	1.035
Var Student (d)	0.849	0.593	0.971	0.638	0.496	0.939	1.174
Var Dif. (c - d)	-0.628	0.849	-0.177	-0.220	0.230	-0.180	-0.138
STDEV Adm (e)	0.471	1.201	0.891	0.647	0.852	0.871	1.018
STDEV Student (f)	0.922	0.770	0.985	0.799	0.705	0.969	1.083
STDEV Dif (e - f)	-0.451	0.431	-0.094	-0.152	0.148	-0.098	-0.066
t test	0.408	-1.475	1.890	1.309	-0.274	0.038	-0.946
df	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	q31	q32	q33	q34	q35	q36	q37
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.789	4.000	4.316	4.737	4.579	4.158	3.632
Mean Adm. (g)	4.429	3.286	3.429	4.000	3.857	3.714	3.714
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.361	0.714	0.887	0.737	0.722	0.444	-0.083
Overall Mean (a)	4.692	3.808	4.077	4.538	4.385	4.038	3.654
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.175	1.444	0.561	0.316	0.591	0.585	1.246
VAR Adm. (n)	0.286	1.238	0.952	0.333	0.810	1.238	0.571
VAR dif (m - n)	-0.110	0.206	-0.391	-0.018	-0.219	-0.653	0.674
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.419	1.202	0.749	0.562	0.769	0.765	1.116
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.535	1.113	0.976	0.577	0.900	1.113	0.756
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	-0.116	0.089	-0.227	-0.015	-0.131	-0.348	0.360
t test	1.613	1.420	2.180	2.907	1.884	0.973	-0.216
df	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
Result	accept	accept	reject	reject	accept	accept	accept

Comments

Administration
Environment conducive to learning
Larger number of tech. enhanced and delivered courses
Instructional technologies

Student
Student assessment of instructors
Internet capabilities to reach more students
Our instructors seam very qualified with high experience

Additional Categories Round 1 Summary

ID **q39**

Comments

Administration	Response of Student to University Mentoring History of graduate success on certification tests You might add quality of EIU's (1) technology and Veterans
Student	Campus bus service(could pay something?) Instructional Design Instructional Methods Also, all teachers are required to take a proficiency

APPENDIX P

Categories, Quality Indicators, Mean Ratings and Comments

Category	Quality Indicators	Mean		
		R1	R2	R3
Institution	Reputation of institution	4.25	4.25	4.26
	Vision of institution	3.61	3.76	3.84
	Strategic plan	3.30		
	Adults feel they matter	4.16	4.20	4.36
	Outreach efforts		4.03	4.10
	High national ranking among public universities		3.90	3.98
	Mission of institution		3.70	3.87
	History of graduate success on certification tests		3.90	4.08
	Job placement rates following graduation		4.03	4.08
	Quality of technology		3.81	4.01
	Enrollments, full-time equivalency, & semester hours		3.78	3.82
Administrative Function	Staff development	3.50	3.61	3.68
	Faculty development	3.65	3.83	3.91
	Marketing	3.23		
	Assessment	3.38		
	Program management	3.75	3.95	4.05
	Strategic planning	3.23		
	Commitment to students	4.11	4.20	4.42
	Recruitment		3.65	3.64
	Delivery of courses in a timely manner		4.03	4.29
	Service to university		3.48	
Program Strategies	Weekend and evening course offerings	4.28	4.36	4.49
	Course location	4.23	4.41	4.47
	Cohort groups	3.66	3.75	3.73
	Mentoring	3.40		
	Assessment	3.58	3.76	3.86
	Credit for experiential learning	3.41		

Appendix P continued next page.

Category	Quality Indicators	Mean		
		R1	R2	R3
	Cost of program	4.05	4.03	4.05
	Faculty support	4.28	4.16	4.31
	Peer interaction		4.05	3.98
	Teaching excellence		4.41	4.47
	Technology supported delivery programs		3.85	3.98
	Good textbooks		3.78	3.80
	Learner-driven course scheduling		3.96	4.01
	Sufficient number of graduate and undergraduate courses		4.18	4.17
Student Services	Flexible operating hours	4.11	4.25	4.17
	Qualified staff	4.48	4.41	4.42
	Food services	2.60		
	Greater availability and access to parking	3.25		
	Security for late hours	3.61	3.75	3.87
	Orientation to university or class location	3.50	3.55	3.56
	Flexible payment plans	3.70	4.00	3.98
	Computer access		4.21	4.14
	Technology enhancements		4.00	3.96
	Network that will support internet courses		3.85	3.87
	Facilities are handicapped accessible		3.95	3.78
Instructional Strategies	Instructor expertise	4.65	4.61	4.61
	Use of knowledge already gained by adult students	4.03	4.13	4.07
	Small group activities	3.81	3.78	3.80
	Curriculum relevance	4.40	4.36	4.47
	Instructor enthusiasm	4.41	4.50	4.47
	Instructional methodology	4.03	4.15	4.19
	Assessment	3.80	3.78	3.84
	Environment conducive to learning		4.30	4.40
	Student assessment of instructors		3.98	3.87
	Instructional technologies		3.95	4.08
	Internet courses		3.65	3.89

Appendix P continued next page.

Comments from R1	Good survey.	
	Good list of quality indicators.	
	Quality indicators should focus more on program output.	
	I did not feel I could adequately answer some.	
	I was not sure what was meant by "assessment."	
	The study is very interesting.	
	An N/A column would be helpful.	
	Thank you for conducting the survey.	
	Our instructors seem very qualified with high expectations.	
Comments from R2	Quality is in the eye of the beholder.	
	From whose perspective am I, as the respondent, suppose to rate the quality indicators?	
	The term "assessment is unclear as to whether it is student assessment, instructor assessment or program assessment.	
	Students value access to programs close to their location as a critical factor.	
	Courses only offered at set times each semester is inherently problematic for working adults.	
	Web CT is slow and discourages people from taking internet courses.	
	My experience at EIU is excellent. Thank you and God bless.	
	I have always felt I receive a high quality of education at EIU.	
	More technology studies need to be offered, i.e. power point, web page design, more digital art.	
	There needs to be more evening, weekend, and summer classes. Very few of Eastern's departments offer a masters for students to take without quitting their job.	

Appendix P continued next page.

Comments from R3	Technology (WebCT) used in delivering web courses works sporadically.	
	The off-campus schedule comes out too late. It is much later than the on-campus schedule.	
	I found myself changing answers as I switched from what was quality to me and what a student might expect to be quality.	

APPENDIX Q

From : "Connie Butler" <conniesb67@hotmail.com>
To : conniesb67@hotmail.com
Subject : Survey, Round 2
Date : Mon, 14 Oct 2002 12:53:36 -0500

Hello Participants:

Round 1 has been completed and the survey has been updated. It is now time for round 2. Please access the survey at your earliest convenience and complete at that time. If you have problems, let me know. The last day to complete and submit the survey is Thursday, October 17.

You may access the survey at the following address:

http://cats.eiu.edu/butler/index.cfm

Thanks again,
Connie

APPENDIX R

SURVEY
ROUND 2

Please check one of the following:

C STUDENT
C ADMINISTRATOR
As an administrator, do you have faculty status? C Yes C No

Survey Instrument

The following is a list of quality indicators for off-campus programs. Some were carried over from round one for additional ratings. Others were added by administrators or adult students. Please rate these quality indicators on a 5-point Likert scale showing your level of agreement with the item as a quality indicator for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. Quality indicators are terms or statements that describe measurable elements, methods, and procedures whose presence or absence indicates quality. Quality indicator is a term used to describe a characteristic of an effective program (Eichhorn, 1994). Please refer to your e-mail for the last day to submit your survey.

INSTITUTION

	High level of agreement				Low Level of agreement
Reputation of institution	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Vision of institution	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Outreach efforts	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Adults feel they matter	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
High national ranking among public universities	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Mission of institution	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
History of graduate success on certification tests	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Job placement rates following graduation	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Quality of Technology	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Enrollments, full-time equivalency, & semester hours	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTION

	High level of agreement				Low Level of agreement
Staff development	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Faculty development	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Recruitment	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Delivery of courses in timely manner	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Program management	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Service to university	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Commitment to students	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O

PROGRAM STRATEGIES

	High level of agreement					Low Level of agreement
Weekend and evening course offerings	5	4	3	2	1	
Course location	5	4	3	2	1	
Cohort groups	5	4	3	2	1	
Peer interaction	5	4	3	2	1	
Assessment	5	4	3	2	1	
Teaching excellence	5	4	3	2	1	
Cost of program	5	4	3	2	1	
Faculty support	5	4	3	2	1	
Technology supported delivery methods	5	4	3	2	1	
Good textbooks	5	4	3	2	1	
Learner-driven course scheduling	5	4	3	2	1	
Sufficient number of graduate and undergraduate courses	5	4	3	2	1	

STUDENT SERVICES

	High level of agreement					Low Level of agreement
Flexible operating hours	5	4	3	2	1	
Qualified staff	5	4	3	2	1	
Computer access	5	4	3	2	1	
Technology enhancements	5	4	3	2	1	
Security for late hours	5	4	3	2	1	
Orientation to university or class location	5	4	3	2	1	
Flexible payment plans	5	4	3	2	1	
Network that will support internet courses	5	4	3	2	1	
Facilities are handicapped accessible	5	4	3	2	1	

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

	High level of agreement					Low Level of agreement
Instructor expertise	5	4	3	2	1	
Use of knowledge already gained by adult						

students	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Small group activities	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Curriculum relevance	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Instructor enthusiasm	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Instructional methodology	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Assessment	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Environment conducive to learning	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Student assessment of instructors	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Instructional technologies	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Internet courses	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C

General comments about quality indicators or study

Submit Response

APPENDIX S

From : "Connie Butler" <conniesb67@hotmail.com>
To : conniesb67@hotmail.com
Subject : Survey, Round 2
Date : Wed, 16 Oct 2002 17:24:25 -0500

Hello Participants:

Just a reminder that the last day to submit Round 2 is Thursday, October 17. If you have already submitted Round 2, please disregard this e-mail. I have no way of knowing who has submitted. Those of you who have not submitted, please complete and submit before the deadline.

You may access the survey at the following address:

http://cats.eiu.edu/butler/index.cfm

Thanks again,
Connie

APPENDIX T

EXCEL STATISTIC REPORT
ROUND 2

Institution Round 2 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R2q1	R2q2	R2q3	R2q4	R2q5	R2q6	R2q7	R2q8	R2q9	R2q10
Mean Adm (a)	4.240	3.600	4.320	4.360	3.760	3.680	3.920	4.080	3.800	3.520
Mean Student (b)	4.257	3.886	3.829	4.086	4.000	3.714	3.886	4.000	3.829	3.971
Mean Dif. (a-b)	-0.017	-0.286	0.491	0.274	-0.240	-0.034	0.034	0.080	-0.029	-0.451
Overall Mean	4.250	3.767	4.033	4.200	3.900	3.700	3.900	4.033	3.817	3.783
Var Adm (c)	0.523	0.583	0.643	0.657	0.440	0.477	0.910	0.743	0.833	1.177
Var Student (d)	0.432	0.810	0.852	0.787	0.765	0.739	0.928	0.706	1.440	0.793
Var Dif. (c - d)	0.091	-0.227	-0.209	-0.130	-0.325	-0.263	-0.018	0.037	-0.607	0.383
STDEV Adm (e)	0.723	0.764	0.802	0.810	0.663	0.690	0.954	0.862	0.913	1.085
STDEV Student (f)	0.657	0.900	0.923	0.887	0.874	0.860	0.963	0.840	1.200	0.891
STDEV Dif (e - f)	0.066	-0.136	-0.121	-0.077	-0.211	-0.170	-0.009	0.022	-0.287	0.194
t test	-0.094	-1.325	2.196	1.242	-1.208	-0.171	0.137	0.358	-0.105	-1.710
Df	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
Result	accept	accept	reject	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R2q1	R2q2	R2q3	R2q4	R2q5	R2q6	R2q7	R2q8	R2q9	R2q10
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.231	3.769	4.308	4.308	3.769	4.000	4.000	4.077	3.923	3.769
Mean Adm. (g)	4.143	3.571	4.143	4.286	3.857	3.429	3.429	3.857	3.429	3.000
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.088	0.198	0.165	0.022	-0.088	0.571	0.571	0.220	0.495	0.769
Overall Mean (a)	4.200	3.700	4.250	4.300	3.800	3.800	3.800	4.000	3.750	3.500
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.359	0.526	0.731	0.897	0.526	0.333	0.833	0.744	0.910	1.526
VAR Adm. (n)	0.143	0.619	0.810	0.571	0.476	0.286	0.952	0.810	0.952	0.333
VAR dif (m - n)	0.216	-0.093	-0.079	0.326	0.049	0.048	-0.119	-0.066	-0.042	1.192
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.599	0.725	0.855	0.947	0.725	0.577	0.913	0.862	0.954	1.235
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.378	0.787	0.900	0.756	0.690	0.535	0.976	0.900	0.976	0.577
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.221	-0.062	-0.045	0.191	0.035	0.043	-0.063	-0.037	-0.022	0.658
t test	0.309	0.379	0.275	0.041	-0.188	1.519	0.872	0.366	0.752	1.520
df	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration Function Round 2 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R2q11	R2q12	R2q13	R2q14	R2q15	R2q16	R2q17
Mean Adm (a)	3.720	4.040	4.000	4.440	4.240	3.440	4.440
Mean Student (b)	3.543	3.686	3.400	3.743	3.743	3.514	4.029
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.177	0.354	0.600	0.697	0.497	-0.074	0.411
Overall Mean	3.617	3.833	3.650	4.033	3.950	3.483	4.200
Var Adm (c)	0.460	0.457	0.500	0.590	0.607	1.340	1.257
Var Student (d)	1.314	1.575	1.365	1.726	1.550	1.610	1.793
Var Dif. (c - d)	-0.854	-1.118	-0.865	-1.136	-0.943	-0.270	-0.537
STDEV Adm (e)	0.678	0.676	0.707	0.768	0.779	1.158	1.121
STDEV Student (f)	1.146	1.255	1.168	1.314	1.245	1.269	1.339
STDEV Dif (e - f)	-0.468	-0.579	-0.461	-0.546	-0.466	-0.111	-0.218
t test	0.749	1.409	2.470	2.582	1.899	-0.235	1.291
df	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
Result	accept	accept	reject	reject	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R2q11	R2q12	R2q13	R2q14	R2q15	R2q16	R2q17
Mean A/Fac. (h)	3.846	4.077	3.923	4.615	4.231	3.692	4.769
Mean Adm. (g)	3.571	3.857	3.857	4.000	4.143	2.714	3.714
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.275	0.220	0.066	0.615	0.088	0.978	1.055
Overall Mean (a)	3.750	4.000	3.900	4.400	4.200	3.350	4.400
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.308	0.410	0.577	0.256	0.692	1.064	0.359
VAR Adm. (n)	0.286	0.476	0.476	1.333	0.476	1.238	3.238
VAR dif (m - n)	0.022	-0.066	0.101	-1.077	0.216	-0.174	-2.879
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.555	0.641	0.760	0.506	0.832	1.032	0.599
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.535	0.690	0.690	1.155	0.690	1.113	1.799
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.020	-0.050	0.069	-0.648	0.142	-0.081	-1.200
t test	0.755	0.479	0.140	0.845	0.183	1.294	0.935
df	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Program Strategies Round 2 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R2q18	R2q19	R2q20	R2q21	R2q22	R2q23
Mean Adm (a)	4.520	4.320	3.800	4.000	3.520	4.360
Mean Student (b)	4.257	4.486	3.714	4.086	3.943	4.457
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.263	-0.166	0.086	-0.086	-0.423	-0.097
Overall Mean	4.367	4.417	3.750	4.050	3.767	4.417
Var Adm (c)	0.510	0.727	0.833	0.583	1.010	0.407
Var Student (d)	1.608	0.669	0.857	0.787	0.644	0.491
Var Dif. (c - d)	-1.098	0.058	-0.024	-0.203	0.366	-0.084
STDEV Adm (e)	0.714	0.852	0.913	0.764	1.005	0.638
STDEV Student (f)	1.268	0.818	0.926	0.887	0.802	0.701
STDEV Dif (e - f)	-0.554	0.035	-0.013	-0.123	0.203	-0.063
t test	1.020	-0.755	0.356	-0.400	-1.744	-0.558
df	58	58	58	58	58	58
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration/Students

ID	R2q24	R2q25	R2q26	R2q27	R2q28	R2q29
Mean Adm (a)	3.800	4.120	3.760	3.800	4.000	4.160
Mean Student (b)	4.200	4.200	3.914	3.771	3.943	4.200
Mean Dif. (a-b)	-0.400	-0.080	-0.154	0.029	0.057	-0.040
Overall Mean	4.033	4.167	3.850	3.783	3.967	4.183
Var Adm (c)	1.333	0.693	1.107	0.500	0.667	0.807
Var Student (d)	0.576	0.518	0.787	1.123	0.997	0.753
Var Dif. (c - d)	0.757	0.176	0.320	-0.623	-0.330	0.054
STDEV Adm (e)	1.155	0.833	1.052	0.707	0.816	0.898
STDEV Student (f)	0.759	0.719	0.887	1.060	0.998	0.868
STDEV Dif (e - f)	0.395	0.113	0.165	-0.352	-0.182	0.030
t test	-1.514	-0.388	-0.597	0.125	0.243	-0.172
df	58	58	58	58	58	58
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	Accept
df	25	25	25	25	25	25
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	Accept

Program Strategies

Round 2 Summary

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R2q18	R2q19	R2q20	R2q21	R2q22	R2q23
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.615	4.308	4.000	4.000	3.846	4.462
Mean Adm. (g)	4.143	4.000	3.571	4.000	3.000	4.143
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.473	0.308	0.429	0.000	0.846	0.319
Overall Mean (a)	4.450	4.200	3.850	4.000	3.550	4.350
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.256	0.564	0.833	0.500	0.308	0.436
VAR Adm. (n)	1.143	1.333	0.619	1.000	2.000	0.476
VAR dif (m - n)	-0.886	-0.769	0.214	-0.500	-1.692	-0.040
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.506	0.751	0.913	0.707	0.555	0.660
STDEV Adm. (p)	1.069	1.155	0.787	1.000	1.414	0.690
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	-0.563	-0.404	0.126	-0.293	-0.860	-0.030
t test	0.701	0.417	0.783	0.000	0.949	0.688
df	25	25	25	25	25	25
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R2q24	R2q25	R2q26	R2q27	R2q28	R2q29
Mean A/Fac. (h)	3.538	4.154	3.846	3.769	4.077	4.231
Mean Adm. (g)	4.143	4.000	3.571	3.714	3.286	3.714
Mean Dif. (g - h)	-0.604	0.154	0.275	0.055	0.791	0.516
Overall Mean (a)	3.750	4.100	3.750	3.750	3.800	4.050
VAR A/Fac. (m)	1.936	0.641	1.141	0.526	0.410	0.359
VAR Adm. (n)	0.810	0.333	0.952	0.571	0.571	1.905
VAR dif (m - n)	1.126	0.308	0.189	-0.046	-0.161	-1.546
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	1.391	0.801	1.068	0.725	0.641	0.599
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.900	0.577	0.976	0.756	0.756	1.380
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.492	0.223	0.092	-0.031	-0.115	-0.781
t test	-0.892	0.369	0.412	0.109	1.543	0.597
df	25	25	25	25	25	25
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	Accept

Student Services Round 2 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R2q30	R2q31	R2q32	R2q33	R2q34	R2q35	R2q36	R2q37	R2q38
Mean Adm (a)	4.200	4.400	4.080	3.840	3.880	3.600	4.080	4.080	3.880
Mean Student (b)	4.286	4.429	4.314	4.114	3.657	3.514	3.943	3.686	4.000
Mean Dif. (a-b)	-0.086	-0.029	-0.234	-0.274	0.223	0.086	0.137	0.394	-0.120
Overall Mean	4.250	4.417	4.217	4.000	3.750	3.550	4.000	3.850	3.950
Var Adm (c)	0.833	0.500	0.910	0.723	1.110	0.750	0.660	0.993	1.193
Var Student (d)	0.739	0.311	0.457	0.516	1.350	1.198	0.761	1.869	0.647
Var Dif. (c - d)	0.094	0.189	0.453	0.207	-0.240	-0.448	-0.101	-0.876	0.546
STDEV Adm (e)	0.913	0.707	0.954	0.850	1.054	0.866	0.812	0.997	1.092
STDEV Student (f)	0.860	0.558	0.676	0.718	1.162	1.095	0.873	1.367	0.804
STDEV Dif (e - f)	0.053	0.150	0.278	0.132	-0.108	-0.229	-0.060	-0.370	0.288
t test	-0.367	-0.168	-1.053	-1.312	0.774	0.338	0.625	1.292	-0.466
df	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R2q30	R2q31	R2q32	R2q33	R2q34	R2q35	R2q36	R2q37	R2q38
Mean A/Fac. (h)	3.923	4.462	4.154	3.846	3.615	3.769	4.077	4.000	3.692
Mean Adm. (g)	4.143	4.000	3.714	3.714	3.714	3.286	3.714	4.000	3.714
Mean Dif. (g - h)	-0.220	0.462	0.440	0.132	-0.099	0.484	0.363	0.000	-0.022
Overall Mean (a)	4.000	4.300	4.000	3.800	3.650	3.600	3.950	4.000	3.700
VAR A/Fac. (m)	1.077	0.269	1.141	0.974	1.256	0.859	0.744	1.500	1.564
VAR Adm. (n)	0.476	1.000	0.571	0.571	0.905	0.238	0.571	0.333	0.571
VAR dif (m - n)	0.601	-0.731	0.570	0.403	0.352	0.621	0.172	1.167	0.993
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	1.038	0.519	1.068	0.987	1.121	0.927	0.862	1.225	1.251
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.690	1.000	0.756	0.756	0.951	0.488	0.756	0.577	0.756
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.348	-0.481	0.312	0.231	0.170	0.439	0.106	0.647	0.495
t test	-0.430	0.728	0.795	0.246	-0.150	1.208	0.693	0.000	-0.038
df	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Instructional Strategies Round 2 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R2q39	R2q40	R2q41	R2q42	R2q43	R2q44	R2q45	R2q46	R2q47	R2q48	R2q49
Mean Adm (a)	4.600	4.120	3.840	4.440	4.400	4.160	3.680	4.200	3.840	3.920	3.560
Mean Student (b)	4.629	4.143	3.743	4.314	4.571	4.143	3.857	4.371	4.086	3.971	3.714
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.029	0.023	0.097	0.126	-0.171	0.017	0.177	0.171	0.246	0.051	0.154
Overall Mean	4.617	4.133	3.783	4.367	4.500	4.150	3.783	4.300	3.983	3.950	3.650
Var Adm (c)	0.333	0.443	0.473	0.590	0.417	0.390	0.560	0.417	0.890	0.577	1.340
Var Student (d)	0.299	0.714	1.314	0.869	0.429	0.773	0.832	0.358	0.787	0.793	0.975
Var Dif. (c - d)	0.034	0.271	0.841	0.279	0.012	0.383	0.272	0.059	0.103	0.217	0.365
STDEV Adm (e)	0.577	0.666	0.688	0.768	0.645	0.624	0.748	0.645	0.943	0.759	1.158
STDEV Student (f)	0.547	0.845	1.146	0.932	0.655	0.879	0.912	0.598	0.887	0.891	0.987
STDEV Dif (e - f)	0.030	0.179	0.458	0.164	0.009	0.255	0.164	0.047	0.057	0.131	0.170
t test	0.193	0.117	0.409	0.571	1.008	0.088	0.824	1.045	1.020	0.240	0.541
Df	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R2q39	R2q40	R2q41	R2q4	R2q43	R2q44	R2q45	R2q46	R2q47	R2q48	R2q49
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.615	4.308	4.231	4.462	4.308	4.077	3.846	4.154	3.769	3.846	3.462
Mean Adm. (g)	4.286	3.714	3.286	4.000	4.286	4.143	3.429	4.143	3.714	4.000	3.714
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.330	0.593	0.945	0.462	0.022	0.066	0.418	0.011	0.055	0.154	0.253
Overall Mean (a)	4.500	4.100	3.900	4.300	4.300	4.100	3.700	4.150	3.750	3.900	3.550
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.423	0.231	0.359	0.436	0.397	0.410	0.308	0.474	1.192	0.641	2.269
VAR Adm. (n)	0.238	0.905	0.238	1.000	0.571	0.143	0.619	0.143	0.571	0.333	0.571
VAR dif (m - n)	0.185	0.674	0.121	0.564	0.174	0.267	0.311	0.332	0.621	0.308	1.698
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.650	0.480	0.599	0.660	0.630	0.641	0.555	0.689	1.092	0.801	1.506
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.488	0.951	0.488	1.000	0.756	0.378	0.787	0.378	0.756	0.577	0.756
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.162	0.471	0.111	0.340	-0.126	0.263	0.232	0.311	0.336	0.223	0.750
t test	0.936	0.980	2.512	0.717	0.044	0.227	0.818	0.037	0.100	0.369	0.407
df	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Result	accept	accept	reject	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Additional Categories Round 2 Summary

ID **R2q50**

Comments

Administration	Quality is in the eye of the beholder. From whose perspective am I, as the respondent, supposed to rate the quality indicators? In the absence of such direction, I chose to answer from the perspective of the typical off-campus student (employed adult female). The term "assessment" is unclear as to whether it is student assessment (grading), course-instructor evaluation by the student, or program assessment done as a part of an institutional assessment program. I chose the latter. Good luck, Connie.
	I believe that most of our students value access to programs close to their location as a critical factor. Once that need is met, other factors become more important.
	I did not have an opportunity to complete Phase 1 of the survey I was out of town and apparently missed my window of opportunity. I hope my responses to this phase are still useful to you.
Student	Course availability and flexible times are paramount. I believe course only offered at set times each semester is inherently problematic for working adults, as it could generate a very substantial obstacle to complete a preferred course or degree program.
	WebCT is slow and discourages people from taking internet courses.
	I was not sure what was meant by delivery of courses in a timely manner. Does it mean, the class schedule being out in time for students to plan their next semester?
	My experience here was overall excellent ant thank you and God bless you
	I have always felt that I receive a high quality of education at EIU. I do wish that there were more technologies studies offered and encouraged, i.e. PowerPoint, web page design, more digital art, etc. Also there needs to be more offered when teachers and working people can take classes. More evening, weekend, and summer classes. Most schools allow a working person to complete a Masters degree while still working. Very few of Eastern's depts. offer a masters without quitting the present job

APPENDIX U

From : "Connie Butler" <conniesb67@hotmail.com>
To : conniesb67@hotmail.com
Subject : Survey, Round 2
Date : Fri, 18 Oct 2002 17:27:01 -0500

Hello Participants:

Round 2 has been completed and the survey has been updated. It is now time for round 3, the final round. Give your rating of each indicator serious thought. Those indicators with high means will be identified as quality indicators for off-campus programs at EIU. Be sure to click either "Student" or "Administrator" at the top of the survey. A couple of you did not identify your category on the last survey. At the end of the study I will e-mail each of you a concise report of my findings. Please access the survey at your earliest convenience and complete at that time. If you have problems, let me know. The last day to complete and submit the survey is Wednesday, October 23.

You may access the survey at the following address:

http://cats.eiu.edu/butler/index.cfm

Thanks again,
Connie

APPENDIX V

SURVEY
ROUND 3

Please check one of the following:

C STUDENT
C ADMINISTRATOR

As an administrator, do you have faculty status? C Yes C No

Survey Instrument

The following is a list of quality indicators for off-campus programs carried over from Round two. Some indicators were deleted because of low ratings. Please rate the listed quality indicators on a 5-point Likert scale showing your level of agreement with the item as a quality indicator for off-campus programs at Eastern Illinois University. Quality indicators are terms or statements that describe measurable elements, methods, and procedures whose presence or abssence indicates quality. Quality indicator is a term used to describe a characteristic of an effective program (Eichhorn, 1994). Please refer to you e-mail for last day to submit your survey.

INSTITUTION

	High level of agreement				**Low Level of agreement**
Reputation of institution	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Vision of institution	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Outreach efforts	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Adults feel they matter	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
High national ranking among public universities	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Mission of institution	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
History of graduate success on certification tests	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Job placement rates following graduation	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Quality of Technology	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Enrollments, full-time equivalency, & semester hours	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTION

	High level of agreement				**Low Level of agreement**
Staff development	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Faculty development	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Recruitment	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Delivery of courses in timely manner	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Program management	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O
Commitment to students	5 O	4 O	3 O	2 O	1 O

PROGRAM STRATEGIES

	High level of agreement					Low Level of agreement
Weekend and evening course offerings	5	4	3	2	1	
Course location	5	4	3	2	1	
Cohort groups	5	4	3	2	1	
Peer interaction	5	4	3	2	1	
Assessment	5	4	3	2	1	
Teaching excellence	5	4	3	2	1	
Cost of program	5	4	3	2	1	
Faculty support	5	4	3	2	1	
Technology supported delivery methods	5	4	3	2	1	
Good textbooks	5	4	3	2	1	
Learner-driven course scheduling	5	4	3	2	1	
Sufficient number of graduate and undergraduate courses	5	4	3	2	1	

STUDENT SERVICES

	High level of agreement					Low Level of agreement
Flexible operating hours	5	4	3	2	1	
Qualified staff	5	4	3	2	1	
Computer access	5	4	3	2	1	
Technology enhancements	5	4	3	2	1	
Security for late hours	5	4	3	2	1	
Orientation to university or class location	5	4	3	2	1	
Flexible payment plans	5	4	3	2	1	
Network that will support internet courses	5	4	3	2	1	
Facilities are handicapped accessible	5	4	3	2	1	

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

	High level of agreement					Low Level of agreement
Instructor expertise	5	4	3	2	1	
Use of knowledge already gained by adult students	5	4	3	2	1	

Small group activities	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Curriculum relevance	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Instructor enthusiasm	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Instructional methodology	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Assessment	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Environment conducive to learning	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Student assessment of instructors	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Instructional technologies	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C
Internet courses	5 C 4 C 3 C 2 C 1 C

General comments about quality indicators or study

Submit Response

APPENDIX W

From : "Connie Butler" <conniesb67@hotmail.com>
To : conniesb67@hotmail.com
Subject : Survey, Round 2
Date : Wed, 23 Oct 2002 06:39:43 -0500

Hello Participants:

Just a reminder that this is the last day (Wednesday, October 23) to submit Round 3. If you have already submitted Round 3, please disregard this e-mail. I have no way of knowing who has submitted. Those of you who have not submitted, please complete and submit before the deadline. This is the final round so the next time you hear from me will be to give you results of the study.

You may access the survey at the following address:

http://cats.eiu.edu/butler/index.cfm

Thanks again,
Connie

APPENDIX X

EXCEL STATISTIC REPORT
ROUND 3

Institution Round 3 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R3q1	R3q2	R3q3	R3q4	R3q5	R3q6	R3q7	R3q8	R3q9	R3q10
Mean Adm (a)	4.320	3.800	4.280	4.440	3.920	3.920	4.240	4.200	4.000	3.760
Mean Student (b)	4.219	3.875	3.969	4.313	4.031	3.844	3.969	4.000	4.031	3.875
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.101	0.075	0.311	0.128	0.111	0.076	0.271	0.200	0.031	0.115
Overall Mean	4.263	3.842	4.105	4.368	3.982	3.877	4.088	4.088	4.018	3.825
Var Adm (c)	0.477	0.667	0.543	0.340	0.993	0.827	0.773	0.500	0.667	0.773
Var Student (d)	0.370	0.500	0.483	0.673	0.805	0.717	0.483	0.710	0.870	0.694
Var Dif. (c - d)	0.107	0.167	0.060	0.333	0.188	0.110	0.290	0.210	0.203	0.080
STDEV Adm (e)	0.690	0.816	0.737	0.583	0.997	0.909	0.879	0.707	0.816	0.879
STDEV Student (f)	0.608	0.707	0.695	0.821	0.897	0.847	0.695	0.842	0.933	0.833
STDEV Dif (e - f)	0.082	0.109	0.042	0.238	0.099	0.063	0.185	0.135	0.116	0.047
t test	0.579	0.365	1.622	0.685	0.437	0.324	1.264	0.974	0.135	0.501
Df	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R3q1	R3q2	R3q3	R3q4	R3q5	R3q6	R3q7	R3q8	R3q9	R3q10
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.500	4.000	4.429	4.500	4.000	4.214	4.357	4.357	4.143	4.000
Mean Adm. (g)	3.750	3.250	3.875	4.250	3.625	3.125	3.875	3.875	3.500	3.250
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.750	0.750	0.554	0.250	0.375	1.089	0.482	0.482	0.643	0.750
Overall Mean (a)	4.227	3.727	4.227	4.409	3.864	3.818	4.182	4.182	3.909	3.727
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.269	0.615	0.571	0.269	1.231	0.643	0.555	0.401	0.593	0.615
VAR Adm. (n)	0.500	0.500	0.411	0.500	0.554	0.411	1.268	0.696	0.571	1.071
VAR dif (m - n)	0.231	0.115	0.161	-0.231	0.677	0.232	-0.713	-0.295	0.022	-0.456
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.519	0.784	0.756	0.519	1.109	0.802	0.745	0.633	0.770	0.784
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.707	0.707	0.641	0.707	0.744	0.641	1.126	0.835	0.756	1.035
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.188	0.077	0.115	-0.188	0.365	0.161	-0.381	-0.201	0.014	-0.251
t test	2.623	2.299	1.824	0.874	0.946	3.493	1.083	1.417	1.906	1.778
df	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Result	reject	reject	accept	accept	accept	reject	accept	accept	accept	accept

Administration Function Round 3 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R3q11	R3q12	R3q13	R3q14	R3q15	R3q16	R3q17
Mean Adm (a)	3.680	4.040	4.120	4.720	4.400	0.000	4.680
Mean Student (b)	3.688	3.813	3.281	3.969	3.781	0.000	4.219
Mean Dif. (a-b)	-0.007	0.228	0.839	0.751	0.619	0.000	0.461
Overall Mean	3.684	3.912	3.649	4.298	4.053	0.000	4.421
Var Adm (c)	0.727	0.540	0.443	0.293	0.417	0.000	0.310
Var Student (d)	1.383	1.448	1.176	1.773	1.596	0.000	1.725
Var Dif. (c - d)	-0.656	-0.908	-0.733	-1.480	-1.179	0.000	-1.415
STDEV Adm (e)	0.852	0.735	0.666	0.542	0.645	0.000	0.557
STDEV Student (f)	1.176	1.203	1.085	1.332	1.263	0.000	1.313
STDEV Dif (e - f)	-0.324	-0.468	-0.419	-0.790	-0.618	0.000	-0.757
t test	-0.028	0.880	3.593	2.899	2.399	#DIV/0!	1.791
Df	55	55	55	55	55	0	55
Result	accept	accept	reject	reject	reject	#DIV/0!	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R3q11	R3q12	R3q13	R3q14	R3q15	R3q16	R3q17
Administration - Faculty Status/Administration							
Mean A/Fac. (h)	3.929	4.000	4.000	4.786	4.571	0.000	4.786
Mean Adm. (g)	3.250	3.750	4.125	4.625	4.125	0.000	4.375
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.679	0.250	-0.125	0.161	0.446	0.000	0.411
Overall Mean (a)	3.682	3.909	4.045	4.727	4.409	0.000	4.636
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.533	0.462	0.462	0.181	0.418	0.000	0.181
VAR Adm. (n)	1.071	0.500	0.411	0.554	0.411	0.000	0.554
VAR dif (m - n)	-0.538	-0.038	0.051	-0.372	0.007	0.000	-0.372
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.730	0.679	0.679	0.426	0.646	0.000	0.426
STDEV Adm. (p)	1.035	0.707	0.641	0.744	0.641	0.000	0.744
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	-0.305	-0.028	0.038	-0.318	0.005	0.000	-0.318
t test	1.636	0.809	-0.431	0.561	1.567	#DIV/0!	1.433
df	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	#DIV/0!	accept

Program Strategies Round 3 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R3q18	R3q19	R3q20	R3q21	R3q22	R3q23
Mean Adm (a)	4.600	4.680	4.000	4.120	3.720	4.600
Mean Student (b)	4.406	4.313	3.531	3.875	3.969	4.375
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.194	0.368	0.469	0.245	-0.249	0.225
Overall Mean	4.491	4.474	3.737	3.982	3.860	4.474
Var Adm (c)	0.417	0.227	0.667	0.610	0.960	0.333
Var Student (d)	0.636	0.673	1.354	0.758	0.999	0.500
Var Dif. (c - d)	0.219	0.447	-0.687	-0.148	-0.039	-0.167
STDEV Adm (e)	0.645	0.476	0.816	0.781	0.980	0.577
STDEV Student (f)	0.798	0.821	1.164	0.871	0.999	0.707
STDEV Dif (e - f)	0.152	0.345	-0.347	-0.090	-0.020	-0.130
t test	1.014	2.118	1.785	1.117	-0.943	1.322
df	55	55	55	55	55	55
Result	accept	reject	accept	accept	accept	accept

Program Strategies Round 3 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R3q24	R3q25	R3q26	R3q27	R3q28	R3q29
Mean Adm (a)	3.920	4.200	4.080	3.920	4.200	4.320
Mean Student (b)	4.156	4.406	3.906	3.719	3.875	4.063
Mean Dif. (a-b)	-0.236	0.206	0.174	0.201	0.325	0.258
Overall Mean	4.053	4.316	3.982	3.807	4.018	4.175
Var Adm (c)	0.827	0.833	0.577	0.493	0.500	0.727
Var Student (d)	0.781	0.314	0.797	1.370	0.887	0.964
Var Dif. (c - d)	0.045	0.520	-0.221	-0.877	0.387	0.237
STDEV Adm (e)	0.909	0.913	0.759	0.702	0.707	0.852
STDEV Student (f)	0.884	0.560	0.893	1.170	0.942	0.982
STDEV Dif (e - f)	0.025	0.353	-0.134	-0.468	0.235	0.129
t test	-0.985	-0.993	0.793	0.805	-1.488	1.058
df	55	55	55	55	55	55
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Program Strategies Round 3 Summary

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R3q18	R3q19	R3q20	R3q21	R3q22	R3q23
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.929	4.857	4.214	4.286	3.500	4.714
Mean Adm. (g)	4.125	4.375	3.500	3.750	4.000	4.500
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.804	0.482	0.714	0.536	-0.500	0.214
Overall Mean (a)	4.636	4.682	3.955	4.091	3.682	4.636
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.071	0.132	0.489	0.374	1.038	0.374
VAR Adm. (n)	0.411	0.268	0.857	1.071	0.857	0.286
VAR dif (m - n)	-0.339	-0.136	-0.368	-0.698	0.181	0.088
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.267	0.363	0.699	0.611	1.019	0.611
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.641	0.518	0.926	1.035	0.926	0.535
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	-0.374	-0.154	-0.227	-0.424	0.093	0.077
t test	3.382	2.328	1.895	1.337	-1.174	0.858
df	20	20	20	20	20	20
Result	reject	reject	accept	accept	accept	accept

Program Strategies Round 3 Summary

Administration Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R3q24	R3q25	R3q26	R3q27	R3q28	R3q29
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.000	4.286	4.143	4.000	4.357	4.500
Mean Adm. (g)	3.625	3.750	3.750	3.625	4.000	3.750
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.375	0.536	0.393	0.375	0.357	0.750
Overall Mean (a)	3.864	4.091	4.000	3.864	4.227	4.227
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.923	0.681	0.440	0.462	0.401	0.423
VAR Adm. (n)	0.839	1.071	0.786	0.554	0.571	1.071
VAR dif (m - n)	0.084	-0.390	-0.346	-0.092	-0.170	-0.648
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.961	0.825	0.663	0.679	0.633	0.650
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.916	1.035	0.886	0.744	0.756	1.035
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.045	-0.210	-0.223	-0.065	-0.123	-0.385
t test	0.907	1.254	1.091	1.173	1.129	1.851
df	20	20	20	20	20	20
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Student Services

Round 3 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R3q30	R3q31	R3q32	R3q33	R3q34	R3q35	R3q36	R3q37	R3q38
Mean Adm (a)	4.160	4.520	4.240	4.040	3.920	4.000	3.920	4.080	3.920
Mean Student (b)	4.188	4.344	4.063	3.906	3.844	3.219	4.031	3.719	3.688
Mean Dif. (a-b)	-0.027	0.176	0.178	0.134	0.076	0.781	-0.111	0.361	0.233
Overall Mean	4.175	4.421	4.140	3.965	3.877	3.561	3.982	3.877	3.789
Var Adm (c)	1.307	0.260	0.690	0.540	1.243	0.917	1.077	0.993	1.493
Var Student (d)	0.738	0.555	0.835	1.120	0.910	1.209	0.934	1.693	1.060
Var Dif. (c - d)	0.569	-0.295	-0.145	-0.580	0.333	-0.292	0.142	-0.699	0.433
STDEV Adm (e)	1.143	0.510	0.831	0.735	1.115	0.957	1.038	0.997	1.222
STDEV Student (f)	0.859	0.745	0.914	1.058	0.954	1.099	0.967	1.301	1.030
STDEV Dif (e - f)	0.284	-0.235	0.083	0.323	0.161	0.142	0.071	-0.304	0.192
t test	-0.100	1.058	0.766	0.562	0.273	2.863	-0.414	1.187	0.763
df	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	reject	accept	accept	accept

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R3q30	R3q31	R3q32	R3q33	R3q34	R3q35	R3q36	R3q37	R3q38
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.143	4.643	4.429	4.214	4.071	4.357	4.000	4.143	4.000
Mean Adm. (g)	4.000	4.125	3.625	3.500	3.375	3.125	3.500	3.875	3.500
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.143	0.518	0.804	0.714	0.696	1.232	0.500	0.268	0.500
Overall Mean (a)	4.091	4.455	4.136	3.955	3.818	3.909	3.818	4.045	3.818
VAR A/Fac. (m)	1.824	0.247	0.264	0.335	0.995	0.401	0.923	1.055	2.000
VAR Adm. (n)	0.857	0.125	1.125	0.571	1.696	0.982	1.429	0.982	0.857
VAR dif (m - n)	0.967	0.122	-0.861	0.236	-0.702	-0.581	-0.505	0.073	1.143
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	1.351	0.497	0.514	0.579	0.997	0.633	0.961	1.027	1.414
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.926	0.354	1.061	0.756	1.302	0.991	1.195	0.991	0.926
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.425	0.144	-0.547	0.177	-0.305	-0.358	-0.234	0.036	0.488
t test	0.293	2.838	2.012	2.313	1.309	3.166	1.011	0.602	1.000
df	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Result	accept	reject	accept	reject	accept	reject	accept	accept	accept

Instructional Strategies Round 3 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R3q39	R3q40	R3q41	R3q42	R3q43	R3q44
Mean Adm (a)	4.760	4.040	3.920	4.640	4.520	4.280
Mean Student (b)	4.500	4.094	3.719	4.344	4.438	4.125
Mean Dif. (a-b)	0.260	-0.054	0.201	0.296	0.082	0.155
Overall Mean	4.614	4.070	3.807	4.474	4.474	4.193
Var Adm (c)	0.190	0.457	0.493	0.240	1.093	0.627
Var Student (d)	0.968	0.668	0.854	0.749	0.512	0.629
Var Dif. (c - d)	-0.778	-0.212	-0.360	-0.509	0.581	-0.002
STDEV Adm (e)	0.436	0.676	0.702	0.490	1.046	0.792
STDEV Student (f)	0.984	0.818	0.924	0.865	0.716	0.793
STDEV Dif (e - f)	-0.548	-0.142	-0.222	-0.376	0.330	-0.001
t test	1.337	-0.272	0.934	1.631	0.338	0.733
df	55	55	55	55	55	55
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Instructional Strategies Round 3 Summary

Administration/Students

ID	R3q45	R3q46	R3q47	R3q48	R3q49
Mean Adm (a)	3.720	4.400	3.800	4.000	3.760
Mean Student (b)	3.938	4.406	3.938	4.156	4.000
Mean Dif. (a-b)	-0.218	-0.006	-0.138	-0.156	-0.240
Overall Mean	3.842	4.404	3.877	4.088	3.895
Var Adm (c)	1.043	0.500	0.750	0.667	0.857
Var Student (d)	0.770	0.378	0.835	0.588	0.774
Var Dif. (c - d)	0.273	0.122	-0.085	0.079	0.082
STDEV Adm (e)	1.021	0.707	0.866	0.816	0.926
STDEV Student (f)	0.878	0.615	0.914	0.767	0.880
STDEV Dif (e - f)	0.144	0.092	-0.048	0.050	0.046
t test	-0.848	-0.035	-0.581	-0.736	-0.993
df	55	55	55	55	55
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Instructional Strategies Round 3 Summary

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R3q39	R3q40	R3q41	R3q42	R3q43	R3q44
Mean A/Fac. (h)	4.786	4.071	4.143	4.643	4.357	4.571
Mean Adm. (g)	4.750	3.875	3.500	4.500	4.625	3.750
Mean Dif. (g - h)	0.036	0.196	0.643	0.143	-0.268	0.821
Overall Mean (a)	4.773	4.000	3.909	4.591	4.455	4.273
VAR A/Fac. (m)	0.181	0.533	0.440	0.247	1.786	0.264
VAR Adm. (n)	0.214	0.411	0.571	0.286	0.268	1.071
VAR dif (m - n)	-0.033	0.122	-0.132	-0.038	1.518	-0.808
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	0.426	0.730	0.663	0.497	1.336	0.514
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.463	0.641	0.756	0.535	0.518	1.035
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	-0.037	0.089	-0.093	-0.037	0.819	-0.522
t test	0.179	0.657	2.005	0.618	-0.667	2.102
df	20	20	20	20	20	20
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept	reject

Instructional Strategies Round 3 Summary

Administration - Faculty Status/Administration

ID	R3q45	R3q46	R3q47	R3q48	R3q49
Mean A/Fac. (h)	3.500	4.500	3.643	4.214	4.000
Mean Adm. (g)	4.000	4.125	3.875	3.500	3.375
Mean Dif. (g - h)	-0.500	0.375	-0.232	0.714	0.625
Overall Mean (a)	3.682	4.364	3.727	3.955	3.773
VAR A/Fac. (m)	1.192	0.577	1.016	0.489	0.615
VAR Adm. (n)	0.857	0.411	0.411	0.857	1.411
VAR dif (m - n)	0.335	0.166	0.606	-0.368	-0.795
STDEV A/Fac. (q)	1.092	0.760	1.008	0.699	0.784
STDEV Adm. (p)	0.926	0.641	0.641	0.926	1.188
STDEV Dif. (p - q)	0.166	0.119	0.367	-0.227	-0.403
t test	-1.140	1.233	-0.659	1.895	1.332
df	20	20	20	20	20
Result	accept	accept	accept	accept	accept

Additional Categories

Round 3 Summary

ID **R3q50**

Comments

Administration	I found myself changing answers from one sample to the next as I switched from thing what was quality for me and what a student might expect is quality.
Student	Technology (WebCT) used in delivering web courses works sporadically. The Off-Campus schedule comes out much latter than the On-Campus schedule.

APPENDIX Y

EXCEL LISTING CODES FOR QUALITY INDICATORS BY ROUND

Category	Quality Indicator	EXCEL Identifying Code
Institution	Reputation of institution	Q1
	Vision of institution	Q2
	Strategic plan	Q3
	Adults feel they matter	Q4
	List Add additional quality indicators to Institution	Q5
Administrative Function	Staff development	Q6
	Faculty development	Q7
	Marketing	Q8
	Assessment	Q9
	Program management	Q10
	Strategic planning	Q11
	Commitment to students	Q12
	List Additional quality indicators to Administrative Function	Q13
Program Strategies	Weekend and evening course offerings	Q14
	Course location	Q15
	Cohort groups	Q16
	Mentoring	Q17
	Assessment	Q18
	Credit for experiential learning	Q19
	Cost of program	Q20
	Faculty support	Q21
	List additional quality indicators to Program Strategies	Q22
Student Services	Flexible operating hours	Q23
	Qualified staff	Q24
	Food services	Q25
	Greater availability and access to parking	Q26
	Security for later hours	Q27
	Orientation to university or class location	Q28
	Flexible payment plans	Q29
	List Additional quality indicators to Student Services	Q30
Instructional Strategies	Instructor	Q31

Category	Quality Indicator	EXCEL Identifying Code
	Use of knowledge already gained by adult students	Q32
	Small group activities	Q33
	Curriculum relevance	Q34
	Instructor enthusiasm	Q35
	Instructor methodology	Q36
	Assessment	Q37
	List Additional quality indicators to Instructional Strategies	Q38
	List additional categories	Q39
	General comments	Q40

Category	Quality Indicator	Excel Identifying Code
Institution	Reputation of institution	R2Q1
	Vision of institution	R2Q2
	Outreach efforts	R2Q3
	Adults feel they matter	R2Q4
	High national ranking among public universities	R2Q5
	Mission of institution	R2Q6
	History of graduate success on certification tests	R2Q7
	Job placement rates following graduation	R2Q8
	Quality of technology	R2Q9
	Enrollments, full-time equivalency, & semester hours	R2Q10
Administrative Function	Staff development	R2Q11
	Faculty development	R2Q12
	Recruitment	R2Q13
	Delivery of courses in timely manner	R2Q14
	Program management	R2Q15
	Service to university	R2Q16
	Commitment to students	R2Q17
Program Strategies	Weekend and evening course offerings	R2Q18
	Course location	R2Q19
	Cohort groups	R2Q20
	Peer interaction	R2Q21
	Assessment	R2Q22
	Teaching excellence	R2Q23
	Cost of program	R2Q24
	Faculty support	R2Q25
	Technology supported delivery methods	R2Q26
	Good textbooks	R2Q27
	Learner-driven course scheduling	R2Q28
	Sufficient number of graduate and undergraduate courses	R2Q29
Student Services	Flexible operating hours	R2Q30
	Qualified staff	R2Q31
	Computer access	R2Q32
	Technology enhancements	R2Q33
	Security for late hours	R2Q34
	Orientation to university or class location	R2Q35
	Flexible payment plans	R2Q36

Category	Quality Indicator	EXCEL Identifying Code
	Network that will support internet courses	R2Q37
	Facilities are handicapped accessible	R2Q38
Instructional strategies	Instructor expertise	R2Q39
	Use of knowledge already gained by adult student	R2Q40
	Small group activities	R2Q41
	Curriculum relevance	R2Q42
	Instructor enthusiasm	R2Q43
	Instructional methodology	R2Q44
	Assessment	R2Q45
	Environment conducive to learning	R2Q46
	Student assessment of instructors	R2Q47
	Instructional methodologies	R2Q48
	Internet courses	R2Q49
	General Comments	R2Q50

Category	Quality Indicator	Excel Identifying Code
Institution	Reputation of institution	R3Q1
	Vision of institution	R3Q2
	Outreach efforts	R3Q3
	Adults feel they matter	R3Q4
	High national ranking among public universities	R3Q5
	Mission of institution	R3Q6
	History of graduate success on certification tests	R3Q7
	Job placement rates following graduation	R3Q8
	Quality of technology	R3Q9
	Enrollments, full-time equivalency, & sem. hrs.	R3Q10
Administrative Function	Staff development	R3Q11
	Faculty development	R3Q12
	Recruitment	R3Q13
	Delivery of courses in timely manner	R3Q14
	Program management	R3Q15
	Service to university	R3Q16
	Commitment to students	R3Q17
Program Strategies	Weekend and evening course offerings	R3Q18
	Course location	R3Q19
	Cohort groups	R3Q20
	Peer interaction	R3Q21
	Assessment	R3Q22
	Teaching excellence	R3Q23
	Cost of program	R3Q24
	Faculty support	R3Q25
	Technology supported delivery methods	R3Q26
	Good textbooks	R3Q27
	Learner-driven course scheduling	R3Q28
	Sufficient number of graduate and undergraduate courses	R3Q29
Student Services	Flexible operating hours	R3Q30
	Qualified staff	R3Q31
	Computer access	R3Q32
	Technology enhancements	R3Q33
	Security for late hours	R3Q34
	Orientation to university or class location	R3Q35

Category	Quality Indicator	EXCEL Identifying Code
	Flexible payment plans	R3Q36
Student Services	Flexible operating hours	R3Q30
	Network that will support internet courses	R3Q37
	Facilities are handicapped accessible	R3Q38
Instructional strategies	Instructor expertise	R3Q39
	Use of knowledge already gained by adult student	R3Q40
	Instructional methodology	R3Q44
	Assessment	R3Q45
	Environment conducive to learning	R3Q46
	Student assessment of instructors	R3Q47
	Instructional methodologies	R3Q48
	Internet courses	R3Q49
	General Comments	R3Q50

APPENDIX Z

HIGH/LOW RATINGS OF QUALITY INDICATORS BY CATEGORIES OF ADULT STUDENTS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Quality Indicators with Highest (4.0 or higher) Mean Rating of Importance by Students After Round 3

Quality Indicator	Mean Rating
Instructor expertise	4.50
Instructor enthusiasm	4.43
Weekend and evening course offerings	4.40
Faculty support	4.40
Environment conducive to learning	4.40
Internet courses	4.40
Teaching excellence	4.37
Qualified staff	4.34
Curriculum relevance	4.34
Adults feel they matter	4.31
Course location	4.31
Reputation of institution	4.21
Commitment to students	4.21
Flexible operating hours	4.18
Cost of program	4.15
Instructional technologies	4.15
Instructional methodology	4.12
Use of knowledge already gained by adult students	4.09
Sufficient number of graduate and undergraduate courses	4.06
Computer access	4.06
High national ranking among public universities	4.03
Quality of technology	4.03
Flexible payment plans	4.03
Job placement rates following graduation	4.00

Quality Indicators with Highest (4.0 or higher) Mean Rating of Importance by Administrators After Round 3

Quality Indicator	Mean Rating
Instructor expertise	4.76
Delivery of courses in timely manner	4.72
Commitment to students	4.68
Course location	4.68
Curriculum relevance	4.64
Weekend and evening course offerings	4.60
Teaching excellence	4.60
Qualified staff	4.52
Instructor enthusiasm	4.52
Adults feel they matter	4.44
Program management	4.40
Environment conducive to learning	4.40
Reputation of institution	4.32
Sufficient number of grad. and undergrad. courses	4.32
Outreach efforts	4.28
Instructional methodology	4.28
History of graduate success on certification tests	4.24
Computer access	4.24
Job placement rates	4.20
Faculty support	4.20
Learner-driven course scheduling	4.20
Flexible operating hours	4.16
Recruitment	4.12
Peer interaction	4.12
Technology supported delivery methods	4.08
Network that will support internet courses	4.08
Faculty development	4.04
Technology enhancements	4.04
Use of knowledge already gained by adult students	4.04
Quality of technology	4.00
Cohort groups	4.00
Orientation to university or class location	4.00
Instructional technologies	4.00

Quality Indicators with Lowest (less than 4.0) Mean Rating of Importance by Students After Round 3

Quality Indicator	Mean Rating
Outreach efforts	3.96
History of graduate success on certification tests	3.96
Delivery of courses in timely manner	3.96
Assessment (Program Strategies category)	3.96
Assessment (Instructional Strategies category)	3.93
Student assessment of instructors	3.93
Technology supported delivery methods	3.90
Technology enhancements	3.90
Vision of institution	3.87
Enrollments, full-time equivalency, & semester hours	3.87
Peer interaction	3.87
Learner-driven course scheduling	3.87
Mission of institution	3.84
Security for late hours	3.84
Faculty development	3.81
Program management	3.78
Good textbooks	3.71
Network that will support internet courses	3.71
Small group activities	3.71
Staff development	3.68
Facilities are handicapped accessible	3.68
Cohort groups	3.53
Recruitment	3.28
Orientation to university or class location	3.21

Quality Indicators with Lowest (less than 4.0) Mean Rating of Importance by Administrators After Round 3

Quality Indicator	Mean Rating
High national ranking among public universities	3.92
Mission of institution	3.92
Cost of program	3.92
Good textbooks	3.92
Security of late hours	3.92
Flexible payment plans	3.92
Facilities are handicapped accessible	3.92
Small group activities	3.92
Vision of institution	3.80
Student assessment of instructors	3.80
Enrollments, full-time equivalency, & semester hours	3.76
Internet courses	3.76
Assessment (Program Strategies category)	3.72
Assessment (Instructional Strategies category)	3.72
Staff development	3.68