6-8-2012

# Distinguishing Online and Face-to-Face Learning: Acquisition, Learning, and Online Pedagogy

Abigail A. Grant
*Indiana University of Pennsylvania*

# DISTINGUISHING ONLINE AND FACE-TO-FACE LEARNING: ACQUISITION, LEARNING, AND ONLINE PEDAGOGY

A Dissertation Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Abigail A. Grant

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

May 2012

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Abigail A. Grant

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____ _____
Patrick Bizzaro, Ph.D.
Professor of English, Advisor

_____ _____
Sedef Smith, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics

_____ _____
Christopher Kuipers, Ph.D.
Professor of English

ACCEPTED

_____ _____
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Distinguishing Online and Face-to-Face Learning: Acquisition, Learning, and Online Pedagogy

Author: Abigail A. Grant

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Patrick Bizzaro

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Sedef Smith
Dr. Christopher Kuipers

This dissertation examines the type of training currently available to potential online instructors in order to generate a graduate-level degree program design effectively offering online pedagogy.

Current online teacher training is largely based on acquisition of technological skills, such as mastering the operational components of a platform (Blackboard, Moodle, D2L), however, current scholars are now demonstrating that platform-only training is insufficient and does not provide online instructors with a metacognitive understanding of pedagogy unique to online classrooms. Using Krashen and Gee's definitions of acquisition and learning, this dissertation identifies online teacher training as a movement of New Literacy Studies.

The results from analyzing multiple data sources demonstrate that a balance of technological acquisition and pedagogical learning provides an appropriate framework for creation of a graduate-level program in online pedagogy. This research also demonstrates that online pedagogy is a unique field of study and cannot rely on definitions, behaviors, or training designed for face-to-face instructors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, a huge thank you to my wonderful advisor, Pat Bizzaro. Thank you for your support, enthusiasm, encouragement and wonderful ideas along the way. I appreciate all of the work that you did to help me with this process.

Also, thank you to Chris Kuipers and Sedef Smith who also offered their unique ideas, insights, and encouragements for this dissertation. I value the unique perspectives that everyone on my committee had to offer and still feel that all comments and revisions were a good idea. So thank you.

Thank you to Patrick for living with me and loving me throughout this entire process. It was a challenge and I appreciate all of your support and encouragement always.

Thank you to my Mama for always asking, encouraging, and being excited for my progress. And thank you for requesting off for my final defense the day that I scheduled it. Who knew I'd like college after all?!

Hey yo, T! OMG you guys! Thank you for all of your help, cookies, cards, emails, pictures of Frank, readings, revisions, listening to me talk, and for introducing me to Joe Morrelli. I owe you one big cannoli.

There are so many more people to thank for their love and encouragement: Mom, Dad, Dave, Brianna, Ethan, Megan, Matt, Amy, Nate, Ella, Emily, John, Sydney, Aunt Liz, Uncle Paul, Manda, Eric, Alex, Amanda, Tom, Asher, Nick Statzer, Erik Murphy, Mrs. Nock, Debi Allen, Mrs. Haupt, Mrs. Houlihan, Mrs. Murphy, and my fabulous IUP cohort. I appreciate everything that you all do for me. Look at me go! S-M-R-T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER ONE

# WHY ONLINE EDUCATION?

## Narrative Introduction to Online Education

Upon receiving my masters of English with a concentration in literature in 2009, I sought online teaching positions that would lend me flexibility in both time and location. Although I had never taught, my skills and earned degrees landed me an adjunct faculty position with the University of Phoenix to teach Research Writing and Introduction to Literature online. At the time, there were no available face-to-face (F2F) teaching positions in the University of Phoenix's Pittsburgh satellite campus. I asked each of my new students to provide biographical information about themselves and almost all of them shared their story of struggle and personal strife that led them to seek their degrees online. I heard stories of single parents deterring their educational paths for their families, adults who needed financial stability right out of high school and could not attend college, and those that thought college was not the right path for them until now. Also, many of these students were adults who were returning to their education after twenty or thirty years away from a classroom. These students revered the flexibility of online learning, especially the fact that they did not have to go to a specific location for their courses.

This pattern has continued to this day in all of my online courses for multiple institutions; students appreciate the flexibility and convenience of asynchronous online education. Finally, with the movement towards completely online education, these students are having the opportunity to make their dreams of higher education a reality. Because of students' shared experience with online learning and their struggle to make higher education a possibility for themselves, I advocate for the opportunity to make this student dream a reality. This passion has led to my personal preference for asynchronous online learning because I feel that it most

respects and understands the students' position in the education process and their need for flexibility.

It wasn't until two years later that I had the opportunity to teach the same types of courses F2F for Westmoreland County Community College and found that there were little to no similarities between F2F and online teaching and learning environments in terms of the demographic of students, communicative interactions, and course expectations. The vast difference between my teaching experiences led to my deep interest in the training programs available for online educators. More specifically, the teacher training that I received in my traditional literature master's program prepared me for all facets of the F2F classroom including rubrics, assessment, syllabi, policies, test making, small group and large group discussions, classroom management, creative projects, teamwork, and building and maintaining democratic relationships with my students. However, upon graduation from the program, I worked in an environment in which not many of these characteristics were similar, if they existed at all. In my doctoral program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, I met several colleagues who have experience with both online and F2F classrooms who shared my confusion over the extensive training available for F2F classroom teachers, but the limited training available for online teachers. The more that I spoke with colleagues in the field of composition, the more I learned of their own struggles to formulate and execute their courses online, which led to the motivating concern of this dissertation.

Many independent universities offer "online pedagogy training" that demonstrates how to use the online learning platform required by the university—Blackboard, Moodle, D2L, ECollege, etc. Though labeled as pedagogical trainings, these are solely platform trainings which allow the instructor to see the classroom from the students' perspective (Savenye, Olina, &

Niemczyk, 2001; Wang, Chen, & Levy, 2010). Seeing the classroom from the students' perspective is undoubtedly a crucial point of training for online instructors, but it is not the only necessary training. This dissertation will describe necessary changes to online instructor training based on significant differences between F2F and online environments in terms of student demographics, student-student and instructor-student communication, and learning expectations. As more traditional universities go online and more online universities develop, there will be instructors that *never* have to or intend to teach F2F. Larger universities such as the University of Phoenix and branches of Corinthian Colleges Inc. offer full-time Instructor positions solely for online campuses. These instructors still receive the institutional benefits of a university of organization without having to commute or *be* anywhere F2F. Some future scholars will undoubtedly make "*online* college instructor" their career goal. Current degree programs and universities need to update their programs and degree options to match such career movements.

The state of universities is dynamic and changing with the development of technologies; teacher training must develop in a similar manner so that instructors are equipped with the capability to teach for the proper environment. This is a concept that seems fundamental at the primary and secondary levels: Would a special education teacher whose experience is with primary students be asked to teach eleventh grade history? The answer is *probably not* because that is not the classroom environment or demographic of student in which that teacher was trained to work with. So why are online college instructors ill prepared to teach in their classroom environment? Because until very recently, there have been no formal degree programs in place for teacher training in online pedagogy (Kennedy, 2005; Littlejohn, Falconer, & Mcgill, 2008; Savenye, Olina, & Niemczyk, 2001).

Although a significant portion of a teacher's education is through trial and error in the classroom itself, teacher training must align with the context of the classroom. If we rely solely on a teachers' trial and error for classroom success, why require any education or disciplinary specific degree to become a teacher? With the rapid pace in which online education has entered higher education, teacher training at the post-secondary level has not been able to keep up with these developments. We are left with students who request or need their courses online, instructors who are ill-equipped to offer online courses, administration telling instructors to make classes happen, and IT/ computer science departments perpetuating the platform-only training programs.

I have also determined that there are different modes of gaining knowledge that take place in the online environment related to both formal and informal training processes. Training must take into consideration both—the technological skills and classroom expectations of both students and instructors. I propose to consider technology and classroom awareness in separate manners in order to understand them more easily. The terminology most effective for demonstrating the similarities and differences of teacher training is by using Gee's (1989) definitions of acquisition and learning. Gee's definitions stem from Krashen's (1981) Acquisition-Learning hypothesis which identifies acquisition as subconscious and learning as a conscious system of increasing knowledge of a language (p. 1). Krashen identifies acquisition as:

> very similar to the process children use in acquiring first and second languages. It requires meaningful interaction in the target language—natural communication—in which speakers are concerned not with the form of their utterances but with the messages they are conveying and understanding. (p.1)

Language learning, however, Krashen defines as:

> thought to be helped a great deal by error correction and the presentation of explicit rules. Error correction it is maintained, helps the learner come to the correct mental representation of the linguistic generalization. Whether such feedback has this effect to a significant degree remains an open question. (p. 2; Krashen and Seliger, 1975; Faneslow, 1999; Long, 1977)

In order to discuss literacy, Gee also defines these terms. Gee defines "acquisition" as a "process of acquiring something subconsciously by exposure to models and a process of trial and error, without a process of formal teaching," while he defines learning as a more formal process "that involves conscious knowledge gained through teaching… This teaching involves explanations and analysis" (p. 5). Because this dissertation uses the terms of acquisition and learning in a way that accommodates *technological literacy*, I will use Gee's definitions of the terms. Using these definitions, I will identify the methods of acquisition and learning that take place in online learning for teachers to demonstrate the need for an online-specific pedagogical training. I believe it to be an important distinction (distinguishing acquisition and learning) in the development of online teacher training and online learning because understanding the role of each in the classroom is crucial to online teaching success.

Although Gee does not necessarily discuss acquisition or learning in terms of specific content, for the purpose of this dissertation, I will distinguish my utilization of the terms. By way of initial distinction, I believe "acquisition" to be associated with the technological skills acquired throughout the course of an online class through trial and error. "Learning," though, applies to the metacognitive understanding behind online classroom practices and the conscious noting of the differences I will later identify between F2F and online learning contexts. There is often a heavy reliance on the "acquisition" aspect of online teacher training, as defined above,

without the balance of learning or vice versa. Because of the unique environmental constraints of the online classroom, a balance of both of these types of training is necessary for student and instructor success. This dissertation will argue for the necessary balance of acquisition and learning in online teacher training to best prepare instructors for the educative content pertaining to online pedagogy, technology, and environment of web-based learning.

As a student of a traditional master's program, technology was rarely discussed at all as a tool to compliment or method to provide presentations or information to students. After graduation, I stumbled upon the opportunity to teach online having never actually considered its similarities and differences to my education. Through my initial exposure to online education and with opportunities granted to me in my doctoral program (web design, web editing, spreadsheets, emails, and presentations), technology quickly became the focus of my career. I would name myself as a student of acquisition: I had no formal training in many of the technologies I currently use on a daily basis. Though I do not consider this to be a negative, I often wonder if additional degrees and certifications would provide adequate training for my technological needs in order to supplement my acquired knowledge. Unfortunately, "English" and "technology" are terms that are rarely acknowledged as a match and would require me to pursue additional degrees in computer programming or instructional technology. It should be noted early on that my experience with online learning is limited to my own student and instructor experience in the fields of education and composition. Therefore, when this dissertation uses the term "classroom," I am referring to the composition classroom, as that is my area of study. However, I have found that the need for sufficient teacher training for online pedagogy is a cross-discipline concern and have therefore left my dissertation and the aforementioned terminology open to broad interpretation for a multitude of disciplines.

## Defining Online Instruction Terminology

Admittedly, no field has succinctly addressed the terminology related to online learning. There are terms such as *F2F*, *blended*, *hybrid*, *web-facilitated*, *online*, *distance education,* and many more. Boettcher and Conrad (2010) opted to describe the terminology in proportion to the amount of content delivered online. Using their definitions, I will highlight the most pertinent terminology associated with online teaching.

Traditional F2F education, according to Boettcher and Conrad, has no content delivered online and can be described as "course with no online technology used; content is delivered in writing or orally" (p. 9). This is known as the traditional bricks-and-mortar classroom. In order to be considered an "online" course, according to Boettcher and Conrad, 80 percent or more of the content must be delivered online and it should be "a course where most or all of the content is delivered online. [And] Typically has no face-to-face meetings" (p. 9). The authors have other types of learning defined by percentage that lie between F2F and online, such as hybrid learning.

This dissertation does not intend to discuss blended, hybrid, or web-facilitated courses on their own. These courses lie somewhere in a spectrum between online and F2F and use one environment to supplement the other. While I am a proponent for supplementing a F2F class with technology or an online component (such as using a Blackboard shell to maintain a calendar and due dates with students in an accessible location), I am opposed to supplementing an online class with F2F time, or, synchronous learning[1]. As defined by Hewett and Ehmann (2004), synchronous learning "us[es] the Internet to interact through real-time talk platforms" (p. 116). This means that, in a synchronous online classroom, students would be required to log in at a

[1] As stated in Chapter One of this dissertation, many online students desire online education for its flexibility and their capabilities of completing work anytime, anywhere. When synchronous components are added to this, I believe it detracts from students' necessary classroom needs (Lieblein, 2000; Savenye, Olina, & Niemczyk, 2001; Rovali, 2000). In my experience, if students had the opportunity to log in at a certain time each day, they would attend F2F classes.

certain time to partake in a chat room discussion, watch a live podcast, or otherwise engage their peers and instructor.

As previously noted in my introductory narrative, I have found that students *choose* the online environment for its flexibility because they are typically unable to work within the routine of a traditional classroom (Lieblien, 2000). Requiring synchronous collaboration in an online classroom detracts from this fundamental component of online learning and, in my opinion, nullifies the concept. If students request synchronous communication with each other or with the instructor, I am, of course, open to working with them to better assist their learning process.

The alternative is asynchronous learning which does not require students to log in at a specific time. This still allows for instructor flexibility on classroom and assignment management. For instance, all of my online courses are asynchronous, but some require that students log in on several days during the week in order to complete discussion boards and assignments for a required day. However in other classes, I post all of the work for the week on Sunday evening and students just have to submit everything by the following Saturday. This is entirely dictated by personal preference; some instructors require the daily interaction so they feel connected with their students. Other instructors may feel that their students are well equipped to handle the separation of the online classroom and do not need to "check in" that often. It is up to the discretion of the instructor as to how to format the course and when to create assignments for students, but I recommend keeping with the goal of flexibility for online students.

For the purposes of this dissertation, I prefer to use the term "online instruction" in regards to the teaching aspect of my discussion and "online learning" in reference to the students' position. I will also distinguish environment by utilizing the terms "online" classroom

in which a majority of or all content is delivered over the web *or* "traditional" or "F2F" classroom which consists of a bricks-and-mortar physical location.

## Defining Teacher Training

Teacher training entirely depends upon context, discipline, and grade or age level of student. In terms of first-year composition, in my experience, specific teacher training is dependent upon the graduate or doctoral program of the instructor. My graduate experience has been heavy with pedagogy and experiential teaching opportunities, both with composition and literature, and to acquire teaching skills. The unspoken aspect of this was that it was, of course, designed to be utilized in the F2F classroom. At no point in my graduate education was I asked to focus on a specific type of classroom: we were inherently discussing F2F. Yet, as previously mentioned, I spent my first two years of teaching entirely online. I believe that some of the skills are transferable between teaching environments. But, as I will argue below, not all of the skills are transferable. It seems prudent for the teachers of graduate courses to understand the context in which their students (the teachers) will be teaching whether that is online or F2F. I believe that it is similar to understanding cultural and sociocultural considerations of the country in which a student is teaching. In American higher education, though, we are still a culture of F2F classes and our assumptions demonstrate this. We need a change of mindset to understand that F2F is no longer our only option. In terms of numbers of students and instructors, online education is rapidly catching up (Cronjé, 2001; Kennedy, 2005; Littlejohn, Falconer & Mcgill, 2008; Maor, 2006; Nachmias, 2002; Savenye, Oilna & Niemczyk, 2001).

I have yet to encounter a graduate course which discusses the similarities, differences, transferability, and concerns of an online classroom prompted by someone other than myself. Certainly the type of program in which I am enrolled plays a part, but to what degree, really?

Although I have heard of some institutions moving towards degrees in online education, I know of only one program in the United States to offer such a program—but not without difficulties to be discussed later in this dissertation. Sufficient teacher training for online education should include at minimal a certification program, but ideally, a degree program to prepare teachers for their proper teaching environment.

## The Stereotype of Online Instruction

In terms of training and preparation, there is an overarching stereotype that governs the way in which online course management and teacher training occur: The F2F classroom is able to be replicated exactly in the online classroom. Textbooks about teaching online, until recently, have reveled in this stereotype perpetuating the idea that if you can teach well F2F, you can teach well online. However, more recent scholarship is breaking away from this view by naming online teaching its own unique discipline (Boettcher & Conrad, 2010; Cronjé, 2001; Cummings, Bonk, & Jacobs, 2002; Granić, Mifsud, & Ćukušić, 2009; Kennedy, 2005; Liebein, 2000; Littlejohn, Falconer, & Mcgill, 2008; Maor, 2006; Nachmias, 2002; Palloff & Pratt, 2007; Rovai, 2000; Savenye, Olina, & Niemczyk, 2001).

Returning to my previous example of a primary special education teacher in a secondary history classroom, the fundamentals are the same: there is a teacher and there are students. This is the same for the transition from F2F to online: there is a teacher and there are students. However, through a combination of my own experience and current research on the topic, I have determined that there are three overarching differences that distinguish F2F instruction and learning from online instruction and learning. These differences will be discussed thoroughly in the next section of the text: demographic of student, student and instructor expectations, and communication styles.

## Differences in the Online and F2F Classroom

This section will highlight major differences between online and F2F classrooms in terms of the demographics, expectations of students, and communication.

### Difference One: Demographics

Depending on the institution, online students can be parents, grandparents, single parents, military personnel on active duty, recently unemployed, those with a full-time job, those working more than 40 hours a week, traditional college-aged students, or any variety of individual. In my experience with my local community college, the online student demographic typically matched the F2F demographic: there were mostly students right out of high school that were either undecided, enrolled in a trade program, or taking credits in order to transfer to a four-year college because there was no solely online degree/certificate program option. In the mix were a couple non-traditional students, but they were the minority. Conversely, in my time with online universities (University of Phoenix and Everest College of Phoenix online), those statistics were flipped. I typically have all or almost all non-traditional students and a few scattered traditional college-aged students.

The demographic of student impacts the classroom environment in multiple ways. Overall, all groups of students are entirely unique and determine the type of classroom environment that is possible for a course. If you have a F2F classroom of individuals that are thirty years separated from their last formal learning experience, they at least have the comfort of the physical classroom space: the desks, the chairs, the teacher in front, the books. However, now put them in an entirely online classroom. Can they type? Do they understand what a Windows-based program is as opposed to DOS? Do they have Adobe installed for handouts? Do they have the correct version of Microsoft Word for assignments (to both receive and submit)? Do they

have Java for a discussion board or chat application? Is there a text book or are they reading from web pages? Are they comfortable in this environment? The purpose of posing all of these aforementioned questions is to consider this separation from the F2F classroom. If you have a student F2F who cannot read or write in a composition class, chances are, you will notice that something is off in the first class session. However, if a student lacks the technological skills to log in online, you may never actually "notice". The student will just eventually be dropped from the course. Palloff and Pratt (2007) share an anecdote about teaching related to student technological skill:

> We cannot assume that our students are adept to any degree with technology…One technical support person gave us an extreme example of this when she told the story of s student living in a remote part of Alaska who was working on a doctorate through a distance learning program. She was attempting to talk him through some of his difficulties in accessing an Internet-based course and began to explain a command that needed to be typed in both capital and lowercase letters. The student asked 'How do I make a capital letter with this computer?' Should students who have so little knowledge of and ability with a computer participate in an online course? (p.102)

Although this may be an extreme example of a technological barrier, it is not outside of the realm of possibilities even by today's standards. Moran and Selfe (1999) discuss the detriment of education in assuming that all students have equal access to computers or other technologies and advocate for an understanding that by bringing technology into our schools, "we inevitably push something else out" (p. 48).

Students of the online classroom are not necessarily tech-savvy teenagers who navigate the web and course management systems (CMSs) with ease. While Prensky (2001) referred to

today's students as "native speakers" of digital literacy, that is an overgeneralization of student skill sets. Similarly, Prensky ignores those who lack access to technology and those who choose not to be a part of the technological culture (Considine, Horton, & Moorman, 2009; Kennedy, Judd, Churchward, & Gray, 2008; Mills, 2010; Christ, 2007). Clark-Ibáñez and Scott (2008) explain that "It would be a mistake to overestimate the technology readiness of our online students". Just because individuals are *willing* to take a course online does not necessarily mean that they are *prepared* to take the course online.

Perhaps the online classroom *is* composed of entirely traditional college-aged students who have grown up with more technology than the instructor is familiar with. These students may be better suited for more fast-paced technological tools, such as blogs, wikis, and collaborative teamwork where they set their own communicative style and pattern. Scholars today argue over the ability for current teenagers and young adults to multi-task and work within smaller units of information rather than large, continual projects or written assignments (Baron, 2008; Crystal, 2008; Willingham, 2009). Working in a classroom that allows students access to these technologies in which they are proficient and in some ways, experts at multi-tasking presents its own unique challenges to instructors. Assignments do not necessarily have to be linear in this case, which, in composition, breaks away from a tradition of process-movement. Students, whose minds may work in the short bursts of information, may be more likely to contact the instructor for immediate assistance for any questions because they are accustomed to the instant gratification of answer-seeking on the Internet.

On the whole, instructors understanding the demographic of their online class will allow for more considerate planning in terms of content, weighing student expectations, and communication strategies.

**Difference Two: Expectations**

I would venture to say that the course outcomes of an online class are similar to those of the F2F classroom. In terms of composition, we want students to leave the classroom with a greater interest in and skill level in their writing abilities. However, do we also have expectations of their technological capabilities? Perhaps if your composition classroom is heavily based in a particular technology, such as podcasts, you will expect students to leave the course with the ability to create, edit, and post to a community space, a podcast. But, other instructors may not utilize any particular technology in their composition classroom. In the online composition classroom, though, even if no additional technological tools are used other than the CMS, there is still the expectation that students will be able to navigate around and function within the CMS.

In my first year of teaching with the University of Phoenix (UoP), I taught Research Writing and Introduction to Literature, neither of which are "introductory" courses for the university. About a year into teaching, I was asked to teach Effective Essay Writing, essentially their "basic writing" course. This course was introductory and part of their First Year Sequence courses, a mandatory set of classes that all students must take initially upon enrollment. The first three weeks (out of nine) of the course were spent fielding questions about the CMS, where to post assignments, how often students needed to log on, and where different documents were posted throughout. I was aghast at how many questions there were. "Shouldn't they have some introduction to online learning seminar or online orientation?" I thought to myself. However, there is no online orientation for students available from UoP or many other institutions. Therefore, the expectations of my entire course were off the mark. I needed to combat the technological issues before I could ever work with students on their writing. If my students were

unable to navigate the CMS to find the assignments and readings, how were they ever going to be successful in my course or their future courses?

The same is true for instructors at other universities. How long will it take students to learn a new CMS? Is it your responsibility to train them or will they have had previous experience with a technology? In terms of teacher-training, online instructors must be equipped to handle the possibilities of technological issues with CMSs and experimental technologies. In the F2F classroom, if an assignment "fails" or classroom technology (a PowerPoint, an overhead projector) fails, there can typically be a back-up plan. Perhaps the students could work in groups to discuss the topic at hand. They could freewrite. They could put more time into a larger project of the course. According to Hawisher and Moran (1997), instructors "assume that students have equal access to pen and paper. But because computers and on-line access cost money, computer technology cannot be presumed to be universally and equally distributed" (p. 115). What if the technology in the online course fails? Are the students essentially "off" until the instructor fixes that technology or can impromptu online assignments be made in the same manner? Computers are not nearly as accessible as pen and paper, so what happens when the technology, the crux of the lesson, does not work? Though the possibilities of F2F changes and adaptations are discussed in teacher training programs, current online training programs do not share the same emergency go-to tips leaving online instructors at the mercy of a platform rather than the learning.

Oftentimes, universities are contracted with a specific CMS and these can change yearly, biyearly, or at any time. Indiana University of Pennsylvania currently uses the CMS D2L (Desire to Learn) after the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE) mandated that all of their universities use this platform (IUP IT Support Center, 2011a). The year prior, IUP had used Moodle, and the year before that, Blackboard. Students enrolled in any of the online

programs at IUP may have learned three or more CMSs in the course of their undergraduate education. IUP offers basic information for students regarding discussion, drop box, quizzes, grade book, and how to email the instructor with questions—which is available on the IT Support website (IUP IT Support Center, 2011b, par. Tools). This information, though helpful, is limited by the basic constraints of the CMS. Training can only be generated on the types of technological tools that IT *believes that most* instructors will use: email, discussion board, drop box, and quizzes. However, there are countless other tools available through D2L that instructors may utilize in their course: chat rooms, Wimba, blogs, wikis, hyperlinks, hypertext, text folders, and many more. There is, however, no explanation of those functions on the IT website. Composition instructors must now be equipped to teach basic computer programming and be well-versed enough in their technological tools of choice to not just *run* the program, but to teach it to their students. Other than the brief experimental technological endeavors my professors attempted in graduate school, I was not formally trained to teach technology itself. I was trained to teach writing and literature. By implementing a movement towards online pedagogy, this common lament of online instructors can begin to change.

If pedagogy courses in current graduate programs could expand to include discussions of the online components of pre-existing courses, we would be doing current and future instructors a great service for their teaching by even *starting* this discussion. Institutions that train teachers would be acknowledging the technological expectations that students have for instructors and vice versa and preparing them for this experience. According to the Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics "an estimated 12.2 million students were enrolled during the 2006-07 academic year in college-level, credit-granting distance education courses" (GoDegreesOnline, 2011, par. Online Degrees). This is a statistic that will only continue to grow

with the market of higher education. Allen and Seaman (2010) estimate that currently there are more than 5.5 million students studying online in US higher education. As this type of statistic grows, so does the necessity for instructors who are trained and educated in the field of online pedagogy. This endeavor, however, is stalled presumably because of the significant changes needed to better align current training and practice, which will be discussed later in this dissertation. Perhaps the most notable reason for specialized training in online pedagogy lies in the last difference that I perceive between online and F2F instruction: communication.

**Difference Three: Communication**

I often describe my online teaching experience as having twenty-five independent studies occurring simultaneously. Although there is a developed learning community, my students often come to me with all questions rather than trying to find the answers themselves or asking their peers for assistance. The reason for this is that the communicative styles and expectations of online students are *significantly* different from F2F students (Arbaugh, 2002, Thurmond, Wambach, & Connors, 2002; Lieblein, 2000; Rovai, 2000; Ryan, Carlton, & Ali, 1999; Soon, Sook, Jung, & Im, 2000).

Some F2F instructors may be satisfied and encourage student participation at a minimum of active listening. This means that students may be present in the course but not necessarily have to speak or add to the discussion in order to be noted as “present” and “participating”. However, this is not permissible or even possible in online courses. In online courses, students must log in to the course and make posts, responses, post assignments, or make some notable contribution in order to be considered “present” and “participating”. Paloff and Pratt (2007) describe the online students as:

> not only responsible for logging on but they must also contribute to the learning process by posting their thoughts and ideas to the online discussion. Learning is an active process in which both the instructor and the learners must participate if it is to be successful. (p. 5)

The requirement for substantive participation in online classes becomes caught in a circular problem: students must be proficient in navigating the CMS in order to participate fully, which they may not be able to do if they are unable to navigate the CMS. This is further complicated by the characteristics described by the Illinois Online Network that are associated with successful online students:

- Open-minded about sharing life, work, and educational experience as part of the learning process
- Able to communicate through writing
- Self-motivated and self-disciplined
- Willing to 'speak up' if problems arise
- Able and willing to commit four to fifteen hours per week per course
- Able to meet the minimum requirements for the program (that is, this is not an easier way to meet degree requirements)
- Accept critical thinking and decision making as part of the learning process
- Have access to a computer and a modem (and, we add, at least some minimal ability to use them)
- Able to think ideas through before responding
- Feel that high-quality learning can take place without going to a traditional classroom (par. 2; Palloff and Pratt p. 8).

Most of these are communicative standards that are acknowledged by a governing body, but often not shared with students, administrators, or academic advisors who recommend online learning as an option for students.

Although I post in my initial course information that students need to stay ahead of the work and ask questions if they have any problems, I always have a student contact me after three weeks to say something to the effect of: “Sorry I haven’t done any of the work for the course yet, I can’t find the drop box.” Even when students are forewarned that they must communicate with the instructor at the first sign of a problem, some do not. The instructor, then, must make a decision regarding late work and technological issues and work with this student one-on-one to both catch them up technologically and in terms of coursework—hence the reference to an independent study.

When students do opt to communicate with the instructor, they can often do so in short, sporadic bursts. If a student emails the instructor with a question, oftentimes they expect an immediate answer as though the instructor is available synchronously. Boettcher and Conrad explain:

> Over time, we have learned to quantify what it means to ‘be present.’ The best online faculty, according to students, are faculty who are present multiple times a week, and at best daily. No matter how expectations are communicated regarding faculty availability, the default mode is twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. Students expect online faculty to be present when they are there, no matter the day or the time… (p. 37).

Lieblein (2000) agrees with this claim by saying that:

> online students are ultrasensitive to the time it takes professors to respond to their questions or provide them feedback. It is impossible to define precisely when students

> will conclude that their teacher has disappeared, but it is measured in days… by his or her prior actions, each teacher instills a sense of expectation. (p. 164)

This is both an expectation and a communicative design flaw of online courses that is dramatically different than the expectations of F2F students. In my F2F experience, students attend office hours, show up to class early, or wait around at the end of class to ask the instructor a question and receive feedback. That student is then able to ask follow-up questions in the same conversation until they feel they have received sufficient information to continue with the course or assignment. Online, though, a student may email the instructor mid-morning, after the instructor has already logged on for the day and ask a simple question. It is not until almost 24 hours later that the instructor logs back in, receives, and answers the question. When the student receives that response a day or two later, they may have a follow up question, which perpetuates this lengthy dialogue. Essentially, it may take a week or two for an instructor and student to have a conversation via email that may have taken ten minutes F2F. This is remedied by efficient training for instructors regarding the communicative expectations of online students.

Referring back to the characteristics of successful online learners as defined by the Illinois Online Network, if these characteristics are not explained thoroughly at least to instructors to pass on to their students, how are we to be successful in our online courses? Perhaps what is gleaned from this example is that online instructors need to ensure that their students are aware of these communicative differences and make that part of their online course. Or, perhaps instructors need to be better equipped to handle distance communication in both their own assignment writing and in correspondence to students. The F2F classroom has its own unique communicative nuances that are addressed in education programs, graduate programs, and pedagogy courses. Without at least a course dedicated to online pedagogy, instructors in

training are not receiving adequate preparation for the courses and classrooms of which they will inevitably be a part.

## The Impact of Acquisition and Learning in Online Teacher Training

The next two sections fine "acquisition" and "learning" as they are used in this dissertation and in terms of online teacher training.

### Acquisition

Gee's (1989) definition of "acquisition" is an informal process by which learners attempt new models by trial and error in order to navigate their way of understanding. In terms of the online classroom, I believe that acquisition and learning have a symbiotic relationship and therefore, depend on the growth of the other in order for the learner (the instructor) to flourish. More specifically, the technological skills required to be successful as an online instructor are often acquired by this process of trial, error, and experimentation. Instructors acquire technological skills by trial and error methods: utilizing a wiki in an online class and finding that students cannot use it efficiently may result in a change to a different technology or a more thorough explanation of wikis prior to the assignment. Because technologies vary by assignment, by platform, by course, by instructor, and by semester, there is no way to avoid this process of technological acquisition as one enters a new online learning environment.

There is, undoubtedly, a similar period of adjustment with F2F instruction whereby the students learn the instructors mannerisms and grading tendencies. However, acquiring technological efficiency for the online classroom is not a matter of personal taste or comfort; it is necessary for classroom success. For example, as an online instructor I may attempt to conduct a course attempting a team-based discussion board. If this is a successful endeavor in terms of student participation and overall learning value, I may decide to use it again in future online

courses. However, if students do not participate in the team discussion board or it is apparent that a sole member has taken over the team, changes will need to be made. Based on the successes and failings of this project, I may opt to not use team discussion boards for future courses or I may create a list of "team discussion board rules" to help students navigate effective team-building strategies for this scenario.

The previous example was that of acquisition on the part of the online instructor, but I believe that online students also go through this technological acquisition that is essential to their success in a course. Returning to my previous example of a student who was unable to find the drop box for three weeks, that is their own technological acquisition of the classroom. Perhaps they did submit something in a way that they thought correct only to find that their assignment did not appear on the instructor's end. Or perhaps they submitted it via email attachment or discussion board attachment. Regardless of the process of their acquisition, it should be apparent that acquisition of online classroom technology is crucial to the success of both students and instructors of an online class. Also, although one will acquire sufficient working knowledge to be successful in a course, this is not necessarily transferable into all courses. Online instructors and students need to be prepared to go through an acquisition process for each new online course and/or technology. This dissertation will address the necessary components of online teacher training in respect to technological acquisition.

**Learning**

"Learning," in terms of teacher training, is the more formal instruction by which a concept is explained to the potential online instructor. Learning is the process that teachers in training are more familiar with; a reliance on traditional F2F models being forced into online education (Cummings, Bonk, & Jacobs, 2002; Kennedy, 2005; Littlejohn, Falconer, & Mcgill,

2008; Maor, 2006; Nachmias, 2002; Rovai, 2000). I believe that learning specifically refers to the content of online pedagogy to be learned in a teacher training. For instructors of an online course, learning refers to a metacognitive understanding of the differences between students F2F and online including, but not limited to, demographics, expectations, and communicative styles.

The distinction between acquisition and learning is an important one to make for online instructors. If one aspect is conveyed as more important than the other, the balance of the classroom will be off. For instance, if the technological acquisition is valued tremendously in an online composition course, then teachers will be expert navigators of the CMS, but unable to effectively facilitate the course or create a learning environment. Conversely, if too much emphasis is placed on understanding the students and intricacies of the online classroom, but the teacher in training is never given the option to *try* using a CMS or generating a course with the technology, the resulting course would be poor quality.

The distinction between acquisition and learning also highlights three major differences between F2F and online learning that were previously listed (demographics, communication, and expectations). Although this is not a comprehensive listing of the differences distinguishing online and F2F teaching, categorically, these embody some of the most significant distinctions. Online teacher training must be created to bridge the educational gap that exists between F2F and online instruction for those three areas in particular. Each of the differences—demographics, expectations, and communication—require the balance of instructor capability for *acquiring* the skills to assemble and execute an online course in order for them to *learn* the most appropriate way to handle the online classroom. Specifically, instructors need the period of trial and error (acquisition) combined with formal online pedagogy training (learning) in order to be successful online educators. Perhaps instructors across disciplines that may have the opportunity to teach

their courses online be introduced to the concepts of acquisition and learning as they apply to online education in order to be sufficiently prepared to meet students' technological and conceptual needs.

## Defining Online Pedagogy

The phrase "online pedagogy" is not a new phrase resulting from this dissertation. Rather, "online pedagogy" is a term representative of the changes that have been made in F2F teacher training to accommodate the development of online education. According to Nachmias (2002):

> To look at the impact of these developments within the context of higher education implies, in fact, to examine the ways they challenge the 2500-year-old Socratic, face-to-face, lecturing, and discussion modes characterizing most of college and university teaching. (p. 214)

Online pedagogy, therefore, cannot be a term to represent the movement from F2F teaching styles to online learning; online pedagogy needs to be *representative of online pedagogy only*. However, "pedagogy" refers to the study of being a teacher or the process of becoming a teacher, which is unrepresentative of the current state of online teacher training, as there are essentially no *online* pedagogy degree programs in the United States. Scholars have been mentioning the necessity of an online pedagogy for years, but have yet to demonstrate a concrete way in which higher education and individual universities can combat the steps already made away from this development: "One of the unresolved issues is the dominance of traditional teaching and the unlikelihood of academic staff to adopt pedagogical innovation" (Maor, 2006, p. 134; Reeves, 2003). This dissertation comes at a crucial time in the development of online pedagogy in order to steer higher education to the necessary understanding of it in its own regard without total

reliance on F2F pedagogy. Kennedy (2005) echoes this concern: “If online teachers do not take this step first, then the danger is that quality apparatchiks will draw up standards for every issue in online education” (p. 24). Therefore, this dissertation defines online pedagogy as the study of becoming a teacher in an online or digital capacity (whether asynchronous or synchronous) whereby acquisition of technological skills and learning of student demographic, communication, and expectations are mastered. This dissertation is designed to create small and large scale online pedagogy programs (single masters’ level program or full masters’ degree program, respectively) focusing on the balance of acquisition and learning, as previously defined, of the online classroom.

## Conclusion

Online instructors need sufficient training to address the differences between F2F and online teaching environments; training that is representative of online learning, not a shadow of F2F experiences. This need is especially true in considering the distinction between acquisition and learning that occurs in the online classroom. Boettcher and Conrad (2010) continue this claim: “It is generally assumed that you as faculty know the fundamentals of teaching and learning theory, but undoubtedly you haven’t had a chance to learn the discipline of pedagogy and are generally practitioners rather than theorists” (p. 18). At minimum, graduate programs in education and in discipline-specific professional fields (those that will teach at the post-secondary level) need to include online pedagogy in their course of study. Ideally, though, degree programs will be generated in which an individual can earn a degree (at any level) in *online* education. As online education continues to grow, so does the pedagogical training for online instructors. Since the online and F2F environments are not interchangeable, the teacher training also cannot be interchangeable. Boettcher and Conrad explain more thoroughly:

> You generally teach the way you have been taught. This has not been overly problematic in the past, but the proliferation of new technologies and new environments such as blended and online learning and the rise of the new wave of digital native students who are comfortable with mobile digital communication are creating new teaching challenges. Rather than wanting to listen to lectures, students want to be doing and creating. This means a change in pedagogical strategies both online and in a traditional campus classroom. (p. 18)

Teacher training must develop in tandem with student capabilities and universities' changes. Specifically, online pedagogy must be fostered as a distinction from F2F pedagogy and no longer considered to be interchangeable or minor.

# CHAPTER TWO

## HOW DID WE GET HERE?

Chapter One of this dissertation discussed challenges and new directions for the field of online education in terms of teacher training. In order to understand the current developments in teacher training for online education, we need to understand how fields of study—composition, in particular—have grown to accommodate online education. The field of distance education in itself began in the nineteenth century (Ascough, 2002; Cannell 1999; Hochberg, 2006; Moore and Kearsley, 1996; Patterson, 1996;). Ascough explains: "The development of an extensive, relatively inexpensive postal service in the late nineteenth century led to the creation of print-based correspondence courses" (p. 17). From there, the concept was modified by discipline and eventually taken over by the field of education. Hawisher, LeBlanc, Moran, and Selfe (1996) trace the long history of the slow incorporation of computers into the field of composition instruction. Beginning in the 1970s, these researchers identified the starting point of a revolution that is still changing today:

> Computers thus entered our scene at a moment when there was a loud and public call for the improvement of writing instruction, and at the beginning of what was to be a long and difficult period of retrenchment in American public education. (p. 23)

The particular moment to which the authors are referring may have passed, but arguably, there remains a call for the improvement of writing instruction now in the *online* composition classroom. The broad field of English and English education faced challenges in their desire for traditional pedagogy: "English studies has never been quick to adopt new technologies and computers did not change old habits" (p. 32). This is an issue spanning the decades in the field of "computers and composition." As Hawisher et. al. (1996) identify and as scholars today continue

to identify, we continuously need to adopt new technologies and new methodologies for performing in the classroom to suit the changing needs of the field and the students.

In the early 1980s, the Conference on College Composition and Communication added another C: Computers, which has since developed into its own conference, Computers and Writing (Hawisher et. al. 1996, p. 90). A group of composition scholars came together to discuss the possibilities of using computers in the classrooms, outside of the classrooms, and to supplement the teaching of composition. They considered the possibilities of utilizing technology *as part of* the classroom and discussed the ramifications of technology both as a part of and as an extension of the F2F classroom. Around this time, Hawisher et. al. explain, scholars were making the transition to microcomputers for word processing. The transition held its own technological issues, though by today's standards word processing seems quite basic. Classrooms with computers in the late 1980s experimented with the social construction of knowledge in digital discussion boards which are discussed in publications such as Faigley's *Fragments of Rationality* (p. 135). Instructors who valued the usage of computers in the composition classroom at this time:

> faced not only the need to carve out an increasingly productive role for themselves within their home departments and programs, but also with the need to define the relationship between their emerging area of specialization and the larger profession of composition studies. (Hawisher et. al, 1996, p. 153)

Although the field of computers and composition has grown exponentially since this time to include publications, conferences, journals, and awards, there still remained a separation between "computers and composition" and "composition". This separation began with the introduction of

computers into the field of composition and has remained to the present, in part, because of the field's slow recognition of pedagogical processes and methodologies.

The 1990s brought reputable scholars sharing their computer-based learning techniques, such as Lester Faigley's (1992) experimentation with computer-mediated communication (CMC) in his first year writing course[2]. Hearing new voices in the conversation of computers and composition began to change the fields' definition of a classroom. Hawisher and LeBlanc (1992) discussed the "real possibility of a writing classroom that was not a classroom at all—or at least not one supported by brick and mortar" (p. 244). Burns (1992) also "demonstrated that real-time 'classrooms' could cut across geographical borders and connect classes…" across the United States (p. 244). These changes to the "classroom" have led to shifts in the pedagogical possibilities of online education. In order to account for these changes in the early 1990s, Cynthia Selfe, Gail Hawisher, and Richard Selfe began workshops out of Michigan Tech University entitled "Computers in Writing-Intensive Classrooms" (CIWIC). One of the types of workshops was "Approaches to integrating computers into writing classrooms" in which participants examined their own writing classrooms for computer-based opportunities and discussed ways to share these skills with other faculty and departments at their home institutions (CIWIC-AIC, 2002, par. Description).

Another workshop offered was CIWIC-NM (New Media) where participants considered "how compositional and rhetorical approaches to writing carry over into the interactive and intensely visual places of computer screens" (CWIC-NM, 2002, par. Description). The last workshop offered through this institute was CIWIC-IP (Individual Projects) designed for those

[2] In *Fragments of Rationality,* Faigley utilizes an anonymous chat function to supplement class discussion. What Faigley found in this attempt was that students verbalized their ideas and opinions more freely and that he, the instructor, became a neutral party in the course, no longer "in charge". Specifically, Faigley recalls that "not only is the discourse structure radically different from what goes on in a typical classroom, but so too is the level of participation" (p. 181).

who had already taken the CIWIC-AIC workshop and now had a specific project or course design to develop with assistance from other instructors and the workshop leaders (CIWIC-IP, 2002, par. Description). The goal of these workshops and of these key players in computers and composition was never for the static and individual acquisition of technological skills for integrating computers and composition. Rather, the goal was to share the experience of these workshops with additional faculty, departments, and universities, so that educators at various levels and locations would see the pedagogical opportunities at our fingertips in terms of technology. Hawisher et. al. conclude their history of computers and composition in 1994 by looking forward to the future of this subfield. The future, they believed in 1994, lay in the successful incorporation of multiple perspectives on teaching to the online forum. Technology, they argue, is something that can never be taken for granted; not all students or instructors have sufficient access to technology or the personal knowledge to be a successful computer-assisted learner or instructor.

As the scholarship of online education in composition studies has grown, there has developed a division between understanding technology that is applicable to the online classroom and formulating pedagogy appropriate to the new environment (Stroupe, 2003). Unfortunately, technological advances and opportunities stand at the forefront, overshadowing pedagogical endeavors. Technology changes so rapidly, our technological skills are constantly in need of honing. Instructors focus on developing the technological capabilities without developing the pedagogy to support those skills. Burns (1999) quoted Cynthia Selfe's challenge to educators to "pay attention" as technological expectations developed into the 21st century: "Literacy first. Technology second," he advocated (p. xiii). As the 21st century began, Selfe (1999) strived to define crucial terms for new educational endeavors such as *technological*

*literacy*, which she defines as "a complex set of socially and culturally situated values, practices, and skills involved in operating linguistically within the context of electronic environments, including reading, writing, and communicating" (p. 11). It is not for instructors to decide or assume the technological literacy level of students, regardless of age or demographic, but to be prepared to work with students of all technological literacy levels.

Technological literacy, Selfe believes, should be just as valued and made an educational goal as textual literacy, knowing that this will change the landscape of education entirely. How this translates into the online classroom, then, is the instructors' need to be a facilitator of not only subject area content, but technological components to the educative process. Palloff and Pratt advocate for instructor preparedness for technological assistance:

> The instructor also needs to be somewhat knowledgeable about [the technology] and comfortable enough to be able to help with problems. The instructor should also be able to configure the online course site so that participants find it easy to use and logical in structure… The technology must be accessibly to and usable by all participants. (p. 91).

The necessity for instructor knowledge in technology often propels online instructors out of their comfort zones and areas of training into unfamiliar territory. However, it is not the technology that needs to be at the forefront of the educational process, it is a balance of technology and understanding how to communicate effectively and operate within the online classroom. Online teacher training cannot be heavily biased towards either acquiring technological skills or learning pedagogical skills; training must be a balance of these in order to prepare the instructor adequately for their new role as an online instructor.

Chapter One of this dissertation discussed the necessary balance of acquiring technology skills and studying pedagogy of digital environments in order to be a successful online instructor.

If this balance is not achieved, the result will be disappointed students (who may feel as though they did not learn anything in a class either too focused on technology or too focused on content) and frustrated instructors (who may feel as though students could not have succeeded because they never understood the technological requirements).

Although online and F2F instruction need to be regarded as separate disciplines, the focus of both environments should be the same: the teaching of a subject or subjects to students (Lieblein, 2000; Kennedy, 2005). Universities generate contracts with course management systems or certain technologies and make that the premise upon which a course is built, rather than starting with a course and understanding the requirements of that type of course. The current system in place ultimately works backward of the desired system of online course development. Harasim, Hiltz, Teles, and Turoff (1995) stated that "all education—face to face, distance mode, online—requires understanding the nature of the medium in order to conceptualize and design it as an educational environment" (p. 138). However, an understanding of the medium does not necessitate a focus on the medium *over* the content. The type of technological tools used to facilitate a course need not be the focal point of the course; technology needs to work in tandem with the content being delivered.

Ascough (2002) uses Harasim et. al. as a foundation to build upon, arguing that focusing on the medium of the online classroom leads to "poor pedagogical practices" unless balanced with updated pedagogical strategies (p.17). Instructors need not get carried away with the many applications and options of a CMS (blogs, wikis, discussion boards, tools, assignments, tests, quizzes, group work, and many more). Just because a CMS offers ten, twenty, or thirty ways to present information to students does not mean that all of these methods need to be utilized in a single course. Moran (1999) agrees with limiting the amount of technological usage by asking

the question, “As writers, do we *always* need cutting-edge technologies?” (p. 52). Whitesel (1998) echoes this claim:

> Technology does not teach students; effective teachers do. A virtual learning space that is effectively created by a competently trained instructor can deliver on the promises educators make to their students. It can help us deliver our content to a growing number of learners over a widely diverse geographical area. (p. 1)

Therefore, although technology is becoming a necessary tool for the facilitation of online courses, the focus must still remain on the instructor and the instructors’ capabilities of delivering content to the students. More specifically, online instructors need to understand the balance indicated in Chapter One of this dissertation between *acquisition* of technological skill appropriate to an online course and *learning* as it applies to pedagogical concerns. Warnock (2009) lists technology as a low priority in online writing courses: “The foundation of your class, even in the most high-tech environment, is still your own personal teaching ability and imagination” (p. 19). Online instructors, regardless of discipline, must be sufficiently trained in online pedagogy to compensate for the environmental and technological training necessary to facilitate online courses.

Recent scholars who generate guidebooks for online instructors attempt to codify major differences between F2F and online instruction for those that may be unfamiliar. Two of the categories of significant difference noted by Smith (2008) are the role of the instructor and the role of the student. The differences she notes in the instructor’s role include course development, course design, course facilitation, teaching, and planning (p. 15). These differences cover essentially the entire aspect of teaching except for assessment which is not at all covered in Smith’s text. Other guidebooks direct new online instructors in much the same manner,

indicating major differences in what it means to be an online teacher. In these texts, “online instructor” is defined radically different than a traditional F2F instructor is defined.

Myers-Wylie, Mangiergi, & Hardy (2009) contrast some skills of the online instructor (to the F2F instructor) including proficient typing and computer skills, flawless grammar and writing capabilities as to provide a model to students, and the ability to create a comfortable and open online classroom environment (p. 2). Bates and Poole (2003) define teaching with technology as a radical development in recent years, despite continuous technological advances. With the development of more technology for teaching and online education, Bates and Poole describe the overall changes in the field of education and to instructors. They advocate that major changes need to be made to current structure in higher education to compensate for the additional skills that students and instructors need to operate and thrive with technology today. Operating solely for the content or solely with the technology proves to be a disservice to higher education. Redefinition of terms and roles is necessary to account for the relationship between technology and content. However popular these definitions and changes are in journals and textbooks, universities have not caught up to the point of generating sufficient online teacher training to address such changes.

Specifically, the role of the teacher/instructor is changing (Coppola, Hiltz, & Rotter, 2002; Egan & Akdere, 2005; Goodyear, Spector, Steeples, & Tickner, 2001; Guasch, Alvarez, & Espasa, 2010; Klein, Spector, Grabowski, & De la Teja, 2004; Williams, 2003). “Facilitator” is now the preferred terminology relating to an individual who teaches online referring to an individual who serves as one who facilitates and gently guides learning, rather than a “teacher” who may be focused on lecture-based presentations. King (1993) defined two distinct ways of facilitation often cited in online guidebooks: “sage on the stage” or “guide on the side”.

Generally, “guide on the side” is noted as the more acceptable way of facilitation in online courses as it allows for students to maneuver their way through the course and navigate their own way without overt direction from an instructor (Collison, Elbaum, Haavind, & Tinker, 2000).

Guasch, Alvarez, and Espasa (2010) claim that “all this research pointed out that teachers must rethink their teaching role in order to facilitate communicative situations suited to the peculiarities of various interrelations… in a virtual environment based on asynchronous learning” (p. 199; qtd. in Coppola, et. al., 2002). Guasch, Alvarez, and Espasa condensed the research findings from several studies to identify five specific functions of an online teacher: Design/planning function; social function; instructive function; technological domain; and management domain (p. 201). The design/planning function is not limited to work “prior to the start of the course, but also [is] also an action that requires a concerted effort for the successful completion of the virtual course” (p. 201). Design and planning is also not a solo act, but rather one that requires “relationships between the teacher and other staff in terms of technological/educational coordination” (p. 201).

The social function, as described by Guasch, Alvarez, and Espasa “includes actions related to teachers’ intervention to improve their relationship with their students and the relationships among students themselves during the teaching/learning process in a virtual environment” (p. 202). As this chapter will discuss, online learning communities are an integral part of online courses. Participation and involvement from all students is mandatory for a community to develop and the course to flourish.

The instructive function includes a teacher’s “expertise in their subject matter and his/her competencies, which contribute to deep, complex and critical learning. Teachers need a solid knowledge of the field of distance learning and possessing abilities to present content…” (p.

202). Therefore, instructors are not solely required to have knowledge of their content area, but, in order to be successful, must have a working knowledge of the field of distance education unique from F2F education.

The final two functions required of online instructors, as defined by Guasch, Alvarez, and Espasa are technological domain and management domain. Technological domain refers to the instructor and institution having the capabilities and resources available for successfully technological classroom function. And ultimately, the management domain

> enables the teacher to carry out planned actions and to adapt them: to meet learning expectations, motivations and needs; to handle the virtual classroom; to manage communication channels and spaces; in other words, to supervise and adjust the ongoing and virtual processes. (p. 202)

Understanding these roles as they relate to an online instructors' role in the classroom is crucial to successful teaching and learning opportunities and needs to be addressed in online pedagogy training. These roles would typically not be discussed in a traditional F2F teacher training program because they are not necessarily the same functions as a F2F instructor. Therefore, without a training specific to *online pedagogy*, online instructors do not thoroughly understand their roles before entering their classrooms.

## Online Learning Communities

A newer area of interest and concern for online courses is development of an online learning community. One of the distinct separations of online classrooms from F2F is that online classrooms are almost always referred to as "learning communities" (Barker & Kemp; Gallardo, 2006; Blythe, 2001;Hewett & Ehmann, 2004). Developing an online learning community in the online classroom stems from Vygotsky's (1981) notions of learning by working with others and

Piaget's (1969) claim that students "must have a connection to the learning for it to be meaningful" (Myers-Wylie, Mangieri, & Hardy, 2009, p. xi). Developing online learning communities and "social presence [are] something we rarely consider in the face-to-face classroom. When students see one another within a physical space, we simply assume that presence will occur; students will develop a sense of who their colleagues are simply by being around them" (Palloff and Pratt, 2007, p. 30).

Online learning communities are a group of individuals that come together for a common purpose of learning together and develop a relationship surrounding these learning experiences. Researchers credit the building of online learning communities as the way in which participants' online personas are developed (Cronjé, 2001; Frey, Fisher, & Gonzalez, 2010; Ko & Rossen, 2004; Myers-Wylie, Mangieri, & Hardy, 2009; Nachmias, 2002; Palloff & Pratt, 2007; Rovai, 2000; Savenye, Olina, & Niemczyk, 2001). As these authors indicate, although movement towards a relationship of mutuality is desirable in the F2F classroom, it is not necessarily mandatory for student success or learning in this environment (Wallace & Ewald, 2000; Bourdieu, 1999). However, in the online classroom, studies demonstrate increased student academic success, dedication to coursework, and interest in overall education when online classrooms are not just groups of individuals but a learning community in which each student is personally invested and valued (Beard & Harper, 2002; Beattie, Spooner, Jordan, Algozzine, & Spooner, 2002; Chester & Gwynne, 1998; Hagie & Hughes, 2003; Palloff & Pratt, 2007; Picciano, 2002; Pratt, 2006; Smith, 2005; Wegerif, 1998). Palloff and Pratt (2007) credit early establishment of an online learning community as a way to foster student retention and learner satisfaction (Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997).

Conrad and Donaldson (2004) have found that online instructors (and therefore, students) go through four phases of engagement in order to become a vested member of an online learning community. These phases are:

1. Newcomer (student); Social Negotiator (instructor)
2. Cooperator (student); Structural Engineer (instructor)
3. Collaborator (student); Facilitator (instructor)
4. Initiator/Partner (student); Community Member/Challenger (instructor)

In phase one, the learner is new to the online system, which places the instructor in the role as a "social negotiator," providing opportunities for interaction and community-building for the students (Conrad & Donaldson, 2004). Myers-Wylie, Mangieri, and Hardy, following the lead of Conrad and Donaldson's four phases, have determined that "When dealing with brand-new online students, the importance of answering student questions and concerns as quickly as possible cannot be understated" (p. 17). Students in this phase often expect their instructor to be available at all times, 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. Although this is the initial reaction of both students and instructors, Myers-Wylie et. al. explain:

> There is a fine balance in responding to students' discussion posts. Yes, it is important for the student to get feedback as soon as possible. However, responding too soon or to often can stifle a discussion as students start to wait and rely on the instructor for responses instead of responding to one another. (p. 17)

In Conrad and Donaldson's Phase Two of engagement, the instructor plays the role of a "structural engineer," while the students are moving towards cooperating and collaborating with their peers. Boettcher and Conrad (2010) further define the role of the instructor in Phase Two as "Continuing strong teaching presence, guiding the learning of core concepts and spiraling and

connecting ideas and content; supporting community and work in small teams; balancing the need to cover content with the need for understanding" (p. 11).

In Phase Three, the instructor is able to take a step away from the course because the students are beginning their individual interest in and attention to their learning community. Myers-Wylie, Mangieri, and Hardy clarify Phase Three by stating: "This does not mean, 'Do not participate'. However, responding to one or two students a day is usually enough to keep discussions lively" (p. 18).

The final phase, Phase Four, students are then considered to be "partners" with the instructor, who has less of an instructive role at this point in the course. As these phases progress, the students take  on more responsibility to direct the course and their learning as the instructor slowly steps away from that director role. Boettcher and Conrad define this Phase, for the instructor, as "Letting go of the power" because this is when students take initiative to share independent ideas and group work amongst their peers.

In order to determine if an online community has developed, Palloff and Pratt have established the following criteria:

- Active interaction involving both course content and personal communication.
- Collaborative learning evidenced by comments directed primarily student to student rather than student to instructor.
- Socially constructed meaning evidenced by agreement or questioning, with the intent to achieve agreement on issues of meaning.
- Sharing of resources among students.
- Expressions of support and encouragement exchanged between students, as well as willingness to critically evaluate the work of others. (p. 31).

Although each of these criteria may not be simultaneously representative of ones online classroom, this is an ideal classroom setting in terms of student participation and community-building. Future online instructors, then, need to be aware of the communicative and collaborative potential of online students. Arguably, F2F students have an upper-hand at community-building: students can chat with each other before and after classes.

As a F2F instructor, I have witnessed student conversations occurring in the moments before my composition class begins: “Hey, you’re in my biology lab, right? Do you understand what is going to be on the test?” In terms of my involvement in this situation, I have done nothing to facilitate this learning community. This community has developed on its own. These interactions meet several of the aforementioned criteria of a learning community including active interaction, collaborative learning, and sharing of resources among students. The online classroom does not come with this inherent online learning community and unless created and fostered by the instructor and students, studies have indicated significant student dissatisfaction and lowered retention rates. Many online guidebooks for instructors recommend that online classrooms have a virtual “lounge” or discussion board area where students can come together and discuss topics unrelated to the course or their education in order to foster this similar type of community.

Understanding such relational differences between the F2F and online classroom helps to distinguish these environments and points out specific areas of training that need to be addressed in terms of online pedagogy. Again, though there are similarities in the relationships of students and instructors in the online classroom as compared to the F2F classroom, there are significantly different expectations in the roles of the instructor.

## No Significant Difference

According to Delfino and Persico (2007), online teacher training is most effective when conducted in the online environment itself. Therefore, as Chapter Three will discuss in further detail, this dissertation addresses the necessary changes to teacher training as an online education experience. In terms of teacher training representative of online learning, Palloff and Pratt (2007) are trying to distinguish themselves as scholars moving towards a pedagogy of online education rather than perpetuating technological training: "Regardless of the technology used, it should never serve as the driver of the learning process, but should be viewed as the vehicle through which learning occurs" (p. 90). Many of the previously mentioned scholars are rapidly trying to publicize their experiences with differences in the online classroom among periodic publications claiming that there is no difference between online and F2F.

Russell (1999) published *The No Significant Difference Phenomenon* citing over 300 studies that indicated that online student learning has no significant difference than learning F2F. *No Significant Difference* (*NSD*) now has a website that is continuously updated with literature claiming that online learning solely "does no harm" in comparison to F2F learning (FAQ, 2011). Essentially, this means that online education is not necessarily a positive development, but it does not detract from information learned F2F. Although on the surface this may indicate a large misstep in the desired direction of distance education, these are online claims regarding the questionable effectiveness of *technology*, not online education: "These studies tell me that there is nothing inherent in the technologies that elicits improvements in learning" (Russell, 1999, p. xii). Therefore, despite appearing to work against authors' movements towards online pedagogy, *NSD* actually works in its favor to indicate that technology is not the vehicle by which learning occurs; good teaching is the vehicle. Clark (1994) "advocates the separation of medium and

methodology in research on educational technology, and feels that it is the method, rather than the medium that influences learning" (Cronjé, 2001, p.243). Therefore, good teachers are generated by effective and current teacher training programs.

## How Have we Developed our Standards for Online Education?

Some researchers would argue that the standards for training students and instructors to transition online have been nonexistent other than in our personal experiences with technology (Barkley and Bianco, 2001; Jenkins, 2011). Jenkins (2011) shared his arguments against the development of online education with his department and ultimately, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*: "With countless studies showing success rates in online courses of only 50 per cent—as opposed to 70-to-75 percent for comparable face-to-face classes—isn't it time we asked ourselves some serious questions?" (par. 4). The serious questions need to reconsider teacher training.

Essentially, higher education has the right foundational idea for online education: "the opportunity to teach and learn without the restrictions of time and space" (Hochberg, 2006, p. 130). However, the way in which it was slowly developed, as an extension of the physical classroom, has proved to be a disservice to online education, instructors, and students (Guasch, Alvarez, & Espasa, 2010; Granić, Mifsud, & Ćukušić, 2009; Kennedy, 2005; Lieblein, 2000; Maor, 2006; Palloff & Pratt, 2007; Rovai, 2000; Savenye, Olina, Niemcyzk, 2001) . As this dissertation will discuss, universities are only now considering online teaching as a discipline in its own right, rather than as an extension of the content area. Scholars are now reconsidering the functionality of online teacher training and what that will mean to restructuring universities. In order to best address the differences between F2F and online instruction, teacher training will

need to focus on the pedagogical concerns of the online environment regarding the specific needs of online students.

The 31st Edition of the MacMillan College Blue Book (2004) provides potential online students with things to consider as they choose an online institute of higher learning. Traditional colleges or universities, this text argues, "are established, well-known institutions with reputable faculty members and lots of experience in education… If they fall short, it is likely to be in the areas of instructional and information technology" (p. 25). So although courses, instructors, and institutions may be high quality, reputable institutions of higher education, their distance education departments may not share these credentials. Dykman and Davis (2008) explain that "The need for a consistent framework for online courses poses a real challenge for universities…The distinction that emerges here is that between a 'course designer' and a 'content specialist.' Conventional professors perform both roles, but this will change" (p. 159; qtd. in Bruckman, 2002; Gillette, 1999; Jones & Kelley, 2003; Porter, Griffiths, & Hedberg, 2003). Professors performing both roles could develop in different ways.

According to Myers-Wylie et. al., currently "Courses at most universities are written by professional curriculum writers. All of the courses are written in the same format, giving cohesiveness to the program and universities do not want you to deviate from this material due to accreditation concerns" (p. 20). The path that higher education is currently on will allow for instructional designers to completely decide on and design a course and only allow for instructors to facilitate the course with no say as to the content. Or, by training faculty in online education, they will be prepared for the hybrid role. For the most part, higher education has fallen into online education without deep consideration of the differences it holds from traditional instruction.

What currently exists in American higher education as "online pedagogy training" is a type of professional development, an afterthought to traditional education degree programs (Barrett, 2010; Clark-Ibáñez & Scott, 2008; Delfino & Persico, 2007; Hampel, 2009; Orleans, 2010). Universities including the University of North Carolina system, Drexel University, and Pennsylvania State University, as well as private certifying bodies such as @ONE offer certification programs for individuals who already hold degrees, teach online, and now want to pursue professional development related to their areas of specialization in online education. Typically, online instructors are hired for their at least master's-level knowledge in a subject area and are then platform trained to understand the technological constraints of universities' CMS. Dykman and Davis (2008) refer to this catching-up phenomenon as "credentialing vs. educating": Undoubtedly "online education is going to become more and more mainstream. And there will be increasing pressure for its acceptance as a credential on par with traditional education" (p. 162). This means that instructors are given a CV-credential to show that they *can* teach online, but are not educated to understand online pedagogy and the philosophies of online teaching. Until recently, higher education privileges the acquisition of knowledge about online teaching over learning about online teaching. It is my opinion that such a privilege is a mistake and may be leading to the higher drop rates for online courses and overall dissatisfaction and uncertainty of online education. Without properly credentialed instructors to teach our online courses and degrees, no wonder there is such disappointment in the effects of online education.

The idea of "credentialing vs. educating" can be thought of in terms of both instructors and students seeking degrees. Instructors' online teaching experiences and professional development opportunities need to be considered as equal to their F2F counterparts. Degrees

earned by students, likewise, need to be viewed by society as equal to the F2F version. Barrett (2010) considers the teacher training of credentialing in further detail:

> Further, they [instructors] have realized the need to update their teaching skills, practices, and strategies in order to accommodate the changing needs of the learners in the classroom, as well as updating their own teaching portfolio… virtual instructors today need to develop and enhance their teaching strategies and methodologies in order to meet the growing needs of today's online learning population… The online learning environment differs from the physical, live classroom setting… As a result, it is important for adequate and appropriate online training/instruction be afforded to this specific population of educators. (p. 18)

Online instructors need to have the educational background to match these credentials; they need education in online pedagogy. Instructors cannot rely on the working platform knowledge of a CMS and believe that to be the entire skill set necessary for teaching online. Cynthia Selfe and Gail Hawisher's CIWIC programs discussed earlier in Chapter Two provided instructors with a working knowledge of technology and manipulating computer programs to assist in the teaching of composition in a time *before* there were CMSs. I have encountered very few individuals willing to share their experience in conducting online courses without the use of a CMS (Kuipers, 2011; Saxon, 2011). Therefore, the majority of instructors introduced to, or facilitating, online education rely on a CMS and just fill in their assignments. Barrett presents a large challenge and undertaking to current higher education. Not only do we need to reconsider the way in which we offer online courses to students, we need to do a complete overhaul nationwide, if not worldwide, regarding education available to those who seek to teach online.

Barrett (2010) identifies some of the ways in which changes need to be made: “Due to the technological advancements in the online environment, online instructors must have a different type of skill sets in order to compete in today’s online learning environment” especially considering “student population, use of technology, and vast ranges of time zones shared by a variety of students in an online course” (p. 18). Though these are the specific foci of the research that Barrett conducts on online education, they certainly do not exhaust the list of differences (in Chapter One) between the online and F2F classroom. However, these differences are significant changes from the F2F classroom. F2F, all students are physically present. Online, time zones become an issue when students span states and countries (Lieblein, 2000). In this case, should instructors base the course off of *their* time zone? Or, should instructors take on the daunting task of working with each student based on their own time zone? How well can an online community be developed (which we have determined is crucial to online success) when students’ interactions must be cross-cultural or significantly delayed by time? Barrett likewise considers the requirements of an online instructor from the perspective of a Human Resources department: “A new type of employee is needed to fill online instructional positions, so candidates must have certain skill sets” (p. 18). Scholars like Barrett, Hewett and Powers (2005), and more recently, instructors at Boise State University (2011) are helping to demonstrate the necessity for reconsideration and reconfiguration of online teacher training to not just consist of technological training, but to consider the pedagogical goals unique to the online classroom.

Some United States State Departments of Education have taken the initiative in considering what the demand for online education means for their students, faculty, colleges, and universities. Maryland State Department of Education founded the Maryland Virtual Learning Opportunities at the primary and secondary level to better align curricula with available online

learning opportunities (Maryland Virtual Learning, par. 2). Maryland Virtual Learning Opportunities is not a school in and of itself; it provides supplemental learning opportunities for students that meets the designated curriculum of the Maryland State Department of Education. The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, which is a part of the State Board of Education, has developed the NC Public Schools' Distance Learning program to provide online learning opportunities and professional development opportunities for high school students throughout the state (NC Public Schools, par. 1).

North Carolina has also developed the NC Virtual Public School to make learning more accessible to those throughout the state that may have difficulties attending a physical state school or to "provide courses that students are unable to take at their local schools" (NC Public Schools, par. High School Courses). These programs are similar to "College in High School" programs that are available at community colleges nationwide, but they utilize the skills of teachers in the state of North Carolina to teach in subject areas in which they are especially trained and interested. In doing that, students who attend smaller public schools can still have the opportunities available to the students at larger public schools across the state. The North Carolina Virtual Public School allows high school students to participate in courses that may help them determine or supplement their career path. Although these programs currently exist at the primary and secondary levels, they demonstrate that the governing bodies of educative boards understand the growth of online education in the field of education. With state departments of education taking such an invested interest in online education in these states, it has spread to institutions of higher education in those states as well.

The University of Maryland's University College (UMUC) is one of the eleven institutions participating in the University System of Maryland. Though F2F courses are offered

through UMUC, it is highly regarded as an excellent virtual university. In order to teach online for UMUC, instructors must be qualified to teach at the college level in their respective field and participate in UMUC's WebTycho platform training (UMUC, par. Faculty Training). On par with current research suggestions, UMUC's WebTycho training has faculty training to

> participate first in the role of students, learning how to use the various features of the system, such as submitting assignments and working in study groups. They are then placed in the role of teachers, with other trainees assigned to their "class." For this portion of the training, trainees learn how to create assignments, manage online conferences, and provide student feedback. At the end of the training, trainees are evaluated on their attainment of a pre-established set of objectives and are certified upon successful fulfillment of these objectives. (par. CTLA 201)

UMUC has statistical information defending the quality of their WebTycho training in terms of faculty preparedness. However, it is not solely this platform training that instructors are required to take part in. The mandatory "Expectations for Classroom Setup and Online Teaching" provided to UMUC's online instructors provides not only the technological aspects of online teacher training, but the pedagogy and research behind the expectations. UMUC utilizes the Institute for Research and Assessment in Higher Education (IRAHE) for assistance in garnering the pedagogical and methodological reasons for their online suggestions. Instead of the technological training just having online instructors practice posting announcements, this guidebook provides supplemental information to help instructors succeed in their online classroom. For instance, the guidebook explains how instructors are to describe the assignments in the course syllabus, but then it also states that "IRAHE research findings show that students acknowledge and express satisfaction with clear goals and objectives and appreciate when a

detailed timeline and successive steps are set forth for meeting objectives" (par. Learning Activities). Explaining the process of online teaching is critical for instructor training because it is not just practicing a technological skill, but reinforcing the pedagogical reason for mastering that technological skill.

UMUC currently has four master's level degree options in its Distance Education program including three MDEs (Master of Distance Education) in Distance Education Policy and Management, Training Specialization, and Technology Specialization. They also offer a MS in Technology Management for Distance Education (UMUC Graduate Programs, par. Distance Education). Despite this tremendous accomplishment in course development, these programs are not accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the accrediting committee for the rest of the university system. Instead, the Master of Distance Education program is accredited by the European Foundation for Management Development- Technology-Enhanced Learning (EFMD-CEL) in Switzerland (UMUC, par. Accreditation). Internationally, distance education is referred to as information and communication technologically (ICT). EFMD-CEL (2011) is responsible for international accreditation of business and institutions of higher education that use technology as a primary means of communication. The goal of EFMD-CEL is "to raise the standard of technology-enhanced learning programmes worldwide" (Introductory Guide, par. Introduction). The organization claims, "The quality of both the products and programs in the field of ICT-based learning vary widely and there is still lacking a concept of quality improvement which is theoretically sound and at the same time meeting the expectations of practice" (EFMD-CEL Latest News, par. What is CEL?). That being said, EFMD-CEL is only responsible for accreditation of eleven programs worldwide with UMUC's MDE the only CEL-accredited program in the United States.

Prior to 2003, regional accreditation committees in the United States had a blanket ban on accreditation for online programs because they were determined to be not comparable to their F2F counterparts at the time (Bates & Poole, 2003, p. 19). According to Bates and Poole (2003), "many regional accreditation and professional qualification bodies are now moving away from a blanket ban on a particular mode of delivery. Instead, they are assessing the quality of the programs, irrespective of delivery methods" (p. 19). Although some regional accreditation committees are still not recognizing online courses to be as academically rigorous as F2F, there are three organizations in the United States that have developed their own sets of quality assurance standards for online education. First, the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunication serves as a division of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WCET, 2011b, par. WICHE). The standards of this organization consider:

- Institutional context and commitment
- Curriculum and instruction
- Faculty support
- Student support
- Evaluation and assessment (Bates & Poole, 2011, p. 20)

A second governing body is the Higher Education and Policy Council of the American Teachers Federation which has established fourteen guidelines for online learning:

1. Faculty must retain academic control.
2. Faculty must be prepared to meet the special requirements of teaching at a distance.
3. Course design should be shaped to the potential of the medium.
4. Students must fully understand course requirements and be prepared to succeed.
5. Close personal interaction must be maintained.

6. Class size should be set through normal faculty channels.
7. Courses should cover all material.
8. Experimentation with a broad range of subjects should be encouraged.
9. Equivalent research opportunities must be provided.
10. Student assessment should be comparable.
11. Equivalent advisement opportunities must be offered.
12. Faculty should retain creative control over use and re-use of materials.
13. Full undergraduate degree programs should include same-time same-place coursework.
14. Evaluation of distance coursework should be undertaken at all times. (AFT, 2001, par. Press).

These guidelines set very tangible, general goals for institutions working within this frame of educational expectations. The guidelines also allow for positive teaching and learning experiences for students and faculty because of increased support services, course control being maintained by the instructor, and advisement opportunities. Although these specific guidelines fall into the more general categories given by other governing bodies, using the precise language assists in an institution's abilities to follow and adapt the guidelines to their institution.

Another organization in the United States offering standards for online education is the Institute for Higher Education Policy (IHEP). IHEP is funded by the National Education Association and Blackboard Inc., the course management software company (Bates & Poole, 2003, p. 21). In completing a study of six institutes of higher education (including UMUC), 24 benchmarks were considered mandatory "to ensure quality in Internet-based distance education" (The Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2000, p. 2). The benchmarks are split into six

categories: institutional support, course development, course structure, student support, faculty support, and evaluation and assessment (IHEP, p. 2). These benchmarks range from institutional support such as electronic security measures to assessing students' self-motivation and commitment to online learning to methods of institutional evaluation. IHEP strives to consider online education from a new paradigm because this type of teaching and learning varies significantly from the traditional methods of education throughout history. The full report from this study explains the process of gathering some forty-five benchmarks of online learning from current literature and observation at the six institutions and combining or condensing them based on similarities and overlap. What sets these standards apart from others is that they consider online education in its own context, separate from the F2F part of their respective institutions. This is an invaluable perspective to take because there *is* a new standard for admissions, student retention, add/drop rates, and student or faculty expectations for online education. While there may be some similarities to F2F, the lack of the physical significantly alters these dynamics.

Discipline-specific organizations such as the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) have recently taken a stance on developing and identifying best practices for teaching writing online. In 2013, CCCC will hold a Committee on Best Practices for Online Writing Instruction to consider the following four concepts:

> Charge 1: Identify and examine best strategies for online writing instruction using various online media and pedagogies primarily used for the teaching of writing in blended, hybrid, and distance-based writing classrooms, specifically composition classrooms, but including other college writing courses.

> Charge 2: Identify best practices for using online instruction specifically for English language learners and individuals with disabilities in coordination with related CCCC committees.
>
> Charge 3: Create a Position Statement on the Principles and Standards for OWI Preparation and Instruction. In consultation with the Assessment Committee and the Task Force on Position Statements, review and update the 2004 Position Statement "Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments."
>
> Charge 4: Share best practices in OWI with the CCCC membership in a variety of formats. (CCCC, 2011, par. Committee Charge)

The 2004 Position Statement on Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environment serves as a catch-all for the increasing popularity and demand for online writing instruction across American higher education. The charges listed in this position statement revolve around familiarizing ourselves with technology—both instructors and students—and learning how technology operates in our pre-existing writing courses. The position statement also names that "Department, college, and institutional policies and procedures should acknowledge the time and intellectual energy required to teach writing digitally. This work is located *within a new field of expertise* [emphasis added] and should be both supported—with hardware and software—and recognized" (CCCC, 2004, par. Assumptions). This charge was significantly ahead of its time in 2004 in naming online education as "a new field of expertise" and should continue to be listed in the 2013 revisions of the position statement until educational offerings in higher education match this belief.

The regional accrediting organizations, Middle States Commission, New England Association, North Central Association, Northwest Commission, Southern Association, and the

Western Association of Schools and Colleges, divide the United States into six geographical regions of accreditation for higher education (US Department of Education, 2011, par. Regional Accrediting Agencies). The Middle States Commission on Higher Education is responsible for accreditation of Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland (including UMUC), New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands "including distance education programs offered at those institutions" (par. Middle States Commission). Since the institution of focus in previous sections, UMUC, falls into the jurisdiction of the Middle States Commission, this dissertation will more closely consider the standards of that agency over the others. Since UMUC is currently the only university in the United States to have achieved accreditation for an online pedagogy degree program, their programs will be the focus for content and context for developing such a program. In order for a program to be accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, an institution or program must meet fourteen standards regarding the institutional context and the educational effectiveness (Middle States, 2011, par. The Standards at a Glance). In terms of the institutional context, the standards are mission and goals; planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal; institutional resources; leadership and governance; administration; integrity; and institutional assessment. In terms of educational effectiveness, the standards are student admissions and retention; student support services; faculty; educational offerings; general education; related educational activities; and assessment of student learning. These are, therefore, the standards that this dissertation will take into consideration when designing a degree program in online pedagogy. We have already established that student retention is of considerable concern in online courses as compared to F2F. Perhaps without current faculty sufficiently educated in online pedagogy, a program would not be fully considered for this type of accreditation. This dissertation will consider the

standards of the Middle State Commission for further consideration of an online pedagogy degree program.

## Guidebooks for Online Instructors

Once a program has been established in online pedagogy, another challenge is finding supporting texts to use in the course. In conducting this research, I found only eight online guidebooks relevant to online pedagogy. Although this is not an exhaustive list of online guidebooks, these are the texts that discuss online teaching generally and are not limited to a specific content area. These texts provide a holistic view of online teaching and are designed for an instructor that is new to distance education. The following are brief synopses of these texts; analysis of these texts will come in Chapter Four of this dissertation.

### McVay Lynch

Marguerita McVay Lynch's (2002) *The Online Educator: A Guide to Creating the Virtual Classroom* makes a plea to instructors and administrators to "regroup and look at education from a systems perspective instead of from the perspective that one can slap technology on to an existing system and make it work" (p. 2). In order to define the new parameters of online education, both pedagogical and technological, McVay Lynch defines three foundational rules of online learning for potential instructors: "The first rule in Web-based education is that we must push beyond our comfort zone"; "The second rule in Web-based education is plan, plan, plan, and then do more planning"; and "The third rule in Web-based education is that interactive communication is paramount" (p. 3). By understanding these rules as a foundation to developing ones' online teaching philosophy and persona, McVay Lynch claims that chances will be increased for more meaningful and successful online teaching experiences.

**Hewett and Ehmann**

Beth Hewett and Christa Ehmann's (2004) *Preparing Educators for Online Writing Instruction* develops material appropriate for a training program in online writing instruction (OWI). The pedagogical principles defined in this text are designed from two principles of contemporary education: "there is greater pressure for teachers to use technology than ever before" and "instructors need new skills for teaching in the online environment" (p. xi). Hewett and Ehmann use the phrase "the online training spiral" to describe the misconception that online instruction is interchangeable with F2F instruction, and *Preparing Educators* tries to combat that assumption. The authors present pedagogical theories regarding online instruction, which are then supplemented with descriptions of practical methods of utilizing these skills in an online classroom.

**Ko and Rossen**

Ko and Rossen's (2004) *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide* strives to provide an overview to online instructors in regards to understanding institutional resources, course design, understanding the role of the online instructor, creating an effective online syllabus, building an online classroom, understanding student activity in the online classroom, recognizing copyright and intellectual property laws, and pedagogical suggestions for communicating and operating within the online classroom.

**Palloff and Pratt**

Palloff and Pratt's (2007) *Building Online Learning Communities: Effective Strategies for the Virtual Classroom* begins with the premise that:

> the only books available on the topic of online learning focused mainly on how to set up a Web page by using HTML, devoting little or no attention to how to teach online. As

> frustrated as our colleagues with the lack of literature on this topic, we set out to explore the territory of online teaching and not focus on the technology involved with course delivery. (p. xiii).

The foundation for Palloff and Pratt's understanding of the key differences between online and F2F instruction came in the realization of the importance of learning communities in an online classroom.

**Herrington, Hogdson, and Moran**

Herrington, Hodgson, and Moran's (2009) *Teaching the New Writing: Technology, Change, and Assessment in the 21st-Century Classroom* makes the claim that present-day teaching is outdated, in terms of pedagogy, because of the role that technology plays in the classroom. This collection features ten authors' (not counting the editors) accounts of the shifts in pedagogy based on technology in their respective type and level of classroom: elementary and middle school, secondary grades, and the college years.

**Warnock**

Warnock's (2009) *Teaching Writing Online: How & Why* focuses on the concept of "migration," in which online instructors take the skills they have developed in a F2F classroom and the material they have prepared for their F2F classroom and simply migrate, with that information, into the online classroom. In developing this concept, though, Warnock defines and explains in detail the various differences between an online and F2F classroom which impact instruction and student learning.

**Boettcher and Conrad**

Boettcher and Conrad's (2010) *The Online Teaching Survival Guide: Simple and Practical Pedagogical Tools* defines ten core learning principles to set the framework for their theoretical perspective on online pedagogy. The ten principles are:

Principle 1: Every structured learning experience has four elements with the learner at the center.

The first core learning principle asserts that all structured learning experiences are created by the interaction of four elements:

- The learner as the center of the teaching and learning process
- The faculty mentor who [*sic*] directs, supports, and assesses the learner
- The content knowledge, skills, and perspectives that the learner is to develop and acquire
- The environment or context within which the learner is experiencing the learning event [*sic*] (p. 21).

Principle 2: Learners bring their own personalized and customized knowledge, skills, and attitudes to their experience.

Principle 3: Faculty mentors are the directors of the learning experience.

Principle 4: All learners do not need to learn all course content; all learners do not need to learn the core concepts.

Principle 5: Every learning experience includes the environment or context in which the learner interacts.

Principle 6: Every learner has a zone of proximal development that defines the space that a learner is ready to develop into useful knowledge.

Principle 7: Concepts are not words but organized and interconnected knowledge clusters.

Principle 8: Different instruction is required for different learning outcomes.

Principle 9: Everything else being equal, more time on task equals more learning.

Principle 10: We shape our tools, and our tools shape us. (p. 20)

As demonstrated by these principles, online instructors must seek a metacognitive understanding of the decisions made when setting up an online classroom (which is a process of learning) and not a sole reliance on the CMS or software program.

**Frey, Fisher, and Gonzalez**

Frey, Fisher, and Gonzalez's (2010) *Literacy 2.0: Reading and Writing in the 21st Century Classroom* discusses specifically the changes in literacy requirements and expectations in the classroom as a result of web-based communication and Web 2.0 technologies. Focusing on the role of specific technologies such as text messaging, YouTube, Wimba, and e-books, the authors seek to define pedagogical purposes and places in the classroom (both online and F2F) for these tools as well as how they have changed traditional notions of teaching and communication.

## Where Do we Need to Go with Online Teacher Training From Here?

Scholars have agreed that a shift in paradigm regarding online teacher training is necessary for continued success in higher education (Fitzpatrick & Davies, 2003; Hampel, 2009; Smith, 2008). Also in agreement is that changes in educational standards for online instructors are necessary to meet the expectations and needs of this demographic of instructor (Barrett 2010). In spite of these two factors, though, higher education has not made the connection that what needs to change are teacher education programs.

In terms of online education, scholars in the field need to reevaluate the decisions of the past and restructure the framework of teacher training. Such an evaluation will involve some restructuring of the mindsets of administrators and computer science departments, who have been relying on the set up of a platform to lay the groundwork for online classes. Jenkins (2011) shares a story of a department meeting in which he suggested that students be screened upon entering college in technological capabilities in the same manner in which they are tested for math and writing levels. However, his suggestion

> was met with stony silence. Then the administrator running the meeting let me know, in no uncertain terms, that the college would never go for that idea, because it would limit online enrollment at a time when growth was needed for budget reasons. In other words, 'We don't care what happens to students at the end of the class. We just need them to sign up and stay on the roster long enough to count as enrolled.' (par. 15)

Although such a restructuring may be an unpleasant and time-consuming change to make to higher education, an assessment of technological capabilities needs to take place to ensure that students are prepared for online education. Instructors, likewise, who are already being screened at the human resources level for technological skills for an online course, need to have the education to support their careers. It is no longer in the best interest of students and institutions to offer "quick and dirty" online training. Instructors need to be sufficiently trained in both the acquisition and learning aspects of online pedagogy to meet the needs of their online classroom. Therefore, the goal of this dissertation is to present tangible ways in which current curriculum for college-level instructors can be adapted to better suit the technological *and pedagogical* needs and expectations of present day instructors.

# CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

## HOW CAN WE MAKE THESE CHANGES?

### Research Approach

Due to the amount of qualitative and quantitative studies already conducted on effectiveness of online platforms and online pedagogy indicated in Chapter Two, I will conduct rhetorical inquiry for this dissertation. After researching and reading current literature on online education, I have found that empirical research consumes many of the publications with little to no rhetorical analysis of findings. The more empirical studies are conducted, the more problems or questions are found with online education as it currently stands. Using rhetorical research to consider problems with online teacher training will not only help to clarify the findings of the empirical studies, it can also lay groundwork for change. While empirical research may be prevalent in current publications, "Empirical research is only one of several types of research being conducted in composition studies. Other modes of inquiry include historical, linguistic, philosophical, and rhetorical" (Lauer & Asher, 1988, p. 3). Rhetorical research, according the Lauer and Asher (1988), "stands for inquiry that proceeds largely by deduction and analogy, that starts with probably theoretical premises, examines these premises, posits new theory derived from the premises, and argues for its viability" (p. 4).

Using rhetorical models of Mayers (2005) and Faigley (1992), this dissertation follows the chronological nature similar to those researchers and presents a possible solution to the issue of teacher training for online instructors. Mayers designates the goal of his text *(Re)Writing Craft* to "build upon… scholarship and provide an extensive and systematic consideration of the past, present, and possible future relationships between composition and creative writing in the realms of theory, pedagogy, and institutional/disciplinary structures" (p. xi). As the preceding chapters

of this dissertation indicates, I, too have traced the history of online education as it impacts the field of composition in order to consider its necessary future movements, especially in terms of teacher training. By reviewing scholarship thus far cross-discipline in consideration of online education, I have been able to navigate and evaluate the decisions that have been made up to train teachers.

As scholars indicated in chapter two begin to discuss, a major reform needs to take place in the online teacher training in American higher education in order to better suit the needs of universities, instructors, and students. Mayers, in considering composition and creative writing, describes the challenge of trying to " 'unite' literary studies with other strands of English studies" in order to demonstrate the effective working relationship of the two subdisciplines (p. xv). Ultimately, Mayers "contend[s] that creative writers and compositionists together should strive to invert the traditional hierarchy of English studies," which is, to those in the field of English studies, a radical modification to traditional methodology and manner of thinking (p. xv). I draw parallels to my contestation of the traditional method of teacher training which is suited solely to the teaching of F2F instructors and has, for the most part, not be modified for online education in recent decades. Although it will always be necessary to draw on the past to provide guidance for the future, we cannot solely rely on traditional F2F methods of educating students while not acknowledging or adapting to meet current online needs.

Faigley's (1992) *Fragments of Rationality* chronologically follows the integration of technology into composition, bearing in mind the position of the postmodern. In doing this, Faigley touches upon many aspects of the field of composition including the integration of technology and its ramifications. As indicated in Chapter Six "The Achieved Utopia of the Networked Classroom," Faigley's networked classroom created a unique opportunity to view the

composition student as a new type of individual. Students' descriptions, self-identification, discussions, voices, and tones were not the same online as they were in the F2F classroom (p.197). In the realization of the differences in an online media, Faigley is able to make a number of claims including that "The introduction of electronic forms of writing…have forced a reconsideration of the nature of writing" (p.228). Bearing in mind that technology is not yet as universal as it seems in our discussion, we can not yet fully understand the ramifications of technology on the student-teacher relationship or modes of communication. However, as Faigley indicates, we know that there is a significant difference in online than our traditional F2F. The type of rhetorical research conducted by Faigley in this chapter demonstrates, similar to Mayers, a reliance on the past to explain the present; and a need to critically examine the present in order to help pave the way for the future.

Hikins and Cherwitz (2010) take the research position of "rhetorical perspectivism", an outlook which "unites 'thinking' (reflection) and 'doing' (action), enabling scholars to leverage knowledge for social good" (p.115). In their research, then, Hikens and Cherwitz "contend that engagement… can best flourish when its theoretical foundations rest upon rhetorical perspectivisim" (p. 115). Likewise, I believe in the positioning that Swartz (1997) takes in defining his rhetorical research as an extension of critical theory (p. 5). In considering the social positioning of a research subject, Swartz explains that rhetorical study "invites the opportunity for social change" (p. 5). Likewise, Swartz defines that this connection between critical theory and rhetorical studies "bridges the gap between 'theory' and 'practice' in our discipline" (p. 5). By working within this rhetorical framework, I will be able to bridge the gap between the theory of online pedagogy currently existing in publications and at very few institutions and to demonstrate its need to be practiced in higher education. As Aronowitz (1992) explains, "Critical

theory proceeds from the theorist's awareness of his [or her] own partiality. Thus theory is neither neutral nor objective. Its partisanship consists in its goals" (p. xiv). This dissertation, as a combination of current scholarship in the field of online education and as a degree program in online pedagogy, will demonstrate my partiality towards the development of online pedagogy.

Bronner and Kellner (1989) support rhetorical research of this nature explaining that "critical theory is not a single doctrine or unified worldview. Instead, it is a set of basic insights and perspectives which undermine existing 'truths'" (p. 3). Although this dissertation will be designed as a starting point for universities to adopt a model for change, I do not imagine that this movement will be extremely popular or fast paced. However, I do believe that a movement towards online pedagogy is necessary for the further development of online study and the accreditation and reputation of online higher education.

Specifically, this disssertation will follow the rhetorical positioning as described in Lauer and Asher's explanation of rhetorical research as "entail[ing] several acts: (1) identifying a motivating concern, (2) posing questions, (3) engaging in heuristic search (which in composition studies has often occurred by probing other fields), (4) creating a new theory or hypothesis, and (5) justifying that theory" (p. 5). Lauer and Asher also cite rhetorical research as the type of work of composition theorists Moffet (1968), Kinneavy (1980), and Young, Becker, and Pike (1970): "Each one started with a *motivating dissatisfaction*" (p. 4). Specifically:

> Moffett was bothered by a disparity between the emphasis on English as a content field and studies of children's cognitive development. Kinneavy was troubled by a confusion between aims and modes of discourse. Young and colleagues were concerned about the lack of an "art" of invention. These irritations were motivating because they did not turn into free-floating anxiety, but instead were transformed into catalysts for inquiry, into

> *questions* that specified directions for research, that pointed out what was needed to eliminate these perceived inadequacies. (p. 5)

In much the same way, this dissertation has demonstrated my personal, and the field of composition's, dissatisfaction with the way in which teachers are being prepared for their online teaching assignments. The misalignment of current online teacher training and actual online classroom responsibilities serves as the catalyst for the forthcoming posing questions of this dissertation.

> In order to generate a text-based rhetorical inquiry into a dissatisfaction, theorists went to other disciplines looking for ways in which similar problems had been addressed. Moffett found Langer's notion of structure and Piaget's theories of cognitive development. Kinneavy turned to semiotics. Young and co-workers studied the inquiry processes of linguists, scientists, and artists. In other words, they used work in other fields as heuristics, as analogies to help them go beyond the known. (Lauer and Asher, 1988, p. 5)

Thus, after identifying my motivating concern for such research, this dissertation is considering what literacy studies could add to the understanding of rhetorical inquiry into online teacher training. Specific data sources for this dissertation will follow later in chapter three.

## Motivating Concern and Posing Questions

The motivating concern for this dissertation is the failure in higher education to systematically provide and research the best methods for training online instructors to teach effectively and successfully online. Therefore, the posing questions are:

1. How does literacy in other fields translate into improving technological literacy for online instructors?

2. How can a systematic use of acquisition and learning be applied to the development of technological and pedagogical skills for teachers who want to teach composition online?
3. What would a single course design and a graduate-level degree program in online pedagogy, balancing acquisition and learning, include? And why?

## Heuristic

The heuristic used in this dissertation is the use of Gee's translation of learning and acquisition from second language studies (Krashen) to New Literacies Studies, as identified in Chapter One. In reviewing the literature of online education and through my own experience, I have determined that a change needs to be made to online teacher training in order to better prepare online instructors for the unique experience of the online classroom. Therefore, I see a possible solution to the problem through the continuation of acquisition and learning in New Literacy Studies and will pursue this research to determine if the problems of online teacher training may be solved through a combination of acquisition and learning.

## Creating a New Hypothesis

By extending the definition of acquisition and learning through Krashen and Gee to New Literacy Studies, there is a possibility of achieving a balance in the acquired technological skill and learned pedagogical skill online instructors need to be successful in their classrooms. Although New Literacy Studies focuses on writing, increased competence with technological literacy is a type of New Literacy Study as well. Therefore, online teacher training must seek to balance acquisition of technological skill and developing knowledge of online pedagogy in some way in order for instructors to be adequately prepared.

## Justifying the New Hypothesis

Current training available to online instructors too heavily values the technological aspects of course creation, rather than the instructors' skill level in *teaching* online. Hewett and Ehmann Powers (2007), some of the leading researchers in training for online education, explain:

> those who are teaching online and administering such programs also need orientation and training for their own readiness in the online environment. They need training at the organizational and programmatic levels for more than their technical platform-specific skills development. Of equal if not greater importance, online educators need training for the practical and theoretical transfer of pedagogical principles and practices to online environments. (p. 1)

Although in the past online instructors could make due with the F2F training that they had received, now is a time when there is enough research on online education theory and practice to fully distinguish itself as a field from F2F education. More specifically, according to Hewett and Ehmann Powers, "professionals cannot rely solely on methods deemed successful in conventional, brick-and-mortar situations; rather, they need instructional approaches that address distinctive qualities of teaching and learning online" (p. 2). Universities can no longer rely on their traditional education programs to meet the needs of potential online instructors. Universities that offer online courses also need to find the most qualified candidates for teaching in their courses: those that have been trained in online pedagogy. There are also extensive offerings for certificate programs in online education, discussed in Chapter Two of this dissertation, that serve as a starting ground for understanding all necessary components for an extensive online pedagogy program.

Therefore, this dissertation will be utilized as a tool for generating a graduate-level course in online pedagogy for addition into graduate programs in education or in specific fields of study (such as composition) where graduates take jobs as educators in the field. This dissertation will also create a structure for an education degree (ideally, masters' level, but adaptable to undergraduate) in online pedagogy.

**Creating Appropriate Curriculum**

Although some institutions are working towards generating courses and programs in online pedagogy, there needs to be a uniform approach to this development as there has been for other disciplines across the nation. In American popular culture of the 1960s and 1970s, feminist movements paved the way for activism and social reform. Once a popular social movement, though, Women's Studies made its way into academia at the then San Diego State College (now San Diego State University):

> In the late 1960s, the student community of San Diego Sate University became very much involved in the social movements of that era. New academic departments emerged from the demands of cultural causes. Africana Studies, Chicana and Chicano Studies, and Native American Studies all emerged within a short time. In the midst of these upheavals, the Women's Studies Program was born. (SDSU Women's Studies, par. History)

Beginning as an informal organization and growing into a degree-granting program, Women's Studies is now a common degree program across American colleges and universities. Our universities are not and should not remain frozen in time, but rather, as the example of Women's Studies demonstrates, universities should react to the social changes taking place in educational and popular culture.

Scholars have begun the somewhat underground movement towards the recognition of online pedagogy as a necessary program of study in much the same manner of Women's Studies. There are multiple informal organizations and certificate-granting programs related to online pedagogy that are becoming formally recognized and operated. However, no programs or courses currently in existence meet the criteria of accreditation committees in the United States. Therefore, the course and program structure designed in this dissertation follow the guidelines of state departments of education, current programs in existence such as UMUC, and the standards set forth by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Since the current existence of an online pedagogy program is at UMUC and the context of this dissertation is that of a Pennsylvania State School, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education is the regional accreditation association of this jurisdiction (WorldWideLearn, 2011, par. United States). Colleges and universities in states part of another regional accreditation association can adjust portions of the proposed curriculum appropriately to match any variable standards of that association.

Both the single course design and the master's level curriculum are designed for mid-sized state institutions that already have some web-based courses such as Indiana University of Pennsylvania or UMUC. The reason for this is so that a university looking to adopt a course or program would have the minimal technological capabilities available through the institution to best serve the needs of these potential online students. The curriculum is not designed for institutions who are newly integrating web-based coursework into curriculum or who may not have other degree programs already available online. The reason for this is so that institutions that already have some web-based courses will have the support systems available to assist online students and faculty.

## Data Sources

This dissertation will examine current directions of online teacher training established by educational sources including: NCTE position statements on distance education, Middle States Accreditation standards, published guidebooks on online learning (outlined in Chapter Two), and various universities worldwide with current distance education degree programs. After defining the positioning of these educational sources, I will recommend program and institutional changes required in order to make online learning successful for students, instructors, and institutions based on discovered imbalances in acquisition and learning.

This dissertation will heavily rely on the field of composition studies' current position within the realm of online education, but will be cross-disciplinary in that the ultimate goal of this dissertation will be to create a degree program in online pedagogy. This type of degree would be focused on the educational processes of online learners and not specific to a content area of study.

### Middle States Accreditation Standards

The Middle States Accreditation Council is the governing agency for university accreditation for Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands and operates as one of only six college and university accreditation agencies in the United States. The accreditation standards of each of these six governing bodies provide strict rules for departments, programs, and universities to follow in order to maintain their affiliation with the accreditation agency. The Middle States Accreditation standards, which are readily available as .pdf files from the Middle States website, were used to guide the program requirements and recommendations for a graduate degree program in online pedagogy.

### NCTE Position Statements on Distance Education

The NCTE Position Statements on Distance Education are a list of goals related to distance education by the most prominent organization in the field of composition studies. These position statements, which are readily available on the NCTE website, were used to guide program requirements and recommendations for a graduate degree program in online pedagogy.

### Published Guidebooks on Online Learning

There are currently no textbooks readily available (to the best of my research) focusing on online pedagogy; there are, however, online guidebooks that discuss some pedagogical and technological concerns of online teaching, which have been outlined in Chapter Two. These guidebooks are available by a number of scholars in a number of fields, many of which are directed to a general audience of online educators rather than a specific demographic of instructor in a content area (i.e. an online teaching guidebook for nursing programs). Some guidebooks used in this dissertation are available online in the form of eBooks or broken down in databases by chapter and others were purchased specifically for the purposes of this research. Chapter Four will analyze the positions and arguments made in these texts.

### Institutions Worldwide with Current Online Education Degree Programs

In order to gain a comprehensive overview of the requirements of an online education degree program, this dissertation examined the program and course descriptions, program requirements, and course catalogs of multiple level online education programs throughout the world. Although accreditation was not a standard for using a program for this research, a programs' earned accreditation (or lack thereof) was taken into consideration in the amount of scholarship gleaned from the publications.

## Methods for Analysis

As previously noted, this dissertation aims for the combination of theory and practice demonstrated by Swartz. Therefore, the goal of this dissertation is not just to theorize the appearance and integration of an online pedagogy, but also to create a set of coursework options for universities to adopt to current teacher or teacher-scholar programs by enacting the current theories and guidelines available related to online pedagogy. In order to generate these programs, the data sources were read and analyzed to determine outlines, standards, requirements, and goals of the individual course and degree program.

The first option will be a specific course to be integrated and adopted across disciplines to teach online pedagogy to those that seek employment as an instructor in higher education. The second option will be a framework for a Master's level degree program in Online Education designed to take place completely online. There are multiple options for integration because of the high level of current separation between teacher training and online teacher training. Essentially, American higher education is so far behind in offering quality *education* for those who seek to teach online that it is going to be a very difficult task to integrate entire degree programs, despite the urgent need for this development.

Therefore, I propose to universities interested in integrating online pedagogy into current curriculum that they begin with a single course. This type of course could be modified to be only a section of a single course. For instance, my doctoral program in Composition and TESOL at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) requires that students take a course entitled *Teaching Writing*. If IUP were to follow the lead of this dissertation, they may not be able to automatically integrate a *Teaching Writing Online* course into current curriculum, so they could modify what is currently being taught in *Teaching Writing* to include a consideration of online pedagogy in

terms of writing instruction. Although this is a very small step, it may be much more manageable for immediate integration of online pedagogy into a current program until higher education is able to catch up the quality of teacher training for online instructors. At first, instructors in these established fields and departments may not feel equipped, trained, or interested in adding information about online pedagogy to their current courses. This hesitation is to be expected, but until universities have faculty members specifically trained for online education, we will have to make due with the knowledge and experience of current faculty.

Until a time when masters and doctoral-level instructors are sufficiently trained in online pedagogy, I believe that instructors will have to solicit the input and experience of the students in the program in order to discuss this topic sufficiently and at length. Also, instructors of this (or similar) courses should require students to familiarize themselves with names, articles, journals, and scholarship in the field of online pedagogy in order to prepare them for the vast array of opportunities branching from content area study. Admittedly, these steps will be a slow start to a very fast-paced and growing field of study, but are necessary to catching up and thoroughly training students and faculty for the technological and pedagogical needs of online education.

# CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

## Findings from Data Sources

As already defined in Chapter Three of this dissertation, the data sources used to determine effective strategies for appropriately training online instructors are as follows: Middle States Commission on Higher Education Accreditation Standards, Middle States Hallmarks of Quality in Distance Education Programs, NCTE Position Statements on Distance Education, published guidebooks in online education[3], and various institutional offerings in online education and pedagogy[4]. In following Lauer and Asher's (1988) process of rhetorical research, this dissertation has already identified a motivating concern and posed questions to answer through examination of the data sources named in Chapter Three ( p.5).

Since a field of online pedagogy has yet to be thoroughly developed in higher education or research, this dissertation sought sources from a variety of sources outside of the realm of distance education including, but not limited to, New Literacy Studies. The information garnered from each data source is framed by technological literacy with acquisition and learning as viable components of this type of literacy education. Each type of data source plays a significant role in the understanding and development of a degree program suitable for training online instructors which is why I selected them for analysis in this chapter. More specifically, in this chapter, I

[3] McVay Lynch. (2002). *The Online Educator: A Guide to Creating the Virtual Classroom;* Hewett and Ehmann. (2004). *Preparing Educators for Online Writing Instruction;* Ko and Rossen (2004). *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide*; Mulford (2005). *Online Education: 6 Steps to Starting an Online School*; Palloff and Pratt (2007). *Building Online Learning Communities: Effective Strategies for the Virtual Classroom*; Herrington, Hodgson, and Moran. (2009) *Teaching the New Writing: Technology, Change, and Assessment in the 21st Century Classroom;* Warnock (2009). *Teaching Writing Online: How & Why*; Boettcher and Conrad (2010). *The Online Teaching Survival Guide: Simple and Practical Pedagogical Tools*; Frey, Fisher, and Gonzalez (2010). *Literacy 2.0: Reading and Writing in the 21st Century Classroom*.

[4] Bainbridge College, Brown University, California State University Stanislus, Georgia Southern University, Greenfield Community College, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Lehman College, Monash University, Northeastern University, Parkland College, University of Central Florida, University of San Francisco, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, East Carolina University, Drexel University, Pennsylvania State University, @ONE (Fresno Pacific University), Walden University, The University of Sydney, The University of Melbourne, The University of Maryland University College.

present the critical information extracted from the data sources essential to understanding the educational opportunities already available in the field of online education and standards of quality in higher education.

From each of these sources, I have learned what has been already done to define technological literacy skills in online teacher training, particularly through standards developed in various guidebooks, as those are the leading publications for self-guided online teacher training. However, I have also determined that none of these resources go far enough to propose a degree program in online pedagogy informed by acquisition and learning. So although the raw material for generating this type of program is out there, it is only through examination, analysis, and synthesis of multiple sources, informed by acquisition and learning, that a successful degree program can be constructed. Programs in training online teachers must be envisioned at this juncture in the evolution of technology in education to be stand-alone, and courses in those programs must consciously employ, in some proportion tied directly to the subjects addressed in those courses, acquisition and learning as methods of imparting skills and knowledge.

**Middle States Accreditation Standards**

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education has developed fourteen standards for institutional and program evaluation that are separated into two categories: Institutional Context and Educational Effectiveness. These standards were introduced in Chapter Two, but are further analyzed in the following section. In order for an institution and/or program to be accredited through Middle States, institutions and/or programs must meet each of these criteria in both categories and navigate a lengthy application process including a paper application, a Middle States liaison institutional visit, an Application Assessment team visit, oral reports, and negotiation of applicant expectations (“Becoming Accredited,” p. 4-12).

When an institution makes a change including designing new degree levels, developing distance learning programs, adding locations, or changing ownership, the institution must file paperwork through the Substantive Change Process (p. 28). This application process asks the following two questions of the institutional change: "Is the proposed substantive change acceptable?" and "Does it materially affect the institution's capacity to earn accreditation before the candidate phase expires?" (p. 28). The context of the curriculum design of this dissertation, then, is developed for an institution that already maintains institutional accreditation through the Middle States Commission on Higher Education and would only need to file for Substantive Change in order to earn accreditation for the new degree program in online pedagogy. If an institution did not already meet the Middle States standards regarding institutional resources, assessment, and student support services (just to name a few) there would be a tremendous start-up initiative necessary for the degree in online pedagogy to be successful. However, an institution already familiar and aligned with the Middle States accreditation standards would have an easier implementation of a new program.

Programs added to institutions holding Middle States accreditation need to align with the fourteen standards previously established in Chapter Two of this dissertation. The purpose of this section is to explain, in detail, the standards set forth by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education as they relate to the course and degree program designed for this dissertation. The Institutional Context standards are defined for the purposes of this dissertation as:

**Standard 1: Mission and Goals[5].** This standard corresponds to an institutions' clear articulation of a mission statement and attainable goals that will lead to achieving that mission

[5] Institutions already holding Middle States Accreditation status may have a specific department or division responsible for seeking out and maintaining accreditation for the university in general or specific programs. Seeking MSSCHE accreditation for an online pedagogy program would be a joint effort between the department which will house the program and the appropriate administrative office, such as a Division of Academic Affairs.

statement (“Characteristics of Excellence,” p. ix). In order to comply with this standard, the degree program in online pedagogy for this dissertation will have a clearly defined mission statement and set of goals for the program.

**Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal.** This standard corresponds to ongoing institutional planning in terms of finances and assessment (“Characteristics of Excellence,” p. ix). In order to comply with this standard, the degree program in online pedagogy would need to be part of an institution with the financial and research capabilities already in place to support this standard.

**Standard 3: Institutional Resources.** This standard corresponds to “human, financial, technical, facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution’s mission and goals and are available and accessible” (“Characteristics of Excellence,” p. ix). In order to comply with this standard, the degree program in online pedagogy will need to ensure a highly developed institutional standard of institutional resources, especially in terms of technology and access to research materials comparable to those of face-to-face students of the same institution.

**Standard 4: Leadership and Governance.** This standard relates to the institutional role in developing policies and making decisions for the institution as a whole (“Characteristics of Excellence,” p. ix). Therefore, in order to comply with this standard, the degree in online pedagogy would need to be granted by an institution with a governing body already in place to support this standard.

**Standard 5: Administration.** This standard relates to the administrative structure of the university from departments through higher administration (“Characteristics of Excellence,” p. x). In order to comply with this standard, the degree in online pedagogy would need to adhere to the administrative structuring already in place at the institution. Specifically, this refers to

internal positioning structuring with individuals serving as department chairs, division chairs, and so forth as appropriate to the institution.

**Standard 6: Integrity.** This standard relates to the conduct of programs and individuals affiliated with the university, which must "demonstrate adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support to academic and intellectual freedom" ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. x). In order to comply with this standard, the degree in online pedagogy would need to align its departmental policies as set forth in a program handbook to the institutional policies relating to academic integrity, a student code of conduct, and the faculty handbook.

**Standard 7: Institutional Assessment.** This standard relates to the institution's ability to assess the effectiveness of courses and programs in order to monitor compliance with the mission statement, goals, and standards of accreditation ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. x). In order to comply with this standard, the department housing the degree in online pedagogy would need to determine effective means of course, program, faculty, and student evaluation in order to verify compliance with institutional mission statement, goals, and previously established standards of accreditation.

The Educational Effectiveness standards are defined for the purposes of this dissertation as:

**Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention.** This standard mandates that the institution "seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students' educational goals" ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. x). Specifically for this program, then, students will need to take a technological competency exam as part of the admissions process in order to assess their ability to function with a computer on a basic level. Basic computing level would include turning

on and off the computer, using a mouse and keyboard, accessing internet search engines appropriately and successfully, and basic word processing. In order to comply with this standard, the degree program in online pedagogy will have a clearly defined mission statement and set of goals for the program that define the type of individual perceived to be successful in this type of learning environment.

**Standard 9: Student Support Services.** This standard mandates the institution's ability to provide reasonable support services available to students in order to be successful in various programs ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. x). This is perhaps one of the most detailed standards related to the development of this program. In order to comply with this standard, the degree program in online pedagogy will need to be part of an institution that has a well-developed and staffed IT department available 24/7 in order to answer student questions in regards to CMS's and general technological needs. Also, the institution will need to have digital library resources comparable to the library resources of the ground campus, as well as a digital Writing Center (if a physical Writing Center is offered for F2F students). The institution and/or department also needs to be equipped to possibly provide students with free or reasonably priced software necessary for program involvement if it exceeds normal computer programming standards or is not available as a free download from the Internet.

**Standard 10: Faculty.** This standard mandates that program faculty members be "qualified professionals" in the field of study ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. x). Until a time when degree programs in online pedagogy are more readily available, faculty sufficiently trained in a degree-granting program of online or distance education will be scarce. Therefore, until more individuals are trained, teaching, researching, and publishing solely in the field of distance education, individuals deemed "qualified professionals" will be those with extensive experience

in teaching distance education and training in this subject area ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. x).

**Standard 11: Educational Offerings.** Perhaps the most crucial standard related to this dissertation is that the "institution's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence, appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings" ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. x). As a result of the information from these data sources, this dissertation has developed a 36-credit graduate level degree program in online pedagogy that follows predetermined guidelines set forth by a program mission statement and set of goals. These standards also seek to maintain a proportion of acquisition and learning as introduced in the first three chapters of this dissertation. More information about this proportion will be defined later in Chapter Four and in Chapter Five.

**Standard 12: General Education.** This standard requires that institutions have general education requirements, particularly for undergraduate students that require "at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency" ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. xi). In order to comply with these standards, the required core courses of the degree program in online pedagogy will address all of these general education requirements.

**Standard 13: Related Educational Activities.** This standard mandates that institutions have programs or activities that meet university-set foci and content ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. xi). In order to comply with this standard, the degree program in online pedagogy will be part of an institution with the means to provide activities (both on ground and digitally) for students enrolled in this program.

**Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning.** This standard sets forth certain benchmarks throughout programs that assess student learning progress appropriate to the courses, program mission statement, and set of goals ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. xi). In order to comply with this standard, the degree program in online pedagogy will maintain high academic standards in all individual courses to serve as benchmarks along the way. The program will also mandate a capstone course in which a student designs an entire course (content and technology) appropriate to online pedagogy learned throughout the program.

As discussed previously in this dissertation, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education maintains separate standards for Distance Education Programs. These standards are actually identified as "Nine Hallmarks of Quality" to identify compliance with Middle States Accreditation Standards as related to programs operating at a distance. Each of these hallmarks overlaps with the original Middle States Accreditation standards, save the positioning of the program within the university. The "Nine Hallmarks of Quality" require that distance education programs be considered part of the department that houses them and part of the same institution, not as sub-department or as a separate affiliated college within the university. Also, these hallmarks require that distance education programs and courses be held to all of the same academic, departmental, and institutional standards as their F2F counterparts. The distance education hallmarks of quality are as follows:

1. Online learning is appropriate to the institution's mission and purposes.
2. The institution's plans for developing, sustaining, and, if appropriate, expanding online offerings, are integrated into its regular planning and evaluation process.
3. Online learning is incorporated into the institution's system of governance and academic oversight.

4. Curricula for the institution's online learning offerings are coherent, cohesive, and comparable in academic rigor to programs offered in traditional instructional formats.
5. The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its online offerings, including the extent to which the online learning goals are achieved, and uses the results of its evaluations to enhance the attainment of the goals.
6. Faculty responsible for delivering online learning curricula and evaluating the students' success in achieving the online learning goals are appropriately qualified and effectively supported
7. The institution provides effective student and academic services to support students enrolled in online learning offerings
8. The institution provides sufficient resources to support and, if appropriate, expand its online learning offerings.
9. The institution assures the integrity of its online learning offerings. ("Distance Education Programs," p. 3).

The curriculum set forth by this dissertation strives to accomplish not just the nine hallmarks of quality in distance education, but all of the standards for curriculum and institutional development of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

For the purposes of this dissertation, the Middle States Accreditation Standards and Nine Hallmarks of Quality offer an institutional and program framework which the online pedagogy degree program needs to follow. Multiple standards require that the institution meet particular criteria prior to the establishment of a new program. Therefore, in order for a degree program to earn Middle States Accreditation, the institution that is adding this program needs to already hold accreditation in order to meet standards such as Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional

Renewal; Institutional Resources; Leadership and Governance; and Student Support Services. Each of the program-level standards have been defined and used to guide the mission statement, program goals, course descriptions, and student learning outcomes for each course.

**NCTE Position Statements on Distance Education**

The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) is the leading organization in English education at all levels (K-higher education) in terms of publications, professional development, and research opportunities. NCTE has developed a constitution for guiding the groups' membership and governing authority. One of the sections of the NCTE Constitution regulates that:

> positions on education issues are established by resolutions passed at the Annual Business Meeting for the Board of Directors and Other Members of the Council during NCTE's Annual Convention each November or by 2/3 vote of the NCTE Executive Council. (NCTE, 2011b)

Therefore, in order for an issue to be established as an NCTE position statement, a member has to propose the idea to the Executive Committee and a majority of the committee has to agree on its relevance to the field and importance in English education. The purpose of this section is to explain the two NCTE position statements related to distance education that impact the design of and courses included in the degree program in Chapter Five of this dissertation.

In the past ten years, two position statements were released from NCTE organizations regarding distance education. In 2004, the *Conference on College Composition and Communication* (CCCC) released a "Position Statement on Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments". Although this position statement is specifically linked to *writing* in digital environment, the authors use research from the fields of composition and

distance education. This position statement does not mention anything regarding sufficient online writing instructor training, but does determine that digital writing courses should:

1. introduce students to the epistemic (knowledge-constructing) characteristics of information technology, some of which are generic to information technology and some of which are specific to the fields in which the information technology is used;
2. provide students with opportunities to apply digital technologies to solve substantial problems common to the academic, professional, civic, and/or personal realm of their lives;
3. include much hands-on use of technologies;
4. engage students in the critical evaluation of information (see American Library Association, “Information Literacy”); and
5. prepare students to be reflective practitioners. (National Council of Teachers of English, 2004).

This 2004 position statement from NCTE determines that digital writing courses should utilize both acquisition of technological skills and learning of online pedagogy as those terms have already been defined. Of the five charges listed in the position statement, I believe that two of them (2 and 3) are affiliated with technological acquisition, whereas three of them (1, 4, and 5) are focused on learning the theory behind the technology, as demonstrated in Table 1.

Table 1

*2004 NCTE Charge Categorization into Acquisition or Learning*

| 2004 NCTE Charge | Acquisition of Technical Skill | Learning Online Pedagogy |
|---|---|---|
| Charge 1 | | X |
| Charge 2 | X | |
| Charge 3 | X | |
| Charge 4 | | X |
| Charge 5 | | X |

In 2006, the Center for Excellence in Education (CEE) released a position statement entitled "Beliefs about Technology and the Preparation of English Teachers" that uses extensive research into the fields of education and computer-mediated-communication (CMC) to determine four necessary focal points of technology and teacher preparation:

> Focus 1: On the other hand, many new literacies and modes of inquiry require direct instruction on the use of hardware, peripherals, software, and interfaces.
>
> Focus 2: Theories to inform our thinking about text, language, literacy, as influenced by the latest technologies. Areas in which this group might read would include, for instance, semiotics, grammars of newer literacies, and languages being developed by newer technologies.
>
> Focus 3: Composing processes with multimodal and multimedia technological tools in efforts to create various types of text, including hypertext, hypermedia, web design, PowerPoint presentations, digital literacy portfolios, and digital video documents.

Focus 4: The political, economic, and socio-cultural influences operating upon the practice of the new literacies with the new technologies.

Although these position statements do not formally guide the creation of a new degree program in online pedagogy, they serve to inform this dissertation as to the current research on technological literacy in today's classrooms. The "Position Statement on Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments" demonstrates that a combination of acquisition of technological skills and learned online pedagogical knowledge will form a potential teacher training program. The second position statement, "Beliefs About Technology and the Preparation of English Teachers" strength lies in the first focus point: "Focusing on teaching new technologies rather than English language arts/literacy learning is short-sighted since many newer technologies have relatively short lifespans" (CEE, 2006). Therefore, a large exposure of technological acquisition will work against instructors because of the fast-paced nature of which technologies change. By pairing technology with "Theories to inform our thinking about text," as the position statement indicates, online instructors will be more adequately informed for their classrooms.

**Published Guidebooks on Online Learning**

As the field of online pedagogy begins to develop into its own discipline, researchers from other disciplines (such as composition) with an interest in online learning have been key players in generating research and publications for the masses. Guidebooks in online learning have become the staple for instructors transitioning from F2F to online classrooms. As of yet, there are no published textbooks in online pedagogy; therefore, instructors at all levels rely on guidebooks for assistance in both pedagogy and technology. Guidebooks are essentially advice books regarding online learning with a specific focus: building learning communities, effective

communication, or incorporation of a specific technology. It was necessary that this dissertation examine a number of online education guidebooks in detail to understand the availability of published sources available for individuals interested in learning about online teaching.

All of the guidebooks in the following sections are introduced and discussed in Chapter Two. Also, because the number of online guidebooks is still so limited (eight books are analyzed below), this dissertation also used scholarly journals cited in Chapter Two to inform the research. The purpose of this section is to give the reader detailed information about the guidebooks and to draw distinctions of the way acquisition and learning are employed in discussions of teacher training in these publications. The online guidebooks are analyzed in chronological order by publication date[6]:

**McVay Lynch.** McVay Lynch's recommendations from the 2002 guidebook *The Online Educator: A Guide to Creating the Virtual Classroom* are very fundamental; she identifies basic manipulations to instructors' mindsets that are necessary changes for online success. The three foundational rules that McVay Lynch identifies, as indicated in Chapter Two, are repeated in various publications and websites, particularly the mantra regarding planning for online courses. One of the major accomplishments of this text, I believe, is that McVay Lynch expresses "that it is time to regroup and look at education from a systems perspective instead of from the perspective that one can slap technology on to an existing system and make it work" (p. 2). I interpret this challenge to draw attention to the way we currently train online instructors: to take F2F teacher training and simply add technology to the mix, rather than reconsidering *what technology does* to that system of training. As the oldest (but still relevant) guidebook I found, this text calls to action a change still trying to be made today: recognition of online pedagogy as

[6] The guidebooks are presented in chronological order of publication to provide organization to the reader of this dissertation. Also, since the field of distance education is rapidly changing and adapting, I wanted the reader to note the date of publication as a marker of development.

its own discipline. Therefore, this text attempts to build foundational knowledge applicable to the argument for learning online pedagogy.

**Hewett and Ehmann.** Hewett and Ehmann's (2004) text, *Preparing Educators for Online Writing Instruction* offers practical suggestions to creating an online training program for instructors, particularly focused on learning about electronic communication between instructor and student. Hewett and Ehmann "have found that few straightforward transitions exist between traditional (face-to-face) and online contexts, we believe, [*sic*] there is something fundamentally different about teaching and learning in the virtual medium" (p. xiii). However, the authors also "believe that online teaching and learning *can work as a supplement and complement* to that which occurs in face-to-face settings" (p.xv). This belief perpetuates the misconception that online education is reliant upon F2F education as a model rather than a field of study on its own. Although this text provides practical suggestions and exercises, there is also a great deal of explanation of such processes, giving attention to both acquisition and learning.

**Ko and Rossen.** Building on the already established knowledge of traditional classroom teaching, Ko and Rossen's (2004) *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide* strives to take terms, concepts, and behaviors well defined in the classroom and offer suggestions as to the development of their online equivalent. These steps are made without relying on a direct translation; the authors emphasize: "the online environment is so different from what most instructors have encountered before" (p. 3). This text offers both practical exercises for instructors to use to learn about online pedagogy as well as explanation of familiar terms, concepts, and behaviors and translate them into technological skills an instructor can acquire for their online classroom. Therefore, this text demonstrates one of the most comprehensive compilations of acquisition and learning available in this set of guidebooks.

**Palloff and Pratt.** In order for an online instructor to be successful, Palloff and Pratt (2007) argue in their text *Building Online Learning Communities,* one must acquire a unique set of technological skills appropriate to the demographic of student in online courses beginning with a learned foundation in online educational theory. This text focuses on learning online pedagogy with particular emphasis on classroom interactions and the importance of developing a learning community.

**Herrington, Hodgson, and Moran.** The authors and editors of this text, *Teaching the New Writing: Technology, Change, and Assessment in the 21st-Century Classroom* share in collective frustration over the lack of technological or online pedagogy, which is the premise of the text. By collecting voices of instructors throughout various levels in education, these authors *are* successful in demonstrating the problem with 21st century education: we are using traditional methods of teacher training and then dropping technologies into classrooms expecting success. The editors particularly focus their argument against traditional education and teach training in regards to standardized testing available at all levels of academia. While each of the chapters has a different focus (technology or pedagogy), this collection serves as a strong demonstration of technological frustration throughout all levels of education, as well as a challenge to reconsider training for all potential online instructors.

**Warnock.** By asking questions such as "how is writing instruction different?" or "why teach writing online?," Warnock (2009) outlines key pedagogical differences between online and F2F instruction that complicate the process of migration he identifies. These differences include syllabi, assigning readings, giving feedback, conducting peer review and others. Although *Teaching Writing Online* provides a comprehensive look at the challenges of online learning, the concept of migration significantly undermines the acknowledgement and necessity of learning

online pedagogy. Within the overall argument being addressed by the field and by extension, this dissertation, Warnock's argument does not align with the forward progress of making online pedagogy its own field of study. So although Warnock's argument is unique in that it is specifically about writing instruction online, he is perpetuating an outdated stereotype of online learning.

**Boettcher and Conrad.** The organization of *The Online Teaching Survival Guide* (2010) makes it an invaluable tool for instructors new to online teaching. The first chapter, appropriately titled "Teaching Online—The Big Picture" relies minimally on the familiarity of F2F teaching for determining characteristics that make online learning unique. Chapter Two, "Theoretical Foundations" begins to develop basic online pedagogy necessary to understand the phenomena of online teaching. As the text progresses, the theory deepens and practical suggestions and exercises are included to assist further understanding. Besides the Ko and Rossen text, Boettcher and Conrad's *The Online Teaching Survival Guide* is the most comprehensive collection of pedagogical and technological suggestions available for online instructors. This book leads scholarship in the direction of viewing education in teaching online as a kind of literacy education. This therefore means that teachers will learn best how to teach online with a synergistic relationship between acquisition and learning.

**Frey, Fisher, and Gonzalez.**

Much like the Herrington, Hodgson, and Moran text, Frey, Fisher and Gonzalez (2010) in *Literacy 2.0* seem to have written this text out of frustration over the lack of established rules and learning standards related to Web 2.0 technologies in the classroom. The majority of this text gives practical technological exercises one could use in their classroom, but the strength of this text lies in the last chapter "Present Tense and Future Tensions." "Present Tense and Future

Tensions" not only discusses current problems with technological literacy, but speculates on the increased future challenges if nothing is done to develop online pedagogy. The authors argue for the necessity of technologically literate citizens, whom they believe are not being developed with online teaching and learning standards as they currently stand.

Overall, the available guidebooks in online learning are proving to be stepping stones towards creating larger certification and (hopefully) degree programs in online pedagogy because they convey not only current instructors' challenges with training, but also make suggestions for how teacher training could be built or improved upon. The majority of these texts are making new claims and presenting new arguments for online instructors and classrooms. Although these guidebooks influence the context and reading material of the program design in Chapter Five, sufficient courses were only developed through a synthesis of material from all data sources.

**University Opportunities in Online Education**

Universities around the world are moving towards an understanding that online education is an invaluable, marketable, and opportunistic educational endeavor for the future. Therefore, many institutions are beginning to address online education in various formats for their faculty and students. Some universities have created support websites for current faculty and students regarding frequent issues with online courses (detailed in the section "Online Advice for Instructors for Online Pedagogy"). Other universities have designed bachelor and/or master-level certificate programs in online learning or a similar field, and a small group of institutions have invested in creating degree programs in certain aspects of online education. The following sections describe the current information, programs, and degrees available regarding online education. As with the other data sources, these institutional guidelines were used to demonstrate

the type and offerings of current courses available worldwide related to online education and their affiliations with acquisition and learning.

**Online Advice for Instructors for Online Pedagogy.** In researching universities' available resources and programs related to online pedagogy, several institutions have limited websites related to "best practices" for online pedagogy, typically operated by the IT or computer programming department. These advice websites are not produced by individual academic departments, which means that the learning processes of students or disciplines are not taken into consideration; online instructors are advised as though all courses are interchangeable regardless of level or discipline. These websites typically offer vague guidelines for the physical appearance of an online course shell, advice specific to the CMS required by that institution, and contact information for the institution's IT, web maintenance, and computing support services (Bainbridge College, 2009; Brown University, n.d; California State University Stanislaus, n.d; Georgia Southern University, 2011; Greenfield Community College, 2011; Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2008; Lehman College, 2011; Monash University, 2003; Northeastern University, 2009; Parkland College, 2010University of Central Florida, 2009; University of San Francisco, 2011; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2008).

From these online advice websites from universities, I have confirmed that even in many present-day online courses, technology is an afterthought to F2F pedagogy (meaning that instructors and IT departments take a F2F class and simply add technology to it). It is also clear that CMS problems consume a significant portion of time for online instructors, whereas pedagogy plays a much smaller role. Chiefly, we are too consumed with making the technology "work" correctly, rather than learning about the metacognitive function of technology in online pedagogy. In particular, these websites made me consider the technological capabilities of

potential instructors enrolled in an online pedagogy degree program and generate courses suitable for multiple skill-levels.

**Online Certificate or Professional Development Programs in Online Pedagogy.**

***East Carolina University.*** The University of North Carolina is composed of sixteen public institutions throughout the state. Many of the universities of the system offer certificate programs in varying levels (below baccalaureate certificate, post-baccalaureate certificate, post-master's certificate, professional certificate) in a subject related to distance education (2011). The specific subjects of these certificates range from Educational Media/Instructional Technology (Appalachian State University), to E-Learning (NC State), to Virtual Realty in Education and Training (East Carolina University).

In particular, East Carolina University (ECU) offers a master's level Certificate in Distance Learning and Administration which "provides interested persons an opportunity to learn the basic principles of distance delivery of classes, to manage distance-delivered classes, and to evaluate their effectiveness" (East Carolina University, 2011a). This certificate program at ECU, housed by the Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education, requires students take the following courses[7]:

EDTC 6010: Introduction to Instructional Technology

EDTC 6020: Principles of Instructional Design

EDTC 6300: Introduction to Distance Learning

EDTC 7030: Web Teaching: Design and Development

EDTC 7040: Instructional Strategies for Distance Learning

EDTC 7330: Management of Distance Education (East Carolina University, 2011b).

[7] Full course descriptions for the required courses of East Carolina University, Drexel University, Pennsylvania State University, @ ONE, Walden University, The University of Sydney, the University of Melbourne, and the University of Maryland University College are available in Appendix A.

My initial research into this certificate program showed that this program is part of the Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education, indicating that it was an afterthought; essentially it was a program idea with no home base, so instructional technology housed it. Although the course descriptions (included in Appendix A) indicate a variety of topics related to distance education, the focus of this certificate program is on administration of or management of a program (technological management) rather than on pedagogical concerns.

***Drexel University.*** Drexel University offers a graduate-level certificate program entitled Instructional Technology Specialist Certificate which is "designed to address the dramatically increasing need in public education for certified Instructional Technology Specialists at every level of K-12 schooling" (Drexel University, 2011). This certificate program at Drexel requires students to take the following courses:

EDUC 533: Designing Virtual Communities for Staff Development

EDUC 534: Developing Educational Leadership and Team Building

EDUC 535: Researching and Evaluating Technology

EDUC 542: Fundamentals of Special Education

EDUC 544: The Inclusive Classroom

EDUC 552: Integrating Technology for Learning and Achievement

INFO 520: Social Context of Information Professionals

INFO 640: Managing Information Organizations

If students of this certificate program do not have any prior teaching experience, they are also required to take the following:

EDUC 522: Evaluation of Instruction

EDUC 525: Multimedia in Instructional Design (Drexel University, 2011).

The Instructional Technology Specialist Certificate at Drexel, like the East Carolina certificate option is geared towards individuals who want to manage online classroom development and online instructors, rather than individuals who want to *be* online instructors. Developing online management courses, as these courses indicate, entails more direction towards business approaches to education than pedagogical classroom concerns.

***Pennsylvania State University.*** Pennsylvania State University also offers a graduate-level certificate in Distance Education which advertises the opportunity to study distance education while also participating in that mode of learning (Pennsylvania State University, 2011a). This certificate program at Pennsylvania State requires students to take the following courses:

ADTED 460: Introduction to Adult Education

ADTED 470: Introduction to Distance Education

ADTED 505: Teaching Adults Responsibly

ADTED 531: Course Design and Development in Distance Education

ADTED 532: Research and Evaluation in Distance Education

Students also must take one of the following courses as an elective:

EDTEC 440: Introduction to Computers for Educators

EDTEC 449: Video and Hypermedia in the Classroom

EDTEC 461: Designing Computer Networks for Education

EDTEC 462: Coordinating Technology Use in Education

EDTEC 566: Computers as Learning Tools (Pennsylvania State University, 2011b).

Penn State's certificate in Distance Education, unlike the previous examples of East Carolina and Drexel University certificates, does prepare instructors for online classrooms,

emphasizing andragogy. There are also opportunities for technological acquisition appropriate to the classroom in the elective courses. Penn State's program, therefore, employs elements of both acquisition and learning, making it the strongest combination of learning material of the certificate programs listed in this section.

***@ ONE.*** @ONE is an independent organization offering distance education training in the form of individualized "desktop seminars" with "optional professional development credit available from Fresno Pacific University" (@ONE, 2010). This program at @ONE offers the following courses:

Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning

Creating Accessible Online Courses

Building Online Communities with Social Media

Designing Effective Online Assessments

Introduction to Teaching with Moodle

Introduction to Teaching with Blackboard 9.1

Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning (@ONE, 2010).

While @ONE provides a variety of useful technological skills appropriate to today's online classrooms, the seminars they provide are only short-term, single-goal courses. The intention of these desktop seminars is not to provide a comprehensive view of the online classroom including acquisition and learning. Rather, there is a particular focal point for each lesson: Blackboard, Moodle, Social Media, and so forth. @ONE's desktop seminars would be very useful introductory materials for instructors who are very unfamiliar with technology; something that I would recommend they do prior to ever teaching online.

Each certificate program is offered by a highly reputable institution. These programs have strong focus points that are inarguably necessary for online classroom instruction and/or management. I also believe that most of these certificate programs limit students to a partial, and therefore insufficient, understanding of online education. Penn State's graduate-level certificate in Distance Education offers the most comprehensive set of skills balancing acquisition and learning. Certificate programs are limited in scope and often designed as an element of professional development. The next section will identify degree programs related to distance education and analyze their positions on acquisition and learning.

**Degree Programs Available Related to Distance Education.**

The following sections explain the courses and programs available regarding online pedagogy at universities worldwide.

***Walden University.*** Walden University offers an online Ed.S. degree (Education Specialist) in Educational Technology. This degree program "enables you to support a diverse community of learners by effectively integrating technology" (Walden University, 2011a). Walden University is accredited by The Higher Learning Commission, which is part of one of the six regional accreditation commissions of the United States, comparable to the Middle States Commission (Walden University, 2011b). This Ed.S. is a terminal degree requiring 46 total *quarter* credit hours of the following courses:

EDUC 7001: Foundations: Ed.S. Educational Technology

EDUC 7100: Evolution of Educational Technology in Society, Education, and the Workplace

EDUC 7101: Diffusion and Integration of Technology in Education

EDUC 7102: Principles of Distance Education

EDUC 7103: Leading and Managing Educational Technology

EDUC 7104: Designing Instruction for Distance Education

EDUC 7105: Learning Theory and Educational Technology

EDUC 7106: Technology Integration and Curriculum

EDUC 7107: Multimedia Technology to Facilitate Learning

EDUC 7108: Emerging and Future Technology

EDUC 7109: Diverse Learners and Technology

EDUC 7900: Capstone (Walden University, 2011a)

Since this program is designed as a post-graduate degree program, students are supposed to have a foundational knowledge of learner and teaching theory, as well as "a basic comprehension of behaviorism, cognitivism, and constructivism" (Walden University, 2011c).

Unfortunately, the course descriptions of Walden's Ed.S. program are only available to instructors, students and administrators of Walden University. Therefore, for this dissertation, the content matter of these courses were inferred from their title and the overall program description on the website.

Walden's Ed.S. program specializes in "integrating technology" into the classroom, rather than establishing a digital classroom. Although this is an accredited, online program related to distance education, I feel that the integration of technology into a classroom is becoming an obsolete method of online teacher training. Rather, as this dissertation has argued, online education is a recognizable field of study whose foundation lies *with* technology.

***The University of Sydney.*** The University of Sydney offers a Master of Learning Science and Technology (MLS&T) with two tracks: Professionals in eLearning and Researchers of ICT-supported learning (University of Sydney, 2011a). The Professional stream "is designed for those

who work, or wish to work, in the field of eLearning within companies, government organizations or educational institutions" and the Research stream "is intended for those who wish to conduct research into ICT-supported learning and are likely to progress to a PhD" (University of Sydney, 2011a). The University of Sydney's Professional stream better aligns with the desired outcomes of this dissertation because it is intended for educators, and for that purpose, I will share the course offerings for the Professional stream online:

Foundations of Learning Sciences

Design for Learning

Innovations in Learning Tech & Practice

Systems, Change and Learning

In addition to those four required core units, students of this program are required to work on a "Special Project" and choose one of the following elective units:

Learning Tech. in Education & Practice

Learning, Knowing and Thinking

Learning and Teaching Thinking Skills

Adult Learning and Development

Individual Profession Learning Portfolio

Prof Learning Leadership Portfolio. (University of Sydney, 2011a)

The University of Sydney's MLS&T program begins students with a course emphasizing pedagogy of "contemporary educational technology" (Foundations of Learning Science) (University of Sydney, 2011). After that course, students of this program take "Design for Learning" in which they learn the fundamentals of classroom and course design. It is only after these key pedagogical perspectives are learned that students are introduced to the technological

skills to be acquired. It is my belief that the MLS&T program at the University of Sydney offers a comprehensive view of online education incorporating both acquisition of technological skills and learning online pedagogy. In analyzing the different courses available through this program, the only drawback I see is the limited amount of courses one must take (five) in order to successfully complete the program because of the differences in accreditation process between Australian and US institutions.

***The University of Melbourne.*** The University of Melbourne offers a Master of Education degree with a specialized area of Digital Technologies (2011). Digital Technologies is one of ten areas of specialization within this Master's degree in Education. Therefore, all individualized programs require the same core courses and then each specialization has its own required courses. Digital Technologies requires four additional courses of its students:

EDUC90588 Learning with Interactive Devices

EDUC90589 Technology Culture and Education

EDUC90590 Digital Technologies in the Curriculum

EDUC90591 ICT & 21st Century Learning Communities. (University of Melbourne, 2011)

Unlike the University of Sydney, the University of Melbourne's program is a Master's degree in education which incorporates some technology courses into the curriculum for a specialization in Digital Technologies. Therefore, this program is not established upon the foundation that online education is unique from F2F education.

***The University of Maryland University College.*** The University of Maryland University College offers three specializations as part of their Master of Distance Education and E-learning (MDE): Distance Education Policy and Management, Distance Education Teaching and

Training, and Distance Education Technology (UMUC Graduate Programs, 2011). For the purposes of this dissertation, the MDE specialization in Distance Education Teaching and Training will be evaluated for course and program requirements. In order for a student to earn an MDE in Distance Education Teaching and Training, they must participate in the following courses:

UCSP 611: Introduction to Graduate Library Research Skills (no credit)

ODME 601: Foundations of Distance Education and E-Learning

ODME 603: Technology in Distance Education and E-Learning

ODME 610: Teaching and Learning in Online Distance Education

ODME 606: Costs and Economics of Distance Education and E-learning

ODME 608: Learner Support in Distance Education and Training

DETT 607: Instructional Design and Course Development in Distance Education and E-learning

DETC 620: Training and Learning with Multimedia

DETT 611: Library and Intellectual Property Issues in Distance Education and E-learning

EDTC 650: Special Topics in Instructional Technology

DETT 621: Training at a Distance

DEPM 604: Leadership in Distance Education and E-learning. (University of Maryland University College, DETT Specialization, 2011).

In terms of American university offerings in online instructor training, UMUC holds the leading graduate-level program. The required core courses of this program introduce students to online pedagogy (Foundations of Distance Education and E-Learning), then technology (Technology in Distance Education and E-Learning), and then incorporate them together in a

variety of manners and elective courses (University of Maryland University College, DETT Specialization, 2011). As previously discussed in this dissertation, UMUC's MDE program is not accredited by a regional accreditation agency in the United States, but rather it holds accreditation with the European Foundation for Management Development-Technology-Enhanced Learning (EFMD-CEL) in Switzerland (UMUC, par. Accreditation). Although CEL accreditation is highly reputable, this dissertation is arguing for creation of a graduate-level degree program that meets the accreditation standards of the US Middle States Commission on Higher Education standards.

## Conclusion

Chapter Four has argued for the need for programs in online teacher training to be stand-alone and not reliant upon F2F classroom standards for guidance. This chapter also addressed the acquisition and learning that is currently available for potential online instructors from each of the data sources. In order to accomplish this claim, Chapter Four examined the following data sources: Middle States Commission on Higher Education Accreditation Standards, Middle States Hallmarks of Quality in Distance Education Programs, NCTE Position Statements on Distance Education, published guidebooks in online education[8], and various institutional offerings in online education and pedagogy. Although the information from these data sources present material suited for acquisition of technological skill and online pedagogy, Chapter Four has established that it is only through analysis and synthesis of these data sources, associating acquisition and learning, that a successful degree program in online pedagogy can be established.

[8] McVay Lynch. (2002). *The Online Educator: A Guide to Creating the Virtual Classroom;* Hewett and Ehmann. (2004). *Preparing Educators for Online Writing Instruction;* Ko and Rossen (2004). *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide*; Mulford (2005). *Online Education: 6 Steps to Starting an Online School*; Palloff and Pratt (2007). *Building Online Learning Communities: Effective Strategies for the Virtual Classroom*; Herrington, Hodgson, and Moran. (2009) *Teaching the New Writing: Technology, Change, and Assessment in the 21st Century Classroom;* Warnock (2009). *Teaching Writing Online: How & Why*; Boettcher and Conrad (2010). *The Online Teaching Survival Guide: Simple and Practical Pedagogical Tools*; Frey, Fisher, and Gonzalez (2010). *Literacy 2.0: Reading and Writing in the 21st Century Classroom*.

Also, the proportion of acquisition and learning in a course depends upon the subject of the course should be considered and that consideration is made in Chapter Five.

# CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

## Introduction

Following the description of rhetorical research as defined by Lauer and Asher, this dissertation has thus far identified a motivating concern, posed questions regarding those motivating concerns, and engaged in heuristic search (p. 5). In terms of rhetorical research, Chapter Four was used to conduct the heuristic search. More specifically, in Chapter Four I argued that the data sources do not go far enough to explore the relationship of acquisition and learning to online teacher training. Rather, it is in the synthesis of ideas set forth by the data sources, informed by acquisition and learning, that a successful degree program can be established. The purpose of Chapter Five is to address the final steps of Lauer and Asher's definition of rhetorical positioning: creating a new theory and justifying the theory, as well as to thoroughly answer each of the posing questions.

## Improving Technological Literacy

The first posing question of this dissertation is: How does literacy in other fields translate into improving technological literacy for online instructors? In second language acquisition, Krashen (1981) identifies that second language acquisition needs to "have two major components, acquisition and learning" (p. 101). Krashen claims that acquisition "requires meaningful interaction in the target language," which, in terms of teaching online, would be interaction with the technology in a practice or teacher training scenario (p. 1). Learning, though, Krashen identifies with "the presentation of explicit rules," which, to technological literacy would include formal pedagogical training in which teaching "rules" are applied to the online classroom (p. 2). For this dissertation, Krashen's definitions of acquisition and learning are thus used to frame the evolution of the terms through New Literacy Studies.

Gee takes the terms of acquisition and learning and applies them to literacy studies giving the distinction of informal (acquisition) and formal (learning) teaching styles conducting research of his own (1989, p. 5). Applying this concept to technological literacy, higher education has determined that technological skills can be acquired through trial and error and platform training and that formal pedagogical training in online learning is unnecessary. However, this dissertation has presented research to distinguish online learning as its own field with unique pedagogical concerns for digital classrooms different from those established for F2F teacher training.

By combining aspects of Gee and Krashen's definitions of acquisition and learning, we are able to determine how literacy in other fields translates into improving technological literacy for online instructors. As Krashen identifies, acquisition and learning are both necessary components to acquisition of literacy skills. Therefore, an online pedagogy program needs to have elements of both acquisition and learning. The determining proportion of the two will be dependent on the course content, which will be explained later in Chapter Five. In order for an online pedagogy program to improve technological literacy skills of instructors, the program needs to have elements of both formal and informal learning opportunities in which technology is practiced and pedagogical "rules" are established. Thus, a systematic use of technological acquisition and pedagogical learning are necessary for positive and improved online teacher training.

## Acquisition and Learning in Online Teacher Training

The second posing question of this dissertation is: Does systematic use of acquisition and learning best describe the development of technological and pedagogical literacy skills for teachers who want to teach composition online?

A balance of acquisition and learning best defines and sets the parameters for online teacher training because, as the data sources demonstrate, the culmination of data sources creates an opportunity to seek acquisition of technological skills and learning online pedagogy to some degree. For instance, of the guidebooks analyze in Chapter Four, the two most valuable text resources, as established in Chapter Four, are by Ko and Rossen[9] and Boettcher and Conrad[10] because these texts explained in a manner of equal importance, pedagogical and practical tips for successful online teaching.

Online teacher training cannot solely rely on the technological skills required to operate a CMS, nor can the training be intended for F2F instructors. Many current online instructors have taken part in training that is too heavily focused on acquisition of technological skill (i.e. platform training) and feel that they are ill-equipped for the online classroom (Barrett, 2010; Boise State University, 2011; Clark-Ibáñez & Scott, 2008; Delfino & Persico, 2007; Hampel, 2009; Orleans, 2010). Or, some instructors have taken part in training that is too heavily focused on learning pedagogical skills (most likely F2F pedagogy, as online pedagogy is only being established recently), which is equally as problematic for effective online classroom management (Boettcher & Conrad, 2004; Kennedy, 2005; Littlejohn, Falconer, & Mcgill, 2008; Savenye, Olina, & Niemczyk, 2001). While the proportion of acquisition and learning is dependent upon the subject of the course, the integration of both is important to program design.

So, what does it mean to have a *balance* of acquisition and learning in a course or program of online pedagogy? Through analyzing the current information on online pedagogy from the various data sources, I have decided that a combination of acquisition and learning makes for a comprehensive teacher training program. I have identified a continuum of

[9] *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide*
[10] *The Online Teaching Survival Guide: Simple and Practical Pedagogical Tips*

acquisition and learning that my proposed courses fall into. Even a cursory look at courses designed to prepare teachers to teach online use some combination of acquisition and learning. It is inevitable in becoming technologically literate that students will read texts and hear teachers talk but also at some point put their hands on keyboards. One end of the continuum is "acquisition," meaning that the course is entirely based on gaining technological acquisition for the online classroom. Second is "acquisition-learning," which is mainly focused on the acquisition of technological skills, but is also introducing pedagogy to develop the rationale for utilizing certain technologies. Third is "learning-acquisition," which is focused on developing the pedagogical skills of instructors with some opportunities to practice the technological aspects of these learned skills. Finally is "learning," which is entirely based on building pedagogical knowledge without the opportunity to practice the corresponding technologies.

## Course and Program Objectives

A course and program based upon the standards identified in Chapter Four should meet the following objectives:

1. In order to meet MSCHE standards, each course must have a title, course description and student learning objectives.

2. MSCHE standards and the Nine Hallmarks of Quality require that a degree program in online pedagogy have a clearly defined mission statement and set of program goals.

3. MSCHE general education requirements ("at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency" ("Characteristics of Excellence," p. xi), and have a comprehensive capstone course.

5. Address acquisition and learning in some proportion as indicated by the continuum: acquisition; acquisition-learning; learning-acquisition; learning.

## Proposed Single Course in Online Pedagogy

For most institutions, changing the way that we view online pedagogy will not be a simple step. Although the following section provides elaborate foundation for an entire graduate-level degree program in online pedagogy, I understand that most institutions will not be able to make this transition quickly, if at all. Therefore, I wanted to offer a smaller-scale solution to the problem that this dissertation has identified with online teacher training: a single graduate-level course in online pedagogy. The following sections outlining the single course design and a graduate-level program in online pedagogy seek to answer the final posing question: What would a single course design and a graduate-level degree program in online pedagogy, balancing acquisition and learning, include?

After reviewing the data sources, it is understood that the program or department interested in adding a single course design in online pedagogy would need to be part of an institution that already meets the university standards outlined by the MSCHE. If the university meets the institutional standards, the course would need to be added into the curriculum with approval of the department and college aligned with the processes outlined by the institution.

The single course is designed as a three-credit graduate-level course, which could be adapted for institutional requirements or to be an undergraduate or doctoral-level course. The single course is also designed as an introductory course in online pedagogy, which could be part of any graduate-level degree-granting program with students enrolled who may eventually teach in online classrooms. The following course and program design has been heavily influenced by my personal experience and research within literacy and composition studies as indicated by the data sources. However, it is my belief that the assertions made regarding literacy and

composition studies hold true for all disciplines interested in developing or expanding their research in online pedagogy.

In order to align with the MSCHE standards, the single course design is outlined below with a course description and student learning objectives:

*Balancing Acquisition and Learning in Online Teaching (3 cr.)*

This course is designed as an introductory course for individuals who want to teach online in any discipline. This course will discuss the balance of technological acquisition and pedagogical learning necessary for online instructors to be successful in their courses.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Understand and explain the unique type of instruction necessary to successfully facilitate online learning.
- Differentiate between the theory necessary to understand the components of an online classroom and the technology necessary to put these theories into action.
- Produce educational material suitable for an entry-level online instructor in online pedagogy.

In terms of the continuum defined above, this course falls within "learning-acquisition" because of the greater focus on developing online pedagogy with technology to supplement the learning process. Specifically, this course will develop a pedagogical foundation for online instructors considering the impact of technology on students, CMS, and communication. In order to do this, the course would use such textbooks as Boettcher and Conrad's *The Online Teaching Survival Guide: Simple and Practical Pedagogical Tips* or Ko and Rossen's *Teaching Online: A*

*Practical Guide*, upon which instructor-led lectures and student-led discussions would take place. Once sufficient background pedagogical knowledge is established, students will begin to acquire technological skills appropriate to producing basic-level assignments bearing in mind the learned material in online pedagogy. Since learning foundational knowledge in online pedagogy is the focus of this course, it falls to the learning-acquisition section of the continuum.

"Balancing Acquisition and Learning" demonstrates, as is carried on through the program design in the following section, that the proportion of acquisition and learning depends on the subjects addressed in the courses.

## Proposed Program Design

After reviewing data sources from the NCTE policy statements on distance education, the Middle States Accreditation Standards for institution and the Hallmarks of Distance Education programs, published guidebooks on online learning and distance education, and institutional profiles worldwide offering general information, certificate programs, and degree programs related to online pedagogy, the following section provides the institutional outline for a graduate-level degree program including a mission statement, statement of goals, course descriptions, and student learning objectives for each course. This section will be followed by an explanation of the continuum of acquisition to learning in these courses. Each course of the degree program may not address both acquisition and learning; however, the balance will be achieved in the overall program design.

### Program Mission Statement

The mission of this program is to provide students with highly competitive, graduate level education in the field of online pedagogy by maintaining a balance of acquisition of technological skills and learning of online pedagogical theory. By focusing on both acquisition

of technological skill and learning of online pedagogical theory equally, the students of this program will be well-prepared to continue or pursue their goals of teaching online courses. This program is committed to the highest level of research and support available to the students and will update and adapt due to the ever-changing nature of our field.

**Statement of Program Goals**

After graduating from this program, students will be able to:

- Explain the historical context of distance education and its progression to the present to understand their role in the educational phenomena.
- Define "online pedagogy" and put its theoretical components into practice in a digital classroom.
- Understand the varying demographic(s) of students in the online classroom and effectively communicate with all members of a course in multiple modes.
- Demonstrate a commitment to furthering the field and body of research in online pedagogy.

**Course Descriptions with Student Learning Objectives**

CORE COURSES (Students must take all of these courses- 18 credits total)

1. Foundations of Online Pedagogy (3 cr.)
2. Cultural Considerations for the Global Classroom (3 cr.)
3. Re-Inventing the Digital University (3 cr.)
4. History of Distance Education (3 cr.)
5. Building Learning Communities (3 cr.)
6. Capstone Course: Guided Study in Online Course Development (3 cr.)

18 credits total

*Foundations of Online Pedagogy (3 cr.)*

Designed as an introductory course to online pedagogy, this course is for students to learn about the metacognitive processes and technological skills necessary for successful online teaching. This course will discuss the pedagogical theory behind online teaching, as developed by Grant, including social presence, teaching presence, and cognitive presence using a balanced approach of pedagogical learning and technological acquisition.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Define "online pedagogy" and understand the metacognitive processes of online instruction.
- Understand their role as instructors, as well as the role of the student in the online classroom and how they develop throughout a course.
- Differentiate between the theory necessary to understand the components of an online classroom and the technology necessary to put these theories into action.

*Cultural Considerations for the Global Classroom (3 cr.)*

This course will discuss what it means to instructors and students to partake in a global classroom in terms of cultural, ethnic, racial, and religious concerns. This course will also consider the practical ramifications of a global classroom including, but not limited to: accommodating varied time zones, technological skill levels, and required technological capabilities.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Identify their role as an instructor in a multicultural, multigenerational, and global online classroom and how factors such as culture, ethnicity, race, religion, and location impact student learning and communication.
- Recognize cultural, ethnic, racial, religious, gender, and other types of differences and barriers between students and establish effective methods for creating a learning community in the online classroom.
- Be aware of technological considerations of the global classroom, including, but not limited to, accommodating varied time zones and be able to work with students to ensure equal opportunity and access to course materials and investment into the learning community.

*Re-inventing the Digital University (3 cr.)*

This course will discuss the necessary institutional advancements for successes in distance education including, but not limited to: effective training for instructors, development of digital resources, and aligning distance education programs with proper accreditation standards. This course will also consider the ramifications of technological literacy testing for students prior to admittance in an online course or program.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Distinguish between traditional methods of training face-to-face instructors and the non-transferable pedagogical training necessary for online instructors.

- Evaluate digital resources available at their institution and make educated suggestions for updates, revisions, and additions necessary to properly serve online students.
- Identify the accreditation standards appropriate to their home institution's geographical location and assess online programs' alignment with those standards.

*History of Distance Education (3 cr.)*

This course will discuss the history of distance education starting from memorization through correspondence learning to the introduction of basic computers and web programming. From there, this course will trace the development in modern education considering the role of the computer including CMSs, Web 2.0 technology, and the pedagogical implications of each of these changes.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Explain the historical context of distance education and its progression to the present to understand their role in the educational phenomena.
- Justify the decision to choose or not choose a CMS based on its pedagogical offerings and practicality.
- Modify pre-established course offerings or syllabi to accommodate Web 2.0 technology developments and understand the pedagogical ramifications of such decisions.

*Building Learning Communities (3 cr.)*

Scholars such as Palloff and Pratt; Ko and Rossen; Hewett and Ehmann; Boettcher and Conrad; Garrison, Anderson, and Archer and others maintain that developing the online classroom into a learning community is essential to the success of online classes. Therefore, this course will define what an online learning community is, how it functions, and why it is necessary for classroom success. This course will also discuss the differences between face-to-face and online teaching and course development in order to identify the ways in which a learning community is essential to online instructors and students.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Define an online learning community and differentiate between online student-student and student-teacher relationship from other types of relationships formed in a face-to-face classroom.
- Recognize the function of a learning community in the online classroom and identify troubleshooting methods for classes that form unsuccessful learning communities, or do not form them at all.
- Understand the role that they (the instructors) play in the forming and maintaining the online learning community and practice the communicative modes associated with this process.

*Capstone Course: Guided Study in Online Course Development (3 cr.)*

The capstone course of this program is a guided study in which students develop an entire online course in their content area consistently reflecting on the theories to support their technological decisions. Students currently teaching at an outside institution are encouraged to

design a course specific to the content area needs of their institution. Students not currently teaching are encouraged to develop a likely course for their future teaching opportunities.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Employ effective pedagogical foundation in order to create a transferable course design appropriate to content area.
- Distinguish between the role of acquiring technological skill and learned online pedagogy as demonstrated through metacognitive understanding of the online classroom.
- Prepare a design for an online course in the students' content area of study aligning with the students' own institutional policies and technologies.

TECHNOLOGICAL ELECTIVES (Students must take at least one of these courses—3 credits)

Options: 1. Negotiating a CMS (3 cr.)

2. Web Teaching: Design and Development (3 cr.)

3. Theory-Based Technological Opportunities (3 cr.)

*Negotiating a CMS (3 cr.)*

This course will discuss the pedagogical positives and negatives of using a required content management system (CMS) for online teaching. This course will also discuss the various components of various CMSs including Blackboard, Moodle, D2L, ECollege, WebCT, and others.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Explain the role of a CMS in the online classroom and demonstrate understanding of the capabilities of a CMS.
- Justify preference of a particular (or no) CMS based on knowledge of its functions, design, and operative values.
- Critically examine an institution's affiliation with a CMS and make informed suggestions on necessary updates and changes to a predetermined program.

*Web Teaching: Design and Development (3 cr.)*

Designed as an introductory course to the technological skills necessary for online course development, this course allows students to put into practice the theories of online course development learned throughout earlier courses in the program. This course is designed for a student who has little to no experience in online course design.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Differentiate between the theory necessary to understand the components of an online classroom and the technology necessary to put these theories into action.
- Operate a CMS of their choice with a basic understanding of the functions available to instructors.
- Select appropriate technologies for a specific course depending on institutional requirements, student capabilities, and particular course criteria.

*Theory-Based Technological Opportunities (3 cr.)*

Designed as an advanced course of experimentation with new technology, this course allows students to put into practice the theories of new technologies available to the online classroom.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Question the role of emerging technologies in order to assess the necessity of a technology in a particular classroom environment.
- Justify utilization of a new or uncommon technology in an online course if the specifications of the technology align with the course description and goals and the pedagogical outcomes of the course.
- Operate numerous technologies at a basic level in order to assess the pedagogical function of these new digital tools.

CONTEXTUAL ELECTIVES (Students must take at least one of these courses—3 credits)

Options: 1. Foundations of Andragogy in Online Education (3 cr.)

2. Foundations of K-12 Online Education (3 cr.)

3. Balancing Acquisition and Learning for Online Teacher Training (3 cr.)

*Foundations of Andragogy in Online Education (3 cr.)*

Andragogy is generally understood to refer to developing learning strategies for adult students. This course will discuss the role that andragogy plays in online education in terms of content learning, technological skill levels, required technological capabilities, and students' comfort level of distance education.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Understand and explain the unique demographic of adult learners in online education.
- Distinguish the adult learner from all other types of learners that may be present in an online or face-to-face classroom.
- Formulate learning strategies appropriate for adult learners bearing in mind their students' content and technological understanding.

*Foundations of K-12 Online Education (3 cr.)*

This course is designed as an elective course for individuals who will teach in a K-12 online classroom. This course will discuss the role that the K-12 Department of Education and school district regulations play in online education in terms of content learning, technological skill level, and students' choice of distance education.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Understand and explain the unique demographic of K-12 online learners and the various opportunities and reasons for online learning at these grade levels.
- Discuss the United States Department of Education standards for distance education and the differentiation of these standards from face-to-face classroom teaching regulations.

- Formulate learning strategies appropriate for the K-12 demographic the student will be teaching bearing in mind their students' content and technological understanding.

*Balancing Acquisition and Learning for Online Teacher Training (3 cr.)*

This course is designed for individuals who want to train online instructors to prepare for their online teaching assignments or for those who work in an administrative role related to online pedagogy. This course will discuss the balance of technological acquisition and pedagogical learning necessary for online instructors to be successful in their courses.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Understand and explain the unique type of instruction necessary to successfully facilitate online learning.
- Differentiate between the theory necessary to understand the components of an online classroom and the technology necessary to put these theories into action.
- Produce educational material suitable for an entry-level online instructor in online pedagogy.

ADDITIONAL ELECTIVES (Students must take at least four of these courses—12 credits)

1. Hybrid and Multimodal Teaching (3 cr.)
2. Communicative Modes of Online Education (3 cr.)
3. Current Literature in Online Education (3 cr.)
4. Evaluating Online Assignments (3 cr.)
5. Writing Assignments in the Online Classroom (3 cr.)

6. Fundamentals of Asynchronous and Synchronous Learning (3 cr.)
7. Maintaining Digital Law and Order (3 cr.)
8. Academic Dishonesty in the Online Classroom (3 cr.)
9. Developing Transitional Courses (3 cr.)

*Hybrid and Multimodal Teaching (3 cr.)*

This course will discuss the pedagogical and institutional considerations of hybrid courses (partially face-to-face, partially online) and other experimental, multimodal forms of teaching with technology including an "Information Highway"-based classroom.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Explain the difference between terms associated with multimodal teaching including, but not limited to: hybrid, distance education, Information Highway, asynchronous, and synchronous learning and the ramifications of each of these types of classrooms.
- Formulate arguments for or against the use of any of these types of classroom environments in higher education and provide rationale and research to support these claims.
- Discover and assess institutional rationale for proposing, requesting, or mandating multimodal courses.

*Communicative Modes of Online Education (3 cr.)*

This course will examine the methods of communication available in online learning including email, discussion boards, wikis, blogs, Skype, conference calling, synchronous chat, and anonymous discussion boards and the pedagogical concerns of each of these methods.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Explain the difference between communicative modes associated with online teaching including, but not limited to: email, discussion boards, wikis, blogs, Skype, conference calling, synchronous chat, and anonymous discussion board and the ramifications of each of these types of communicative modes.
- Provide rationale for choosing one communicative mode over another appropriate to institutional affiliation, student capability, and content area of study.
- Understand current literature examining the pedagogical concerns of each of these communicative modes in order to formulate original research in this area of study.

*Current Literature in Online Education (3 cr.)*

This course will review current literature available in the field of online education, regardless of specific discipline, in order to keep students abreast of the unique and ever-changing challenges and opportunities available in the field. This course will also challenge students to attempt publication in one of the journals of the field of online education.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Discuss the leading publications in online education.

- Follow the guidelines for a specific publication in online education in order to attempt publication of an original piece of research on an area of the students' interest.
- Chronologically outline important periods of research in the field of online education and propose future research concerns.

*Evaluating Online Assignments (3 cr.)*

This course will examine the challenges of evaluating online assignments when the instructor and student are separated by numerous factors including distance and time. Also, this course will discuss the differentiation of grade inflation in the online and face-to-face classrooms considering the interpersonal relationship of instructor and student.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Demonstrate appropriate strategies for evaluating online assignments in online classes such as providing sufficient feedback and responding in a timely manner.
- Compare and contrast the amount of and rationale for grade inflation in the online and face-to-face classrooms in order to combat their own tendencies towards grading biases.
- Differentiate between grading based on effort and grading based on performance, particularly considering the impact that technological capabilities has on assignment presentation and submission.

*Writing Assignments in the Online Classroom (3 cr.)*

Since writing plays such a significant factor in the online classroom (especially when asynchronous), this class will examine the specificity required when developing, assigning, and grading online writing assignments.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Plan effective writing assignments based on the learning objectives of a course or unit plan.
- Thoroughly explain writing assignments (in writing) to online students in order to minimize extraneous questions and confusion.
- Demonstrate appropriate strategies for evaluating online writing assignments in online classes such as providing sufficient feedback and responding in a timely manner.

*Fundamentals of Asynchronous and Synchronous Learning (3 cr***.)**

Many types of online classrooms and technologies are available for web-based learning, some of which are synchronous and some asynchronous modes of correspondence. This course will examine the pedagogical difference between these two modes of learning, the technologies appropriate to both, and the student perspective of each of these types of classrooms.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Distinguish between the pedagogical rationale and concerns of choosing to offer an online class as synchronous or asynchronous.

- Formulate appropriate pedagogical strategies for facilitating a course, as solely synchronous or asynchronous.
- Justify the decision to offer a course as either asynchronous or synchronous by providing researched documentation to support their claim.

*Maintaining Digital Law and Order (3 cr.)*

This course will consider the laws surrounding digital media including Fair Use, digital copyright, and institutional agreements. This course will also discuss specific examples of controversial media exchange topics including, but not limited to, the availability of Google Books.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Define and explain key terminology related to digital media law including, but not limited to: Fair Use, digital copyright, and institutional agreement or affiliation.
- Understand the instructor and student role in the phenomena of digital copyright law, as it currently stands and in its constant state of revision.
- Prepare teaching materials appropriate for their specific classroom environment to introduce the key topics of digital law and copyright to their students.

*Academic Dishonesty in the Online Classroom (3 cr.)*

This course will examine the developments in academic integrity regulations and academic dishonesty (plagiarism) when classes transition into the entirely online environment.

Also, this course will examine the controversies surrounding plagiarism-detection software such as Turnitin.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Define academic dishonesty and identify methods of accidental and intentional academic dishonesty in the online classroom.
- Research and critique institutional policies regarding academic integrity, academic dishonesty, plagiarism, self-plagiarism and ramifications of these actions within a course and an institution.
- Question the role of plagiarism-detection software such as Turnitin for its controversial methods of copyrighting student writing and insufficient instructor training of the software in order to make an informed decision as to whether or not to utilize the tool in ones' own classroom.

*Developing Transitional Courses (3 cr.)*

This course will discuss institutional decisions to choose, regulate, and change preferred CMS, regardless of department, program, or instructor preference. Therefore, this course will also discuss ways in which instructors can develop courses that are easily transferable through CMSs while maintaining the same content requirements and high level of standard.

*Student Learning Objectives:*

*After participating in this course, students will be able to:*

- Identify ways in which CMSs are similar and assignments can be restructured in order to fit the options of each system.

- Research and evaluate compatibility software offered by CMSs and private companies to ease instructor and institutional concern when transitioning between CMSs.
- Formulate assignments that are accessible through a number of CMSs based on the type of assignment such as discussion boards, quizzes, and individual assignments.

**Identifying the Acquisition-Learning Continuum in Proposed Courses**

Each proposed course of the 63 credit course schedule in the previous section has a brief course description and student learning objectives to meet the Middle States Accreditation Standards. In what follows I offer insight into the proportions of acquisition and learning that might be employed by the various courses I've proposed. The breakdown of acquisition and learning of each course within the continuum of acquisition, acquisition-learning, learning-acquisition, and learning is demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 2 offers a visual representation of the acquisition-learning continuum in the proposed courses demonstrating that the course "Balancing Acquisition and Learning" is a learning-acquisition course and "Re-inventing the Digital University" is a learning course. Detailed explanation of the courses along the continuum comes in the following four categories: Acquisition Courses; Acquisition-Learning Courses; Learning-Acquisition Courses; and Learning Courses.

Table 2

*Courses Within Continuum of Acquisition and Learning*

| Course Title | Acquisition | Acquisition-Learning | Learning-Acquisition | Learning |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Balancing… | | | X | |
| Foundations… | | | X | |
| Cultural … | | | X | |
| Re-inventing… | | | | X |
| History of DE… | | | X | |
| Building Learn... | | | X | |
| Capstone Course | | X | | |
| Negotiating a CMS… | | X | | |
| Web-Teaching… | X | | | |
| Theory-Based… | | X | | |
| Andragogy… | | | X | |
| K-12 Ed... | | | X | |
| Hybrid/Multi | | | X | |
| Communicative | | X | | |
| Current Lit… | | | | X |
| Evaluating… | | | X | |
| Writing… | | | X | |
| Asynch and Synch | | | X | |
| Digital Law | | | | X |
| Dishonesty… | | | X | |
| Transitional… | | X | | |

**Acquisition Courses**

In order for a course to be considered solely an acquisition course, the focus must be entirely upon acquiring technological skills necessary to function within an online classroom. As demonstrated by Table 2, there is only one course in the curriculum designed as an acquisition-only course. The course "Web-Teaching: Design and Development" is designed as an introductory course for students who are new to online instruction completely. This course will be focused particularly on acquisition of technological skills necessary to run a CMS and communicate effectively using various online media. "Web-Teaching" is one of the three technological electives available to students in this program and designed only for students who are completely unfamiliar with online teaching because it will focus on basic technological skills such as CMS navigation and control. A general online teaching guidebook would be a good text for this course, such as Boettcher and Conrad's *The Online Teaching Survival Guide* or Ko and Rossen's *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide*, as well as resource material appropriate to the students' CMS and/or home institution.

**Acquisition-Learning Courses**

Acquisition-Learning courses have a major emphasis on acquisition and practice of technological skills considering the learned components of online pedagogy in these and other courses.

"Capstone Course: Guided Study in Online Course Development" is designed for students to take at the end of their program of study because it gives the opportunity to practice the acquired technological skills informed by pedagogy throughout the program. Therefore, when students get to this point in their degree program, they will have learned all of the foundational information appropriate to online pedagogy (offered in this program). This course,

then, allows them to practice these skills within the technologies. The goal of this course is to have students generate a workable teaching philosophy and an online course (using their institutionally required CMS) suitable to their content area of study.

The courses comprising "Technological Electives": "Negotiating a CMS," and "Theory-Based Technological Opportunities" focuses on building instructors' experiences with technology in their classrooms, building a pedagogical understanding of such systems on institutions, instructors, and learning communities. The primary goal of these courses will be to let students examine various technologies and identify pedagogical ramifications of choosing a particular CMS or technology. Because the information being presented in these courses is quite new, they fall under the Acquisition-Learning section of the continuum: Students will acquire skills necessary to use various technologies of their choice, including, but not limited to: CMSs, blogs, wikis, podcasts, text messaging, Twitter, Facebook, or Jing. Once skills have been acquired to operate these technologies proficiently, students will be asked to develop the pedagogy behind the technology by asking questions such as: Why choose this technology over another? What will this tool do to/with communication in the online classroom that another tool could not accomplish? Building upon the information learned in other courses, students will negotiate the metacognitive functions of technologies through class discussions and oral and written reports.

**Learning-Acquisition Courses**

Learning-Acquisition courses have a primary function of developing pedagogical knowledge appropriate to the online classroom, which can then be practiced using technology so that these skills can be acquired.

In the course "Foundations of Online Pedagogy," for instance, the majority of information will be theoretical. Therefore, an instructor may use texts such as Selfe's *Technology and Literacy in the Twenty-First Century* and Ko and Rossen's *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide* to teach that material. The course will also employ some elements of research which could be done online during which time students will acquire research skills as well. The focus of this course is on introductory material: defining "online pedagogy," understanding the role of the online instructor and student, and differentiating between theory and technology. However, I feel that these learned principles would be remiss without the opportunity to practice related technologies. This course could include role-playing activities in which the students rehearse various student-instructor situations in the digital classroom, which could then be further analyzed through class discussion. The skills being acquired here, then, would be two-fold: basic technological operation of a CMS/digital classroom and electronic communication skills.

In the course "Cultural Considerations for the Global Classroom," the majority of the course will be spent learning about and considering cultural, gender, sexual, ethnic, racial, and religious concerns that may arise in a global classroom. There will also be opportunity for students to practice positive and effective communication with potential students in order to develop an open online learning community. This course, like "Foundations of Online Pedagogy" could include digital role-playing opportunities in which students practice communication and cross-cultural sensitivity informed by pedagogical foundation. Thereby the focus of the course is on learning with opportunity to acquire the corresponding technological skills for classroom utilization. The text *The Pedaogogy of Lifelong Learning* (2007) edited by Michael Osborne, Muir Houston, and Nuala Toman may be well-suited to complement this type of course.

The course “History of Distance Education” is mostly a historical analysis of the evolution of distance education. In this course, students will examine the development of distance education, particularly in American institutions of education and challenge (through classroom discussion) these movements. Students will also have the opportunity to challenge and modify pre-established courses or syllabi at their home institution to better reflect the pedagogy learned through this and other core courses, thus offering a practical way to exercise their pedagogical knowledge while acquiring technological skills. As with many of the courses in this program, students will be asked to examine processes for recommendation or change at their home institution so that they are able to exercise their skills in real-world situations. Hawisher, LeBlanc, Moran, and Selfe’s *Computers and the Teaching of Writing in American Higher Education, 1979-1994: A History* would be a good text to examine the impact of technology on higher education in general, as well as a specific field of study.

“Building Learning Communities” focuses on the metacognitive importance of developing a learning community in the online classroom and how the student-student and student-instructor relationships differ from traditional F2F instruction, which accounts for the learning in this course. Students will also have the opportunity to practice building an online learning community, troubleshooting unsuccessful or distressed learning communities, and handling courses unable to build a cohesive learning community. Allowing the students to practice these skills gives them opportunity to acquire the technological skills (including developing classroom environment and communication) necessary for building a strong online learning community. Therefore, as with all of the learning-acquisition courses, “Building Learning Communities” provides students with pedagogical knowledge through reading, lecture, and classroom discussion, which is then supplemented with practicing corresponding

technological skills. *Building Online Learning Communities* by Palloff and Pratt would be a good introductory text for this type of course.

**Learning Courses**

Learning courses focus only on building pedagogical knowledge and do not include technological practice of these skills. Although there may be opportunities for role-playing, as described in previous courses, these will not include acquisition of a *technological* skill as this dissertation has defined acquisition; rather, these role-playing opportunities would be an extension of, or visual representation of, the pedagogy. As Table 2 indicates, only three courses of the entire degree program are learning-only courses.

The course "Re-Inventing the Digital University" is a required course of the degree program which serves as an extension of the course "History of Distance Education," in which students trace the progress of distance education in America. In "Re-Inventing the Digital University," students have a strong foundational knowledge of the history in order to challenge the current and future standards of distance education. Through various assigned readings of accreditation organizations and institutions, students will garner an understanding of the current standings of distance education. Class discussion, research, and writing assignments will give students the opportunity to examine, challenge, and hopefully make informed suggestions to their home institution regarding online instructor training and accreditation standards. Therefore, there is no specific technology being examined, practiced, or acquired in this course; the focus is solely on learning.

"Current Literature in Online Education" is designed for students to not only read, study, and discuss current literature in online education, but also to assist research in and development of original research projects geared towards publication in leading distance education venues.

Because, as this dissertation shows, research in online pedagogy is so limited, students will be encouraged to publish their pedagogical findings from the program. The content of this course is, admittedly, very difficult for the instructor to prepare because research is so rapidly changing. However, this learning-focused course could be run almost entirely by student reading and discussion with minimal guidance from the instructor.

## Rationale for Program Design

Now that courses have been identified and described and their place among the acquisition-learning continuum has been defined, I want to offer further explanation on the process by which these courses were developed using the data sources. Table 3 (on the following page) demonstrates the data sources used to create each course of the degree program in online pedagogy. For instance, the course "Foundations of Online Pedagogy" was informed by all six of the data sources in a variety of ways, whereas an informed argument for "History of Distance Learning" was only garnered from the guidebooks and institutional certificate programs. Further explanation of this process is explained in the section following Table 3.

Table 3

*Online Pedagogy Course Connection to Data Sources*

| Course Title | Data Sources[11] NCTE | Guidebook/Lit Review | Online Advice | Certificate | Degree | MSSCHE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Foundations… | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Cultural Consider… | X | X | | X | X | X |
| Re-inventing… | X | X | X | | X | X |
| History of DE… | | X | | X | | |
| Building Learning… | | X | X | | | |
| Capstone Course | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Negotiating… | X | X | X | | | |
| Web-Teaching… | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Theory-Based… | X | | | | | X |
| Andragogy… | | X | | X | X | |
| K-12… | X | | | X | X | |
| Balancing… | X | | | | X | X |
| Hybrid… | X | X | X | | | X |
| Communicative… | X | X | X | | | X |
| Current Lit… | X | X | | | X | X |
| Evaluating.. | X | X | | | | X |
| Writing Assign…. | X | X | | | | X |
| Fundamentals… | | X | X | X | X | X |
| Maintaining… | | X | | | X | X |
| Variations… | | X | | | | X |
| Developing… | | X | X | | | |

[11] Data Sources listed on Table A1 refer to the data sources explained in Chapter Four: The NCTE Position Statements, Published Guidebooks and articles from Chapter Two Literature Review, the university-sponsored Online Pedagogy advice websites, university certificate programs in online education, current degree programs available in online education, and the Middle States Commission on Higher Education Standards (MSSCHE).

Since one of the Middle States standards requires the creation of a program mission statement, I researched institutional and program mission statements from various universities. Once the mission statement was written, I designed program goals that would be achievable given that the program design is that of a graduate-level online program. Using synthesis of all of the data sources to be described later, I then began to identify and create course descriptions for the program curriculum. As I developed the course descriptions and student learning objectives, I ensured that the general education requirements of oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency were met in the student learning objectives of the required core courses of the program. The core courses are defined in the proposed degree program are: Foundations of Online Pedagogy, Cultural Considerations for the Global Classroom, Re-inventing the Digital University, History of Distance Education, Building Learning Communities, and the Capstone Course: Guided Study in Online Course Development.

The other Middle States accreditation standard was that the program requires benchmarks to assess student learning throughout the program. For the purposes of this proposed curriculum, there is a capstone course which serves as one of the possible benchmarks for assessing student learning throughout their progress of this degree. Also, as described in the Middle States Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention, students will need to take a technological competency exam as part of the admissions process to ensure that the students have the basic understanding necessary to be successful in this program. One of the Technological Electives made available for the degree program is Web Teaching: Design and Development. Although ideally the students enrolled in this program would have some online teaching experience prior to their admission, if the students are new online instructors, the Web Teaching course is

designed as an introductory course to the technological aspects of online course design, development, and execution. Also, each individual course and instructor of such courses should hold students to the highest level of performance, thus acting as benchmarks consistently throughout the program.

As discussed in Chapter Four, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education has separate criteria for online education programs. Therefore, the Nine Hallmarks of Distance Education were examined to ensure that a degree program in online pedagogy could also follow this set of criteria. As with the Middle States standards, the Nine Hallmarks of Distance Education outline institutional requirements for accreditation. Under the Nine Hallmarks of Distance Education regulations, all new programs must be a part of a preexisting department or college within an institution and not separated solely for an online program status ("Distance Education Programs," p. 3). Provided that the institution opting to incorporate the proposed degree in online pedagogy already meets the criteria for Middle States accreditation and extends those same parameters to the new program, there should not be an issue in earning accreditation for the new program.

The next data source listed is the published guidebooks in online learning. The way that these guidebooks were used for the course descriptions were to identify overlapping concepts discussed in multiple texts. As indicated on Table 3, the guidebooks were used in conjunction with information garnered from journal articles utilized for Chapter Two of this dissertation. Because the availability of online guidebooks is still so limited (the eight texts discussed in Chapter Four are the most recent and relevant texts currently available in print related to online pedagogy), I deemed the quantity and quality of the guidebooks insufficient and felt that this

degree program would be better informed taking into consideration research published in scholarly journals.

Of the topics found repeatedly throughout the data sources, only three failed to be discussed in detail in the guidebooks and literature review of this dissertation: Theory-based Technological Opportunities, Foundations of K-12 Online Education, and Balancing Acquisition and Learning for Online Teacher Training. In the guidebooks and literature review, K-12 online education was not extensively explored because it lies outside the scope of research, which for this dissertation is the role of online pedagogy in college-level courses. Therefore, it is not unusual that the guidebooks did not inform the development of a K-12 online education course as part of the degree program. The other two courses, Theory-Based Technological Opportunities and Balancing Acquisition and Learning are informed by the program and pedagogical guidelines set forth by NCTE and the MSSCHE.

That being said, the guidebooks discussed a number of issues in extensive detail including, but not limited to, building learning communities, communication, and designing and evaluating online writing assignments. Building learning communities was also mentioned in online advice for instructors and communication was mentioned by NCTE, MSSCHE, degree programs, and online advice. Designing and evaluating online writing assignments was only addressed in detail in one of the guidebooks: Warnock's *Teaching Writing Online: How & Why*. Therefore, Warnock's text provided context for developing the course Writing Assignments in the Online Classroom so that those preparing to be online instructors will understand how writing (the main mode of communication in online classrooms) functions in the online classroom.

Originally, I had intended to have one final category of data sources: current degree programs available related to online pedagogy. Upon further examination of these data sources, though, it was apparent that I needed to distinguish university offerings into three categories: online advice, online certificates and/or professional development, and degree programs related to distance education. The reason that this data source needed to be categorized was two-fold: there are very few programs worldwide associated with the pedagogy of distance education and a large number of institutions offered online advice and certificate/professional development programs, so these could not be discounted.

Many institutions offer information for their faculty and students related to distance education including, but not limited to "best practices," platform assistance, and tips for successful online learning. Some institutional websites have websites, typically run by the university informational technology department, which offers FAQ and basic help for running the platform associated with the institution (i.e. Blackboard or Moodle help). Other institutions had more specific information cited from current research on effective communication and collaboration in the online classroom; tips which helped to form "best practices" guidelines for online instructors or students. One of the "best practices" named by several universities is for instructors to maintain consistent contact with their online students. Maintaining consistent contact (typically this means responding to student questions or emails within 24 hours) gives students the reassurance that they are not in this course alone; someone is on "the other side" for them. Therefore, the online advice led me to create the elective course Communicative Modes in Online Education in which students can examine multiple ways of communication with technology to understand the pedagogical implication of any and all modes. The online advice

also demonstrated universities enacting some of the institutional MSSCHE standards regarding support services and integrating distance education into the rest of the university system.

Many online certificate programs and professional development opportunities related to distance education focus on the expertise in a CMS, rather than teacher certification of pedagogical knowledge. The Certificate in Distance Learning and Administration at East Carolina University offers students the opportunity to design their own courses and learn the elements of effective online course development (East Carolina University, 2011b). East Carolina's course descriptions, in particular, led to the development of Balancing Acquisition and Learning for Online Teacher Training and the hands-on courses such as the capstone course and Web-Teaching. As part of this certificate program, East Carolina University offers a course entitled Management of Distance Education, which provided a foundation for the Balancing Acquisition and Learning course because I wanted to include a course in the curriculum for possible student career outcomes of the program. Thus came the course on andragogy, K-12 online learning, and Balancing Acquisition and Learning, a course designed for those who want to eventually teach online instructors themselves.

Drexel University's Instructional Technology Specialist Certificate is designed specifically for those interested in IT in the K-12 setting. K-12 online learning has not been a focus of this dissertation thus far, but as it was mentioned increasingly more in each of the data sources, I determined that at least one course had to discuss the unique characteristics of distance education in the K-12 environment.

Pennsylvania State University's program takes the opposite approach, focusing almost entirely on andragogy. Pennsylvania State's certificate in Distance Education features two courses related to this subject: Instruction to Adult Education and Teaching Adults Responsibly

(Pennsylvania State University, 2011b). These courses led to the decision to have a course dedicated to andragogy and also to make a required "contextual elective" in the course list. These contextual electives are designed to prepare students for one of three environments in which they see themselves working in the future: administration, K-12, or higher education with adults. Only one of these courses would be required for successful completion of the degree program, but students could take more than one to earn elective credits.

@ONE holds several independent seminars which each provided unique suggestions for course designs. @ONE has one seminar program entitled "Designing Effective Online Assessments" which helped me to create the course Evaluating Online Assignments to discuss the unique concerns of online evaluation (@ONE, 2010). In particular, the Evaluating Online Assignments course will identify the possibility of grade inflation in online classes and how inflation compares online and F2F.

@ONE also offers seminars specifically related to teaching with Moodle or teaching with Blackboard (@ONE, 2010). While these are very popular CMSs available for institutional contracts, there are several other types of platforms available for instructors and institutions to use for online learning. As a result of these platform courses available from @ONE, I developed three electives for the degree program in online pedagogy: Negotiating a CMS, Developing Transitional Courses and Fundamentals of Asynchronous and Synchronous Learning.

Negotiating a CMS gives students the opportunity to explore (or further explore) many CMSs available to instructors and institutions including, but not limited to: Blackboard, Moodle, D2L, ECollege, and WebCT. For this course and throughout the program, students are encouraged both to develop their preexisting technological skills in the CMS required by their

home institution as well as to experiment with new CMSs in order to inform their institution of possible upgrades or necessary changes.

The course entitled Developing Transitional Courses will discuss institutional decisions of using a CMS and what must change pedagogically when a CMS is added, or changed, in a program. Because CMS's are constantly being updated, upgraded, and deemed outdated, I wanted the course to not just focus on understanding a specific CMS, but also understanding the transferability of data, instructions, and evaluative measures from one CMS to another.

The course Fundamentals of Asynchronous and Synchronous Learning also stemmed from the @ONE course on CMSs because each CMS provides instructors with opportunities to make assignments synchronous or asynchronous. As this dissertation has established, instructors should not make the asynchronous-synchronous decision lightly and this course will guide instructors to making an informed pedagogical decision bearing in mind their demographic of students.

The current degree programs related to distance education is a limited supply of information from institutions worldwide. Although "distance education" or "online pedagogy" are popular search terms, many programs claiming to be affiliated with either of these often turn out to be information technology or communication positions, not positions related to online *education*. After reading through numerous institutional documents, I found only four institutions worldwide who offer degree programs directly related to online education: Walden University, The University of Sydney, The University of Melbourne, and The University of Maryland University College.

Walden University's Education Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Technology degree is an accredited terminal degree program specifically related to online pedagogy. The Ed.S. program

at Walden includes a course entitled Evolution of Educational Technology in Society, Education, and the Workplace, which led me to create an elective entitled Current Literature in Online Education (Walden University, 2011a). Although this type of course would involve a significant amount of prep work for instructors *each* time they would facilitate such a course, I feel that it is necessary to include this information *because* technology is constantly changing. Current Literature in Online Education would require degree-seeking students to read and understand current developments in the field of online education, as well as to seek publication in scholarly journals.

The University of Sydney's Master of Learning Science and Technology (MLS&T) professional stream is designed for individuals who seek to teach online or with technology. As this degree is offered from an Australian University, the requirements for successful completion of the graduate-level degree program are much different than the requirements of institutions in the United States. One of the core units of this program includes Innovations in Learning Technology & Practice, which led me to create the course Hybrid and Multimodal Teaching. The course description for Innovations in Learning Technology & Practice includes that this course will "cover emerging theoretical and empirical research in the field of the learning sciences related to how people learn, how to teach, and how to assess higher order knowledge, skills, and dispositions…" (University of Sydney, 2011b). One of the major aspects of learning *how* to teach online or with technology is to understand the pedagogical ramifications of teaching F2F, teaching online, teaching a hybrid class, or offering something experimental such as an "Information Highway" course. Therefore, Hybrid and Multimodal Teaching will give students the opportunity to consider the metacognitive processes of various classroom modalities.

The University of Melbourne's M.Ed. program has a specialization in Digital Technologies. The courses for this specialization added credibility to many of the courses already established for the degree program in online pedagogy. For instance, one of the courses of the University of Melbourne is Learning with Interactive Devices, helping to facilitate definition and description of Communicative Modes of Online Education; Technology Culture and Education, helping to facilitate Cultural Considerations for the Global Classroom (University of Melbourne, 2011). Further definition of the overlap of course development and data sources can be found in Table 2.

The University of Maryland University College (UMUC) represents the most forefront university in the United States offering advanced degrees specifically in distance education. The UMUC Master of Distance Education Teaching and Training (MDE) requires twelve master's level courses, similar in design to the twelve course, 36-credit hour program I designed to suit the program style and accreditation standards set forth by the MSSCHE. UMUCs MDE program offers two policy related courses that facilitated course design of two of my own policy courses. UMUC requires students to take Costs and Economics of Distance Education and E-learning as well as Library and Intellectual Property Issues in Distance Education and E-Learning (University of Maryland University College, DETT Specialization, 2011). Utilizing some of the fundamental concepts of these courses, I designed two electives: Maintaining Digital Law and Order and Academic Dishonesty in the Online Classroom. Maintaining Digital Law and Order requires that students understand the laws that impact their digital classrooms in terms of Fair Use and copyright, in particular. From reading the course description of Intellectual Property Issues in Distance Education and E-learning, I also felt it to be responsible to have an elective course related specifically to academic dishonesty in the online classroom. Although academic

dishonesty is prevalent in all types of classroom environments, online instructors face unique challenges with rampant plagiarism and technologies such as Turnitin. In order for an instructor to be well-prepared to handle inevitable situations of academic dishonesty in their classroom, a course in their degree program should focus on this rampant issue.

## Significance of Findings

As Chapter Two has indicated, the role of the teacher is changing with the advance of technology and online learning (Coppola, Hiltz, & Rotter, 2002; Egan & Akdere, 2005; Goodyear, Spector, Steeples, & Tickner, 2001; Guasch, Alvarez, & Espasa, 2010; Klein, Spector, Grabowski, & De la Teja, 2004; Williams, 2003). However, teacher training has not been modified to reflect this dramatic change in teachers and teaching opportunities. This leaves the field of education, higher education in particular, and its teachers, severely behind. As more researchers, scholars, teachers, and institutions of learning start to realize these significant differences between F2F and online learning, instruction, teacher training, and expectations of teacher qualifications will change dramatically. Instructors will be required to hold a degree in, or have significant training in, online pedagogy in order to teach online; just content knowledge will be insufficient for accredited programs and institutions. As online pedagogy becomes its own respected field of study, so to will the definition of required skills for this field. This dissertation has argued for the recognition of acquisition and learning as necessary components to a sufficient online teacher training program informed by New Literacy Studies. Hopefully, this dissertation will serve as a minor stepping stone in the progression of online pedagogy as a professional development buzzword, to a master's degree level program by offering institutions a starting place for creating a course or degree program.

**Opportunities for Further Research**

One of the major obstacles of this dissertation was the lack of published texts on many of the topics included in the degree program. As the field of online pedagogy progresses and grows, so will the demand for high-quality research in journals and textbooks for use in courses like the ones I have created. Although all of the twenty-two courses designed for the degree program in online pedagogy will require more publications, four topics in particular will require a significant amount of research to utilize in a course: History of Distance Education, Theory-Based Technological Opportunities, Maintaining Digital Law and Order, and Academic Dishonesty in the Online Classroom.

A course in History of Distance Education has very unique challenges because the field can move so rapidly; history is constantly being written and re-written. However, in order for instructors to understand the unique constraints of their teaching environment, they will need to understand the developing of their field from memorization through correspondence-based learning through the multitude of technologies available today.

Theory-Based Technological Opportunities has the same challenges as the previous course. The goal of Theory-Based Technological Opportunities is to give students an opportunity to utilize newly established technologies and to define the pedagogical concerns and metacognitive processes of these technologies. As with many of the courses of this degree program, Theory-Based Technological Opportunities will never be the same course twice, as new types of technologies are constantly emerging. However, this is designed as an advanced course to allow the students to possibly *develop* pedagogical outlines for certain technologies to be made available to the field of distance education through publication.

Maintaining Digital Law and Order and Academic Dishonesty in the Online Classroom carry unique constraints because these courses rely on the expertise of individuals outside of education or distance education. Digital Law and Order relies on information garnered through lawsuits, court ordered decisions, and the generation of new laws based on technological changes to social networking, communication, publishing, and higher education. Many of the rules and regulations have yet to be established, so this course has the potential to both discuss old or current issues, as well as to raise new causes for concern in terms of digital law. Academic Dishonesty carries the same potential, but on a smaller scale: within the constraints of higher education or an institution. Because regulations regarding academic dishonesty vary by programs, departments, colleges, or institutions, this course has the opportunity to study plagiarism as both a topic in itself as well as a phenomenon.

## Conclusion

This rhetorical inquiry has compiled significant benchmarks appropriate for online teacher training. This dissertation considered the research and teaching positions of individuals, organizations, and institutions of higher education in order to create one cohesive course and program for effectively training online instructors. Previously established standards for teacher training have, as identified through the data sources, addressed both acquisition and learning as possible methods for online pedagogy training. However, this dissertation demonstrates a continuum of technological acquisition and pedagogical learning for which courses need to fall into in order for instructors to be thoroughly and effectively trained for the online classroom. A crucial element was determined through examining data sources and designing curriculum: online pedagogy is an exceptionally dynamic field of study that requires its own recognition as a field, effective teacher training, and constant re-examination to account for technological

developments. It is only through a combination of acquisition and learning that an effective technological literacy program can be established.

## References

@ONE Project. (2010).Online Courses. Retrieved November 16, 2011 from http://www.onefortraining.org/online-courses.

American Federation of Teachers (AFT). (2001). American Federation of Teachers Press. Retrieved August 6, 2011 from http://www.aft.org/press/2001/011701.html.

Allen, E. & Seaman, J. (2010). *Class differences: Online education in the United States 2010.* Needham, MA: Sloan Consortium.

Arbaugh, J. B. (2002). Managing the on-line classroom: A study of technological and behavioral characteristics of web-based MBA courses. *Journal of High Technology Management Research, 13,* 203-223.

Aronowitz, S. (1992). Introduction. In M. Horkheimer, *Critical theory: selected essays* (pp. xi-xxi). New York: Continuum.

Ascough, R.S. (2002). Designing for online distance education: Putting pedagogy before technology. *Teaching Theology and Religion,* 5(1).

Bainbridge College. (2009). Faculty technology resources: Online pedagogy. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://fsweb.bainbridge.edu/gaview/pedagogy.html

Barclay, T. T. & Kemp, F. O. Network theory: A postmodern pedagogy for the writing classroom. *Computers and Community,* 1-27.

Barkley, S. & Bianco, T. (2001). Learning experts examine shortfalls in on-site and on-line training. *Performance Improvement, 40*(5), 13-15.

Baron, N. S. (2008). *Language in an online and mobile world*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barrett, B. (2010). Virtual teaching and strategies: Transitioning from teaching traditional classes to online classes. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 3*(12), 17-20.

Bates, A. W. & Poole, G. (2003). *Effective teaching with technology in higher education: Foundations for success.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beard, L. A. & Harper, C. (2002). Student perceptions of online versus campus instruction. *Education, 122,* 658-664.

Beattie, J., Spooner, F., Jordan, L., Algozzine, B., & Spooner, M. (2002). Evaluating instruction in distance learning classes. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 25*, 124-132.

Blythe, S. (2001). Designing online courses: User-centered practices. *Computers and Composition, 18*, 329-346.

Boettcher, J. V. & Conrad, R. (2010). *The online teaching survival guide: Simple and practical pedagogical tips*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boise State University Academic Technologies. (2011). Academic technologies homepage. Retrieved July 18, 2011 from http://at.boisestate.edu/Default.asp.

Bourdieu, P. (1999). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bronner, S. E. & Kellner, D. M. (1989). *Critical theory and society: A reader*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Brown University. (n.d.). Online Pedagogy: Links, Resources, Research. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http:www.brown.edu/ce/faculty/online/resources/pedagogy.php.

Bruckman, A. (2002). The future of E-learning communities. *Communications of the ACM, 45*(4), 60-63.

Brush, T., Glazewski, K., Rutowski, K., Berg, K., Stromfors, C., Van-Nest, M. H., Stock, L., & Sutton, J. (2003). Integrating technology in a field-based teacher training program: The PT3@ASU Project. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 51*, 57-72.

Burns, H. (1992). Teaching composition in tomorrow's multimedia, multi-networked classrooms. In G.E. Hawisher & P. LeBlanc (Eds.), *Re-imagining computers and composition: Research and teaching in the virtual age* (pp.115-130). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Burns, H. (1999). Foreward. In Cynthia L. Selfe, *Technology and literacy in the twenty-first century: The importance of paying attention* (pp.ix-xvii). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

California State University Stanislaus. (n.d.). Online Pedagogy. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from: http://teachonline.csustan.edu/onlinepedagogy/index.php.

Cannell, L. (1999). A review of literature on distance education. *Theological Studies, 36*(1), 1-72.

Chester, A. & Gwynne, G. (1998). Online teaching: Encouraging collaboration through anonymity. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 4*(21), 1-10.

Christ, F. (2007). Empowering faculty to empower student learning. Keynote speech at *2007 Best Practices Showcase and Expo*, a conference sponsored by SDCCS Online Learning Pathways. April 20, 2007, Miramar College, San Diego, CA.

Computers In Writing-Intensive Classrooms-Approaches to Integrating Computers. (2002). Computers in Writing-Intensive Classrooms: Approaches to Integrating Computers into Writing Classrooms. Retrieved August 31, 2011 from http://www.hu.mtu.edu/oldsites/ciwic/2011/aic.htm

Computers in Writing-Intensive Classrooms: Individual Projects. (2002). Computers in Writing-Intensive Classrooms: Individual Projects. Retrieved August 31, 2011 from http://www.hu.mtu.edu/oldsites/ciwic/2001/ip.htm

Computers in Writing-Intensive Classrooms: New Media. (2002). Computers in Writing-Intensive Classrooms: New Media. Retrieved August 31, 2011 from http://www.hu.mtu.edu/oldsites/ciwic/2001/nm.htm

Clark, R. E. (1994). Media will never influence learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 42*(2), 21-30.

Clark-Ibáñez, M. & Scott, L. (2008). Learning to teach online. *Teaching sociology: Lessons learned at the 2007 ASA annual meetings: Insights from the teaching-related workshops, 36*(1), 34-41.

Collison, G., Elbaum, B., Haavind, S., & Tinker, R. (2003). *Facilitating online learning: Effective strategies for moderators.* Madison, WI: Atwood.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2004). CCCC position statement on teaching, learning, and assessing writing in digital environments. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/digitalenvironments

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2011). Committee on best practices for online writing instruction (March 2013): Committee Charge. Retrieved September 18, 2011 from http://www.ncte.org/cccc/committees/owi

Conrad, R. M. & Donaldson, J. A. (2004). *Engaging the online learner: Activities and resources for creative instruction.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Considine, D., Horton, J., & Moorman, G. (2009). Teaching and reading the millennial generation through media literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(6), 471-481.

Coppola, W. N., Hiltz, R., & Rotter, N. (2002). Becoming a virtual professor: pedagogical roles and asynchronous learning networks. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 18*(4), 169-189.

Cox, M., Preston, C., & Cox, K. (1999). *What factors support or prevent teachers from using ICT in their classrooms?* Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference. University of Sussex at Brighton, September 2-5, 1999.

Cronjé, J. C. (2001). Metaphors and models in internet-based learning. *Computers & Education, 37*, 241-256.

Crystal, D. (2008). *Txting: The gr8 db8*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cummings, J. A., Bonk, C. J., & Jacobs, F. R. (2002). Twenty-first century college syllabi options for online communication and interactivity. *Internet and Higher Education, 5*, 1-19.

Dawson, K., Pringle, R. & Adams, T. L. (2003). Providing links between technology integration, methods courses, and school-based field experiences: A curriculum-based and technology-enhanced microteaching. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education, 20*, 41-47.

Delfino, M. & Persico, D. (2007). Online or face-to-face? Experimenting with different techniques in teacher training. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 23*, 351-365.

Doughty, H. R. (2009). *Guide to American graduate schools tenth edition.* New York: Penguin.

Drexel University. (2011). Catalog: Instructional Technology Specialist Certificate. Retrieved November 16, 2011 from http://drexel.edu/catalog/certificates/edu-tech.htm.

Dykman, C. A. & Davis, C. K. (2008). Online education forum: Part two—Teaching online versus teaching conventionally. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 19*(2), 157-164.

East Carolina University. (2011a). College of Education: Department of Mathematics, Science, and Instructional Technology Education. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/grcat/program/MATE.cfm.

East Carolina University. (2011b). Graduate Certificates in Instructional Technology. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.ecu.edu/educ/msite/it/certificates.cfm.

EFMD-CEL. (2011). Introductory Guide: teChnology-Enhanced Learning Accreditation for ICT-based learning programmes. Retrieved July 21, 2011 from http://www.efmd.org/images/stories/efmd/downloadables/EFMD_CEL_Quality_Brochure_SinglePages.pdf.

EFMD-CEL. (2011). Latest News from CEL. Retrieved July 21, 2011 from http://www.efmd.org/index.php/accreditation-/cel--programme-accreditation-for-technology-enhanced-learning.

Egan, M. T. & Akdere, M. (2005). Clarifying distance education roles and competencies: Exploring similarities and differences between professional and student-practitioners perspectives. *American Journal of Distance Education, 19*(2), 87-103.

Ertmer, P. (2003). Transforming teacher education: Visions and strategies. *Educational Technology Research and Development,* 51, 124-128.

Faigley, L. (1992). *Fragments of rationality: Postmodernity and the subject of composition*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Fitzpatrick, A. & Davies, G. (Eds.) (2003). *The impact of information and communication technologies on the teaching of foreign languages and on the role of teachers of foreign languages*. EC Directorate General of Education and Culture. Retrieved July 18, 2011 from http://ec.europa.edu/education/policies/lang/doc/ict.pdf.

Frey, N., Fisher, D., & Gonzalez, A. (2010). *Literacy 2.0: Reading and writing in 21st century classrooms*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Gallardo, X. C. (2006). How the online classroom changed the way I teach. *The Online Classroom*, 23-27.

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 2*(2-3), 87-105.

Gee, J. P. (1986). What is literacy? *Journal of Education, 171*(1), 18-25.

Georgia Southern University. (2011). Online Course Design: Introduction. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/col/id/index.php.

Gillette, D. (1999). Pedagogy, architecture, and the virtual classroom. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 8*(1), 21-37.

GoDegreesOnline. (2011). Online Degrees: More Popular than Ever. Retrieved July 12, 2011 from http://www.godegreesonline.com.

Goodyear, P., Spector, M., Steeples, C., & Tickner, S. (2001). Competence for online teaching: A special report. *Educational Technological Research and Development: A Quarterly*

*Publication of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 49*(1), 65-72.

Granić, A., Mifsud, C., & Ćukušić, M. (2009). Design, implementation, and validation of a Europe-wide pedagogical framework for e-Learning. *Computers & Education, 53,* 1052-1081.

Greenfield Community College. (2011). Professional Resources for Teaching & Learning: Online Teaching. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://web.gcc.mass.edu/faculty-support/online-teaching/.

Guasch, T., Alvarez, I., & Espasa, A. (2010). University teacher competencies in a virtual teaching/learning environment: Analysis of a teacher training experience. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26,* 199-206.

Gunawardena, C. & Zittle, F. (1997). Social presence as a predictor of satisfaction within a computer-mediated conferencing environment. *American Journal of Distance Education, 11*(3), 8-26.

Hagie, C., & Hughes, M. (2003). A close look at the discussion component in an online special education class. *Chulalongkorn Educational Review, 9*(2), 40-51.

Hampel, R. (2009). Training teachers for the multimedia age: Developing teacher expertise to enhance online learner interaction and collaboration. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 3*(1), 35-50.

Harasim, L. M., Hiltz, S. R., Teles, L. & Turoff, M. (1995). *Learning networks: A field guide to teaching and learning online.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hawisher, G.E. & LeBlanc, P. (1992). *Re-imagining computers and composition: Research and teaching in the virtual age*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Hawisher, G. E., LeBlanc, P., Moran, C., & Selfe, C. L. (1996). *Computers and the teaching of writing: American higher education 1979-1994: A history.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Herrington, A., Hodgson, K., & Moran, C. (Eds.) (2009). *Teaching the new writing: Technology, change, and assessment in the 21st-century classroom*. New York: Teachers College.

Hewett, B. L. & Ehmann, C. (2004). *Preparing educators for online writing instruction*. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.

Hikins, J. W. & Cherwitz, R. A. (2010). The engaged university: Where rhetorical theory matters. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 38*(2), 115-126.

Hochberg, J. M. (2006). Online distance education pedagogy: Emulating the practice of global business. *Distance Education, 27*(1), 129-133.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania. (2008). Center for Teaching Excellence: On-Line Pedagogy. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.iup.edu/page.aspx?id=84334.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania IT Support Center (2011a). Desire2Learn (D2L). Retrieved July 2, 2011 from http://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/d2l/default.aspx.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania IT Support Center. (2011b). Getting started with Desire2Learn for Students. Retrieved July 1, 2011 from http://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/howto.aspx?id=105109.

The Institute for Higher Education Policy. (2000). Quality on the line: Benchmarks for success in Internet-based distance education. Retrieved August 6, 2011 from http://www.ihep.org/assets/files/publication/m-r/QualityOnTheLine.pdf.

Jones, K. O. & Kelley, C. A. (2003). Teaching marketing via the internet: Lessons learned and challenges to be met. *Marketing Education Review, 13*(1), 81-89.

Kennedy, D. M. (2005). Standards for online teaching: lessons from the education, health, and IT sectors. *Nurse Education Today, 25*¸ 23-30.

Kennedy, G. E., Judd, T. S., Churchward, A., & Gray, K. (2008). First year students' experiences with technology: Are they really digital natives? *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 24*(1), 108-122.

King, A. (1993). From sage on the stage to guide on the side. *College Teaching, 41*(1), 30-35.

Kinneavy, J. L. (1980). *A theory of discourse*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Klein, J., Spector, M., Grabowski, B., & De la Teja, I. (2004). Instructor competencies: Standards for face-to-face, online, and blended settings. USA: IAP, IBSTPI, & AECT.

Ko, S. & Rossen, S. (2004). *Teaching online: A practical guide*. New York: Routledge.

Krashen, S.D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. & Seliger, H. (1975). The essential contributions of formal instruction in adult second language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 9*: 173-183.

Kuipers, C. (2011, October). *DE for dummies: What English instructors need to know when getting started in online education*. Research presented at the meeting of the English Association of Pennsylvania State Universities, Bloomsburg.

Lauer, J. M. & Asher, J. W. (1988). *Composition research: Empirical designs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lehman College. (2011). Faculty Online Rich Media Teaching and Learning: Online Pedagogy-Our Philosophy. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.lehman.cuny.edu/online-education/faculty/online-pedagogy.php.

Leiblein, E. (2000). Critical factors for successful delivery of online programs. *Internet and Higher Education, 3*, 161-174.

Littlejohn, A., Falconer, I., & Mcgill, L. (2008). Characterising effective eLearning resources. *Computers & Education, 50*, 757-771.

Long, M. (1977). Teacher feedback on learner error: mapping cognitions. In H. D. Brown, C.Yorio, & R. Crymes (Eds.) *On TESOL '77: Teaching and Learning English as a Second Language: Trends in Research and Practice.* Washington: TESOL, pp. 278-294.

MacMillan Reference USA. (2004). *The college blue book 31st edition: Distance learning programs.* New York: Thomson Gale.

Maor, D. (2006). Using reflective diagrams in professional development with university lecturers: A developmental tool in online teaching. *Internet and Higher Education, 9*, 133-145.

Maryland Virtual Learning Opportunities. (2011). Welcome to Maryland Virtual Learning Opportunities. Retrieved July 20, 2011 from http://mdk12online.org.

Mayers, T. (2005). *(Re)Writing craft: Composition, creative writing, and the future of composition studies.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.

McVay Lynch, M. (2002). *The online educator: A guide to creating the virtual classroom.* New York: Routledge.

Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2008). Becoming Accredited: Handbook for Applicants & Candidates for Accreditation. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.msche.org/publications_view.asp?idPublicationType=11&txtPublicationType=Manuals+on+Accreditation+Protocols.

Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2011a). Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Requirements of Affiliation and Standards for Accreditation. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.msche.org/publications_view.asp?idPublicationType=1&txtPublicationType=Standards+for+Accreditation+and+Requirements+of+Affiliation.

Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2011b). Distance Education Programs: Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education (Online Learning). Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.msche.org/publications/Guidelines-for-the-Evaluation-of-Distance-Education.pdf.

Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2011c). Frequently Asked Questions: Standards at a Glance. Retrieved August 4, 2011 from http://www.msche.org/?Nav1=About&Nav2=FAQ&Nav3=Question07

Mills, K. A. (2010). Shrek meets Vygotsky: Rethinking adolescents multimodal literacy practices in schools. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 54*(1), 35-45.

Moffett, J. (1968). *Teaching the universe of discourse.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook

Moore, M. G. & Kearsley, G. (1996). *Distance education: A systems view*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Monash University. (2003). Online Pedagogy and the Challenges for Academic Staff Development. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.monash.edu.au/groups/flt/eet/full_papers/spratt.pdf.

Moran, C. & Hawisher, G. E. (1997). Responding to writing on-line. *New directions for teaching and learning*, (69), 115-124.

Moran, C. & Selfe, C. L. (1999). Teaching English across the technology/wealth gap. *The English Journal, 88*(6), 48-55.

Mulford, D. K. (2005). *Online education: 6 steps to starting an online school*. Charleston, SC: BookSurge.

Myers-Wylie, D., Mangieri, J., & Hardy, D. (2009). *The In's and Out's of Online Instruction: Transitioning from Brick and Mortar to Online Teaching.*

Nachmias, R. (2002). A research framework for the study of a campus-wide Web-based academic instruction project. *Internet and Higher Education, 5*, 213-229.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). What makes a teacher effective? Retrieved September 18, 2011 from http://www.ncate.org/Public/ResearchReports/TeacherPreparationResearch/WhatMakesaTeacherEffective/tabid/361/Default.aspx.

National Council of Teachers of English. (2011). NCTE's History. Retrieved November 30, 2011 from http://www.ncte.org/history

National Council of Teachers of English. (2011). NCTE's Position Statements on Key Issues. Retrieved November 30, 2011 from http://www.ncte.org/positions.

NC Public Schools. (2011a). High School Courses. Retrieved July 20, 2011 from http://www.ncpublicschools.org/distancelearning/student/index.html.

NC Public Schools. (2011b). Welcome to N.C. Public Schools' Distance Learning. Retrieved July 20, 2011 from http://www.ncpublicschools.org/distancelearning/.

North, S. (1987). *The making of knowledge in composition: Portrait of an emerging field.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Northeastern University. (2009). Online Pedagogy. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.northeastern.edu/edtech/teaching_learning/online_pedagogy.

Orleans, A. V. (2010). Enhancing teacher competence through online training. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 19*(3), 371-386.

Osbourne, M., Houston, M., & Toman, N. (Eds.) (2007). *The pedagogy of lifelong learning: Understanding effective teaching and learning in diverse contexts*. New York: Routledge.

Palloff, R. M. & Pratt, K. (2007). *Building online learning communities: Effective strategies for the virtual classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Parkland College. (2010). Creating a Collaborative Environment for Your Students. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://gds.parkland.edu/gds/online/.

Patterson, E. (1996). The questions of distance education. *Theological Education, 33*, 59-74.

Pennsylvania State University. (2011a). Courses-Distance Education Certificate. Retrieved November 16, 2011 from http://www.worldcampus.psu.edu/degrees-and-certificates/distance-education-certificate/courses.

Pennsylvania State University. (2011b). Course List-Distance Education Certificate. Retrieved November 16, 2011 from http://www.worldcampus.psu.edu/degrees-and-certificates/distance-education-certificate/course-list.

Piaget, J. (1969). *The mechanisms of perception*. London: Routledge.

Picciano, A. (2002). Beyond student perceptions: Issues of interaction, presence, and performance in an online course. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 6*(1), 21-40.

Pope, M., Hare, D., & Howard, E. (2002). Technology integration: Closing the gap between what preservice teachers are taught to do and what they can do. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 10*, 191-203.

Porter, A., Griffiths, D. & Hedberg, J. (2003). From classroom to online teaching: Experiences in improving statistics education. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Decision Sciences, 7*(2), 53-56.

Pratt, K. (1996). *The Electronic Personality* (Doctoral dissertation, Fielding Graduate University).

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon, 9*(5), 1-6.

Reeves, T. C. (2003). Storm clouds on the digital education horizon. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 15*(1), 3-26.

Rovali, A. P. (2000). Building and sustaining community in asynchronous learning networks. *Internet and Higher Education, 3*, 285-297.

Russell, T. (1999). *The no significant difference phenomenon: A comparative research annotated bibliography on technology for distance education*. Montgomery, AL: International Distance Education Certification Center.

Ryan, M., Carlton, K. H., & Ali, N. S. (1999). Evaluation of traditional classroom teaching methods versus course delivery via the World Wide Web. *Journal of Nursing Education, 38*(6), 272-277.

San Diego State University Women's Studies Program. (2011). Women's Studies History. Retrieved September 17, 2011 from http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~wsweb/history.htm.

Savenye, W. C, Olina, Z. & Niemczyk, M. (2001). So you are going to be an online writing instructor: Issues in designing, developing, and delivering an online course. *Computers and Composition, 18*, 371-385.

Saxon, J. (2011, October). *Minding for S's and F's: Sequencing and feedback in online courses.* Research presented at the North Carolina Conference of English Instructors, New Bern.

Selfe, C. (1999). *Technology and literacy in the twenty-first century: The importance of paying attention*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

Smith, R. M. (2008). *Conquering the content: A step-by-step guide to online course design.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, S. (2005). The positive and challenging aspects of learning online and in traditional face-to-face classrooms: A student perspective. *Teacher Education*, 52-59.

Soon, K. H., Sook, K. I., Jung, C. W., & Im, K. M. (2000). The effects of Internet-based distance learning in nursing. *Computers in Nursing, 18*(1): 19-25.

Swartz, O. (1997). *Conducting socially responsible research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thurmond, V. A., Wambach, K., & Connors, H. R. (2002). Evaluation of student satisfaction: determining the impact of a web-based environment by controlling for student characteristics. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 16*(3): 169-189.

University of Central Florida. (2009). Teaching Online: Pedagogy. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from: http://teach.ucf.edu/pedagogy/.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2008). Pedagogy and Online Learning: Resources Regarding Pedagogy and Online Learning. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.library.illinois.edu/diglit/faculty/teaching/pedagogy.html.

University of Maryland University College. (2011). Accreditation. Retrieved July 21, 2011 from http://www.umuc.edu/accreditation/.

University of Maryland University College. (2011). Distance Education Teaching and Training (DETT) Specialization Description. Retrieved November 17, 2011 from http://www.umuc.edu/grad/gradprograms/mde-teaching-training.cfm.

University of Maryland University College. (2011). Expectations for Classroom Setup and Online Teaching. Retrieved July 20, 2011 from http://www.umuc.edu/ctl/upload/online_exp_doc_042105.pdf.

University of Maryland University College. (2011). Faculty Training and Certification. Retrieved July 20, 2011 from http://www.umuc.edu/ctl/training.cfm.

University of Maryland University College. (2011). Graduate Programs. Retrieved July 21, 2011 from http://www.umuc.edu/grad/gradprograms/index.cfm.

University of Melbourne. (2011). 960AC Master of Education (Stream 100B) Coursework. Retrieved November 17, 2011 from http://handbook.unimelb.edu.au/view/2011/960AC.

University of North Carolina. (2011). Certificate Inventory. Retrieved November 16, 2011 from http://www.northcarolina.edu/programs/certificates.php?&search_text=&mode=search&actn=go&result_only=0&g[degree_abbr]=M#searchtop.

University of San Francisco. (2011). Instructional Design Support. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://online-pedagogy.wiki.usfca.edu.support.

University of Sydney. (2011a). Master of Learning Science & Technology (MLS&T). Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://sydney.edu.au/education_social_work/coco/postgraduate/mlst/index.shtml.

University of Sydney. (2011b). Unit of Study Handbook: EDPC5023—Innovations in Learning Tech & Practice. Retrieved December 13, 2011 from http://ssa.usyd.edu.au/ssa/handbook/usodetail.jsp?uosindex=175821&session=2@academic_year=2012@back=1.

US Department of Education. (2011a). Accreditation> Agency List. Retrieved August 7, 2011 from http://ope.ed.gov/accreditation/Agencies.aspx.

US Department of Education. (2011b). Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Retrieved August 7, 2011 from http://ope.ed.gov/accreditation/ViewAgencyInfo.aspx?.agencyId=1&tp=undefined.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concepts of activity in soviet psychology.* Armonk, NY: Sharpe.

Walden University. (2011a). Education Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Technology. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.waldenu.edu/Degree-Programs/Education-Specialist-Programs/30783.htm.

Walden University. (2011b). About Us: University Accreditation. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.waldenu.edu/About-Us/18870.htm.

Walden University. (2011c). Course Descriptions. Retrieved November 8, 2011 from http://www.waldenu.edu/Degree-Programs/Education-Specialist-Programs/31794.htm.

Wallace, D. L. & Ewald, H. R. (2000). *Mutuality in the rhetoric and composition classroom.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

Wang, Y., Chen, N., & Levy, M. (2010). The design and implementation of a holistic training model for language teacher education in a cyber face-to-face learning environment. *Computers & Education, 55,* 777-788.

Warnock, S. (2009). *Teaching writing online: How & why.* Urbana, IL: NCTE.

WCET (WCHE Cooperative for Educational Technologies). (2011a). *No Significant Differences FAQ.* Retrieved July 18, 2011 from http://www.nosignificantdifference.org/faq.asp.

WCET. (2011b). *Who We Are*. Retrieved August 6, 2011 from http://wcet.wiche.edu.

Wegerid, R. (1998). The social dimension of asynchronous learning networks. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *21*. Retrieved July 18, 2011 from http://www.aln.org/publications/jaln/v2n1/v2n1_wegerif.asp.

Whitsel, C. (1998). Reframing our classrooms, reframing ourselves: Perspectives from a virtual Paladin. *Microsoft in Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.microsoft.com/education/hed/vision.htm.

Williams, P. E. (2003). Roles and competencies for distance education programs in higher institutions. *American Journal of Education, 17,* 45-57.

Willingham, D.T. (2009). *Why don't students like school?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

WorldWideLearn. (2011). United States Regional Accrediting Associations. Retrieved August 5, 2011 from http://www.worldwidelearn.com/accreditation/accreditation-associations.htm.

Young, R. E., Becker, A. L., & Pike, K. L. (1970). *Rhetoric: discovery and change*. New York: Harcourt.

## Appendix

Appendix A includes the full course descriptions listed in Chapter Four from East Carolina University, Drexel University, Pennsylvania State University, @ONE, Walden University, The University of Sydney, the University of Melbourne, and the University of Maryland University College. All of these course descriptions are readily available on the institution websites and corresponding annotations are footnoted appropriately.

**East Carolina University**[12]

EDTC 6010 Introduction to Instructional Technology (3) Overview of historical background, theories, instructional design and development, deliverers of instruction, current issues and trends.

EDTC 6020***** Principles of Instructional Design (3) Systematic process for design of instruction. Task analysis and task analysis diagrams, learner and context analysis, and development of instructional strategies.

> *EDTC 6060. Using the World Wide Web for Research (3) may be substituted for EDTC 6020 if one was accepted to the certificate program before Spring 2009.

EDTC 6300 Introduction to Distance Learning (3) Introduction to distance learning from an administrative and program development standpoint.

EDTC 7030 Web Teaching: Design and Development (3) Prerequisite: EDTC 6300 or 7310. Principles of Internet (web-based) instruction, including using Internet tools for instruction, and instructional design approaches.

[12] All course descriptions from East Carolina University are available online. East Carolina University. (2011). Graduate Certificates in Instructional Technology: Distance Learning and Administration Certificate. Retrieved December 12, 2011 from http://www.ecu.edu/cs-educ/msite/IT/certificates.cfm.

EDTC 7040 Instructional Strategies for Distance Learning (3) Principles and theories of distance learning, including design, delivery, and evaluation.

EDTC 7330 Management of Distance Education (3) Internet connectivity required. Introduction to management of distance education programs, covering online course management, strategic planning, faculty development and support services, student services, issues, and future trends.

**Drexel University**[13][14]

EDUC 533: Designing Virtual Communities for Staff Development: Examines the impact of distance learning and multimedia technologies on the educational systems of teachers and other professionals responsible for technology and professional development. Online discussion groups, video conferencing, and Web-based instruction will be used to form a virtual learning community. This course includes a 20-hour internship for ITS certification.

EDUC 534: Developing Educational Leadership and Team Building: Addresses leadership and team building competencies that instructional technologists need to work collaboratively with teachers, administrations, parent groups, and the community. Will use technologies that facilitate communication and team building. This course includes a 1-2 day field-based research assignment.

EDUC 535: Researching and Evaluating Technology: Course will focus on teaching and learning technology standards, general applications of technology and basic technology and

[13] All Drexel University courses beginning with the EDUC program code were found online at the following: Drexel University. (2011). Graduate Course Descriptions: Teacher Education Courses. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from https://duapp1.drexel.edu/webcourses/CourseListing.asp?SubjCode=EDUC&Levl=GR&Univ=DREX.
[14] The two Drexel University courses in this certificate program with the INFO program code were found online at the following: Drexel University. (2011). Graduate Course Descriptions: Information Science & Systems Courses. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from https://duapp1.drexel.edu/webcourses/CourseListing.asp?SubjCode=INFO&Levl=GR&Unix=DREX.

skills. Will examine and critique educational software and learning technologies, and through research, develop criteria for technology. This course includes a 1-2 day field-based research assignment.

EDUC 542: Fundamentals of Special Education: This course provides an overview of the essentials of special education for today's teachers. Specific emphasis is placed on; the history of special education, purposes of formal and informal assessments and current research on inclusive classrooms. Additional focus will be placed on legal/ethical considerations in testing and the translation of data. Field observation hours will be required.

EDUC 544: The Inclusive Classroom: The focus of this course is to teach teachers how to manage instruction for students with diverse learning and behavioral profiles in the inclusive classroom by examining normal and abnormal cognitive, physical, social, behavioral and language development of children. The course will address curricular, environmental and instructional adaptations in addressing students' needs. Field observation hours will be required.

EDUC 552: Integrating Technology for Learning and Achievement: This course is designed to teach educators how to integrate technology into instruction to support achievement in general and special education classes, specifically to support reading, writing and mathematics achievement. It also focuses on the use of technology for universal design for learning and using assistive technology with students with disabilities.

INFO 520: Social Context of Information Professionals: Surveys the professional, social, ethical, and legal issues that affect information service professionals and organizations. Addresses such

topics as information law, access, ownership, and censorship. Studies professional organizations and the sociology of professions.

INFO 640: Managing Information Organizations: Applies theories and techniques of management to libraries, information centers, and information enterprise, concentrating on political processes, leadership, communication, human resources, organizational structure, decision making, planning, and control. Also includes elements of project management.

Also, if students of this program do not have any prior teaching experience, they are also required to take the following:

EDUC 522: Evaluation of Instruction: Enables the student to acquire competence in evaluation techniques including portfolios, journals, performance assessments, individual and collaborative projects, and presentations. The course covers qualitative and quantitative assessment used in measuring student achievement. Techniques for grading will also be explored.

EDUC 525: Multimedia in Instructional Design: Investigates learning theory and its implications for interactive multimedia formats, including the relationship of instructional design principles to selection of media elements (text, video, sound, animation, and graphics) for high-quality design. Examines human-computer interface principles, navigation features, and visual thinking using a wide range of educational software examples. Criteria for software assessment and virtual classrooms are reviewed. Students design and write a software prototype as a group design project. Complex issues and concepts in technology and education are analyzed.

**Pennsylvania State University**[15]

ADTED 460: Introduction to Adult Education: History, methods, agencies, program areas, and problems of adult education in the United States and selected countries.

ADTED 470: Introduction to Distance Education: An introduction to the history, philosophy, organizations, learning theories, and instructional procedures used in American and international distance education.

ADTED 505: Teaching Adults Responsibly: Virtues operating in particular teaching situations are examined. Also examined are opportunities and challenges enabling and constraining those virtues.

ADTED 531: Course Design and Development in Distance Education: In-depth study of the practices of designing courses taught by print, broadcast, and telecommunications media to adult distance learners. Prerequisites: ADTED 470, INSYS 415

ADTED 532: Research and Evaluation in Distance Education: Study of previous, current, and needed research, and of strategies and issues concerning evaluation, in distance education.

As part of this certificate program, students must also take one of the following courses as an elective:

EDTEC 440: Introduction to Computers for Education: Use of micro computers, video, and other media in education; models use technologies that include video, audio, print, computer, and telephone.

EDTEC 449: Video and Hypermedia in the Classroom: Skills and knowledge needed to direct the use of learning technologies in educational settings.

[15] All Pennsylvania State University certificate program descriptions were retrieved online from: Pennsylvania State University. (2011). Course List- Distance Education Certificate. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from http://www.worldcampus.psu.edu/degrees-and-certificates/distance-education-certificate/course-list.

EDTEC 461: Designing Computer Networks for Educators: Applying fundamental concepts of computer networking to design effective networks for educational purposes. Prerequisite: EDTEC 448 or equivalent

EDTEC462: Coordinating Technology Use in Education: Skills and knowledge needed to direct the use of learning technologies in educational settings. Prerequisite: EDTEC 448 or equivalent

EDTEC 566: Computers as Learning Tools: Using software to support instructional design and learning, including databases, spreadsheets, semantic networks, expert systems, hypermedia construction, modeling tools, and computer conferencing. Prerequisite: EDTEC 400 or 440

**@ONE**

Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning[16]: Are you thinking about teaching online? This course will introduce you to effective practices in online instruction. Building on a solid understanding of California Community College distance education policies and procedures, you will actively create an effectively designed online learning unit. As you plan your own online course you will learn how to:

- maximize student success by designing effective student-centered learning activities to address different learning styles
- develop customized online policies for your class
- identify the critical functions of a course management system
- evaluate online assessment options
- successfully apply copyright and fair use practices to digital content.

[16] @ONE. (2011). Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning with Catherine Hillman. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from http://www.onefor training.org/node/545.

Creating Accessible Online Courses[17]: Are you interested in reaching as many of your potential students as possible? Then make your course(s) accessible to all students by following a few simple practices. Not only is accessibility legally mandated for public education in California, it's simply the right thing to do. It's not hard and your students will benefit.

Building Online Community with Social Media[18]: Learning is, by nature, a social activity and successful online courses should be designed with this in mind. This class will explore the essentials of fostering community in an online class and provide you with a robust toolkit of tips, learning activities, and creative uses of new collaborative technologies for you to integrate into your course design. Experience new levels of student engagement and retention and see online learning through a whole new lens! Throughout the class, you will be using a variety of tools to converse with your classmates through voice and video conversations, connect through our own closed social network and collaboratively build a wiki.

Designing Effective Online Assessments[19]: Properly assessing your students' performance can be challenging even in traditional classrooms. While teaching online you'll discover not only new challenges, but also more assessment opportunities. This course will introduce you to effective practices in online assessment. Building on a solid understanding of California Community College distance education policies and procedures, you will actively create an effective assessment strategy aligned with student learning outcomes. As you design your assessment strategy you will learn:

[17] @ONE. (2011). Creating Accessible Online Courses with Carolyn Fiori and James Glapa-Grossklag. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from http://www.onefortraining.org/node/547.
[18] @ONE. (2011). Building Online Community with Social Media with Michelle Pacansky-Brock. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from http://www.onefortraining.ord/node/549.
[19] @ONE. (2011). Designing Effective Online Assessments with William Doherty and Kathryn Damm. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from http://www.onefortraining.org/node/551.

- why online assessment is important and what opportunities online assessment offers you
- how to maximize the potential of the digital paradigm in designing your assessment strategy
- how to use a variety of assessment techniques and methods as a critical element in student centered instruction
- about test preparation activities, test bias, and accessibility concerns for the online environment
- how using projects, web resources and digital tools can reduce the possibility of cheating and plagiarism

Introduction to Teaching with Moodle[20]: Are you ready to become a Moodler? Moodle is an easy-to-use, open source, course management system for online, hybrid, or face-to-face classes. In this course you'll learn how to enter a Moodle course shell and organize and present content—including graphics—all without needing to know HTML! You'll discover handy tools for site, course, and student management functions, as well as tools for creating quizzes, assignments with due dates, grades, and interactive forums. You'll not only finish the course with a working knowledge of Moodle, you'll also walk away with the foundation for your own online course.

Introduction to Teaching with Blackboard 9.1[21]: Are you interested in learning how to use Blackboard to teach online? In this course, you'll experience Blackboard from both student and instructor perspectives, while creating your own online course. You'll also learn how to include content from a variety of sources (including multimedia) to give you more teaching power. This

[20] @ONE. (2011). Introduction to Teaching with Moodle with Joan Van Duzer. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from http://www.onefortraining.org/node/553.
[21] @ONE. (2011). Introduction to Teaching with Blackboard 9.1. with Greg Beyrer. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from http://www.onefortraining.org/node/554.

course is recommended for faculty new to using Blackboard, or for those would like to learn more about new features. This course is taught using Blackboard v9.

Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning[22]: Are you thinking about teaching online? This course will introduce you to effective practices in online instruction. Building on a solid understanding of California Community College distance education policies and procedures, you will actively create an effectively designed online learning unit. As you plan your own online course you will learn how to:

- maximize student success by designing effective student-centered learning activities to address different learning styles
- develop customized online policies for your class
- identify the critical functions of a course management system
- evaluate online assessment options
- successfully apply copyright and fair use practices to digital content.

**Walden University**

Walden University course descriptions are not readily available online. These course descriptions are only available to current students, instructors, and administrators of Walden University. The nature of the Ed.S. degree courses were inferred from their title.

[22] @ONE. (2011). Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning with Catherine Hillman. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from http://www.onefortraining.org/node/546.

**The University of Sydney**[23]

Foundations of Learning Sciences: In this unit we build on work in the learning sciences (psychology, education, cognitive and neurosciences) as we look at psychological modes of learning, cognition and motivation, especially as they relate to multimedia and computer-supported learning. Contemporary educational technology use will be analysed from a number of perspectives, including classical information theory, psychological media and communication theories, activity theory, socio-cultural learning theory, constructivist and models of distributed cognition.

Design for Learning: This course provides a framework for considering many of the core problems facing those who carry out the work of educational design. It offers a model of the architecture of learning situations and focuses on three main design components that influence the character and outcomes of learning: the design of good learning tasks, the design of physical and digital resources and spaces for learning, and design intended to evoke convivial learning relationships. The course does not aim to teach specific design techniques - for example, the steps in Instructional Systems Design (ISD). Rather, it suggests ways of identifying which tools and techniques, from the many now available, are most likely to be appropriate for a specific design challenge. The course therefore offers an overview of selected, contemporary approaches, techniques and tools of relevance to designing for other people's learning. It also provides an opportunity to review empirical research on how designers design and what knowledge they draw upon in design work.

[23] The University of Sydney. (2011). Unit of Study Handbook-DETAILS- Foundations of Learning Sciences. Retrieved December 14, 2011from https://ssa.usyd.edu.au/ssa/handbook/uosdetail.jsp?uosindex=175819&session=1&academic_year=2012&back=1.

Innovations in Learning Tech & Practice: This unit explores how new views of learning and pedagogical practices interact and co-evolve with technological inventions and innovations in formal and informal learning settings. Course readings cover emerging theoretical and empirical research in the field of the learning sciences related to how people learn, how to teach, and how to assess higher order knowledge, skills, and dispositions, as well as recent technological developments such as virtual worlds and game environments, 3D computational modeling and visualization tools, mobile communication devices, and "Web 2.0" systems that are increasingly being augmented with intelligent agents and semantic web functionalities. A central themes of this course include how theoretical and research perspectives are used to ground new types of learning and teaching experiences enabled by advanced and emerging technologies, which in turn have the potential to better prepare students for the significant challenges and rapid changes of this century.

Systems, Change and Learning: In this core unit we will use 'systems inquiry' as a conceptual framework to explore change and learning processes, on the individual, group and organisational level. We focus on a theory-based approach to change management and organisational learning, so that students can come to appreciate the complexity and non-linearity of bringing about change in schools, corporations and other organisations. Drawing on contemporary research in the learning sciences, we will explore group and individual learning and conceptual change processes. Students will apply modern conceptual change approaches to investigate their own learning process, and will gain hands-on experience as they apply systems inquiry concepts and methods to analyse change problems in their own professional environment.

In addition to those four required units, students of this program are required to choose one of the following electives:

Learning Tech. in Education & Practice: This unit looks at how learning technologies may be used to facilitate learning in both education and corporate settings. Students will be introduced to strategies in relevance to design (e.g. motivational design, self-regulated learning) and assessment for technology-mediated learning. Opportunities will be provided for students to investigate the best practices in an area of their interests or their profession and issues that may arise from implementation of technology-mediated learning. Students are required to have adequate internet access.

Learning, Knowing and Thinking: A core unit of study which examines ways in which current understanding of cognitive processes related to learning, knowing and thinking may contribute to the design of learning experiences in varied settings. Consideration will be given to constructivist and generative approaches to learning and to schema therory approaches to facilitating knowledge development and problem-solving skills. Emphasis will be placed on the teaching of learning strategies, the development of metacognitive skills and the integration of domain knowledge and strategic knowledge. Issues of transfer of learning, patterns of student interaction in learning, creativity and the facilitation of self-regulartion in the learner will be examined.

Learning and Teaching Thinking Skills: This core unit of study centres on examination and evaluation of a number of approaches to the development of higher order cognitive skills. Consideration will be given to the structuring of knowledge to facilitate explanation, problem-solving and creativity and to the use of internalised sefl-regulatory control strategies in fostering cognitive outcomes. Ways in which thinking and cognition can be supported and extended in

educational contexts will be examined in some detail. Particular attention will be given to factors that influence thinking, the role of tools and technologies in facilitating thinking, and perspectives on thinking and cognition generated by contemporary research in cognitive science.

Adult Learning and Development: This unit examines selected issues relating to adult development and adult learning. Concepts of growth and decline are explored, particularly in relation to cognitive development, transitions in the workplace, within families, and in other social contexts. Considerations of adult learning focus on adult conceptions of learning, higher education, and the development of expertise. It considers contexts for adult learning, and concepts of self-directed and self-regulated learning.

Individual Professional Learning Portfolio: This unit provides you with the opportunity to develop a portfolio, where you can document and critically examine how you supported the learning of other participants in your formal or informal setting. Students are expected to implement an initiative to improve participants' learning in a formal or informal setting. Students are expected to have successfully completed other units of study before enrolling in this unit. University staff may undertake this unit by completing the development program for Research Higher Degree Supervision. No concurrent enrolment with EDPZ6010 unless special permission has been granted by the Faculty. Permission from unit of study coordinator must be sought prior to enrolling.

Professional Learning Leadership Portfolio: This unit is designed to enable educators, with the support of a mentor, to document and engage in critical reflection on professional workplace learning, differing from its companion unit EDPZ5010, due to the focus on leadership and your professional role in working with colleagues' professional development. This unit provides you

with the opportunity to develop a professional portfolio where you can document and critically examine how you have led others to improve the work in your formal or informal setting. Students are expected to have successfully completed other units of study before enrolling in this unit. University staff may complete this unit by undertaking the development program Research Higher Degree Supervision. No concurrent enrolment with EDPZ5010 unless special permission has been granted by the Faculty. Permission from the unit of study coordinator must be sought prior to enrolling.

**The University of Melbourne**

EDUC90588 Learning with Interactive Devices[24]: This subject explores the educational possibilities and philosophies of the use of a range of virtual and physical electronic devices to support learning. Examples include Turtles, Lego Logo and Mindstorms, PicoCrickets, Scratch, interactive whiteboards and other interactive surfaces, remote data collection and analysis, remote control of apparatus, both virtual and physical, and mobile devices. Hands-on experience and experimentation is a major component of the subject, but at all times the context of that experimentation is practical application to support learning, particularly for developing teamwork and catering for a wide range of student interests, abilities and learning styles.

EDUC90589 Technology Culture and Education[25]: This subject analyses of the use of information and communications technology in education, domestic and adolescent and other cultures using current and developing social and education theory. It particularly focuses on identifying educational and social theory perspectives on current and potential uses of

[24] University of Melbourne. (2011). Handbook: EDUC90588 Learning with Interactive Devices. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from: https://handbook.unimelb.edu.au/view/2012/EDUC90588.
[25] University of Melbourne. (2011). Handbook: EDUC90589 Technology Culture and Education. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from: https://handbook.unimelb.edu.au/view/2012/EDUC90589.

technologies in schools and other education and digital settings. It critically appraises developing theories and controversies around new network based learning, communication and other social practices. It compares social, political and educational perspectives on issues that emerge from the use of information technology and technological networks in education and associated cultures.

EDUC90590: Digital Technologies in the Curriculum[26]: This subject will examine key aspects the uses of digital technologies in education, with a specialization (chosen by the student) in primary, secondary, or higher education. A detailed investigation of the roles and uses of digital technologies in a selected area of the curriculum will be undertaken. Implications of technological changes in society for the curriculum will be explored.

EDUC90591: ICT & 21st Century Learning Communities[27]: This subject explores the practical 21st Century application of theories of communities of practice as described by Wenger and Lave, and others. It explores virtual learning communities with a particular focus on open source tools and resources. Underlying this investigation is a theoretical framework designed to make relevant and contextual links between theory and practice. The subject should be of interest to educators from all sectors including primary and secondary, tertiary, industry and training, and others interested in the use of modern applications to support learning communities.

[26] University of Melbourne. (2011). Handbook: EDUC90590: Digital Technologies in the Curriculum. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from: https://handbook.unimelb.edu.au/view/2012/EDUC90590.
[27] University of Melbourne. (2011). Handbook: EDUC90591: ICT & 21st Century Learning Communities. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from: https://handbook.unimelb.edu.au/view/2012/EDUC90591.

**The University of Maryland University College**[28]

UCSP 611: Introduction to Graduate Library Research Skills: Required within the first 6 credits of graduate study for all new graduate students.) An overview of online library and information resources material that is critical for 21st-century managers. An in-depth introduction to the library research process and the tools necessary to succeed in graduate study are provided. Emphasis is on the efficient and effective use of a variety of electronic retrieval systems, including the online catalog of the University System of Maryland and affiliated institutions (USMAI), UMUC"s subscription databases, and the Web. Discipline-specific research is conducted in order to gain experience in formulating viable research questions, selecting the most appropriate investigative methods and resources for research, locating relevant research materials, evaluating the scholarly value of sources, and effectively citing sources.

ODME 601: Foundations of Distance Education and E-Learning: (Developed by Ulrich Bernath of Germany and Eugene Rubin of the United States, in collaboration with Borje Holmberg of Sweden and Otto Peters of Germany.) An overview of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are required by a competent practitioner of distance education. Critical concepts and issues identified in the distance education literature are explored and the history and theories of the field are critically examined.

ODME 603: Technology in Distance Education and E-Learning: A review of the history and the terminology of technology used in distance education. The basic technology building blocks of hardware, networks, and software are identified. Analysis covers the characteristics of

[28] University of Maryland University College. (2011). Distance Education Teaching and Training (DETT) Specialization Description. Retrieved December 14, 2011 from: http://www.umuc.edu/grad/gradprograms/mde-teaching-training.cfm.

asynchronous and synchronous technologies and tools used in the teaching and learning, as well as the administration of distance education. The relationship between technology and the goals of the educational/training organization are critically examined. The relationship between information technology (especially online technology) and distance education is explored. Topics include the criteria and guidelines for selecting technologies for distance education and the future directions of technology in distance education.

ODME 610: Teaching and Learning in Online Distance Education: An exploration of the online teaching and learning dynamic, including its theoretical foundation and best practices. The themes that shape the online teaching/learning relationship are addressed through individual and collaborative projects. Topics include philosophical frameworks; instructional, social, and cognitive presence; interaction, collaboration, and participation; community and engagement; and administration and management.

ODME 606: Costs and Economics of Distance Education and E-Learning: (Developed by Thomas Huelsmann of Germany.) A study of the economics of distance education in the larger context of the economics of education. A variety of methodological approaches (including cost/benefit and cost/effectiveness analysis) are applied to the distance education context. A variety of costing techniques and economic models are explored and applied to different institutional forms and levels of distance education.

ODME 608: Learner Support in Distance Education and Training: An introduction to the theories and concepts of support for learners in distance education and training. The various types of learner support including tutoring and teaching; advising and counseling; and library, registrarial, and other administrative services are examined. Discussion addresses management

issues, such as planning, organizational models, staffing and staff development, designing services to meet learner needs, serving special groups, and evaluation and applied research. Assignments include designing a learner support model for a particular context (e.g., public or private educational institution or corporate or military training).

DETT 607: Instructional Design and Course Development in Distance Education and E-Learning: (Formerly OMDE 607.) An examination of the instructional design process, its history and place in today's course development efforts, and the use of instructional design components in practice. Emphasis is on the nature of learning and the requirements for effective instruction. The theoretical underpinnings of learning are explored and applied to the design of a prototype classroom. Management issues surrounding course and curriculum development efforts are discussed, and a comprehensive curriculum management plan is developed.

DETT 620: Training and Learning with Multimedia: (Formerly OMDE 620. Developed by Joachim Hasebrook of Germany.) An examination of the use of digital media in a variety of educational settings to identify properties, strengths, and weaknesses of multimedia in different learning contexts. Basic psychological processes of perception, understanding, and learning are introduced. Focus is on multimedia and instructional design for online learning systems, such as Web-based training. Hands-on experiences with several multimedia and online learning and information systems are provided. Topics also include groupware and collaborative learning technologies, intelligent systems, instructional simulations, and virtual reality systems.

DETT 611: Library and Intellectual Property Issues in Distance Education and E-Learning: (Formerly OMDE 611.) An overview of the development and delivery of digital resources for distance education. Discussion covers the intellectual property issues affecting the use of

copyrighted works in distance education, developing and delivering library resources online to a faculty and student population, and the future of digital information delivery and the impact of digital rights management (DRM) technologies and social networking.

EDTC 650: Special Topics in Instructional Technology: Prerequisite: EDTC 640 or DETC 620. An introduction to K-12 distance education, including the policies and structures of K-12 virtual schools, teaching and course development strategies appropriate for K-12 online courses, and current issues involved in the K-12 virtual enterprise. Emphasis will be on K-12 schools that offer courses over the Internet; also included will be discussion of principles that apply to other forms of K-12 distance education, such as television and correspondence courses. Topics include different models of current K-12 virtual schools; district, state, and national regulations governing these schools; role of parental involvement and student support systems; social and collaborative aspects of learning at a distance; and training and mentoring of online K-12 teachers. Trends in international K-12 virtual schools will be compared with those in the U.S. The effectiveness of virtual schools and courses at the elementary and secondary school level will be explored.

DETT 621: Training at a Distance: (Formerly OMDE 621.) An examination of the role of distance training in business, nonprofit, and government organizations. A wide variety of issues, problems, and solutions in Web-based training are explored. Topics include the economics of distance training, distance technology in the business organization, synchronous versus asynchronous interactive tools, collaborative and problem-solving tools, authoring tools, insourcing versus outsourcing, and the role of multimedia in distance training. Emphasis is on the concept of the corporate virtual university and its design and operation.

DEPM 604: Leadership in Distance Education and E-Learning: (Formerly OMDE 604.) An introduction to the organization, management, and administration of distance education and e-learning training programs and systems. Topics include management theory and practice, organizational behavior and change, leadership roles and styles, and planning and policy. Discussion covers education and training in academic and corporate settings and the knowledge and skills necessary for a distance education practitioner to function effectively in either type of organizational environment. Assignments include individual and group case-study analyses, brief essays, and literature searches related to distance education and e-learning leadership.