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**ABCs of Distance Education**  
**Pre-conference sessions – Tuesday, August 6**

Are you new or relatively new to the field of online education? Join us as we address a range of topics in online teaching. At the end of this session you’ll leave with a deeper understanding of the hot topics in the field as well as practical tips and techniques to help you succeed.

*Moderator: Olena Zhado, Lehman College, CUNY*

**Podcasting as a tool for active learning in online environments**  
*Lauren Caruso, Wake Technical Community College*  
Description

**Strategies for evaluating and selecting eLearning technologies**  
*Nikki McIntosh, University of Wisconsin–Madison*  
Description

**Group work in online courses**  
*Henny Breen, Linfield College*  
Description

**Meeting the needs of the gen z and millennials in distance education**  
*KeriAnne Moon and Carla J. Ackerson, Texas State University*  
Description
Discussion Sessions

D-01
Revising success: Taking equine science to the next level!
Penny Ralston-Berg, Penn State World Campus
Hear about a case of collaborative course revision and discuss opportunities and challenges for continuous improvement in course design.

D-02
"Is there anybody out there?": Twitter as a supportive environment for first year teachers' online induction workshop
Yehuda Peled, Western Galilee College
This research examines Twitter as a support tool to enhance social interaction to aid the workshop's moderator in monitoring the group and enhance and support the early-service teachers' growth and resilience. They reveal a process of socialization among the participants which leads to personal and professional support, thus enhancing the new teachers' professional growth.

D-03
A discussion about strategies for growing a scalable and sustainable learning analytics initiative
Kimberly Arnold and James McKay, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Learning analytics is not a tool, but rather a complex organizational change model. We will discuss how to leverage the affordances of learning analytics at scale. The facilitator will provide a pragmatic framework for understanding organizational capacity for LA including: technology (infrastructure and LA tools), culture, processes and workflows, and policy. The facilitator can provide some examples, but this session is meant to be an interactive discussion.

D-04
A model for making campus life accessible to online students
Molly Mott, State University of New York at Canton
Improve online student retention rates by mapping engagements to different dimensions of students’ lives, using the dimensions of technology, innovation, and pedagogy.

D-05
Learner engagement and community involvement in online/blended classes
Rebecca Dumiao, East Carolina University
Explore pedagogical possibilities and "choice points" to plan collaborative student-to-community projects using technology and dialogue.

D-06
You expect me to work with who? Making the case for learning design
Ann Taylor, Pennsylvania State University
Overcome faculty "do it all myself" arguments and see how to demonstrate learning-design team value, quality, and worth to colleagues.

D-07
Gold standard course design
Joseph Alsobrook, Lindenwood University
Discuss how to collect extensive, experimental, "bulletproof" evidence based on human motivation and learning for your online course design process.
D-08
Conducting literature reviews to guide research and practice
Rebecca Thomas, Oregon State University–Ecampus
Uncover tips and learn systems for conducting higher-education literature reviews that can guide your future research and practice.

D-09
Digital credentials: Making sense of an emerging field
Jaclyn Goudie, Northwestern University
New forms of digital credentials (certificates, badges, micro-credentials, and nano-degrees) have been popping up more rapidly – fueled by new technology and changing marketplace demands. This discussion will focus on learning what all of these credentials are, what their value is, and how different sectors are using them.

D-10
Keeping up with the kids ~ When mom & dad go back to college!
Lori Wynia, Southwest Minnesota State University
Admissions, advising, transfer, registrar, and other student-services staff: come hear best practices for recruiting, retaining, and serving adult learners.

D-11
Faculty still resistant to online education? These strategies can help
Brian Udermann, University of Wisconsin–La Crosse
Discover strategies to reduce faculty resistance to online education.

D-12
Conflict, candor, and crisis: Finding and using your voice
Lois Harrison, Cengage Learning
Respond to online program crisis situations effectively: know how to speak well, show care in dealing with conflict, use candor, and manage curriculum and staffing projects effectively.

D-13
Lessons learned migrating from Blackboard to Canvas
Valerie Shapko, Texas Woman's University
Drawing from one institution’s 2-year transition from Blackboard to Canvas, examine what worked, what didn’t, and additional lessons learned.

D-14
Using animated videos to create unifying course themes
Doug Waters, Washtenaw Community College
Discover how software, like GoAnimate, can create workable animated-series stories that tie together course concepts and bring them to life.

D-15
Interdisciplinary perspective on the value instructors place on feedback
Scott Greenberger and Morgan McNaughton, Grand Canyon University
Explore how online instructors from a variety of disciplines provide students with various types of feedback and unearth the types of feedback most valuable to students.
D-16
Teaching online: Challenges and successes as a blind instructor
Vileen Shah, Harding University
Although blind since age 3, Vileen Shah teaches online classes for the blind and visually impaired. At the City College system in which all learners are sighted, his experience as a blind instructor are unique. At Hadley, in addition to teaching American Government and History, Shah also teaches braille and conducts online weekly sessions related to braille using the Zoom platform. Join him and hear about his unique experiences.

D-17
Bi-modal teaching: The challenge of teaching two audiences simultaneously
Adam Rusch, University of Illinois
Discuss the unique challenges of teaching both online and face-to-face students simultaneously.

D-18
Where in the world is my adjunct professor?
Reba-Anna Lee, Northwestern University
Explore strategies for supporting adjunct instructors and instructional designers who work from a distance in order to create and maintain quality course design and instruction.

D-19
Rapid infusion of emerging disciplines into modern online curriculum
Jacob Krive, University of Illinois at Chicago
Identify shifting job market trends, find new business/scientific developments, and rapidly embed findings from that analysis into a flexible curriculum that anticipates student needs.

D-20
Bridging the distance: Creating a PLC for online associate faculty
Alan Belcher, Ashford University
MAED is lacking a systematic process of gathering input from their specific Associate Faculty on the impact and effectiveness the provided professional development offered, as well as some random efforts to develop a more cohesive online community.

D-21
Featured Session follow-up discussion on online discussions
Tori Svoboda, University of Wisconsin–La Crosse

D-22
The doctoral peer mentor program: Engaging and retaining new online doctoral students
Terren Rye and Christy Fraenza, Walden University
Find out how a peer mentor program for first-year, online doctoral students affects retention, engagement, and a sense of community.

D-23
Integrating/Scaling virtual and mixed reality educational experiences
Bradley Aldridge, Squadron Officer School
Learn about how to integrate and scale virtual and mixed reality experiences in face-to-face, online, and hybrid instructional modalities.
Online nursing education: A collaborative approach

*Henny Breen and Melissa Robinson, Linfield College*

In this session, we will facilitate a discussion about our book which is to be published soon. Theoretical approaches to online teaching and learning for professional students will be discussed. Topics will include our model which was developed to guide holistic and collaborative approaches to online education programs, teaching strategies, leadership of online programs, and quality assurance to name a few.
Distance Teaching & Learning Talk Sessions

**DTLT-01**  
Connectivism and participatory culture: A new model for distance education?  
*Karin Spader, University of Wisconsin–Madison*  
Unpack connectivism, a newer but under-utilized theory of online learning, and consider how it can change the way you design online learning spaces.

**DTLT-02**  
Recruiting online graduate students with virtual information sessions  
*Julisa Ricart and Lisa Hubbard, Indiana University*  
Discover the benefits of a virtual information session—and how to build one—based on our new session for prospective Master of Social Work (MSW) students.

**DTLT-03**  
Invisible borders: Faculty mindset in the virtual classroom  
*Kristi Yorks, Colorado Technical University*  
Examine how a shift in mindset can re-engage faculty and turn an unsuccessful virtual writing classroom into a successful one.

**DTLT-04**  
Reconceptualizing online teaching for the 21st century  
*Anita Samuel, Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences*  
See a new model of online teaching that helps both seasoned and new online instructors experience more satisfaction in their online teaching.

**DTLT-05**  
The power of choice in online classroom teaching  
*Ben Vilkas, Wayne State College*  
Providing opportunities for choices in an online environment promotes self-efficacy for both students and instructors. I'll share why this is so and show you how you can incorporate choice in your design, too.

**DTLT-06**  
Top 10 evidence-based online teaching strategies  
*Scott Hamm, Hardin-Simmons University*  
Learn 10 evidence-based pedagogies you can use in your own teaching, or to train faculty and instructional designers at your institution.

**DTLT-07**  
Conducting literature reviews to guide research and practice  
*Rebecca Thomas, Oregon State University–Ecampus*  
Uncover tips and learn systems for conducting higher-education literature reviews that can guide your future research and practice.

**DTLT-08**  
Enhancing learning and engagement through experiential e-Learning  
*Monica Belus, University of North Carolina at Charlotte and Northeastern University*  
Enhance learner engagement and outcomes in online humanities courses through experiential learning techniques.
DTLT-09
More than a paycheck: Creating a remarkable work climate
Cyndi Briggs and K. Elizabeth McDonald, Walden University
This session will walk through a process to help you identify challenges in your workplace climate and generate ideas, solutions, and a plan to implement change toward a climate of excellence. Attendees will contribute to finding innovative solutions and come away with strategies for their own workplace environments.

DTLT-10
Analyzing Duolingo users’ discussion of digital badges: A case study
Helen Chen, University of Wisconsin – Madison
Learn about digital badges through Duolingo users' interactions with gamified elements in the app.

DTLT-11
Why SME? Communicating the benefits of serving as a subject matter expert
Becky Costello, Rasmussen College
Hear practical, easy-to-implement suggestions for attracting quality subject matter experts for online curriculum and course design.

DTLT-12
Sure, we’ll be the guinea pigs...Adopting adaptive courseware
Amy LimBybliw, University of Minnesota, Rothenberger Institute
Unpack the benefits and challenges of migrating online course content to an interactive, adaptive course-authoring platform (Cogbooks).

DTLT-13
Live webcasting with Panopto
James Tobin, Carnegie Mellon University
Set up a live Panopto webcast that can be saved and edited. Experience how live streaming plus archiving allows remote audiences to see and interact with events they might otherwise miss.

DTLT-14
Let’s screencast! Create easy-to-make videos to enhance learning!
Angela Velez-Solic, Rush University
Improve the quality of learning materials and enhance rapport with online students by creating educational videos featuring your own voice and content.

DTLT-15
Integrating synchronous technologies within the asynchronous course
Bill Knapp, Grand Rapids Community College
See how a design-based research (DBR) integration of synchronous interactions within asynchronous online courses affects student engagement and instructor immediacy.

DTLT-16
Practical and effective synchronous online learning
Keith Dils, Slippery Rock University
Investigate practical applications for engaging students in deep learning in online environments.
DTLT-17
Experiential learning in online courses
Henny Breen, Linfield College
Explore how to use experiential learning experiences to facilitate conceptual understanding for both undergraduate and graduate students.

DTLT-18
Lightboards for online instructor presence
Stacey DeLoose, Northern Michigan University
Learn how to implement a lightboard to record online lectures.

DTLT-19
Becoming student-ready for today's diverse distance learners
Drew Geant, Wyzant
Uncover three strategies that innovative distance education programs use to foster success for post-traditional students struggling with readiness gaps.

DTLT-20
Using blogs and social media to create “significant learning”
Melissa Robinson, Linfield College
Examine outcomes and student feedback about two online teaching strategies that have significantly affected student learning.

DTLT-21
They didn't want online! How paramedic students came to love it!
William Ballo and Alan Natachu, Madison Area Technical College
Experience the transition from "no way" to "OMG, this is awesome" as Wisconsin emergency medical service (EMS) students began taking online synchronous classes.

DTLT-22
An online honors college: A high-impact initiative
Eric Klein, Ashford University
See how an online Honors College offers students enriched interdisciplinary courses and special co-curricular opportunities.

DTLT-23
Recruiting online graduate students with virtual information sessions
Julisa Ricart and Lisa Hubbard, Indiana University
Discover the benefits of a virtual information session—and how to build one—based on our new session for prospective Master of Social Work (MSW) students.

DTLT-24
Use of a modified RAFT technique to enhance online education
Julie Slade, Chatham University
Learn how to apply a modified RAFT technique (Role, Audience, Format, Topic) in the online classroom to enhance student engagement and achievement of course outcomes.
DTLT-25
Creative exercise physiology course & allied health collaboration
Kim LeBard-Rankila, University of Wisconsin–Superior
Explore a distance learning exercise-science lecture/lab course that incorporates creative teaching experiences, technology, mentors, and a lab kit.

DTLT-26
Strategies and methods for change in educational technology
Mitchell Kuster, University of Wisconsin–Platteville
Learn best practices for effectively communicating and carrying out change from an IT perspective.
ePoster Sessions

EP-01
Students' perceptions of course design quality
Trena Houp and Lydia Frass, University of South Carolina
Strengthen your online courses with the results from our study of students' perceptions of online course design, based on our institutional quality review process.

EP-02
Webinars: Connecting field instructors to one another and the program
Alexis S. Glennon, Keuka College
Learn how to employ webinars as a tool for connecting field instructors to one another and to the institution while enhancing their teaching skills.

EP-03
“Is there anybody out there?”: Twitter as a supportive environment for first year teachers' online induction workshop
Yehuda Peled, Western Galilee College
This research examines Twitter as a support tool to enhance social interaction to aid the workshop’s moderator in monitoring the group and enhance and support the early-service teachers' growth and resilience. They reveal a process of socialization among the participants which leads to personal and professional support, thus enhancing the new teachers' professional growth.

EP-04
Using microlearning principles to teach information/library literacy
Elizabeth Walker-Papke, Spring Arbor University
Apply microlearning principles to design self-paced tutorials that impart core concepts and bring struggling students up to speed about online research skills.

EP-05
Flexible delivery - Students and instructors in lab-based courses
Bobbi Bishofberger and Kyle Vanderkin, Blackhawk Technical College
Inform your practice based on lessons learned from developing and improving flexible, performance-based blended courses in manufacturing.

EP-06
Utilizing a technology dashboard to analyze key performance indicators
Steve Peterson, Grand Canyon University
Learn more about Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), a tool used to evaluate organizational success, and analyze critical performance measures through dashboards and data-visualization.

EP-07
Hybrid teaching that works!
Zoaib Mirza, Adtalem Global Education
Learn about best practices in designing and teaching hybrid courses.
EP-08
**Zoom! Activate students to search for missing data**  
*Jeanne Ferguson and Haley Kerkhoff, University of Wisconsin–Madison*
Learn how to introduce novel experiential tasks to facilitate contemplation of complex problems and seeking solutions, and to create openings for student thinking into online classrooms.

EP-09
**Online teaching reflections: Behind the curtain and inside the mind**  
*Marija Franetovic, Lawrence Technological University*
25 mindfulness/reflective sessions between an instructional designer and faculty members. Discussion about lessons learned and what it really means to teach online: the time-spent, the non-data elements, the sticky/uncertain future landscape of online teaching, and other key factors.

EP-10
**Online teaching and learning research seminars program**  
*Rebecca Thomas and Mary Ellen Dello Stritto, Oregon State University–Ecampus*
Learn about the Online Teaching and Learning Research Seminars program that supports multi-institutional research on topics related to college-level online and blended teaching and learning.

EP-11
**Balancing canned and original content in online courses and programs**  
*Nikki McIntosh, University of Wisconsin–Madison*
Online students don't like everything to be "canned" publisher content. See how to incorporate original content in your courses without overtaxing your existing workload.

EP-12
**Where in the world is my adjunct professor?**  
*Reba-Anna Lee, Northwestern University*
Explore strategies for supporting adjunct instructors and instructional designers who work from a distance in order to create and maintain quality course design and instruction.

EP-13
**Leveraging collaborative tools to accelerate student outcomes**  
*Yvonne Phelps and Joni Iglinski, University of Phoenix*
Leverage the four principles of cooperative learning—Positive Interdependence, Individual Accountability, Equal Participation, and Simultaneous Interaction (PIES)—and the Innovators Compass as faculty support tools to accelerate student outcomes.

EP-14
**Preparing collaborative partners - Comparison of discussion formats**  
*Suzanne Kucharczyk and Scott Wright, University of Arkansas*
Learn about how to foster collaboration in online courses based on findings that graduate students engage differently when the same course uses text-based versus video-based discussion formats.

EP-15
**Use of technology to enhance interactive online practical exercises**  
*Angela Lindsey and Rob Fortner, National Defense University, Joint Forces Staff College*
Hear how the presenters used Blackboard to create interactive real-time and asynchronous interactions for homeland security/defense providers.
EP-16
Designing successful faculty development model for virtual exchanges
Rositsa (Rosi) Leon and Joseph Olivier, DePaul University
Hear about how one institution extended their faculty development program by creating an institution-wide, virtual exchange initiative by leveraging innovative institutional structural synergies.

EP-17
(Virtual) Reality check: How is this supposed to work?
Pam Snyder and Joshua Wilkins, Filippelli Institute for eEducation and Outreach at Penn State University
Learn how to incorporate virtual reality (VR) and 360° video into online courses. Poster addresses outcomes, workload, costs, learning curve, pedagogy, and technology.

EP-18
Engaging learners through a live museum
Julie St.John, Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center
See how we created displays for a public health museum with a class project for both face-to-face and online students.

EP-19
Report reader checklist: A research resource
Mary Ellen Dello Stritto and Rebecca Thomas, Oregon State University–Ecampus
Discover how to apply the "Report Reader Checklist" tool to make data-driven decisions and evaluate the quality of study reports that are published in online education.

EP-20
Analysis of Inspire for Faculty as a tool to improve course completion
Alan Belcher and Marjorie Estivill, Ashford University
See how the Civitas "Inspire for Faculty" program has supported interventions for at-risk online students across an entire university.

EP-21
On the grid: Flipgrid! Elevate student engagement through technology
Katie Sprute and Kimber Underdown, Grand Canyon University
Learn about using Flipgrid to elevate online students' voices, promote engagement, foster a sense of community among students, and benefit leadership teams too.
Exploratory Sessions

E-01
Charting the path: Provide structure & autonomy in self-paced courses
Kristine Pierick and Eric Peloza, UW Extended Campus
Join this session to explore strategies to improve student engagement and success within an asynchronous course environment. Presenters will showcase ideas they've used, as well as discuss how others have approached similar concerns.

E-02
What will online higher education look like in the year 2040?
Lydia Frass and Trena Houp, University of South Carolina
Discuss changes in current and future online higher education, and identify what we can do to be successful in this changing landscape.

E-03
Connectivism in online courses
Rick Shearer, Pennsylvania State University
Explore why we should move our current online courses designs from a social-constructivist model to a connectivist model.

E-04
Turn on, tune in, and drop out: Dropout in online programs
James Moore, DePaul University
Do students drop out of online programs at greater rates than their face-to-face counterparts? How do we know? What can we do to address both questions?

E-05
How does competency-based education change the faculty/dean dynamic?
Heather Bradshaw-Arne and Caroline Gulbrandsen, Rasmussen College
Create a climate of support between faculty and administrators in competency-based education programs.

E-06
Humanizing the online learning environment
Ollie Dreon, Millersville University of Pennsylvania
Examine ways to move beyond developing "presence" online and begin to develop ways to humanize the online learning environment and foster greater connections with students.

E-07
Learning styles: Myth or fact?
Carolyn Andrews, Brigham Young University
Participate in a critique of "learning styles" and uncover why "learner readiness" is a better means to prepare students for a successful distance education experience.
Featured Sessions

F-01
Learning from men of color: Success strategies for at-risk students
Newton Miller, Ashford University
Engage in discussion around the three pillars that drive the mindsets of high performing and survival-driven at-risk learners.

F-02
More tools than time: A rubric for the predictive evaluation of e-Learning tools
Gavan Watson, Memorial University
With the growth of e-learning tools, educators are increasingly pressed to make timely and evidence-based selections that are best for them, their courses, and their students. Learn how to use a selection rubric to save yourself time and select the right tools for your learning interactions.

F-03
The digital badge landscape - Perspectives from Stakeholders
Luc Fjelstad, Madison College; Heidi Kaeppler, Wisconsin Crop Innovation Center; Susan Manning, Credly; and Lesley Voigt, Madison College
Moderator: Janet Staker Woerner, University of Wisconsin – Madison
This panel will discuss the suite of digital badges that represent skills employers are seeking, but struggle to identify in college graduates.

F-04
Hollywood film presents: Creating an online community and building instructor presence with video
Mary O’Brien, Winona State University
Explore how to pair learning management system (LMS) tools with video to engage students and increase instructor presence within online or blended courses.

F-05
Making the case: Strategies and tools for communicating innovation
Penny Ralston-Berg, Penn State World Campus and Eddie Andreo, Cowley College
For faculty and designers not in formal leadership positions, this session encourages attendees to grow ideas, lead from where they are, and increase innovation. Learn how to support your ideas with research, pilots, and evaluations to achieve buy-in.

F-06
Creating a faculty community of inquiry for online teaching
Karen Skibba, Jonathan Klein, and Maria Widmer, University of Wisconsin – Madison
Explore how instructors and designers at your college or university can employ the Community of Inquiry framework to apply meaningful strategies for online course design and teaching. Learn about how the COI framework engages participants with social, cognitive, and teaching presence to inspire teaching transformation.
F-07
Why and how to get your journal article published
Dietmar Kennepohl, Athabasca University; William Diehl, Pennsylvania State University; and Lucy Rai, Scholarship and Innovation Centre (WELS)
This panel will raise awareness of the benefits of publishing your work and how to avoid common mistakes that result in submission rejections.

F-08
Using gap analysis to identify courses impeding student progress
Karen Swan and Bill Bloemer, University of Illinois-Springfield
Learn how to collect, analyze, and apply institutional system data to identify courses in which students are performing better or worse than predicted, and then explore possible causes for underperformance and some ways to address them.

F-09
"Stop giving me busy work!": Why online discussions can be a drag for students and instructors alike, and what you can do about it
Tori Svoboda, University of Wisconsin–La Crosse
Come listen to one professor's adventures in online teaching. Find out why she is encouraging others to let go of the strategy "post once - reply twice" in favor of new methods for online engagement.

F-10
Neuro-andragogy & student success: The science & art of changing the brain
Kristen Betts, Drexel University
Discuss the important connections among the learning sciences and mind, brain, and education science.

F-11
The culture quotient: Uncovering organizational culture to deliver online faculty development in an online delivery model
Carol Hernandez, Stony Brook University and Wendy Williams, Yeshiva University
Learn about using Schein's three levels of organizational culture to uncover the hidden forces at play as faculty developers do their work via an online delivery mode.

F-12
Taking it higher: Raising the bar on course video design
Judith Dutil, Central Penn College
Examine evidence-based measures of quality for online video design, with emphasis on contextualizing content, optimizing video for learning, and managing our precious time without cutting corners on quality.

F-13
Deliberate innovation for tomorrow's lifetime learners
Nelson Baker, Georgia Institute of Technology
Nearly every engineering conference, gathering and journals have authors, speakers and futurists talking about the need for a lifetime education for today’s and tomorrow’s workforce.
F-14
Federal update: Reauthorization and department of education rulemaking
Cheryl Dowd, State Authorization Network for WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technology; Van Davis, Foghlam Consulting, LLC; and Fred Lokken, Instructional Technology Council
This session will include an update on the progress of the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA) as well as the procedure and outcomes of the U.S. Department of Education (USED) 2019 Federal rulemaking process.

F-15
AI in distance learning
Nelson Baker, Georgia Institute of Technology; Jonathan Fry, Accenture; and Bilge Mutlu, University of Wisconsin–Madison
Moderator: Thomas Smith, University of Wisconsin–Madison
Investigate the current status and future implications of artificial intelligence (AI) in three subject areas: instruction, student support and business services (back office.)

F-16
Teach smarter: 5 strategies for effective (and efficient) online teaching
Jean Mandernach, Grand Canyon University
Examine five key strategies for maximizing the impact of instructional time without burdening your workload.
Interactive Sessions

I-01
What's in your project management toolkit?
Lois Harrison and Lisa Trumble, Cengage Learning
Explore the basics of project management: tools, processes, and skills that are vital to timely and successful delivery of curriculum projects.

I-02
The 5 dos and dont's of using animation
Liesl Christle and Peter Stout, Reflection Software
Gather tips for thinking more strategically about how and when to use animation to reach your audiences in online interactions.

I-03
Utilizing an online course design matrix to enhance learner engagement
Amber Ray, University of Hawaii at Manoa
Learn about the course design matrix, a tool that can be used to support adult learning in online contexts, and discover how you can embed critical components of engagement in course design.

I-04
Begin here: Writing quality learning objectives
John Hollenbeck, UW Colleges Online
Learning objectives are a critical element in course design, as they form the basis for determining the selection and alignment of course content. Identify key elements involved in writing quality learning objectives and receive hands-on, step-by-step guidance to complete at least one learning objective by the end of this session.

I-05
Veteran learning: Serving the service population in online learning
Steve Peterson and Amanda Ziemendorf, Grand Canyon University
Though we have made great strides in supporting our veteran population as they enter education and the workforce, more discussion is needed to support the special need in service of those who serve us.

I-06
Adopt or adapt: An OER about OER!
Olena Zhadko and Susan Ko, Lehman College, CUNY
This session is itself an Open Educational Resource (OER) to help you better understand and promote the use of OERs at your institution.

I-07
Bridging the gap between theory and practice: Implementing experiential learning
Tamara Mitchell, Oregon State University and Josie Strahle, University of Arizona
This session will help faculty and IDs envision, plan, and facilitate experiential learning in fully online courses. Attendees will be guided through an interactive process in which they will design an experiential learning activity.
I-08
Add some sparkles to your online course with Adobe Spark
Alan Natachu, Madison Area Technical College
You don't have to be a graphic designer to look like you've spent years working as one. Explore Adobe Spark, a free tool that easily allows you to create graphics, web pages and animated videos that are more than just eye candy.

I-09
Building a house without a blueprint: Why storyboards matter
Alicia Raff, Reflection Software
Struggling with how to communicate project needs to developers and stakeholders? Discover best practices for creating storyboards, so anyone can build their dream training.

I-10
Your roles and career goals: Prioritizing what’s important
Kimberly Jarvis, All Career Matters, Inc.
Want to move ahead in the distance education field? We'll identify career values, create inspiring career goals and develop an initial plan to reach them.

I-11
Analyzing the use of the Pattern study tool in online courses
James McKay and Kimberly Arnold, University of Wisconsin–Madison
Pattern is a tool that can be used in conjunction with online or blended learning environments, where students often struggle with time management and good studying habits. Unpack how to leverage data tracked in Pattern to improve your understanding of students’ study habits in your online courses and ultimately, your teaching.

I-12
Discussion hero: Gamified discussions for online learners
David Noffs and Jacob Guerra-Martinez, Northwestern University
See a demonstration of the new award-winning, gamified discussion tool, Discussion Hero.

I-13
Secret experiences and strategies for nontraditional online students
Courtney Plotts, Council For At Risk Student Education and Professional Standards
Online student participation is affected by many personal and social factors. Learn the most common ways that online spaces become unwelcoming for LGBTQ students and other marginalized learners, and discover strategies to address these issues.

I-14
Bringing the outside in: Integrating Web 2.0 tools in LMS environments
Alexandra Miller, Arizona State University
Examine how and why to implement Web 2.0 tools into your LMS and online courses.

I-15
Four things to consider in response to an "OCR letter"
Angela Jackson and Shannon Beller, University of South Dakota
At risk for an ADA-related investigation, complaint, or lawsuit? Learn four key take-aways for how to respond as a faculty developer, administrator, IT staffer, librarian, or manager.
I-16
**Accessibility: Options for affordability and replicability**
*Vance Martin, University of Illinois Springfield*
Explore how one institution increased their online-program accessibility using student workers. You’ll leave the session with details about the history, costs, benefits, and replicability of this process for others, including a downloadable worksheet.

I-17
**Welcome to the neighborhood: Building community in an online classroom**
*Crystal McCabe and Sonya Berges, Grand Canyon University*
Foster student success by bringing out their feelings of belonging and self-worth. This session foregrounds building relationships to accomplish mutual goals.

I-18
**Reimagining student engagement through simulations in virtual spaces**
*Terra Gargano, American University, School of International Service*
Let’s all rethink student engagement in virtual spaces. We’ll examine the interactive simulations that we construct and include in our courses.

I-19
**Teaching online lab science courses: Challenges and solutions**
*Bobby Duke, Carolina Distance Learning and Kathryn Kloepper, Mercer University*
Basic science can be taught online! Explore how to design hands-on, at-home lab investigations for online courses.

I-20
**Let’s talk competencies**
*Amy Carpenter, Utah State University*
Define competency-based education and identify the best practices for your unique needs.

I-21
**In the zone: VR/360 and new frontiers for student learning**
*Kathleen Beardsell, Michelle Ehlert, and Thomas James, Maryville University*
Design learning activities for VR/360° videos with navigational and interactive hotspots; walk away with an immersive activity.

I-22
**The value of visuals in online learning**
*Ryan Eash, TechSmith Corporation*
Images and videos have been shown to increase retention rates by helping your students to not only focus on, but remember content. Discover ways to share an annotated screenshot, infographic, short video, or animated gif to provide the clearest message possible.

I-23
**Using distance education to help fix the U.S. science teacher shortage**
*Jim Brinson, American Military University*
Help more non-traditional students become secondary science teachers by aligning your home-based/alt-location lab learning spaces with NSTA standards and criteria for science teacher preparation/certification.
I-24
Connectivism and participatory culture: A new model for distance education?
Karin Spader, University of Wisconsin–Madison
Unpack connectivism, a newer but under-utilized theory of online learning, and consider how it can change the way you design online learning spaces.
Panel Sessions

P-01
Plagiarism due to misunderstanding: Online instructor perceptions
Scott Greenberger, Rick Holbeck, John Steele, and Thomas Dyer, Grand Canyon University
During this panel session, you will have the opportunity to analyze your personal perceptions of plagiarism and explore a more nuanced conceptualization: "accidental plagiarism".

P-02
Panel: A CBE course framework guided by faculty
Myshie Pagel and Luz Cadena, El Paso Community College
During this panel, we will share a framework that helps administrators and faculty see how CBE works differently than cohorted classes. The framework shows course strengths, how learners can traverse competencies, and how to build paths into the LMS.

P-03
Strategies for launching online science labs
David Brashinger, American Public University System; Kathryn Kloepper, Mercer University; and Scott Walker, eScience Labs
Moderator: Brian Udermann, University of Wisconsin – La Crosse
The number of institutions offering online lab science courses is increasing; however, there still remains considerable faculty and administrative resistance to the idea. This panel session will explore a variety of strategies that can be utilized to help institutions get started offering online science lab courses. Topics covered will include overcoming faculty and administrative resistance, the logistics of selecting and ordering lab kits for students, evaluation strategies, and supporting faculty interested in teaching online lab science courses. Additionally, considerable time will be dedicated to responding to questions from participants.

P-04
Building a comprehensive online and blended faculty development program
Nicole Weber, University of Wisconsin–Whitewater and Dylan Barth, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee CETL
Join these experts as they share how they supported higher education administrators and instructional designers in building a comprehensive online and blended faculty development program to meet their campus’ needs.

P-05
Title IX: Supporting students in the online environment
Marcie Batschelett and Yvonne Phelps, University of Phoenix
Managing Title XI complaints including sexual harassment and gender discrimination complaints in the online environment is a necessary function of an online administrator. Explore strategies including investigating, collecting evidence, reporting and full circle resolution.
Proven Practice Sessions

**PP-01**
Adventures in data visualization: Lessons learned and applied  
*Mary Ellen Dello Stritto, Oregon State University–Ecampus*
Based on their work using data visualization, presenters will share lessons learned and teach you how—and where—to apply data visualizations to your own work, based on our self-study of data visualization.

**PP-02**
e-Orientation use of digital learning tech to reduce achievement gaps  
*Samantha Wolfe-Taylor and Julisa Ricart, Indiana University*
Discover the benefits of an electronic orientation session—and how to build one—based on our eOrientation program for prospective Master of Social Work (MSW) students.

**PP-03**
Sudden accountability: Faculty-initiated evaluations of online courses  
*Angela Velez-Solic and Margaret Checchi, Rush University*
Share an effective method for rapidly evaluating online courses to meet newly-initiated standards for online course design.

**PP-04**
Effective & efficient grading using front loading and Web 2.0 tools  
*Janet Darvas and Rob Krise, Grand Canyon University*
Participate in a discussion about limitations to focused grading, investigate ways to effectively prepare for student success, and practice using Web 2.0 tools for efficient grading.

**PP-05**
Adding interactivity to an online nursing program  
*Jeffrey Drake and Constance Creech, University of Michigan, Flint*
In this hands-on session, join the presenters as they share the interactive methods taught to their graduate nursing students. Their students apply these methods in developing and delivering engaging online teaching units. Come away with presentation templates and handouts for demonstrated accessible techniques using available technologies.

**PP-06**
Gaming your online course  
*Jim Marteney, Los Angeles Valley College*
Gaming in an online course improves student participation by increasing intrinsic motivation. Further, setting up levels of competency creates more effective measurements of success. After attending this session, you will be able to explain the pros and cons of gamification and competency-based grading.

**PP-07**
Pedagogical innovation through technology training  
*Lane Sunwall and Dylan Barth, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee CETL*
Delve into best practices for improving instructor pedagogy by providing technology training. Presenters will share faculty feedback from their training opportunities and provide ideas and tips you can readily employ in your own institutions.
Research Sessions

R-01
Student perceptions on the impact of virtual exchange: Course data
Rositsa (Rosi) Leon, DePaul University
In this session you will hear about findings from a study spanning 34 virtual exchange (VE) courses that explored student perceptions of the impact of collaborative online international learning.

R-02
Tracking trends in online education: Student & administrator insights
Melissa Venable, HigherEducation.com
What are the current trends in online education? Discover insights gleaned from the 5th annual survey of 300 online program administrators and 1500 students. Learn about how the feedback was used to inform decisions related to program design, marketing, and retention.

R-03
Discussion forums: Instructor and student insights
Terrie Nagel and Alexandria Lewis, University of Missouri
Learn about a variety of tech tools (e.g., Panopto, VoiceThread, FlipGrid, Zoom) you can use to turn your online discussion forums into an interactive space and enhance student learning. Presenters will also discuss learner preferences for engagement strategies, and share examples of quality small group discussions and rubrics for assessing them.

R-04
A study of student learning & progress in blended, online & F2F
Carolyn Andrews, Brigham Young University
Hear about a study of a first-year Korean language course in three different modes (face-to-face, blended, and online) that yielded implications for federal regulations regarding "seat time" definitions.

R-05
Recreational smartphone use and how it impacts academic performance
Shawn DeShields, Bermuda College
What impact does excessive recreational smartphone use have on student's study patterns, grades, learning capabilities and direct interactions with fellow students and faculty?

R-06
Administrative considerations impacting the quality of online teaching
Michael Coplan, Helen Hammond, and Jean Mandernach, Grand Canyon University
Address online instructional behaviors by creating data-drive dialogue in collaboration with instructors.

R-07
Online class visits, faculty delivery data, and proving what works
William Hatheway and Nillab Pazhwak, Northern Virginia Community College
Conducting online class visits can be a valuable tool for evaluating online faculty, but these visits can be time-consuming and labor-intensive. Presenters will demonstrate how they used formative assessments to evaluate 500 faculty, over two years, via online class visits and resultant faculty improvement. Walk away with examples of best practices.
R-08
Are they really listening? An ongoing study of student viewing habits
Josh Lund, DePaul University
We all want to make better videos, that more students will watch, and that they will get something out of. Diving into the statistics of over 20,000 videos gives a clear picture of what students do and don’t watch at a large and diverse institution, and provides insights as to what piques their interest, and perhaps how to keep it.

R-09
The impact of course design and enriched instruction on retention and success in high-attrition online classes
Matthew C. Henry, Wake Technical Community College
As part of a First in the World grant, Wake Technical Community College has deployed an experimental method of online course delivery designed to increase retention and student success among minority males in online classes. This session will present an experimental model of online course design and research findings obtained from an in-progress exploratory study as well as the course design and instruction method itself and present results and conclusions.

R-10
Taking the bite out of online student anxiety
M'Hammed Abdous, Old Dominion University
Discover how online-learning orientations ease students’ transition into online environments, clarify course expectations, and build their self-confidence and preparedness.

R-11
Accelerated online courses - Strategies for faculty presence & caring
Lynne Zajac and Adrianne Lane, Northern Kentucky University
Presenters will share their findings from a mixed-method study on faculty presence in accelerated online courses. They will also discuss how to integrate effective strategies for faculty presence and caring.
Workshops
Pre-conference sessions – Tuesday, August 6
Separate registration required

AM-01
Multi-generational learning
Ray Schroeder and Vickie Cook, University of Illinois Springfield
Explore strategies to address the needs of the many generations of learners who may be in your courses. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities has noted that “nontraditional is the new traditional,” and that higher education needs to be more reflective of its diverse range of students. Learn how to establish an even playing field for all students in your course, identify similarities, and acknowledge differences as strengths.

AM-02
Harnessing the power of Google tools
Julie Gahimer and Elizabeth Kiggins, University of Indianapolis
Gain hands-on experience with innovative tools to make online learning more participatory and interactive. Learning management systems (LMS) can be limited in their ability to engage students, but there are no-cost options to supplement and support LMS options. This workshop will cover easy-to-access and easy-to-use Google tools that make learning more interesting, engrossing, and relevant to your discipline.

AM-03
Facilitate genuine communication in your online course
Andrew Cole, University of Wisconsin–Whitewater
Move beyond the traditional notions of online discussions as text-based threads in a learning management system. This workshop will explore strategies for employing digital communication tools and feedback approaches to facilitate learning, student motivation, community building, and help keep students on track in online learning environments.

AM-04
Caring for and connecting with adjunct faculty: Strategies that work
Brad Garner, Indiana Wesleyan University
Higher education and K-12 schools need to quickly recruit, train, and deploy online faculty, entrusting the integrity and success of their programs to these individuals. This session will walk through the critical elements of recruitment, onboarding, training, and support to assure that part-time and adjunct faculty members receive ongoing training and assistance so they can provide the best possible learning opportunities to your students.

AM-05
Assessing students in online courses: Best practices
Raymond Lawson, Oakton Community College
Well-planned assessments continuously measure how well students are learning and provide instructors information to improve their teaching methods and strategies. This workshop will focus on aligning instructional outcomes with a variety of assessment activities, integration of learning outcomes into the assessment process, and the use of rubrics to foster an objective assessment climate and provide a feedback channel.
AM-06
Unpack this workshop! An OER about OER
Olena Zhadko and Susan Ko, Lehman College, CUNY
Learn the most effective and impactful implementation of Open Educational Resources (OER) for your courses or at your institution. This unique workshop, itself an OER, is for anyone wanting to better understand and promote research-based, successful uses of OERs. You will be able to take the workshop content itself and a draft OER plan for adaptation at your institution to assist you in developing OER as part of your online and/or hybrid offerings.

AM-07
Ignite creativity in your student assignments using visual design principles
Eric Cornish and Tommy Demos, Miami Dade College
The dreaded online discussion board or 12 page, double-spaced paper can often be replaced with dynamic, multi-media presentation options that leverage photos, videos, and audio to communicate learning achievements. Multimedia projects can effectively replace written assignments by improving student engagement and retention. Learn how to guide students to effectively and attractively communicate and reflect on their learning using free web-based design tools.

PM-01
Improve learning with voice and screencasting feedback to students
John Orlando, Northcentral University
Investigate the benefits of providing voice and screencasting feedback to students and experiment with techniques and tools to use in your own online teaching or coaching. Work hands-on with both types of feedback and explore free and low-cost tools you can start using right away.

PM-02
Creating personalized, social, and co-constructed learning experiences
Rick Shearer and Jessica Resig, Penn State World Campus
As distance education continues to evolve we are moving beyond the industrial approach to learning and toward a post-modern, post-industrial model. In this workshop we will examine this future based on research findings and stretch our thinking about personalized, adaptive, and social-connectivist teaching and learning approaches. We will begin with a vision for online learning that addresses learner needs at personal, social, and content levels then sketch out potential solutions to take back to your organization.

PM-03
That’s a wrap: Develop self-directed learners with cognitive wrappers
Amanda Hinson-Enslin, Texas Woman's University
Learn the what, when, and why of using cognitive wrappers by working with examples, templates, and application tools in this workshop. Cognitive wrappers aid students in becoming self-directed learners by providing the opportunity to self-assess their work process alongside their learning outcomes. Wrappers can help students reflect and identify both their shortcomings and achievements so they can adjust their learning approach. Using cognitive wrappers throughout the semester can help establish a growth mindset for online students and help them get on the path of self-directed and deep learning.

PM-04
Create engaging videos for online learning
Ryan Eash, TechSmith Corporation
In online learning, visual content is fundamental to most student engagement and retention. Go beyond the basics and strengthen your existing video content. Join this hands-on workshop featuring intermediate and advanced tactics, tips, and best practices for better, more impactful instructional video demonstrations.
and lessons. You will experiment with the tools and skills needed to create digital materials that better engage students and enhance student outcomes.

**PM-05**

*Let's get "persona-l": Using personas to help design universally inclusive courses*

_Jana Hitchcock and Sonya Woods, Penn State World Campus_

Technology has made it possible for people to learn online, and for people with disabilities to more easily access web-based content. Online content has to be intentionally created to work well with the constant changes in assistive technology and to make content and assessment engaging. Instructors and course designers often make assumptions about the needs of our learners, which can result in inaccurate generalizations. In this workshop we will design learning interactions using research-based personas to understand the variability of learners and to design universally inclusive courses.

**PM-06**

*Transform your online discussions*

_Tori Svoboda, University of Wisconsin–La Crosse_

Explore a variety of approaches to shift discussions from more transactional to more transformative. Discussions can be used to build community, apply concepts, or assess student learning. Yet we often ask students to post once and reply twice, seeing only variations of “I agree” or “good post” replies.

**PM-07**

*Technology hacks for cementing learning*

_Jane Sutterlin and Emily Baxter, Pennsylvania State University_

Explore how cognitive science research can be easily applied in the online classroom to help students retain what they learn - all without adding extra demands on your time and workload. Experience practical teaching strategies that can be implemented in your online classroom with minimal investment of time. The workshop will focus on the ways that tools such as Canvas, Poll Everywhere, Kaltura, Kahoot, Google and Piazza can be used in innovative ways to make teaching more effective and student learning more durable.
The ABCs of Distance Education
Podcasting as a Tool for Active Learning in Online Environments

Lauren Caruso
Instructional Designer
Wake Technical Community College

Summary

This session will explore the various ways in which podcasts, generally recognized as a passive medium, can be employed as effective tools for active learning. In addition to simply using podcasts as tools to support flipped classroom environments or as a means of recording lectures, podcasts can be used to encourage interactive project-based learning and can serve as tools for student engagement and creativity across disciplines.

While faculty benefit from using podcasts in a more active and collaborative manner, students can also be engaged in creating their own podcasts for group or individual assignments. Podcasting has been utilized in many seated courses, yet it is an untapped resource in online settings, where student engagement and instructor presence are especially vital to constructing productive and memorable learning experiences.

About the Presenter

Lauren Caruso is an instructional designer and faculty member at Wake Technical Community College and holds master’s degrees in Religious Studies and Education. Lauren has experience both teaching in and designing for online environments. In addition to teaching online courses, she works collaboratively with faculty members in designing and reinventing their online courses as well as creating new professional development sessions to support and guide faculty toward improving online learning.

Address: 9101 Fayetteville Road, Raleigh, North Carolina 27603
Email: lacaruso@waketech.edu
Phone: 919-866-5631
No proceedings paper was provided for this session.
Group Work in Online Courses

Henny Breen, PhD, RN, COI
Associate Professor of Nursing
Linfield-Good Samaritan School of Nursing

Summary

Group work in the online learning environment can be particularly frustrating for both faculty and students, which often results in avoiding it. Different working styles contribute to the challenges. For example, some students like to start early, and others wait to the last minute. Some students like to take control, not trusting their peers to others letting others do the majority of the work. Therefore, it is very important to be purposeful in planning how the group work will be set up, keeping in mind leveling of course work in the program of study and the learning outcomes you want to achieve.

Purpose and Design of Group Work

Collaborative and cooperative skills are essential to maximize teamwork and is highly valued in many work environments today. It is important for faculty to be able to delineate collaborative work from cooperative work in order to design group assignments. Cooperative work involves students working independently on a part of a project to contribute to the final product. It is a division of labor. In collaborative work students work together throughout the process to construct new understanding of relevant information so that the final product is better than any one person could do on their own (Harasim, 2017).

Example of Group Work for Beginning Students

In a nursing history class, students are divided into groups of 3 to 5 students. Each group is assigned a special topic such as public health, feminism, or minorities in nursing. Individually they write a brief paper focusing on a nurse leader related to their topic. Each group member shares their paper in their small group. They are to read and respond to each paper for the purpose of ensuring each paper is read and to expand their knowledge about the topic. Then as a small group, they compare their findings and write a brief summary of the highlights of their topic. The summary is shared with the class in the discussion board and the instructor based on the summary writes a discussion question or prompt. In this way the entire class has an opportunity to engage in all the topics.

Example of Group Work for Advanced Students

This is a large complex group assignment with many requirements that results in a comprehensive coalition planning document for homeless veterans. Specific deadlines are set for individual work in preparation for working together. The individual work is to read the extensive instructions, related articles and to post a community assessment of their community with a focus on homeless veterans that builds on a windshield survey they completed in a earlier class. Then as a group they decide which community to use to complete the coalition planning document. They decide which parts of the assignment they will complete based on their schedule. This is a critical task as each part of the plan builds on the next, so they need to work closely together to ensure the plans flows from one section to the next. For example, key issues are identified from the community assessment and from there their mission, vision, values which then lead to the development of goals, strategies, action plan and evaluation.

Evaluation

Often in group work, a final group grade is assigned based on the quality of the end product. In the above examples, individual grades are assigned for the individual work completed in preparation for the group work. Student feedback about group work with this kind of preparation has been very positive as each group member comes to the group prepared. Depending on the learning outcomes for the assignment, it is
recommended that group process skills, which have more to do with interpersonal skills be evaluated separately from the final product (Breen, 2015).
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Meeting the Needs of Generation Z and Millennials in Distance Education

Dr. KeriAnne Moon
Lecturer

Dr. Carla Ackerson
Clinical Lecturer

Texas State University

Summary

Introduction

If we are not equipped through practice and sound pedagogy, how would our students be equipped in their perspective fields? Seventy-four percent of Generation Z are in high school or in college (Dombrosky, Templeton, & Fong, 2018, p84). Three quarters of Generation Z are open to other ways of a good education versus the traditional focus on college, think MOOCs and other free online education (Chicioreanu & Amza, 2018; Jenkins, 2017). Even more surprising might be that Generation Z and Millennials have not abandoned face to face communication and both are proficient and capable of creating connection with social media and online environments (Chicioreanu & Amza, 2018; Jenkins, 2017). Are we ready to meet the challenge of fostering connection in a variety of ways? The purpose of this presentation is to guide educators with functions of technology in the classroom that engage our students, the youngest of them as well, as best as we can.

Define all Generations and Learning Styles

Discussing generations and their differences has been a hot topic for a long time. Elder generations tend to complain about how the new generations are not like their own. This creates a large disparity and some strong feelings about how to best approach new generations and their learning styles. First, it is important to discuss all generations and their characteristics. Traditionalists (born 1900–45), Baby Boomers (born 1946–64), Generation X (born 1965–80), Millennials (born 1981–1994), Generation Z (born 1995–2005), and now Generation Alpha (born 2005–to present) have some very distinct characteristics.

The Traditionalists are rule followers, conformists, savers, and are loyal. Traditionalists’ learning and new skill development are best when active and in the “real” setting. They like hierarchy and do well with a focus on the individual modality of learning. Baby Boomers on the other hand are about personal growth, are driven “workaholics”, value collaboration and in general challenge authority and are nonconformists. Learning and new skill development is best in the “real” environment and putting in the time and effort to succeed and succeeding through visibility and experience. Generation X is the first generation of balance. Instead of living to work, they work to live. Generation X is more global in thought and prefer diversity and are task and project orientated. Learning new skills is vital for this generation and the more they know the more comfortable they feel. They prefer to learn skills and then put those skills to practice in a meaningful way which often leads to a new position or new employment.

Lastly, the two most talked about generations, the Millennials and Generation Z. Millennials are achievers that want things done now. Technology is a large part of life including learning. Millennials are confident in their learning and abilities to acquire skills. While they are ambitious and want to learn they are very tied to the contribution they are making in their field and even their tie globally. Another important characteristic of Millennials is they like individual attention. Where past generations did not expect this in the learning environment, Millennials want to feel mentorship and connection – even if
through technology (spoken like a true GenXer). Millennials also exhibit elevated narcissism (nonclinical), lack of self-regulation, anxiety, instant gratification, consumerism, inflated self-esteem, and selfishness which can lead to academic entitlement within the classroom (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004; Foster, Campbell, & Twenge, 2003; Twenge & Campbell, 2001). Generation Z is determined, even more global and accepting of diversity, open-minded, and they have confidence in themselves. This generation is very connected and resourceful. Learning and skill-development is truly about what they cannot google. Generation Z are lacking some focus and always appear to be multi-tasking however this could be because engagement in learning is not dynamic enough to hold their attention. Generation Z students want to learn and want to learn in ways they cannot learn by themselves. This generation is connected 100% of the time. Their smartphone is not an accessory but rather an essential part of their body, as if it was an extremity to the hand. By 2021, 84.1% of 12-year-olds will have a smartphone (Dombrosky, Templeton, & Fong, 2018, p. 41). Therefore, information, fact or fiction, is found fast and either through the internet or social media network.

Technology and Teaching Methods

Game based pedagogy (web-based games applications like Kahoot and Socrative) are good for interactive learning, formative evaluation, presentation feedback, as well as immediate feedback on knowledge/comprehension (Shatto & Erwin, 2016). One for Gen Z and in some cases, Millennials, are using an extension of themselves – their smartphone. Use of visuals that grab attention are also beneficial for Millennial and Gen Z learners. Other teaching methods that are interactive and use words minimally are great for engaging this population of learner. Picking something that you are passionate about will also come through and engage the Millennial and Gen Z learner so pick the passion over the technology in some instances to enhance intergenerational engagement.

Team based learning (TBL) is also another way to engage our students in the online environment. Including teams and group-based learning can really facilitate the connection to peers but also pull students in to thinking critically about the learning material. It helps that both Millennials and Gen Z are motivated to learn in teams (Chicioreanu & Amza, 2018) and that if you have multigenerational classrooms, TBL can work the strengths of each generation to make a true collaborative environment.

Asking Millennial and Gen Z learners to take charge of their own learning can help introduce and deepen the critical thinking skills. How can they customize an assignment or a learning activity to benefit their learning and passion about a skill or concept? Using the technological knowledge and bringing it full circle into their own customized assignment can really connect the learning for this population. For example, if you would like students to show the ability to paraphrase and summarize scholarly research, let them pick the topic and the modality. Maybe some will do a written blog or build a website; another student may choose to do a presentation or a vlog, and yet another student may write a literature review.

Conclusion

We all are teaching in multigenerational classrooms. The virtual classrooms allow for more flexibility in the learner environment, but engagement can be a challenge. Using passion and having student gain some control in their learning environment can increase the engagement of each learner.
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Discussion Sessions
Revising Success: Taking Equine Science to the Next Level!

Penny Ralston-Berg
Senior Instructional Designer
Penn State World Campus

Summary

This session discusses the evolution of online courses over time and the questions to consider when revising a successful online course. A course may be considered successful if enrollments and retention rates are high or if student evaluations are favorable. The instructor’s joy of teaching may also be an indicator of success. But what happens when a course has run for several years – with success? Materials and media may become dated. Methods for delivering, teaching or grading may have become outdated. There may be new tools to streamline processes or new instructional methods to better support student learning. Courses can grow organically over time and what once was the best solution may now be problematic.

Designing and developing online courses is an iterative process. Online courses are never really “done.” In revising the ANSC 107 Equine Science course at Penn State, we considered the following questions as we worked through a three-semester revision process to improve the already successful “horse course.”

Questions for Consideration

Collaboration
- What resources are available?
- Could we assemble a diverse team of experts to share feedback and ideas?
- Could we include this diverse team from the start of the revision process?
- Are the instructors/course authors open to receiving recommendations?

Administration
- Could the course be offered to a wider audience?
- Could multiple campus enrollements be merged into one large section?

Extant Data
- Do the instructors have feedback from students?
- Have the instructors applied a quality rubric such as Quality Matters?
- Are there other data sources we should investigate?

Task and Time Analysis
- How much time do instructors (or IDs) spend preparing the course each semester?
- How much time do instructors spend grading student work and providing feedback?
- What tasks do students need to perform to successfully complete the course?
- Are student tasks disproportionately time consuming?

Alignment
- Are the course and module learning objectives clear and measurable?
- Do the objectives align with the materials, activities and assessments?
- Is a course map available?

Design Analysis
- Is the course effective, efficient and appealing?
- Is the course structure sound?
- Are students supported in getting started?
- Are instructions and expectations clear?
• Do students interact with the materials, instructors and other students?
• Are there concepts where students have difficulty? Are there places where students don’t “get it”?
• Are there activities where students ask an inordinate amount of questions or don’t perform as expected?

Media Analysis
• What types of media are included in the course? (images, video, etc.)
• Where is this media located?
• Is the media dated? Should it be swapped out for newer / more recent sources?
• Is the video and audio quality high? Should videos be re-recorded?

Accessibility
• Is the course accessible by minimum acceptable standards?
• Is the course as acceptable as it could be?

Copyright
• Are the materials, images and videos included in the course properly cited?
• Are there any uncited items that need to be investigated?

Scholarship
• Have we considered sharing the methods for your success?
• How might the scholarship of teaching and learning be applied to the course?
• Are there research, publication or presentation opportunities?
• Are there awards for which we should submit entries?

Continuous Improvement
• Is there a pre-determined revision cycle? (A set plan to review the course on a regular basis)
• Are there improvements we have in mind for future iterations of the course beyond this revision?
• Are future improvements prioritized based on student need, faculty time, available resources, etc.?
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"Is There Anybody out There?": Twitter as a Supportive Environment for First Year Teachers' Online Induction Workshop

Yehuda Peled
Senior Lecturer

Efrat Pieterse
Faculty Member

Western Galilee College, Israel

Summary

The transition from being a student teacher to being a teacher, solely responsible for his or her class, is decisive. New teachers, during their first year, struggle with their new role; they describe difficulties with class management, in particular, and management within the school in general. This research examines the feasibility and benefits of using Twitter as a support tool, to enhance social interaction among teachers in their first year of service, as they participate in an online induction workshop, and as a tool to aid the workshop’s moderator in monitoring the group and enhancing and supporting the early-service teachers' development. The 6914 tweets that were posted during the induction workshop enabled the workshop's moderator to constantly monitor the participants' progress – both their lows and their highs. These tweets reveal a process of socialisation that was taking place among the participants, which led to an increased availability of personal and professional support, and thus enhanced the new teachers' professional growth. Content analysis was conducted on the 6914 tweets that were posted during the eight months of the induction workshop. Participants answered a feedback questionnaire in the middle, and at the end of the induction workshop. Findings revealed the existence of a process of creating a "community of practice" – a process that creates professional and social support, through its members sharing their feelings and experiences directly from the field. This confirms the claim that tweets on Twitter can be a worthy substitute for face-to-face meetings. However, the questionnaire painted a different picture, in that participants’ evaluations of the Tweets were neutral, which raises questions for further research.

About the Presenters
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A Discussion about Strategies for Growing a Scalable and Sustainable Learning Analytics Initiative

Kimberly E. Arnold
Senior Evaluation Consultant and Campus Learning Analytics Lead
University of Wisconsin–Madison

Summary

While the concept of “learning analytics” (LA) goes back a decade, in practice, it is still quite nascent. Practitioners are still struggling with moving LA from small-scale explorations to enterprise-level solutions. Scaled, sustained learning analytics solutions are paramount if educational transformation is to be achieved. In large part, this shift suffers because learning analytics is often approached as a technical tool (much like an LMS) rather than a complex process that has far reaching implications.

Learning analytics should be approached not as a tool, but rather a complex organizational change model. This discussion will focus on how to leverage the affordances of learning analytics at scale. The facilitator will provide a pragmatic framework, adopted from Pugliese, for understanding organizational capacity for LA including: i) technology (infrastructure and LA tools), ii) culture, iii) processes and workflows, and iv) policy. The facilitator can provide some examples, but this session is meant to be an interactive discussion.
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A Model for Making Campus Life Accessible to Online Students

Dr. Molly Mott
State University of New York at Canton

Summary

Online programs are increasingly becoming an accepted part of higher education and a feature of brick and mortar institutions. While the majority of enrollments in online programs are still post-traditional students seeking the convenience and flexibility of an online degree, campuses are beginning to see traditional students enroll in online degrees in order to reduce college costs, particularly room and board. With more traditional students pursuing online degrees, the needs of online students are changing. Many are seeking a fuller college experience beyond the usual links to campus resources and services provided to students at a distance. As one student stated, “It would be nice if the online student were included with campus (brick & mortar) student’s events ....anything that shows we are just as important and equal to the brick & mortar...activities to make me feel like a true student of SUNY Canton.”

At the same time, institutions are struggling with the challenge to retain students in their online programs. Both traditional and post-traditional online students are more likely to drop out of their programs than their classroom counterparts. The most common reason cited for dropping out is a feeling of isolation. To reduce isolation, campuses must use strategies that increase the connections online students have with their peers and institution. Not only should campuses deliver engaging academic content, it is time for them to consider co-curricular opportunities in a virtual environment that are of value to traditional and post-traditional students.

Research shows that engaging students in campus life outside of the classroom fosters personal growth, development and connections to others; however, engagement in student life is difficult for online learners who are often limited by geography and time constraints. Is it possible that online experiences can be developed that mirror campus-based experiences? Do students seek these experiences, and if so, what kind of experiences do they seek? Such questions and their answers are important if we want to increase retention rates of online students.

The State University System at Canton (SUNY Canton) created a model for engaging online students in campus life, call the T.I.P method. This model, grounded in technology, innovation, and pedagogy, maps to the different dimensions of student life: academic, social, and co-curricular. The T.I.P method creates community and connectedness in a virtual environment by developing relevant campus experiences for online learners that strive to educate the whole student, decrease isolation, and subsequently improve retention rates. The method is grounded in the theoretical constructs for improving student engagement, teaching effectiveness, and using technology to serve pedagogy. Successful outcomes in the first year include a three percent increase in the retention rate of students enrolled in our fully online degrees.

This practice is an innovative, cross-campus retention effort to increase the retention rate of online students. It included partnerships with student affairs professionals across the campus and collaboration with the college’s online learning department and information technology services. Online student engagement activities such as Virtual Career and Study Abroad Fairs, online varsity eSports teams, student government and advisory board representation, as well as other online academic and student life efforts will be detailed in the presentation.
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You Expect Me to Work with Who? Making the Case for Learning Design

Ann H. Taylor, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean for Learning Design

Stevie Rocco, M.Ed.
Director of Learning Design

College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, Pennsylvania State University

Summary

As higher education costs continue to rise, institutions look for ways to reduce expenses. This can often mean that learning design units find themselves faced with having to justify their role in the design, development, and delivery of online courses. Our work can seem mysterious or even unnecessary to those who are used to going it alone in the face-to-face classroom. In our college, our stakeholders (e.g., faculty, department heads) have become increasingly curious to learn more about the work of our learning design unit and the related expenses, as they wonder out loud if there might be ways to cut costs. With a lot of misunderstanding about the role of learning design to online course design, development, and delivery, our work can be assumed to be only technology-focused (versus pedagogical) and can be seen as "optional." In response, we recently undertook a process of codifying the role of learning design in the design, development, and delivery of our online courses in order to clearly articulate what our learning design team contributes to the process at each step of the way and how their work dovetails with the faculty instructor's own effort. In this session, we share our work and discuss how we have demonstrated to stakeholders the value that learning design brings to ensuring the quality of our online offerings.
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Gold Standard Course Design

Joseph Alsobrook
Dean
Lindenwood Online

Summary

As Pescatore et al. (2015) proposed, we are fortunate to practice with immediate access to information and ideas, which brings its own challenges. Now, more than ever, our job is to critically assess the quality of resources and the validity of their evidence (Mallin et al., 2014). Accordingly, this session focuses on connecting the design and delivery of online courses with extensive, experimental evidence associated with human motivation and learning. Discussion topics include purpose, mastery, autonomy, personality, and objective quality assurance.
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Conducting Literature Reviews to Guide Research and Practice

Rebecca Thomas, Ph.D.
Oregon State University

Summary

While most people know that literature reviews are required for research papers, fewer are aware of additional ways literature reviews can guide practice in higher education. The presentation will have three primary purposes:

- **To discuss various uses and roles that literature reviews can play in higher education.**
  - Literature reviews can be used to provide a foundation for original research. It is important for researchers to understand what research has previously been done so that they can appropriately fill gaps in understanding and avoid “recreating the wheel.”
  - Administrators and other leaders can use literature reviews to guide decision making. Literature reviews have the potential to point administrators toward data driven and evidence-based decisions that can help their teams and organizations.
  - Employees such as instructional designers can use literature reviews to facilitate persuasion. Stakeholders may be more likely to agree to a policy or practice if a literature review can demonstrate efficacy.
  - Since literature reviews can provide information about what others in the field are doing, as well as frame existing work in a new light, literature reviews can be used to enhance inspiration.

- **To provide practical tips and tools for those conducting literature reviews in higher education.**
  - Tips for starting literature reviews include outlining goals, identifying parameters, and using tools such as google scholar.
  - Process tips include ways to save and organize literature, as well as discussion of delegating and collaborating on projects.
  - Tips for finishing literature reviews include discussing presentation and dissemination.

- **To encourage creative thinking surrounding literature review processes and dissemination.**
  - Throughout the presentation, examples will illustrate the broad potential of literature reviews to shape higher education. This discussion will allow attendees to brainstorm ways in which literature reviews could be conducted and disseminated in their respective positions and subfields.
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Digital Credentials: Making Sense of an Emerging Field

Jaclyn Goudie
Assistant Director of Online Programs
Kellogg School of Management, Executive Education
Northwestern University

Summary

As technology advances, so too must our institutions, processes, and procedures. Digital credentials are fundamentally changing the way programs are able to communicate their value to both learners and employers. However, these credentials are still quite new and there is a lot of misunderstanding as to what they are, how to use them, and how to deliver them to learners.

A quick search of the terms “digital credential” or “digital certificate” will pull back over 4 million results. If there is no standard among issuers, it is no wonder that consumers are equally as confused and mystified by terms such as “badge” vs “micro-credential” vs “nano-degree” (not to mention digital certificate is also a way of encrypting things). In order to facilitate a deeper conversation, definitions for these certificates and their platforms was given (see handout).

Once we have common definitions, the next common question is “which one is best?”. To answer that, we need to look at the broader eco-system of hiring and skills verification. From there, we can start to see a new marketplace emerging: one where the issuer no longer “owns” the verification of certificates, but the learner does and has a passport of skills representing their lifelong learning. “As a more diverse credentials landscape has evolved, the push to create a more connected and navigable system has gained steam, opening way for technological forces to prevail” (Merisotis, 2016).

Platforms enable the new credential eco-system. Credentialing organization issues certificate (side benefits of marketing exposure), Earner now “owns” their own credential and can instantly share a verifiable link. Hiring companies’ talent analytics systems can use these to make better hiring decisions. These platforms enable transparent sharing of skill verification. Highlight how hiring decisions are changing due to enhanced data analytics and talent analytics HR programs. This has also changed how job-seekers search and apply for jobs (matching skills with job posting) and using digital credentials as a form of “payment” to get noticed. Digital Credential platforms are attempting to help close the “skills gap” and enable employers to assess for competencies prior to hiring. These platforms are a powerful new tool in the recruitment and sourcing process (Perry, 2018).

Historically, the hiring ecosystem included Professionals/Learners wanting to advance, Employers wanting skilled labor, and Traditional forms of education supplying the education. However, one of the key findings from a recent report is that “Skills-based or competency-based hiring appears to be gaining significant interest and momentum, with a majority of HR leaders reporting either having a formal effort to de-emphasize degrees and prioritize skills underway (23%) or actively exploring and considering this direction (39%)” (Gallagher, 2018).
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Keeping Up With the Kids ~ When Mom & Dad Go Back to College

Lori Wynia
Assistant Director of Extended Learning & Academic Outreach
Southwest Minnesota State University

Summary

When Mom or Dad become first generation, college students at the same time the kids do! This discussion-style presentation will explore tips, techniques and best practices centering on how to recruit and retain adult learners. Working adults with families are returning to school at an ever-increasing rate yet many admission departments focus their strategies toward the traditional freshman experience. Our discussion will compare the differences in recruiting and retaining the two different age groups along with providing many tools that participants can take away with them and implement in their home institution. Topics that under discussion will include online orientation and advising, transfer evaluation, marketing tools, retention tools and tracking all focused on the adult learner.
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Faculty Still Resistant to Online Education? These Strategies Can Help

Brian Udermann
Director of Online Education
University of Wisconsin–La Crosse

Summary

I’ve served as the Director of Online Education at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse since 2007. While we have made great strides in improving the acceptance of online education on our campus, some faculty still remain resistant and skeptical to the idea of online courses and degree programs. This brief summary paper identifies four strategies that can help reduce faculty resistance to online education.

Faculty Still Resistant to Online Education? These Strategies Can Help.

1. Involve faculty early and often.
   This is a strategy I’ve used often over the years. Ways to make faculty feel like they are involved include having them serve on an online education committee, having faculty involved with discussing policies and procedures related to online education, having experienced online instructors mentor newer online instructors, and providing stipends or another incentive for faculty to lead efforts related to new online degree development.

2. Be open and transparent.
   Faculty are a pretty perceptive bunch and can often determine when administrators are not being forthcoming or truthful about something. It has always been my belief that openly communicating with faculty about online education initiatives and priorities diminishes the fear and concern that some faculty have that administrators are often deceitful. Open communication generally has a positive impact on faculty buy-in of online education.

3. Offer high quality professional development opportunities for faculty.
   One of the primary barriers that faculty have to developing and teaching online courses is a feeling that they are not prepared to teach in the online modality. This barrier can often be overcome by offering consultations, workshops, and training courses preparing faculty to teach online. Some institutions attempt to incentivize the faculty training by offering stipends or release time for successful completion.

4. Ask them why.
   Early on in my online education administrative career there was a lot of resistance to online programming on my campus. Having taught previous online courses, and having enjoyed the experience, I didn’t fully understand why faculty were so resistant. I decided to survey faculty and find out, and realized there were concerns about online education having the same rigor as face-to-face courses, academic integrity, and intellectual property rights, which I was then able to address.
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Conflict, Candor, and Crisis: Finding and Using Your Voice

Lois Harrison
Manager of Project Management
Cengage Learning

Summary

Respond to online program crisis situations effectively: know how to speak well, show care in dealing with conflict, use candor, and manage curriculum and staffing projects effectively.
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Lessons Learned Migrating from Blackboard to Canvas

Valerie Shapko
Instructional Designer, Teaching and Learning with Technology
Texas Woman’s University

Summary

Instructors who ever moved from one LMS to another know how it is hard, and time consuming. This session will help audience to learn tricks what not to do, how to move from one LMS to Canvas, best practices moving to Canvas, and best way to import content to Canvas. I will share what lessons we learned at Texas Woman’s University as far as migrating, promoting, and teaching faculty using Canvas. This project took us four years and we can proudly say that it was a challenging, but a great change.
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Using Animated Videos to Create Unifying Course Themes

Doug Waters, J.D., M.B.A.
Professional Faculty and Business Department Chair
Washtenaw Community College, Ann Arbor, MI

Summary

Online classes typically consist of common tasks such as watching video lectures and participating in discussion boards. Creating an animated-video series is a fun, engaging way to break up common-task monotony and connect topics from multiple course modules. The animated series can be delivered in digestible segments spanning the curriculum.

This session will show you how to make it happen for your course. This will involve partnering with your college’s online department, scripting a story theme, and building scenes using animated software. There are many animated-software options, including free ones (Tobies, 2019). You will also gain tips for connecting your story to your course’s objectives and practical advice for creating your first story. Yes, creating an animated-video series will be time-consuming, but it will also be exhilarating and transformative. Take the plunge!
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**Interdisciplinary Perspective on the Value Instructors Place on Feedback**

Scott W Greenberger  
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Stephanie K Knight  
Adjunct Faculty

Grand Canyon University

**Summary**

Within this session, the key concept is the value instructors place on providing feedback on written assignments across disciplines. There is not complete consensus on the definition of effective feedback in written assignments in higher education coursework (Boud & Molloy, 2013; Carless, 2006; Ferris, 2014; Mulliner & Tucker, 2017; Williams & Smith, 2017). Ferris (2014) explored instructor feedback practices to student writing in English courses. Some studies have explored instructor feedback in specific disciplines, such as education (Carless, 2006) and engineering (Nicol, Thomson, & Breslin, 2014), but no studies were identified in the literature that explored instructor feedback practices across disciplines. The session includes a discussion of different types of feedback, including embedded comments and summative comments. The session also includes a discussion of instructor tone in the feedback, whether positive, instructional, or even conversational. This analysis is further analyzed between disciplines to evaluate differences in perceived value in the types of feedback instructors provide to students. Research is from the instructor point of view in order to begin conversations on instructional efficiency, to match instructor perceptions later to student perceptions, and to dig deeper to explore if instructional platform or instructor education level affect the feedback they deem valuable for students. The discussion also includes instructor’s sense of feedforward, or feedback that provides opportunity for students to self-assess, within summative comments as opposed to strictly targeted feedback.
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Teaching Online: Challenges and Success as a Blind Instructor

Vileen Shah
Instructor
Hadley Institute for the Blind and Visually Impaired

Summary

The purpose of this paper is to outline salient challenges that a distance-learning instructor faces in general and a blind instructor faces in specific.

Introduction to the Topic

Distant Teaching and Learning are two sides of a coin, with one being nearly impossible without the other. It is imperative that educators find new ways to incorporate technology to stay current by employing tools and applications that will not only enhance a student’s educational experience but also support teaching and learning. In this constantly changing world of technology, staying current is quite a challenge for all educators in general and it becomes more challenging when you have no sight. Taking a general view that most employers use the Microsoft Windows environment and Microsoft Office, it is an open secret that the Windows and Office features keep changing/updating more often than we could envision. Every change implies something new to learn for a user. As a blind computer-literate educator, this challenge is much greater than one could ever imagine! A blind individual uses a computer with the help of a screen reader, such as JAWS, a speech output software. This tool speaks in words what appears on the screen but it’s not so simple! The screen reader reads nearly everything, much of which you don’t want to hear when you want to work efficiently and effectively. Its output is more confusing when you are working on a website. In addition, the screen readers are often not updated with the ongoing changes in Microsoft Windows and Office. Speaking of my own experience as a blind educator, despite these challenges, I managed with reasonable success to stay current and successfully taught my classes at City Colleges of Chicago (CCC) as well as at Hadley Institute for the Blind and Visually Impaired. At City Colleges, my experience with using two LMS—Learning Management Systems—BlackBoard and BrightSpace has been a mixed bag. With my skills as a screen reader user, I am able to navigate between various headings and subheadings. The screen reader technology also provides a number of key combinations to substitute mouse clicking and thus, helps us save time. Nonetheless, at times it also becomes frustrating when JAWS does not read certain information shown on the screen and reads other things that are not related or relevant to the operations. For instance, when I go to the Gradebook on BrightSpace and try to enter students’ grades, the screen reader does not behave properly to guide me to the right spot of entry. In such cases, I need to use some assistance by a sighted person. I keep records of students’ grades in braille and enter them into the system with the help of an aide that my employer provides at the City College of Chicago. At Hadley, it’s altogether a different experience. This institute serves the blind community and hires blind learning experts. Accommodations provided to help perform our job duties are effective. Access technology experts are available to help us learn and use new features that Microsoft introduces from time to time. When it is found that JAWS is not compatible with visual output of any computer program, we have sighted assistance available to help us perform the necessary tasks. For instance, while using JAWS it was not possible to set up a recurring weekly meeting that I conduct every Thursday using the Zoom platform. My sighted peer set it up for me and it has been working well ever since. Different programs offer a varying degree of compatibility with JAWS and other screen readers. Zoom, for instance, is quite compatible with JAWS and allows me a greater independence in operating it. BlackBoard, a learning management system that I was using at City Colleges of Chicago, was very frustrating. This website was so visually designed that JAWS was not reading basic and important information on the screen while reading grossly irrelevant materials, resulting in wasted time on my part and ultimately being ineffective. Independence is a prime key to successfully performing...
assigned tasks, and for a blind educator, it’s not easy but absolutely doable with necessary accommodations. My successful teaching in the CCC system for nearly 22 years and at Hadley for 18 years bears this testimony. Having said this, I will now explore and relate each challenge as a distant educator in general and as a blind distant educator in specific. I will also throw some light on my experience with distant teaching including some successes.

**Challenges and Successes**

**How to design courses and construct effective learning objectives**

“Although courses may vary in size, subject matter or level, a systematic process will help you plan and structure your course and syllabus to effectively reach desired instructional goals. Effective course design begins with understanding who your students are, deciding what you want them to learn; determining how you will measure student learning; and planning activities, assignments and materials that support student learning.” http://www.washington.edu/teaching/teaching-resources/

Designing a course, course syllabus, and related learning objectives is as much an employer’s domain as is an educator’s with bewildering points of difference throughout the whole gamut of distance education. In the CCC (City College of Chicago) system, we are at liberty to design our own syllabus based on the framework provided by the employer. In order to prepare a course syllabus conducive to students’ needs, it’s essential that we know the level of their ability to access and grasp the course materials, their academic goals, the extent of diversity, and social backgrounds. It is equally important that the learning objectives are conducive to the course design as well as a learning environment that the system offers. Keeping this in view, I may offer to say that I truly enjoyed designing courses and setting learning objectives for my students for multiple reasons. I could do this task using my computer skills fairly independently. My typing skills, ability to place markers, such as bullets, underlines, boldface, italics on my own made me confident enough in this area. A page layout is, however, an issue that would benefit from some sighted assistance. JAWS does help to check whether or not words, lines, and/or sentences have been underlined, boldfaced, or italicized as desired. It also helps to know if a line has been indented as needed. Nevertheless, there are some visual issues that need to be taken care of. I borrow my volunteer readers and/or aide’s eyeballs to check if a document looks well visually. More often than not, I pass this test but at times, it turns out to be frustrating, but I do manage with or without sighted assistance to post the course syllabus online without the knowledge of my students that their instructor is blind. At Hadley, the courses are designed by a special curriculum team and as learning experts, we get the course materials handy to teach our learners via mail or email.

**How to make the process of distant learning interactive and participatory**

Amy Peterson lists five tips to make your class interactive and participatory. These include: 1. Integrate real-time interaction, 2. Get creative with discussion boards, 3. Maximize engagement with non-task interaction, 4. Use multiple communication tools, and 5. Have a plan around the tool. https://www.facultyfocus.com › Articles › Online Education

Both in face-to-face classes and online ones, I have had a reasonably high mark of success in making them interactive and participatory. To me, encouraging students to speak up and creating a comfort zone for them to be able to voice their opinions are the two keys to unlocking isolation and reservations of your students. At CCC, instructors teaching online are mandated to offer a minimum of three synchronous session in which we meet students via video conferencing. This activity works like a face-to-face class. Right in the beginning, I inform my students of my visual impairment without hesitation and apprise them of my successful handling of classes over many years. My friendly tone creates an environment that motivates students to speak up, ask questions, and express views without hesitation and offending others. At Hadley, my experience with running a weekly group like a conference call has also given me encouraging results. This is evident from what Michelle, a Hadley learner said, “Thank you so much for
providing us with clear, instructive, professional and educational supports during each session of Embracing Braille. For instance, on last week, May 16, 2019, covering topic, common braille errors in reading and writing, information you shared was beneficial to my ongoing learning stage in reading and writing Braille.” Angela, a CCC student writes, “Professor Shah was clear in his course objectives and his expectations of his students, something that seems to be difficult with online courses. In addition, he was always available to answer questions both online and via phone, and even offered to meet students in person for tutoring. I really enjoyed the course material and the personalization of chapter summaries which always discussed current events, quite important in this particular subject. I especially enjoyed the research paper project which enabled me to use both what I learned in the course and my experience working within social services to examine the correlations between poverty and education. I would recommend him for further teaching through the CDL program and city colleges.”

**How to engage students and keep them involved in learning at a distance**

In face-to-face classes, you can change your tone or way of presenting your thoughts when you see the reactions/responses of students, but the same is not true about distance education. An educator here needs to demonstrate his/her ingenuity to keep students engaged and active in learning the course materials. My experience reveals that employing all possible tools of communication helps a great deal. One such option is to promptly respond to students’ email messages. This proves quite an effective way to keep students involved in doing their assignments and quizzes. Students feel engaged and secure when an instructor responds to their concerns/questions immediately. Yet another way is to regularly post announcements underlining their performance statistics, analysis, and words of encouragement. In my personal experience, I have quite successfully performed these tasks. The screen reader has been very useful and helpful in writing email responses and typing and posting announcements and handouts. This is evident from an email Lola, a CCC student, sent to the management, “At the outset, I would like to thank the management for giving us such a kind and knowledgeable professor! He did an amazing job teaching this course. I was not sure I could ever understand the intricacies of American political system, but he made it easy by posting explanatory handouts and providing extra reading materials. I was extremely nervous and very shy about “posting” anything on Discussion Board that I felt was like a social media. I emailed my Professor right in the beginning to let him know my concerns. At once, he offered a helping hand. His encouraging and inspiring words much soothed my discomforts.”

**How to incorporate instructional technology to the best benefit of students as well as instructor**

“Advances in educational technology have changed the way educators teach and shaped the way children learn. As new products continue to be introduced at a rapid pace, teachers are becoming more reliant on it to engage learners and keep them hooked.”

[https://www.teachtomorrow.org/education-technology-tools/](https://www.teachtomorrow.org/education-technology-tools/)

Any technology comes with challenges for blind individuals, especially a blind instructor. He/she has to not only demonstrate sufficient skills, or I will say, expertise in using the latest technology, but also needs to incorporate it into instructional designs. An insight into the course materials as well as the use of instructional technology is a key to successful distant online teaching. I have used PowerPoint, video conferencing and other tools of technology for my distant teaching but I will not say that it was all perfect. The challenges that the screen reader poses are disheartening at times and heartening at others. In order to prepare an effective PowerPoint presentation, I do need sighted assistance because PowerPoint itself is more visual than audio descriptive. Despite challenges and limitation caused by visual impairment, I am happy to say that I managed to successfully use instructional technology in my distant teaching including some PowerPoint presentations.

**How to create a collaborative class environment**

Encouraging students to be interactive and participatory and then keeping them engaged and involved are the two basic tenets for creating collaborative environment for your distant learning class. A successful
synchronization of active interactions and participation helps me create a collaborative class environment that my students at CCC enjoy a great deal. At Hadley, teaching is carried on an individual basis. Hence, the idea of collaborative class environment does not apply.

**How to employ creative ideas to refresh existing lectures and course content**

Oftentimes, I post chapter summaries, additional resources on current events, and create challenging questions reflecting ongoing socio-economic and political issues as appropriate for students at CCC. At Hadley, I cover current and universal issues in my weekly group sessions. Caroline, a former CCC student writes: “Currently I am one of your students in your Social Science WWW class. I would like to take this opportunity to personally thank you for your total commitment to your students. You've made my experience with Social Science online to be a lasting one. Prof. Shah you've opened up yourself totally to your students by giving us the tools and resources that we needed. Often, you constantly reminded us through your emails that you were always available (7 days a week) to address a question or concern either via email or by phone. I really enjoyed how you conduct your classes; normally instructors give you a weekly assignment, which consist of questions from the book. But what amazed me about your style of teaching is that you took it a step further. After reading the chapter, you advised us to analyze certain topics and give our observations. By doing this, it allowed me to open up my mind by reading and learning the material. Without reading the material, it would be totally impossible to give my observations to you. Last but least, Prof. Shah, what I like about you, as an instructor is your personality. I feel very comfortable with communicating to you. You constantly advise your students to don't be afraid to express themselves. Regardless of what my comments are, you never judged me. I have to be honest; I've never had an instructor where I could just be myself. I am very happy that I chose your class this semester.”

**How to establish instructor as a role model**

Blindness comes to be a blessing here. Your students are right away impressed when they learn that their educator is a successful blind instructor. Nathaniel, a CCC student supplements this view when he says, “Thank you for generosity, encouragement, for time and patience with us as your students. I’m sure without these things I myself wouldn’t be able to complete this semester …” Andrew, a Hadley student appreciating individualized teaching from a distance writes: “Professor Shah: I want to say a special thanks to you for all the years of faithful and astute tutelage in Braille learning, especially for your patience with my lengthy or complicated questions and then most especially in the sometimes lengthy delays of submitting my Braille lessons. It has been a good run indeed, and I have learned many things with you even beyond simple Braille literacy and proficiency.”

**Conclusions**

Although distant teaching and learning and distance education is no longer a new concept, it continues to go through the process of development and transition. Hadley Institute for the Blind and Visually Impaired, founded in 1920, is the earliest distant educators of people with vision loss. With the advent of computer technology, the number of educational institutions offering distant teaching and learning for all sections of society has been mushrooming. It offers a viable and convenient option to be educated and earn degrees for those who are not able to or do not have convenience to attend face-to-face classes. Its contribution to educating people from a distance is noteworthy. It is, however, pertinent to note here that no transition ever takes place without challenges for all and a blind instructor is no exception. The challenges that I encountered and successes I have attained as a blind distant educator has made me a strong and confident individual as well as instructor.
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Summary

The health informatics program at UIC was established at a time when the discipline was small and emerging on the heels of the growing popularity of electronic medical records in hospitals and medical groups. The program predicted early and correctly that first introduction of health information technology (HIT) to patient care environments would give birth not only to a new discipline but to an array of niches sprinting towards healthcare digitization. Formal education needs followed the industry growth, and enrollment grew rapidly to the program’s current count of 400+ students. However, as part of the normal economic cycle, other programs launched and compete for a finite pool of students. The job market for graduates of these programs matures and calls for adjustments to the curriculum to align academics with practical use of degrees earned. To address these issues, the program went back to its innovation roots.

Innovation takes place via multiple streams: from new content and methods, to online teaching tools, to distance delivery approaches. However, the ability of the program to remain relevant in the fast-paced world of HIT is its capability to maintain quality flexible curriculum that embeds new tracks, courses, and certificates into its core base. In an environment where formal review by the governing professional associations introduces significant change and new scrutiny, the innovative faculty team consisting of industry professionals and full-time academics continues adding topics that have relevance in the world of today and prepare students for the demands of tomorrow. Examples are one of the first MS healthcare data science tracks that includes such avant-garde topics as artificial intelligence in medicine; clinical data visualization; and a mobile informatics track that addresses the growing popularity of wearable devices and patient reported data in healthcare.

The faculty team learned how to spot new trends in the rapidly expanding field and translate its experience in industry and research into curriculum that is relevant, high quality, accredited, and forward-looking – catapulting students into the hottest fields of informatics immediately upon graduation. The program learns and re-learns how to maintain its prestige and enrollments by not shying away from experimentation. Faculty do not wait until textbooks catch up with demand for new knowledge, and employ a wide variety of resources in teaching – from live lectures using custom slides and information from industry to recent publications to guest speakers to assignments developed in house by industry practitioners.

Some of the assignments and materials may go through trial and error as necessary, yet student surveys indicate high interest and appreciation despite experimental nature of the new courses that assume some adjustments along the way. Students feel they receive relevant knowledge and report immediate application in their organizations and during successful job interviews with some of the most innovative organizations in the industry. Despite experimental nature of teaching, the program remains highly regarded and retains high quality via combination of academic rigor and industry relevancy, helping grow enrollments and ensure academic success of its students. This experimentation and innovative spirit, along with methods and tools, would be of interest to all conference attendees regardless of the fields of study and disciplines they represent.
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Summary

Ashford University is committed to supporting all its faculty. Within the College of Education (COE), Associate Faculty are utilized to teach over 83% of courses. This group, then, would appear to be key to student success and retention. The challenge lies within the online adjunct (Associate Faculty) role where faculty can feel isolated, disconnected, and even burned out and not utilized for their strengths. Retention and engagement of online faculty is essential for the success of students. Therefore, developing a MAED Professional Learning Community could make an impact for staff and student retention and success.

The literature clearly denotes the benefits of maximizing the strengths of Associate Faculty and highlighting their instructional expertise, honoring their assistance with the course workload, and helping keep program costs manageable (Henkel, 2012, p. 2016). The focus on retaining high quality faculty to ensure greater student retention is also found throughout the literature (Ferencz, 2016). These topics in the literature are often segmented into coaching and mentoring this group, the instructional review process, and/or developing an inclusive and robust onboarding process.

Statistical analysis of measures of faculty performance and qualitative analysis of survey data show that there is an interest in establishing professional learning communities for adjunct and fulltime faculty.
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Summary

In the summer of 2016, we began a pilot doctoral peer mentor program designed to support new online students in programs with high rates of attrition. After seeing strong gains in retention and positive feedback from pilot mentees, we launched a larger, permanent program in February 2018. The program centers around our Savvy Steps to Success: weekly messages mentors email mentees on topics designed to help new students become a savvy student who connects with others; is informed about resources and support; learns and applies new academic skills; seeks out help; and practices self-reflection.

The program incorporates social media, technology, as well as initiatives designed to build community for new students. Our emphasis on social connections and integration aligns with Tinto’s (1975) interactionist model of student attrition, which holds that becoming integrated within the university academically and socially is the main factor in student withdrawal decisions. Therefore, our program is designed to support students as they integrate into the university.

In this session, we will discuss how we have implemented a peer mentor program to support first-year online doctoral students, present our program’s data on the impact on student retention term-to-term, share how program initiatives have created a community for new students, and discuss qualitative feedback from students who have completed our program.
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Summary

Our goal for writing this book was to expand on what has been written about the theoretical approaches to online education by making a deep connection to the application of learning theory to the practice of online teaching. It has been our experience that the emphasis in distance education often begins with discussions about technology, as opposed to discussions about the delivery of online education being driven by educational theory, best practices, and learner needs. Our book also provided the opportunity to share the lessons that we have learned teaching in an online nursing program that is part of a traditional liberal arts college. As a result of our experiences, we have developed a collaborative model for online nursing education.

Theoretical Approaches to Online Education

While our philosophy of constructivism provides a foundation for understanding our epistemological approach to learning, learning theory provides an explanation of why and how learning occurs. A solid understanding of a variety of educational theories as applied to the online classroom is critical for effective online teaching in education. The value of theory is the insight that it provides for understanding how learning occurs and the teaching strategies that evolve out of that understanding (Cusatis Phillips, 2018). The primary learning theories that guide our teaching practice in the online classroom include cognitive and social constructivist learning theories, adult learning theory, transformative learning theory, collaborativist learning theory (previously known as Online Collaborative Theory) and narrative pedagogy, while not a theory is within the realm of constructivist learning theory.

To illustrate the application of theory to teaching practice, we will discuss two qualitative research studies that we have conducted. The first study examines the effectiveness of Harasim’s (2017) online collaborative learning theory as a framework for designing online collaborative work. This theory has three phases in which students move from divergent to convergent thinking. The second study examines how generational differences influence learning in the online classroom.

Collaborative Model for Online Nursing Education

As faculty teaching in an online nursing program positioned within a private, liberal arts institution that includes traditional, residential, and online campuses has presented challenges in gaining recognition as a rigorous, high-quality degree program. It has been critical to develop the program through the implementation of policies, professional development of faculty, and best practices for high quality teaching. An on-going commitment to quality assurance in online education and program evaluation has impacted our ability to improve outcomes for students. To support student success, we have implemented a holistic approach to academic progression developed by an interprofessional team including an outreach coordinator, admission counselors, academic advisors, and faculty mentors (Robinson, Mole, Hiller, Swenson, & Harrington, 2018). The success of our online program relies on effective collaboration within the institution, among faculty and staff in the nursing program, and with our community partners as we identify workforce learning needs. The emphasis on collaboration that strengthens our program is further
carried to an emphasis on effective collaboration among students and faculty within the online classroom, in keeping with constructivist learning theory.
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Summary

One popular framework used to guide the design and facilitation of fully online courses is the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2000). Although this framework is useful for designing interactive spaces of learning, it does not address broader, workplace skills necessary for 21st century life. Jenkins et al., (2006), have noted the importance of these 21st century skills such as appropriation, transmedia navigation, networking, and negotiation. Ito et al., (2013) also discusses a variety of 21st century skills, including: cognitive competencies (e.g., critical thinking, information literacy), intrapersonal competencies (e.g., adaptability, productivity), and interpersonal competencies (e.g., collaboration, leadership). Unfortunately, the CoI framework fails to provide tangible design principles which emphasize this broader scope of 21st century skill development.

For this reason, I have been developing a new conceptual design model for online courses that builds off of Jenkins (2006) concept of participatory cultures, using Siemens (2005) theory of connectivism as a guiding epistemological framework. The theory of connectivism argues that knowledge and learning is distributed, located across a diverse set of individuals, places, and mediating technologies. During this session, I hope to engage attendees in a discussion about why and how connectivism and participatory cultures can provide us with new ideas for designing and delivering fully online, asynchronous courses. Join me as we explore new ideas.
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Summary

Virtual Information Session Development for Indiana University’s Online MSW Program
The flexibility offered in online graduate programs are attractive to non-traditional students. However, with the rise of predatory, for-profit online institutions, prospective students have become rightfully cautious of fully online programs. Thoughtful recruitment practices are crucial in online programs since prospective students will use recruitment materials to determine if a program is legitimate. Even when an online program is associated with a well-known university, recruiting these students can be difficult when recruitment methods may focus on the campus experience. On-campus information sessions are standard for many graduate and professional programs, but are largely inaccessible to the non-traditional students that make up the bulk online programs. Recruitment of online graduate students through virtual information sessions allows programs to validate themselves and showcase components of the online learning environment to prospective students.

Recognizing this during the development of the Indiana University School of Social Work’s MSW Direct program’s virtual information session, technology best practices were developed. For example, through thoughtful video conferencing tool selection, barriers were removed for prospective students by selecting tools that are free and do not require software installation, a microphone, nor camera. In addition, using video conferencing tools similar to those that students use in the program provide the added benefit to prospective students of insight into how they may meet with future classmates, advisors, and professors. In addition to technology best practices, best practices were developed for scheduling for non-traditional prospective students, personnel selection, in-session communication, and branding.

About the Presenters

Julisa Ricart is a Graduate Research Assistant for the IU School of Social Work. She earned her BS from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and is a MS Data Science student at IU Bloomington.

Email: jricart@iu.edu

Lisa Hubbard, MSW, LSW is a Student Services Coordinator for the IU School of Social Work. She earned her MSW degree from Indiana University and completed her Professional Certificate in Online Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Email: lshubbar@iu.edu

Curtis Williamson, MSW, LCSW, LISW is an Academic Advisor for the IU School of Social Work. He earned his MSW from Indiana University and BSW from the University of Cincinnati.

Email: willcurt@iu.edu
Invisible Borders: Faculty Mindset in the Virtual Classroom

Kristi Yorks
Lead Faculty

Lindsey Anderson
Lead Faculty

Colorado Technical University

Summary

Dilemma: Can You Effectively Teach Writing Online?
For many students, an introductory composition course will be among the first classes that they take on their journey towards a college degree. These students are motivated, impassioned, dedicated – and they are also failing. During a meeting in which we were tasked with solving the pervasive mystery of high withdrawal rates, a colleague shared: “these classes should not be taught online. You simply cannot replicate the student/faculty relationship online.” Thus far, he has been right. Effective writing instruction depends on direct faculty and student interaction, on immediate feedback and drafting, and on building a sense of belonging that fosters critical thinking, analysis, and the ability to try, fail, and try once more. This can be deceptively easy in a traditional classroom. In a virtual classroom, however, this critical engagement can be more difficult to realize.

Faculty Mindset
As we continued to study the data-fields of our virtual classrooms, we discovered something profound – regardless of external intervention and curriculum, some faculty were consistently successful. What were those faculty doing differently? We expected to find a box to check, a strategy that could be easily replicated and even programmed into the classroom itself. We could not have been more wrong. The "difference maker" was mindset: how faculty saw and utilized the existing tools within the virtual classroom to facilitate connections with students. In comparing two instructors, with similar expertise, teaching the same curriculum, we experienced two classrooms that could not have been more different. One instructor saw the virtual classroom as an open space where they could move freely and where their instruction was personal, individualized, and ever-present. The other saw the classroom as a closed space with designated boundaries between them and their students. From this data, a new question emerged: Can we, as mentors, managers, and administrators, let go of our “checked boxes,” shift faculty mindset, and deconstruct these boundaries? Through a framework that focuses on presence, engagement, relevance, and innovation, we are transforming how faculty see and then utilize technology in virtual classroom to engage students, provide instruction, and build community and belonging.

Lessons and Insights Moving Forward
We must re-engage faculty within virtual education, not through curriculum or technology, but through a shift in mindset. If approaching the classroom as a closed and segmented space, the result is an atmosphere that feels automated and robotic. However, when approaching the classroom as an open space, faculty use the classroom seamlessly, bringing in their persona to create a sense of community and to help students make connections. Faculty must see the online classroom as an open space where they can empower, guide, and mentor their students. It is our responsibility to create this shift in mindset using the framework of presence, engagement, relevance, and innovation.
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Introduction

The fast expanding field of online learning is poised for further growth. 70% of administrators of higher education view online learning as a critical element of their long-term strategy (Allen & Seaman, 2014). The growth in online learning is accompanied by an increasing need for instructors to teach online. These instructors grew up in traditional learning environments and are now being asked to make a mental shift. Most faculty who are being asked to teach in the online environment lack relevant experience since online instruction is a new paradigm for them. As Prensky (2001) notes, “our Digital Immigrant instructors, who speak an outdated language (that of the pre-digital age), are struggling to teach a population that speaks an entirely new language” (p. 2). Faculty now need to master new technological skills, learn new pedagogical strategies, and work in an environment that does not provide the forms of interactions they are used to.

A study was conducted with various online instructors to understand how they perceived teaching online and what factors affected their sense of presence in the online environment. The research questions posed were:

1. What are instructor perceptions of online teaching?
2. What factors affect instructors’ experience of presence in the online environment?

The findings from this study showed that the more experienced and satisfied online instructors had changed their perceptions of the teaching environment. Their perceptions of the online teaching and learning environment mirrored the virtual interactions of the 21st century.

This paper will provide a literature overview of the dramatic elements of teaching, followed by the methodology implemented in the study. Findings from the study will be presented leading to a discussion of the findings and implications for practice.

Literature Review

Teaching has been compared to a dramatic performance where the teacher occupies the role of stage actor and interacts with the audience, in this case, the students. In 1968, Eliot Eisner wrote:

Teachers, like actors, attempt to communicate to groups of people in an audience-like situation, and while the ends of comedy and instruction differ markedly, both the actor and the teacher employ qualities to enhance communication; both must come through to the people with whom they work. (p. 362)

Researchers like Barbuto (2006), Griggs (2001), and Harris (1977) have also suggested incorporating acting techniques as successful strategies for teachers to utilize in their classrooms. The metaphor of teacher as actor has appeared in research on online teaching as well. A faculty participant in Conceição’s (2006) study explicitly compared the experience of teaching online to “performing on stage or filming in front of a camera” (p. 40). In addition, Sims (2014) employed the metaphor of an “educational performance” (p. 106) when referring to the online learning environment.
A comprehensive metaphor of teaching as performance was presented by MacFarlane (2007). According to MacFarlane (2007), teaching cannot be viewed as a narrow activity that occurs within the confines of the classroom. Rather, teaching extends beyond the physical classroom. MacFarlane (2007) applied a dramaturgical lens to teaching and framed the act of teaching as a performance enacted by the teacher for the student audience. He asserted that there were three phases to teaching: a pre-performance (off stage), followed by the performance (on stage), and finally, the post-performance (off stage). Pre-performance activities included program design, lesson planning, developing teaching materials, etc. On stage, the teacher engaged in face-to-face interactions with students through lectures, experiments, workshops, etc. Lastly, the post-performance moved off stage and included student advising, assessment and feedback, to name a few.

**Methodology**

In order to examine the individual and subjective experiences of faculty, this qualitative research study adopted the Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) approach within the conceptual frameworks of dramaturgy and the determinants of presence (Lehman & Conceição, 2010).

**Context**

This study was conducted at an urban, public, mid-western four-year institution of higher education offering online and blended learning programs for more than a decade. Purposive sampling was employed to ensure selection of participants (Table 1) across the four discipline quadrants: pure-soft, pure-hard, applied-soft, and applied-hard disciplines (Biglan, 1973) and across novice (had taught less than 2 fully online courses) and experienced faculty (had taught 3 or more fully online courses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experienced faculty</th>
<th>Novice faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pure/Hard</td>
<td>2 participants</td>
<td>3 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied/Hard</td>
<td>4 participants</td>
<td>3 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure/Soft</td>
<td>3 participants</td>
<td>4 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied/Soft</td>
<td>4 participants</td>
<td>2 participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data for the study were collected from three sources:
1. Interviews - One 60 - 90 minute semi-structured interview with the participant;
2. Documentary evidence – Two course syllabi from two different course offerings for each participant;
3. Online course site observations – The online course sites of 5 participants were observed over the duration of an academic semester (16 weeks).

**Conceptual Framework**

**Dramaturgy.** Dramaturgy as a sociological theory was proposed by Erving Goffman in *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959). The dramaturgical lens views all human interactions as stage performances where everyone is an actor, enacting a performance and presenting themselves in a particular way. Dramaturgy recognizes that people assume different personae, attitudes, behaviors, and manners based on the situations they are participating in. The concepts of “front” and “back regions” (Goffman, 1959, p. 66) guide the performance and are manipulated to manage the impression created.

**Determinants of Presence.** Lehman and Conceição (2010) identify six determinants that affect the sense of presence in an online course: content, format, strategies, instructor role, technology, and support. While they used a learner-centered focus, the determinants were applied to a faculty-centered approach in this study.
Dramaturgy and the determinants of presence were used as the conceptual framework for data analysis in this study.

Findings

In this study, some of the faculty participants revealed a new vision of online learning. They identified the online learning environment as being separate and different from traditional teaching environments. Acknowledging this shift was important to the faculty participants’ experience of presence. As an experienced online instructor, P1 stated, “I think it [online instruction] does take a switch or cognitive reframing to do well online.” Some participants were able to see online instruction as different from face-to-face teaching. Not only did they acknowledge the differences between face-to-face and online instruction, they also realized that online instruction could not be compared to face-to-face teaching. Others, like P6, recognized that online instruction was different and required a change in mindset and for the instructor to “redefine how [they] think about engagement.” P2 commented, “I don’t try to re-create what’s in the [traditional] classroom. I try to do something entirely different.”

Another strategy to create presence was through one-to-one relationships with students. Sixteen (64%) of the faculty participants talked about interacting with individual students through emails or discussion postings. These one-to-one (1-1) exchanges created a greater sense of presence for the faculty. The faculty participants were relating to individual students or small groups of students. They did not see themselves as being present with the whole class. It was only in individual contexts that they spoke about presence. Some of the faculty participants were conscious of this. As P22 put it, “As a whole class, I feel connected to them but in a much more macro sense. I’ll have a relationship with each student in the class but collectively, I have a much more macro or removed presence from them.” P11 described it as “You feel engaged with some students and not so much other students, I guess. For the students who do show up to class and everything, you have a greater sense of group presence. . . . So I guess, in some cases, it might not feel like I have an entire group, class, but there’s smaller groups, smaller clumps.” P25 also felt he engaged with students “individually, yes. Not as a group.”

These participants succinctly conveyed the 1-1 relationships that existed online. The participants talked about individual students and individual relationships and highlighted the need to think of online teaching differently.

Discussion

The findings from the study revealed a new conception of online teaching – a new model for online teaching (Samuel, 2016). Using the dramaturgical lens, the findings presented a unique performance of online teaching (Figure 1).

![Figure 1. A new model of online teaching](image-url)
A. Front: The front comprises of the stage and the faculty performer. This space can be shared with co-instructors and teaching assistants who then assume the role of supporting actors. Their function is to assist the faculty to ensure a successful performance.

B. Props: On the stage, faculty are surrounded by technological props that enhance their performance such as Skype, instant messaging services, as well as video and audio recording. The purpose of these technologies is to enhance the performance of the faculty actor.

C. Content: Every online course is governed by specific content that provides the frame for the particular performance.

D. Back: Backstage is occupied by support services (training, technological support, or support from peers, mentors, and other sources such as workshops and conferences) and administrative activities (course design and set up, grading assessments and providing feedback) This support occurs backstage, behind curtains, invisible to the student audience.

E. Online environment: In the online learning environment, the front (stage) is abstracted from the audience by time and distance. The grey layer between the front and the audience represents the separation of faculty and students.

F. Individual interactions: Interactions in the online learning environment are primarily 1-1. Some students interact with the instructor more than others. In such cases, there is a two-way interaction between faculty and student as indicated by the double-sided arrows. These interactions give faculty the sense that they know these students well and hence the students are represented as larger and more defined.

G. Group interactions: In some courses, faculty interact with small groups and get a sense of their students within this context. The success of this relationship is also dependent on two-way communication.

H. Non-responsive students: In an online course, there is communication from the faculty as denoted by the arrow. However, some students do not respond or participate in the course. The interaction becomes one-sided from the faculty with no reciprocation from the students. These students become faint and distant to the faculty.

Model for the 21st century
The 21st century is characterized relationships and interactions that occur online through social media platforms such as Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Snapchat, Instagram, and WhatsApp among others. On these platforms, content is posted by the content generator. Viewers choose to interact with the content generator through likes and comments. These interactions become vibrant when the content generator responds to the comments and a dialogue is created. Rapport in these environments is created through “frequent personal interactions” (Rotman & Preece, 2010, p. 326). These interactions exemplify the concept of many 1-1 relationships. The 1-many model of publishing information is fast fading as seen by the move of media organizations and corporations from traditional newspapers and TV broadcasts to social media platforms.

This shift is also observed in online teaching. There is no longer one instructor teaching a collective of many students (1-many relationship). Rather, there are a number of 1-1 relationships between instructor and learners which create closer connections and experiences of presence and satisfaction for learners and instructors.

Implications for Practice
This paradigm shift from a 1-many relationship to many 1-1 relationships is not mentioned in the literature of online education. And yet, it is a vital part of understanding how the online environment works. Faculty participants expressed dissatisfaction with teaching online when they were unable to recreate the 1-many relationship of a traditional classroom. Introducing faculty to the new model of online
teaching (Samuel, 2016) will help set up realistic expectations and potentially reduce experiences of dissatisfaction.

The pictorial representation of the online learning environment (Figure 1) encapsulates all aspects of the teaching performance and clearly depicts the nuances of the performance such as audience response. Furthermore, it enables readers to immediately visualize the online learning environment as different from traditional face-to-face learning environments. It is an effective tool to facilitate a cognitive reframing of the online learning environment.
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The Power of Choice in Online Classroom Teaching
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Summary

In today’s modern society, we are constantly provided with choices to make. Every day we have an ever increasing amount of options for the foods we eat, the clothes we wear, and even the people we choose to interact with on a daily basis. Life is full of choices and these choices can give us a sense of empowerment and control. Yet, when it comes to online teaching and learning, there often are fewer options for both faculty members and students regarding the decisions on what should be taught and how it should be assessed. This lack of choice can lower the motivation to teach and learn in this environment.

The Power of Choice

Online Teacher Self-Efficacy and Choice

In 2017, a study using Bandura’s (1997) theory of self-efficacy as a theoretical framework, was published that examined teacher self-efficacy among online college faculty (Vilkas, 2017). The study, limited to faculty at one university, had results that indicated higher than average levels of teacher self-efficacy among the participants. Overall, these faculty members felt that they were able to successfully teach their students in the online environment. However, when examining the participants’ answers to questions closely and reading through the comments provided, there was a trend that emerged. The trend was that the issue of control over the curriculum was important to the participants. Those faculty members that felt that they had permission to make changes to their courses or could add their own expertise to the course that they were teaching, were more likely to have higher scores on particular questions. Furthermore, there were participants that indicated that they felt constrained at times to make curriculum and instructional decisions and this made them see their role in the online classroom as that of a facilitator and not a teacher.

A recommendation from this study was for college and universities to ensure clear communication on what changes are allowed to the curriculum in an online course. In addition, the idea for allowing faculty members to have an assessment bank available of options to choose from was suggested. That recommendation was not researched and was simply provided as a possible compromise for any university that wanted to maintain a certain level of uniformity among multiple faculty teaching the same course, while still giving individual faculty members more control and academic freedom.

Thus, the original idea was for curriculum departments to have three or four assessment options for each learning objective in the course. Then, the individual faculty member would be able to choose one of the options when setting up the course and this would provide a sense of ownership and control to the faculty member. However, in this scenario, the students would still not have any additional control or sense of buy-in to the tasks.

Providing Assessment Choices to Online Students

Therefore, a new idea emerged. Instead of the faculty member choosing from a bank of assessment options when creating the course to simply allow all of the options be given to the students and let them make their own choice. To test whether or not students liked having options and choices in their online classroom, a basic research study was conducted during the summer of 2019.
Research

The study was conducted at a traditional college located in America’s Midwest region. The public institution has less than 5,000 students and most complete the majority of their courses in person on campus. Online courses are optional and taken mainly by students as a way to lighten their course load during the traditional school year or to speed up their graduation date. Thus, at this particular institution, the majority of online students are choosing to take this course in this modality and not forced to do so.

In addition, at this particular institution, it is important to note that there is limited oversight regarding online course design. Faculty are given the freedom to make any and all course modifications, curriculum changes, and assessment decisions. The main principle that faculty are to follow is that the established course goals and outcomes are to remain in place but specific decisions about how to assess students on mastery of those goals is up to the discretion of the faculty member. Because of the limited oversight in online course design, there would be no need to give an assignment bank to faculty members to choose from but there could be value in giving options to students.

For this study, the researcher was also the instructor for the course, along with two other courses at the same time. The experimental course was eight weeks in length and was the course that the instructor provided choices to the students for all assessments. In addition, the researcher opted to not have a discussion forum for this course but instead used a “Response to Reading” task to serve the purpose of ensuring that students were completing the assigned reading. Options for how students would demonstrate their learning of the reading was given as well on this particular task. There were eight assessments in the course and a minimum of three options for students to choose from each week. As well, students could choose to work individually on the task or with partner or in a group of up to 4 students. Student e-mail addresses were provided for students to collaborate if desired and an optional discussion forum space created as well. The topic for the course was educational curriculum and assessment practices. The instructor had taught the course twice in the traditional classroom environment but this was the first iteration of it in the online classroom environment. There were 14 students in the course.

At the end of the course, the students were given an optional survey to complete. 9 out of 14 students (64.28%) completed the survey. In addition, students completed the college’s standard end of course survey.

Results

Based on the survey answers, along with overall student grades during the course, the use of choices appeared to be quite promising. All participants in the survey felt that they were more motivated by having options and enjoyed their overall learning experience by being able to choose how they wanted to complete their tasks and if they wanted to work with others or alone. Interestingly, in the online classroom, only 4 students- 2 sets of partner groups- ever worked with others. Most choose to work alone. When this course was taught in the traditional classroom environment and students were given the same options, roughly 2/3 of the class of 30 chose to work in small groups, usually of four students.

Comparing the grades and overall quality of work showed no differences based on choice, but the number of students asking for extensions was significantly lower in the online course.

However, since comparing the online course to the traditional course is two different modalities, the use of choices may not be the important variable. In addition, what tended to cause the most delays in task completion in the students in the traditional classroom environment was when one or two students did not
contribute fully to their group task. Since most students in the online course chose to work alone, this could have helped decrease the issue of late submissions.

When comparing the experimental online course to the two control online courses, more differences emerged. Primarily, the students in the traditional classrooms were required to complete weekly discussion forum questions and participate with each other. This requirement was met by most students but minimally with students often choosing to respond to each other with basic feedback and compliments and not to follow up questions by the instructor. Overall, the “Response to Reading” task had more quality responses and was perceived as more educationally beneficial by the instructor.

Another interesting phenomenon that emerged was that there was an option for students to request the traditional test if desired. A few students would request this test, usually when they indicated that they felt pressed for time. However, since the tests were not multiple choice but were instead short answer essay questions, students sometimes indicated that this was harder than the option they were going to choose. At one point, a student requested the test, was given it, and then asked if she could complete one of the previous options instead. It was granted and she ended up doing well on that task and felt grateful for being able to not complete the test which covered all the same concepts she had in her presentation.

Recommendations

A suggestion for improving the use of options in the online classroom would be to provide a video explaining the rationale behind the options and also ensuring that there is no difference in grading of the different options. Students sometimes indicated a belief that certain options should be given “more credit” as they were perceived by the students as being harder than other options. This leads to a final issue of perceived fairness. There were students that felt that they made the wrong choice at times as they worked a longer amount of time on their task than a classmate but yet received similar grades based on the scoring rubric. Thus, a misperceived view on the nature of grades created some tension in using these options.

In conclusion, the use of options and choices for students seems to be a promising practice in the online classroom community. However, giving parameters and ensuring that all choices are aligned with the course objectives is key for success and in helping students to see that all choices are fair choices for demonstrating learning.
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Top 10 Evidence-based Online Teaching Strategies

Dr. Scott E. Hamm
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Hardin-Simmons University

Summary

As higher education continues to incorporate technology in the learning environment, evidence-based pedagogy assists faculty members and instructional designers to maximize their teaching to achieve learning outcomes, engage students, and continually improve their pedagogy. This session will introduce the participants to the concepts of evidence-based pedagogy, learning outcome alignment with teaching strategy and connecting good pedagogy to theory. This practical approach provides participants with a lot of ideas as well as the foundation for applying them in the most effective manner in an online course. Learners will use the community of inquiry+1 framework reduces cognitive load by giving them a common-sense framework for the top 10 teaching strategies. I introduce the framework, then have them then work in pairs to identify teaching strategies which allows me to check a priori knowledge and validate the experience and skill of the group. I then demonstrate the strategies by starting with the learning outcome and brainstorm teaching strategies to accomplish the outcome. This allows the top 10 strategies to have multiple approaches and the participants leave feeling they got more than thought they would get from the session.
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Conducting Literature Reviews to Guide Research and Practice
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Summary

While most people know that literature reviews are required for research papers, fewer are aware of additional ways literature reviews can guide practice in higher education. The presentation will have three primary purposes:

- **To discuss various uses and roles that literature reviews can play in higher education.**
  - Literature reviews can be used to provide a foundation for original research. It is important for researchers to understand what research has previously been done so that they can appropriately fill gaps in understanding and avoid “recreating the wheel.”
  - Administrators and other leaders can use literature reviews to guide decision making. Literature reviews have the potential to point administrators toward data driven and evidence-based decisions that can help their teams and organizations.
  - Employees such as instructional designers can use literature reviews to facilitate persuasion. Stakeholders may be more likely to agree to a policy or practice if a literature review can demonstrate efficacy.
  - Since literature reviews can provide information about what others in the field are doing, as well as frame existing work in a new light, literature reviews can be used to enhance inspiration.

- **To provide practical tips and tools for those conducting literature reviews in higher education.**
  - Tips for starting literature reviews include outlining goals, identifying parameters, and using tools such as google scholar.
  - Process tips include ways to save and organize literature, as well as discussion of delegating and collaborating on projects.
  - Tips for finishing literature reviews include discussing presentation and dissemination.

- **To encourage creative thinking surrounding literature review processes and dissemination.**
  - Throughout the presentation, examples will illustrate the broad potential of literature reviews to shape higher education. This discussion will allow attendees to brainstorm ways in which literature reviews could be conducted and disseminated in their respective positions and subfields.
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Enhancing Learning and Engagement through Experiential e-Learning
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Summary

Experiential e-Learning with Kolb Experiential Learning Theory (KELT)
A significant criticism of the online learning platform is its lack of connections to active learning opportunities; thus, leaving students feeling disengaged and isolated (Willging & Johnson, 2009). Problematically, lack of engagement is a key contributor to course attrition (Boton & Gregory, 2015; Willging & Johnson, 2009).

Experiential learning (EL) is also known as active learning or “learning by doing” (McCarthy, 2010, p. 131). EL is a philosophy that informs many methodologies in which educators purposefully engage with learners in direct experience and focused reflection to increase knowledge, develop skills, clarify values, and develop people's capacity to contribute to their communities (Association for Experiential Education, 2019). EL is widely believed to be an effective mode of learning as students take an active role in their education (Benek-Rivera & Mathews, 2004).

In this session, the presenter will showcase experiential learning resources that can be embedded in 100% asynchronously delivered, humanities-style courses to enhance student learning outcomes and increase student engagement. Exemplars will come from courses that have been framed with Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory (KELT) and that represent student activities at each of the four-stage cycle of Kolb's Learning Model: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. After attending this session, attendees will understand the significance of experiential learning, and they will be able to design and embed elements of experiential learning in humanities-style, online courses in higher education. Further, attendees will be able to incorporate a variety of active and engaging learning techniques into their online courses to enhance student engagement and increase student learning outcomes.

References


**About the Presenter**

**Monica Belus** is a doctoral candidate pursuing her Ed.D. in Curriculum Design and Leadership at Northeastern University. Her dissertation follows the interpretative phenomenological design and is focused to understand undergraduate students’ experiences who have completed an online course, Food in America, framed with Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory. Further, Mrs. Belus is an instructor in the Interdisciplinary Department at The University of NC at Charlotte.

Email: mfbelus@uncc.edu
No proceedings paper was provided for this session.
Analyzing Duolingo Users’ Discussion of Digital Badges: A Case Study

Helen Y. Chen
Instructional Designer, Division of Continuing Studies
University of Wisconsin–Madison

Summary

This session explores how Duolingo users discuss their interaction with the app’s gamified elements, specifically the implementation of digital badges. The study aims to contribute to current understandings on the affordances of using digital badges in non-formal, autonomous, online language learning environments. User discussion posts are collected through an asynchronous message board, /r/duolingo, an online community of Duolingo users discussing general topics about the app. Data analysis focused on gaining insights into the relationship between user motivation and the daily streak, a counter that keeps track of consecutive days a user practices Duolingo lessons. Another area of interest for this study is /r/duolingo users’ discussion around the skill tree, a graphical organization of language skills represented in an order of progression or learning path. While the gamified elements in Duolingo were designed to afford users with enhanced learning experiences, the data revealed unintended consequences by the daily streak on learner motivation. The study also exposed an inherent disconnect between Duolingo lessons and language fluency. These findings suggest that the digital badges’ impact on learner motivation might be more complicated depending on its design and implementation. Moreover, results from this study also reinforce the importance of connecting task designs with achievements.
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Why SME? Communicating the Benefits of Serving as a Subject Matter Expert

Becky Costello
Manager, Course Improvement and Quality Enhancement
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Summary

Attracting quality subject matter experts (SMEs) for curriculum and course design can be very challenging. Successful, passionate practitioners have many options for professional development and service. Why SME? Stakeholders in the curriculum and course design processes may benefit from crafting simple talking points for communicating to prospective SMEs the benefits of serving as a subject matter expert.

Subject matter experts possess knowledge that makes them valuable in their fields and to their organizations. Whether or not they have the official title of subject matter expert, their peers may see them as a “go-to.” Appeal to their sense of authority and recognize the importance of their high level of expertise in the development process.

Serving as a subject matter expert can increase the SME’s exposure to peers and other industry professionals. This can empower the SME to learn even more from other stakeholders in the curriculum and course design processes (e.g., other SMEs, department leadership, instructional designers) about topics like instructional design, assessment, and a variety of other critical concepts in higher education. Leverage their desire to grow and develop in their role.

Lastly, subject matter experts also benefit from the competitive edge that comes from demonstrating not only their knowledge, but their ability to share that knowledge with a wider audience. SME work can enhance a CV, especially for those who have been in the same position for many years. Highlight this significant advantage when recruiting potential subject matter experts.
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Summary

Implementing an Adaptive Courseware Platform in a Fully Online Curriculum

The Rothenberger Institute (RI) in the School of Public Health at the University of Minnesota licenses their curriculum to campuses across the country, including four high enrollment online wellness courses delivered to their undergraduate students. After a lengthy RFP process, RI contracted with CogBooks, a cloud-based course authoring platform, to house and deliver the content of these courses. RI began transitioning content for two of their courses in August of 2017 for pilot delivery in Spring of 2018. CogBooks licenses their cloud-based course authoring platform to educators, allowing them to develop and deliver online course learning modules in a flexible, media-rich online textbook, with seamless integration of videos, interactions, just-in-time assessments, discussion boards, and other communication tools for students. In addition, this platform includes personalized learning pathways and robust learner analytics, which hold the promise of maximizing student learning outcomes through early, ongoing, and targeted student interventions and evidence-informed opportunities for course design improvements. Contracts to this platform provides academic teams the opportunity to build out their course content collaboratively with CogBooks instructional designers, which students then access securely through an LTI integration within Learning Management Systems. While these types of innovative platforms market well, has the time and investment been worth it? What have we learned along the way? Is a tool like this really transforming learning outcomes for students or is it just creating more work for the sake of flashier technology? Is the amount of learner analytics useful? With a spring 2018 launch of two courses and two more courses being migrated and delivered this spring and summer, the presenter will discuss some preliminary findings from their pilots and initial thoughts on their experiences transitioning courses into this tool.
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Summary

The video team at The Institute for Software Research has been creating content for distance learning since 1999, growing from a one-person operation to a team of six. In that time the need to Webcast courses and lectures has grown to the point where it is the primary source of delivery for many of the departments we work with. In this ePoster, I will share the team’s experience with Webcasting using Panopto, and give a demonstration of various scenarios where it is used. In addition, this session will share our experience with ordering equipment for varying budgets and best practices to make the Webcasts successful. The team as currently constructed handles Webcasting, course capture, photography, social media and promotional videos. My goal is to share our experience.
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Let’s Screencast! Create Easy-to-Make Videos to Enhance Learning!
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Summary

Students are demanding more visual content in their courses, which should include instructor-created learning videos. Creating these videos can be easy and simple! By utilizing an inexpensive tool called Screencast-o-matic, faculty members can quickly and effectively create instructional content for their students. Videos have built-in closed captioning that can be edited and are easy to embed in various learning management systems.
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Summary

Michael Moore (1997) suggests that the “interactive nature of the medium” has an impact on student-to-instructor dialogue and therefore, the potential to mitigate the sense of isolation often experienced by the distance learner. Transactional Distance Theory posits that the autonomous learner requires less dialog or interaction to be successful in the distance learning environment. Inversely, it is important to recognize that students lacking in autonomy may benefit from learning environments that provide substantive interpersonal interaction. The most flexible online learning formats are those that permit learners to move at their own pace within the asynchronous online course. However, it has been shown that students’ perception of instructor immediacy may be enhanced through the incorporation of synchronous activities into the asynchronous online course (Baker, 2010). This session will engage participants in exploring ways of improving student engagement and instructor immediacy by integrating higher levels of structure and interactivity into the asynchronous online course using synchronous technologies and just-in-time communication techniques.
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Experiential Learning in Online Courses
Henny Breen, PhD, RN, COI
Associate Professor of Nursing
Linfield-Good Samaritan School of Nursing

Summary
Kolb’s (2015) theory of experiential learning helps explain how experience is transformed into learning through a holistic perspective that combines experience, perception, cognition, and behavior. From this theory he developed a model in which the student strives to understand new information through concrete experience (CE) or abstract conceptualization (AC) and at the same time is transformed through reflective observation (RO) or active experimentation (AE).

Inter Professional Communication
Students are required to interview two different members from another professional or paraprofessional group, one assigned, and the other of their choice. They are to ask experiential questions related to communication with Registered Nurses, including both positive and negative experiences as well as what they would like nurses to know about their role. After reflecting on the interview, they write a brief summary and briefly share their finding with the class in the discussion board and from there develop recommendations for best practice inter professional communication. This has been a very popular assignment as students discovered things, they never knew about other members of the healthcare team, it strengthened relationships and often changed how they communicated.

Virtual Community
The Neighborhood, a virtual community features the unfolding stories of several characters representing community and nurse members. The stories are enhanced with pictures, video clips, medical records, and newspaper clippings (Giddens, 2010). Students are required to become familiar with several members of the community in the weeks preceding an announcement in the course management system that an earthquake had struck The Neighborhood. Videos and articles about earthquakes were added to the module. Students are asked to place themselves as Community Health Nurses in The Neighborhood in order to explore their role as if they were there.

Service Learning
Students are required to complete 50 hours of service learning during their capstone course. It is an experiential approach that requires students to meet the needs of the community while addressing academic requirements (Trail Ross, 2012). Further, it requires time to reflect on the complexity involved in the service issue, the context in which the experience takes place, the social meaning of the population served and the link to program concepts (Gillis & MacLellan, 2010). The students choose their own service-learning experience. The only requirement is that they are to work with a vulnerable population which is broadly defined. This provides them the opportunity to bridge the gap between theory and practice in a way that works for them. In researching the impact of service learning, we found that students demonstrated a higher-level thinking by linking concepts learned earlier in the curriculum by ongoing reflection on their experience and they reported applying this new learning to their nursing practice (Breen & Robinson, 2016).
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**Lightboards for Online Instructor Presence**

Stacey DeLoose  
Instructional Technologist  
Northern Michigan University

**Summary**

Online courses are often very text based. Students perceive this as either having no instructor – they are in the class on their own, or a very uninvolved instructor. Using video can alleviate this problem. Specifically, using a lightboard can create a sense of virtual eye contact. Lightboard videos include content as well as the instructor teaching. This leads to a more conversational and engaging mini-lecture. The lightboard is a 4x6 foot piece of glass that is internally lit and recorded through while the instructor writes on the glass. Using this technology, instructors can record engaging mini-lectures for asynchronous presentation. Since the instructor is facing the camera at all times they maintain virtual eye contact with students. The students see the instructor and the instructor “sees” the students. The instructor can emphasize details of their board work with hand gestures and their personality.
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Becoming Student-Ready for Today's Diverse Distance Learners

Andrew Geant CEO
Wyzant

Summary

This session focuses on how institutions and educators can address the needs of distance learners, many of whom are considered “post-traditional.”

Today's distance learners come from a wide range of backgrounds, including many post-traditional students struggling with readiness gaps. This session will cover three strategies that innovative distance education programs, like WGU, are using to help students succeed.
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Using Blogs and Social Media to Create “Significant Learning”

Melissa Robinson, PhD, RN
Professor of Nursing
Linfield College School of Nursing

Summary

Teaching online requires that faculty design courses that enhance student learning through course interaction. “Significant learning” reveals a wider aim of what students are learning (Marken & Morrison, 2013) and how they might learn in ways that they take informed actions in the real world (Fink, 2013). “Significant learning” involves diverse perspectives and ways of thinking, and preparing students to become responsible citizens in a democratic society, convincing them that “they can make a difference” through political, social, and community action (Kovalik & McGeehan, 1999, p. 372). It is essential for nursing students to be prepared with knowledge of diversity, social justice, and problem-solving skills in order to serve critical health and social issues in the community.

Social Constructivism

In a population health nursing course, two learning activities have been designed to inform RN to BSN students on current public health issues. The online classroom is particularly effective for required participation activities that involve sharing diverse perspectives and real-life examples from experiences in the community. A public health blog and social media activity draw on the theory of social constructivism that emphasizes active learning, social interactions, and a personal critical thinking process (Powell & Kalina, 2009). Both activities have been used effectively to engage online students in active learning and critical dialogue about complex public health issues impacted by social, economic, environmental, and political factors. While informing RN to BSN students’ professional practice in nursing related to advocacy and a greater awareness of public policy, students have also reported developing a passion for engaging on issues impacting vulnerable members of the community.

Public Health Blog

A public health blog was created in the learning management system. For each blog topic, students are assigned a set of materials to study including a media presentation (i.e. you tube video, ted talk, or podcast), a web resource with reliable public health data to illustrate the prevalence of the problem, and a resource that depicts the social and health consequences in the community (local, national, or global). Students are required to participate in a discussion by sharing their personal perspectives, experiences, and concerns for the health of the public. Since not everyone will have the same point of view or beliefs, they are required to communicate in a respectful and meaningful manner. Grading is conducted using a rubric and is based on meaningful participation. Topics have included human trafficking, gun violence, opioid epidemic, immigrant and refugee health issues, vaccinations, and more.

Social Media Activity

A social media activity (twitter) activity was created to engage students in the digital community to understand how nurses are impacting public health in the community. Students are required to actively participate in ways that increase their knowledge of how health organizations are using social media to promote health, how social media influences decision-making about individual and family health, and how civic engagement influences health policy. Students are required to use their knowledge and experience to contribute to conversations on issues that inspire their passion and interests as well as demonstrate their expertise as health professionals in the community. Grading is conducted using a rubric and is based on meaningful engagement.
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An Online Honors College: A High-Impact Initiative

Eric Klein, Ph.D.
Dean, Honors College
Ashford University

Summary

Focus of the Session
This session will focus on an innovative differentiator for student learning and achievement. Specifically, I will discuss how an online Honors College can offer enriched interdisciplinary courses and special co-curricular opportunities for students.

Relevance to the Field of Distance Teaching and Learning
The mission of the Honors College is to engage a community of exceptional students in educational opportunities that promote leadership, innovation, global perspective, and civic responsibility in the online modality. During this session, the Dean of the Honors College will share lessons learned regarding the development, implementation, and launch of the Honors College. Extra emphasis will be placed on the College’s commitment to intentionally provide quality experiences in the curriculum and co-curriculum that best meet student needs.

Session Description
Ashford University’s mission is proudly centered on student learning and success, academic reputation, and organizational integrity and effectiveness. The development of a new online Honors College represents a collaboration between students, faculty, and staff. Moreover, the mission of the Honors College is to engage a community of exceptional students in educational opportunities that promote leadership, innovation, global perspective, and civic responsibility. In addition, the Honors College is designed to provide enriched interdisciplinary courses and special co-curricular opportunities specifically intended for academically prepared and motivated students. It also provides a unique online community of place and purpose, where students are provided an opportunity to meaningfully engage in the life of the institution and their local communities. During this session, the Dean of the Honors College will share lessons learned regarding the development, implementation, and launch of the Honors College. Extra emphasis will be placed on the College’s commitment to intentionally provide quality experiences in the curriculum and co-curriculum that best meet student needs.

Key Takeaways
1. Identify the benefits of providing special curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities for high-achieving students in the online modality.
2. Apply practical methods and techniques for fostering well-rounded and well-educated global leaders as a distance educator or administrator.

Session Format
During the session, I will structure the presentation to foster an interactive, engaging, and open discussion. I will share how our Honors College offers enriched interdisciplinary courses and special co-curricular opportunities designed for academically prepared and motivated students in the online modality. In addition, I will discuss how it recognizes and elevates underrepresented high-achieving students.
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Recruiting Online Graduate Students through Virtual Information Sessions

Julisa Ricart
Graduate Research Assistant

Lisa Hubbard, MSW, LSW
Student Services Coordinator

Indiana University

Summary

Virtual Information Session Development for Indiana University’s Online MSW Program

The flexibility offered in online graduate programs are attractive to non-traditional students. However, with the rise of predatory, for-profit online institutions, prospective students have become rightfully cautious of fully online programs. Thoughtful recruitment practices are crucial in online programs since prospective students will use recruitment materials to determine if a program is legitimate. Even when an online program is associated with a well-known university, recruiting these students can be difficult when recruitment methods may focus on the campus experience. On-campus information sessions are standard for many graduate and professional programs, but are largely inaccessible to the non-traditional students that make up the bulk online programs. Recruitment of online graduate students through virtual information sessions allows programs to validate themselves and showcase components of the online learning environment to prospective students.

Recognizing this during the development of the Indiana University School of Social Work’s MSW Direct program’s virtual information session, technology best practices were developed. For example, through thoughtful video conferencing tool selection, barriers were removed for prospective students by selecting tools that are free and do not require software installation, a microphone, nor camera. In addition, using video conferencing tools similar to those that students use in the program provide the added benefit to prospective students of insight into how they may meet with future classmates, advisors, and professors. In addition to technology best practices, best practices were developed for scheduling for non-traditional prospective students, personnel selection, in-session communication, and branding.
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Use of a Modified RAFT Technique to Enhance Online Education

Julie Slade, DNP, RN
Assistant Professor of Nursing | RN-BSN Program Coordinator
Chatham University

Summary

Background

Many publications have been written focusing on the challenges of engaging students in online learning (Darby & Lang, 2019; Gillett-Swan, 2017). Online classes often utilize the pattern of assigning chapters or articles to read or videos to watch, followed by mandatory participation in a discussion forum consisting of a main post and response posts on several days of the class week. Students can find this work disengaging, which can result in poorer outcomes or dissatisfaction for the student.

Methodology

The RAFT technique was invented by Nancy Vandervanter, a junior high English teacher, as a way to help students understand their role as a writer, the audience they are writing to, the format to be followed, and the expected content (Vandervanter, 1979; Santa et al., 1988). By expanding on the original premise, the RAFT technique can be utilized in higher education to help students in any discipline engage with classroom materials in different ways, allowing them to incorporate creativity or focus on a particular area of interest, resulting in increased engagement. Using the RAFT technique in online education presents other risks, such as students assumed authority on all areas of a topic. Thoughtful creation of the RAFT assignment by the instructor, accompanied by clear directions, can mitigate those risks.

Outcomes

Inserting RAFT activities in place of a weekly discussion forum activity in an online, accelerated, undergraduate nursing program has found success and challenges. The instructor has learned that students require forewarning that their typical pattern of work will be disrupted, very clear instructions, and a well-planned activity in order to appropriately display learning that the instructor can assess. Once students understand RAFT activities, they further engage in the activities and express satisfaction in being able to complete a different type of learning.
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Creative Exercise Physiology Course & Allied Health Collaboration

Dr. Kim LeBard-Rankila  
Assistant Professor  
University of Wisconsin–Superior

Summary

The main focus of this presentation is to share how new doors have been opened up, allowing students to complete an Exercise Science degree fully on-line. UW-Superior has a well-structured and respected Exercise Science program with an exercise physiology lab that contains equipment to mirror the real world of allied health professionals. The aim when designing the on-line exercise physiology lab course(s) was to mirror the applied aspects of the course(s) as closely as possible allowing students the opportunity to practice hands-on application techniques. The design of the course is creative but also requires a solid commitment from the instructors to support the student centered learning environment. Bridging the gap between DL and the historic “campus only” lab course is a growing area of need and want.

The presentation will share the creative blending of engaged teaching, current technology, lab kits, and community mentors all of which have allowed our courses to succeed and prepare our students for future careers in allied health fields or graduate schools. The blending of knowledge with hands on application skills has allowed our students to build professional contacts while practicing skills that they will need to succeed in the real world. Currently there are only three fully on-line exercise science programs nationally. UW-Superior is proud to be one of them.
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Strategies and Methods for Change in Educational Technology

Mitchell Kuster
Digital Learning Environment Conversion Specialist
University of Wisconsin–Platteville

Summary

This ePoster session will discuss how communication played a large role in a major IT change at UW-Platteville. Due to a system-wide change, our technology team needed to familiarize students and faculty with new technology and our new Learning Management System (LMS). This impacted how hundreds of online students and instructors would access and interact with our courses. A tight timeline with various deadlines also influenced how we explained and rolled out this initiative. Even if you haven’t worked with an LMS, this may sound familiar to you. Addressing terminology and navigation issues are a common problem with any IT change process, as is working on deadlines. This ePoster session will break down some of the best practices that we learned during our transition and then guide the group in considering how they might take the lessons that we learned and apply them to their own situations.
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Students’ Perceptions of Course Design Quality

Trena Houp
Associate Director, Office of Distributed Learning

Lydia Frass
Senior Instructional Designer, Center for Teaching Excellence

University of South Carolina

Summary

Distributed Learning (online and blended) courses are becoming increasingly popular and it is important for such courses to be designed with quality in mind. In 2013, the University of South Carolina (UofSC Columbia) launched the Provost’s Distributed Learning Quality Review process (DLQR), which is a university-wide effort to ensure the quality of Distributed Learning courses (i.e., courses for which technology is used to facilitate learning, whether on- or off-campus, in real-time or at student discretion, including 100% Online, Blended, Web Conferencing/Streaming, and Two-way delivery). A checklist was developed using the Quality Matters (QM) Higher Education Rubric as a benchmark for quality and these standards also became the guideline for developing new Distributed Learning courses.

Methodology

To assess students’ perspective of course design, a survey was administered to students enrolled in courses that previously successfully completed the DLQR process. This research study was designed to evaluate our university’s quality review process and whether courses maintain their level of quality years after successfully completing the review the process. Students in 16 courses representing seven programs were given the QM Higher Education Rubric Standards and asked to evaluate their course using these standards and a scale of Exceeds, Met, and Did Not Meet. In addition, the students were asked to provide comments as to the strengths and weaknesses of the Distributed Learning course.

Results and Discussion

Of the 620 students enrolled in the courses and asked to participate in the survey, 194 completed the survey for a response rate of 31.29%. The responses revealed that students do perceive that their online courses have an overall quality design based on the QM Higher Education Rubric Standards as shown below. In addition, the students’ feedback was used to improve course design.

Table 1. Percentage of Student Responses by Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Did Not Meet</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Total Met + Exceed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Course Overview</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>36.30%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>97.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning Objectives</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>35.79%</td>
<td>60.21%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessment/Measurement</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>37.85%</td>
<td>58.56%</td>
<td>96.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructional Materials</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>38.80%</td>
<td>58.03%</td>
<td>96.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Learning Activities/Interaction</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>37.31%</td>
<td>59.74%</td>
<td>97.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Course Technology</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>38.36%</td>
<td>58.97%</td>
<td>97.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learner Support</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>41.54%</td>
<td>56.41%</td>
<td>97.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Accessibility</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>41.23%</td>
<td>55.69%</td>
<td>96.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Webinars: Connecting Field Instructors to One Another and the Program

Alexis Glennon
LCSW Division of Social Work, Assistant Professor, Field Director
Keuka College

Summary

Importance of Field Practicum Experience for Social Work Students:
Field Instructors play a critical role in the development of the next generation of Social Work. The Social Work profession values the role of Social Workers in the field being a part of the training and education of Social Work students. Often, licensed social workers take on this role voluntarily, with little to no compensation and a large amount of responsibility. Field Instructor’s relationship with social work student interns has a lasting impact of the future social work profession and student developmental success. Fernandez (1998) points to the importance and quality of interaction between the instructor and the student in affecting student satisfaction with field education. While quality of supervision is critical, often Field Instructors want training and support in the supervision process and role. Quality field instruction is a critical component of social work education; however, the ability to provide quality field instruction does not necessarily develop naturally from social work training or from subsequent years of practice it requires the learning of new skills (Bogo, 1981; Larsen & Hepworth, 1982.

How using Webinars creates connection and positive learning outcomes:
Keuka College’s Field Practicum program utilizes webinars to help connect Social Work professionals, that are in the role of Field Instructors, across New York State — having geographically widespread programs can create a disconnect for Field Instructors from both the institution and each other. The focus of the webinars is to create a platform to increase connection to the College and more importantly, to each other to improve Field Instructor’s supervision and mentorship skills. There are other mechanisms in forms of training and individual support that is provided for Field Instructors connection to Keuka College, but the Field Instructor Webinar Series is uniquely formatted to provide an opportunity for Field Instructors to connect and learn from one another.

The webinar series acts as an arena to provide information on topics such as “Stages of Intern Development,” “Mindfulness for Field Instructors” and “Role of Supervision: Supporting Students and Managing Time.” The first portion of the webinar provides psychoeducation on a topic, and an online atmosphere is created through breakout activities for the Field Instructors to engage with one another online. Subsequently, the final time is spent allowing for open discussion about the topic and other general concerns or questions providing time for Field Instructors to give each other advice from their experiences and learn from one another.
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"Is There Anybody out There?: Twitter as a Supportive Environment for First Year Teachers' Online Induction Workshop

Yehuda Peled
Senior Lecturer

Efrat Pieterse
Faculty Member

Western Galilee College, Israel

Summary

The transition from being a student teacher to being a teacher, solely responsible for his or her class, is decisive. New teachers, during their first year, struggle with their new role; they describe difficulties with class management, in particular, and management within the school in general. This research examines the feasibility and benefits of using Twitter as a support tool, to enhance social interaction among teachers in their first year of service, as they participate in an online induction workshop, and as a tool to aid the workshop’s moderator in monitoring the group and enhancing and supporting the early-service teachers' development. The 6914 tweets that were posted during the induction workshop enabled the workshop’s moderator to constantly monitor the participants’ progress – both their lows and their highs. These tweets reveal a process of socialisation that was taking place among the participants, which led to an increased availability of personal and professional support, and thus enhanced the new teachers' professional growth. Content analysis was conducted on the 6914 tweets that were posted during the eight months of the induction workshop. Participants answered a feedback questionnaire in the middle, and at the end of the induction workshop. Findings revealed the existence of a process of creating a "community of practice" – a process that creates professional and social support, through its members sharing their feelings and experiences directly from the field. This confirms the claim that tweets on Twitter can be a worthy substitute for face-to-face meetings. However, the questionnaire painted a different picture, in that participants’ evaluations of the Tweets were neutral, which raises questions for further research.
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Utilizing a Technology Dashboard to Analyze Key Performance Indicators

Steve Peterson M.Ed., MAIS
Faculty Manager, College of Nursing and Healthcare Professions
Grand Canyon University

Summary

A Key Performance Indicator (KPI) is a performance-measuring tool used to evaluate the success of an organization or particular activity. Identifying and analyzing critical performance measures through the integration of a KPI dashboard supports efficacious faculty coaching which leads to effective operationalization of student success. A collaborative, operational approach tying scheduling and faculty recruiting together provides a synergy of effectiveness leading to faculty retention, academic excellence, and student success.

The operationalization of student success begins with establishing, analyzing, and monitoring of key performance indicators of faculty and the supportive infrastructure. Effective, efficient, and outcome-driven synthesis of these indicators encourages proactive management of critical operative functions. Faculty training, development, and support, coupled with personnel scheduling and space utilization protocol, is bolstered and becomes a more efficacious platform by which academic excellence and student success is realized. Intuitive data management tools, such as the KPI dashboard, provide real-time snapshot data to streamline management and end-user higher education delivery. If student success and quality educational delivery is the intended outcome, then the KPI dashboard is the vehicle by which this innovative approach is delivered.
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Zoom! Activate Students to Search for Missing Data

Jeanne Ferguson
Adjunct Faculty

Haley Kerkhoff
Instructional Designer and Quality Control Coordinator

University of Wisconsin–Madison

Summary

This ePoster session will include
- slides of the visual material presented in an online environment,
- an interactive exploration of the purpose and methodology for sharing the experience
- the opportunity to process take-aways for your application following the experience.

Focus:
Introduce a novel experiential task into online courses that are contemplating complex problems, looking for solutions or opportunities to foster novel and creative student thinking.

Takeaways:
1. Audience will learn to engage their visual and verbal acuity to problem solve the Zoom! conundrum and do it either face-to-face or via online connection.
2. Participants will come away with additional ideas for using novel technology to advance student engagement and learning in an online environment.

Promo:
Try an exercise you have never thought of trying in an online environment to engage students, challenge yourself as an instructor, and extrapolate from this experience to other course related content.

Outcomes:
This exercise has proven very successful with dozens of groups whose participation yields new ideas, additional respect for the power of solid data collection prior to application, and expanding their view of possibilities in a world that is often compliance-driven and bias-infused that seems to limit choice, creativity, and novelty.

Methodology:
We will utilize a visually interactive exercise for engaging participants in a data search that is applicable across disciplines, activates their powers of observation, invites them to seek connections and imagine missing pieces. The exercise can be as effective online as face-to-face, and we have done both. The behind-the-scenes work of an online tech support professional will be explained and explored. Participants will experience what their students will experience if they implement this exercise in their online class. Creativity around how to implement Zoom! uniquely within various content areas will form the final discussion element.
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Online Teaching Reflections: Behind the Curtain and Inside the Mind

Marija Franetovic, PhD
Course Developer and New Media Specialist
Lawrence Technological University

Summary

In distance education, there are often sessions between a faculty member and an instructional designer on designing, developing and delivering a course which are focused on a product or a process and not necessarily around reflection. This project takes an innovative approach of facilitating reflective sessions after teaching online. What were lessons learned from completing a questionnaire after teaching online and having follow up reflective sessions between a faculty member and an instructional designer? Reflective sessions were recorded and followed up by post-session notes by the instructional designer where 6 common themes emerged. 1) These reflective sessions enable faculty to find out what other online teaching strategies might be available that they might not have thought of implementing before. Faculty also learn about other online faculty members’ methods from the instructional designer. It is a window of opportunity for the instructional designer to follow up with guidance on new strategies and tools. 2) The reflective sessions provide the instructional designer insight into faculty strategies that they might not have been previously aware of, especially from faculty who have also taught online at other universities. 3) The reflective sessions afford both an opportunity to reflect upon their practices, therefore validating online teaching strategies being utilized, as well as learning from their personal new insights. 4) The reflective sessions form a body of resources that will be coded in order to consolidate a primer for first-time online instructors and instructors who are in need of a refresher. The primer will summarize insights from faculty reflecting about teaching online. 5) The reflective sessions facilitate open-ended and free form discussions, ones that are free from a particular goal, and as such an earnest conversation may ensue that can help grow common understandings and collaboration within the professional relationship. 6) The reflective sessions may assist in online teaching professional development to be implemented in future online teaching and future instructional design consulting. The ePoster will summarize lessons learned thus far, provide representative quotes that align with the findings to date, generate feedback to further the research to its next iteration, and ask the question as to whether these reflective sessions between faculty members and instructional designers might be a useful format for other institutions with distance programs.

About the Presenter
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Online Teaching and Learning Research Seminars Program

Rebecca Thomas, Ph.D.
Postdoctoral Scholar

Mary Ellen Dello Stritto, Ph.D.
Assistant Director of Research

Oregon State University

Summary

In this session, the presenters will share information about the Oregon State University Online Teaching and Learning Research Seminars Program. The presentation will have three primary purposes:

1. **To share the purpose and goals for the Research Seminars Program.**
   - Build community among online teaching and learning researchers from a range of institutions.
   - Create space for multi-institutional collaboration and networking around online teaching and learning research.
   - Publish research findings to advance the field of online teaching and learning in a range of mediums (peer-reviewed papers, white papers, reports, etc.).

2. **To provide a description of the structure of the Research Seminars Program.**
   - Each year, individual researchers at higher education institutions around the world will be invited to apply for one of eight participant spots.
   - Accepted participants will collaborate on research over two academic years including three week-long, in-person meetings each summer held on Oregon State University campus. Each cohort of participants will be invited to explore a specific topic in the field.
   - Summer 1: During the first week-long seminar, participants will meet to develop research questions and plan small team research projects to be conducted throughout the following year.
   - Summer 2: The following summer, during the second week-long seminar, participants will meet to share their initial results, plan data analysis, and plan the research activities for year two.
   - Summer 3: During the final week-long seminar the following summer, participants will meet to share their results of the previous years’ research and plan for the dissemination of results and the continuation of their work.

3. **To share information about the current projects underway by current seminar participants.**
   - In July of 2019, the first cohort of Research Seminar participants met to plan projects surrounding the topic of learning analytics from a systems perspective.
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Balancing Canned and Original Content in Online Courses and Programs

Nikki McIntosh
Instructional Designer
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Summary

Online and distance learners often have concerns before participating in an online course: Will I receive quality support and feedback online? Will I feel like a cog rather than a student? Will the course be comparable to other online courses I’ve taken or a wild card? As instructional designers, faculty, and administrators, we must strive to address these questions in our instructional systems.

In this session, we will learn how to think critically about these questions and examine the role of content strategy in online courses and programs. While it may be tempting to rely on a template or “out-of-the-box” solution, that may be a detriment to our learners. The goal is to balance this canned, “out-of-the-box” content with original content, feedback, and other course components that will enhance learning.

The goal is to create an exceptional learner experience while also managing workload and expectations. Learning to do this takes planning and practice. One helpful activity to do is to identify facilitation and content development tasks that are needed and identify their level of impact and amount of effort something will take to make original content. Where each task falls will help you determine whether or not the content should be modified.
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Leveraging Collaborative Tools to Accelerate Student Outcomes

Yvonne Phelps
Vice President Academic Affairs Campus Services

Joni Iglinski
Director of Academic Affairs

University of Phoenix

Summary

Collaborative learning has gained traction as research indicates its positive impact on student learning outcomes. Framing effective collaborative learning can be challenging without vibrant resources and tools. This session will delve into leveraging the four principles of cooperative learning (P.I.E.S) (Kagan, 2014) and the Innovators’ Compass (link below) as faculty support tools to accelerate student outcomes. All session participants, especially those within higher education and training environments, will be able to immediately apply these tools effectively to their instructional approaches to improve effectiveness and student outcomes. These tools will help to provide a structure for learning goals to promote authentic and tangible peer collaboration (rather than just team activities). After attending this session, attendees will be able to leverage P.I.E.S, and the Innovators Compass to maximize positive student outcomes through collaborative learning. In addition, attendees will be able to expand on the research premises that are shared relating to the impact of collaborative learning and these two tools.
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Preparing Collaborative, Interdisciplinary Partners: Comparison of Discussion Formats
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Summary

Preparing for Interprofessional Engagement through Online Learning

For today’s graduate students, online education provides students the possibility of earning an advanced degree that is considerably more flexible compared to face-to-face on-campus programs. In 2012, approximately 22% of graduate students in the U.S. were enrolled exclusively in distance education courses and an additional 8% were enrolled in some distance education coursework (Ginder et al., 2015). While online learning offers increased convenience to graduate-level students, it is not without drawbacks. Student retention in higher education online courses is an ongoing concern across the country. For example, a recent study of higher education chief academic officers revealed that 41 percent agreed that student retention was a greater problem for students taking online courses compared to face-to-face courses (Allen & Seaman, 2014). One specific factor cited in the research that aided student persistence in online courses was a “sense of belonging” to an online community with significant interaction with other students as well as the instructor (Hart, 2012). According to recent peer-reviewed research, there are a growing number of asynchronous online tools that have received positive feedback from higher education faculty targeting the improvement of online teaching and learning. One of VoiceThread’s primary uses is its ability to have both faculty and students share their voices in an asynchronous, online learning environment. Researchers have found that audio and video technologies that do not rely exclusively on text may be more effective at enhancing the quality of faculty and student communications in online courses (Stodel, et al. 2006).

Expectations of Graduates in Interdisciplinary Fields

Graduate programs are often tasked with preparing future professionals to be effective collaborators and purveyors of their knowledge through team-based work. The field of special education as evidenced in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires collaboration across stakeholders, including families and students with disabilities in the development and implementation of education programs. In 2017, the Inclusive Educational and Clinical Program at the University of Arkansas was funded by the US Department of Education to create a graduate program that prepares future special educators, speech and language pathologists and others to learn to work collaboratively in the implementation of transition plans for students with disabilities (Frazier et al., 2019).

Interdisciplinary Professionals in Online Learning Programs

Such interdisciplinary, graduate-level work requires interdisciplinary learning opportunities, which may be particularly challenging in today’s asynchronous, online learning formats. Best practices in online learning emphasize the need to promote student engagement, motivation, and enhance the value of the learning experience through an array of technological tools. Often, the lack of face-to-face contact in an online environment can make collaborative learning challenging. Our program, Teaming for Transition, experimented with two forms of discussion to see if either was more likely to engage graduate students in collaborative behaviors during their coursework. We analyzed the collaborative behaviors of graduate
students using both text-based, threaded discussion and VoiceThread, assessed perspectives on interdisciplinary engagement through learning and in their future work, and sought perceptions of satisfaction of online coursework. Implications from the study will inform similar programs using discussion platforms to promote collaborative learning.

**VoiceThread**

VoiceThread is a cloud-based application within which the instructor uploads slides, documents, audio files, videos, presentations, and other files on which the instructor and students can comment using voice through microphone, webcam, phone, audio-file upload or text. Through a grant from the Teaching Faculty Support Center at the University of Arkansas four Teaming for Transition faculty and instructors were funded to complete instructor certification training in VoiceThread. VoiceThread use is also supported by instructional designers at the University of Arkansas’ Global Campus.

**Methods**

**Use of VoiceThread in Interdisciplinary Courses**

Students completed coursework adapted to include VoiceThread discussions within each lesson. Lessons were structured to include the following: 1) step-by-step plan for the week’s lesson, 2) instructor led content using web-cam comments on slides to provide additional knowledge, 3) 2-3 discussion slides with instructor led prompts, and 4) group based assignment to create content and upload to the VoiceThread presentation on which student peers were instructed to engage in discussion and/or provide feedback. Expectations for students were to reply to at least 2 comments in each discussion with a unique perspective on their thoughts and respond to replies of others left on their comments. Students were also encouraged to ask open ended questions meant to support reflection or seek clarification. In coursework used for comparison, that did not include VoiceThread, instructor prompted discussions were created using text-based discussion boards on BlackBoard. Communication disorder students also had experience with face-to-face graduate courses.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

Students (n=10) were all completing their master’s degrees in either special education or communication disorders. Students completed two surveys to assess their perspectives on interdisciplinary learning (i.e. adapted Interdisciplinary Education Perception Scale; Luecht et al., 1990) and work (i.e. adapted Interprofessional Attitudes Scale; Lassche et al, 2015). Further, we asked graduate students to share their experiences of using the different discussion formats and analyzed use of these formats by graduate students from 2 different cohorts taking the same course content. Survey data were gathered through Qualtrix and descriptive statistics were used to summarize these data. Qualitative data were also gathered through open-ended questions using Qualtrix. Text and VoiceThread discussions were sampled that used similar prompts across coursework to analyze collaborative behaviors adapted from Council for Exceptional Children-Division on Career Development and Transition Collaboration Competencies for Transition Personnel (2013) (e.g., sharing information, providing feedback, critical constructive feedback, asking open ended questions). Collaborative behaviors were compared in sampled discussions from coursework specific to teaching children and youth with high need disabilities. From these discussions 7 students were chosen from each of two years (2017 and 2019) of the course for analysis. Discussions were selected that included similar discussion prompts. Both courses were taught by the same instructor. Three discussions were sampled: 1) Least Dangerous Assumption, 2) Data Collection, and 3) Communication Skills.

**Research Questions**

In order to determine the differences between discussion methods we asked: In what ways do graduate students engage in discussion using a text-based, threaded discussion differently from video chat discussion (i.e. VoiceThread)? 2. What types of collaborative behaviors do graduate students use in text
and video-chat discussions, and 3. Do graduate students express a preference for one discussion format over another format?

**Findings and Discussion**

**Interprofessional Attitudes**
On the scale of Interdisciplinary Education students shared high levels of agreement that: 1) shared learning before graduation would help them become better transition team members, help to think positively about other professions, help become more effective team member and help them understand their own limitations. They also had high levels of agreement that their profession required skills in interacting and partnering, respect for unique cultures, values, roles/responsivities, effective communication, and advocacy at the community and state level. Interestingly students were not in agreement on questions around interprofessional biases and in particular on whether graduate students from other disability related professions have prejudices or make assumptions about their own discipline or whether these prejudices and assumptions get in the way of future individualized planning for their students with disabilities. On the scale of Interprofessional Attitudes students reported high agreement with statements of the capacity for individuals in their profession to be effective interprofessional partners, but were least convinced that their “individuals from my profession have a higher status than individuals in other professions”.

**Collaborative Behaviors**
Both text and voice-based discussions enabled students to express collaborative behaviors such as self-reflection, providing feedback, and asking questions. Perhaps due to the dynamic nature of the voice-based platform students posted more frequently and more individually (i.e. posting directly to someone else’s comment more often) on this platform. Additionally, students asked more open-ended questions of the group, individuals, and the professor. Further, students were less likely to rely on responses that simply repeated the previous person’s statement.

**Discussion Platform Preferences**
When asked to rate (from 5 most valuable to 1 least valuable) using VoiceThread had for aspects of coursework students rated all aspects as generally high (range of mean from 4.13-4.75) expect for “collaborating on course content (e.g., debate, small group work)”. Aspects rated highest were: direct instruction by professor (4.63), visual examples of content covered (4.75), uploading student application of lesson content (e.g., “create and upload”) (4.75), asking questions of instructor (4.75), engaging in discussion about questions asked by instructor (4.63), preparing for the week’s content (4.63), and review of course requirements (4.63). Students rated VoiceThread lectures and discussion as the most helpful instructional activities with text readings and research articles receiving lowest rank. Qualitative comments were particularly telling of the impact of VoiceThread for students.

_So far, I have really enjoyed the voice thread lectures. It is unlike any online class that I have ever taken. I feel more confident expressing my opinion via voicethread and enjoy watching Dr. K’s videos. I like being able to listen to my peer's comments which allows me to learn from them as well. To be honest I interact more with people and the discussions on voice thread then I do even in the classroom lectures that I am in._

_The collaboration between the T4T cohorts and our Voice Tread discussions have been a great learning experience. Dr. Kucharczyk has provided plenty of resources and information that has been beneficial. I have been able to share that information with colleagues and it has inspired the building and expansion of my district’s transition program._
Being able to learn not only from the professor but also other students. Gaining other perspectives was vital.

These comments exemplify the opportunities VoiceThread gave students to engage actively in learning together and the importance of that interdisciplinary collaboration.

Conclusion

Interdisciplinary, graduate-level work requires interdisciplinary learning opportunities, which may be particularly challenging in today’s asynchronous, online learning formats. We found VoiceThread to be an effective vehicle for not only ensuring students are gaining knowledge and applying course content, but expanding their repertoire of collaborative, interdisciplinary skills.
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Summary

This session will describe how the Joint Forces Staff College designs an online exercise for distance education students. Using technologies within Blackboard, we present a blended synchronous and asynchronous online exercise focused on homeland security and homeland defense. We will present an overview of the exercise, then discuss how we use learning modules within Blackboard to manage message traffic, videos, and other material to lead students through the exercise. We will provide innovative ideas using online learning platform technologies for developing an interactive educational experience for students within a synchronous and asynchronous learning environment. We will demonstrate how we take the desired learning outcomes and develop an online practical exercise using current instructional design technologies.
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Summary

In recent years, virtual exchanges (VEs), also known as collaborative international learning (COIL), have emerged as an effective way to offer structured, intercultural experiences to students, beyond traditional study abroad. VEs offer students the opportunity to interact in substantial ways, either synchronously or asynchronously, with peers in other parts of the world, engaging in disciplinary focused work. In 2013 DePaul University developed and implemented an institution-wide VE initiative, titled the Global Learning Experience (GLE) through which to date, we have trained over 200 faculty and implemented 100 VE/GLE projects in 26 countries, with almost 1800 student participants.

In this presentation, first, we will highlight how DePaul’s VE initiative relies on an innovative model that requires collaboration across division and teams. Then, we will describe key aspects of our successful faculty development program, carefully designed to support VE pedagogies. Finally, we will conclude with a few examples of projects implemented between DePaul and various international partner schools, including collaborations with the University of Dubrovnik in Croatia, Abertay University in Dundee, Scotland and Symbiosis University in Pune, India.
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Summary

Much of the available research on VR and 360° video focuses on either the empirical investigation of specific aspects of these technologies, or the ways in which VR and 360° video have been used in specific disciplines, predominantly in healthcare and STEM fields. Research suggests that creating immersive learning experiences can help online learners engage more with their learning. However, the literature gives very little guidance for educators who want to put these technologies into practice, especially for an online course or with nontraditional students. We will explain the steps our group took in collaborating with a faculty member to build VR and 360° video into an online course, from the initial idea to developing a focused committee, brainstorming, exploring the literature, researching options, making selections (pedagogy, hardware, and software), and developing prototypes.

VR and 360° video offer certain affordances in presence and immersion that other media do not. When these affordances align with pedagogy and intended learning outcomes, students stand to benefit. However, there is a learning curve involved in adopting these technologies, including learning how to evaluate available options and how to address technical considerations such as portability (i.e., can it be used on different systems or browsers). A comparison of several options, including cameras, headsets, and software, will indicate what considerations come into play when deciding if and how to use VR and 360° video. There are also limitations in when and how immersive technologies should be used. We will share what we have learned over the past year about the expectations and limitations of immersive technologies.

Instructional designers and faculty will learn how to navigate the decision-making process around the adoption of VR and 360° video as pedagogical tools, particularly for an online environment with nontraditional students. Our ePoster will explain how to align learning objectives with technological affordances. We will demonstrate the sense of presence and immersion that these media can have when used in a way that aligns with current cognitive and learning theory. We will convey information about our process and some of the options for pedagogy, hardware, and software that we have explored, and we will display examples of 3D models we have developed so far.
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Engaging Learners through a Live Museum
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Associate Chair, Julia Jones Matthews Department of Public Health
Abilene Campus, Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center

Abstract

This session will focus on public health course projects that engaged face-to-face and online students to across multiple universities, levels of degree programs, and courses to create displays for a live “public health museum” that focused on different course content that served to educate the public about public health. The audience will learn about this method of engaging all learners in creative, hands on learning that produces products from both face-to-face and distance learners that utilizes Bloom’s taxonomy. This session will outline the steps involved and project outcomes across two years of doing the public health museum, including lessons learned.
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Summary

The Oregon State University Ecampus Research Unit developed the Report Reader Checklist, a comprehensive set of criteria that offers the report reader a guide to evaluate the quality and rigor of online education study reports. The checklist features six focus areas: context, methodology, sample, reporting results, transparency and reader experience.

The checklist is intended to provide an overview of the foundational elements that should be included when reporting on the results of a study. Report readers can apply each checklist criterion to a report to see whether that element has been included or not. If readers find one area (e.g., “Context”) that is missing several criteria within a report, that would indicate that a report is weaker in that particular area.

The following is an overview of the six areas of the checklist and selected criteria in each area:

- **Context**: Does the report describe the larger purpose of the study? Does it explain the history or theoretical framework? Does the report include research goals and suggestions for further research?
- **Methodology**: Does the report have a methodology section? Is it clear how data were collected and analyzed? If the study used statistics, were they named? If coding was used, was the procedure described?
- **Sample**: Are the study participants described in detail? Is it clear how participants were recruited? Does the sample represent an appropriate level of diversity? Are subgroups appropriately identified?
- **Reporting Results**: Are all numbers in the report easy to comprehend? Is the “N” provided? Does the report identify missing data? Is it clear where study findings fit with the study’s purpose?
- **Transparency**: Are raw data included in the report? Are instruments or study protocols provided in the report? Are the authors clear about any conflicts of interest? Is the discussion rooted in data results?
- **Reader Experience**: Does the report use language that is easy to understand? Is the report ADA accessible? Does it include a summary or abstract? Is the study an appropriate length?

Download a one-page PDF of the checklist and access additional details for each criterion and a list of exemplar reports for each criterion.
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**Introduction**

Data analytics is now used in higher education for a number of reasons (Siemens & Long, 2011). These researchers indicate that while higher education has historically gathered data, it has just recently been using the data more effectively to make decisions. Baepler and Murdoch (2010) also tell us that the use of data analytics can open up new lines of assessment and communication with students. Their research of analytics specifically in course management systems for online learning indicate useful practices in teaching and learning.

As part of the University’s effort to improve course completion rates, the institution has acquired Civitas Learning’s *Inspire For Faculty*, or IFF, a data analytics and communication tool. The IFF tool is designed to provide a visual tool for faculty to determine the level of engagement by individual students within a course, and allows for an easy method to communicate with the students and their advisors. *IFF* suggests that it analyzes an institution’s individual data concerning student engagement and provides predictions of students’ likelihood to persist (Civitas Learning, 2019).

Statistical analysis of course completion rates pre- and post-implementation show varied levels of change in student success, based on level of use of IFF, type of instructor, and College within the University.
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Summary

In online settings, students often report feeling isolated or unsupported (Gilette-Swan, 2017). To combat this challenge and increase feelings of student community and collaboration, instructors must make conscious decisions to use technologies or other teaching strategies to meet students’ needs and increase feelings of belonging. One such technology for increasing student engagement and sense of belonging is Flipgrid. Flipgrid has been used in traditional K-12 classroom environments and online settings. In this summary, Flipgrid will be described, the uses in online and traditional environments explored, and results from a survey of student use of Flipgrid will be shared.

Flipgrid is a free Web 2.0 video discussion platform (http://flipgrid.com). Using Flipgrid, instructors create topics for students to respond to using short videos. “There are two key terms in Flipgrid—grid and topic. A grid is what you create for a class or course. The grid houses the topics (discussions) you create for a class or course” (Green, & Green, 2018, 1). All students responding to the prompt can see the responses of others. This provides an opportunity for students in online settings to see, hear and respond to their classmates and instructors. Which allows students and instructors to establish a sense of community and build positive relationships in a modality that is otherwise limited in how social and affective support is provided (Kim & Thayne, 2015). Flipgrid can be used in traditional and online settings.

Traditional classroom environments have found an increase in student engagement via the use of tech tools such as student response systems (Heaslip et. al., 2014). Other tools used take advantage of the ubiquitous nature of mobile devices and can be used in online and traditional environments. Thus, a trend in education to “Bring your Own Device” (Cheng et. al., 2016, page number). In using one’s own device, students can engage using Flipgrid and have reported an increase in social engagement (Koivula, 2015). In online classroom settings, opportunities to engage with peers and classroom learning objectives have been explored. Through the Learning Management System (LMS), instructors share links to grids for students to respond to a variety of prompts. Some of the prompts are social in nature, while others directly align to course objectives. “Using the video style discussion forum helps students get to know each other as well as increases communication efficiency by showing body language, facial expressions, and tone of voice” (Bartlett, 2018, 2). To determine student perception and usage of Flipgrid, a survey was conducted.

A survey was posted in the LMS for undergraduate students attending courses on our main campus (traditional setting) as well as undergraduate and graduate online students. There were over 180 respondents. Out of the total respondents 125 had participated in class using Flipgrid. 134 had watched the videos their peers had posted, and 160 respondents indicated that they would participate again using Flipgrid if the opportunity presented itself again.

All instructors should strive to establish a positive rapport with their students, while also creating a feeling of connectedness among students. Technology, such as web 2.0 tools and Flipgrid, is one way to enhance instruction and establish a community of learners.
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Summary

Need
This session is focused on evidence-based practices for student engagement in asynchronous courses. The goal of the session is to give participants an evidence-based approach to incorporating practices into online self-paced courses that provide structure and autonomy to students. Autonomy and structure help drive student engagement. Engagement has been shown to be a strong indicator of student success and satisfaction in a course (Finn & Zimmer, 2012 & Paechter et al., 2009). A successful online learning experience depends on many things; a key item is student motivation, which leads to stronger engagement, and educators have focused on increasing it for many years. For example, one component of the Keller's ARCS model of motivation focuses on student relevance. Student relevance increases motivation by giving students autonomy while in a course, such as giving students a choice in determining workload or workflow (Keller, 1987). Giving students autonomy in an online course is one way to allow students to champion their learning is also supported by the self-determination theory (SDT). SDT emphasizes the value of motivation by creating room for student autonomy (Reeve, 2007). Other studies have shown a two-fold benefit of student autonomy. Not only does autonomy increase motivation, students demonstrate a higher level of cognitive learning (Skinner et al., 2009 & Vansteenkiste et al., 2005). Understanding student motivation and how that factors into engagement is important to consider when developing or facilitating an online course.

Another factor that influences student engagement in an online course is structure and support. Structure and support can come in many forms in an online course, such as facilitator, administrative, and course structure, and has a positive influence on student satisfaction (Lee et al., 2011). Having a consistent support and content structure in place allows students to focus on their learning instead of spending time and energy orienting themselves. This is especially true if students are taking multiple online courses from the same institution or program. Facilitators play a key role in providing structure, and research has shown that building orientation support from faculty was beneficial to students (Yukselturk & Yildirim, 2008). Along with facilitator support, administrative support structures have been shown to play a role in how students perceive an online class (Taylor & Holley, 2009). It is clear that online students gain great value from a clear structure and support, but also thrive when given ownership of their learning.

Solution
It is important for instructors and course designers to prepare students for a successful and satisfying online course experience. Unfortunately, many students may be unaware of effective strategies for online learning. While we can never guarantee that students will have a particular experience in our online courses, there are many things we can do to set the stage for success. This interactive session will highlight steps taken by the UW Extended Campus Independent Learning Program to provide a consistent structure, support, and motivation strategies used in its asynchronous courses. Participants will also be asked to share with their peers ideas and examples from their own courses.
Participants in this session will learn of best practices that lead to increased student engagement and motivation. After a brief introduction to the Independent Learning Program and its courses, we will discuss challenges that our program and students faced from a course design perspective. We will have a discussion to hear about challenges participants face at their institutions. Next, we will demonstrate how we addressed the challenges that we faced at UW Extended Campus. This will spark the discussion for our participants regarding possible solutions for themselves. The final section of our session will involve a discussion of measuring success from a program and course level perspective. We will save time for an open discussion so participants can expand upon any ideas from our session. Participants will leave with examples and templates that they can apply to their own courses or programs.
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Summary

Current Changes in Higher Education
Higher Education is in a period of transition due to changes in student demographics, student expectations, competition, and sources of funding. While enrollments are projected to grow from 2024 to 2026, enrollments are projected to drop significantly after 2027 (Seltzer, 2016). Declining college enrollment, coupled with constraints on tuition pricing and suppressed revenue growth, is why Moody's outlook remains negative (2018). Colleges and universities are also experiencing increasing competition. More colleges are offering online degrees and contributing to the competition is the arrival of large-scale degree programs offered at significantly lower prices and the rise of mega-universities (Blumenstyk, 2018). The way students consume higher education is also changing. Students may attend multiple institutions, earn credit in a variety of ways (e.g., both on-campus and online, competency-based, prior learning, micro-credentialing, etc.), and reject the traditional core curriculum (Mintz, 2013). Technological changes are also impacting course delivery and support services.

Discussion of Potential Changes in Higher Education
This session will explore what these changes may mean for the future of higher education and how it might look online in 2040. Participants will be divided into small group to discuss potential changes and innovation in online learning around the themes of impact on students, learning and delivery options, campus environment, and faculty; groups will summarize their discussions and share out the results. The session will then end with a facilitated discussion about what colleges and universities can do now to academically innovate in terms of pedagogy, technology, support services and delivery models. The presenters will record this discussion and synthesize the major concepts identified by participants.
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Summary

The concept of connectivism has been around for several years and gained attention through the work of Siemens (2005) and the cMOOC offered by Siemens and Downs. However, what do we mean by connectivist pedagogy? In Anderson and Dron’s (2011) work they have stated that connectivist pedagogy is where “learning is the process of building networks of information, contacts, and resources applied to real problems” (p. 87). They also state that connectivism “assumes that information is plentiful and that the learner’s role is not to memorize or even understand everything, but to have the capacity to find and apply knowledge when and where it is needed … and the learners are literate and confident enough to exploit these networks...” (p.87). Anderson and Dron subsequently discuss that the role of the faculty within a connectivist learning environment is not to define, create, or generate content, but it becomes a collaboration between the instructor and the learners both individually and as a group.

Within Anderson and Dron’s (2011) discussion of connectivist pedagogy and the first two generations of distance education pedagogy, they highlight that our online courses today use a blend of cognitive/behaviorism, social/constructivism, and connectivism in their pedagogical designs. However, if we were to stretch our thinking and ask what an online course would look like if designed with a primarily connectivist framework, what would one imagine? Is it a selection of knowledge/information nodes that students self-organize around, or is it structured content where learners self-organize around dialogic learning communities, or would it be something else? Also, at what course level is this pedagogical approach best suited (novice or expert learner), and as self-organizing events, what role do learning objectives, learning outcomes, and grades play? These are intriguing questions for designers and faculty members, who would like to explore the implementation of a connectivist approach in online courses environments.

To gain insights around these questions and connectivist pedagogical design, this session examines with participants how they envision a connectivist course, technologies that may be used, and institutional policies and procedures that may need to evolve to allow for courses of this design.
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Summary

Online Learning programs are seen to be as good, or better, than traditional face-to-face programs. However, the historical perception is that students are more likely to drop out of online programs than their face-to-face counterparts. There are signs to indicate that this perception is incorrect and unjustified.

Resources and accompanying video can be found at: http://condor.depaul.edu/jmoore/uwdtl2019
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Summary

This session will explore techniques to a successful working relationship between faculty and their supervisors in the competency-based education format.
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Summary

Learning styles became a hot topic in the 1970s; since then, the notion of learning styles has significantly influenced education in multiple ways. Today, educators of all types are still dissecting theories surrounding learning styles, trying to find ways to respond to varying learning styles of their students. But why? Is this theory actually rooted in neuroscience? Is there something to learning styles, or is it all a myth? Either way, will attending to learning styles contribute to learner success in blended and online learning?

Participants in this session take learning styles and learner readiness quizzes and analyze themselves first. Unpacking personal reactions will lead to applying critical thinking to the impact on students, teachers, course designers, and administrators. This session is designed for attendees to come away with ways to implement effective strategies to help students identify their readiness to learn online and improve their self-efficacy without skewing practice and pedagogy with learning styles theories.

Challenging Assumptions

Those who have some experience and knowledge about learning styles (Riener & Willingham, 2019) may find some of their assumptions challenged. Many people develop specific pedagogy and course design to accommodate varied learning styles, based on their assumptions that tailoring to learning styles “works,” but some experts warn against the use of learning styles (Dembo & Howard, 2007). This presentation challenges assumptions, critically analyzes accepted practices, and identifies more effective paths for non-F2F learners.

Learning Styles vs. Learner Readiness

Instead of tailoring pedagogy to perceived learning styles, educators can change the lens a bit to instead on learner readiness (Hung et al, 2010; Smith, 2005). Notably in an online environment, helping students understand their readiness to learn online can respond to individual differences and position students for greater success. Challenging learning styles theories and proposing alternate perspectives can facilitate consideration of different ways (and possibly more effective ways) to increase self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Bandura & Adams, 1977) and help students have a better experience in distance education.
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Summary

At-risk populations such as men of color consistently exhibit low retention and high failure rates in the higher education community. This presentation provides experiential data that considers cognitive and non-cognitive factors that contribute to those rates in online programs and explains why, suggests how, and what to do to combat these negative trends.

This presentation is important in impacting teaching and learning in online higher education models as it focuses on two major objectives that are valuable to online institutions across the U.S.

1. Evaluating factors that contribute to constructing culturally responsive academic and student facing systems that enhance the support of success of at-risk populations.
2. Generating insight on data to provide a unique approach to academic factors such as course design, assignments and assessment, based on strategies and methodologies specific to at-risk populations, particularly men of color successfully navigating their academic programs.

Participants will perform a self-assessment and work in homogeneous groups to realize and address individual and organizational competency as it pertains to serving at-risk learners. Takeaways for participants of this session are:

1. Exposure to three foundational principals that can be applied to inform the design and modification of online teaching and learning models such that they support the success of any at-risk population, particularly MOC without compromising effectiveness for any other demographic subgroup.
2. A list of five research-based highly effective strategies for serving at-risk populations.
3. Exposure to two highly effective strategies for serving at-risk populations

Thus, participants will walk away with both broad indicators of cultural shifts that could be contemplated at their institutions and more focused strategic and procedural implications for adjustments to better support at-risk populations in the teaching and learning process in online higher education programs.
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Summary

With the growth of e-learning tools, educators are increasingly pressed to make timely and evidence-based selections that are best for them, their courses, and their students. To help foster the predictive, independent evaluation of e-learning tools, Drs. Lauren Anstey and Gavan Watson developed a rubric to aid in the appraisal of functional, technical, and pedagogical affordances important to selecting an e-learning tool. Published in *EDUCAUSE review*, the editors selected the article as one of the best of 2018. Come and learn about the eight categories that span technological and pedagogical considerations so that you can be better prepared to evaluate any new e-learning tool you encounter.

At the end of this hands-on session facilitated by rubric co-author Gavan Watson, participants will be able to:

- Describe the rationale for the rubric’s categories;
- Evaluate e-learning tools using the rubric;
- Judge the value of the rubric for their work; and
- Describe how they can adopt and adapt the work for their purposes.
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Summary

The takeaway of this session is to examine, support, and plan pilot ideas and to lead the acceptance of innovative ideas at your own institution by planning written proposals and strategic selling ideas. Active communicating of your idea will lead to collaboration, which in turn will lead to a positive performance outcome. When we have an idea, sometimes, our own perceptions get in the way. It is important to know your audience and to be able to portray your ideas in a streamlined and efficient manner or proposal. Helping your addressees to understand the background of your idea is also beneficial. People appreciate learning where an idea had its inception. The strategies that you will learn in this session, such as, innovative management, establishing a strong sense of direction, writing proposals, and eliminating processes that don’t work, will be invaluable to your idea. Let us help you ensure that your idea is a success and is heard loud and clear.

Concept

Do you have an idea, but don’t know what to do with it? This session is just what you are looking for. It’s designed specifically for faculty and designers who are not in formal leadership positions, but who desire the strategies, tools, and templates for effectively communicating an innovative idea. Innovation is nothing new. Each business or product was once an idea in the making. However, many have failed from lack of a proper foundation. We will teach you how to support your ideas with research, pilots, evaluation, and achieving buy-in. Attendees will work alone or in small groups, guided by the handout provided. Primary activities are discussion of each step, brainstorming and planning, and recording thoughts and future plans. At the completion of the session, participants will have a framework filled with plans and strategies for promoting their idea at their institution.

Activities

The following activities will be covered:

1.) Initial Evaluation: Putting ideas to paper. Why are you interested in this idea? What are the key functions, the potential uses of your idea and/or the value you see in it? What interested you in this idea in the first place? What are the design implications?

2.) Support the Idea: Back it up with resources and research. What are others doing? What does the research say? Why is this a good idea?

3.) Plan a Pilot: Iterative design and evaluation. What do you plan to investigate? Who are the key players? How will you know it’s successful?

4.) Write a Proposal: Request time and resources. What are the elements of a successful proposal? How do administrators and managers see your idea?

5.) Sell the Idea: Get buy-in. What is the difference between sharing and selling? How can you push ideas up the chain? How can you build interest and get buy-in?

As part of each stage, the presenters will encourage participants to share their ideas. The presenters will then discuss ideas from participants, break them down to help define specific needs, and discuss strategies
that may be applicable. Effective communicating is key. By using the discipline of this 5-step framework, your ideas will be prioritized based on their purpose.

About the Presenters

**Eddie Andreo** is the Associate Vice President for Distance Learning at Cowley College. Eddie leads the instructional design processes and administers the online campus component of the college by facilitating technology-rich instruction and learning through collaborative curricular innovation, including online course creation and revision, online course reviews, and faculty training and technical support.

Email: eddie.andreo@cowley.edu

**Penny Ralston-Berg**, M.S., has been designing online courses since 1997. She has also served as a technology trainer and design consultant for K-12, community college, higher education, and non-profit groups. Penny is currently a senior instructional designer for the Penn State World Campus. Her primary research interests are games and simulations for education and how student perspectives of quality impact online course design.

Email: plr15@psu.edu
Creating a Faculty Community of Inquiry for Online Teaching

Karen Skibba
Online Faculty Development Program Manager

Jonathan Klein
Instructional Design and Technology Consultant

Maria Widmer
Instructional Designer

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Summary
A cross-campus committee of instructional designers from the University of Wisconsin-Madison developed a two-semester collaborative faculty learning community called “TeachOnline@UW.”

To support the exploration and application of best practices in online course design and facilitation, learning community facilitators made strategic use of the Community of Inquiry theoretical framework (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2011). This framework represents a process for creating collaborative-constructivist learning experiences through the development of three interdependent elements: social, cognitive, and teaching presence. While the Community of Inquiry framework was initially presented within the context of online learning experiences, the three dimensions of presence that are foundational to the framework can be used to establish a successful faculty learning community.

Social presence strategies used in the faculty learning community include face-to-face and online discussions. Program facilitators establish teaching presence through the “design, facilitation, and direction” of participants’ experiences (Anderson, Rourke, Garrison, & Archer, 2011). Cognitive presence is established through learning activities that promote reflection, discussion, and application.

About the Presenters
Karen Skibba, PhD, is an Online Faculty Development Program Manager for Educational Innovation Program Development in the Division of Continuing Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. As project manager of a faculty learning community called TeachOnline@UW, she is responsible for helping instructors learn how to design and teach quality online courses.

Address: Room 7101, 21 N. Park St., Madison, WI 53715
Email: karen.skibba@wisc.edu
Phone: 608-265-9752

Jonathan Klein is an Instructional Design and Technology Consultant for University of Wisconsin-Madison’s College of Letters and Science where he leads online course design and production services.

Address: 299 Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Dr., Madison, WI 53706
Email: jbklein2@wisc.edu
Phone: 608-263-3828
Maria Widmer is an Instructional Designer for the University of Wisconsin-Madison School of Education.

Address: 376 Teacher Education, 225 N. Mills St., Madison, WI 53706
Email: maria.widmer@wisc.edu
Phone: 608-262-7301
Why and How to Get Your Journal Article Published

William Diehl
The American Journal of Distance Education

Lucy Rai
Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning

Dietmar Kennepohl
International Review of Research in Online and Distributed Learning (IRRODL)

Summary

Writing for publication is a lot of work and the process of article selection and acceptance through peer-review can sometimes seem frustrating (Rai, 2018). That topic has been deliberated on quite often in the past and will, no doubt, continue to be in the future. This panel session is designed for scholars and practitioners and from the experienced researcher to those that are new to publishing. Whether you need to publish as an academic or as a non-academic had not really considered it, we first look at the advantages that come with communicating your work through peer-reviewed journals. The panel consists of editors from leading open, online and distance journals from around the world who bring their perspective on submitted articles and offer helpful practical advice on how to get published and read. However, this is just the beginning. Once the panelists have introduced themselves and have made a few opening remarks on issues that they have experienced, it is your turn.

Most of the session will be devoted to an open dialogue (not just Q&A with panelists) to help answer those perennial questions including: Why should I publish in peer-reviewed journals? Where should I publish my work? How do I get my article submission accepted? How do I get people to read my work?

About the Presenters

William C. Diehl is an assistant professor of Education at Penn State and coordinator of online graduate programs in Lifelong Learning and Adult Education. He serves as an associate editor for The American Journal of Distance Education and is the director of The American Center for the Study of Distance Education.

Email: wcd116@psu.edu

Lucy Rai is a senior lecturer in social work at The Open University, UK, Director of PRAXIS Scholarship Centre and co-editor for Open Learning: the journal of open, distance and e-learning. Lucy is a former editor for the Journal for Learning Development in Higher Education and has published widely on academic and professional writing in social work.

Address: The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK
Email: lucy.rai@open.ac.uk
Phone: 44 (0)1908 655841
Dietmar Kennepohl is Professor of Chemistry and former Associate Vice President Academic at Athabasca University—Canada’s Open University. He is a well-published and sought-after presenter for over two decades and is currently an interim co-editor at IRRODL.

Address: AU Press, Athabasca University, 1200, 10011 – 109 Street NW, Edmonton, AB T5J 3S8
Email: dietmark@athabascau.ca
Phone: 780-391-1234
Using Gap Analysis to Identify Courses Impeding Student Progress

Karen Swan
Distinguished Professor

William Bloemer
Professor Emeritus

University of Illinois at Springfield

Summary

Improvement in undergraduate retention and progression is a priority at many US postsecondary institutions. A number of institutions address this issue by identifying gateway courses (foundational courses in which a large number of students fail or withdraw) and concentrating on “fixing” them. This presentation will argue that may not be the best use of limited resources. No matter what we do, there will always be courses with too many students receiving grades of D, F and W simply because of the nature of their content and the preparation of the students who must take them. Our research suggests that student type and the point in their academic careers at which students take classes affect student success, and that courses which block student progression can be found at all undergraduate levels.

Specifically, we have found that one can use binary logistic regression with student type, academic stage, cumulative GPA, and prior withdrawals as predictor variables to estimate individual students’ success in undergraduate courses at our institution. We can then use these predictions to calculate an expected D/F/W rate for each course. Moreover, relating predictions to observed D/F/W rates can highlight courses which fail to meet expectations, as well as those exceeding them, to support a more nuanced understanding of where attention is needed. In this presentation, we will describe our “gap analysis” procedure and illustrate the utility of such approach with examples from issues surrounding success in online courses at our institution.

About the Presenters

Karen Swan is the James Stukel Professor of Educational Leadership and a Research Associate in the Center for Online Learning, Research and Service at the University of Illinois at Springfield. She has been involved in online learning for over 20 years and is well known for her research in the area and service to the Online Learning Consortium.

Address: University of Illinois Springfield, MS BRK 377, Springfield, IL 62703
Email: kswan4@uis.edu
Phone: 217-206-7424

Bill Bloemer is a Research Professor of Educational Leadership, a chemist, and Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. He has been involved in the implementation of online degrees and research related to them for over 20 years.

Address: University of Illinois Springfield, MS HSB 314, Springfield, IL 62703
Email: bbloe1@uis.edu
Phone: 217-206-6589
"Stop Giving Me Busy Work": Why Online Discussions Can Be a Drag for Students and Instructors Alike, and What You Can Do about It

Tori Svoboda, Ed.D.
Associate Professor, Student Affairs Administration
University of Wisconsin–La Crosse

Summary

As a new online instructor about a decade ago, I clung to the “post once, reply twice” asynchronous discussion strategy as I attempted to facilitate meaningful peer-to-peer interactions. I attempted to recreate the “think-pair-share” dialogue that seemed to work so well in a face-to-face class. But I quickly learned my approach created discussions that were formulaic, transactional, and just plain tired. Students were on to me, knowing (perhaps even before I did) that I was really using discussions to see if they completed the reading. There’s nothing wrong with checking for learning, but as instructors, we ought to be honest and clear about the purpose of our assignments and assessments.

I realized monitoring discussions became “busy work” for me, too, as my tracking tools, grading rubrics, and instructions became ever more complex. In a Distance Teaching & Learning session a few years ago, I shared my encyclopedia of failures as I tried out different approaches to online discussions. Many laughed along, realizing that they were not alone in trying – but failing – to create meaningful dialogue.

My guess is that’s why I was invited to speak again this year, as folks might relate to my journey from early online instructor trying to control the environment to, hopefully, more experienced online instructor willing to reveal the messiness of instructional design.

About the Presenter

Dr. Tori Svoboda is an associate professor and M.S.Ed. Program Director in Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education at the University of Wisconsin–La Crosse. A former skeptic of online learning, Tori teaches mostly online now, engaging in research about faculty perceptions of, and student experiences with, online graduate education. She is an experienced presenter, educator, and consultant, focusing her research on how traditional college practices alienate working class and first-generation students. Her latest publication is ""I could always go back to being a bartender": Musings of an ambivalent academic," in S. Ardoin and b. martinez (Eds.), Straddling Class in the Academy (Stylus Publishing).

Address: University of Wisconsin–La Crosse, 1725 State St., 325 Morris Hall, La Crosse, WI 54601
Email: tsvoboda@uwlax.edu
Phone: 715-220-6889
Neuro-Andragogy & Student Success: The Science & Art of Changing the Brain

Dr. Kristen Betts
Clinical Professor
Drexel University

Summary

Advancements in neuroscience and technology reveal that the brain continues to change over a lifetime. In fact, neuroscientist Dr. Lara Boyd (2015) shares that “…every time you learn a new fact or skill, you change your brain.” Therefore, it is critical for educators to be aware of current and emerging research from the learning sciences that support instructional design, teaching, and assessment.

This interactive session will examine common neuromyths and evidence-based practices related to learning. The concept of neuro-andragogy will be discussed with high touch strategies to take a course from good to great to exceptional building upon research from Mind, Brain, and Education science. The session will include demonstrations on how metacognitive strategies and technology can transform classrooms (online, blended, onsite) through Universal Design for Learning, differentiated instruction, and Online Human Touch to support deeper learning, critical thinking, and real-world transfer.

About the Presenter

Dr. Kristen Betts is a Clinical Professor in the School of Education at Drexel University. Kristen has over 20 years of experience working in higher education with online learning and serving in key leadership positions within private, public, and for-profit institutions. Her research focuses on online and blended learning; Mind, Brain & Education science; Online Human Touch/high touch; online andragogy; accreditation; student/faculty recruitment and retention; and transfer of learning.

Address: School of Education, Drexel University
3401 Market Street, Suite 353, Philadelphia, PA 06804
Email: kbetts@drexel.edu
Phone: 912-257-8336
The Culture Quotient: Uncovering Organizational Culture to Deliver Online Faculty Development in an Online Delivery Mode

Carol Hernandez, M.A.
Instructional Designer
Stony Brook University

Wendy Williams, Ph.D.
Director, Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning
Yeshiva University

Summary

Faculty developers face an increasingly complex set of circumstances as they practice their work in training and supporting online faculty to provide excellent teaching. Consequently, what works at one institution might not work at all. We use Schein’s three levels of organizational culture to uncover what hidden forces are at play as faculty developers do their work via an online delivery mode. Some factors that impact the work include: various assumptions and values, levels of technological mastery, access to resources, student demographics, and a variety of prior teaching experiences for faculty, from new adjuncts to veteran instructors. Topics to be covered include: tackling conceptual assumptions, modeling teaching and learning in a distance environment, creating and sustaining a remote community of learners, lack of resources, creating and distributing templates, creating just-in-time teaching videos, using video conference tools, hosting and recording webinars; establishing a new center for faculty development and policies and procedures for online faculty.

About the Presenters

Carol Hernandez is an instructional designer and faculty developer. She is a doctoral candidate in Organizational Leadership Studies at Northeastern University. Her research is focused on faculty developers of color, intersectionality theory, and organizational change.

Address:
Long Island University
Post Campus, Schwartz Library 366, 720 Northern Blvd., Brookville, NY 11548

Email: carol.hernandez@stonybrook.edu
Phone: 305-389-6250

Wendy Williams is director of the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning at Yeshiva University, a small faith-based institution in New York City, with about 7,500 students and 600+ faculty. She holds a Ph.D. in Cultural Anthropology.

Address: Yeshiva University, 500 W. 185th Street, Furst Hall, Rm. 507, New York, NY 10033
Email: wendy.williams@yu.edu
Phone: 646-592-4265
Taking It Higher: Raising the Bar on Course Video Design

Judith Dutil
Lancaster Center Director
Central Penn College

Summary

Educators face many new skills to learn and master when they first begin their online teaching journeys. Many online educators learn that video content is an essential element in an online course yet most are not experienced video creators when they begin teaching online. Once an educator masters the technical skills necessary to create educational videos, it is time to consider the qualities videos should possess to make them optimal for engaged learning.

This interactive session will overview evidence-based measures of quality for online video design. Emphasis in this session will be on contextualizing content, optimizing video for learning, and time management.

About the Presenter

Judith Dutil is an experienced online educator with over 15 years of experience working and teaching in higher education. She currently serves as the director of the Lancaster Center at Central Penn College where she supports faculty who teach in the blended modality and she also works as a project manager at the Online Learning Toolkit, a web-based resource dedicated to supporting faculty through the online course design process with an emphasis on creating effective online video content.

Address: Central Penn College, Lancaster Center, 1905 Old Philadelphia Pike, Lancaster, PA 17602
Email: judithdutil@centralpenn.edu
    info@onlinelearningtoolkit.com
Phone: 717-384-5370
No proceedings paper was provided for this session.
Federal Update: Reauthorization and Department of Education Rulemaking
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Principal  
Foghlam Consulting, LLC

Cheryl Dowd  
Director of the State Authorization Network (SAN)  
WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technology (WCET)

Fred Lokken  
Chair of the Instructional Technology Council (ITC)  
Truckee Meadows Community College

Summary

Post-secondary education for the 21st Century is a current subject for philosophical thought, strategic planning, political concern, and Federal law and rulemaking. In Washington D.C., Congress has expressed that it plans to reauthorize the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) by the end of this calendar year. The HEA was last reauthorized in 2008. Since the last reauthorization, technology has played a significant role in the delivery of education and is anticipated to be prominently addressed in the reforms of the reauthorization.

The Department of Education (USED) has been left to manage the impact of new technological advances in post-secondary education through Federal regulations. Most recently, the USED held negotiated rulemaking on Accreditation and Innovation that ended in consensus. The USED has released the first of what will likely be three sets of proposed regulations. The first set of proposed regulations focuses on accreditation issues and state authorization of distance education. If the USED releases final regulations by November 1, 2019, the regulations will be effective July 1, 2020. However, HEA reauthorization that addresses any of the topic areas of the regulations, would supersede regulations. Federal regulations are created to implement Federal law created by Congress.

This presentation will summarize the actions taken place by Congress and the Department of Education to address technological advances in post-secondary education. Additionally, we will discuss the impact and implementation strategies that institutions must take to comply with possible changes to the HEA and Federal regulations.

About the Presenters

Dr. Van Davis is Principal at Foghlam Consulting, LLC where he focuses on higher education policy, distance education, college affordability, competency-based education, and educational technology.

Email: Van.Davis@foghlamconsulting.com  
Phone: 512-740-5333

Cheryl Dowd is the Director of the State Authorization Network (SAN) for WICHE Cooperative for Educational Technology (WCET). Cheryl earned her Juris Doctorate from the University of Richmond.

Email: cdowd@wiche.edu  
Phone: 303-541-0210
Fred Lokken is currently chair of the Instructional Technology Council (ITC). Fred is a tenured Political Science faculty member at TMCC in Reno, Nevada.

Email: flokken@tmcc.edu
Phone: 775-673-7148
No proceedings paper was provided for this session.
Teach Smarter: 5 Strategies for Effective (and Efficient) Online Teaching

B. Jean Mandernach, PhD
Executive Director, Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching
Grand Canyon University

Summary

The online classroom offers a plethora of instructional opportunities. So many, in fact, that it may interfere with teaching effectiveness. The ubiquity of the online classroom combined with an ever-evolving list of instructional technologies, limitless educational resources, and a plethora of pedagogical tasks (facilitating discussions, grading, feedback, content development, one-to-one communication, etc.) often leaves faculty struggling to prioritize their limited teaching time. While research supports the value and relevance of fostering an engaging, personalized, interactive online classroom, it stops short of explaining how to create this experience. To be effective, faculty need to know more than what to do; they need the skills, abilities, and tools to implement pedagogical strategies in an efficient and effective manner. To maximize instructional effectiveness, it is essential that online faculty prioritize their time investment to focus on high-impact instructional activities that promote interaction, presence, and participation. The key is to teach smarter, not harder (or longer). There are five key strategies for maximizing the impact of instructional time without burdening your workload:

1) Don’t waste a minute (prioritize and budget instructional time; batch instructional tasks);
2) Know your teaching ROI (emphasize interaction, presence, and feedback; capture students’ attention; customize existing content and resources; engage students as co-creators of content; save, organize, and recycle instructional materials; structure online discussions);
3) Streamline repetitive tasks (shift feedback time; create a holistic approach to grading and feedback; automate repetitive tasks);
4) Anticipate challenges (provide extracurricular student support and guidance; utilize proactive communication strategies; design opportunities for individualized learning); and
5) Limit supplemental technology (identify value and impact; focus on pedagogy).

About the Presenter

B. Jean Mandernach, Ph.D. is Executive Director of the Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching at Grand Canyon University. Her research focuses on enhancing student learning in the online classroom through innovative instructional and assessment strategies. She explores strategies for integrating efficient online instruction in a manner that maximizes student learning, satisfaction, and engagement. Jean is an active presenter and consultant in the field of online education and serves on various editorial boards. In addition to authoring numerous journal articles and chapters, Jean co-authored (along with Tobin and Taylor) the book, Evaluating Online Teaching: Implementing Best Practices.

Address: Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching
3300 West Camelback Road, Phoenix, AZ 85017
Email: Jean.Mandernach@gcu.edu
Phone: 602-639-7004
Interactive Sessions
What’s in Your Project Management Toolkit?

Lois Harrison
Manager of Project Management

Lisa Trumble
Supervisor of Project Management

Cengage Learning

Summary

Explore the basics of project management: tools, processes, and skills that are vital to timely and successful delivery of curriculum projects.
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About the Presenters

**Lois Harrison** is a former teacher with 5 years distance education experience who moved into project management 10 years ago. In that role she has worked with instructional designers and educational technologists to deliver many online programs and several hundred online courses at the higher ed and career school levels. She has also worked to develop many processes and tools that have made delivering online course projects easier and more successful. For the past three years, Lois has managed a team of PMs who project manage the delivery of online courses and programs. Lois has a MEd and a PMP.

Address: 199 Oak Creek Way, Dawsonville, GA 30534
Email: lois.harrison@cengage.com
Phone: 678-221-7368

**Lisa Trumble** is a former teacher, Lisa has more than 20 years of professional experience in project and program management for the development of learning products, educational materials, and curriculum development. Her expertise involves the use and adaptation of standard project management tools and processes to varying development efforts and team structures. She has trained many teams in how to identify the level of project management support needed and in how to select and use the right tools and processes to support those needs. Lisa has an MA in Project Management and a PMP.
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The 5 Dos and Don’t’s of Using Animation

Liesl Christle
Senior Account Manager

Peter Stout
Art Director

Reflection Software

Summary

Animation: Defining the Term

How Defining Animation Leads To Open Conversations
There are varying ideas and interpretations about how particular elements should look, function, sound, etc. And all of it seems to get mashed together and packed down into this one term of ‘animation.’ Merriam-Webster has the definition of animations as “the act of animation: the state of being animate or animated – animated cartoon.” The definition for ‘animate,’ is then “possessing or characterized by life; full of life.” The use of ‘cartoon’ as part of the definition easily brings to mind the shows that are watched by children on a Saturday morning. But often ‘cartoon is the last word that our clients want to hear, because it can misinterpret as something childish, immature, and just not the right ‘look’ for a training. And ‘full of life’ makes it seem that animation is all about personification – that idea of giving human characteristics to thoughts, ideas, or inanimate objects. It seems that animations should be all about that human elements – and to a certain extent that’s true. From our seat as the developers of the content, animation really comes down to anything that moves…going back to our definition, anything that has “life.”

So when animations is first brought up, we suggest starting with an open conversation of what animation means to you, your team, and your audience. And we would highly suggest that you look to your developers and graphic artists to be part of the conversation as their insight is invaluable when you to start collaborating on his and future projects.

Animation Do’s and Don’ts

Determine if animation is the right vehicle
- Do we have a concept?
- Is this just one concept?
- Does the concept need visuals?
- Would the concept require a “guide”? Something like a mascot or narrator

Be concise
- Don’t go above 2 minutes in length/time
- Don’t use as a catch-all
- Do know the terminology and make sure others on your team know and understand the terms being used as well

Tell a story
- Do make it entertaining
- Write a script, like you would for a movie or televisions show. Remember, it’s a story and you have to write it that way
Stay on target

- Don’t get side-tracked or try to tie in too many other topics that ‘seem’ to relate
- Get the script right the first time
- Don’t use as a catch-all – if the animation requires the end user to pause and read, then animation may not be the right vehicle

Be open minded

- There are a lot of ways something can be represented visually, and it will only better your animation to keep an open mind
- The collaboration can be just as impactful as the original script/concept
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Peter Stout is the Art Direction for Reflection Software’s Visual Communications Department. As the Director, Peter works with colleagues and clients to bring their vision to life through animation and graphical design. The create techniques used to achieve these visual goals include graphic design, conceptual design, animation, character design, and motion graphics.
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Utilizing an Online Course Design Matrix to Enhance Learner Engagement

Amber B. Ray
Assistant Professor
University of Hawaii at Mānoa

Summary

Teaching an online class is substantially different from teaching a face-to-face class. Quality instructional design must incorporate techniques and strategies that engage students and encourage them to be actively involved with the course content, the instructor, and each other. Providing instructors with the Course Design Matrix for Embedding Critical Components of Engagement will enhance their courses by assisting them in incorporating critical components for engagement of adult learners in an online environment.

Specific examples for online course activities and assignments that reflect the theoretical background of adult learning, Communities of Inquiry, and research literature on engagement will be provided. The aim of this presentation is to stimulate interest in and support faculty in developing quality, online educational experiences that result in learners’ active engagement with content, peers, and the instructor.

After attending this session, attendees will be able to:

- utilize and take home a tool that will assist them in online course design,
- apply the three critical components of engagement in the design of online course elements,
- evaluate the degree to which their course elements include critical components for engagement of adult learners in an online environment, and
- describe Communities of Inquiry and adult learning theory and how they apply to online course design.

About the Presenter

Amber B. Ray, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa. She has experience developing and teaching online and blended courses. In her online courses she incorporates synchronous meetings utilizing virtual meeting programs (e.g., Zoom) and asynchronous sessions within the university's learning management system. One of her areas of research includes a focus on effective instruction. A recent collaborative research endeavor has included examining effective strategies for supporting learning in online contexts.
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Begin Here: Writing Quality Learning Objectives

John A Hollenbeck, Ph.D.
Senior Instructional Design Consultant
University of Wisconsin Colleges Online

Summary

This interactive session is a guided exercise in creating quality learning objectives that clearly state the instructional goals of a course. Learning Objectives are a key element in course design, as they form the basis for determining the selection and alignment of learning elements in a course using observable and measurable language. The session will begin by addressing the three elements involved in writing well-formed learning objectives, then explore how learning objectives relate at different institutional and course levels, and finally how learning objectives map out in cognitive and knowledge dimensions. Using a series of handouts attendees will follow a step-by-step process to complete at least one quality learning objective by the end of the course.

Faculty and instructional designers with benefit from a complete explanation of the rationale and intent of learning objectives. In distance learning it is especially important to understand how learning objects interact at all levels of an educational institution to form a structure for the curriculum. Ultimately, clear learning objectives create a transparent learning environment for students that focuses their efforts. This session is informed by Anderson and Krathwohl’s 2001 publication “A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing,” which revises and expands on Benjamin Bloom’s 1956 Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain and provides a complete guide to using learning objectives in the systematic planning of learning systems.

Success in this session will be gauged by participants’ ability to use provided handouts to map a course of their own choosing. These handouts will provide fill-in areas for each of the steps of the course design process and will be a tangible reminder of the topics covered.
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Veteran Learning: Serving the Service Population in Online Learning

Steve Peterson M.Ed., MAIS
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Amanda Ziemendorf, DNP, MSN, RN
Doctor of Nursing Practice Program Chair/Lead Faculty

Grand Canyon University

Summary

Though we have made great strides in supporting our veteran population as they enter education and the workforce, more discussion is needed to support the special need in service of those who serve use. Student veteran retention rates in post-secondary academic environments continue to be low, in spite of available funding for their educational experience (Marcus, 2017). A Hechinger Report of federal data has suggested of full-time students who receive the GI Bill attending community colleges that approximately 15% actually graduate, while an independent National Student Clearinghouse report of 20 academic institutions identified that only one in five GI Bill recipients actually graduated when eligible to do so in 2014 (Marcus, 2017). In 2016 there were nearly 20 million veterans in the U.S. (DVA, 2016), with 13.1% of female and 10.5% of male veterans being either homeless or living in poverty (DVAffairs, 2014), a pattern consistent for several years prior. This session helps to establish basic awareness, context, and introduction to strategic support pertaining to the increasing population of veteran learners. Session discussion will aim to further the overarching dialogue and broaden collective understanding of challenges and solution.
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Address: 9737 East Lobo Ave, Mesa AZ 85209
Email: amanda.ziemendorf@gcu.edu
Phone: 716-807-6672
Adopt or Adapt: An OER about OER!

Olena Zhadko
Director of Online Education

Susan Ko
Faculty Development Consultant, Office of Online Education
Clinical Professor, History

Lehman College, City University of New York

Summary

Open Educational Resources (OER) offer the promise of more affordable, more current, and accessible learning for our students. OER enable faculty to refresh and renew their courses and by means of intentional planning improve course design and student learning. This unique session, itself an Open Educational Resource, is for those who want to better understand and promote the most effective and research-based use of OER at their own institutions or in their own courses. Participants will walk away with workshop materials (https://oerworkshop.commons.gc.cuny.edu/), enabling them to adapt and deliver a faculty development program at their own institution.

About the Presenters

Olena Zhadko has nearly 15 years of experience in the field of educational technology, a PhD in teaching and learning as well as the drive for advancing teaching and learning with technology. She has successfully worked at three academic centers by providing leadership and assistance in articulating and implementing effective teaching, and infusing best practices into curriculum development, delivery, and assessment through the effective use of technology. In her current role, she serves as the Director of Online Education at Lehman College, acting as the College's senior administrator charged with the oversight of all facets of online instruction.

Address: 250 Bedford Park Blvd W, Carman 264, Bronx, NY 10468
Email: olena.zhadko@lehman.cuny.edu
URL: https://oerworkshop.commons.gc.cuny.edu/
Phone: 718-960-1172

Susan Ko authored four editions of Teaching Online: A Practical Guide, a leading book in the field of online teaching. Responsible for the training of faculty and supporting online education at many institutions, including as Director of Faculty Development and Instructional Technology at CUNY School of Professional Studies, and as Executive Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning at University of Maryland, University College. She is currently Faculty Development Consultant in the Office of Online Education at Lehman College. She has more than 20 years of online teaching experience and currently serves as clinical professor in History department at Lehman College.

Address: 250 Bedford Park Blvd W, Carman 249, Bronx, NY 10468
Email: susan.ko@lehman.cuny.edu
URL: https://oerworkshop.commons.gc.cuny.edu/
Phone: 718-960-5586
Bridging the Gap between Theory and Practice: Implementing Experiential Learning

Tamara Mitchell
Associate Director of Learning and Design
Oregon State University, College of Science

Josie Strahle
Senior Instructional Designer
University of Arizona, Office of Digital Learning

Summary

Is it possible to effectively engage students in experiential learning in online courses? Although experiential learning in online environments is growing, many find it difficult to envision how experiential learning can be as effective in online courses (Britt, M., Goon, D., & Timmerman, M., 2015). Over the course of 6 months, we delved into the research on experiential learning in online courses, focusing on actionable examples and ideas. Recognizing the need to bridge the results of our research with day to day instructional design, we created a worksheet to facilitate the mapping of experiential learning in online courses. Through a brief summary of the literature along with case studies to demonstrate, participants will be engaged in a discussion on how existing activities or projects can be augmented to fit the learning cycle. Within this interactive session, attendees will collaboratively brainstorm activities and technology and then use a version of the experiential learning cycle to create or modify an online activity. The intent is for faculty and instructional designers to leave the session with a practical approach to bolstering experiential learning in their online courses.
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About the Presenters

**Tamara Mitchell** is an Associate Director of Learning and Design in the College of Science at Oregon State University. Her work for the past eight years spans three universities and includes developing and instructing courses in a nationally-ranked program and improving course quality for east and west coast universities through four years as a Quality Matters Peer Reviewer. Her primary focus is on integrating innovative research-based pedagogical approaches in undergraduate and graduate online courses. She seeks to improve learning and retention by actively applying experiential learning practices that customize the student experience.

Address: Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97355
Email: tamara.mitchell@oregonstate.edu
URL: [https://www.linkedin.com/in/tamaralmitchell/](https://www.linkedin.com/in/tamaralmitchell/)
Phone: 541-737-7818

**Josie Strahle** is a Senior Instructional Designer at the University of Arizona. She supports STEM courses and faculty and is especially interested in implementation of evidence-based practices and leveraging technology to improve engagement and learning.

Address: University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721
Email: jstrahle@email.arizona.edu
Add Some Spark'les to Your Online Course with Adobe Spark

Alan Natachu  
Learning Experience Designer  
Madison Area Technical College

Summary

You don’t have to be a graphic designer to look like you’ve spent years working as one. Adobe Spark is a free tool that easily allows you to create graphics, web pages and animated videos that are more than just eye candy.

Takeaway 1: Using Adobe Spark
Learn how to quickly create a “viral-worthy” graphics, web pages and videos without need to supply anything other than your words and thoughts.

Takeaway 2: Real World Applications
Learn how to incorporate your creations into your trainings, classes, emails and anywhere else you need add some sparkles to your projects.

About the Presenter

Alan Natachu is a Gen X’er with a Zen’ial* influence. He has 20 years video production experience as a Video Producer / Installation Artist / Documentarian / Short Video Producer / EDU Video Producer. He is one a heck of a MacGyver when it comes to making videos (be it analog, digital or 360). Natachu is a Learning Experience Designer with Madison Area Technical College, Madison WI.

Email: anatachu@madisoncollege.edu

*Zen’ial - Zen Millennial  
Definition: A millennial who can effortlessly cross the analogue (i.e. VHS Tape and digital (i.e. .mp4 video) divides.
Building a House without a Blueprint: Why Storyboards Matter

Alicia Raff
Account Manager
Reflection Software

Summary

An Effective Storyboard Leads to an Effective Training
Building a house requires careful planning, and must take into account a multiplicity of factors, such as the type of climate the house will reside in, the topography of the land, and even the people who will be living there themselves. All of these factors are deliberately and meticulously considered and planned out, and then placed into a blueprint which becomes the framework for bringing the house to life. Much like building a house, constructing an online learning training (eLearning) requires careful planning and a critical eye to detail to make it come to life for learners. In order to effectively build the eLearning that works best for learners, it is critical that a “blueprint” also known as a “storyboard” be developed so that any and all individuals involved with a project will be able to understand the content and create the best eLearning possible. The storyboard outlines everything about the eLearning, from the onscreen text and the audio, all the way to the timing of media paired with the content. Every organization’s storyboarding needs will be unique to their own training goals and development, but this session will look to support participants in identifying their particular storyboard components and then help them begin to build out a custom storyboard template that can be used immediately on their next eLearning initiative. By implementing a standard storyboard template that can be used throughout the organization, eLearning training development will become more streamlined, thereby cutting out the “guesswork” of development and creating a more effective training.

About the Presenter

As an Instructional Designer and Account Manager, Alicia Raff supports the Reflection Software Development Team in creating engaging eLearning content. This work includes writing, proofreading, creative treatment generation, and assimilating content pieces into cohesive sections for a comprehensive training. Alicia also acts as the liaison between the Reflection Software Internal Development Team and the client’s project team, ensuring that the vision and mission of the client are implemented in every aspect of the training. She has spoken at several conferences over the years, including the Chicago eLearning and Technology Showcase in 2017, and the Online Learning Conference and ATD Central Annual Indiana Learning Summit in 2018.

Address: 900 South Frontenac Street, Aurora, IL 60504
Email: araff@reflectionsoftware.com
URL: www.reflectionsoftware.com
Phone: 630-270-1221
Your Roles and Career Goals: Prioritizing What’s Important

Dr. Kimberly Jarvis
CEO & Founder
All Career Matters, Inc.

Summary

During this interactive session, participants will be encouraged to consider their own professional growth and development, beginning with identifying the primary life roles they juggle, their main priorities and whether they’re focusing their time, energy and attention on what’s important. They will create a career goal they would like to achieve, identify potential obstacles, consider the knowledge, skills, and experience they need to achieve the goal in addition to the steps they'll take in the next 30 days to work towards the goal. Finally, participants will share their career goal and gain resources, ideas and connections from other participants.

About the Presenter

Dr. Kimberly Jarvis is a strategic talent developer with over 20 years’ experience in career and leadership development coaching with individuals and groups from diverse backgrounds and industries. Kimberly is an official member of the Forbes Coaches Council and her career advice has been featured in Forbes, Barron’s, CNBC, Vogue, Training Industry and Moneyish. Leveraging her leadership experience in several different industries, Kimberly creates and delivers customized organizational, leadership and talent development initiatives aimed at improving individual and team performance and engagement. She specializes in implementing large-scale programs and initiatives geared toward people development. In addition to consulting with leaders and teams, Kimberly teaches for the Distance Education program at UW-Madison.

Email: kjarvis@allcareermatters.com
Website: www.allcareermatters.com
Phone: 773-362-7594
No proceedings paper was provided for this session.
Discussion Hero: Gamified Discussions for Online Learners

David Noffs
Learning Designer and Lecturer

Jacob Martinez
Learning Designer

Northwestern University

Summary

Online discussion boards have been used since 1979 and, while foundational to asynchronous interaction among students and teachers, they can be tedious and predictable, even when instructors design carefully worded prompts. Students tend to agree with each other in class discussions even if they do not feel the same way. Many faculty have shared with their learning designers how they wish students would engage with each other in a more dynamic exchange of ideas. As a result, Northwestern learning designers Jacob Guerra-Martinez and David Noffs explored various ways to gamify discussion boards to do just that. The result was Discussion Hero, a gamified discussion board which places student participants into Hero/Villain roles and brings debate-style interaction to Canvas discussions.

During this presentation, Guerra-Martinez and Noffs will describe the evolution of Discussion Hero from an idea explored during a year-long Educational Technology Teaching Fellowship (ETTF) and developed over the past year as part of the Provost’s Digital Learning Fellowship. As part of the presentation, the two learning designers will demonstrate how Discussion Hero works, plus showcase research data from three pilot programs over the last year.

About the Presenters

David Noffs has spent most of his life designing innovative and experimental learning environments, from his early work with hi-tech mobile classrooms in Australia’s rural communities, to over ten years as an instructional technologist and designer in the Center for Innovation in Teaching Excellence at Columbia College Chicago. In 2015 he began teaching learning environment design at Northwestern University’s School of Professional Studies and then joined the Distance Learning team as a Learning Designer in 2017. In this role, he feels able to do what he loves most; help educators make learning a productive, enjoyable, and transformative experience. His doctoral dissertation in Adult and Continuing Education from National Louis University is entitled, Resonating Frequencies of a Virtual Learning Community: An Ethnographic Case Study of Online Faculty Development at Columbia College Chicago.

Address: Northwestern University, Abbott Hall, Third Floor
710 North Lakeshore Dr., Chicago, Illinois 60611
Email: david.noffs@northwestern.edu
Phone: 312-503-5982

Before moving to Chicago from a small town in Texas (right at the southern tip), Jacob Martinez worked as an Instructional Designer for almost eight years at a local community college. That role allowed him to collaborate with faculty members in the development of online courses for various programs, thus expanding the educational opportunities to students of all types throughout the region. He is currently a Learning Designer at Northwestern University, where he develops online courses for the School of Professional Studies. Prior to the journey that is online learning, he was a Special Education Teacher for five years, where he taught high-school students with learning disabilities in the subjects of Math,
Computers, and English. Jacob graduated with a Bachelor’s degree in Radio-Television-Film from the University of Texas at Austin, and then went on to earn a Master’s degree in Computer Education and Cognitive Systems from the University of North Texas. That program is where he got my first taste of distance learning, and from then on he was hooked. One of Jacob’s passions outside of education is writing, which is why he also decided to complete an MFA in Creative Writing at the University of Texas Pan-American (now the University of Texas – RGV).

Address: Northwestern University, Abbott Hall, Third Floor
710 North Lakeshore Dr., Chicago, Illinois 60611
Email: jacob.guerra-martinez@northwestern.edu
Phone: 312-503-5124
No proceedings paper was provided for this session.
Bringing the Outside In: Integrating Web 2.0 Tools in LMS Environments

Alexandra Miller
Instructional Designer
Arizona State University

Summary

The abundance of Web 2.0 tools, particularly those designed for education, is tempting for instructors to dive into. Web 2.0 technology refers to internet-based tools and services that are collaborative, community-based, and interactive. For instructors who value constructivist teaching, Web 2.0 tools, which typically turn students from receivers of content to creators, are a natural pedagogical fit (Can, Gelmez-Burakgazi, & Celik, 2019; Craig, 2007). Additionally, Web 2.0 tools, and the collaboration that comes along with them, can be valuable in preparing students for the latest trends in the workplace (Cummings, 2016). However, the integration of these into learning management systems is not necessarily straightforward. Faculty training, student tech-savviness, student privacy, and platform compatibility must all be considered ahead of time (Craig, 2007).

In this session, participants will explore the value of integrating Web 2.0 technology, such as cloud-based documents, wikis, social bookmarking, blogs, and social media, in online courses as well as investigate strategies for implementation. Participants will come away from the session with an understanding of the research into using Web 2.0 tools in higher education and online learning, practical considerations for implementation, and strategies for integrating Web 2.0 tools into their own online course.

References


About the Presenter

Alexandra Miller is an Instructional Designer with the Mary Lou Fulton Teacher's College at Arizona State University. She designs and manages online courses in multiple graduate education programs. Previously, she was the Educational Technology Specialist for the Office of English Language Acquisition Services at the Arizona Department of Education. In that capacity, she created and delivered virtual professional development and online certification courses for teachers of English learners. She has an M.Ed. in Education Technology from Northern Arizona University and an M.A. in Anthropology from Arizona State University.

Address: 4701 W. Thunderbird Rd., Glendale, AZ 85306
Email: alexandra.miller@asu.edu
Phone: 602-543-0003
Four Things to Consider in Response to an “OCR Letter”

Angela Jackson
Online Program Manager

Dr. Shannon Beller
Education Technology Integrationist

University of South Dakota

Summary

Accessibility compliance ensures that students with disabilities have the opportunity to participate fully in high education distance education courses and communicate effectively through electronic technology with all student services. Online courses that are not accessible creates unintentional barriers for learners with disabilities and opens up colleges and universities with online programs to several risks. Faculty developers, managers, designers, and IT – those “leading from the middle” play a significance role within the institution when responding to a legal complaint or investigation related to accessibility. This session will examine the four important things institutions need to consider when preparing for and responding to an institutional audit, legal complaint, or investigation related to ADA and accessibility – people, policy, plan, and resources (time and budget).

About the Presenters

Angela Jackson is the Online Program Manager for USD Online and a Section 508 Specialist at the Center for Teaching and Learning for the University of South Dakota (USD). She is a champion for digital accessibility on her campus and serves as an institutional representative on the South Dakota Board of Regents Accessibility Taskforce. Angela is currently pursuing an Ed.D. in Adult and Higher Education, and holds a master’s degree in Technology for Education and Training, and B.Sc. degree in information systems. Her research includes understanding online faculty experiences designing accessible courses. She is a member of the International Association of Accessibility Professionals (IAAP), EDUCAUSE, POD Network, and WCET

Address: University of South Dakota
        414 East Clark Street, McKusick Room 112, Vermillion, SD 57069
Email:  angela.jackson@usd.edu
Phone:  605-677-5411

Dr. Shannon Beller is an Education Technology Integrationist for the Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of South Dakota where she works with faculty members on course design, integrating technology in the classroom, and pedagogy. Her education includes a doctorate in Adult Higher Education Administration.

Address: University of South Dakota
        414 East Clark Street, McKusick Room 107, Vermillion, SD 57069
Email:  shannon.beller@usd.edu
Phone:  605-677-5411
Accessibility: Options for Affordability and Replicability

Vance S. Martin, PhD
Campus Accessibility Specialist
University of Illinois at Springfield

Summary

Accessibility has become a major topic within p-20 education over the last few years, and one which typically raises more questions than answers. What is legally required? How do we meet these requirements? Who is responsible? The University of Illinois at Springfield took the proactive step of hiring a Campus Accessibility Specialist in 2017. Since then he has given many presentations to departments and faculty on what needs to be done, as well as trained a group of student workers to help ease the load of busy faculty making course files accessible.

In this presentation we will look at some of the regulations in place for higher education, and the process undertaken at the University of Illinois at Springfield. The initial process involved trainings and education for faculty and staff. The secondary process involved hiring, training, and managing student workers. We will look at these processes, as well as the cost savings of using student workers to remediate digital files compared to commercial options. Finally, we will share a spreadsheet which you can take back to your institution to help you determine how much a similar undertaking would cost at your institution.

About the Presenter

Vance Martin is the Campus Accessibility Specialist at UIS. For over fifteen years he has taught undergraduate and graduate courses in history, humanities, education and technology. He has taught using in-person, online, and hybrid formats. He has over ten years of experience in curriculum design, instructional design, and accessibility.

Vance’s research looks at technology use in education, social justice, and the intersection of the two. His dissertation project used wikis in community college history classes, which he found encouraged students to question standard historical narratives and created an environment in which minority students felt represented and engaged.

Address: Center for Online Learning, Research, and Service (COLRS)
University of Illinois Springfield
One University Plaza MS - Brookens Library 428, Springfield, IL 62703
Email: vmart02s@uis.edu
URL: https://sites.google.com/view/vancesmartin/home
Phone: 217-206-8118
Welcome to the Neighborhood: Building Community in an Online Classroom

Crystal McCabe Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Sonya Berges M.Ed.
Assistant Professor

Grand Canyon University

Summary

Sense of Community
Being a part of a community brings out the feelings that we belong, we matter to each other, and we are able to build relationships to accomplish our mutual goals (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). In an online or distance classroom, developing these feelings of community is an important step toward student success. Online students express feelings of isolation and a desire for more interaction with fellow students and the instructor (Berry, 2017; Bowers & Kumar, 2015). Student success and degree completion are vital to the field in online, blended, and distance education. This session will discuss the importance of community in the online classroom through the lens of two theories, Student Embeddedness and Sense of Community. Through interactive discussion and hands-on practice, attendees will leave with practical tools to add to their Teacher Toolbox and use in your next online classroom.
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About the Presenters

Crystal McCabe is an associate professor at Grand Canyon University. Crystal has been teaching full-time as an online instructor for six years and has presented and been published in the area of building relationships in the online classroom.

Address: 3300 W. Camelback Rd., Phoenix, AZ 85017
Email: Crystal.McCabe@gcu.edu
Phone: (602)639-7936

Sonya Berges is an assistant professor at Grand Canyon University. Sonya has also been teaching as a full-time instructor for the past six years. She has presented and been published on using technology to build community and student success in the online classroom.

Address: 3300 W. Camelback Rd., Phoenix, AZ 85017
Email: Sonya.Berges@gcu.edu
Phone: (602)639-8830
Reimagining Student Engagement through Simulations in Virtual Spaces

Terra Gargano, PhD
Professorial Lecturer, School of International Service
Program Director, Online Programs
American University

Edward Timke, PhD
Instructor and Associate Editor
Department of Cultural Anthropology, Duke University
Adjunct Professorial Lecturer
School of International Service, American University

Summary

This session explores how to successfully adapt simulations developed for traditional classrooms for synchronous platforms. Acknowledging the importance of the co-construction of knowledge and the impact of “learning by doing” in classrooms, this session will explore instructional design approaches, logistical issues, cultural perspectives, and pedagogical considerations for translating successful in-person simulations to online synchronous learning environments. An example from a graduate level intercultural communication course, including lessons learned and best practices, will be shared. Participants will be given an opportunity to collectively brainstorm approaches for adapting their own simulations for a synchronous classroom.

Session Goals

- Examine critical junctures throughout the training life cycle to adapt in-person simulations to a synchronous environment.
- Create a space to engage participants in online simulations.
- Discuss what it means to engage as a facilitator at the intersection of content knowledge, technology know-how, and training pedagogy and instructional design to conduct successful synchronous simulations.
- Identify the ways culture impacts how participants engage in virtual training environments.
- Provide a space to consider and evaluate new approaches and activities in virtual classrooms.

About the Presenters

Terra Gargano serves as the Program Director and Faculty Advisor for the School of International Service’s Online Programs at American University in Washington, DC. With over 300 graduate students enrolled and logging in from 16 different time zones, it is the largest graduate program in the School. She spent time teaching English in Japan and was the Assistant Dean of Semester at Sea before serving as a faculty member at American University as well as the University of Maryland. Throughout her career in international and online education, she managed dozens of study abroad programs, institutional collaborations, and virtual exchanges worldwide.

Address: School of International Service, 4400 Massachusetts Ave, Washington, DC 20016
Email: gargano@american.edu
URL: https://www.american.edu/sis/faculty/gargano.cfm
Phone: 202-885-1612
**Edward Timke** is Instructor of advertising and society courses at Duke University. He is also Associate Editor of *Advertising & Society Quarterly*, a journal focused advertising’s role in society, culture, history, and the economy. He is also Adjunct Professorial Lecturer in the Master of International Relations online program at American University's School of International Service. He is the Co-Director of Circulating American Magazines, a project funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Edward’s work centers on the role of advertising and media in shaping how different cultures and people come to understand and imagine each other.

Address: Department of Cultural Anthropology, Campus Box 90091, Durham, NC 27708  
Email: edward.timke@duke.edu  
URL: www.edwardtimke.com  
Phone: 919-684-8863
Teaching Online Science Lab Courses: Challenges and Solutions

Bobby Duke
Distance Learning Specialist
Carolina Biological Supply Company

Kathryn Kloepper
Associate Professor of Chemistry/Director of Research that Reaches Out (QEP)
Mercer University

Summary

The best way to learn science is by doing science, but how can distance learning students do science in their homes? A lack of quality, safe, and affordable lab materials can prevent students from doing the kinds of rigorous, hands-on lab investigations they would on campus.

There are alternatives to traditional lab materials, such as videos and simulations. However, such alternatives do not fully capture the essence of a physical experimental setup. Videos are experienced passively, which makes them poor substitutes for interactive involvement. Most simulations are very low-stakes endeavors. Students can’t run out of materials, mistakes are easily reversed, and the number of possible outcomes is very limited. No preparation or cleanup is necessary; events typically do not unfold in real time.

Lab kits can provide quality instructional materials to support active, engaged learning. Ideally, a kit is comprised of multiple investigations, each with its own set of measurable student learning outcomes. With such a lab kit, the student is responsible for carrying out every aspect of the experimental procedure. Mistakes can happen, results may not be as anticipated (which does not necessarily mean they are incorrect), and troubleshooting is sometimes necessary. Using lab kits can provide raw material for rich discussions with the instructor and classmates. The lab experience lends itself to varied and robust assessment. Session participants will have the opportunity to discuss planning and implementation of lab kits and try a sample investigation.

About the Presenters

Bobby Duke has been a Distance Learning Specialist with Carolina Biological Supply Company for the past four years where he has spent his time creating and implementing online labs for colleges and universities. Before he started at Carolina, he worked as an Environmental Chemist for four years. Bobby also taught and redesigned environmental and oceanography labs for North Carolina State University for an additional two years. He received his B.S. in Environmental Science from Elon University, as well as his M.S. in Marine Science from North Carolina State University.

Address: 2700 York Rd., Burlington, NC, 27215
Email: Robert.Duke@carolina.com
URL: www.carolina.com/distancelearning
Phone: 1-800-334-5551 x6328
Kathryn Kloepper is an Associate Professor at Mercer University and has been teaching for over 10 years with four years of experience teaching in distance learning. She has also been teaching an online chemistry lab course for the past two years using hands-on lab activities from Carolina Distance Learning.

Email:  kathrynkloesser@cla.mercer.edu
URL:    https://www.mercer.edu/
Phone:  1-800-MERCER.U
Let’s Talk Competencies

Amy Carpenter
Instructional Designer
Center for Innovative Instructional Design and Instruction
Utah State University

Summary

Who are your students, how will they register for courses, when will they complete the course work, what grades will they receive on their transcripts, and where will you find your pilot program for the degree you are offering? As your institution begins to grapple with implementing a competency based model, you will want to answer as many of these questions, with as many stakeholder as possible, before you start recruiting faculty and developing courses. You will want to involve the Registrar’s office, advisors, the marketing team, instructional designers, assessment specialists, and your online teaching and learning group from the beginning as you hash out the details. Once you are ready to start working with faculty, consider putting together a worksheet to walk them through the process of defining and writing competencies and objectives, and mapping their competencies to assessments and materials.

About the Presenter

Amy Carpenter in a senior instructional designer with the Center for Innovative Design and Instruction (CIDI) at Utah State University. She oversees the development of all online courses, including the development of a CBE program focusing on an Associate’s of General Studies. She also works with faculty to plan, build, and evaluate online, blended, and broadcast courses.

Address: Utah State University, 5105 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322
Email: amy.carpenter@usu.edu
Phone: 435-797-9497
In the Zone: VR/360 for and New Frontiers for Student Learning

Kathleen Beardsell, MEd, MFA
Learning Designer

Michelle Ehlert, MSIDT, MLIS
Senior Learning Designer

Thomas James, MET
Video Production Manager/Instructional Designer

Maryville University

Summary

In this interactive session, we’ll share examples from online courses at Maryville where we use VR/360 videos with navigational and interactive hotspots. The equipment, software, and process that Maryville uses to create these videos will be discussed, as well as sharing lessons learned. Literature supports the use of these types of technologies to help motivate and engage students, provide more immersive experiences, and enhance retention. We’ll introduce and demonstrate one free, open-source app which can be used to add informational hotspots to web-based images. Attendees will download an image and add their own interactive hotspots to the image using the app, then work in groups to design a VR/360 video learning activity for an online course. Participants will be guided through the design process: groups will select an image, identify a learning objective, determine placement of interactive hotspot(s), plan infobox content, and propose how to situate the activity in the context of an online learning environment (LMS).

About the Presenters

Kathleen Beardsell is a Learning Designer in the School of Adult & Online Education at Maryville University, where she partners with faculty to design interactive learning experiences and develop multimedia course content for online learning environments. Her interests include virtual reality, mixed reality, collaborative learning, active learning, constructivist pedagogy, and concept mapping.

Address: 650 Maryville University Drive, St. Louis, MO 63141
Email: kbeardsell@maryville.edu
Phone: 314-529-9627

Michelle Ehlert is a Senior Learning Designer in the School of Adult & Online Education at Maryville University, where she partners with faculty to design and develop online courses in a variety of disciplines. She likes using technology not only to help make learning more engaging but believes it’s important for students to use technology themselves to “show what they know” and be creators of content – not just consumers of content.

Address: 650 Maryville University Drive, St. Louis, MO 63141
Email: mehlert@maryville.edu
Phone: 314-529-9615

Thomas James is the Video Production Manager and Designer for the School of Adult and Online Education at Maryville University. As the Production Studio Manager, he works with faculty to produce a variety of video products for both online and on-ground courses. His areas of interest include graphic
design, photography, digital visual effects, audio production, web development and video post-production.

Address: 650 Maryville University Drive, St. Louis, MO 63141
Email: tjames.l@maryville.edu
Phone: 314-529-6563
The Value of Visuals in Online Learning

Ryan Eash
Learning and Development Specialist
TechSmith

Summary

90% of information transmitted to the brain is visual. Utilizing visual communication can help clarify your message and provide retention for the learner. Using screen captures and video explanations humanize the communication and help answer questions clearly the first time. During this session we will look at ways to remove the back-and-forth emails of text that leave recipients trying to decipher what was meant by a statement. Please join me to discuss how using visual communication tools can improve the learning experience for students.

About the Presenter

Ryan Eash is the Learning and Development Specialist for TechSmith, and an adjunct faculty member at Lenoir-Rhyne University, teaching two fully online courses for the Online Learning and Instructional Design master’s program. Ryan utilizes video as a primary means of communication with students. He’s been teaching others about the benefits of using Camtasia for the past 12 years.

Address: TechSmith Corporation, 2405 Woodlake Dr, Okemos, MI 48864
Email: r.eash@techsmith.com
Phone: (517) 381-2300 x589
Using Distance Education to Help Fix the U.S. Science Teacher Shortage

Jim Brinson, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Ecology
Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College

Summary

Methods and Results

National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) Secondary Content Analysis was used to demonstrate the alignment and mapping of the B.S. in Natural Sciences program courses at American Public University System (APUS) to state and national certification standards for teaching licensure. Current NSTA Preservice Science Standards language does not preclude the use of non-traditional lab environments that retain the use physical manipulatives to meet standards related to content knowledge (Standard 1) and professional knowledge and skills (Standard 6) (NSTA, 2012a). Non-traditional labs, such as kits, also do not contradict the knowledge base used to support these standards (NSTA, 2012b). Digital data acquisition instrumentation and custom laboratory kits containing green chemicals, specimens, glassware, instrumentation, hardware, etc. are shipped to students worldwide, and examples of such kits were shown and demonstrated. It is also possible to overcome the financial and logistical barrier of meeting international shipping regulations and delivering laboratory equipment and materials across international waters and borders, even into remote regions of military deployment. Liability, materials warehousing, and inventory can also be transferred away from the university. To preserve academic integrity and maintain records of student identity, students are required to take pictures and videos at various benchmarks within the laboratory procedures (i.e. practical skills, laboratory setups, measurements, product validation, observation validation, and post-lab content assessments). All pictures additionally require the student’s face, and a label with lab name, date, lab title, and description of the picture. Videos require students to pan the laboratory workspace, and the student must be visible as he/she starts the recording, films the required footage, and then be visible again as the recording is stopped. The video cannot be edited or spliced during the recording. Tables, graphs, charts, and statistical analysis are collated and uploaded into the virtual classroom. Post-lab assessments involve submission of data in the aforementioned formats, benchmark and identity verification using digital media (pictures or video), mathematical calculations involving student-generated data, self-analysis of performance, assessing pronunciation of scientific terminology (via audio submission), and textual responses.

Implications for Science Education Policy

NTS offer unique challenges for teacher education programs, as they are often unable to participate in traditional, synchronous face-to-face classroom events and schedules (Collins et al., 2015), and thus increasingly rely on online education (Ford & Vignare, 2015). This is particularly challenging for science teacher preparation programs wherein laboratory experiences are not only required, but critical (Hofstein & Lunetta, 2004; Hofstein & Mamlok, 2007). Though current research suggests it is possible to meet laboratory learning objectives using virtual or remote laboratory methods (Brinson, 2017, 2016a, 2016b, 2015a, 2015b), blending them with a traditional hands-on option, such as a lab kit, caters more to the multi-modal needs of NTS, and perhaps more clearly fulfills state and national science teacher content certification standards.
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Summary

One popular framework used to guide the design and facilitation of fully online courses is the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2000). Although this framework is useful for designing interactive spaces of learning, it does not address broader, workplace skills necessary for 21st century life. Jenkins et al., (2006), have noted the importance of these 21st century skills such as appropriation, transmedia navigation, networking, and negotiation. Ito et al., (2013) also discusses a variety of 21st century skills, including: cognitive competencies (e.g., critical thinking, information literacy), intrapersonal competencies (e.g., adaptability, productivity), and interpersonal competencies (e.g., collaboration, leadership). Unfortunately, the CoI framework fails to provide tangible design principles which emphasize this broader scope of 21st century skill development.

For this reason, I have been developing a new conceptual design model for online courses that builds off of Jenkins (2006) concept of participatory cultures, using Siemens (2005) theory of connectivism as a guiding epistemological framework. The theory of connectivism argues that knowledge and learning is distributed, located across a diverse set of individuals, places, and mediating technologies. During this session, I hope to engage attendees in a discussion about why and how connectivism and participatory cultures can provide us with new ideas for designing and delivering fully online, asynchronous courses. Join me as we explore new ideas.
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Summary

Plagiarism is one pervasive instructional problem not often made visible. From a college instructor’s perspective, dealing with student plagiarism is neither attractive nor easy. Plagiarism is an issue that can occur in all classrooms whenever a writing assignment is necessary to assess student learning. Because information is readily available online, some past reports have declared that plagiarism is more prevalent in the online modality (Ackerman & White, 2008; Gilmore, Strickland, Timmerman, Maher & Parsell, 2004; Logue, 2004).

In this study, a focus group of 14 online full-time instructors participated in discussing perceptions of plagiarism due to misunderstanding. The results show that instructors identified two primary causes of this kind of plagiarism, which were poor paraphrasing and incorrect citing of academic sources. In addition, the results showed that there were three primary approaches taken to address such cases, which were coaching, simply allowing the student to rewrite the assignment with limited feedback, and referring the student to a plagiarism tutorial. Lastly, as part of a reflective critique, and in preparation for a pilot study, the authors constructed two vignettes as examples of cultural and generational factors that may contribute to such plagiarism.
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Summary

The panel discussion will focus on the lessons learned over the past two years as El Paso Community College (EPCC) began developing CBE pathways. EPCC is located on the U.S. Mexico border in the far west corner of Texas that serves just under 30,000 students. Less than 23% of the population has earned a Bachelor’s degree or higher. The college serves as a primary gateway to higher education for many low-income, educationally disadvantaged, and Hispanic students. Through a Perkins Leadership grant, EPCC began the first steps to developing CBE pathways that lead to a certificate or degree. The points of discussion include, introducing CBE to faculty and staff, understanding the value of standard frameworks, engaging Core Curriculum faculty participation, identifying hurdles to the cultural change CBE introduces.
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Summary

Faculty development and engagement continues to be an important topic of conversation, especially as institutions work to meet the needs of their students by increasing online and blended learning opportunities. However, building a comprehensive online and blended faculty development program to support the development of rich online and blended learning experiences can be difficult for higher education teaching and learning professionals. How do you get started? What are common components that institutions can include in their approaches to supporting online and blended instructors? How can institutions support instructors throughout the lifecycle of their teaching? What challenges arise when building a comprehensive vision?

Getting Started

Getting started can be the most difficult, but the key is to focus on gathering instructor needs, understanding your institution’s expectations, and keeping abreast of trends in higher education. To gather the needs of your institution’s instructors, think about developing a survey or facilitating focus groups to ask about their teaching challenges and needs. More informally, you might review feedback from prior workshops and catalog issues or concerns from meetings or consultations with faculty. Another key challenge to getting started is understanding your institution’s expectations. Become familiar with your institution’s strategic goals and enrollment plans. Make explicit links between your comprehensive vision and how it enables goals and enrollment. Finally, it is important stay abreast of the national trends. Key publications, like the ELI Key Issues in Teaching and Learning and the Horizon Report, will help you prepare for building your vision in the present as well as maintaining and updating it effectively with an eye toward the future.

Common Components

As you build your comprehensive vision for online and blended faculty development think about the journey of the instructor: What do they need when they need to teach their first online course? What will they need to help others as they progress in their teaching? It is important that instructors get both the technological (e.g., how to upload content and facilitate interaction in the learning management system) and pedagogical (e.g., how to support collaborative and active learning online) support that they need. Many institutions offer a formalized Online and Blended Teaching Program, supplemental workshops, informal communities of practice, and certification programs to ensure quality.

Challenges

As you plan your program, don’t forget that instructors often have diverse skill sets (e.g., some are more familiar with technology than others) and roles (e.g., full-time faculty vs. part-time adjunct). This necessitates a plan that incorporates experiences aimed at all skill set levels in mediums that support participation remotely and/or asynchronously.
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Summary

Title IX is a federal law that was passed as part of the Educational Amendments of 1972 that requires compliance by all educational institutions that receive federal funding. They must meet Title IX requirements regardless of the level of education offered or the modality in which it is offered. Over 90% of the current University of Phoenix students are enrolled in the online modality, and over 7,000 faculty members teach for the university, primarily in the online modality. The University’s Title IX Team has been recognized as a leader with regard to Title IX compliance by the Association of Title IX Administrators, and they continually update the University’s policy as federal law requires. Sexual harassment and discrimination in the online environment and use of technology to investigate, conduct interviews, and obtain evidence will be discussed in this session. The use of technology to report on and conduct Title IX climate surveys, how to conduct hearing board training remotely, supportive measures used to assist students impacted by Title IX, and how the university informs students, faculty, and staff of their rights and responsibilities under Title IX will also be addressed. Attendees of this session will understand the complex requirements of reporting, investigating, and closing the loop on all reported Title IX concerns; and they will understand the work flow from start to finish for the Title IX investigations at the University of Phoenix.
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Proven Practice Sessions
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Summary

In this session, the presenter shares her experience of a self-study of data visualization undertaken by her online education research unit and offers examples of how her research unit has applied what they have learned to a range of projects. The session presents the following 10 lessons learned:

1. Data visualization as storytelling
   • What are the key elements in your data? Who is your audience? Will a visual be helpful?

2. Shaping data visualizations for different audiences
   • What is the broadest audience that you’re trying to reach? What is the best way to reach your audience? What are your primary outlets for delivery?

3. Choosing the right chart or graph for your data
   • What are the purposes of certain chart or graph types? What are the best charts or graph types for your data? Would a colleague (unfamiliar with the data) understand your visual?

4. The importance of color
   • How can a focus area be emphasized with color? Are your color choices accessible? Are there additional ways to emphasize focus areas?

5. The role of font choice
   • Does your institution offer branded fonts? Is it simple, clear and easy to read on paper, online and at a distance (if projected)? How will I ensure font transferability?

6. The impact of institutional branding
   • Who is your institution’s marketing contact? Does your institution offer templates or other resources? Are your data visualizations aligned with your institution’s brand?

7. Accessibility considerations
   • Use available resources to help you learn. Build time into your preparation process and create a planning document. Use accessibility checkers within your software.

8. Repurposing data visualizations
   • Can the visual stand alone? Will this information be relevant days, months or years from now?
   • Plan ahead for the various outlets through which your visual can be repurposed

9. Learning by example(s)
   • Review data visualization examples

10. Resources for approaching a self-study of data visualization

Using these lessons, participants complete a data visualization roadmap answering reflective and practical questions to choose a data visualization method to apply to a project.
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Summary

e-Orientation Development for Indiana University’s Online MSW Program
Within the last two years, admissions in the online MSW Direct program have grown by 41%, making it the third largest online graduate program at Indiana University. Due to this growth, the needs of online students have diversified and expanded. We have shifted from an in-person orientation to a fully online, interactive orientation which utilizes digital courseware and adaptive learning technologies to meet the growing needs and demands of these online learners. The initial in-person orientation was delivered on campus over a 3-day period. This placed a financial burden on our mostly non-traditional students. Many incoming students were required to take off work, stay in hotels and prepare transportation to, from, and within Indianapolis. In addition to this burden, the orientation did not provide students the opportunity to practice using the technology they would be required to use in their coursework.

When Direct initially piloted an e-Orientation, it did not include interactive components and lacked the opportunity for students to utilize the required digital courseware learning technologies. Although this was convenient for students, it did not properly prepare them for the interactivity, engagement, and the technology skills required to succeed in their coursework. Based upon the students’ feedback and early performance in the program, we recognized the need to adapt the e-Orientation to better reflect the coursework. Since an e-Orientation is a first touch point for incoming online IU School of Social Work graduate students, it was important that it acclimated students to their learning community and the courseware learning tools and technologies they will use throughout the program. By adding in digital courseware learning technologies, the new e-Orientation prepares students for their future coursework by mirroring and demonstrating the technology platforms, modes, and modalities that will be used daily within their online courses.

This presentation will explore the successes and challenges of developing the e-Orientation. We will discuss the impact the e-Orientation has had on student learning, engagement, and preparation for their online education and demonstrate the orientation process for attendees.
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Summary

Quality online learning should follow standards for course design and teaching, but instituting standards can be a difficult endeavor when faculty members are used to the ‘wild west’ and are not enthusiastic about having to change their courses to meet a set of standards. In this session, participants will learn about how Rush University tamed the wild west mentality in a relatively short period of time, involving faculty members in the entire process, from creating the standards to deciding how they would get implemented. The process Rush uses involves faculty members performing an electronic self-evaluation that, once completed, is assigned to an instructional designer who works with the faculty to improve the course.
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Summary

"Effective & Efficient Grading Using Front Loading and Web 2.0 Tools" workshop provides a no-nonsense look at how to bring grading practices into the 21st Century, expedite the grading process using web 2.0 tools, and meet grading deadlines without sacrificing quality feedback. When instructors properly prepare students for assignments, provide positive engagement in the online classroom and through assignment feedback, students are more likely to retain information, successfully complete the class, and submit positive end of course surveys.
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Summary

In this session we share the interactive instructional methods we teach to our novice graduate nursing students. In the class we co-teach, students are directly involved in the instructional process by creating and delivering instructional materials related to topics of their choices to undergraduate or graduate nurses. Dr. Creech designed this course to expose graduate nursing students to the important role of the nurse educator. Nurse educators are responsible for designing, implementing, evaluating and revising academic and continuing education programs for nurses. The academic nurse educator prepares and mentors current and future nurses by creating formal academic programs that lead to a degree or certificate. Our students prepares students for this role by having them create materials for online instructional units. They develop and deliver these units to either an undergraduate or graduate nursing class.

Interactive tools can be quite sophisticated. Our goal is to show beginning course developers the most efficient path to creating interactive materials. The methods we suggest are easy to learn as we will demonstrate. We will show attendees tools that provide analytics and discuss the importance of using feedback as a motivator. In the process of our hands-on session, we highlight the benefits of our partnerships between instructional designers and course instructors when developing materials.

Link to Presentation Materials.

Dr. Creech has been partnering with the Office of Extended Learning and its team of Instructional designers for the past 7 years in creating and delivering this unique, online Nursing course. For the past three years, Dr. Drake has co-taught the course with her.
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Summary

Throughout UW-Milwaukee’s transition to the Canvas LMS, the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) has maintained focus on its long-term objective of empowering faculty as effective educators. Indeed, we have employed our LMS transition as an opportunity to advance this goal.

In this Interactive session, we will examine techniques used at UW-Milwaukee to reimagine technology training as an opportunity to teach faculty better teaching strategies. We will showcase lessons learned in technology training and suggestions for best practices in instructor outreach. We will share the outcome of our first semester of Active Teaching Lab (a faculty-led workshop series exploring Canvas), as well as a selection of faculty-created Canvas-centered pedagogical innovations featured in those labs. Finally, we will share the outcomes of our migration thus far, including faculty feedback and evaluations.

Learning Goals

Participants will leave being able to . . .

- Identify methods to train faculty in pedagogy while helping them learn new technologies
- Recognize benefits of faculty-led training in sparking innovation and facilitating instructor “buy-in” of pedagogical strategies
- Anticipate key issues instructors may have regarding migration to a new LMS
- Apply these methods in their own institution.
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Summary

Virtual exchanges (VEs), also known as collaborative international learning (COIL), have emerged as an effective way to offer structured, intercultural experiences to students, beyond traditional study abroad. VEs offer students the opportunity to interact in substantial ways, either synchronously or asynchronously, with peers in other parts of the world, engaging in disciplinary focused work. In 2013 DePaul University developed and implemented an institution-wide VE initiative, titled the Global Learning Experience (GLE), through which we have trained over 200 faculty and implemented 100 projects in 26 countries, with almost 1800 student participants.

The GLE program involves a multistep process, ending with a final project assessment, which we started implementing in Fall of 2015. This presentation focuses on results from 542 student responses from 63 courses over 10 terms. The GLE survey instrument is managed quarterly by the office of Global Engagement. Data from all GLE courses is compiled, set up in Qualtrics, and distributed to students via email. The final data is carefully organized and shared with the faculty member for formative assessment purposes. The survey instrument distributed to students consists of 12 topical questions, 1 summative question, 3 open-ended questions, and 3 demographic questions. In this report we focus on the results of the 12 topical questions and the summative one. The 12 topical questions are all presented as statements, with a 5-point Likert scale of agreement, and can be described as belonging to four different broad categories in increasing level of cognitive impact: a first group of questions that address student perception of logistical and practical aspects of the experience; a second group that targets perception of changes in elementary intercultural competence; a third group that aims at measuring perceptions of more complex behavioral changes and/or learning outcomes; and finally a group of questions asking for summative perceptions on the entire experience. Interesting trends emerge from the analysis and will be highlighted during the presentation. While students indicate very positive perceptions on the logistical aspects of the experience and positive perceptions on intercultural communication gains, they are divided on summative perceptions of the experiences and report neutral or slightly negative perceptions on actual behavioral changes. The presentation will discuss these findings in more details, rooting observations in actual data.
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Tracking Trends in Online Education: Student and Administrator Insights
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Summary

What are the current trends in online education? This paper includes a brief summary of the 5th annual 2019 Online Education Trends Report (BestColleges.com, 2019). This original survey research project was designed to help higher education administrators make the best possible decisions about current and future online programs. The goals of this project include long-term tracking and identification of trends related to: online learner demographics, online program marketing and recruitment, and new program design and development.

This year 451 school administrators and 1500 online students (current, prospective, and alumni) responded to project surveys providing detailed information about their experiences in online education. Trends are presented in three major categories: online student demographics, online program marketing and recruitment, and online program design and development. Five key recommendations are also provided.

Methodology

Two online surveys were administered during January and February 2019. The first was sent to school administrators representing public and private, two-year and four-year institutions that currently offer online courses, per IPEDS reporting. In this year’s study, 451 school participants shared information about their experiences with program management and the challenges of launching new programs. The second survey, delivered using a mobile survey platform, collected feedback from 1,500 current and prospective online students and online graduates, who shared information about their experiences as online learners.

Online Education Trends

Demographics: Career Goals Drive Enrollment
There are many reasons students might choose to learn online. For the past three years this project has found that motivations for enrollment center on career and employment goals. This year, 69% of students identified career goals as a primary motivator. A majority of these students identified themselves as “career accelerators” who are already working in or have experience with their area of study.

Demographics: The Typical Online Student is Getting Harder to Define
Are online students getting older or younger? Perhaps both. When asked what demographic trends they are seeing, 37% of school administrators reported that students are getting older while 28% said they are getting younger. Administrators also shared the geographic diversity of online learners logging in from farther away (i.e., international locations, all regions of the U.S.) and closer to (i.e., from the local community and resident students) campus. A range of support needs was also identified as administrators shared increased numbers of students with disabilities and English as a second language, as well as underrepresented minorities and disadvantaged students.

Demographics: The College Campus is Part of the Online Experience
For the third year in a row, students cited convenience and flexibility as the top reasons for learning online instead of on campus. However, it appears that campus still plays a role as 46% of online students say they visit campus either by choice or to fulfill a requirement (e.g., testing, tutoring, orientation).
Marketing and Recruitment: Financial Considerations Impact Students’ Enrollment Decisions
For three years in a row, “estimating annual costs” and “applying for financial aid and finding sufficient funding sources” were the top challenges related to making a decision about online education. Online program graduates said they would “compare more programs” and “do more research about financial aid” if they had it all to do again.

Marketing and Recruitment: Demand Remains Steady
This year, 99% of school administrators said demand for online education is either “increasing” or has stayed the same for the past few years.” This perception of demand has remained steady all three years of original data collection in this study.

Design and Development: New Online Programs Bring Both Benefits and Challenges
Administrators shared that they decide to offer new online programs for many reasons, with the leading two being, “as a response to student demand” (73%) and “as a growth opportunity to increase overall student enrollment” (71%). While there is recognition of student-driven demand, there is also concern about “marketing and meeting recruitment goals” (69%).

Design and Development: Life Happens in Online Education
As with changing demographics, working with students to manage unexpected interruptions has implications for support services, student tracking and intervention, and faculty development. Almost 40% of administrators said “unexpected circumstances or events in their personal life” were their online students’ biggest challenges.

Design and Development: Student Satisfaction Seems High
This study looked at student satisfaction through the lenses of return on investment (ROI), willingness to recommend to others, and perceived value of academic quality. Overall, 77% of students said online education is “better than” or “equal to” on-campus options, while 88% said their degrees had or will have a positive ROI and 89% would recommend online education to others.

Recommendations
How should an institution move forward with decisions about online programs and supporting online students?

1. Explore the range of characteristics and needs among students at your institution. How do they compare with the trends presented in this year’s trends report?
2. Provide easy access to the information students need in order to identify the best-fit programs for them. Share details about actual costs and the financial aid process, as well as ways to compare programs and set realistic expectations.
3. Support your students throughout their career journeys. Focus not only on recruiting career-minded students, but also on supporting them with career preparation activities and experiences while they are students, and with each other and career services after they graduate.
4. Financial support doesn’t end after a financial package is offered and accepted. Prepare students for what they can expect in terms of costs and assistance, and teach them to monitor assistance throughout their programs and anticipate loan repayment after graduation.
5. Seek out feedback from your online students and graduates for insights about their satisfaction with online learning and perceived value of completing their programs.

For more details about the findings and recommendations from the 2019 Online Education Trends Report, the full report is available online to download as a PDF (BestColleges.com, 2019).
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Summary

Discussion forums and other learner activities are important tools that can increase student engagement, retention, and persistence. Insights gathered by surveying online instructors and students at the University of Missouri about discussion forums and other learner engagement activities will be provided. Ninety-eight instructors and 525 students participated in the online survey. Key concepts include ways to enhance student learning in the online environment including making the discussion forum an interactive space using tools such as Panopto and VoiceThread and using Zoom for small group and other collaborative work. Examples of discussion forum rubrics and quality discussion contributions are also given. Successful outcomes or results of well-designed discussion forums and other learner activities include the following: engaged students are more likely to be satisfied, persist and finish coursework (Bigatel & Edel-Malizia, 2018; Martin & Bolliger, 2018) and participation in well-designed discussion forums or activities can result in reflective thinking development and enhance motivation (Martin & Bolliger). These ideas directly complement the community of inquiry (COI) framework that focuses on engaging students in order to create virtual communities through the use of social, cognitive, teaching, and learning presence (Bigatel & Edel-Malizia, 2018). Understanding how appropriate well-designed discussion forums and other learner engagement activities build social, cognitive, teaching, and learning presence in online classes is beneficial and, when implemented, leads to best practices in quality online course development and teaching.
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A Study of Student Learning & Progress in Blended, Online, and F2F
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Summary

Over the past few decades, language learning and teaching have been evolving to an approach that emphasizes a more actively involved learner and more technology-enhanced instruction. University students today often have the option of face-to-face, web-facilitated, blended, or fully online classes (Allen & Seaman, 2013). Much controversy exists surrounding the effectiveness of online and blended instruction, notably in the context of language learning. In 2012, 26.4 percent of all college students were enrolled in at least one online class or distance education program (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, 2014). Current estimates suggest one third of all college students take at least one online course (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). With this current trend towards technology in teaching and learning, the question of student success within varying modes of instruction is a question worth evaluating.

Brigham Young University (BYU) is a private institution located in Provo, Utah. Not unlike national trends, several departments on campus have begun developing or expanding offerings in online and blended coursework. The Korean department was an early adopter to offering online and blended coursework and developed first-year Korean courses in face-to-face, blended, and online delivery modes. BYU faculty conducted an ex post facto exploratory study of first-year Korean courses in these three modes and compiled a preliminary analysis of student experiences in each course type. This study focused on student scores, time spent with course material, and student feedback. Implications for further research, federal regulations regarding "seat time" equivalencies in online/blended courses, and the nature of evaluating student experiences will be discussed.

Study Background

This was an ex post facto exploratory study of first-year Korean courses which were delivered in three different ways: face-to-face, blended, and online. The participants, setting, and methods are described below.

Participants

Participants in this study enrolled into one of three beginning Korean classes at BYU (face-to-face, online, and blended). The courses were all listed in the university catalog, and students self-selected their section/enrollment. All students in blended or face-to-face sections were BYU matriculated. Online enrollments included non-matriculated/non-BYU students as well; 88% were from universities other than BYU. In all sections, student status as full-time or part-time was not disclosed; however, all students were taking Korean as part of their university’s requirements in a degree-seeking program.

The sample of participants in this study is detailed below:

- Face-to-face: N=30; 17 male, 13 female
- Blended: N=37; 15 male, 22 female
- Online: N=29; 11 male, 18 female

The professor was the same across all sections, and the text, assignments and assessments were also static across all sections. The professor administered an oral language assessment used by the department at the beginning of the face-to-face and blended courses to ensure students were true beginners. Additionally, all
sections participated in a written diagnostic pre-test. All students in this study tested at a novice level and were considered otherwise equivalent based on previous experience with the language and background. All three sections of the course were supported by the same professor, though the TAs varied from campus to online classes. This was the first time the professor and TAs had supported an online or blended course, though the professor had been teaching face-to-face for 17 years.

Setting
In the face-to-face course, the students met together 5 days a week for 50 minutes each session. The professor led the course Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and the teaching assistants (TAs) led classroom activities Tuesdays and Thursdays. The professor and TAs had set office hours outside of class where they were available to students.

In the blended course, students were still scheduled for 5 days a week of time, following the face-to-face schedule, but on one day a week they did not meet in the classroom. Instead, students were directed to accomplish specific online activities and tasks. This reduced one day of professor-led class time per week. The professor and TAs had set office hours outside of class where they were available to students.

In the online course, students did not have any required synchronous meetings with professor or TA. As with the F2F and blended sections, the online section included set office hours for the professor and TAs. Additionally, this section included a TA-moderated speaking lab administered online called the Conversation Cafe (Quinlan, 2018) available to students for additional practice and feedback. While speaking practice typically took place in the classroom setting for both the F2F and blended sections, it took place online in the online section.

Methods
As an exploratory study, flexible research methods were used to report on success factors, reasons for failure or success, and distinguishing features. In this case, the questions asked were what are key factors and features. The study specifically explored student learning experiences in blended, online and F2F coursework by evaluating student scores in midterm, final exam, and overall course grade; student time spent with course materials (in class or online); and student feedback as gathered through end-of-semester evaluations.

Student data was compiled from the Learning Management System, end of course survey responses, and customer support database (CRM software). All statistical analysis controlled for the variable of heritage speaker/prior Korean experience.

A one-way ANOVA was run to determine any statistically significant difference in assessment results for students in each type of course. Using a Pearson correlation, researchers examined relationship between time spent with course material and final course grade across each type of course. Finally, course and teacher ratings from end-of-semester student evaluations were compiled in aggregate form. Course completion percentages were tallied.

Findings
This study was designed to analyze the learning and progress of students in three different course formats. The first question analyzed variance in student grades including quizzes, midterm, final exam and overall course grade; across all three types of delivery (F2F, blended, and online), no statistically significant difference in assessment grades was observed.

Pearson correlation of final course grade and time spent with course materials revealed the following: a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.23$) in the online section, positive and moderately strong correlation ($r = +0.58$) in the blended section, and a weak positive correlation ($r = +0.23$) in the face-to-face section.
The course ratings were very similar, with variance of .2 or less across course types. End of course surveys underscored weaknesses and strengths for each delivery platform. Notably, students and faculty identified lack of familiarity with blended or online learning and difficulties with the technology as challenges that impacted their experience. Likewise, this was the faculty member’s first time teaching blended and online, which may have contributed to student dissatisfaction. Conversely, students highly valued the time/place flexibility offered by the blended and online sections. Although they seemed to seek more in-person teacher interaction such as is typical in a F2F section, they also valued the ability to access online material multiple times and to do so at their own convenience.

Conclusions

Because this was an exploratory study, it was limited in its scope. During the process of gathering data, variables were discovered which were unknown at the onset, and valid statistical analysis was limited. General observations and preliminary correlations revealed insights which will impact future research.

Researchers observed that students in all three course environments were able to master the learning outcomes as stated and measured in the course. A few key course elements seemed to contribute most significantly to student success and/or satisfaction:

1. Unlimited access to course content, lecture material, and practice activities in blended and online sections.
2. TA support via classroom interaction in F2F section as well as Conversation Café (online speaking lab) access in blended and online sections.
3. Responsiveness of TA and instructor within 48 hours to student needs.
4. Consistency of certain elements across all sections (stability for instructor, TAs, and students).

Further research is merited to isolate variables, consider factors such as motivation and placement tests, and to explore specifically the ways in which students interact with online materials (e.g. evidence of using some resources more than others, evidence of binge studying, etc.). The authors have been researching and publishing on blended, online, and face-to-face learning since 2012. This particular study has led to continued research and experimentation which is currently underway.
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Summary

The purpose of this study is to ascertain whether excessive recreational smartphone use significantly affects students’ academic performance outcomes, study patterns, learning abilities and interactions with fellow students and faculty. Data was collected from 257 students attending a small community college in Bermuda to identify if there is a direct correlation between the grade point averages of participants and excessive recreational time spent on their smartphones. This study will also highlight creative technology-based learning platforms and productive strategies that can assist faculty with converting excessive recreational smartphone use into productive and engaging learning opportunities.

Introduction

Contrary to popular belief, Bermuda is not located in the Caribbean region. These 150 islands are situated in the Atlantic Ocean, roughly 774 miles northeast of New York City. Approximately 65,000 residents inhabit Bermuda’s tropical landscape and the sophisticated microstate’s economic stability is primarily due to the thriving insurance and captive insurance sectors. However, prior to the 1990s tourism was responsible for sustaining Bermuda’s economy due to the island’s upscale hotels, famous beaches and welcoming residents. The only tertiary institute on the island is the Bermuda College.

In 2024 the Bermuda College will celebrate 50 years of providing higher education to the citizens of Britain’s oldest dependent territory. As the only institution of higher learning within a thousand mile radius it has its privileges, challenges and opportunities. Discovering ways to stay abreast of an ongoing technology tsunami will require agility, and foresight. Moreover, successfully navigating in this digitally infused 21st-century society requires the adaptation of innovative technology-based learning platforms, which are designed to not only fully engage students but also meet the changing learning need of digital natives.

Steve Jobs put it best when he said, “Every once in a while, a revolutionary product comes along that changes everything” (Jobs, 2007). It goes without question that smartphones are indeed revolutionary. The technologies required to make them functional and dependable will continue to have a significant impact on educational norms, which are ripe for disruption and an infusion of innovation.

Smartphones did not appear magically, they were strategically created and programmed by some of the world’s best engineers to not only manipulate users but also to be extremely persuasive. These observations were made by Tristan Harris a former Google product manager.

Have you ever noticed how our smartphones reward us when we give them some attention? This is certainly not accidental but an ingenious design feature that all smartphones have. For example, with a just few clicks the Internet appears on our smartphones and we are transformed into a completely new world of information overload. Instantaneously the attention span or our students has been kidnapped by a powerful device, which has cleverly convinced them to always keep these devices within eyeshot so that
they consistently remain connected to the virtual world. This behavior usually tends to distract people, and in particular students who would benefit from what is being taught in their classrooms.

The swift popularity of smartphone devices has forced higher education institutions to grapple with a formidable shift in the teaching and learning process. Omnipresent smartphones are now an essential part of modern societal norms. To the point where most students, and on occasion faculty, are unable to effectively function without their multifaceted handheld devices.

Smartphones can be considered as, “the gift that keeps on giving”, or akin to junk food. Both are difficult to discontinue having a craving for, even though we know that too much of it is not good for us. This significant smartphone dependency or love affair with smartphones equates to addictive tendencies. An addiction can be defined as the continuous pursuit of something, despite achieving negative outcomes.

Extensive research is available describing how this revolutionary handheld device has forever changed the way people think, communicate, learn, spend time and even interact with each other. Smartphones and the Internet have also completely transformed the way people acquire goods and services. For example, online shopping conglomerates such as Amazon and eBay have made shopping easy and convenient via smartphone apps. Pressed for time like most of us? Just use your smartphone to preorder all your weekly groceries online and drive by the Walmart Express pick-up area to collect when ready. Conversely, there is limited research which concludes if there is a direct correlation between excessive recreational smartphone use and the learning experiences of students. For example, what impact does excessive recreational smartphone use have on student’s study patterns, grades, learning capabilities and direct interactions with fellow students and faculty?

**Review of Literature**

Smartphone dependability has become pervasive for most students as they are usually using their smartphones for communication and/or recreational activities. To paraphrase Mark Twain “Don’t let your studies interfere with your education,” puts things into context. Consequently, are institutions of higher learning strategically transforming themselves to take advantage of and embrace this smartphone dependency epidemic? Those that do will most likely have an increase in enrollment. However, those that do not will most likely vanish.

Connectivity is now essential as many students feel the need to always stay “connected” with their friends, family and, in many cases, their teachers. Not being able to consistently dwell in one or several virtual social networking communities often creates unwanted anxiety and the feeling of being disconnected from the mainstream. Frequently glancing at smartphones while riding elevators, attending classes, walking on campus, sitting on flights, commuting on trains or metro lines, standing at intersections waiting to cross, or even waiting in line at Starbucks is common practice for most. Reaching for our smartphones as soon as we wake-up in the morning, before we go sleep at night or during private moments in the bathroom have become second nature.

A unique philosophy about addictive tendencies was depicted by Norman Doidge, a Canadian psychiatrist who concluded that, “Addicts show a loss of control of the activity, compulsively seek it out despite negative consequences, develop tolerance so that they need higher and higher levels of stimulation for satisfaction, and experience withdrawal if they can’t consummate the addictive act.” (Doidge, 2007).

Many restaurant tables have been converted into smartphone hubs during peak operational hours. Absence of any verbal communication has become the norm. Usually, excessive smartphone activity occurs throughout the dining experience and patron’s devices all seem to be repeating those famous Tupac Shakur lyrics, “All eyes on me.”
Research by Pirani and Sheehan as cited by Kim, IIon and Altmann, indicated that, “digital natives,” those who grew up in the digital technology era, often consider smartphones as one of their preferred learning tools. “Students are plugged in and communicating constantly,” (Kim, IIon and Altmann, 2013). In many cases this also applies to faculty. According to a May 31, 2018 Pew Research Center report, “Some 95% of teens now say they have or have access to a smartphone, which represents a 22% increase from the 73% of teens who said this in 2014-2015.” More alarming is that this same report noted how, “Some 45% of teens say they use the internet almost constantly, a figure that has nearly doubled from 24% who said the same thing in the 2014-2015 survey.” (Pew Research Center, 2018).

Over the next decade the logical expectation is that a much higher percentage of Generation X, Y and Z students will most likely be “habitually” online. Consequently, institutions of higher learning must understand that smartphones are not only directly affecting how students learn but also forever changing the trajectory of longstanding “chalk and talk” teaching practices. Such transformational change from the analog to a digital learning space must be accompanied with reformed teaching methods that are aligned with the radical changes associated with the arrival of smartphones and how students use them.

A study looking at the relationship between cellphone and academic performance by Lepp, Barkley and Karpinski found that, “cellphone use may disrupt behaviors conducive to academic success.” (Lepp, Barkley and Karpinski, 2013) Findings from a study conducted by Andrew Lepp, Ph.D., of Kent State University noted that, frequent cellphone usage by college students “was negatively related to GPA and positively related to anxiety” (Lepp, 2013). Additionally, this study concluded that excessive daily smartphone users tended to have lower grades, higher anxiety levels and lower satisfaction with life (happiness) relative to their college peers who spent less time on their smartphones.

Research by Pirani and Sheehan concluded that the majority or 85% or university leaders in the U.S. are convinced about how eventually Web-accessible and/or portable devices such as smartphones would be crucial in higher education. (Pirani and Sheehan, 2009). A study by Roach established that it would be advisable for institutions of higher learning to adopt smartphones as an effective campus-wide learning tool. Roach also noted that electronic devices would most likely become the preferred delivery option by university students in the future. (Roach, 2010)

New York University Professor Dr. Donna Quadri delineated at her Foundations of Effective Technology Integration: Best Practices in teaching workshop, “If you are not using technology to teach you should be, and technology should be used as an attraction not a distraction” (Quadri, 2013).

A study discussing the implementation of seven technology best practices supports the aforementioned notion when concluding that, “Technologies can help students learn in ways they find most effective and broaden their repertoires for learning.” (Chickering & Ehrmann, 1996) These authors are also conceded that, technology used in the classroom, “can strengthen faculty interaction with all students, but especially with shy students who are reluctant to ask questions or challenge the teacher directly.” (Chickering & Ehrmann, 1996)

Furthermore, research by Zellweger as cited by Aldunate and Nussbaum supports how, “faculties who commit to more time integrating educational technology into their teaching have a greater chance of adopting new technologies.” A creative writing teacher and Pepperdine University doctoral student denoted that, “the most successful teachers are putting lessons into a context that ensures students their real value in the real world, and that often requires additional effort to learn technologies that they have already mastered.” (Rudi, 2011) This same author is also convinced that, “purpose-driven learning has much more promise with today’s “what’s in it for me?” students, who typically don’t respond to the concept of learning for its own sake.” (Rudi, 2011) When investigating how technology supports learning,
a study by Martinez concluded that, student learning can be enhanced with the use of programs and applications in a number of different ways. However, she also cautioned about making technology the “servant not the master.” (Martinez, 2014)

Previous research by one of this paper’s authors examined the impacts of technology being used in classrooms at the Bermuda College. Out of the 237 students who participated in that study, 140 or 59% indicated that they preferred attending classes where lecturers used more technology rather than those who used less to deliver the course content. A majority of students confirmed that different forms of technology used by faculty in the classroom played an important role in improving their learning experience as 46.1% or 108 agreed and 69 or 29.5% strongly agreed with this premise. Conversely, only 2.1% or 5 students noted that this was not the case. Over three quarters or 85% of respondents believed that using more technology in the classroom in general will most likely play a pivotal role in transforming education in the 21st century. (De Shields, 2016)

A thought-provoking article entitled, “Have Smartphones Destroyed a Generation,” by psychologist Jean Twenge noted that, “the arrival of the smartphone has radically changed every aspect of teenagers’ lives, from the nature of their social interactions to their mental health.”

A 2017 New York Times article by Matt Richtel explores whether teenagers are, “using drugs less in part because they are constantly stimulated and entertained by their computers and phones.” (Richtel, 2017). Research by Lepp, Barkley and Karpinski emphasized that a need exists for faculty to better understand how smartphones can be used to make a genuine contribution to the student learning process.

A descriptive study analyzing how 109 Iranian dental students used their smartphones for learning purposes concluded that, “the learning purposes or combining traditional educational approaches and e-teaching methods, including smartphones, can provide students with more diverse learning opportunities.” (Shooriabi, M., & Gilavand, A. 2017). Worth mentioning is how “96% of these dental students use their smartphones and the Internet to search required educational texts, 94% use it to share their notes with classmates, 94% use it to take pictures of their work in university, 93% use it to make a video of their works in university, and 92% used their smartphones for other educational purposes, not indicated in this study.” (Shooriabi, M., & Gilavand, A. 2017).

A recent online article titled “How Technology is Taking Higher Education Learning Spaces to New Heights,” produced by the Next Generation Learning Spaces contingent argues that, “the time for higher education learning spaces to invest in technology is now. Tech-savvy students are entering colleges and universities with more self-taught knowledge than ever before. Having grown up in the digital age, millennials and Gen Z’ers are not only looking for schools that meet their technological capabilities - they’re demanding it.” (Next Generation Learning Spaces, 2019)

When discussing the significance and relevance of teaching with smartphones in higher education Odem mentioned how, “The world has gone mobile. Smartphones are here to stay. They are in our classrooms. It is essential that educators continue to explore effective uses of smartphones in the classroom.” (Odem, 2016)

A reflective study by Halaweh observed how students behaved when using smartphones spontaneously during class in a university in Dubai. The author concluded that smartphones are constantly being used by students “to directly or indirectly support and enhance personal learning. Therefore, universities policies’ and the instructors’ teaching tools and methods must be adapted to correspond with mobile technology advancement and the widespread use of smartphones.” (Halaweh, 2017) Furthermore, Halaweh delineated that, “the current policies are old, having been set in arena when the mobile phone was simply a device for making phone calls and sending text messages. Indeed, university policy-makers
should formulate policies to regulate, not prevent, the usage of mobile phones in the classroom.” (Halaweh, 2017)

Research examining how active learning affects the academic outcomes of science, engineering and mathematics students concluded that, “the average examination scores improved by about 6% in active learning sections, and that students in classes with traditional lecturing were 1.5 times more likely to fail than students in classes with active learning.” (Freeman, Eddy, McDonough, Smith, Okoroafor, Jordt & Wenderoth, 2014) When assessing the link between excessive in class smartphone usage and “smarts in the classroom,” Barkley presumed that active learning occurs “when the mind is actively engaged. Its defining characteristic is that students are dynamic participants in their learning and that they are reflecting on and monitoring both the process and the results of their learning.” (Barkley, 2010)

Appealing to the diverse learning needs of Generation X, Y, and Z students, who are noticeably “attached at the hip” with their smartphones will require faculty to discover ways of integrating immersive technology solutions into their teaching techniques. Immersive technologies such as augmented, virtual and mixed reality platforms are becoming mainstream and will continue to shift the learning experience away from traditional delivery methods. Confucius said it best, “Tell me, and I will forget. Show me, and I may remember. Immerse me, and I will understand.” (Confucius, 450BC)

An Inside Higher ED online article entitled, “Students are Using Mobile Even if You Aren’t” discusses how “Smartphones and tablets are changing how teachers teach and how students learn.” (Lieberman, 2017). Data from an Educause study established that one third of the 44,000 students surveyed used smartphones in classroom to, “make other connections with material.” This article also highlights how Professor of Philosophy Megan Sullivan from the University of Notre Dame is a proponent of in class smartphone usage and contends that, “Finding ways to meet [students] halfway, using what feels normal for them and feels exciting can make your teaching that much more effective, rather than sticking your head in the sand,” (Lieberman, 2017)

**Methodology**

Twenty of the thirty-eight full time Bermuda College faculty were randomly selected to participate in this study. Each faculty member received emails in advance requesting if and when the online survey tool could be administered during the first 10 minutes of their classes. The questionnaire was embedded as a Survey Monkey link into the main page of Bermuda College’s learning management system called Moodle. At the agreed-on survey administration time students were asked to use their smartphones or the classroom computers to log on to Moodle’s main page and click on the survey tool link to complete the online questionnaire.

The survey was designed to take less than eight minutes to complete. The data collection timeframe occurred between November 16 and December 2. A pre survey trial was completed by five random students to test the online questionnaire’s flow, validity, question design and anticipated completion time.

Prior to the start of students gaining access to the survey tool students were asked to indicate their consent by the researchers to obtain access to their grades/cumulative GPA. After which students were directed to log on the course management system via their smartphones and complete the survey. Students were instructed that answering the first survey question with a “yes” or “no” response determined if they could or could not complete the balance of the questions. Giving consent by selecting the “yes” option allowed the balance of the survey questions to be answered. Negative responses prompted the survey tool to close and students were exposed to a short thank you message.
It was made clear to all potential respondents that access to student grades could only be obtained with their permission by providing their official Bermuda College email addresses for question two. It was also explained that no student names would be used in the research findings, just their cumulative GPAs for the respective semester. Both researchers attended all classes selected to deliver the aforementioned survey guidelines, provide a brief explanation about what the objective of the survey was and to offer any assistance to students if required during the questionnaire completion process.

**Research Findings and Implications**

A total of 257 students responded completed the online survey. This sample size represents approximately 40% of the entire student population. Hence, if collected randomly, the data would have had a ± 4.76% margin of error at the 95% confidence level.

In the data cleaning phase of the survey, it was noted that although some students had provided permission to access their grades, they failed to provide either their Bermuda College email address or an email address that could identify them. Further, some students were freshman taking noncredit courses and, as such, did not have a cumulative GPA. Both of these student data sets were eliminated from the study when making the GPA comparisons with excessive recreational smartphone use. Hence, only 181 students were usable for this section of the study.

The focus of this research was to determine if there was a correlation between smartphone usage and grade point average (GPA). If one were measuring the relationship between two continuous variables, the appropriate statistic to use would be the Pearson Correlation. In this study, only one of the variables were continuous, the GPA, while the other variables were categorical. As such the Pearson Correlation was not the appropriate statistic to use. When comparing continuous and categorical variables, the appropriate statistic to use is the ETA statistic. Like the Pearson Correlation, the ETA statistic measures the strength of a relationship between 0 and 1, with a statistic close to 0 showing no relationship, while a statistic closer to 1 showing a strong relationship.

Using the SPSS software package, there are two ways to calculate ETA. Under descriptive statistics, one can select cross tabulations and there is an option, under the Nominal by Interval tab, to select the ETA statistic. If the square of that value was calculated, ETA squared, it would provide a measurement of association of the dependent variable in the independent variable. The squared value is the same statistic that is provided in the General Linear Model, univariate, using the option of effect size. In this study, the General Linear Model was used to determine the level of association between smartphone usage and GPA. GPA was the independent variable as the hypothesis was the grades were dependent upon the level of smartphone usage.

Unlike other studies, which attempted to determine the number of hours spent on a phone, this study sought to determine if students use of their devices were excessive or not, allowing students themselves to interpret excessive. This was done as students tend to under report their level of usage. In either case, students self-reported their usage of smartphones.

This study found that there was a strong association between the level of smartphone usage and their impact on student grades. For recreational usage and GPA, the level of association using the ETA squared statistic, was 0.82. For students that reported that they checked their smartphones frequently day and night, the statistic was similar at 0.82. The findings of this study can be compared to research performed at Kent University in 2014 of 500 undergraduate students, which found that, “students who used the smartphone more on a daily basis had a significantly lower college GPAs than similar students who used the phone less,” (Lepp, Barkley & Mansfield, 2015)
Clearly, there is a strong correlation between smartphone usage and its impact on grades. What this study did not determine is exactly what level of usage tends to impact grades. There are now apps such as available that accurately measure usage and thus a more precise measure of association could be obtained if, in a future study, sufficient numbers of students participated.

Other pertinent data worth mentioning involves determining how many students indicated that they actually use their smartphones for educational purposes and if a majority or minority of students would most likely use their smartphones for educational purposes if encouraged by faculty. A majority or 89% of students indicated that they are already using their devices for educational purposes. (See Table 1 on the next page). These results are similar to the 54.1% and 36.6% would very likely, or somewhat likely, use their smartphones for educational purposes if encouraged by faculty.

Just over half of the respondents indicated that they are often distracted by their smartphones while studying and a similar amount noted that they spent more time on their smartphones using social media platforms than studying for classes. (See Table 2 on the next page). A more alarming but very concerning statistic was the vast amount of students or 77.1% who said that they used their smartphones for recreational purposes while in class. Eleven students or 5.4% confirmed how they excessively used their smartphones for recreational purposes during class. These findings place into question archaic and redundant smartphone polices that some faculty still include in their course outlines. For example, the following smartphone policy was retrieved from a faculty member’s spring 2019 course outline at the authors’ institution, located on their portal. “Students are not allowed to use cell phones during class and WILL be told to leave the class and not return for that particular session when observed using cell phones. If you are expecting a very important phone call or electronic message you may discretely leave the room and return without disrupting the class or allowing the cell phone to be seen.”

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I USE MY SMARTPHONE FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
I SPEND MORE TIME ON MY SMARTPHONE USING SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS THAN STUDYING FOR MY CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The smartphone usage relationship factor between other students and faculty was weak with an ETA value of 0.057 for students and 0.016 for lecturers (See Tables 3 and 4). These findings imply that smartphone use, whether it be excessive or not does not affect student to student and/or student to faculty relationships. This conclusion seem reasonable as smartphones are primarily used to stay in close contact with friends and family, but not with fellow students without a previous relationship. Similarly, due to personal privacy preferences, student to teacher smartphone contact would likely be minimal under most circumstances. Therefore, the level of smartphone use would have little bearing on that relationship.

TABLE 3
SMARTPHONE USAGE AFFECTS MY RELATIONSHIP WITH MY FELLOW STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests Between-Subjects Effects</th>
<th>Use my phone for recreational activities</th>
<th>Affects interaction with fellow students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Type III Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>5.221a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>596.684</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q0006_0003</td>
<td>5.221</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>87.110</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>773.000</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>92.331</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .057 (Adjusted R Squared = .035)
# TABLE 4
SMARTPHONE USAGE AFFECTS MY RELATIONSHIP WITH MY LECTURERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>475.857</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>475.857</td>
<td>921.723</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q0006_0004</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>90.863</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>773.000</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>92.331</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .016 (Adjusted R Squared = -.006)

**Conclusion**

Smartphone devices not only continue to play a pivotal role in the lives of most people but are also here to stay. Moreover, institutions of higher learning have undeniably been, and will continue to be transformed by how students remain dependent on these devices. Our reliance on smartphones affect how we communicate, travel, purchase goods and services, manage our finances, time, socialize and even how students learn.

Smartphones have made it much easier and faster to obtain vast amounts of relevant knowledge that can be applied pre, during, and post the learning process. Data obtained from this and other relative research highlights how smartphones, if endorsed correctly by faculty, can improve the learning process, increase student-to-student and faculty-to-student interactions. These devices can also give students the opportunity to acquire real-time information about concepts being debated during class or an important learning objective that might require an alternative perspective. The benefits associated with in-class smartphone use are persuasively outlined by Marcus Hennessy when he stated in a Lesson Plans by Teachers for Teachers online article, that “Smartphones give students a wealth of creative options to enhance the classroom experience, including:

- Access to the internet for research and referencing
- Access to e-mail
- The ability to snap a picture of the day’s homework assignment scribbled on a whiteboard or take a short video of a key lecture moment
- Apps like Evernote to store, catalog, and annotate smartphone photos
- Apps like ResponseWare that convert smartphones into classroom “clickers” that can answer multiple-choice questions
- Recording lectures with Voice Memo and other third-party note-taking apps
- Using QR codes to find relevant websites with a simple click
- Keeping track of schedules and dates.” (Hennessy, 2018)

Over the past decade a plethora of engaging technology-based teaching and learning platforms have revolutionized how and where course content gets delivered. Consequently, faculty should consider...
adopting creative smartphone-friendly content delivery options, which are designed to shift unproductive recreational time students spend on smartphones into more productive learner-centric time. Likewise, faculty will most likely benefit from embracing the wisdom associated with encouraging "smartphone dependent" students to use their devices so that they can experience a more personalized learning experience while in or out of the classroom.

An abundance of free, engaging, virtual learning platforms such as: Kahootit.com, H5P, FlipGrid, Packback, Remind.com, ClassDojo.com, Inspiration.com, Zoom.com, Quizlet.com, Poll Everywhere.com, and Nearpod can be used to facilitate and encourage mobile learning. Moreover, smartphones can be used to create an emerging and active learning environment that encourages virtual knowledge gathering and sharing.

Outside of the brick and mortar classrooms, students can use their smartphones to not only stay connected with faculty but also continue learning in a virtual “anywhere, anytime” environment. A classic example of this approach was recently featured in the New York Times when Ohio State Journalism Professor Nicole Kraft proclaimed that she, “Takes attendance for her class via Twitter, posts coursework on the instant-messaging app Slack, and holds office hours on the video-conferencing app Zoom at 10:00 p.m., because that is when they have questions.” (Pappano, August 2018) A study by Odem validates this unique digital driven approach by concluding that, “In mobile learning, students access course content when and where they want.” (Odem, 2016)

The results from this study clearly indicate that students prefer more faculty adopt teaching practices that are infused with higher amounts of technology so that increased amounts of educationally driven smartphones usages occurs in the classroom instead of recreational. According to Odem, specific smartphone guidelines must be established detailing when smartphones can and cannot be used during class. Also, clear distinctions must be made to determine appropriate versus inappropriate smartphone use during class.

This study also deduced that smartphones distract students from learning due to the excessive time they spent using online social networking platforms, texting, gaming and streaming videos. With an abundance of entertainment options available on smartphones, high users, with some exceptions, are most likely not studying as much as they need to. This constant connection with their smartphones is unfortunately for recreational instead of educational purposes.

Maybe it is time to let the archaic teaching delivery methods die. Those faculty who provide creative technology-based teaching techniques and platforms that are not only appealing but also capable of delivering engaging and immersive learning experiences will most likely not have to worry about declining enrollment numbers. Albeit, technology is not a panacea, but when utilized correctly it can certainly do more good than harm when attempting to deliver course content that remains appealing to digital natives.

The dilemma faced by many higher learning institutions remains the same. What steps should be taken to strategically convert excessive recreational smartphone use into productive and engaging student learning opportunities? Can the implementation of a digital strategic plan create a paradigm shift that swings the pendulum away from excessive recreational smartphone usage by students to excessive educational smartphone usage because, as mentioned earlier, students are going to use their beloved mobile devices even if faculty do not.

Finally, it must be noted that data collected for this study involved a self-reflective variable and future studies may well involve students using software such as "Moment" to measure exactly how much time they spend on their smartphones and identify which apps are being used the most. Thus, it would be able
to quantify exactly how much time students spent on their smartphones and the particular recreational apps being used. This process will replace the self-reflective variable with a numerical one when determining the correlations with educational outcomes.

**Study Limitations**

It must be noted that this study acquired self-reflective data and did not examine the correlation between the actual amount of recreational time students spent on smartphones and overall GPA results. However, the authors plan to conduct a controlled follow-up study, which requires students to install smartphone use tracking software such as “Moment” that is capable of calculating the actual amounts of screen time activity, most and least frequently used apps, and smartphone pick-ups per day. Similarly, important data such as time spent on social media platforms and popular gaming websites will be analyzed to determine if these activities have or do not have a significant impact on overall academic outcomes. This process will replace the self-reflective variable with a numerical one when determining the correlations with educational outcomes. Consequently, the authors will be able to conduct more rigorous statistical tests that will better ascertain the degree to which student grades are affected by excessive recreational smartphone use.
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Summary

While content and pedagogical knowledge are the foundation of quality instruction, there are a number of administrative, policy, and operational factors that influence instructional behaviors. Understanding the influence (positive or negative) of operational functions on teaching and learning can help inform policies, procedures, and support to maximize the teaching and learning dynamic in the online classroom. Survey and interview data were gathered from online full-time and adjunct faculty (n=223). Survey findings indicated that both full-time and adjunct faculty perceive advance notice of course changes as having great impact on teaching effectiveness. Interview findings illuminate Learning Management Software, faculty support, curriculum, and communication as holding greatest importance for administrative consideration of teaching effectiveness. Administrators can use this information to make key policy and process decisions that focus on improving the quality of online teaching.

Introduction

The growing number of faculty teaching online (Allen & Seaman, 2013) has led to an increased interest in understanding factors that influence the quality of online education (Dittmar & McCracken, 2012; Harrison & El Mansour, 2008; Prieto-Rodriguez, Gore, & Holmes, 2016). As online learning becomes a mainstay across colleges and universities, it is imperative that distance learning programs and administrators understand how to best support faculty teaching online (Nordin & Anthony, 2014; Walters, Grover, Turner, & Alexander, 2017). Research has explored a wide range of factors that impact the quality of online learning, yet there is a paucity of research that addresses faculty perspectives on the impact of administrative programs, policy, and support services on the quality of online teaching and learning.

While content and pedagogical knowledge are the foundation of quality teaching, there are a number of administrative, policy, and operational factors that influence instructional behaviors. Research highlights several factors that influence teaching effectiveness in the online environment: administrative programs (Wickersham & McElhany, 2010), instructional technology (Macaulay & Pantazi, 2006), faculty support initiatives (Arbaugh, 2000; Dittmar & McCracken, 2012; González-Sanmamed, Muñoz-Carril, & Sangrà, 2014; Irlbeck, 2008; Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013; Planar & Moya, 2016), scheduling (Tomei, 2006), faculty compensation (Ehrenberg, 2012; Green, Alejandro, & Brown, 2009), and faculty community (Baran & Correia, 2014; Dittmar & McCracken, 2012; González-Sanmamed, Muñoz-Carril, & Sangrà, 2014; Irlbeck, 2008; Lewis & Abdul-Hamid, 2006; Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013). Research has explored the influence of four key administrative issues on the quality of teaching in the online classroom: instructional technology, faculty support, scheduling, compensation, and faculty community.
**Instructional Technology**
The most prevalent areas of instructional technology explored in the literature include Learning Management System (LMS) (Tonbuloglu & Gurol, 2016; Black, Beck, Dawson, Jinks & DiPeitro, 2007), multimedia (Macaulay & Pantazi, 2006), curriculum (Puzziferro & Shelton, 2009), and supplemental technology (Suda, Bell, & Franks, 2011). When considering the LMS, Tonbuloglu & Gurol (2016) found that faculty want this element integrated/controlled by the institution, with readily available support. Black, Beck, Dawson, Jinks & DePeitro (2007) suggest that while important to online success, the LMS is simply a vessel to deliver the course content, but one that should be evaluated and considered with feedback from as many impacted parties as possible. Use of multimedia instruction is another component of instructional technology to consider as it helps student performance as the concept of “difficulty” advances; allowing programs to support multiple methods of instruction to meet the needs of students (Macaulay & Pantazi, 2006). Another element of instructional technology is the use of course shells which according to Puzziferro & Shelton (2009) create a sense of uniformity for all students, decrease preparation loads for instructors, but leave the ideal of “quality” instruction open to interpretation. The final piece of instructional technology to consider for this study focuses on the theme of supplemental technology/information, which according to Suda, Bell, & Franks (2011) is essential as students are less than likely to review textbooks and course materials but will rather focus on materials created/provided by the faculty member.

**Faculty Support**
Support of online faculty including faculty development (Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013), pedagogical and technology training (Arbaugh, 2000; Irlbeck, 2008; Orr, Williams, & Pennington 2009); peripheral roles (González-Sanmamed, Muñoz-Carril, & Sangrà, 2014), policies (Dittmar & McCracken, 2012), and feedback (Planar & Moya, 2016) have been explored in the context of faculty effectiveness. Implementation of targeted faculty development programming is one of four areas of focus identified by Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson (2013) to connect adjunct faculty to fulltime faculty. Focused on effective instructional strategies for online learning, the programming should be asynchronous and web-based to meet the time and location constraints of all faculty (Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013). Faculty development encompasses both technology and pedagogy; and undoubtedly, both lead to teaching effectiveness.

Arbaugh (2000) examined the influence of pedagogical and technological factors and found that pedagogy played the most significant role in student learning in online courses. As a significant influence on student learning, the level of faculty support in the area of pedagogy becomes key. Orr, Williams, and Pennington (2009) surveyed faculty concerning barriers to the planning and delivery of online instruction and concluded that as faculty become more adept with the technology, focus and needs shift to further development in pedagogy. Support through training and development programming should expand beyond these areas to also include how educators evaluate student performance. Planar underscores the importance of effective personalized feedback in the student experience (2016), making this an important area of focus for faculty support efforts.

While pedagogy and technology are important considerations for faculty development, another theme that emerged related to faculty support in online teaching effectiveness was that of peripheral roles (González-Sanmamed, Muñoz-Carril, & Sangrà, 2014). The authors identify seven roles (social, evaluator, manager, technologist, advisor/counsellor, personal, and researcher) as associated with online teaching effectiveness (2014). González-Sanmamed, Muñoz-Carril, and Sangrà (2014) explored faculty perceptions of their own proficiency and development needs in each of the seven roles and identified the importance of providing developmental support in each of these areas (2014).

Finally, institutional policies emerged as an important theme to faculty support. Institutions should consider policies that will create the supportive culture in which supporting faculty through training and
development is an expectation. Faculty training and development related to university policies is an important consideration (Dittmar & McCracken, 2012; González-Sanmamed, Muñoz-Carril, & Sangrà, 2014), so are policies related to faculty training and development (Mueller, Mandernach & Sanderson, 2013). While institutions regularly incentivize training and development in position descriptions and contracts for fulltime faculty, opportunity also exists within the context of adjunct faculty. Mueller, Mandernach, and Sanderson also propose that universities explore structures and policies that encourage adjunct faculty to invest further in themselves beyond their course contracts. Policies such as these create accountabilities, partnerships, and expectations between the institution and the faculty member.

Class size, faculty compensation, and course scheduling.
While class size, faculty compensation, and course scheduling are administrative factors outside the control of individual faculty, it is important to consider the impact of each on teaching effectiveness. Simply put, administrative policies, practices, and procedures can often unintentionally help—or hinder—faculty support, motivation, and commitment.

To address budget constraints, institutions often increase class size or teaching loads (Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013); while the financial benefits of these approaches are clear, it is important to consider the impact of class size on student learning (Harrison & El Mansour, 2008). Despite disagreements in the current literature about what constitutes a “perfect” online class size, there is a general consensus that smaller classes tend to be associated with outcomes that are more positive. Tomei (2006) suggests that the “perfect” online class size is twelve students; but research by Sorenson (2015) indicates that faculty performance is consistent up to 30 students. Additional research by Arzt (2011) echoes the slightly large class size and finds classes of 12-22 to be most desirable in the online classroom. While these “perfect” numbers may not be practical or realistic within institutional budget constraints and instructional resources, Tomei explains that it should be the target as positive results are more likely when compared to larger classes.

While class size is outside the control of the instructor, institutions should consider class size as a function of teaching effectiveness. Research on online education finds that faculty workload is directly related to class size (Cavanhaugh, 2005; Mupinga & Maughan, 2008; Rockwell, Schauer, Fritz & Marx, 1999). When class sizes are smaller, it is feasible to have higher expectations in relation to instructor interaction, engagement and feedback; in contrast, larger class sizes may mandate shifts in curriculum or course expectations to ensure manageable faculty workload (Harrison & El Mansour, 2008). Recognizing the instructors only have a finite amount of time available to devote to their online teaching (Mandernach & Holbeck, 2016), shifts in class size directly impact on the teaching quality that instructors are able to provide.

Faculty compensation may also influence teaching effectiveness. Not only do higher paying institutions have the potential to attract more qualified faculty, but also compensation may influence the motivation and commitment of an instructor’s teaching activities (Windes & Lesht, 2014). Time is limited, and individuals often have to prioritize time and effort in relation to the compensation they receive. As such, low pay may translate into less time-on-task dedicated to instructional activities. In addition, higher pay may increase an instructor’s willingness and ability to engage in professional development, technology, or interactions that would further foster teaching effectiveness.

Related to limited time, the consistency or inconsistency by which an instructor is scheduled to teach a given course may impact teaching quality. If a faculty member has a consistent teaching schedule, then they have an opportunity to build course-specific instructional resources and enhance their expertise in that course. In contrast, if teaching schedules are not consistent, there are three potential pitfalls: 1) faculty may have decreased motivation to invest in the creation of instructional resources for a course they may never teach again; 2) faculty are constantly in ‘new course prep’ mode so time that could be spent on student interaction or feedback must be invested in instructional preparation and development;
and 3) repeated teaching of the same course leads to higher level of expertise, comfort and resource development that, in turn, promotes better teaching. While the issue of consistent course schedules is often discussed as a function of job stability and fairness for adjunct faculty (Giannoni & Tesone, 2003), consistency in course schedules can impact teaching effectiveness – and student learning – in a meaningful way.

**Faculty Community**

Online teaching creates the unique opportunity for faculty, either fulltime or adjunct, to teach remotely. The geographic separation from campus may prevent online faculty from the benefits of daily interaction, community, and opportunities for collaboration that are inherent in campus-based teaching position. The remote nature of online teaching has the potential of leaving faculty feeling isolated and disconnected from the campus-based faculty community (Baran & Correia, 2014; Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013). Reduced opportunities for collaboration and resource sharing with the broader faculty community may hinder teaching effectiveness.

Online learning and faculty effectiveness has been discussed in the context of community (Baran & Correia, 2014; Lewis & Abdul-Hamid, 2006), collaboration (Baran & Correia, 2014; Dittmar & McCracken, 2012; Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013), development of best practices (Irlbeck, 2008); the opportunity to share resources (Irlbeck, 2008; Orr, Williams, & Pennington 2009), team based approach (Orr, Williams, & Pennington 2009), and communication (González-Sanmamed, Muñoz-Carril, & Sangrà, 2014). The importance of faculty community in supporting effective teaching emphasizes collegial learning groups, peer support, and mentoring. Prioritizing this important factor may have the ability to unite and ignite important work of the faculty as a community and may lead to teaching effectiveness.

Community provides an excellent platform for collaboration particularly in areas of emerging technologies such as web 2.0 tools (Dittmar & McCracken, 2012). Dittmar and McCracken (2012) developed the META Model for the development of high performing online faculty. The model includes four components, each with associated themes (Mentoring, Engagement, Technology integration, and Assessment) of collaboration and community (2012). González-Sanmamed, Muñoz-Carril, & Sangrà (2014) proposed that the collaborative approach to online teaching including community and teamwork could strengthen faculty development of peripheral roles. In addition, teaching efforts including the development of best practices (Irlbeck, 2008) and the opportunity for faculty to share resources (Mueller, & Mandernach, 2013; Orr, Williams, & Pennington, 2009) as benefits of collaborative teaching communities.

**Purpose**

As indicated by existing research, many administrative factors have the potential to influence teaching effectiveness in the online classroom. While each of these factors has the potential to influence instructional practices, there is limited information on faculty perceptions about which factors are most influential to online teaching. Understanding the influence (positive or negative) of operational functions on teaching and learning can help inform policies, procedures, and support to maximize the teaching and learning dynamic in the online classroom. Equally important is an awareness that most, if not all, of these factors are outside of the control of individual faculty members. As such, it is essential to gain faculty feedback on institutional policy, structures, and procedures that can either support or hinder effective instructional practices. The purpose of this study is to explore faculty perceptions about administrative, program, or policy factors that impact the quality of online teaching and learning. Understanding the influence (positive or negative) of operational functions on teaching and learning can help inform policies, procedures, and support to maximize the teaching and learning dynamic in the online classroom. Another likely byproduct of this understanding and the resulting efforts include a greater sense of
community between administration and faculty, which in turn benefit students through faculty growth and stability.

**Methods**

**Materials**

The complete online survey consisted of five demographic questions, one multiple-choice question, five open-ended essay questions, and nine rating questions (each containing 5 to 15 individual items requiring independent rating) exploring various aspects of online teaching and learning. Survey items were developed based on key considerations highlighted in the literature; survey was reviewed for content validity by two experts in online education. Prior to survey administration, survey was pilot-tested by a faculty focus group to ensure readability and clarity. Due to the length of the survey, it was divided into two forms (Form A and Form B) that each included approximately half of the questions. Demographic questions were included in both forms of the survey; demographic questions are listed in Table 2.

**Table 1: Survey Demographic Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe your primary teaching role?</td>
<td>Adjunct Online Instructor; Fulltime Online Faculty; Traditional Campus Adjunct Instructor; Fulltime Campus Faculty; Dissertation Faculty; Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With regard to your primary teaching role, in which discipline area do you primarily teach?</td>
<td>Business; Education; Fine Arts; Humanities &amp; Social Sciences; Nursing &amp; Health Care; Science, Engineering &amp; Technology; Theology; Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In which of the following modalities do you currently (within the last year) teach? Select all that apply.</td>
<td>Campus; Online; Dual Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years have you taught face-to-face at the college level?</td>
<td>Open answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years have you taught online at the college level?</td>
<td>Open answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions targeting the impact of administrative considerations on the quality of online teaching were only included on Form A of the survey; the two survey questions relevant to this study are listed in Table 3. Participants responded to rating survey items using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = no value; 2 = minor value; 3 = some value; 4 = significant value; 5 = extreme value; and 6 = not applicable).
**Table 2: Survey Questions Targeting Administrative Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate the impact or value of each of the following factors on the quality</td>
<td>• Consistent and predictable schedule of specific courses that you teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of your online teaching.</td>
<td>• Lead time of course assignments in relation to class start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching the same course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching in the same modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased input on course revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review faculty comments on end-of-course surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Notification of course changes (curricular, assignments, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Notification when students are added or dropped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other (with open-ended response option)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What can the university do (or provide) to enhance the quality of your</td>
<td>Open response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online teaching? How can administration support you to foster high-quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedure**

After receiving IRB approval and site authorization, a request to participate in the survey was emailed to all faculty. The email was sent out from the academic affairs office as a component of a larger institutional effectiveness initiative. The initial email requesting faculty participation in the survey outlined the purpose and scope of the investigation. Faculty electing to complete the online survey accessed it via a link embedded in the email. There was no incentive for participation nor were there any consequences for electing not to complete the survey. The survey was administered anonymously via an online survey tool; no personal identifiers or IP address information was collected. The survey access remained open and available for participants for 30 days; there were no reminders or follow-up emails to encourage participation in the survey. Per the survey design, participants could skip questions, move throughout the survey, and/or change answers to questions at any time. Survey answers were not finalized until faculty clicked the “submit” button. At the conclusion of the survey, faculty were provided a notification with contact information in the event they had questions, comments or desired access to survey results.

**Participants**

Respondents included 227 faculty currently teaching online; 4 responses were eliminated, as the individuals were online doctoral mentors and did not teach typical, asynchronous online courses. The resultant 223 faculty responses were included in the analysis; 30 (13.5%) are fulltime faculty and 193 (86.5%) are adjunct. Faculty reported a wide range (0 to 27 years) of online teaching experience with an average of 6.77 (SD=4.54) years; in addition, faculty indicated an average of 6.98 (SD=8.16) years of experience teaching traditional campus-based courses.

Faculty represent a range of academic disciplines: 23.3% business; 17.5% education; .4% fine arts; 19.3% humanities and social sciences; 18.4% nursing and health care; 1.8% science, engineering and technology; 13.0% theology; and 6.2% graduate studies. No information was collected on faculty age, gender or race.
All faculty respondents teach online at a single-target university in a large, fully established online program that utilizes a faculty-created, centralized curriculum. Courses last 8-weeks in duration and are organized into weekly, time-limited, asynchronous modules. All modules contain online lecture information (primarily text-based overviews with embedded multimedia supplements), discussion activities and homework assignments. Course development is completed independently of course facilitation, so during an active term, faculty are responsible solely for teaching the established course.

Results

Data was cleaned to remove incomplete responses and eliminate respondents who did not indicate “online as their primary teaching mode. An analysis of faculty ratings of administrative factors that impact the quality of online teaching found significant differences between fulltime and adjunct faculty in their perceptions of administrative factors that have the greatest impact on the quality of their online teaching. As indicated in Table 4, a one-way ANOVA revealed significant differences in fulltime versus adjunct faculty perceptions for six of the eight administrative considerations. Specifically, adjunct faculty were more likely than fulltime faculty to believe that lead time of course assignments and reviewing faculty feedback from end-of-course evaluations would have an impact on the quality of their online teaching. In contrast, fulltime faculty were more likely than adjunct faculty to rate collaboration with disciplinary peers, collaboration with other online faculty, input on course revisions, and notification of course changes as having a higher impact on online teaching quality. There was no difference between adjunct and fulltime faculty’s perceptions of the impact of a consistent/predictable teaching schedule or notification of when student rosters change (i.e., drops or adds). Table 5 provides mean ratings for each administrative factor by faculty role.

Table 3: Significant Differences of Faculty Role in Rating Impact of Administrative Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Factor</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent and predictable schedule of specific</td>
<td>1, 220</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses you teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead time of course assignments in relation to</td>
<td>1, 219</td>
<td>19.501</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching</td>
<td>1, 219</td>
<td>10.337</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the same course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching</td>
<td>1, 219</td>
<td>10.377</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the same modality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased input on course revisions</td>
<td>1, 219</td>
<td>6.305</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review faculty comments on end-of-course surveys</td>
<td>1, 217</td>
<td>5.379</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of course changes (curricular, assignments,</td>
<td>1, 219</td>
<td>5.243</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification when students are added or dropped</td>
<td>1, 218</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adjunct faculty rated higher than fulltime faculty
**Fulltime faculty rated higher than adjunct faculty
Table 4: Mean Ratings for Administrative Factors by Faculty Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Factor</th>
<th>Fulltime Faculty Rating</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent and predictable schedule of specific courses that you teach</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead time of course assignments in relation to class start</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching the same course</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching in the same modality</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased input on course revisions</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review faculty comments on end-of-course surveys</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of course changes (curricular, assignments, etc.)</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification when students are added or dropped</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fulltime faculty indicated that advanced notification of course changes ($\bar{x}$=4.70; SD=.60) was the most important factor while advanced notification of course changes ($\bar{x}$=4.27; SD=.99) and a consistent/predictable teaching schedule ($\bar{x}$=4.27; SD=.96) tied as the most important administrative considerations for adjunct faculty. While lead-time of teaching assignments ($\bar{x}$=3.13; SD=1.83) was the lowest rated administrative consideration for fulltime, this was a highly rated factor for adjunct faculty ($\bar{x}$=4.12; SD=.99). Similarly, collaboration with disciplinary peers ($\bar{x}$=3.77; SD=1.21) and collaboration with other online faculty ($\bar{x}$=3.57; SD=1.19) were the lowest rated factors for adjunct faculty but were some of the most important factors ($\bar{x}$=4.50; SD=.63 and $\bar{x}$=4.30; SD=.92 respectively) for fulltime faculty. Table 6 highlights the relative ranking of administrative factors for fulltime and adjunct faculty.

Table 5: Ranking of Administrative Factors by Faculty Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Fulltime Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Notification of course changes (curricular, assignments, etc.)</td>
<td>* Notification of course changes (curricular, assignments, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching the same course</td>
<td>* Consistent and predictable schedule of specific courses that you teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching in the same modality</td>
<td>Lead time of course assignments in relation to class start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increased input on course revisions</td>
<td>Notification when students are added or dropped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Consistent and predictable schedule of specific courses that you teach</td>
<td>Increased input on course revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Notification when students are added or dropped</td>
<td>Review faculty comments on end-of-course surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Review faculty comments on end-of-course surveys</td>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching the same course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lead time of course assignments in relation to class start</td>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching in the same modality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*tie
Recognizing that the impact of administrative factors on the quality of one’s teaching may shift as a function of teaching experience, faculty responses were divided into two groups: novice (less than one-year online teaching experience) and experienced (more than one-year online teaching experience). Forty-three faculty were novice (3 fulltime; 40 adjunct) and 370 (46 fulltime; 324 adjunct) were experienced. A comparative analysis of faculty perceptions as a function of online teaching experience revealed no significant differences between groups; Table 7 provides complete significance testing results. A factorial analysis of variance was not conducted due to the extreme group size difference between novice fulltime faculty (n=3) and experienced adjunct faculty (n=324). It is worth noting that two administrative factors (e.g., opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching the same course and review faculty comments on end-of-course surveys) approached significance with novice faculty placing a higher importance on these factors compared to experienced faculty. Table 8 provides the mean rating for each administrative factor as a function of faculty experience.

Table 6: Significance Testing of Rating Impact of Administrative Factors by Faculty Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Factor</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent and predictable schedule of specific courses that you teach</td>
<td>1, 216</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead time of course assignments in relation to class start</td>
<td>1, 215</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching the same course</td>
<td>1, 215</td>
<td>3.607</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching in the same modality</td>
<td>1, 215</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased input on course revisions</td>
<td>1, 215</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review faculty comments on end-of-course surveys</td>
<td>1, 213</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of course changes (curricular, assignments, etc.)</td>
<td>1, 215</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification when students are added or dropped</td>
<td>1, 214</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Mean Ratings for Administrative Factors by Faculty Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Factor</th>
<th>Novice Faculty Rating</th>
<th>Experienced Faculty Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent and predictable schedule of specific courses that you teach</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead time of course assignments in relation to class start</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching the same course</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration with peers teaching in the same modality</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased input on course revisions</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review faculty comments on end-of-course surveys</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of course changes (curricular, assignments, etc.)</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification when students are added or dropped</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two researchers conducted a content analysis of open-ended questions; all responses were reviewed initially to identify key themes then analyzed and coded into the emergent themes. The content analysis focused on the open-ended questions “What can administration do (or provide) to enhance the quality of
your teaching? How can the institution support you to foster high-quality instruction?” and revealed four themes that were discussed in at least 10% of faculty responses: learning management system, faculty support, curriculum, and communication. The most common theme (31.21% of responses) focused on improved functionality of the learning management system (LMS). Specifically, faculty believed that enhancing the LMS with push-notifications and multimedia integration would allow them to be more effective teachers. In addition, faculty indicated that faster, more efficient, functionality of the LMS would allow them to dedicate more of their time to high-impact teaching activities. Reflective of this concern, one respondent indicated, “The biggest issue is efficiency. There are too many clicks required to get to each area. Push notifications would be huge! The gradebook needs some efficiency as well, including integrated grading of documents within the LMS [LoudCloud] (instead of having to download the file). Perhaps being able to provide comments on the TII [TurnItIn] report would be helpful!”

The faculty support issues (15.03% of responses) mentioned in the open-ended questions echoed the findings of the quantitative data. Faculty desired consistent teaching schedules, advance notification of teaching assignments, and feedback/guidance on their teaching. Highlighting this issue, a faculty member stated, “It would be nice to have more faculty collaboration opportunities as well as a more consistent and transparent schedule with regard to future classes/contracts available to faculty.” Curriculum enhancements (14.45% of responses) highlighted the importance of curriculum updates including assignments, rubrics, multimedia, examples and current event applications. Reflective of this concern, one respondent indicated, “giving online students & instructors a solid (but fluid), seamless, fully functioning system with a well thought out curriculum is #1 priority.”

The final theme, communication (10.98% of responses), emphasized the desire of faculty to be more connected with the institution and informed of institutional initiatives. Specifically, faculty indicated the need for follow-up between administration and faculty in relation to student and curriculum issues. As one faculty member explained, “I feel I do not get any feedback about my teaching. I also feel as though I have no idea who to contact if I have a question ... I have submitted numerous early alerts and have no idea if the student has dropped or continuing. I also have submitted academic dishonesty forms and have not have heard anything back about the outcome.” Other, less prevalent, themes that emerged during the content analysis are listed in Table 9.

**Table 8: Content Analysis Themes for Administrative Support of Online Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Associated Topics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced LMS</td>
<td>push-notifications, tools for instructor multimedia integration, efficiency of use</td>
<td>31.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty support</td>
<td>consistent teaching schedules, advance notification of teaching assignments, feedback/guidance on teaching</td>
<td>15.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved curriculum</td>
<td>updated assignments, rubrics, multimedia, examples, current events</td>
<td>14.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication</td>
<td>connection with the institution, informed of institutional initiatives, follow-up</td>
<td>10.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support</td>
<td>more support resources to help students outside classroom</td>
<td>8.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia integration</td>
<td>increased audio, video, interaction embedded into course curriculum</td>
<td>8.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology access</td>
<td>more options for university-supported technology supplements</td>
<td>7.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty community</td>
<td>opportunities for faculty collaboration, shared teaching resources</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty voice</td>
<td>increased input on policy, curriculum</td>
<td>5.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional policies</td>
<td>faculty-friendly teaching policies</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional flexibility</td>
<td>opportunity for faculty modification of course curriculum and requirements</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty compensation</td>
<td>increased pay; pay per student/assignment</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>reduced class size</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading efficiency</td>
<td>grading support; reduced feedback expectations</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty development opportunities</td>
<td>more professional development opportunities</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Faculty perceptions of the impact of administrative factors on their online teaching effectiveness revealed six key considerations: scheduling, course design, multimedia, curriculum, faculty development, and faculty support. While these factors were relevant to all faculty teaching online, the relative importance of each factor varied between fulltime and adjunct faculty. For example, quantitative research identified that both fulltime and adjunct faculty perceived advanced notice of course change (Fulltime $m = 4.70$, Adjunct $m = 4.27$) as the most important administrative factor impacting quality teaching. Adjunct faculty also identified a consistent and predictable schedule ($m = 4.27$) as equally impactful. Recognizing that administrators must create policies and procedures which support both fulltime and adjunct faculty, it is essential that institutions reflect upon their unique faculty population when addressing the impact of administrative factors on online teaching effectiveness. Four key categories emerged in the qualitative analysis of this study: functionality of the Learning Management System (LMS), faculty support issues, curriculum enhancements, and communication.

Results of the qualitative analysis illuminated the Learning Management System (LMS) as having the greatest perceived impact on instructional quality. The LMS is often thought of as the platform in which student and faculty interaction takes place; however, faculty feedback from this study shines light on the importance of LMS features and perceptions of how they encourage (or hinder) effective teaching. Faculty in this study indicated that improved functionality and additional LMS features such as push notifications and multimedia integration to enhance the quality of their teaching.

It is important to recognize that the LMS features most relevant to faculty may be a function of their current LMS tool as well as their institutional context (fulltime vs. adjunct). Administrators should actively solicit faculty feedback on the interaction between pedagogy and the LMS. Appendix A provides an example of a faculty feedback survey that could be utilized to gain faculty insights to enhance LMS functionality. Not only can this feedback be passed along to technology administrators and LMS organizations, but it can also be used to guide faculty development initiatives targeting teaching within the LMS. Specifically, faculty development may look at third party technologies that can be integrated into the online classroom to compensate for missing LMS features or provide pedagogical workarounds that can be used within the current LMS.

Qualitative findings indicated faculty support as the second highest ranked category influencing teaching effectiveness. Faculty support in this study related to schedule consistency, advance notice of teaching assignments, and feedback/guidance on teaching. Faculty respondents in this study prioritized a consistent schedule and advanced notification of the classes that they teach.

The third category illuminated in data relates to curriculum enhancements. Institutions are again unique in how they address course design, as some utilize centralized curriculum (as is the case in this study) while others use faculty driven design from course to course. Each of these categories are unique and while relevant in a standardized, centralized curriculum, they are also generalizable to environments where faculty create their own courses.

The final category that emerged in the data analysis was communication. Faculty in the present study showed they want to be connected to their institution, contribute, and be informed of institutional initiatives. They also are looking for more follow up and discussion between administrators and faculty regarding their own teaching performance. Faculty respondents indicated that they want to be involved in, and notified of, course and curriculum changes.

Current research also echoes the finding in the present study of faculty interest in pedagogical and supplemental development (Arbaugh, 2000; Irlbeck, 2008; Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013;
Orr, Williams, & Pennington (2009). University administrators should focus on balance in response to this finding. More is not necessarily better; it should be targeted, real, and relevant. It is also important to realize that appropriate training and development resources are available; but faculty may not realize what is offered. Another important consideration is that administrators must be mindful of is when the training is offered. Mueller, Mandernach, and Sanderson (2013) posit scheduling to meet the needs of part-time and fulltime faculty to ensure ability to participate.

A valuable option within this discussion is for administrators to balance the desire for faculty development and the commitment to avoid overloading faculty with too much. To accomplish this, administrators may consider identifying overarching developmental areas of focus each academic year. Once decided, these areas of pedagogical and supplemental development can be focused, and consistent – to ensure that commitment and participation is achieved, without overload.

**Recommendations**

**Scheduling**

As administrators, there are a number of things we can do to meet faculty needs in regard to scheduling such as developing better projections of student enrollment so that schedule projection occurs more efficiently for the future. Another approach that administrators could take to create stable schedules for adjunct faculty would be to minimize the number of adjuncts retained for instruction, but this creates a potential situation where enrollment increases could jeopardize the overall stability of scheduling created by the need to recruit. A final combination to consider is that faculty with more experience with a course could be scheduled at higher loads due to the minimized need for lead time which would allow us administrators the ability to pay an individual more to do more work rather than relying on more people to do the same amount of work, which then effectively minimizes the risk of having a decreased adjunct pool to operate with.

These concerns are very relevant to content specific scheduling. If this is true, we recommend that administrators include faculty in the planning and development of faculty scheduling. An additional benefit of this level of support would extend to the ability of administrators to begin to provide teaching expectations as well as feedback and guidance on their teaching. This resulting level of support could include provisions for scheduled time for administrators to observe faculty and conduct spot checks in classrooms and identify what is working and what is not. Faculty best practices that may be presented to the larger body of faculty. In addition, administrators may identify opportunity for potential mentorship and course lead opportunities for seasoned faculty.

University academic administrators should explore creative ways in which to address this issue. For example, one way this could be accomplished is map a degree plan for the entire program, specific to the student and schedule the student in all courses from point of entry to graduation. Utilizing these projection numbers, faculty can be tentatively scheduled for several terms out with an awareness that student scheduling can then be monitored on an ongoing basis so that adjustments if needed can be made to faculty scheduling. Another option is to create a course walk for each program that maps the sequence of courses taken in each program of study. Then forecasting may be used to schedule courses.

Similarly, recognizing that one of the benefits of a consistent schedule is that faculty do not have to spend as much time preparing for new courses but rather can invest this time into other instructional activities. Creating a scheduling structure that prioritizes consistency in scheduling may lead to less lead-time needed to prep for courses, as the schedule is expected and planned. When faculty have a consistent schedule, they have potential to improve the quality of their teaching as time will be freed to further develop and build their own curriculum and resource library, mentor and or collaborate with other faculty, and engage in service, scholarship, and professional development. With this in mind, creating stability in the scheduling of faculty becomes a key component to be considered by administrators.
Staffing models for online instruction generally are comprised of fulltime online faculty, fulltime faculty who have a portion of their course load in class, and the other portion online, as well as adjunct online faculty. Some institutions are moving toward fulltime online faculty models with supplemental scheduling of adjunct faculty. While this approach may appear costly, the cost benefit may be realized in student satisfaction and retention (Mueller, Mandernach, & Sanderson, 2013). Regardless of whether the institution uses fulltime faculty or predominantly adjuncts the use of consistency in scheduling as a tool to support faculty may in turn lend itself to potential improved teacher effectiveness as well as commitment to the organization (Giannoni & Tesone, 2003).

Undoubtedly, there exists a continuum of various faculty models that include some combination of adjunct and fulltime online faculty. The faculty model employed by the institution in this study includes a combination of both online fulltime faculty and online adjuncts. Faculty in this study perceived scheduling variance as having impact on their own teaching effectiveness. There is significant time commitment accepted by the faculty member when scheduled for a course (for example: class set up, welcome calls, etc.). When course scheduling is sporadic the return on that that time investment is limited, which may result in diminished teacher effectiveness (Harrison & El Mansour, 2008). However, if the scheduling is consistent in terms of frequency or the actual courses themselves, then faculty can develop materials that can be used over several courses and improvements can be made from course to course as that familiarity develops.

This familiarity bodes well for the students as familiarity with the course materials, objectives, and outcomes leads the faculty or adjunct to know shortcomings or concerns that commonly arise which they can address prior to them popping up in future courses which results in better student outcomes. All faculty (novice $m = 4.39$ and experienced $m = 4.32$) perceive the being notified with course change information as impactful on teaching quality. From an administrative perspective, this familiarity could be used to foster teaching circles, between faculty regardless of position type, which would allow for collaboration of ideas and teaching methodology/pedagogy.

**Faculty Support**

The issue of consistent teaching schedules is a challenge in online programs that utilize a large population of adjunct faculty. One of the benefits of adjunct faculty is that they allow institutions to schedule faculty to teach as a direct function of student enrollments. Simply put, the institution does not have to pay an instructor for a class that fails to have an adequate number of students. Fulltime faculty data did not support this concept as impactful as the adjunct ($m = 4.16$, which places it fifth), however the benefits of creating stability would still likely be felt by all regardless of institutional status. The downside of this model is that faculty are often scheduled for courses with little notice as enrollments fluctuate. With this in mind, solutions that provide scheduling consistency for online faculty have to be balanced with awareness of the budgetary needs of the institution.

When considering scheduling, the fulltime faculty ranked this number five while the adjuncts ranked this number two on their respective lists. A likely rationale for this is that fulltime faculty inherently know they will have a predetermined course load when hired into their position, whereas adjuncts employment is typically on an as needed basis.

**Curriculum Enhancements**

In reviewing the results of this study, some approaches from an administrative perspective could be advantageous. The recommendation would be to create basic course shells at the minimum, which would contain relevant materials, objectives, resources, and potential talking points. This would allow faculty in either course design model to have solid foundations to build on and allow them to maximize their time in the classroom teaching.
The use of a basic course shell would create a fostering environment for faculty and adjunct alike as it allows them to focus more on their teaching. The results indicated that fulltime faculty placed an increased sense of value on this collaborative element than their adjunct counterparts. A likely causation of this is the notion of proximity in that fulltime faculty have the means to collaborate more directly with their colleagues than adjuncts do. From an administrative perspective, this desire for collaboration within the fulltime faculty can be fostered by encouraging collaboration and offering opportunities within the college, content, or team to meet and discuss ideas, develop course materials, or create research works.

Focusing on adjunct faculty, administrators could create opportunities for these individuals to become engaged with colleagues by holding conference calls via ZOOM or a similar video-conferencing service where fulltime faculty are also included so that relationships can develop. With the value relationship in mind utilizing more novice faculty would be perceived as more impactful (If same course novice faculty $m = 4.30$ whereas experienced faculty $m = 3.81$, if different course novice faculty $m = 3.78$ and experienced faculty $m = 3.64$). Also, by maintaining documents where research interests or general interests are visible to all, opportunities for collaboration could be sought out by the faculty regardless of their position and/or experience level within the university. This increased focus on collaboration allows for additional administrative focus on faculty support.

Administrators should also address the role of multimedia as it impacts the quality of online teaching. Multimedia supplements, while only explored in this study via qualitative means, allow faculty to teach and students to learn using integrated technology to engage with and process information in an online environment (Bledsoe & Simmerok, 2014). Multimedia may include social media, web-enhanced tools, video, games, and the like. Recognizing that faculty are busy, it is important to minimize the workload associated with multimedia integration. If multimedia and technology integration is easy, faculty are more likely to use it. As such, administrators should focus on provided limited multimedia options that have heightened support. Involving faculty in multimedia adoption decisions may help ensure ease-of-use and relevance.

The findings from the present study, for example, indicate that both students and faculty find instructional videos valuable to student learning.

- Videos created by the instructor may include:
  - welcome videos
  - content specific
  - announcements
  - library overview
  - APA formatting
  - assignment overviews

- Videos from the internet
  - content specific
  - related podcasts or Ted Talks
  - related movie clips
  - related commercials

It is recommended that university administrators focus on the integration of multimedia in the curriculum. As administrators, it is essential to make informed decisions about the funding and training provided in relation to instructional technology to ensure that faculty have the necessary tools for effective teaching. In addition, it may be more cost-effective to explore options for building multimedia curriculum directly into the course materials (as opposed to attempting to support individualized selections of each faculty). Another recommendation is to provide access to multimedia resources directly in the online classroom such as quick links for instructors and students to create audio or video files for
each other. In addition, multimedia may be optimized in assignments by providing access to technology resources like Loom and Zoom for student presentations.

Multimedia integration does come with a cost. While investments in site licenses for technology may be expensive, if sufficient faculty utilize a given technology (such as ZOOM) it may be worth the investment for the resultant gains in instructional quality. In addition, there are several free web enabled tools and multimedia options available to faculty such as Flip Grid and Loom, faculty development and tech support to assist with their use.

As earlier mentioned, faculty are more likely to implement pedagogical approaches that are quick and easy. As such, administrators may consider the integration of strategies that make it easy for faculty to incorporate multimedia into the online classroom. Such strategies may include faculty development workshops that demonstrate set-up and implementation of multimedia resources will assist in garnering participation. Institutions can also tap into their existing faculty leaders by recognizing faculty who multimedia innovators; these faculty may lead collaborative teams to integrate multimedia in specific courses.

Communication
While many institutions engage lead faculty in course development, all faculty have insight into best practices, tools, and resources that work best for them. Administrators can capitalize on what is working well by engaging all faculty in the sharing of best practices in creative ways including presentations, resource centers, and weekly communiqué to keep faculty updated on updates and changes. Communication may include any combination of email, newsletter, faculty forums, and college specific announcements. Recognizing faculty time is limited, each of these should be concise, and encourage opportunity for faculty to engage their voice.

Less seasoned faculty may become further empowered and engaged in and with the curriculum if given the opportunity to use their expertise in the courses that they teach. Allowing less seasoned faculty to develop enhanced assignments, integrated rubrics, and the development of standardized templates and examples that are course and assignment specific could be beneficial for further developing newer faculty. In turn, these resources can then be provided as instructor resources for all instructors teaching the course. Course specific email accounts could be used for faculty to submit feedback and ideas about the course that they teach (for example, setting up an email for PSY502@universityaddress.edu). The emails could then go to a lead instructor or the instructional designer. Content collaboration groups and course specific forums are additional options to engage faculty at various levels of experience in the content of the course.

Conclusion
The current study identified scheduling, course design, multimedia, curriculum, faculty development, and faculty support as perceived by faculty to have the greatest impact on their teaching effectiveness. Each institution is unique, and the administrative approach used to facilitate effective teaching is undoubtedly a mix of art and science. Several insights and recommendations have been provided related to LMS, faculty support, curriculum enhancement, and communication. The opportunity for administrators is to utilize the insights provided to construct an integrated approach within their institution that creates an environment that sets instructors up for success.
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Appendix A

Example: LMS Faculty Feedback Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate the extent to which you think the following LMS course revisions would enhance teaching and learning in the courses you teach:</th>
<th>Scale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional videos from the Internet integrated into lectures</td>
<td>1 = no value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = minor value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = some value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = significant value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = extreme value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to relevant websites/ resources embedded in the written lectures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to relevant websites/ resources listed in the course</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory announcements for each module</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary announcements for each module</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online games or activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-programmed feedback in relation to quiz answers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample papers and assignments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preloaded rubrics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Online Class Visits, Faculty Delivery Data, and Proving What Works

Will Hatheway
Quality Assurance Specialist, NOVA Online

Nillab Pazhwak
Quality Assurance Specialist, NOVA Online

Northern Virginia Community College

Summary

Distance learning institutions tend to have shared assumptions about what best practices for delivering an online college course are. Data backing these assumptions, though, can sometimes be hard to come by, and determining how well faculty are following them can be a daunting task. This presentation will share the results of a rubric-based assessment of 468 online faculty in terms of how well they met NOVA Online’s Faculty Memorandum of Understanding required best practices, provide snapshots of how many practices do indeed correlate with student success, discuss our process, show initial Year-1 to Year-2 changes in full-time faculty adherence to the MOU, and offer ideas to make all of this information actionable. Attendees will come away with a data-driven understanding of what practices benefit students and understand how to undertake a large-scale faculty evaluation project aimed at improved online instruction and greater student success.

About the Presenters

Will Hatheway is a Quality Assurance Specialist at Northern Virginia Community College’s NOVA Online (NOL), where he works on online faculty development, investigates student complaints, and performs annual class-visit reviews of about 250 faculty. He is also NOL’s Quality Matters coordinator, a Master Reviewer, and Online APPQMR facilitator. He has taught online since 2010.
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Accelerated Online Courses- Strategies for Faculty Presence & Caring

Lynne Zajac PhD, RN
Associate Professor, DNP Program Director

Adrianne Lane EdD, RN
Professor

Northern Kentucky University

Summary

Faculty presence and caring behaviors present challenges in online educational settings due to lack of face to face interaction; faculty who are teaching accelerated online courses of 8 weeks or less may face additional obstacles. This session 1) describes the findings of a mixed method study which focused on 122 post-licensure RN/BSN, MSN, and DNP online nursing students’ perceptions of faculty online presence and caring behaviors (FOPCB) in accelerated online courses, 2) discusses strategies to enhance FOPCB, and 3) explores how to integrate the strategies into online courses to increase FOPCB.

Quantitative results indicate that students rank timely communication, academic support, and empathetic presence as top behaviors of FOPCB; even so, up to one-third of students disagreed that faculty exhibit these behaviors. Expansive qualitative themes of authentic and empathetic communication, timely and respectful feedback, faculty interaction and investment in student success support the quantitative findings. Examples of broad strategies informed by the findings to enhance FOPCB include authentic communication, methods and conveyance of timely feedback, instructor flexibility, and investment in the student. The benefits of the session will be an implementation plan and timeline for integration of faculty online presence and caring behaviors/strategies into the accelerated online classroom environment.

About the Presenters

Dr. Lynne Zajac is a faculty member and Director for the online Post Masters Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) Program at NKU; she teaches online courses in nursing research, epidemiology, leadership, and advises for DNP scholarly projects. Dr. Zajac holds a Ph.D. in Nursing Education, an online program, from the University of Northern Colorado. She has experience in online education, which includes faculty development, curriculum and course development, and revision- including modification of courses to an accelerated format. Her areas of expertise, interest, and research include adult health, nursing and online education, diversity in nursing education, and nursing scholarship.

Address: NKU 300 Nunn Drive Highland Heights KY 41099
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Dr. Adrianne J. Lane has been developing online courses and teaching online since 2006, with sole online focus since 2008. She has been an administrator for fully online DNP, MSN, and RN/BSN programs. Her online education experience includes curriculum development and evaluation, interprofessional education, and faculty development. She has extensive experience in development of and conversion of online courses to various term formats, ranging from two to 15 weeks. She has presented nationally and internationally and published on a variety of educational topics including curriculum development, student evaluation, use of technology in the classroom, and hybrid and online education.
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Harnessing the Power of Google Tools

Elizabeth A. Kiggins
Instructional Technologist & Assistant Professor

Julianna Gahimer
Professor of Physical Therapy

University of Indianapolis

Summary

Presenters will showcase and demonstrate tools that can be easily implemented to create engaging online courses. Presenters will discuss their experiences in the use of these tools to develop blended/online courses. These tools can be used to support a variety of domains of learning (cognitive, psychomotor, and affective.) Presenters have developed a wealth of expertise offering these types of hands-on workshops. Combined, they have over fifty years of experience providing professional development opportunities for faculty. In addition, they have been teaching online in higher education for a more than thirty-five years. This workshop will be beneficial to:

1. Faculty who are teaching online for the first time or are relatively new to teaching online,
2. Faculty who are developing a blended course,
3. Faculty who have experience teaching online but want to learn new skills, and
4. Faculty who have been "voluntold" that they are teaching online.

Participants will be given the opportunity to develop hands-on experience in the use of these tools. They will design a plan of how to incorporate three of their tools into their teaching. Participants will share the development of their projects with others. Upon the conclusion of this workshop will have developed a new set of skills to support development of blended/online courses. Participants will be exposed to innovative tools that are more engaging to the digital-age students.

About the Presenters

Elizabeth A. Kiggins has been involved in online learning at the University of Indianapolis since 1997 and has taught online for about 20 years. She regularly conducts workshops to assist faculty who teach online with issues related to mechanics and pedagogy of the online platform. She has designed numerous courses for faculty using the Quality Matters rubric. She has created numerous Google sites with supporting materials for UIndy faculty (and for conference presentations). She has completed the Quality Matters APPQMR and Peer Reviewer courses.
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Julianna Gahimer has been teaching at the University of Indianapolis for over thirty years. She was an early adopter of online teaching and learning nearly fifteen years ago. She has received several faculty fellowship awards to assist UIndy faculty enhance their online teaching and learning skills. She has participated in the APPQMR Quality Matters workshop and have co-led Faculty Learning Communities related to online technology tools for several years. She has presented at local, national and international conferences in the area of online pedagogy.
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Facilitate *Genuine Communication* in Your Online Course

Andrew W. Cole  
Learning Technology Specialist  
University of Wisconsin–Whitewater

**Summary**

Much research exists on issues relating to communication and interaction in online courses. However, work experiences with administrators, faculty, and students provide anecdotal evidence suggesting that perhaps some negative outlooks may linger about the online interpersonal communication component in many online courses. One of the goals of this workshop is therefore to encourage participants to explore technology-mediated communication options beyond the more traditional notions of online course communication as text-based email and discussion threads. To do so, this workshop will explore various communication practices that appear related to student success in traditional face-to-face courses, as well as the potentially inherently different nature of online course communication. This workshop will then examine potential uses of technology to help facilitate communication to help guide student learning and keep students on track, as well as discuss potential barriers to employing emerging technologies for these purposes. By the end of this workshop, participants will collaborate to develop a definition of genuine online communication that they can then work to cultivate in their own courses.

**About the Presenter**

Andrew W. Cole is a Learning Technology Specialist at the University of Wisconsin–Whitewater. He received his PhD in Communication from the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. He has taught technology-enhanced, blended/hybrid, and fully online courses in university and technical college settings. He also assisted on the development of one of the first programs for the UW Flex Option.

Address: University of Wisconsin–Whitewater, 800 W. Main Street, Whitewater, WI 53190  
Email: coleaw09@uww.edu  
Phone: 262-472-2199
Caring for and Connecting with Adjunct Faculty: Strategies That Work

Brad Garner Ph.D.
Director of Faculty Enrichment
Center for Learning and Innovation
Indiana Wesleyan University

Summary

Colleges and universities typically need to quickly recruit, train and deploy online faculty, entrusting the integrity and success of their programs to these individuals. This session will walk through the critical elements of recruitment, onboarding, training, and support to assure that part-time and freelance faculty receive ongoing training and assistance so they can provide the best possible learning opportunities to your students.

Key Takeaways

1. Ability to immediately implement at least one of the tools shared in the workshop.
2. To effectively advocate for a comprehensive system of helping online faculty to be at their very best in teaching.

The Basics

In increasing numbers, across the span of higher education, there are a growing number of adjunct faculty. There are estimates that as many as 75% of courses taught in colleges and universities are taught by faculty who are not on a tenure track. It behooves college and universities to intentionally support adjunct faculty as they engage with students in online and onsite settings. This workshop will equip participants with the skills necessary to implement a variety of faculty development strategies including:

- The development and implementation of an intentional onboarding process
- Clarification of specific responsibilities of adjunct faculty
- Creation of multiple strategies for connecting with adjunct faculty using a variety of digital tools (e.g., email, website, social media, face-to-face learning opportunities)
- Create a collection of asynchronous learning materials that are available to adjunct faculty for additional growth or as remedial tools.

As a practical reality, each institution must determine the top priorities for their unique collection of adjunct faculty (i.e., academic disciplines, onsite/online, course development process). The point, however, is one of taking the first step toward creating a comprehensive support system for adjunct faculty.

About the Presenter

Brad Garner is the Director of Faculty Enrichment at Indiana Wesleyan University. He is the Founding Editor of The Toolbox newsletter published by the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition at the University of South Carolina (The Toolbox). Garner also serves as host of the “Digital2Learn” podcast.

Email:  brad.garner@indwes.edu
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Assessing Students in Online Courses: Best Practices

Raymond L. Lawson
Dean of Online Learning
Oakton Community College

Summary

Assessing students learning in general and particularly in online courses has an important impact on student learning. The assessment of student learning is essential to ensuring that students have opportunities to achieve course learning outcomes. With that goal, assessments in online courses should be well-planned to continuously measure how well students are learning and provide instructors information to improve their teaching methods and strategies as well as their facilitation skills. During this workshop, participants will be conversant with the goals of various assessment types and examine the characteristics of an assessment for learning. Best practices of assessing students from mapping institutional goals to program and course outcomes, as well as to student learning outcomes will be examined and discussed. Additionally, participants will plan the implementation of assessment best practices for an online course or a distance education program.

About the Presenter

Dr. Raymond L. Lawson has nearly 20 years of experience in curriculum development, instructional design, online and innovative education, and digital technologies. Currently he serves as the Dean of Online Learning at Oakton Community College, where he is responsible for providing the college’s strategic vision, direction and planning for distance learning. Raymond received his doctoral degree in Instructional Technology and his Masters’ degree in Management Information Systems from Northern Illinois University. He also earned a Masters’ degree in Global Economic Development from Eastern University.
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Unpack This Workshop! An OER about OER!

Olena Zhadko
Director of Online Education

Susan Ko
Faculty Development Consultant, Office of Online Education
Clinical Professor, History

Lehman College, City University of New York

Summary

This unique session, itself an Open Educational Resource (OER), previously piloted with faculty at a large public institution, is for those faculty and staff who want to better understand and promote the most effective and intelligent use of OER at their own institutions or in their own courses. By exploring OER together, and working on a course planning document, faculty can rapidly progress toward implementing OER. Participants will learn how to identify, find, evaluate, and integrate OER. Participants will also take away the workshop content itself for adaptation at their own institution. Faculty development as represented by this workshop presents a scalable and sustainable strategy for implementing OER on a course, program, institutional, or system-wide basis. Feedback and facilitation will be provided by the co-presenters, both experienced faculty developers with expertise in online education and open educational resources.

Literature Review

Affordability, inclusion, and college completion are three issues at the heart of higher education concerns today (Allen & Seaman, 2016; Annand & Jensen, 2017; Hilton III, 2016). Open Educational Resources (OER) offer the promise of more affordable, more current, and accessible learning as students are equipped with up-to-date, faculty-curated resources, all available to students from the very first day of class (EDUCAUSE, 2011; Ozdemir & Hendricks 2017; Wiley, 2017).

Workshop Takeaways

The workshop will allow the audience to prepare for planning and implementation of OER, from having some familiarity with OER, learning how to find, select, and evaluate OER using appropriate standards and criteria, to actually being able to complete a course planning document to implement revisions or integration of a chosen OER within a course. For those in faculty development, the workshop will provide a ready-made set of online workshop materials that they can adopt for their own work with faculty.

Workshop Outline

The workshop comprises of 3 parts:

- Part 1 - Introduction and Defining OER: definitions of OER, the various types of permissions and use of published work, inventory of current course materials.
- Part 2 - Finding OER: a focus on resource collections and discipline specific sites, challenges of finding OER, and searching for OER.
- Part 3 - Evaluating, Selecting and Integrating OER: focusing on criteria and standards with reference to course design, accessibility, and considerations for adopting or adapting. Course Planning with OER: course planning document, analysis and discussion of course planning.
Each part enables each participant to take on an active role, and engage in hands-on and reflective activities and discussion throughout.
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About the Presenters

Olena Zhadko has nearly 15 years of experience in the field of educational technology, a PhD in teaching and learning as well as the drive for advancing teaching and learning with technology. She has successfully worked at three academic centers by providing leadership and assistance in articulating and implementing effective teaching, and infusing best practices into curriculum development, delivery, and assessment through the effective use of technology. In her current role, she serves as the Director of Online Education at Lehman College, acting as the College’s senior administrator charged with the oversight of all facets of online instruction.
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Phone: 718-960-1172

Susan Ko authored four editions of Teaching Online: A Practical Guide, a leading book in the field of online teaching. Responsible for the training of faculty and supporting online education at many institutions, including as Director of Faculty Development and Instructional Technology at CUNY School of Professional Studies, and as Executive Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning at University of Maryland, University College. She is currently Faculty Development Consultant in the Office of
Online Education at Lehman College. She has more than 20 years of online teaching experience and currently serves as clinical professor in History department at Lehman College.
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The presenters are currently working on a book titled “Best Practices in Designing Courses with Educational Resources (OER)” for Routledge, due for publication in the Best Practices in Online Teaching and Learning Series (https://www.routledge.com/Best-Practices-in-Online-Teaching-and-Learning/book-series/BPOTL). The presenters have created and successfully delivered an online, instructor-facilitated workshop (https://oerworkshop.commons.gc.cuny.edu/) for faculty, enabling these faculty to get a jump start on designing and developing courses with OER.
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Improve Learning with Voice and Screencasting Feedback to Students

John Orlando
Associate Director of Faculty Support
Northcentral University

Summary

Numerous studies have demonstrated that voice and screencasting feedback to students significantly improves learning. Students report gaining a better understanding of the feedback and more motivation to do better in the future, among other benefits. Come discover the benefits of voice and screencasting feedback, as well as how to provide each with tools that you already own. Also learn the best practices in delivering voice and screencasting feedback to maximize effectiveness. Participants will practice giving voice and screencasting feedback, and will be able to teach others to do the same after the workshop.

References

(2016). A comparison of text, voice, and screencasting feedback to online students. The American Journal of Distance Education, 30(3).

About the Presenter

John Orlando, PhD, is an associate director of faculty support and professor at Northcentral University. He is a sought-after speaker who has published over 70 articles and delivered over 60 presentations, workshops, and keynote addresses on online education and teaching with technology. Dr. Orlando is also the editor of Online Classroom Newsletter, and has created and taught numerous courses for faculty on teaching with technology.
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Creating Personalized, Social, and Co-Constructed Learning Experiences

Rick L Shearer
Director Research – World Campus
Affiliate Faculty – Adult Education

Jess Resig
Instructional Designer

The Pennsylvania State University

Summary

As online learning continues to evolve many have proposed that we think differently about our pedagogical approaches to online learning in distance education, to move beyond the replication of the face-to-face experience to one that better integrates the unique capabilities of today’s and future technologies. Therefore, what should our online courses look like and how can we move them from the current replication of our face-to-face models to a post-industrial, post-modern model of learning? Within this workshop we will explore a vision that emerged from a three-year study that involved student and faculty perspectives of a future learning experience. The resulting vision consists of three key components: a personalized learning experience; well-integrated, community-based social interactions; and co-constructed, negotiated learning paths. These findings align well with the findings of the recent CHLOE 2 Report (Legon & Garrett, 2018), in which higher education administrators articulated that online programs currently offer limited opportunity for personalization, and who ranked adaptive learning, learning analytics, and student support dashboards as the top three tools and technologies they would most like to adopt for online programs. The components of the vision, whether considered in isolation or as a collective whole, pose challenges and opportunities that vary greatly across institutional contexts. As a group we will explore what this vision may mean for the design of our online courses, and for how students and faculty will engage with the courses and each other in the future.
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**Dr. Rick Shearer** is the Director Research for the World Campus at Penn State, and an affiliate faculty member with the Lifelong Learning and Adult Education program. Prior to his current position he led the World Campus Learning Design unit for over ten years. Dr. Shearer has published several chapters and articles throughout his career in distance education.
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That’s a Wrap: Develop Self-Directed Learners with Cognitive Wrappers

Amanda M. Hinson-Enslin
Instructional Designer, Office of Teaching and Learning
Technology Texas Woman’s University

Katie Deering
Instructional Design Consultant
Center for Learning Experimentation, Application, and Research
University of North Texas

Summary

One of the major topics of discussion among scholars of teaching and learning in recent years has centered around the benefits of metacognition; however, getting students to reflect about their own thinking can be difficult because they may lack the skills to describe their process or they enter higher education with misconceptions about how they learn (Bowen, 2013). Creating and implementing cognitive wrappers for online students is a way to encourage students to reflect on their deliverables and their work process. Cognitive wrappers aid students in becoming self-directed learners by providing the opportunity to assess their deliverables and work process by identifying shortcomings and achievements. After completing cognitive wrappers, students are prompted to adjust their work process and improve on their deliverables. Using cognitive wrappers throughout the semester can help establish a growth mindset among students and help them to get on the path of self-directed learning. The goals of this workshop are for participants to design a cognitive wrapper for an assignment in a course and select an appropriate tool to deploy the cognitive wrapper.

About the Presenters

**Amanda M. Hinson-Enslin** is an instructional designer for the College of Professional Education, College of Business, and undergraduate academic programs. She has been an instructor since 2014 in online and face-to-face formats. She aids faculty in developing content and assignments that promote self-directed learning in the online and/or face-to-face classroom.

Address: P.O. Box 425649, Denton, TX 76204
Email: mandihinson@twu.edu
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**Katie Deering** is an instructional design consultant for the Center for Learning Experimentation, Application, and Research at the University of North Texas. She has been teaching face-to face-courses since 2010 and online since 2013. She enjoys working with faculty to create engaging and dynamic courses that help students to become better learners and better professionals in their field.
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Create Engaging Videos for Online Learning

Ryan Eash
Learning and Development Specialist
TechSmith

Summary

In online learning, visual content is fundamental to most student engagement and retention. Join this hands-on workshop featuring intermediate and advanced tactics, tips, and best practices for better, more impactful instructional video demonstrations and lessons using Camtasia. You will experiment with the tools and skills needed to create digital materials that better engage students and enhance student outcomes. Go beyond the basics and strengthen your existing video content.

About the Presenter

Ryan Eash is the Learning and Development Specialist for TechSmith, and an adjunct faculty member at Lenoir-Rhyne University, teaching two fully online courses for the Online Learning and Instructional Design master’s program. Ryan utilizes video as a primary means of communication with students. He’s been teaching others about the benefits of using Camtasia for the past 12 years.

Address: TechSmith Corporation, 2405 Woodlake Dr, Okemos, MI 48864
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Let’s Get “Persona-l”: Using Personas to Help Design Universally Inclusive Courses

Jana Hitchcock
Instructional Designer

Sonya Woods
Accessibility Specialist and Training Coordinator

Penn State World Campus

Summary

Technology has made it possible for people to learn online and for people with disabilities to more easily access web-based content. This presents both an opportunity to foster diversity and inclusivity in our courses and a challenge for course authors and instructional designers to create courses that meet the needs of all student populations attending courses online and in person.

Online content must be intentionally created to work well with the assistive technology that some students use to access their courses. The technology use is dependent upon need. Some may use tools like Kurzweil, software that reads the text in an electronic document or web page aloud as well as visually highlighting and/or magnifying the text. Some may use ZoomText for magnification. Others may use JAWS (job access with speech) to navigate their computer, search the internet, and read and interact with content. Some may even use a combination of tools for various situations within a course. Designers must make sure that course content, assignments, and readings are compatible for all of these tools and others. Moreover, as these tools adapt and evolve, and new technology emerges to meet the changing needs or learners, we, as distance educators, must continuously expand and evolve our own skill set. This includes our understanding of the capacity of technology as well as how we approach course design.

In addition to being compatible with assistive technology, content and assessment strategies need to be engaging and foster learning for all students. We must challenge ourselves to keep accessibility and universal design principles and best practices at the forefront of all course developments, either online or face-to-face.

These same practices also benefit people with "hidden" disabilities such as ADHD (attention deficit hyperactivity disorder), or mental health issues. Often one practice, such as using good page heading hierarchy with clear headings and sub-headings will benefit everyone, but in other cases the needs diverge. For example, people who are blind need text descriptions and people on the autism spectrum need informative images.

When designing universally assessible courses, we, as course designers, are often forced to make assumptions about the needs of our audiences. This can and often does result in inaccurate generalizations and poorly informed decisions. The use of research-based personas of students with disabilities can serve as a teaching tool to increase empathy and provide a clearer understanding of how to practically meet diverse learner needs. Personas can also be used to solve design challenges and build our capacity to identify innovative solutions to design problems.

Understanding accessible practice and universal design for learning principles takes the mystery out of designing learning experiences that will effectively meet the needs of diverse learners, while creating a richer learning experience for all students.
About the Presenters

Jana Hitchcock is an instructional designer for the Penn State World Campus. She specializes in online course design and supports the Higher Education masters program in Higher Education and a variety of other courses in homeland security and business. She has a master of education degree in Training and Development from Penn State, Capitol College. She has been involved in adult education since 2000 working to design, deliver, and evaluate effective learning experiences. Prior to joining Penn State World Campus, she was a curriculum and instructional specialist for the University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work Child Welfare Resource Center.
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Transform Your Online Discussions

Tori Svoboda, Ed.D.
Associate Professor, Student Affairs Administration
University of Wisconsin – La Crosse

Summary

Online discussions can be used to build community, apply concepts, or assess student learning. Yet, we often ask students to post once and reply twice, and then are disappointed if we only see variations of “I agree” or “good post” replies. In this workshop, we will explore questions like, “When should we NOT use online discussions?” (e.g., if a quiz, blog or journal, or other assignment may make more sense) and “What’s the difference between grading and feedback?” (e.g., do we need to give points for every post?).

In this extended session, we will review a variety of approaches to shift discussions from more transactional to more transformative spaces. Drawing from Darby and Lang’s (2019) *Small Teaching Online*, we will review how discussion may be used to “guide learning through engagement.”
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Technology Hacks for Cementing Learning

Jane Sutterlin
Learning Designer, Dutton e-Education Institute, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences

Emily Baxter
Instructional Designer, e-Learning Design Innovation Group, Smeal College of Business

The Pennsylvania State University

Summary

Why don’t they know this stuff?!? Students today often rely upon last minute cramming and rereading, with the occasional highlighting, to prepare for quizzes and exams. While these study practices may be effective at helping students feel prepared for a specific test, cognitive science research overwhelmingly demonstrates that this type of studying does not lead to learning that endures. The information students crammed for last semester’s final will be long forgotten when the time comes to apply it to next semester’s courses. We provide a concise overview of best practices for teaching and learning, as framed by the field of cognitive science. Participants engage in practical teaching strategies that can be implemented in the online classroom immediately, with minimal investment of time. In particular, we focus on the ways that tools such as Canvas, Poll Everywhere, Kaltura, Kahoot, and H5P can be used in innovative ways to make teaching more effective and student learning more durable.

About the Presenters

Jane Sutterlin is a Learning Designer in the John A. Dutton e-Education Institute in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences at Penn State. Over the past 12 years, Jane has designed face to face, blended and online courses that utilize technology as a tool for learning in the K-12 and Higher Ed environments. In her current role as a Learning Designer, Jane collaborates with faculty to design fully online and hybrid courses for a wide range of learners, including undergraduates and graduate students in the disciplines of Geography, Energy Business and Finance, Energy and Geo-Environmental Engineering, Petroleum and Natural Gas Engineering, Mining, and Geoscience.
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Emily Baxter is an Instructional Designer in the e-Learning Design Innovation Group (eLDIG) in the Smeal College of Business at The Pennsylvania State University. In the last 20+ years, Emily has designed instruction for a wide range of learners – from preschoolers through adults – in widely ranging subject areas, from meteorology to music! In her position as an Instructional Designer, Emily enjoys having the opportunity to collaborate with faculty to create meaningful course experiences that utilize best practices in online education. She is particularly passionate about cultivating meaningful engagement and applying learning science research to reinforce retention.
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