

## Open Questions (23)

---

3. Theresa Swann: what if the other two mask the technology fear issues

4. (Deleted) Theresa Swann: other

**RESPONSE:** Theresa, this is entirely possible! As you can imagine, it is difficult to flesh out a “true” number one barrier. Sometimes, it is a combination of one, or more. Technology challenges can certainly add to the “I don’t have time to do this” mentality, especially if faculty are not familiar with the current technologies available to facilitate online teaching and learning.

5. (Deleted) Martin Hoffman: Technology was combined with user support...

**RESPONSE:** Yes, for the purposes of this poll, technology/user support issues were combined into one. Certainly “technology” is a wide category with which many sub-topics could easily fit!

6. (Deleted) Inger Stark: question: if participants today are from community colleges, might that explain the higher response related to technology?

**RESPONSE:** My experience is that technology “issues” occur in institutions of all size and scope. The daunting feeling of integrating unfamiliar technologies (even if it is as simple as maximizing what the learning management system [D2L, Moodle, Canvas, etc.] can do) happens everywhere. Perhaps community colleges may not have the same level of infrastructure to support technology/user support/professional development training as other universities, but I think it just depends. Technology as a “barrier” happens in all intuitions. At least, that is my experience ☺

7. Tatyana Feofilaktova: I like "Elephant" explanation!

**RESPONSE:** Thanks! The elephant analogy for perceptions is relevant to so many issues in higher ed!

8. Farah Kashef: But Quality Matters only helps with the design, not much with the delivery, and innovative ways of teaching online.

9. Farah Kashef: However QM is a very good start!

10. Farah Kashef: and there's a misconception that if it's face-to-face, it has quality!

**RESPONSE:** Farah, you are exactly right. QM is about effective and efficient *course design*. They do not attempt to address any content issues. The assumption is that the faculty member is the subject matter expert and content is always left to the faculty member (just as it is in face-to-face teaching). QM is an excellent “quality control” that universities can use to demonstrate their commitment to quality in online education. I highly recommend the course review process occur using at least one faculty member within the same academic department to not only review for QM, but to take a quick look at content. For example, I am not a health education expert. That is not my area (I am a physical education pedagogy person!). I am currently in the process of converting a course to online that covers both *health and physical education* for elementary education majors. I rely **heavily** on the health education faculty in my department to be sure I am using the correct, most current, and relevant resources on the health education side. Sometimes it is good to have just another set of eyes from your area to look at your course and be sure you haven’t missed something (an updated resource, changes in the physical activity guidelines [for my course anyway!], etc.). I value the opinions of faculty from across campus on my course design. After all, if someone from accounting can navigate my Health and Physical Education course, then I will feel pretty good about that. But I also value the opinion of my Health and Physical Education colleagues who may be able to give a quick look at my content and just be sure I haven’t made some egregious content error accidentally ☺

11. Vivian Johnson: I agree we need PD for online faculty but would not all faculty benefit from PD related to quality teachers?

12. Vivian Johnson: I meant teaching

**RESPONSE:** Vivian, you are spot on! Yes, all faculty need and should be engaged in regular PD for their teaching. Remember, in higher ed especially, we are all content experts, but we are not necessarily all pedagogy experts!! Fortunately, at Kennesaw State University, we have amazing resources offered through our "Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning" (CETL) that provide a plethora of PD options for faculty who teach online AND face-to-face. Our Distance Learning Center (DLC) also works collaboratively with CETL to provide training for faculty teaching or developing online courses. This is so important from a quality teaching standpoint.

13. (Deleted) Lauren Elmore: You said that "hopefully" an instructor has taught the class before in a traditional classroom. Do you believe that it is better to have an instructor have previous experience with a course or should he/she not have any previous experience with which to compare?

**RESPONSE:** Lauren, great question! My response is based on my own personal journey and teaching experiences. I find that it is easier to convert a course to online if I have taught it face-to-face in the classroom at least once. That gives me a chance to find out what assignments work well (or not so much!) and to make the necessary tweaks to the course that I would want to make *before* converting the course to online. For example, I can get clarity on issues like: am I happy with the textbook? Did I have too much or not enough content to meet the course objectives? Were there certain discussions that emerged during class that I should be sure to include as a discussion forum in the online class? If I have no frame of reference at all for having taught the class previously, I don't get the benefit of these experiences. I'm not saying a person couldn't develop a course for online that they'd never taught, but for me, I would find it to be very challenging.

14. Terry Grieb: Please address issue of remote student assessment.

**RESPONSE:** Terry, I assume by "remote student assessment" you mean test taking? If so, we have to first think through some things philosophically. The first question I would ask a faculty member to consider is: is a test/exam/final absolutely necessary? Can the course objectives be met through other mechanisms (class project, portfolio, etc.). Here's an example, in the course I am currently converting, we discussed eliminating the two tests that occur in the face-to-face course. We've ensured the learning objectives are assessed through assignments and projects. That way, students do not incur an additional expense for proctoring (using a service like ProctorU). However, there are many instances in which a test MUST occur! In those instances, I give ProctorU my highest recommendation as a proctoring service that will monitor (remotely) the students taking their test. You can learn more about ProctorU at <http://www.proctoru.com/>. Also, some universities have developed proctoring policies that would allow a student in a remote location to use a service like Kaplan for proctoring, or if the student lives near a local community college or university, they can utilize their testing center to take tests. I'm happy to follow up with you more on this if you would like! Just email me at [cbryan4@kennesaw.edu](mailto:cbryan4@kennesaw.edu).

15. Robert McCunney: In your opinion is creating a "hybrid" course the better approach to bringing a traditionally classroom teaching faculty into the "online world" rather than full conversion to online?

**RESPONSE:** Robert, I think this is a GREAT idea. There are so many advantage to taking the small steps to hybrid, and then to online. First, as we know, the research supports hybrid ("blended") courses for student learning. There are multiple sources for this statement (too many to list!), but a good place to start for an overview is here: <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf> (yes, it is from 2010, but offers a solid meta-analysis that, again, is a good place to start).

In terms of overcoming or minimizing barriers for faculty, hybrid is a great "small step." In fact, my own college at KSU offers a stipend for converting face-to-face courses into hybrid, so that faculty who may not yet be interested in converting their course to online can at least be financially incentivized to take the "half way" step of converting to hybrid. Many faculty will, of course, be happy to stop at the hybrid midpoint. However, many faculty will begin the conversion to hybrid and have the "lightbulb" moment where they realize that

converting to fully online is actually achievable. For many resistant faculty, the hybrid approach is a great middle ground, once they are comfortable in the "land of hybrid" it becomes easier to have the discussion of converting the hybrid course to fully online. Keep in mind, this will also allow some "future flexibility" in that the subsequent conversion of hybrid to online will be less time intensive, because much of the work will already be done. Further, faculty start to realize they could "teach this class in the summer" (from the beach?!?!) if it were fully online. Or, as other life circumstances occur, the faculty member may start to engage in conversations about the potential flexibility a fully online course could offer them (in addition to the resource savings to the university in terms of decrease classroom space requirements, etc.).

Robert, I have completely gone off the rails and given you a very long winded answer to your question. The short answer is **YES** creating a "hybrid" course is a great way to bring a traditional classroom-based teaching faculty into the "online world" rather than starting with a full conversion to online right out of the gate).

16. Erica Stern: a new survey re. faculty response to technology

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/partial-credit-2015-survey-faculty-attitudes-technology>

**RESPONSE:** Thank you, Erica! This is why we love our friends at Inside Higher Ed ☺ They are doing great work!

17. Robert McCunney: What are your suggestions regarding targeting and creating a faculty "champion" and using them as examples for greater buy in from other faculty?

**RESPONSE:** Robert, what a great question! The impact of having a "faculty" champion is absolutely huge. Faculty champions can do several things: (1) they can slay myths and barriers that faculty may often use to stand in the way of new ideas or development of online courses/programs. Faculty champions can (2) "show the way" to other faculty and be a torch bearer of good examples of online teaching.

In some of my previous work, I had the opportunity to work with a highly reluctant MBA faculty. Luckily, there was one MBA professor who was a true champion for online learning. His online courses were **excellent**; they were engaging and extremely popular with the students. He was able to serve as a "shining star" in the MBA program for online teaching and learning. He also was willing to speak up in faculty meetings and let everyone know what was going well with the online MBA program. The value of this faculty member champion cannot be overstated. He was crucial to our continuing the MBA program and improving it.

While he was not able to change the minds of all of the MBA faculty, he certainly changed the minds and attitudes of many. He was well respected and this level of respect made him extremely credible with his colleagues. We talked yesterday on the webinar about "creating a culture" of faculty helping faculty and the value that comes from creating that culture. This faculty member often helped others in the online MBA program. They would come to him with challenges/problems, ideas and he would offer advice. This only served to strengthen the overall program.

This "faculty champion" was very interested in online classes, and had long wanted to "give online a try." So he was what I call the "Army of the Willing"! He had extensive professional development training and, on his own, sought credentials that would enhance his own skills and abilities as an online instructor. Other faculty saw him doing this and it only bolstered his "value" in their eyes when it came to online education.

I suggest starting with the "Army of the Willing" . . . find those faculty members who are interested in online teaching and learning. Provide them with opportunities for training and development. Then, have them convert a course that is QM certified and let that course be your "shining star" online course in your department/college. Use the "Army of the Willing" to evangelize others into the opportunities that are available through online teaching and learning. My thoughts ☺ Another very long answer to a great question!

18. Margaret Jacques: Thanks you. I am new to online and the resources are very helpful!!

**RESPONSE:** I'm so glad it was helpful to you, Margaret!

19. Judith Sebesta: Thanks! Great presentation. Kennesaw is lucky to have you.

**RESPONSE:** Awwww, thanks so much Judith!

20. Alice Myatt: Thank you!

**RESPONSE:** Thanks for participating, Alice!

21. Martin Hoffman: For community colleges a fantastic resource is the Instructional Technology Council (ITC) <http://itcnetwork.org>

**RESPONSE:** Thank you for sharing the ITC Network with us, Martin!

22. Joan Walker: Thank you, Charity!

**RESPONSE:** Thank you, Joan!

23. Dominick Sturz: In your experience, are you converting 16 week F2F courses to 16 week online courses or are your online courses shorter? If shorter, how do you create equivalency in outcomes?

**RESPONSE:** Dominick, I have done both. Our courses in LSU Online were 7 week modules. My course that I am converting here at Kennesaw State is a typical 16 week course (though I will be teaching it online first in summer school which is only about 8 weeks).

As for equivalency in outcomes, there is (and should be) NO DIFFERENCE in outcomes due to the time frame of a course. For example, let's think about a course we offer in the regular fall semester. If we offer that same course in summer school, we know we will have to cover that same material, but in a shorter period of time. That's why our summer school class may meet Monday through Friday for 3 or 4 hours per day. The contact hours should be the same no matter what "term" the course is taught in.

When I am taking a traditional 16 week course and offering it in a shorter time frame (like summer school, "Jan Term", or "May Mester" [intercession]) I do not change anything about my course. I don't change the learning outcomes, and I don't reduce the number of assignments (I also do not "eliminate" assignments or alter them). Everything remains the same. I'm simply operating on a shortened time frame.

So, for example, what I might normally cover during the first week of a MWF class (from 8:00-8:50 am) in the normal 16 week fall semester, may have to be covered in days 1-2 of summer school or a shortened "modular" calendar (for 7 week courses). It's all about the daily course schedule and "accelerating" the timeline for a shortened calendar. Condensing the content into a shorter calendar is certainly harder on the faculty member, but it is also challenging to the student. They must be very diligent and manage their time very wisely in a shortened term. I hope I have answered your question! If not, feel free to email me at [cbryan4@kennesaw.edu](mailto:cbryan4@kennesaw.edu).

24. Dana Kemery: YES!!!!

25. Dominick Sturz: Additionally, how were you able to effectively convert hands on lab experiences to a virtual environment? Do you have any examples you can share?

**RESPONSE:** Labs are tricky but doable ☺ In my area (Kinesiology) we have several lab based components for anatomy, physiology, anatomical kinesiology, etc. There are several great resources available through various publishing companies that can facilitate labs for online courses. In fact, for some biology courses, there are even lab based courses that can be done at home for cadaver labs with frogs, pigs, etc. (gross to think about, but can be done!). I am not sure of what labs you may be offering in your area, but it is doable with a lot of thought and planning. I'd be happy to follow up with you more if you want to email me ([cbryan4@kennesaw.edu](mailto:cbryan4@kennesaw.edu)) and we can brainstorm some ideas. Also, for a quick overview, a Google search of online labs in your content area will help get the ideas rolling ☺ But I'd be happy to talk with you more at length about this great question!

26. Tatyana Feofilaktova: [tfeofilaktova@asa.edu](mailto:tfeofilaktova@asa.edu)

**RESPONSE:** Tatyana, I'm not sure if you wanted me to email you or if this was for another participant! Feel free to email me at [cbryan4@kennesaw.edu](mailto:cbryan4@kennesaw.edu) if you have a question!

27. (Deleted) Olajide Agunloye: This last question is even more so in online course. These are new technologies and contents you want to incorporate.

**RESPONSE:** Hi Olajide! I'm not sure if this was a question for me or for one of the participants. If it was for me, please email me if you'd like ([cbryan4@kennesaw.edu](mailto:cbryan4@kennesaw.edu)) for further discussion! I cannot tell exactly what this statement is in reference to . . . but I'm happy to talk with you further!

28. Cindy Piletic: thank you...

29. Olajide Agunloye: Thank you.

30. Malcolm Stubblefield: Thank you!

**RESPONSE:** Thanks to all of you and a HUGE THANK YOU for your patience on the webinar as the Adobe Connect issues were resolved ☺

My best to you all!

Charity Bryan, PhD

Associate Professor and Program Director for Online Education

WellStar College of Health and Human Services

3109 Prillaman Hall

Kennesaw State University

Office: 470-578-4937

