

© 2012 Trevor James Eagle

A SURVEY OF UNIVERSITY TEACHING PRACTICES AND PERCEPTIONS OF
COMPRESSED COURSES

BY

TREVOR JAMES EAGLE

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in Educational Organization and Leadership
with a concentration in Higher Education
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2012

Urbana, Illinois

Master's Committee:

Professor Michael C. Loui, Chair
Professor Michelle Perry
Assistant Professor Denice Hood

ABSTRACT

This is a quantitative study that investigated faculty pedagogical changes, perceptions, and preparation of semester length courses taught in a compressed course format. One hundred and three faculty members teaching at a large Research I University in the Midwest completed an online survey addressing their teaching pedagogy, perceptions, and preparation for compressed courses taught in the last four years. Results showed that many faculty did indeed make adjustments and have differing perceptions when teaching a compressed course. Faculty made different pedagogical changes to compressed courses based on the time in the academic calendar when they taught a compressed course (i.e. fall, winter, spring, summer), instructional method used to teach compressed courses (i.e. face-to-face, online, or blended), faculty rank, highest degree earned, full-time work status, and amount of years teaching compressed courses. Further, faculty had differing perceptions and attitudes of compressed courses based on the number of years teaching compressed courses, number of total years teaching full-time in higher education, tenure status, full-time work status, instructional methods used to teach compressed courses, and disciplinary college affiliation. Lastly, a large majority of faculty did not receive training or mentorship (i.e. professional support) for teaching in a compressed format. However, nearly half of the faculty who responded indicated they discussed differences in or concerns regarding compressed courses teaching with their colleagues.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW | 5 |
| CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY | 12 |
| CHAPTER 4: RESULTS | 17 |
| CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION | 25 |
| CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION | 31 |
| REFERENCES | 33 |
| APPENDIX A | 36 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Over the last thirty years, the academic calendar in higher education has seen much debate and reform, but the semester calendar continues to dominate American higher education (Quehl, Bergquist, & Subbiondo, 1999). At most American colleges and universities, the academic year comprises two semesters of fourteen to sixteen weeks each. Some general advantages of the semester calendar, regardless of its implementation, include providing sufficient time to study subject matter and to provide adequate classroom contact between students and faculty (Quehl et al., 1999). On the other hand, the quarter calendar has four equal sections, each approximately ten or eleven weeks. The quarter calendar offers some advantages over the semester calendar, such as allowing students to take a larger variety and greater number of courses per academic year and allowing for sequencing of courses to occur across three successive quarter sections (Quehl et al., 1999).

An alternative to the semester and quarter calendar systems is block scheduling. Although primarily a term used in K-12 education, a block schedule utilizes smaller instructional modules throughout an academic year. The full academic year would offer eight or nine blocks with students traditionally taking eight blocks. A block schedule compresses and concentrates the students' learning with fewer courses per block than a semester. This schedule allows a student to focus on fewer subjects at a time. Because students and faculty alike often find the condensed time period of the blocks stressful, this calendar choice is often limited in its usage (Quehl et al., 1999). Implemented in 1970, Colorado College still utilizes a block plan: four

blocks per semester, eight blocks per year. In each block, a student takes just one course (Colorado, 2012).

The duration and frequency of a given course are also important considerations for an institution to make. Changing student demands have dramatically altered the timing of course offerings. As the number of working adults attending school part-time increases, the daytime classes that meet multiple times in a week are a hindrance. Community colleges and public and private universities that offer intensive programs specifically directed to working adults have expanded their weekday evening and weekend instruction options. Furthermore, many institutions are now offering intensive courses, which last from an entire day, several weeks, or a condensed few months, as another way to accommodate the varying schedules and demands of today's students (Quehl et al., 1999).

Few researchers have studied the effects of switching from one academic calendar to another. Administrators at institutions considering a calendar switch often noted that there was little research on the effect of academic calendars on student learning (Chabot College, 1975; College of the Redwoods, 1976). Decisions to switch have been based primarily on administrative cost savings rather than on improvement of student learning (College of DuPage, 1992). Johnstone and Maloney (1998) claimed that higher education institutions should focus on enhancing student learning instead of on cutting costs. Since faculty are crucial for student success, instead of cutting faculty or staff, increasing faculty workload, or substituting lower cost part time faculty, Johnstone and Maloney (1998) contended that administrators need to focus on enhancing student learning. They argued that overpaid, under worked or excessive faculty or staff are not the issue, but rather inefficiencies in teaching and learning are the principal problems. Excessive non-learning time, redundant learning, excessive course taking and

ineffective learning all contribute to the problems according to Johnstone and Maloney (1998). They suggested many ways to solve these problems, including the call for a year round academic calendar and a conscious attempt to better use the full potential of the learning day, week, and year (Johnstone & Maloney, 1998).

In the 1990's, Western State College in Colorado implemented a year round calendar. Cash (1993) found positive consequences of the calendar change at the institution. The academic calendar at Western State College now comprises four alternating 12-week and 8-week terms. Course flexibility has dramatically expanded with the implementation of block, traditional, and grouped courses within the terms. Classes at Western are more intensive, and there has been more interaction between faculty and students. Cash's (1993) findings suggest how modified academic calendars utilizing block scheduling can have positive effects on student learning outcomes.

Problem Statement

For the purpose of this study, a compressed course is defined as a course that has the same number of contact hours as the same traditional semester taught course. A compressed course session is the delivery of a traditional regular course in a shorter timeframe (Kretovics, Crowe, & Hyun, 2005). In the literature, compressed courses are also called "condensed courses" (Scott, 1994) and "time-compressed courses" (Hyun, Kretovics & Crowe, 2006). There is little research specifically on compressed courses. The research that has been conducted has primarily addressed student perspectives, expectations, and learning outcomes. Scott (1995) reported that some faculty have criticized compressed courses for lack of academic rigor and sacrifice of breadth of knowledge. Though, research indicated that students in compressed courses learn as much or more than students who take the courses in the traditional semester

(Daniel, 2000; Scott, 1995; Van Scyoc & Gleason, 1993). Kember (2001) found that faculty focused on different approaches to learning in an effort to maintain academic rigor in compressed courses (Kember, 2001). Further, others have suggested that faculty may need to modify their pedagogical techniques when teaching compressed courses (Daniel, 2000).

Kretovics, Crowe and Hyun (2005) focused on how faculty may change their pedagogical practices when they taught courses in a summer compressed format that they also taught in a traditional semester format. The researchers administered a survey to gauge the perceptions and pedagogical practices of faculty in compressed courses. Their findings suggested that faculty do modify their pedagogical practices when teaching compressed courses. Faculty adjusted many aspects of their traditional semester courses including texts, discussions, assignments, and exams (Kretovics et al., 2005).

The Kretovics et al. (2005) study is the only previous research that investigated faculty pedagogical changes for compressed courses. Because they surveyed faculty at only one institution, generalizability is limited. Thus, there is a strong need to investigate and survey other faculty populations at other institutions. Because no comparative data exists, further research is needed to compare with previous findings and provide relevant perspective. This thesis study will extend the research of Kretovics et al. (2005) by surveying current faculty at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign who have taught a compressed course that they have also taught in a traditional semester format. The study investigates faculty perceptions and pedagogical changes of a compressed course taught within the last four years from fall 2008 through summer 2012.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Student Learning Explored: Compressed Courses

Scott (1994) conducted an extensive review of compressed courses. In a report to the North American Association of Summer Sessions, Scott concluded that students' experiences in compressed courses do indeed differ from their experiences in traditional semester length courses (Scott, 1994). However, she noted that the quality of those experiences depends on whether the courses exhibited specific attributes, such as instructor enthusiasm and communication skills, or active, experiential, and applied learning methods. If these attributes were present, compressed courses offered effective learning experiences for students. In the absence of these attributes, however, compressed courses were less effective for student learning outcomes when compared with a traditional semester length course (Scott, 1994).

Scott (1995) investigated further into compressed courses as she began to develop a study of her own to evaluate compressed courses. She noted surprise when she began reviewing the literature and discovered that compressed courses yield equivalent and sometimes superior learning outcomes and experiences, qualitatively speaking, in comparison with traditional semester length courses, regardless of the format or subject matter. Further exploring the student learning outcome differences among compressed courses and a traditional semester, Scott (1995) developed an experimental design study. This study utilized both compressed courses and traditional semester length courses of the same subject matter. Scott's study specifically compared students' learning experiences in two British literature courses and two marketing

courses. Each course was taught in a compressed format and in a semester length format with the same instructor and curriculum content in each.

Scott's (1995) findings were robust: each compressed format course experienced greater continuity of learning that was credited to the four consecutive class days per week the course met. It was suggested that students could connect and synthesize their ideas better while developing a broad understanding of the subject. If students took only one or two courses while taking a compressed course, rather than the typical four or five courses during a semester, students were better able to concentrate and immerse themselves in the material. This greater immersion was attributed to not having their attention divided among more courses during the semester. This increased concentration also allowed students to give increased energy for coursework that might otherwise not have received as much attention in a more traditional schedule. Since students were juggling fewer courses at one time, students additionally felt they were better able to plan and manage their course assignment loads. In addition, in the compressed courses, the longer sessions fostered more thorough and meaningful discussions (Scott, 1995).

In Scott's (1995) study, students in compressed course reported many positive experiences and the following few negative experiences. For the students who were working jobs while attending school, the compressed courses created more stress than a traditional semester course. Students were not pleased that some assignments became shortened due to the compressed format. This shortening caused some assignments to seem less interesting and not as meaningful among the students. Students reported that compressed courses were found to create a boring and monotonous learning environment if instructors used lecture as the only style of teaching. Since lectures in compressed courses felt like a bombardment of information, students

reported feeling more stress and pressure. Students said they would prefer the compressed course format if good teaching practices could be assured (Scott, 1995).

Students expressed they wanted to learn, rather than be taught to, and provided strong support for a process oriented, connected approach to teaching and learning. The positive reaction from the students in the compressed courses seemed to be attributed to the amount of class time per day and the continuity between course sessions. This continuity allowed a greater connectedness, facilitated by instructors who incorporated more complex activities into the classroom experience. For instructors, courses in the compressed format were taught in a way that required more instructional preparation. Scott's (1995) findings of faculty concerns regarding preparation for compressed courses can be put in better perspective by taking into account Felder and Brent's (1996) contribution. They said that faculty even in a traditional semester format have difficulty and concerns regarding preparing a strong learning environment. Lee (2010) reinforced some of Scott's (1995) findings, asserting that faculty in compressed courses were concerned about the scope and timing of assessment tasks, student workload expectations, administration of the course, and workload. Overall, Scott's (1995) study contended that the extra preparation time required of instructors in compressed courses additionally interfered with their demands for research and took away from responsibilities that the institution valued more highly than their ability to effectively teach (Scott, 1995).

In the literature, few studies have addressed the long-term differences among compressed courses, and expanding on Scott's (1995) work, few have compared student learning outcomes between compressed and semester formats. After Scott (1995), no one appears to have compared the effects of a traditional semester course additionally taught in a compressed format by the same instructor until 2004. Seamon (2004) compared the learning outcomes for two

different courses in educational psychology that were each taught in both compressed and semester formats. Seamon (2004) found that as long as the courses had equal classroom instructional time, compressed courses produced better learning outcomes than traditional semester length courses. This finding remained even after controlling for the demographic characteristics of the students enrolled (Seamon, 2004). However, Seamon (2004) also began studying long-term effects and chose to track student learning retention through follow-up questionnaires. These findings suggested that compressed courses had no advantage in long-term learning. The study concluded that compressed courses provided a "better start", but unless learning is actively maintained, that edge fades over time (Seamon, 2004).

Kucsera and Zimmaro (2010) compared standardized student evaluations of courses taught by the same instructor in both a traditional and compressed format. When confounding variables were taken into account, they found that compressed courses did not significantly differ from traditional semester length courses in overall student ratings of teaching effectiveness. Additionally, after specifically controlling for class size and probable grade in course, they found that compressed courses received significantly higher overall course ratings than traditional semester courses. This study indicated that from a student perspective, compressed courses may have some advantages in comparison with traditional semester courses.

Faculty Pedagogy in the Classroom

Crowe, Hyun, and Kretovics (2005) reflected on their respective teaching of summer compressed courses, and discussed whether compressed courses could foster academic rigor. The authors defined rigor in a variety of ways, but emphasized a learning process that included challenging work, deep thinking, making and understanding connections, and construction of new knowledge (Crowe et al., 2005). Crowe et al. (2005) showed how faculty members balance

the compression of time against depth and breadth of instruction within compressed courses.

The authors concluded that in both compressed and semester formats a course should have the same content and expectations of students. However, they also concluded that faculty must be conscious of necessary differences in methods of delivery and assessment (Crowe et al., 2005).

In a follow-up study, Kretoivics et al. (2005) surveyed faculty members who had taught summer compressed courses. The survey gathered the pedagogical tendencies and perceptions of 151 faculty members at a multi-campus state institution in Ohio. The study primarily focused on how pedagogical practices in a summer compressed course differed from a semester version of the same course. This research additionally investigated faculty perceptions of summer compressed courses. Broadly, Kretoivics et al. (2005) found that faculty adjusted their teaching methods and approach to student assessment when teaching the course in a compressed format. The authors also found differences between tenured and non-tenured faculty members in their approaches to compressed course teaching: tenured faculty members made pedagogical changes more often than did their untenured colleagues. The authors speculated that untenured faculty may have been more pedagogically risk averse due to their political standing within the department and their focus on gaining tenure. Faculty also responded that they received little or no training and support for teaching and modifying their summer compressed courses (Kretoivics et al., 2005).

The specific results of Kretoivics et al. (2005) indicated the types of pedagogical modifications and faculty perceptions. Of the respondents, 46% of the faculty indicated they changed their syllabus, 33% changed reading assignments, 39% changed writing assignments, and 40% changed project assignments. Additionally, 39% of faculty indicated they reduced the content of their summer courses while 16% indicated that they added content. In regards to

changes to their teaching methods within the compressed course, 47% either agreed or strongly agreed that they had made changes. For the questions that addressed attitudes and perceptions, the authors inquired if faculty felt they had received training or mentorship specific to teaching summer or compressed courses; 84% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they had received training and 83% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they had received mentorship. Whether faculty had conversations with their colleagues regarding compressed course teaching, 60% indicated that yes, they had conversations with their peers. For questions that addressed overall perceptions of compressed courses, faculty indicated they enjoyed teaching compressed sessions. Faculty also had an overall positive perception of their students and their abilities (Kretovics et al., 2005). Although Kretovics et al. (2005) noted that further research was needed to evaluate whether these pedagogical changes produced different student learning, their research was focused on faculty changes and perceptions, not student learning. Additionally, the authors noted the importance of future research beginning to investigate whether pedagogical changes differ amongst academic disciplines to later determine if some courses should not be taught in a compressed format (Kretovics et al., 2005).

In summary, research on student learning outcomes and student perceptions showed that compressed courses are not inferior to traditional semester length courses (Scott, 1995; Seamon, 2004; Kucsera and Zimmaro, 2010). The research also suggested that compressed courses are important to students for cognitive development and practical reasons, especially to adult and non-traditional students (Quehl et al., 1999). High quality teaching in compressed time frames required attention to key attributes and a willingness to adapt instructional techniques and evaluative assessment measures to the time constraints (Kretovics et al., 2005; Kretovics et al.,

2006). Compressed courses may hold the promise of exceptional learning experiences for both students and faculty.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

The Study

This research is a quantitative study that uses a survey to obtain descriptive statistics from faculty who have taught a compressed course that they have also taught in a traditional semester format. Kretoivics et al. (2005) discussed further research for investigating other institutional types, the timeframe of the year when these courses take place, and to start trying to determine if certain courses should not be taught in a compressed format. Thus, the purpose of this study is to extend the research of Kretoivics et al. (2005) to a different faculty population, include all compressed courses throughout the academic calendar, not just summer compressed courses as Kretoivics et al (2005) surveyed, and address new demographic characteristics previously never asked. These demographic characteristics include inquiring about the variation of length within the term of compressed courses, the timing in the academic calendar the compressed courses were taught, the instructional methods used to teach compressed courses (i.e. face-to-face, online, blended), the variation of length of their traditional semester course, and their disciplinary college affiliation.

This study addresses the following exploratory research questions:

- 1) What pedagogical changes do faculty make when they teach a semester-length course in a compressed format?
- 2) What are faculty perceptions of compressed courses, in regards to teaching and students?
- 3) What professional support is provided to faculty for teaching compressed courses?

- 4) Are there differences in faculty perceptions of compressed courses based on surveyed demographic characteristics?
- 5) Are there differences in faculty pedagogical changes based on surveyed demographic characteristics?
- 6) What are faculty disciplinary college affiliations for compressed courses?

A recognized theoretical framework has not been established for the creation of these research questions, though the questions take into account previous findings, limitations, and stated areas of future research from Kretoivics et al. (2005). The sixth research question is an attempt to begin exploring if certain areas of study are more apt to teach compressed courses or not. Thus, it is intended to provide preliminary findings that can be used to explore future research investigating whether certain courses, disciplines, or areas of study should or should not be taught in a compressed format. Diverse pedagogical practices have long been used for different academic disciplines to elicit student learning outcomes for that specific field (Van Scyoc & Gleason, 1993). Specifically, these pedagogical differences include the use of demonstrations and laboratories in science courses, and discussions in humanities courses. To determine whether compressed courses are more prevalent in certain disciplines, it is critical to obtain the disciplinary college affiliation of each respondent.

Population and Data Collection

The population of the study included all faculty at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign who have taught a compressed course that they have also taught in a traditional semester format between fall 2008 and summer 2012. Only faculty who were still currently employed were invited to participate. A representative from the Office of the Provost, Division of Information Management, generated a list of faculty who met these criteria. After approval

from the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects (IRB#12897), all faculty were requested to participate via email. An email letter of introduction was used to explain the purpose of the study and additionally serve as the consent document. A hyperlink to the secure survey was included as well as directions for login and assurances of anonymity. The survey instrument was active for fourteen days during the final two weeks of the last 2012 summer session. Reminder emails were dispersed at the half-way mark after one week, and 24 hours before the close of the survey. The survey was created electronically and hosted using the campus's WebTools function that required participants to provide their unique username and password to access the survey. None of the participant's login information was recorded or linked to their responses. A total of 868 faculty were asked to participate, while 31 faculty replied that they had not taught a compressed course and should not have been included in the sample. The removal of these 31 faculty resulted in 837 as the new sample size that was used for subsequent email reminders. One hundred and three unique participants completed and returned usable results resulting in a response rate of 12%.

Instrumentation

The survey consisted of 36 questions that fell into three categories; demographics, attitudes and perceptions, and pedagogical practices. Overall, the survey instrument included a total of 36 questions that were adapted from Kreto vics et al. (2005) research. The present study retained all of the 33 original questions from Kreto vics et al. (2005) survey instrument while a total of five questions were added and included in the demographics section. These questions asked faculty about the timing in the academic calendar year that they taught compressed courses, the instructional methods used to teach compressed courses (i.e. face-to-face, online, blended), the duration within the term of their compressed courses, the duration within the term

of their traditional format courses, and their disciplinary college affiliation. Additionally, differing from the original survey of Kretovcis et al. (2005), the choice *adjunct* was added to the faculty rank question to be more exhaustive. Please refer to Appendix A to review the survey instrument.

The survey's reliability was measured by calculating a Cronbach's alpha to determine if the items were internally consistent. The overall survey, excluding the demographic questions, had an alpha score of .76. According to Gliner and Morgan (2000), this value of alpha meets the generally accepted guidelines for internal consistency. Further, the questions regarding attitudes and perceptions, pedagogy, and faculty preparation were factor analyzed using SPSS to determine if the instrument was in fact measuring independent factors. The results of the factor analysis showed that these survey questions measured four independent factors. Though, the fourth factor only included one question (added content). Thus, the factor analysis was re-run compressing the factors into three categories and the revised rotated component matrix indicated that the lone question was best correlated with first factor. The revised Factor 1 (pedagogy) included eight questions: changed syllabus, changed readings, changed writing assignments, changed projects, changed assessment measures, added content, reduced content, and used different teaching methodology. Factor 2 (perceptions) included six questions: enjoy teaching compressed courses, students are more focused, establish rapport more quickly, students participate more, students attendance is higher, and students are intellectually more challenging. Factor 3 (faculty preparation) included three questions: received training regarding compressed courses, received mentoring regarding compressed courses, and discussed concerns about compressed courses teaching with colleagues. A Cronbach's alpha was then calculated for each of the three factors to give an indication of their reliability. The resulting alpha's were .85, .84,

and .67, respectively. For Factor 3, if the smallest loaded question were removed, the alpha would be .85.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

The survey collected demographic data about each respondent, as presented in Table I.

Table I
Participant Demographics

| Years of compressed courses | Years of full-time higher ed teaching | Faculty Rank | Teacher status | Highest degree earned | Sex |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1-3: 56% (<i>n</i> = 58) | 0-3: 8% (<i>n</i> = 8) | Full professor: 23% (<i>n</i> = 24) | Tenured/tenured track: 49% (<i>n</i> = 50) | Terminal: 80% (<i>n</i> = 82) | Male: 56% (<i>n</i> = 58) |
| 4-6: 23% (<i>n</i> = 24) | 4-6: 16% (<i>n</i> = 16) | Associate: 19% (<i>n</i> = 20) | Non-tenure track: 51% (<i>n</i> = 53) | Master's: 15% (<i>n</i> = 16) | Female: 44% (<i>n</i> = 45) |
| 7-12: 16% (<i>n</i> = 16) | 7-12: 22% (<i>n</i> = 23) | Assistant: 16% (<i>n</i> = 16) | | Bachelor's: 2% (<i>n</i> = 2) | |
| 13 or more: 5% (<i>n</i> = 5) | 13 or more: 54% (<i>n</i> = 56) | Instructor: 29% (<i>n</i> = 30) | | ABD: 3% (<i>n</i> = 3) | |
| | | Adjunct: 13% (<i>n</i> = 13) | | | |

Table 1 shows that 88% (*n* = 91) of faculty were full-time instructors, 80% (*n* = 82) held a terminal degree, 51% (*n* = 53) were non-tenure track, 42% (*n* = 43) held rank of instructor or adjunct while 16% (*n* = 16) were Assistant Professors, and 42% (*n* = 44) were Full or Associate Professors. Regarding teaching experience, 24% (*n* = 24) of the faculty had less than seven years of full-time teaching experience in higher education and 54% (*n* = 56) had 13 or more years overall. Specifically, in regards to years teaching compressed courses, 79% (*n* = 82) of faculty had fewer than seven years experience and 5% (*n* = 5) had 13 or more years. In regard to what level of student was being taught in the compressed format, 15% (*n* = 15) of faculty were teaching both graduate and undergraduate students while 51% (*n* = 53) were only teaching

undergraduate students. Faculty were additionally asked why they teach compressed courses.

Table II summarizes those findings and responses.

Table II
Reasons Why Faculty Teach Compressed Courses

| Questions | Percentages |
|---|-------------|
| For extra money ($n = 42$) | 41% |
| As part of my contract ($n = 22$) | 21% |
| To fulfill programmatic needs ($n = 66$) | 64% |
| Because I like it ($n = 33$) | 32% |
| Because I cannot offer the course in a semester term ($n = 12$) | 12% |
| Other ($n = 12$) | 12% |

Note. Participants were instructed to choose all that apply.

Table III summarizes three of the additional demographic questions specifically added to this study. Four of the five of these additional demographic questions instructed respondents to choose all that apply, explaining why the percentages accumulate over one hundred percent. In regard to type of instructional method, 66% ($n = 68$) indicated they had taught a compressed course face-to-face, 37% ($n = 37$) had done so online, and 12% ($n = 12$) had used a blended method. Regarding the timing in the academic year compressed courses were taught, 69% ($n = 71$) of the faculty had taught a compressed course during the summer, 38% ($n = 39$) of the faculty had taught during the spring, 36% ($n = 37$) had taught during the fall, and 5% ($n = 5$) had taught during a winter term. This winter term may have included courses taught in January for programs with short study abroad trips during the break between fall and spring semesters. Finally, regarding the duration in the term of their compressed course, 68% ($n = 70$) of faculty had previously taught a course between eight and ten weeks in length, 48% ($n = 49$) had taught a four to seven week length course, and 11% ($n = 11$) had previously taught a course less than four weeks in length.

Table III
Participant Demographics

| Term when taught | Weeks in length of compressed courses | Instructional method |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Summer: 69% (<i>n</i> = 71) | Four or less: 39% (<i>n</i> = 40) | Face-to-face: 66% (<i>n</i> = 68) |
| Fall: 36% (<i>n</i> = 37) | 5-7: 12% (<i>n</i> = 12) | Online: 37% (<i>n</i> = 38) |
| Winter: 5% (<i>n</i> = 5) | 8-9: 59% (<i>n</i> = 61) | Blended: 12% (<i>n</i> = 12) |
| Spring: 38% (<i>n</i> = 39) | 10-12: 13% (<i>n</i> = 13) | |

Note. Participants were instructed to choose all that apply.

In response to the first research question regarding if faculty make pedagogical changes when teaching a semester-length course in a compressed format, the data indicated overall, 39% agreed they made a change, while 61% disagreed they made any changes to their compressed courses. As summarized in Table IV, 56% (*n* = 58) of the faculty had a different syllabus in their compressed course, 43% (*n* = 44) changed reading assignments, 45% (*n* = 46) changed writing assignments, and 43% (*n* = 44) changed projects assigned. Further, 40% (*n* = 41) of faculty made changes to their assessment measures for compressed courses. Regarding content, 53% (*n* = 55) of faculty reduced the content of their compressed courses while 18% (*n* = 19) added content to their compressed courses. Lastly, with regard to pedagogical changes, 48% (*n* = 49) of faculty made curricular adjustments and changed their approach/delivery methods for the compressed courses. These findings show faculty did modify their teaching methods, curriculum, and instructional approaches when teaching compressed courses. Though, only changes to the syllabus and reducing content were done by a majority of faculty respondents.

In response to the second research question, 50% (*n* = 52) of faculty agreed they enjoyed teaching compressed courses, 20% (*n* = 21) disagreed, and 29% (*n* = 30) responded neutral/no

opinion. The findings showed that 37% ($n = 38$) of the faculty perceived students in compressed courses were more focused on learning outcomes and 42% ($n = 43$) perceived they could establish a rapport more quickly. Additionally, 43% ($n = 44$) of faculty perceived students were not more intellectually challenging, while 39% ($n = 40$) responded with neutral/no opinion. Faculty perceiving compressed courses students participate more in class discussions, 37% ($n = 38$) agreed, 33% ($n = 34$) disagreed, and 31% ($n = 31$) responded neutral/no opinion. Lastly, 36% ($n = 37$) of faculty agreed compressed courses students had better attendance, 29% ($n = 30$) disagreed, and 35% ($n = 36$) responded neutral/no opinion. Table V shows faculty perceptions of why students take compressed courses: wanting to stay on track to graduate on time, interest in the course, and course availability during the regular term was limited. Many of these faculty perceptions of students were similar to the student perspectives from Scott's (1995) study.

Table IV
Pedagogical Changes for Compressed Courses (Factor 1)

| Questions | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| Changed syllabus | 2.52 | .998 |
| Changed reading assignments | 2.29 | .914 |
| Changed writing assignments | 2.38 | .941 |
| Changed projects | 2.35 | .926 |
| Changed assessment measures | 2.24 | .923 |
| Content added | 1.83 | .845 |
| Content reduced | 2.51 | .938 |
| Changed teaching methodology | 2.45 | .926 |

Note. The mean is based on the scale of 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 4 (*Strongly Agree*).

Research has suggested that faculty do not receive training when beginning their professoriate career. Phillips (1999) noted that summer teaching is another area where faculty do not receive training. Investigating these assertions, research question three asked whether faculty received any kind of training or mentorship (i.e. professional support) for teaching in a

compressed format. The findings showed 90% ($n = 93$) of the faculty strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement they had received training regarding compressed courses teaching. Additionally, 86% ($n = 89$) strongly disagreed or disagreed they received mentoring regarding compressed courses teaching. However, 48% ($n = 49$) of faculty indicated they discussed differences in or concerns regarding compressed courses teaching with their colleagues. Table VI summarizes the respondents' experiences regarding whether training or mentorship for compressed courses occurs at their institution.

Table V
Perceptions and Attitudes (Factor 2)

| Questions | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|-----------|
| Enjoy teaching compressed courses | 3.47 | 1.136 |
| Students are more focused | 3.02 | 1.155 |
| Established quicker rapport | 3.11 | 1.187 |
| Students participate more | 3.07 | 1.123 |
| Students have better attendance | 3.13 | 1.160 |
| Students are more intellectually challenging | 2.64 | 1.008 |
| Enjoy teaching compressed courses | 3.47 | 1.136 |
| Students are more focused | 3.02 | 1.155 |

Note. The mean is based on the scale of 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 4 (*Strongly Agree*).

Research questions four and five are focused on the many surveyed demographics. As a comparative question, several ANOVAs were conducted, and when appropriate a post hoc Tukey test analysis was used, to determine if there were any statistically significant differences among the groups surveyed. A .05 alpha threshold value was used to indicate statistically significant differences on the analyses. Faculty who have taught compressed courses for 7-12 years ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.10$) enjoyed teaching compressed courses more than those who have taught compressed courses for 1-3 years ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.03$) $F(3, 99) = 4.80$, $p = .024$. Faculty who have taught for 1-3 years ($M = 2.64$, $SD = .93$) were more likely to change their teaching

methodology than faculty who have taught compressed courses for 4-6 years ($M = 1.96, SD = .69$) $F(3, 99) = 3.28, p = .012$. Faculty who have taught compressed courses for 0-1 years ($M = 1.50, SD = 1.00$) were not able to build a rapport more quickly than faculty who have taught cumulatively for 4-6 years ($M = 3.44, SD = 1.09$) $F(4, 98) = 3.13, p = .025$ or 13 or more years ($M = 3.27, SD = 1.17, p = .028$).

Table VI
Faculty Preparation (Factor 3)

| Questions | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|------------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| Received training | 1.64 | .790 |
| Received mentorship | 1.70 | .802 |
| Discussed concerns with colleagues | 2.42 | .913 |

Note. The mean is based on the scale of 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 4 (*Strongly Agree*).

Faculty who indicated they were tenured/tenured track ($M = 3.44, SD = 1.07$) perceived students have better attendance for compressed courses than faculty who indicated they were non-tenured track ($M = 2.83, SD = 1.17$) $F(1, 101) = 7.56, p = .007$. Full-time faculty perceived students were more focused ($M = 3.12, SD = 1.11$) $F(1, 101) = 6.35, p = .013$, were able to build rapport more quickly ($M = 3.21, SD = 1.14$) $F(1, 101) = 6.05, p = .016$, and were intellectually more challenging ($M = 2.71, SD = .99$) $F(1, 101) = 4.22, p = .041$ than part-time faculty ($M = 2.25, SD = 1.22; M = 2.33, SD = 1.30; M = 2.08, SD = 1.00$). Full-time faculty ($M = 2.33, SD = .90$) were more likely to change course assessments than part-time faculty ($M = 1.58, SD = .90$) $F(1, 101) = 5.91, p = .008$. Instructors ($M = 1.87, SD = .90$) were less likely to change reading assignments than adjuncts ($M = 2.92, SD = 1.04$) $F(4, 98) = 3.50, p = .003$ and assistant professors ($M = 2.69, SD = .60, p = .020$). Respondents with master's degrees were more likely to change the syllabus ($M = 3.00, SD = .89$) and reduce content ($M = 2.94, SD = 1.00$) than

respondents with a bachelor's degree ($M = 1.00, SD = 0$) $F(3, 99) = 3.06, p = .035$; ($M = 1.00, SD = 0$) $F(3, 99) = 3.45, p = .027$.

Three of the five additional demographic questions added to Kretoivics' et al. (2005) survey showed significant main effect differences in relation to research questions four and five. Faculty who taught in the fall term changed projects ($M = 2.65, SD = .89$) and added content ($M = 2.08, SD = .89$) more than faculty who did not teach in the fall term ($M = 2.18, SD = .91$) $F(1, 101) = 6.35, p = .013$; ($M = 1.68, SD = .79$) $F(1, 101) = 5.53, p = .021$. There were no significant main effect differences for the winter term. Regarding the spring term, faculty who taught changed projects ($M = 2.59, SD = .79$) and added content ($M = 2.13, SD = .98$) more than faculty who did not teach in this term ($M = 2.20, SD = .98$) $F(1, 101) = 4.37, p = .039$; ($M = 1.64, SD = .70$) $F(1, 101) = 8.67, p = .004$. Faculty who taught in the summer were less likely to change reading assignments ($M = 2.10, SD = .91$) and reduce content ($M = 2.37, SD = .93$) than faculty who did not teach in the summer ($M = 2.72, SD = .77$) $F(1, 101) = 11.16, p = .001$; ($M = 2.84, SD = .88$) $F(1, 101) = 6.00, p = .016$.

Faculty who taught in a traditional face-to-face format perceived students to be more focused ($M = 3.19, SD = .93$) and were able to build rapport more quickly ($M = 3.41, SD = 1.20$) than faculty who did not teach in this format ($M = 2.69, SD = 1.16$) $F(1, 101) = 4.59, p = .035$; ($M = 2.51, SD = .92$) $F(1, 101) = 15.01, p = .000$. Faculty who taught in an online format were not able to build rapport more quickly ($M = 2.74, SD = 1.01$) than faculty who did not teach in this format ($M = 3.32, SD = 1.24$) $F(1, 101) = 6.14, p = .015$. Faculty who taught in a traditional face-to-face format changed the syllabus ($M = 2.37, SD = .93$) and their teaching methodology ($M = 2.29, SD = .83$) less than faculty who did not teach in this format ($M = 2.83, SD = 1.07$) $F(1, 101) = 5.12, p = .026$; ($M = 2.74, SD 1.04$) $F(1, 101) = 4.65, p = .019$. Faculty

who taught in an online format changed their teaching methodology ($M = 2.74, SD = 1.01$) more than faculty who did not teach in this format ($M = 2.28, SD = .84$) $F(1, 101) = 6.22, p = .014$.

And finally, regarding disciplinary college affiliation, respondents from the College of Applied Health ($M = 4.29, SD = .76$) enjoyed teaching compressed courses more than faculty from the College of Engineering ($M = 2.17, SD = .98$) $F(12, 88) = 2.25, p = .032$.

Table VII

Participant Academic Disciplinary College Affiliation by Percentages

| | |
|--|-----|
| College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences ($n = 6$) | 6% |
| College of Applied Health Sciences ($n = 7$) | 7% |
| College of Aviation ($n = 2$) | 2% |
| College of Business ($n = 9$) | 9% |
| College of Education ($n = 8$) | 8% |
| College of Engineering ($n = 6$) | 6% |
| College of Fine and Applied Arts ($n = 7$) | 7% |
| Graduate College ($n = 1$) | 1% |
| School of Labor and Employment Relations ($n = 5$) | 5% |
| College of Law ($n = 3$) | 3% |
| College of Liberal Arts and Sciences ($n = 35$) | 34% |
| School of Library and Information Science ($n = 6$) | 6% |
| College of Media ($n = 3$) | 3% |
| School of Social Work ($n = 2$) | 2% |
| College of Veterinary Medicine ($n = 2$) | 2% |
| Other ($n = 1$) | 1% |

Table VII displays respondents' affiliated disciplinary college. In response to the sixth research question regarding disciplinary college affiliations, expectedly due to being the largest college, the college of liberal arts and sciences represented 34% ($n = 35$) of the sample.

Graduate/professional colleges including labor and employment relations, medicine, veterinary medicine, school of library and information science, and law comprised 17% ($n = 17$) of the responses.

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

This study's focus on whether faculty make pedagogical changes when teaching compressed courses differs from previous research that mainly focused on faculty perceptions and preparations of compressed courses only. These differences, along with the new questions that were not present in Kretoivics et al. (2005), are the first findings of their kind to be contributed to the body of literature on compressed courses. This study went beyond solely focusing on summer compressed courses and gathered data from faculty who have taught compressed courses in the fall, winter, spring, and summer terms. Further, investigating the variations of the duration of the compressed courses in the academic term, and disciplinary college affiliations of faculty who teach compressed courses significantly adds to the literature. The instructional method for which compressed courses were taught also represents new data existing for beginning to explore how compressed courses are delivered. While this study found similar findings to Kretoivics et al. (2005) in regards to faculty indeed making adjustments to their courses when teaching in a compressed session format, generalizability is still limited.

Limitations

The low response rate is one of the most noticeable limitations of the study. This low response rate may have resulted from the timing of the data collection: the survey. Notably though, the Office of the Provost, Division of Information Management, provided a queried list of eligible faculty to be contacted, but there was no way to verify the list. As noted in the participant section of the methodology, participants responded that they should not have been

included in the query. This evidence suggests that the master query used as the population had errors in it that unknowingly could have falsely raised the population size.

The survey itself has a few limitations worth noting. The survey did not measure the specific amount of change for the pedagogical practices. For example, when a faculty member indicated that he or she changed writing assignments, the degree or extent of change is unknown. Kretovics et al. (2005) first incorporated a six point Likert scale in their pilot study and then trimmed it down to a four point forced choice. When this measure was replicated for this study, a five point Likert scale was used. Armstrong (1987) noted that the difference of mean values when comparing a four point and five point Likert scale are negligible and not significant. Thus, making the change should have not affected any of the reliability of the measure. In regards to analysis, questions 19 through 25 and questions 32 through 35 were re-coded for a four point forced choice Likert scale. The neutral/no opinion response when responding agree or disagree to making changes or directional perceptions was incompatible. Thus, due to the directional nature of these pedagogy (Factor 1) and faculty preparation (Factor 3) questions, a neutral/no opinion was re-coded as a disagree value. For example, choosing strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) to “The syllabus was different from the regular session syllabus”, anything other than agree or strongly agree indicates that the syllabus was not changed. Further, for questions 26 to 31, the 5 point Likert scale utilizing the neutral/no opinion response was retained since these questions were perception questions where a forced choice agree or disagree may not have always been appropriate. For these questions, the neutral/no opinion choice was added to allow the participant to potentially choose this response when they perceive the students to be no different from students in a traditional semester course. Although the reasoning for these

changes can be understandable, there was no standardization process to address the limitations of the Likert scale after the data had been collected.

Future Research

Relating to the first limitation discussed, future research should attempt to measure to what extent and how many changes occur when faculty make adjustments. The degree of change would provide further information regarding the pedagogical practices being used in compressed courses and would shed more light on potentially linking specific pedagogy to student learning. Although this study did not directly evaluate student learning outcomes, further research should investigate concurrently what pedagogical practices are used in compressed courses, how they differ from traditional courses, and what are the student learning outcomes of students when these changes occur. With the question remaining of what is causing students to learn equally well or better in compressed courses, investigating both pedagogical changes and student learning concurrently could be helpful for developing new best practices in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Since the findings suggest that faculty receive little training and nearly half discussed concerns with colleagues, the need to continue research for the development of best practices for compressed courses to better prepare faculty is paramount.

Although this study asked participants to respond with the duration of their compressed course, future research needs to take into account the amount of time that each class session occurs and how much time is in between class sessions. Due to the variation of durations discovered for compressed courses, variations would likely be found in regards to class session lengths as well. Hyun, Kretovics, and Crowe (2006) examined curriculum characteristics utilized in summer compressed courses. The amount of time in between class sessions was a common theme of concern for the faculty regarding teaching and curricular decisions. Faculty

curriculum concerns for compressed courses were driven primarily by a concern for student learning due to the limited time between class sessions. The most significant concern expressed by faculty was developing teaching approaches that would be effective for the longer class sessions. Most of the curriculum concerns were rooted in the organizational aspects of the institution, e.g. students unable to keep up with the workload because no institutional policy regulated how many compressed courses could be taken per term. Additionally, due to the time pressures between class sessions in the compressed format, faculty were unable to make significant curricular changes that may have been beneficial to the course. This study reinforces the need to investigate further how class session length and time between class sessions affect faculty pedagogical changes and perceptions and attitudes.

Investigating class size and what affect it may have on faculty pedagogical changes or attitudes and perceptions would be worthwhile too. Student's participation, easier ability building rapport, and focus could be attributed to a smaller more comfortable class size for some students. Additionally, faculty may like teaching compressed courses more if their traditional course was very large and their compressed course smaller. Or vice versa, a smaller class required more attention and time to be given to the students and thus faculty liked teaching compressed courses less. Investigating class size could help better explain the changes, perceptions, and attitudes that faculty have when teaching compressed courses.

Along with researching how class session length, time between class sessions, and class size affect faculty pedagogical practices and perceptions, future research should also compare these findings to student learning outcomes. Austin and Gustafson (2006) investigated effects of course length on student learning by evaluating course grades across the academic calendar year among traditional and compressed courses. The authors found that, after controlling for student

demographics and other characteristics, students received higher grades in compressed courses than traditional semester length courses. Additionally, Austin and Gustafson (2006) determined students sufficiently worked for their grades and higher grades were not simply a result of less academic rigor during the compressed courses.

Due to the limited amount of research on compressed courses, a myriad of areas exist for future research. Similarly to what Kretoivics et al. (2005) suggested, different institutional types should continue to be explored to discover what similarities and differences may exist. Size of institution, academic calendar format (i.e. semester, quarter, or block) and the faculty's priorities on teaching and research may all influence how compressed courses are taught. Community colleges offer many varying academic calendar formats and often are more focused on teaching principles rather than research production. Thus, they may be an ideal comparison institution type to continue investigating faculty perceptions and changes in pedagogy for compressed courses. Sheldon and Durdella (2010) investigated course length and course success (i.e. student's grades) for developmental courses at a community college. The authors discovered students in compressed courses were more likely to earn higher grades and graduate compared to students taught in a traditional semester. Outside of this study, different institutional types have not been researched or explored regarding compressed courses.

Although the findings of this study did not produce any significant differences for pedagogical changes by disciplinary college affiliation, there was a significant main effect difference for the attitude of liking to teach compressed courses. Since this is the first known study to investigate possible effects by disciplinary college in regards to compressed courses, there remains a need to investigate what academic disciplines are taught in a compressed format.

This line of inquiry would additionally extend to investigating whether courses in some disciplines should or should not be taught in a compressed format.

This study investigated all compressed courses, not summer courses exclusively, revealing that indeed faculty pedagogical changes and perceptions depend on when in the academic calendar the compressed course was taught. Thus, this reinforces the need for compressed courses research to go beyond simply evaluating summer compressed courses in future research. Further, this study showed that whether the compressed course was taught face-to-face, online, or in a blended format also affected faculty pedagogical changes and perceptions. Each teaching delivery method may have separate unique qualities in regards to pedagogy and future research should investigate the differences between these formats.

Ongoing research for compressed courses continues to expand in new ways. Recently, Lukes and Davies (2012) evaluated undergraduate student workload between traditional semester length courses and their compressed courses counterparts. They found a statistically significant difference in student workload between the two. Students spent more time on studying and assignments in the traditional semester course compared to the compressed format. Aside from this most recent study, no other recent literature has been published regarding the general topic of compressed courses. The demographic data of this study showed that 44% ($n = 45$) of the respondents have been teaching compressed courses for four or more years, and 21% ($n = 21$) have been teaching them for seven or more years. Thus, compressed courses teaching has been occurring while the literature in this field has been sparse. Since a majority of the respondents for only a few years have been teaching compressed courses, the literature needs to help support the growing number of faculty who teach compressed courses.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This study investigated faculty perceptions, attitudes, and pedagogical changes when semester length courses were taught in a compressed format in the last four years at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The Kretoivics et al. (2005) study was the only study of its kind that researched what kinds of changes faculty make when teaching a semester course in a compressed course format. This study extended the research of Kretoivics et al. (2005) by additionally asking faculty when in the academic calendar they teach compressed courses, the instructional methods used to teach compressed courses (i.e. face-to-face, online, blended), the duration in the term of their compressed courses, the duration in the term of their traditional format courses, and their disciplinary college affiliation.

The invitation to participate and complete the online survey was extended to 868 faculty and 103 survey responses were eventually used for analysis. Overall, faculty do make pedagogical changes when teaching in a compressed course environment. Factors such as when in the academic calendar compressed courses are taught, instructional method used to teach compressed courses, faculty rank, highest degree earned, work status, and amount of years teaching compressed courses were shown to influence faculty making pedagogical changes. In regards to changes among perceptions and attitudes, number of years teaching compressed courses, number of total years teaching full-time, tenure status, full-time work status, instructional methods used to teach compressed courses, and disciplinary college affiliation were shown to make significant differences.

Reviewing some the most important findings from the literature, research suggested that student learning outcomes are equal or superior compared to traditional format courses. Additionally, students as well as faculty prefer compressed courses under positive conditions (Kretovics et al., 2005; Scott, 1995). Compressed courses learning environments may encourage faculty to think more creatively in terms of their teaching pedagogy. Someday a link may be discovered between pedagogical changes in compressed courses and their subsequent student learning outcomes. As institutions expand their compressed courses offerings and faculty are required to adapt their courses to these formats while maintaining all other professional duties, the need for research findings to educate faculty on best practices for engagement with these courses will be extremely prevalent. Although change at institutions comes slowly, one can only hope that these findings will act as an additional foundation to encourage others to grow the literature on compressed courses. Additionally, it is a larger hope that this study reminds both faculty and administrators to evaluate the higher education academic calendar to ensure the focus aligns with the most important outcome: student learning.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, Robert (1987). "The midpoint on a Five-Point Likert-Type Scale". *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 64, 359-362.
- Austin, M., & Gustafson, L. (2006). Impact of course length on student learning. *Journal of Economics and Finance Education*, 5(1), 26–36.
- Cash, R. (1993). "Reinventing community by changing the academic calendar: Changing time and the consequences." Poster presented at the 1993 National Conference on Education of the American Association for Higher Education in Washington, D.C.
- Chabot College, Hayward, CA. (1975). "A Report on the Academic Calendar: Quarter System or Semester System?."
- Colorado College. (2012). *The Block Plan*. Retrieved August 16, 2012, from <http://www.colradocollege.edu/basics/blockplan/>
- College of DuPage, G. (1992). "Academic calendar task force report to the president."
- College of the Redwoods, E. (1976). "Calendar study committee final report."
- Crowe, A., Hyun, E., & Kretoivics, M. (2005). Reflections on summer teaching: Academic rigor or curriculum light? *Summer Academe*, 5, 7-20.
- Daniel, E. L. (2000). A review of time-shortened courses across disciplines. *College Student Journal*, 34, 298–308.
- Felder, R., & Brent, R. (1996). Navigating the bumpy road to student-centered instruction. *College Teaching*, 44(2), 43-47.
- Gliner, J. A., & Morgan, G. A. (2000). *Research methods in applied settings: An integrated approach to design and analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Hyun, E., Kretovics, M., & Crowe, A. (2006). Curriculum characteristics of time-compressed course in a U.S. higher education institution. *Educational Research and Review, 1*(2), 29-39.
- Johnstone, D., & Maloney, P. (1998). Enhancing the productivity of learning: Curricular implications. *New Directions for Higher Education, 103*, 23-34.
- Kember, D. (2001). Beliefs about knowledge and the process of teaching and learning as a factor in adjusting to study in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 26*, 205–221.
- Kretovics, M., Crowe, A., & Hyun, E. (2005). A Study of Faculty Perceptions of Summer Compressed Course Teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 30*, 37-51.
- Kucsera, J. V., & Zimmaro, D. M. (2010). Comparing the Effectiveness of Intensive and Traditional Courses. *College Teaching, 58*(2), 62-68.
- Lee, Nicolette. (2010). Accelerated Learning: A Study of Faculty and Student Experiences. *Innovative Higher Education*.
- Lutes, L., & Davies, R. (2012). Comparing the Rigor of Compressed Format Courses to Their Regular Semester Counterparts. *Innovative Higher Education, 1-11*.
- Philips, T. (1999). Whole course work in higher education teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education, 4*, 179–183.
- Seamon, M. (2004). Short- and long-term differences in instructional effectiveness between intensive and semester-length courses. *Teacher College Record, 106*, 852-874.
- Scott, P. (1994). A comparative study of students' learning experiences in intensive and semester-length courses and of the attributes of high-quality intensive and semester course learning experiences. *A report to the North American Association of Summer Sessions*.

Scott, P. (1995). Learning experiences in intensive and semester-length classes: Student voices and experiences. *College Student Journal*, 29, 207–213.

Sheldon, C., & Durella, N. (2010). Success rates for students taking compressed and regular length development courses in the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 34(1–2), 39–54.

Van Scyoc, L. J., & Gleadon, J. (1993). Traditional or intensive course lengths? A comparison of outcomes in economics learning. *Journal of Economic Education*, 2, 15–22.

APPENDIX A

Welcome to the Compressed Courses Teaching Survey

Survey responses will be analyzed and research results will be used in completion of a master's thesis and findings may be shared at professional meetings, and/or in publications. No names or identifying characteristics will be reported; researchers will not have access to login identifying information. Participants must be 18 years of age or older and the survey should take about 5-8 minutes to complete. Thank you for your consideration, time, and participation. (Compressed session meaning: delivery of a traditional regular course in shorter weeks.)

*1. Have you ever taught compressed session courses?

- Yes
- No

*2. Were one or more of the courses that you taught in the compressed session the same course that you have taught during traditional regular sessions?

- Yes
- No

If you have answered No to either Question 1 OR 2, please discontinue the survey.

*3. When have you taught compressed session courses?

Please check all that apply.

- Fall term
- Winter term
- Spring term
- Summer term

*4. What instructional method have you used to teach compressed session courses?

Please check all that apply.

- Traditional Face-to-Face
- Online
- Mixed (Face-to-Face & Online)

*5. For how many years have you taught compressed session courses?

- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-12
- 13 or more

*6. How many weeks in length have the compressed session courses lasted?
Please check all that apply.

- Less than a week
- One week
- Two weeks
- Three weeks
- Four weeks
- Five weeks
- Six weeks
- Seven weeks
- Eight weeks
- Nine weeks
- Ten weeks
- Eleven weeks
- Twelve weeks
- Thirteen weeks
- Fourteen weeks
- Fifteen weeks
- Sixteen weeks
- Seventeen weeks
- Eighteen weeks
- More than eighteen weeks

*7. How many weeks in length is the traditional regular session that you teach?
Please check all that apply. (Same options as Question 6)

*8. What reasons do you teach compressed session courses?
Please check all that apply.

- For extra money
- As part of my contract
- To fulfill programmatic needs
- Because I like it
- Because I can not offer the course in a traditional regular term
- Other: Enter text

Background Information

*9. Your department or subject discipline

Enter text

*10. Your college affiliation of which the compressed course has been taught
(Drop down box with all UIUC colleges)

Other: Enter text

*11. Years of full-time teaching in higher education

- 0-1
- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-12
- 13 or more

*12. Teacher Status

- Tenured/tenured track
- Non-tenure track
- Teaching assistant

*13. Work Status

(Full time = 30 hours or more per week)

- Full-time
- Part-time

*14. Faculty Rank

- Teaching assistant
- Adjunct
- Instructor
- Assistant professor
- Associate professor
- Full professor

*15. Sex

- Male
- Female

*16. Highest Earned Degree

- Terminal professional degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., Psy.D., J.D., etc.)
- ABD

- Master's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Other: Enter text

* 17. In which system do you teach?

- Semester
- Quarter
- Other: Enter text

Specifics regarding Compressed Session Courses

For the following questions regarding compressed session courses, I am referring to...

* 18. For the following questions regarding compressed session courses, I am referring to...

- Primarily graduate students
- Primarily undergraduate students
- Both graduate and undergraduate students

Instructions for questions 19 through 35.

Please Rate the following statements on the 1 - 5 scale of Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral/No opinion Agree Strongly Agree

* 19. The syllabus for the compressed session course was different from the regular session syllabus.

* 20. The reading assignments for the compressed session course were different from the regular session.

* 21. The writing assignments for the compressed session course were different from the regular session.

* 22. The projects were different from the regular session.

* 23. Assessment measures (e.g. tests, quizzes, research papers) were different from

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral/No opinion Agree Strongly Agree

the regular session.

- *24. Additional content was included for the compressed session of the course.
- *25. Content was reduced for the compressed session of the course.
- *26. I enjoy teaching compressed session courses.
- *27. The students in the compressed session courses are more focused on learning outcomes.
- *28. I am able to establish a rapport with students more quickly in the compressed session courses.
- *29. Students in the compressed session courses participate more in class discussions.
- *30. Students have better attendance records with the compressed session courses.
- *31. Students in the compressed session courses are intellectually more challenging.
- *32. I use different approaches/delivery methodology in the compressed sessions than I do in the regular session. (i.e. technology, lecture, discussion, small group work etc)
- *33. I have discussed differences/concerns in my compressed session teaching pedagogy with other faculty colleagues in the past year.
- *34. I received training regarding compressed session teaching.
- *35. I received mentoring regarding compressed session teaching.

*36. You perceive students who take compressed session courses are there...
Please choose all that apply.

- Because they perceive it as easier than a regular session course
- Because they are academically deficient (make-up a course)
- Because they are trying to graduate early
- Because the courses are rarely offered during the regular year
- Because their availability during the regular term is limited
- Because they want to stay on track to graduate on time
- Because they are interested in the course

Optional: Qualitative Questions Used for Future Research

37. What is your main concern with teaching compressed session courses?

38. Briefly describe any differences that you perceive between compressed session teaching and regular session teaching.

39. Briefly describe any similarities that you perceive between compressed session teaching and regular session teaching.

Please email the principal researcher, Trevor J. Eagle, teagle2@illinois.edu, if you would like to be contacted regarding findings.

Thank you very much for your time and comments.