Boise State University

ScholarWorks

2020

Flexible Teaching for Student Success: A Three-Tiered Initiative to Prepare Faculty for Flexible Teaching

Devshikha Bose
Boise State University

Lisa Berry
Boise State University

Rob Nyland
Boise State University

Anthony Saba
Boise State University

Teresa Focarile
Boise State University

Flexible Teaching for Student Success: A Three-Tiered Initiative to Prepare Faculty for Flexible Teaching

Devshikha Bose, Lisa Berry, Rob Nyland, Anthony Saba, and Teresa Focarile

The COVID-19 pandemic brought some unique challenges for the academic community. To counter the disruption caused by campus closure, faculty who taught in-person, blended, and hybrid courses needed to be prepared to pivot to remote instruction. This article describes the design and evaluation results of a three-tiered professional development initiative that focused on preparing faculty to teach with flexibility, whatever may be the necessary teaching environment. This design may serve as a model for professional developers building similar programs for faculty. The authors also share a resource—a Flexible Learning and Instruction Plan (FLIP).

Introduction

In spring 2020, the world experienced an unprecedented emergency in the form of the COVID-19 outbreak. Face-to-face teaching and learning were curtailed by the worldwide pandemic, which necessitated social distancing. Instructors who usually taught in-person courses were suddenly asked to teach in a "remote" format, and faculty and students both reported experiencing many technical, social, emotional, and learning challenges as a result. Most centers for teaching and learning (CTLs) saw in this moment a dire need to prepare faculty to teach remotely, thus supporting the continuity of instruction not only in the current term but also when social distancing might be required again in the near (and even distant) future.

Conversations within national and international faculty professional development organizations and other faculty support forums indicated the need to prepare faculty to teach in a flexible format. Discussions are still continuing around how students should be taught. Descriptions like hyflex, synchronous online, remote, asynchronous, hybrid, and blended are only some

of the course configurations being considered. The debate on the nomenclature of how courses should be best described still continues in the faculty developer community. However, one thing is clear—faculty should be prepared to teach online, whether remotely/synchronously or asynchronously, as well as face-to-face. This article describes the design of a three-tiered approach to professional development for faculty that prepared them to be flexible in their teaching.

Background

Formal and informal data on student and faculty perceptions at many universities indicated that on the whole, the learning and teaching experience in the spring of 2020 was not optimum. A survey conducted at the University of Pittsburgh (2020, May) indicated that of the respondents, 61% of the faculty found it somewhat or very difficult to get students to adequately participate and respond. While 63% of the faculty found it somewhat or very difficult to understand how best to assess student learning in a remote environment, 56% found it somewhat or very difficult to translate their lessons or activities to the remote environment. A large-scale survey conducted by Ithaka S+R involving more than 15,000 students across 21 U.S. colleges and universities indicated that during the pivot to online learning, students faced many learning challenges (Blankstein, Frederick, & Wolff-Eisenberg, 2020). Some of these challenges included: finding a quiet place for school-related work; completing collaborative, technical, and specialized assignments; disconnection from peers; feeling physically and mentally unsafe due to the pandemic; and food and housing insecurities.

Most faculty were preparing for an uncertain Fall semester. As indicated in a large-scale survey conducted by Top Hat with over 800 faculty and instructional support staff in July 2020, 51% of the respondents felt uncertain about the fall term. In the same survey, nearly half (49%) of the faculty indicated that they did not have clear directions from their institutions on how to prepare for fall. In a survey involving 826 U.S. faculty and administrators representing 641 different institutions, nearly half (48%) the faculty respondents indicated the need to have an online resource hub on how to quickly transition online (Johnson, Veletsianos, & Seaman, 2020). Hence, it was essential that training and resources support a flexible transition to online teaching and learning.

Flexible Teaching for Student Success Initiative: What and Why?

While there are many modalities of teaching and learning—online, face-to-face, hybrid, and blended to name a few—the COVID-19 pandemic showed us that we need to be prepared for flexibility. We need to be able to pivot to different learning environments that meet the needs of students when on-campus teaching is not an option. The goal of the Flexible Teaching for Student Success Initiative (FTSS) was to prepare faculty to teach not in any specific modality but to be flexible, so that they are ready to respond to changes in circumstances imposed by the pandemic.

The authors acknowledge that there are multiple definitions and terms describing various teaching modalities. For the purposes of this article, "flexible" is used to describe the adjustable format in which a course can be delivered. Flexible teaching is marked by the ability to deliver course content synchronously and asynchronously, in face-to-face, blended, hybrid as well as in remote learning formats. Remote teaching is distinguished from fully online asynchronous courses in that the former denotes a course that includes required synchronous sessions, whereas the latter has no required real-time activities. An asynchronous course is defined as an online course which allows students to learn primarily at their own pace and time, but may include some optional synchronous sessions that are offered or encouraged. The term "blended course" is defined here as courses which are face-to-face but are accompanied by online materials and activities which supplement and enhance the content discussed in the face-to-face classroom (Siegelman, n.d.). A hybrid course is being defined as one in which online learning replaces an element of the face-to-face class (Wong, n.d.). Materials that are shared asynchronously in this course, are considered to be part of the main lesson plan and meant to be alternatives to in-person instruction. Thus, a hybrid approach combines asynchronous and synchronous materials to create a flexible learning environment.

Boise State University is a mid-sized, metropolitan public research university located in the northwest United States. In the 2019-2020 academic year, the university had a student body of 26,272 and 1,410 instructional faculty. The U.S. News and World Report ranked Boise State in the nation's top 50 Most Innovative schools. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) at Boise State was founded in 2006 and currently has 13 full-time staff mem-

bers. The CTL's mission is to support, promote, and enhance teaching effectiveness and engagement in student learning. To achieve this mission, the CTL provides consultation, resources, and programs that promote excellence in teaching through the use of evidence-based instructional practices. In order to prepare faculty to teach flexibly and effectively in Fall 2020, the CTL at Boise State partnered with the eCampus Center to create the FTSS—a three-tiered faculty professional development (PD) offered during the summer of 2020. The eCampus Center at Boise State is a unit that focuses on assisting faculty with the design of fully asynchronous online courses as well as PD on how to effectively teach online.

The FTSS targeted faculty who had little-to-no experience developing or teaching a non-traditional classroom-based course, i.e., fully online, remote, hybrid, or blended delivery. Designed and delivered by a team of instructional designers and faculty members from both units, the goal of the FTSS was to prepare faculty who usually teach face-to-face to pivot to other modalities of teaching, in case an emergency situation led to campus closure. However, the pedagogic methods discussed in the FTSS could be easily applied to face-to-face, hybrid, and blended courses, in case the circumstances did not require any sort of pivoting.

To model flexibility, the FTSS was designed to have three tiers, thus offering participation options for faculty. Content was similar across the tiers but varied in the depth of the learning experience, giving faculty the opportunity to select the option that best aligned with their needs and availability. Due to the pandemic and consequent campus closure during summer 2020, the facilitated sessions modelled effective asynchronous online teaching practices while providing an opportunity for faculty to experience online asynchronous learning from the student perspective.

Program Description

The following sections describe the three tiers of the FTSS in greater detail.

Tier 1: Institute

Tier 1 of the FTSS consisted of a single, three-week highly facilitated online Institute. Participating faculty were expected to asynchronously engage with the content for approximately 36 hours. In summer 2020, four sessions of the Institute were offered, with three to four sections in each session. In this article, "Tier 1: Institute" is used interchangeably with "Institute" and "Tier 1" to denote the same meaning.

Each session of the Institute was co-facilitated by a faculty member experienced in online teaching and an instructional designer from the CTL or eCampus Center. Apart from other course completion assignments, the primary final deliverable of the Institute was a course planning document referred to as the Flexible Learning and Instruction Plan (FLIP). Upon completion of the requirements of the institute, faculty were eligible to receive a $1000 stipend. However, faculty had the option to decline a stipend, keeping in mind the budgetary constraints imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic on the limited resources of the university.

The FTSS Institute was designed for faculty who were new to non-traditional classroom-based formats, i.e., fully online asynchronous, synchronous/remote, hybrid, or blended delivery and would benefit from experiencing such a course first-hand while also receiving specific and immediate feedback from experienced faculty and instructional designers. The Institute could also be beneficial to faculty who may already be familiar with asynchronous teaching but were looking for additional skills and/or collaboration with peers around flexible course planning. This time-intensive, fully asynchronous course had both group and individual activities, which gave faculty the opportunity to interact with peers while considering important aspects of their Fall 2020 courses. Participants considered their course learning outcomes, identified alternative assessments, reviewed the key elements of asynchronous teaching, and planned ways to create engaging, inclusive, learning experiences for students. The purpose of the Institute was to prepare faculty to have a foundation for flexible teaching in the fall.

Faculty could participate in the Institute individually or as a member of a cohort. Typically, a cohort was a group of faculty members from a single department or faculty who taught different sections of the same course. In each session of the Institute, faculty were grouped in sections based on similar departments or disciplines.

During summer, 14 sections of the Tier 1: Institute were offered. Each section had between 21 and 26 participants. Of the 1,410 instructional faculty

at Boise State University, throughout the summer of 2020, 379 (27%) faculty registered for the Tier 1: Institute. Of the registrants, 326 (86.02%) faculty successfully completed all the requirements of the Institute.

Tier 2: Workshop

Tier 2 of the FTSS consisted of a menu of six, week-long facilitated online workshops. Participants were expected to asynchronously engage with the content of each workshop for approximately three to four hours over the course of the week, completing interactive and individual activities. In this article, "Tier 2: Workshop" is used interchangeably with "Workshop" and "Tier 2" to denote the same meaning. The description "workshop" indicates a specific offering within Tier 2: Workshop.

Content for each of the workshops was taken from the Institute and adapted to a one-week format. Workshops were co-facilitated by a faculty member and an instructional designer from the CTL and/or eCampus Center. A $250 stipend was provided when a faculty successfully completed three workshops and submitted a FLIP. Similar to the Tier 1: Institute, faculty could opt out of receiving the stipend.

The individual workshops included in Tier 2 were designed for faculty who were new to online asynchronous, blended, hybrid, and remote teaching and wanted an introduction to basic concepts related to those formats of teaching. However, these workshops could also be useful to faculty who already had knowledge of asynchronous teaching but needed a refresher and/or additional skills. These workshops were suitable for faculty who had limited time to engage in PD. Each of the six Tier 2 workshops were scheduled to be offered four times, on a rotating schedule throughout the summer. Out of the 1,410 instructional faculty at Boise State University, there were 211 (15%) unique registrants for the Workshop. Of the registrants there were 91 (43.12%) unique attendees who completed at least three workshops and submitted the final deliverable. The total/overall number of registrants for all six workshops was 737, out of which 476 (64.5%) attendees fulfilled all the requirements of completion. The six workshops had the following titles:

- Active Learning in Asynchronous Settings
- Building Inclusive Learning Communities
- Creating Courses that Meet the Needs of All Students
- Establishing Instructor Presence
- Integrating Flexible Assessments
- Strategies for Providing Effective Feedback

Tier 3: Resources

Tier 3 of the FTSS consisted of independent access to web-based resources and regularly scheduled help sessions facilitated by instructional designers from the CTL and eCampus Center. In this article, "Tier 3: Resources" is used interchangeably with "Resources" and "Tier 3" to denote the same meaning.

Faculty could access Resources at any time, from anywhere, and attend as many help sessions as they needed. There were no required deliverables and no stipends were offered. Help sessions were scheduled two times a week throughout the summer. A total of 23 help sessions were offered to faculty, and 146 (10.35%) of the 1,410 instructional faculty at Boise State University attended these sessions.

Tier 3 was best suited for faculty who needed "just-in-time" support and had limited availability during the summer months. The help session topics were:

- How Do I Provide Materials to Online Learners?
- How Do Students Collaborate Online?
- How Do I Keep Students Engaged?
- How Do I Assess Students Online?
- How Do I Provide Students Feedback Online?
- Bring Your Own Topic

Flexible Learning and Instruction Plan (FLIP)

The goal at the end of both the Institute as well as the Workshop was for faculty to create a Flexible Learning and Instruction Plan (FLIP), which captured the course learning outcomes and showed alignment with the various assessments and activities that can be completed in either synchronous or asynchronous settings. It also provided faculty the opportunity to identify strategies for instructor presence and ways to represent course content in multiple ways. The FLIP was a working document that faculty returned to multiple times throughout the institute. See Appendix A for the FLIP template and a partially completed example of a FLIP for a media course.

Faculty who wanted to earn a stipend after taking at least three out of the six Tier 2 workshops needed to complete the FLIP, based on their learning from the workshops. The FLIP was meant to be a place where faculty could collect their ideas about their course(s) and as a reference tool when developing the online portion of the course(s) to be delivered via Blackboard.

The goal of Tier 3 was to provide just-in-time support as well as a collection of resources to faculty seeking assistance on immediate ways and means of teaching remotely and flexibly. Creating a FLIP was not a required element of this experience.

FTSS: Course Design

A team of instructional designers and faculty members from the eCampus Center and CTL designed and developed the courses in the FTSS. The course content in the Institute and Workshop were delivered through weekly modules. Within each weekly module, participants completed various assignments and activities which were designed keeping in mind the transparent assignment design framework (Winkelmes et al., 2016). In the interest of flexibility and Universal Design for Learning (UDL), participants could demonstrate their learning in multiple formats. Transparent assignment design and UDL were the two broad principles used to design the FTSS and served as a model for those faculty wanting to implement flexible teaching.

Transparent Assignment Design

Transparent assignment design makes the process of designing assignments and demonstrating learning more explicit for students. Transparent assignments clearly state an assignment's purpose, task, and criteria. Studies have found that making assignments more transparent often helps students navigate assignments more successfully, increases students' overall sense of belonging, and improves institutional retention rates (Winkelmes et al., 2016; Winkelmes, 2019, p.9). These findings applied to all students, but underrepresented minorities and first-generation college students realized greater benefits from transparent assignments than did their peers.

In a recent study, Gillis and Krull (2020) found that while most students experienced barriers to their learning due to the pandemic, non-white students were more likely to feel unmotivated, suffer from less flexibility of coursework, and be worried about finances and access to medical care. First-generation students were more likely to lack a dedicated workspace, suffer from less flexibility of course-work, and be worried about finances. Thus, the FTSS was designed transparently to model how faculty could design transparent courses. Such courses would support all students including those

who were facing the emotional, social, and economic barriers to learning caused by the pandemic.

Universal Design for Learning

While there are many definitions of UDL, the one that most closely aligns with the FTSS is from the Center for Teaching Innovation at Cornell University (n.d.) which describes UDL as:

> A teaching approach that works to accommodate the needs and abilities of all learners and eliminates unnecessary hurdles in the learning process. This means developing a flexible learning environment in which information is presented in multiple ways, students engage in learning in a variety of ways, and students are provided options when demonstrating their learning.

The UDL guidelines developed by the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST), promotes the development of curricula that incorporate three principles (Burgstahler, n.d.). These principles include multiple means of 1) representation, 2) action and expression, and 3) engagement. By focusing on flexibility and reducing barriers to learning, UDL acknowledges that many students may learn differently (Rogers-Shaw, Carr-Chellman, & Choi, 2017) from the one-size-fits-all approach to course design and teaching. The FTSS was built keeping in mind the tenets of UDL, as flexibility of teaching and learning was a key requirement during the uncertainty and changes brought on by the pandemic. As such, the design of FTSS modeled ways of presenting content in multiple ways, which in turn enabled learners/faculty to engage with that content in multiple ways and express their mastery of learning in multiple ways.

In the following sections, we will discuss some of the fundamental course design elements of the Institute, Workshops, and Resources of the FTSS.

Tier 1: Institute

The Institute was asynchronously delivered through the Blackboard Learning Management System (LMS). The course content was delivered over three weeks, segmented into three weekly modules. The overall learning objectives of the course and each week's Module Learning Objectives (MLOs) were clearly stated. Participation guidelines and completion expectations were specified. The following paragraphs describe the various course components of the Institute in further detail:

Learning Outcomes. It was expected that after actively participating the Institute, faculty would be able to:

- Write measurable course learning outcomes that can be met in flexible ways.
- Design alternative assessments that demonstrate student achievement of those outcomes.
- Develop a variety of activities that engage students and scaffold growth toward the learning outcomes.
- Choose strategies to create an inclusive and engaging community, in both synchronous and asynchronous settings.

Participation Guidelines*.* Faculty were encouraged to participate in all course activities in order to deepen their learning and benefit from the insights of their peers. Logging in regularly to the Blackboard course was recommended. Also, the Institute had recommended "do by" indicators on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday at both 2:00 PM and 11:59 PM, U.S. Mountain Time. While these guidelines were not hard "due dates," participants were asked to complete each activity within the suggested timeframe, so as to get peer feedback and develop as a community. To assist faculty to manage their time effectively, each activity in the course included a time estimate.

Completion Expectations*.* In order to be eligible for the stipend, participants had to participate in/submit at least 85% of the activities and deliverables as well as meet the minimum requirements of the FLIP (see Appendix A). Activities, including the FLIP, had to be completed by the last day of the Institute.

Pre-Institute Survey. Before starting work in the Institute, participants completed a short survey (see Appendix B). This survey was intended to give participants the opportunity to share some demographic information as well as to allow facilitators to gather participant availability information to schedule a synchronous session during the last week of the Institute. The latter activity was intended to model instructor presence. The demographic data was collected in order to know faculty strengths and needs. Knowledge of faculty preferred names, pronouns, self-identified skills and strengths was thought to be helpful to set a welcoming tone and to create meaningful facilitator presence.

Weekly Modules. The course content was divided into three weekly modules with each module having specific MLOs. The MLOs of each of the three weekly modules were as follows:

Week 1:

- Reflect upon Spring 2020 teaching and learning experiences from both the perspectives of the teachers and the learners.
- Apply the CALMS (Clear, Achievable, Learning-Centered, Measurable/Observable, Specific) framework (T. J. Souza, personal communication [lecture notes], 2016) to refine course learning outcomes.
- Provide a rationale for UDL principles.
- Summarize the importance of instructor presence.

Week 2:

- Design a flexible assessment aligned with course learning outcomes.
- Explore tools for providing feedback to students.
- Articulate instructions to students in a transparent format.

Week 3:

- Select activities that can be used in a variety of modalities in support of your learning outcomes.
- Consider how to best include all students and address equity issues when planning for activities.
- Communicate to students about your consideration of their learning when planning the course.

Weekly Activities. Content was delivered only on Monday through Thursday of the week. Fridays were reserved as work time for participants and to hold scheduled optional synchronous activities with facilitators and/or campus instructional technologists. In each module, participants were guided to engage in several activities including readings, discussions, writing reflective journal responses, and to complete various sections of the FLIP. The institute also modeled the use of various applications like Padlet, Google Slides, and Flipgrid to respond to assignment prompts. The following table represents the schedule of the various activities the participants engaged in during Week 1 of the Institute (See Appendix C for activities completed in Weeks 2 and 3):

Table 1:
Tier 1: Institute, Week 1, Schedule

Day	**Morning Activities (by 2:00 p.m. Mountain Time)**	**Afternoon Activities (by 11:59 p.m. Mountain Time)**
Monday	- Faculty Challenges Readings - Flipgrid Video: Post - Shared Institute Guidelines	- Student Experience Readings - Flipgrid Video: Replies - FLIP Document: Fill in Columns 1-3 - Reflection Journal Entry
Tuesday	- Learning Outcomes Readings - Learning Outcomes Discussion: Post	- Learning Outcomes Discussion: Replies - Scaffolding Learning Outcomes Presentation - FLIP Document: CLOs and MLOs Updates
Wednesday	- Universal Design for Learning Readings and Multimedia - UDL Case Study Activity	- Applying UDL Principles Padlet - FLIP Document: UDL Updates
Thursday	- Regular and Substantive Interaction and Instructor Presence Readings and Multimedia - Online Instructor Presence Strategies: Your Ideas	- Week 1 Summary: Our FLIP - Work Time: Your FLIP

Assignments. Each assignment in the Institute was designed using the transparent assignment design framework based on the work of Winkelmes et al. (2016), with explicit delineation of the assignment's purpose, task, and criteria. Here is an example of an assignment from Week 2 of the institute:

> *Certain kinds of assessment posed major challenges following the shift to remote teaching. For example, instructors who give exams were frustrated*

that they could not ensure academic integrity using the same mechanisms they could on campus, including proctoring in class and in the Testing Center. To compensate, some instructors tried to use the campus's remote proctoring service, only to discover their students didn't have the webcams necessary to conduct such proctoring. Other faculty found students struggled to access technologies or other resources required to complete projects. Students lacked access to video editing software, reliable internet, and lab supplies. Your first assignment this week is to reflect on your own assessment experiences during Spring semester, so that we can then start to plan for how to create flexible assessments for this fall.

Purpose
- *Knowledge: This assignment will help you reflect on how your assessment process was affected by the switch to remote teaching.*
- *Skills: This assignment asks you to engage in self-reflection by analyzing the outcome of decisions you made and to determine how you might decide to take a different approach in the future. Understanding the complex cause (your decisions about assessment) and effect (students' reactions to your decisions) relationships involved in designing a course will help you as you plan for flexible teaching this fall.*

Task
- *Think about the assessments you gave students during Spring semester—but especially those that students needed to complete after the shift to remote teaching and learning. Select one that raised the thorniest issues for you or for students.*
- *Click on the journal link above (05.2 Your Assessment Challenges: Journal Reflection).*
- *In your journal entry, reflect on how that assessment went, for you and your students, by answering the following questions.*
  - *What was the assessment (exam, essay, physical demonstration, etc.)?*
  - *What learning outcome(s) did it measure?*
  - *Did the change in teaching modality in the spring lead you to alter the assessment or how it was administered? If so, what were the repercussions of the adjustments you made? What was lost, and what was gained?*

○ *If you did not alter the assessment or how it was administered, what frustrations, if any, did you experience? What frustrations, if any, did students express? If you could rewind to mid-semester, would you make different choices about offering this assessment without changing it? Why or why not?*
Note: You may submit this journal entry in any format. While many participants will prefer to create a text entry, you can also attach an audio file, link to a video, insert an infographic, etc.

Criteria
● *This journal will be marked complete in My Grades if your entry addresses each of the questions.*

Universal Design. Modeling the principles of UDL, participants in both the Tier 1 and Tier 2 were encouraged to submit assignments in any suitable format—audio (ex., recorded response), visual (ex., infographic, flowchart, and graphic), presentation, etc.

Optional Synchronous Meetings and Technology Help Sessions. On Fridays of the week, participants were given the option to participate in synchronous Blackboard help sessions, where instructional technologists from the campus learning technology support unit, Learning Technology Solutions (LTS), were available to help faculty with questions on how to set up and organize their Blackboard course site. On Week 3, faculty also met with course instructors and their course peers synchronously, using the application Zoom. These meetings were optional and faculty could choose to participate in an asynchronous discussion instead of participating in the live synchronous sessions. During this meeting, they described an activity that they normally would do in their face-to-face classrooms, identified the learning objectives it supported, and described how they were thinking of doing the same activity in their remote online classes. They also discussed potential challenges and possible solutions with peers and instructors. Approximately half of the participants elected for the synchronous option while the other half elected to participate in the asynchronous discussion.

Discussions. In the Institute, faculty participated in asynchronous peer discussions as a whole group as well as in small groups. The small groups were pre-assigned, keeping in mind the disciplinary cohorts. Faculty who had applied to Tier 1 were grouped into sessions and cohorts. Session priority was

based on several factors including faculty preference, experience with online learning, impact of their course, and whether they wanted to work with other faculty from their department. As far as possible, faculty from the same or similar disciplines were placed in the same session of the Institute. Within a session, faculty were encouraged to work in informal disciplinary cohorts, with the assumption that, having similar teaching goals and content, they could support each other's learning.

Whole-Group Discussions. Whole-group discussions were possible through the Institute Questions forum where participants asked general and logistical questions regarding the Institute and received responses from peers and instructors. The Learning Technologies Questions forum was a space where participants could ask questions related to Blackboard and other learning technologies. Answers could be provided by peers, course instructors, and learning technologists from LTS. Participants also shared with the group their plans for engaging students in remote online activities as well as their course welcome videos.

Cohort-Based/Small-Group Discussion. In their cohort-based, small, asynchronous discussion groups, faculty sought answers to questions like: How can we support students in an online environment to achieve course learning objectives that were built to function in a face-to-face environment?; And, how might we reconfigure assessments and course activities so that they can be more flexible to students' remote learning needs?

Tier 2: Workshop

Tier 2: Workshop provided participants opportunity to engage with six topics (See Program Description for topics), asynchronously delivered through Blackboard. All workshops had the same design elements though the content changed according to the topic. The course content was delivered over a week, segmented into three daily modules corresponding to Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. The overall learning objectives of the course and each week's MLOs were clearly stated. Participation guidelines and completion expectations were specified. Within each daily module, participants completed various assignments and activities designed with the transparent assignment design framework in mind (Winkelmes et al., 2016). In the interest of flexibility and UDL, participants could demonstrate their learning in multiple formats. The following description of the workshop on "Creating

Courses that Consider the Needs of All Students," may be viewed as a representative example of the key design elements of the Tier 2: Workshops.

Learning Outcomes. The Creating Courses that Consider the Needs of All Students workshop aimed to examine UDL principles in the context of both flexible teaching strategies and address flexibility issues in synchronous and asynchronous learning. After completing this workshop, participants would be able to do the following:

- Describe examples of the three principles of UDL.
- Apply the principles of UDL to course planning.

Participation Guidelines. Regular course announcements reminding faculty to log-in and participate in all activities were sent via the LMS and email to encourage faculty to deepen their learning and benefit from the insights of their fellow participants. The workshop was divided into three sections (Monday, Wednesday, Friday). Though there were no specific due dates, participants who wanted to get peer feedback and develop as a community had to complete each section by 11:59 p.m. U.S. Mountain Time of the corresponding day. Each activity in the course included a time estimate.

Completion Expectations. In order to be eligible for a stipend, participants had to complete any three out of the six workshops offered in the Tier 2: Workshop menu and meet the minimum requirements of the FLIP (as outlined in that document). It was expected that faculty would be able to complete portions of the FLIP, based on their learnings from the three Tier 2 workshops they selected.

Daily Modules. The one-week workshop had content delivered through daily modules on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Participants were guided to complete the learning activities in a timely manner. The following is an outline of the activities which the participants would complete during the week:

> Complete the following activities by 11:59 p.m. U.S. Mountain Time on Monday:
> - 1.1 Workshop Introduction
> - 1.2 Participant Introductions: Post
> - 1.3 Reading and Multimedia

Complete the following activities by 11:59 p.m. U.S. Mountain Time on Wednesday:
- 1.4 Participant Introductions: Replies
- 1.5 UDL Case Study Activity

Complete the following activities by 11:59 p.m. U.S. Mountain Time on Friday:
- 1.6 UDL Case Study Activity: Follow-Up
- 1.7 Applying UDL Principles to Your Course Design: Initial UDL Plan
- 1.8 Conclusion

Assignments. Each assignment in the workshop was designed using the transparent assignment design framework based on the work of Winkelmes et al. (2016), with explicit delineation of the assignment's purpose, task, and criteria. The following is an example of an assignment from this workshop. See Appendix D for the UDL Applied for Flexible Teaching and Learning document referred to in this assignment:

The information in 1.3 [refers to an assignment in the course] *provided a basic introduction to the principles of UDL. You will now develop your understanding of the principles by applying them to various (likely) teaching scenarios in the fall. Through this work, you will also start to generate ideas about how you can apply these ideas to your own classes. You will do this while interacting with other faculty using a tool that models UDL principles, Padlet. Padlet uses digital sticky notes to record and organize ideas using text, images, or videos. The free version allows you to create 3 Padlets.*

Purpose
- *This activity gives you the opportunity to apply UDL principles of exploring alternative means of representation, expression, and engagement to a series of realistic teaching scenarios.*

Task
- *Review the three scenarios described in the UDL Applied for Flexible Teaching and Learning document.*
- *For at least one of the scenarios, add a suggestion to the Padlet for an alternate way the instructor could present course materials, activities, or assessments.*
- *Posting in Padlet:*

- *Consider how best to express your idea (Padlet allows you to post in writing or to insert an image or video). When you are ready to share your idea, click on this Padlet (link to Padlet board in padlet.com).*
- *(Optional, though encouraged) Login using your Boise State University Google Account. If you do not want to create a (free) Padlet account, you can post anonymously, but please include your name in your post so that we can note participation.*
- *Click on the plus symbol at the bottom right corner of the page.*
- *Share your idea for how to integrate a UDL principle into your class (your post can be in writing, expressed visually with an image, or explained in a video that you insert into your post). Be sure to include the UDL principle you are focusing on (Representation, Engagement, or Expression).*
- *Click outside of the text box to complete your post. Note: You can click in the box to edit it as long as your session is active in your browser.*
- *If you run into issues, check out <u>Padlet Support</u> (link to Padlet support site).*
- *If someone has already posted your idea, you can add a comment that you "Agree!"; then try to stretch yourself to think of creative additions and add those.*

Criteria
- *This activity will be marked complete in My Grades if you share in the Padlet a suggestion for an alternate way for the instructor to address their challenge as described in the scenarios and comment on two of the suggestions of your fellow participants (in 1.6).*

Universal Design. Modeling the principles of UDL, participants were encouraged to submit assignments in any suitable format--audio file (ex., recorded response), visual (ex., infographic, flowchart, and graphic), presentation, etc.

Synchronous Meeting and Technology Help Sessions. Unlike the Tier 1: Institute, the weeklong Tier 2 workshops did not have any options for synchronous meetings or technology help sessions.

Discussions. Participants in the workshops discussed with peers as a whole group. On day 1 (Monday) of the UDL workshop, faculty introduced themselves to their peers and discussed a challenge that they were facing related to creating a course that met the needs of all students, especially keeping in mind the equity concerns brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants also used the workshop questions forum to ask questions related to the workshop which were answered by their peers and instructors.

Tier 3: Resources

Tier 3: Resources included 23 synchronous sessions that consisted of a combination of presentations and consultations. The sessions covered five topics, each of which were offered two times. Additionally, there was a session called "Bring Your Own Topic," which was offered three times. A variety of online support materials were made available to faculty in the *eCampus Center Online Course Development Knowledge Base*.

Help Sessions. Each help session was held synchronously using Zoom. They were 1.5 hours long and were supported by a facilitator, a host, and two to three consultants. The facilitator welcomed the participants, led the introductions, and presented a short (approximately 15-minute) introduction to the session topic. After this, the session host set up and assigned participants to breakout rooms where discussion was facilitated by consultants. The host also deployed polls meant to capture participant opinions and facilitated interaction via the chat tool.

After the session, the facilitator sent a follow-up email to participants leading them to resources related to the session topics. The consultants also provided follow-up support to participants after the session if needed. The synchronous help sessions were recorded and an edited version (containing the facilitator presentation on the session topic) was shared with participants as a resource.

FTSS: Facilitator Guidelines

For all Tiers of the FTSS, facilitator guideline documents were created which provided step-by-step delineation of how facilitators could support faculty before and during the learning experience. Due to the limited space available, only the main elements of the facilitator guideline for each Tier are being listed below:

Tier 1: Institute

- Institute FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions).
- Institute overview.
- Facilitator overview (What facilitators are expected to know).
- Facilitator expectations (What facilitators are expected to do).
- Content, activities, and assessments included in the Institute.
- Step-by-step: How to set up the course and launch in Blackboard.
- Weekly facilitation checklist—actions facilitators need to take each week to facilitate the course.
- Link to a sample FLIP document.

Tier 2: Workshop

- Workshop overview.
- Facilitator overview (What facilitators are expected to know).
- Facilitator expectations (What facilitators are expected to do).
- Step-by-step: How to set up the course and launch in Blackboard.
- Weekly facilitation checklist—actions facilitators need to take per week to facilitate the course.
- Link to additional resources.
- Tier 2: Information on what faculty must do to be eligible to earn their stipend.

Tier 3: Resources

- Before the session—set-up
- Session roles and responsibilities
    - Facilitator—before, during, and after session
    - Host—before, during, and after session
    - Consultants—before, during, and after session
- Links to additional resources
- Session content
    - Welcome and introductions
    - Part 1: Presentation
    - Transition to Part 2
    - Part 2: Hands-on time in breakout rooms

Evaluation

To evaluate the efficacy of the FTSS program, feedback was collected via an evaluation form/survey from Tier 1: Institute and Tier 2: Workshop participants, when they completed an Institute session or a workshop. (Tier 3: Resources attendees were not asked to complete any evaluations.) The feedback forms included a consent statement at the end of the questions, which allowed researchers to use an anonymized version of the evaluation data from the respondent for research purposes. However, participant consent (or lack thereof) had no bearing on their receiving a stipend for completing the FTSS Institute/Workshop. The evaluation instruments are shared (see Appendix E) to serve as a model for professional developers planning to build and evaluate similar faculty PD programs.

Due to the time constraints imposed by the pandemic and the immediacy of faculty need for PD, the FTSS needed to begin as soon as possible. Hence the researchers were able to obtain Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for this study only after the end date of some of the sessions of Tier 1 and workshops of Tier 2. As such, 134 participants in Tier 1 and 210 in Tier 2 had already filled out the evaluation survey before IRB approval for this study was obtained. After IRB approval was obtained, 88 participants in Tier 1 and 87 in Tier 2 filled out the evaluation surveys. This article only reports data that was collected after receiving IRB approval for the study. In Tier 1, 80 (91%) out of the 88 and in Tier 2, 78 (90%) out of the 87 survey respondents agreed to have their evaluation data used for research purposes.

Tier 1 Evaluation

Tier 1: Institute participants were asked about the extent to which the Institute met its intended learning outcomes. A summary of participant responses to the learning outcomes is shown in Table 2. Overall responses were high, with levels of agreement ranging from 95% to 98%. Participants felt most strongly that the Institute helped them to "develop a variety of activities that engage students and scaffold growth towards learning outcomes."

Participants were also asked to respond to a series of statements to gather their overall perceptions of the Tier 1: Institute. These statements along with their ratings are displayed in Table 3. Here again, the overall ratings were

high (with agreement ranging from 93% to 98%), with participants being most enthusiastic about support from Institute facilitators.

						Table 2

Table 2
Participant Perceptions of Tier 1 Outcomes

Outcome	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly Disagree	% Agree (Strongly + Some- what)
Write measurable learning outcomes that can be met in flexible ways.	76% (n = 61)	19% (n = 15)	4% (n = 3)	0% (n = 0)	1% (n = 1)	95% (n = 76)
Design alternative assessments that demonstrate student achievement of those outcomes.	78% (n = 62)	20% (n = 16)	1% (n = 1)	1% (n = 1)	0% (n = 0)	98% (n = 88)
Develop a variety of activities that engage students and scaffold growth toward the learning outcomes.	85% (n = 68)	13% (n = 10)	1% (n = 1)	1% (n = 1)	0% (n = 0)	98% (n = 78)

Choose strategies to create an inclusive and engaging learning community, in both synchronous and asynchronous settings.	76% (n = 61)	20% (n = 16)	1% (n = 1)	0% (n = 0)	3% (n = 2)	96% (n = 77)

Participants were also asked to provide open feedback about the most and least valuable aspects of the Tier 1: Institute. Identified positive themes included (1) facilitation, (2) modeling of quality online learning, and (3) peer learning. Here is a positive comment given from one of the participants:

> Overall, the Institute left me feeling excited and empowered to create a fantastic online course. I was exposed to many new tools (Flipgrid, discussion boards) that I found engaging and useful and that I will incorporate in my own courses. I think the most valuable aspect of the Institute is that I created assignments/activities that I will use in my course.

Identified themes in the open responses regarding the least valuable aspects of the Institute included (1) challenges with using the FLIP document, (2) time spent on learning outcomes (when faculty members felt like they already understood them), and (3) challenges regarding how to apply UDL and inclusive teaching practices.

Tier 2 Evaluation

Tier 2: Workshop participants were also asked their perceptions of the workshops using the same metrics that were used in Table 3. Their responses to these items are displayed in Table 4. While overall agreement level was slightly less than Tier 1, there is also a marked difference in the strength of agreement, particularly when it came to the level of feedback provided by the workshop facilitators (51% Strongly Agree in Tier 2 vs. 84% Strongly Agree in Tier 1). From the responses here, it appears that workshop participants found more value from the resources and activities as opposed to the

						Table 3
						Participant Perceptions of Different Aspects of Tier 1

Outcome	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly Disagree	% Agree (Strongly + Some-what)
Overall, I found the In-stitute to be a helpful and meaningful experience.	73% (n = 58)	25% (n = 20)	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)	3% (n = 2)	95% (n = 78)
The facilita-tors were pre-sent and pro-vided helpful feedback.	84% (n = 67)	9% (n = 7)	5% (n = 4)	3% (n = 2)	0% (n = 0)	93% (n = 70)
The resources provided (e.g., readings, or videos related to the content) were informa-tive and use-ful in my course plan-ning.	70% (n = 56)	28% (n = 22)	1% (n = 1)	0% (n = 0)	1% (n = 1)	98% (n = 78)
The activities in the Institute were relevant to my course planning needs.	71% (n = 57)	25% (n = 20)	1% (n = 1)	0% (n = 0)	3% (n = 2)	96% (n = 77)

facilitators. This is in alignment with the fact that the workshops were intended to be a more flexible professional development path—faculty could choose workshop topics that met their individual needs.

Participants were also given an opportunity to provide additional open response feedback regarding the most and least beneficial aspects of the workshops. Identified open themes regarding the most valuable aspects of the workshops included (1) the community of faculty that was created, (2) the resources that were provided, and (3) the strategies that were shared in the workshops. Here is an illustrative quote from one of the faculty participants:

> I really benefited from seeing other professor's feedback. It sparked some ideas for me and how I might change my practice, as well as affirming some of the methods I already consciously use in feedback.

Identified themes in the open responses regarding the least valuable aspects of the workshops included (1) duplication in the use of introductory videos (Flipgrid was used in every workshop), (2) the desire for additional individual feedback from facilitators, and (3) the desire for additional case studies and in-depth readings.

Follow-Up Evaluation Survey

At the time of writing this paper, a follow-up evaluation was scheduled to take place in the middle of Fall 2020, with faculty who participated in the different tiers of the FTSS. This would be done to further understand the impact of the FTSS on faculty teaching practices. Evaluation questions addressed implementation of the flexible plans that were created as part of the FTSS Institute and Workshops, whether the FLIP truly helped prepare faculty to teach flexibly, and which topics from the FTSS program were most and least beneficial to prepare faculty to teach flexibly. To view all the items included in this evaluation, see Appendix F. This anonymous survey would be delivered online via the survey management platform Qualtrics. At the time of writing this paper results from this survey were not yet available.

Table 4
Participant Perceptions of Different Aspects of Tier 2

Outcome	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly Disagree	% Agree (Strongly + Some-what)
Overall, I found the workshop to be a helpful and meaning-ful experience	59% (n = 46)	36% (n = 28)	0% (n = 0)	3% (n = 2)	3% (n = 2)	95% (n = 74)
The facilita-tors were pre-sent and pro-vided helpful feedback.	51% (n = 40)	32% (n = 35)	9% (n = 7)	6% (n = 5)	1% (n = 1)	83% (n = 75)
The resources provided (e.g., readings, or videos related to the content) were informa-tive and use-ful in my course plan-ning.	67% (n = 53)	28% (n = 22)	1% (n = 1)	3% (n = 2)	1% (n = 1)	95% (n = 78)
The activities in the work-shop were rel-evant to my course plan-ning needs.	67% (n = 53)	24% (n = 19)	4% (n = 3)	3% (n = 2)	3% (n = 2)	91% (n = 72)

Discussion

The prolonged need for social distancing during the pandemic has brought social, economic, and emotional challenges for both students and instructors. Moving forward, it appears that preparing faculty to teach and students to learn flexibly in a remote environment will continue to be of paramount importance. The pre-COVID-19 methods of teaching, learning, and faculty PD need to be re-imagined to reflect changed circumstances. The FTSS was just a beginning in this long journey. As we reflect on the experience of designing and delivering the FTSS, we attempt to share some of the lessons learned that might be helpful to other professional developers.

It Takes a Village:
Collaboration Among Campus Faculty Support Units

Collaboration among campus faculty support units may be a key factor contributing to the success of faculty PD that needs to be designed quickly and delivered in a timely manner. Due to the uncertainty around the COVID-19 pandemic, university leaders wanted to develop a program that would help to meet the needs of faculty, wherever they were in terms of their knowledge and comfort level of teaching online. At Boise State University, the instructional designers and faculty members from the CTL collaborated with their counterparts in the eCampus Center to design and implement the FTSS. They were supported by instructional technologists from LTS. Coordinators from all three units made sure that the concerted effort led to efficient use of facilitator talent and expertise. The goal of this collaboration was to bring together professional developers and faculty members who had expertise in online learning with those that had expertise in face-to-face learning, thus creating a blend of experience best suited to enable faculty and student success.

Flexible Professional Development

To remain true to the spirit of flexible learning and teaching, faculty participating in the FTSS were given the option to approach this PD opportunity through multiple levels of engagement via the various tiers, depending on their availability. Providing such flexible PD opportunities to faculty may

become the norm in the near future, considering the time and socio-economic constraints brought on by the global pandemic. Even when pandemic conditions no longer prevail, faculty developers need to be prepared to build programs designed to be flexible to faculty and student needs. Through flexible programs, we may be able to reach more faculty who otherwise are not able to make use of PD opportunities due to work commitments and time constraints.

Self-Reflection, Peer Connection, and Learning

The FTSS Initiative gave both faculty and facilitators the opportunity to connect with peers online, during a time when social distancing was essential. The resources included in the FTSS Institute, Workshop, and Resources were meant to support faculty to reflect on their teaching practices. Faculty who worked as a cohort in the Institute were encouraged to meet online, synchronously, to learn from each other. Each session of the Institute was co-facilitated by a faculty member and an instructional designer, thus giving participants the opportunity to learn from both their fellow faculty as well as instructional design experts. Each of the workshops were facilitated by either a faculty member or an instructional designer. The Tier 3 help sessions were facilitated by instructional designers. Evaluations indicated that the self-reflection, peer discussions, and learnings from the FTSS enabled faculty to set new norms of effective teaching geared toward student success during the pandemic and onwards.

Faculty Connection to Campus Faculty Support Units

The authors who were also facilitators of the FTSS observed that the FTSS brought many faculty to seek support from campus units like the CTL and eCampus Center, faculty who otherwise seldom use these services. Faculty who participated in Tier 3: Resources sessions often requested follow-up consultation sessions with instructional designers. This further emphasizes the role that campus teaching support units play toward sustaining student success.

A Mixed Bag: The Pros and Cons of the FTSS Initiative

The design of the FTSS was far from perfect. It received both positive and negative feedback from participating faculty. The Initiative successfully prepared faculty to review their existing courses with preparedness for flexibility—to write measurable learning outcomes that can be met in flexible ways, design alternative assessments, and to choose strategies that create inclusive and engaging learning communities for synchronous and asynchronous modalities. Faculty reported that the Institute was a helpful and meaningful experience in that they received supportive feedback from facilitators and access to useful resources and activities that helped them plan better for their courses.

Faculty also reported some challenges that call for a revision of some design elements of the Initiative, were it to become a more permanent PD Program in future. Some faculty reported that the FLIP document was difficult to use and faculty did not quite understand how to apply UDL and inclusive teaching in their courses, even after completing the Institute. Faculty attending the Tier 2 workshops often did not receive extensive individual feedback and felt that they needed access to additional case studies and readings.

Questions for Fall 2020 and Onwards

At the time of this writing, formal feedback on teaching and learning experiences from Fall 2020 were not yet available. However, certain anecdotal observations can be made. Fall 2020 is different from Spring 2020 in that there was no rapid change or panic during the former, even though some of the pandemic conditions were the same. Faculty appeared to be more prepared to teach in fall than they were in spring.

Upon reflection, certain important questions emerge that might help envision the direction of future faculty PD. What were some teaching practices adopted during the pandemic, which we should continue to use going forward, in order to maintain the momentum of growth? How has the pandemic changed public health consciousness that can modify operating procedures, so that we remain flexible for short-term disruptions that usually occur on a yearly basis? Going forward, how will the pandemic affect course policies on things like late submissions, assessments, and absenteeism? How can technology be leveraged to front load flexibility in course design and delivery? Does the expectation of flexibility carry over to the infrastructure (ex. classroom technology, online course/lab availability) that supports it? In

what ways can faculty be supported to teach students how to learn or be independent learners in their discipline? How can campuses which do not have dedicated educational technology support units, work to support faculty and students? What is the CTL's role in this ever-emerging scenario of constant change?

Conclusion

At the time of this writing, faculty at Boisie State taught either fully online or in a blended format until Thanksgiving Break, after which all courses were to be delivered asynchronously. While we hope not to experience another pandemic like COVID-19, natural disasters leading to campus closure can happen at any time. The longstanding importance of the FTSS lies in that it prepares faculty to rapidly transition to flexible teaching modalities that enable learning continuity.

It must be emphasized that flexibility to pivot is key, whatever may be the teaching modality. The goal of the FTSS was to prepare faculty to be flexible in case the pandemic required them to pivot from their current teaching modality. Irrespective of the teaching modality, the COVID-19 pandemic taught us that we need to be prepared to respond to change flexibly. Even when the pandemic ends, students may demand more blended and hybrid courses as compared to face-to-face ones. By preparing faculty to think and teach with flexibility, initiatives like the FTSS empower them to face a future where more innovative ways of learning will be expected.

References

Blankstein, M., Frederick, J. K., & Wolff-Eisenberg, C. (2020, June 25). Student experiences during the pandemic pivot. https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.313461

Burgstahler, S. (n.d.). Universal Design of Instruction (UDI): Definition, principles, guidelines, and examples. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from https://www.washington.edu/doit/universal-design-instruction-udi-definition-principles-guidelines-and-examples

Center for Teaching Innovation, Cornell University. (n.d.). Universal Design for Learning. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from https://teaching.cornell.edu/teaching-resources/designing-your-course/universal-design-learning

Gillis, A., & Krull, L. M. (2020). COVID-19 remote learning transition in Spring 2020: Class structures, student perceptions, and inequality in college courses. *Teaching Sociology, 48*(4), 283-299.

Rogers-Shaw, C., Carr-Chellman, D. J., & Choi, J. (2017). Universal Design for Learning: Guidelines for accessible online instruction. *Adult Learning, 29*(1), 20-31.

Johnson, N., Veletsianos, G., & Seaman, J. (2020). U.S. faculty and administrators' experiences and approaches in the early weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Online Learning, 24*(2), 6-21. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i2.2285

Siegelman, A. (n.d.). Blended, hybrid, and flipped courses: What's the difference? Temple University, Center for the Advancement of Teaching. https://teaching.temple.edu/edvice-exchange/2019/11/blended-hybrid-and-flipped-courses-what%E2%80%99s-difference

Top Hat. (2020). *Top Hat field report*: *COVID-19 faculty preparedness*. Top Hat. Retrieved September 14, 2020, from https://tophat.com/teaching-resources/interactive/faculty-preparedness-survey/

University of Pittsburgh, Office of the Provost (2020). *COVID-19 Faculty Survey.* Retrieved July 14, 2020, from https://www.provost.pitt.edu/faculty/covid-19-faculty-survey

Winkelmes, M., Bernacki, M., Butler, J., Zochowski, M., Golanics, J., & Weavil, K. H. (2016). A teaching intervention that increases underserved college students' success. *Peer Review, 18*(1/2).

Winkelmes, M., Boye, A., & Tapp, S. (2019). *Transparent design in higher education teaching and learning: A guide to implementing the transparency framework institution-wide to improve learning and retention.* Stylus.

Wong, L. (n.d.). Understanding the difference between hybrid learning and blended learning. Poll Everywhere. https://blog.polleverywhere.com/difference-between-blended-and-hybrid-learning/

_____

Devshikha Bose, Ph.D., is an Instructional Design Consultant at the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) at Boise State University. She has over eight years of experience as a faculty developer. Her areas of expertise include student success, scholarship of teaching and learning, teaching and learning strategies, course design strategies, integration of technology, and assessments. Before joining the CTL at Boise State, Devshikha worked as an Instructional Designer at Brenau University, GA. She has also taught college courses and high school in the United States and in India. Lisa Berry, Ed.D., is the Instructional Design Team Manager for the eCampus Center at Boise State University. She leads the team of instructional designers who assist faculty with the design and development of fully online courses at Boise State. She also collaborates with academic departments to guide them through a program-level curriculum and instructional design process for fully online programs as well as leading an effort to provide faculty development opportunities centered around online teaching and learning. Prior to her work at Boise State University, she was a curriculum manager at a K-12 state virtual school. She also has years of face-to-face and online teaching experience at both the higher education and K-12 levels. Rob Nyland, Ph.D., is the eCampus Research and Innovation Team Manager at Boise State University, where he leads a team that performs research in online learning, learning analytics, and OER. He has previously worked as a Learning Engineer for Learning Objects, and as a full-time faculty member of Multimedia Design and Production at Lake Washington Institute of Technology. His research interests include learning analytics, instructional design, and online learning. Anthony Saba, Ed.D., has been an Instructional Design Consultant for the eCampus Center at Boise State University since 2016 where he has worked with faculty to design and develop fully online courses. Anthony has been teaching at the college level for 22 years, including 12 years teaching a variety of online graduate courses for Boise State's EDTECH department. Prior to working at Boise State, he lived and worked in South Korea for 18 years—as a college professor for 14 years, and for 4 years as part of Hyundai Motor Group's Global HRD team where he designed and managed culture and diversity and leadership development programs for overseas affiliates in 34 countries. Teresa Focarile, Interim Administrative Director, Center for Teaching and Learning, Boise State University, has taught at the college level for 16 years, the past 10 for Boise State, and the previous six for the University of Connecticut. Her scholarly work has focused on best practices for supporting adjunct faculty. At the CTL, she supports a variety of CTL and University-wide efforts, including Program Assessment Reporting, adjunct faculty programs, and the Course Design Institute.

Appendix A
Flexible Learning and Instruction Plan (FLIP)

The Flexible Learning and Instruction Plan (FLIP) is a tool that will help you outline the central components of your course design and capture the practical strategies you can adopt to meet the needs of students in various ways. In addition, the FLIP should be a useful resource for you when building your Blackboard course site. For an example of how a FLIP would be completed for a course, please see this underlined example of a FLIP from a Media course.

Course Title:

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs):

1.
2.
3.
4.

1 - Week and Topic: One row for each week of the course list the topic(s) you will cover.	2 - Module/ Unit Learning Outcomes: The module/unit learning outcomes for this week (and which CLOs they align with).	3 - Learning Materials/*UDL: Representation:* The materials students will review (read, watch, etc.) to prepare for the activities and assessments.	4 - Instructor Presence Strategies: The planned strategies to engage with/include your students.	5 - Student Engagement Activities/ *UDL: Engagement:* The ways in which students will engage with the content and/or each other; also consider the modalities of those activities. (A - Asynchronous, S - Synchronous, E - Either)	6 – Assessments/ *UDL: Expression:* The ways in which students will demonstrate their achievement of the course learning outcomes; also consider the modalities of those assessments. (A - Asynchronous, S - Synchronous, E - Either)

Minimum FLIP requirements for Tier 1: Institute

Minimum Expectations for Tier 1: Institute					
Numbered weeks or modules (i.e. 15 rows for a 15 week course). If they have topics/titles for each week or module, then those would be included here.	MLOs for at least two CLOs	1 alternate means of representation	1 strategy for each week/topic (row in the table)	7 activities. • Minimum 4 asynchronous/remote activities • Aligned to LO	1 summative assessment for each CLO. • At least 1 has an additional options (1-2) for flexibility • At least 2 ideas for formative assessment

Minimum FLIP requirements for Tier 2: Workshop

Minimum FLIP Expectations for each Tier 2 workshop					
Please fill in your FLIP based on the minimum requirements for the three Tier 2 workshops you attended.					
Active Learning in Asynchronous Settings	**Building Inclusive Learning Communities**	**Creating Courses that Meet the Needs of All Students**	**Establishing Instructor Presence**	**Integrating Flexible Assessments**	**Strategies for Providing Effective Feedback**
Column 5	Columns 3, 4, 5 or 6	Columns 3, 5 or 6	Column 4	Column 6	Column 4
Minimum 3 activities that can be done asynchronously, spread across multiple weeks	1 example of inclusive practices in at least 2 of the columns listed above.	2 examples of UDL principles included, across the columns listed above	3 different strategies, spread across multiple weeks	At least 1 flexible assessment, clearly aligned to at least 1 Course Learning Outcome	Feedback plan for minimum of 3 assignments/ assessments using at least 2 strategies/tools

References

Dee Fink and Associates. (2020, July 13. *3-Column Course Design Table*. Designing Significant Learning Experiences. http://www.designlearning.org/resource-downloads/helpful-handouts/

Map Your Way to a Quality Course Poster. (2020, July 13). Quality Matters. https://www.qualitymatters.org/sites/default/files/presentations/MapYourWayToAQualityCourse_Poster__ApodacaForsythe.pdf

Example Flexible Course Instruction Plan (FLIP)

(Modified & abridged from Media 201 course with permission from Therese Woozley.)

Introduction to Media (Media 201) examines constructions of reality in mass communication with an emphasis on the relationship between media and power in society.

Course learning outcomes:

1. Explain the historic and contemporary influences of media using course terminology. (Bloom: Understand, Fink: Foundational Understand)

2. Demonstrate a critical media mindset which considers the ethical responsibilities of creating and consuming media. (Bloom: Apply)

3. Evaluate media platforms and their effect on society. (Bloom: Evaluate)

4. Design written, graphic and/or video messaging using multiple media platforms. (Bloom: Create)

5. Examine how media trends affect national issues, globalization, democracy and individual civic engagement. (Bloom: Analyze/Apply)

1 - Week and Topic	2 - Module/Unit Learning Outcomes	3 - Learning Materials *UDL: Representation*	4 - Instructor Presence Strategies	5 - Student Engagement Activities *UDL: Engagement*	6 - Assessments *UDL: Expression*
For each week of the course list the topic(s) you will cover.	List the module/unit learning outcomes for this week (and which CLOs they align with).	List the materials students will review (read, watch, etc.) to prepare for the activities and assessments.	List planned strategies to engage with/include your students.	List the ways in which students will engage with the content and/or each other. (A - Asynchronous, S - Synchronous, E - Either)	List the ways in which students will demonstrate their achievement of the course learning outcomes. (A - Asynchronous, S - Synchronous, E - Either)
1 Media Influences	Build community & clarify expectations

Describe the history, terminology and key concepts of media in the textbook chapters. (CLO 1)

Summarize how these terms and concepts impact society, personal lives, media consumption and communication practices. (CLO 1) | Review Syllabus

View welcome video

Read Ch. 1 | Welcome letter

Co-construction of group agreements | Discussion engagement & feedback

Online individual and group activities (A)

Participation in online or FTF at a distance class discussion (E)

Syllabus scavenger hunt (E) | Deconstructing media; Method: Concept maps; Format: Individual reflection of media consumption (E)

Guided Inquiry Activity; Method: Media consumption diagrams; Format: Working in pairs online (E)

Post-a-Note: a running discussion board for commentary, peer-to-peer feedback and 'muddiest point' interaction; Method: Blackboard Discussion Board; Format: Individual feedback and Reflection (A) |

| 2 Critical Media Mindset | Examine social media platforms (CLO 2)

Utilize several new online applications (CLO 2)

Initiate an educational online presence (CLO 2)

Create audio and video blogs, projects and activities which challenge societal assumptions and stereotypes. (CLO 2) | Review media applications

View peer audio/video blogs, etc.

Read Ch. 2 and article 1 | Discussion engagement & feedback

Individual email check in w/ each student

Virtual Office Hours | Participation in online class discussion boards, video chats and presentations (A)

Participate in PIP project feedback (A) | Create and participate in online quizzes and games; Method: Online quiz/game construction; Format: Individual assignment game creation using online applications. (A)

Create media commentary and written media articles / blogs. Provide PIP reflections on peer projects; Method: Using several media applications students will develop a new skill, then provide feedback for others; Format: Individual development and perception. (A)

Create a short DIY Video using Padlet; Method: deciphering perceptions by creating an original DIY video that demonstrates a simple skill other students may learn; Format: Individual presentation. (E) |

Appendix B
Flexible Teaching for Student Success Institute
Pre-Institute Survey

In order to help us to get to know and best support you during this institute, please tell us a bit about yourself by completing this survey. We will use this information when communicating with you, as well as to set the times for our optional synchronous session during Week 3.

Note: The questions in this survey are designed to not only gather information we need for the institute, but also to model the kinds of questions you can ask students at the beginning of your course in order to get to know them, their strengths and their needs. Sending such a survey - and utilizing the results - is one way that you can create instructor presence in your course and set a welcoming tone from the beginning.

1. Last Name:
2. First Name:
3. Preferred Name:
4. Pronouns:
5. What helps you learn? Please be specific.
6. What skills and/or strengths do you bring to this course?
7. What can we do, as facilitators, to make this a significant and meaningful experience for you? *
8. We will be offering an optional synchronous session on the last Wednesday of the workshop. If you are able/choose to join, which of the following times would work best for you (choose all that apply):
   - 9-10 AM
   - 10-11 AM
   - 11 AM - 12 PM
   - 12-1 PM
   - 1-2 PM
   - 2-3 PM
   - 3-4 PM
   - 4-5 PM
   - 5-6 PM
   - 6-7 PM
9. This summer, X University faculty and staff are collaborating in an exceptional effort to ensure instructors are ready to engage our stu-

dents this fall. Because most faculty are off-contract during the summer months, the University is providing a $1000 stipend for faculty who complete the activities and deliverables for the institute. At the same time, the university is responding to the budgetary fallout of the COVID-19 pandemic and professional staff are taking furlough days this summer. We recognize the summer stipend will provide essential support to many instructors, while others may wish to forgo stipends. If you have decided to opt-out of the stipend for the institute, you may indicate that below (should you change your mind by the end of the institute, you can email XXX@XXX.edu to make that change).

10. I wish to opt-out of receiving a stipend for my participation in the FTSS Institute.

Appendix C
Weekly Activities Schedules

Week 2

Day	Morning Activities (by 2:00 p.m. Mountain Time)	Afternoon Activities (by 11:59 p.m. Mountain Time)
Monday	• Flexible Assessments: An Introduction Reading • Your Assessment Challenges: Journal Reflection • Frameworks for Flexible Assessments: Reading	• Alternative Assessments Brainstorming: Google Slides Activity • Rethinking Our Assessments Discussion: Post
Tuesday	• Rethinking Our Assessments Discussion: Replies • Introducing Transparent Assignments: Reading and Multimedia	• Make your Assessment Transparent: Assignment Submission • Assessments: FLIP Updates and Revisions
Wednesday	• Effective Instructor Feedback: Reading • Effective Feedback Self-Assessment: Journal Reflection	• Feedback Tool Exploration: Assignment Submission
Thursday	• Common Types of Formative Assessment: Reading and Multimedia • Flexible Formative Assessment Discussion: Post	• Flexible Formative Assessment Discussion: Replies • Week 2 Summary: Our FLIP • Work Time: Your FLIP

Week 3

Day	Morning Activities (by 2:00 p.m. Mountain Time)	Afternoon Activities (by 11:59 p.m. Mountain Time)
Monday	- Challenges of Engaging Learners: Journal Reflection - Engaging Learners: Reading - Brainstorming Ideas to Engage Learners: Contribute	- Brainstorming Ideas to Engage Learners: Review - Student Engagement Activities: Journal Reflection
Tuesday	- Flexible and Engaging Activities: Reading - Flexible and Engaging Activities: Work Time - Flexible and Engaging Activities Discussion: Post	- Flexible and Engaging Activities Discussion: Replies - Planning for Group Brainstorming: Synchronous or Asynchronous
Wednesday	Student Engagement Plans Discussion: Synchronous or Asynchronous Discussions	- Student Engagement Plans Discussion: Replies - Week 3 Summary: Our FLIP - Work Time: Your FLIP
Thursday	- Communicating with Students: Reading - Creating and Sharing a Welcome Video Discussion: Post	- Creating and Sharing a Welcome Video Discussion: Replies - Submit Your Final FLIP - Resources for Supporting Your Ongoing Work - Institute Evaluation

Appendix D
UDL Applied for Flexible Teaching and Learning

UDL Principles are grouped into three categories: Representation, Engagement, and Expression. Below are three teaching scenarios that require applying UDL principles to diverse pedagogical and interdisciplinary situations. Referencing the UDL readings for this module, what do you think are possible alternative means of representation, engagement, and expression in these scenarios?

Scenario 1: Representation Example

Dr. Nicolaides teaches Calculus and usually writes out problems and solutions on the board. She isn't sure how she can do this asynchronously. How else could she represent this information?

Scenario 2: Engagement Example

Dr. Jones teaches Philosophy and loves Socratic seminars for lively in-class discussions. How could they do something similar online in ways that students find engaging?

Scenario 3: Expression Example

Dr. Lopez teaches Ecology and wants to keep his mid-term project (campus-based field trip to document building vs. green space) as an option. How could he have students demonstrate their learning in an online environment where they don't have to physically walk around campus together?

Appendix E

Tier 1 Evaluation Survey

Please note that you will have an option at the end of the evaluation form to have anonymized versions of your responses to certain questions used as research.

1. What session of the FTSS Institute are you enrolled in?
    a. Session 1: June 1 – 19
    b. Session 2: June 15 - July 3
    c. Session 3: July 6 - July 24
    d. Session 4: July 20 - August 7
    e. Other
2. What cohort of your session were you assigned to?
    a. Cohort A
    b. Cohort B
    c. Cohort C
    d. Cohort D
    e. Other
3. The *Flexible Teaching for Student Success* Institute was designed to provide tools and strategies so that faculty could plan a fall course that accommodates different potential scenarios (and allows them to pivot if needed). We are interested in understanding how your experience in the FTSS Institute may have led to certain outcomes. Please indicate your agreement with the following question:
    My participation in the *Flexible Teaching for Student Success* Institute helped/will help me to: (strongly agree to strongly disagree)
    a. Write measurable learning outcomes that can be met in flexible ways.
    b. Design alternative assessments that demonstrate student achievement of those outcomes.
    c. Develop a variety of activities that engage students and scaffold growth toward the learning outcomes
    d. Choose strategies to create an inclusive and engaging learning community, in both synchronous and asynchronous settings.
4. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? (strongly agree to strongly disagree)

   a. Overall, I found the institute to be a helpful and meaningful experience
   b. The facilitators were present and provided helpful feedback
   c. The resources provided (e.g., readings, or videos related to the content) were informative and useful in my course planning
   d. The activities in the institute were relevant to my course planning needs
5. The final deliverable of the institute was the Flexible Learning and Instruction Plan (FLIP). Please respond to the following statement: Completing the FLIP helped me feel better prepared to deliver my course flexibly in the future
   a. Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree
6. Additional comments about the FLIP?
   a. Open Text
7. Identify the most significant strength(s) of the FTSS Institute and indicate why it was a strength.
   a. Open Text
8. What topic, session, or component of the institute seemed least valuable and why?
   a. Open Text
9. Is there any other feedback you'd like to provide about the FTSS Institute?
   a. Open Text

Tier 2 Evaluation Individual Workshop Completion Evaluation

Thank you for taking time to provide feedback regarding this 2020 *Flexible Teaching for Student Success* workshop. Your responses will help us improve future sessions of the workshop and assess the overall effectiveness of this initiative.
1. Which workshop did you participate in?
   a. Establishing Instructor Presence
   b. Strategies for providing effective feedback
   c. Active learning in asynchronous settings
   d. Creating courses that meet the needs of all students
   e. Building inclusive learning communities
   f. Integrating Flexible Assessments

2. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? (SA to SD)
   a. Overall, I found the workshop to be a helpful and meaningful experience.
   b. The facilitators were present and provided helpful feedback.
   c. The resources provided (e.g., readings, or videos related to the content) were informative and useful.
   d. The activities in the workshop were relevant to my course planning needs.
3. What was MOST meaningful/helpful about this workshop?
   a. Open text
4. What was LEAST meaningful/helpful about this workshop?
   a. Open Text
5. Is there any other feedback you'd like to provide about this Flexible Teaching for Student Success workshop?
   a. Open Text

Tier 2 Completion Submission Form

1. Last Name
2. First Name
3. Department
4. Employee ID Number
5. Primary Employment Status at X University
6. Which FTSS Workshops did you complete?
   a. Active Learning in Asynchronous Settings
   b. Building Inclusive Learning Communities
   c. Creating Courses that Meet the Needs of All Students
   d. Establishing Instructor Presence Online
   e. Integrating Flexible Assessments
   f. Strategies for Providing Effective Feedback
7. Please use this space to upload a copy of your FLIP document
8. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (SA to SD)
   a. Completing the FLIP helped me feel better prepared to deliver my course flexibly in the future
   b. Tier 2: Workshops helped me feel more prepared to deliver my course flexibly in the future

      c. I was able to select workshops that aligned with my profes-
         sional development needs
9. Additional comments about the FLIP?
      a. Open Text

Appendix F

Questions for Mid-Fall Follow-up Evaluation

1. What tier of the Flexible Teaching for Student Success Initiative did you participate in?
    a. Tier 1 Institute
    b. Tier 2 Workshop
    c. Tier 3 Help Sessions
2. How would you rate your overall experience participating in the FTSS?
    a. Positive to negative
3. What did you see as the benefits/challenges of the format that you chose for FTSS?
    a. Open Text
4. In what modality are you teaching your class(es) this fall? (Check all that Apply)
    a. Face-to-Face
    b. Hybrid
    c. Online
    d. Remote

Cohort

5. (If Tier 1) Did you participate in the institute as part of a cohort with other faculty from your department, course, or college?
    a. Yes or No
6. (if Q6, yes) How helpful was being in a cohort to your overall success in FTSS?
    a. Not at all to very helpful
7. (if Q6, yes) What did you see as the benefits/challenges of completing the institute within a cohort?
    a. Open text

FTSS Impact

8. (If Tier 1 or Tier 2) The main deliverable of the FTSS was the FLIP. How useful was the FLIP in preparing you to deliver your course?
    a. Not at all to very helpful

  b. I did not complete a FLIP

9. Imagine what your course would be like had you not participated in FTSS. How different do you think your course would be compared to what you delivered with FTSS?

  a. Not at all different to very different

10. Share an example of how a student in your course(s) has benefitted by offering your class in a more flexible format (open text)

11. (If Tier 1) Rank the following topics from the FTSS program in terms of their benefit to you as you delivered your course this semester? (1 being most beneficial)

  a. Creating Learning Objectives/Outcomes
  b. Universal Design for Learning
  c. Instructor Presence
  d. Alternative Assessments
  e. Transparent Instructions/Assignments
  f. Providing Feedback
  g. Formative Assessment
  h. Inclusive and Equitable Teaching
  i. Active Learning
  j. Communicating with Students

Faculty Development

12. For ongoing faculty development, which of the following workshop topics would best help address challenges that you face in your teaching this academic year? (Choose all that apply)

  a. Syllabus design
  b. Incorporating active learning strategies
  c. Methods for meeting the needs of diverse students
  d. Integrating effective writing assignments
  e. Designing service-learning activities
  f. Designing student learning outcomes
  g. Using technology to enhance learning
  h. Effective course design
  i. Designing effective group work
  j. Creating and facilitating effective discussions
  k. Incorporating field-based/experiential learning
  l. Designing effective assessments
  m. Academic honesty and plagiarism

n. Incorporating Open Education Resources
o. Leveraging learning analytics
p. Effective online teaching
q. Fostering student engagement
r. Other (open text)

13. Please rank which delivery formats for professional development would be most beneficial to you
    a. Asynchronous online workshops
    b. Synchronous online workshops/webinars
    c. Face-to-Face workshops
    d. Online Resources (blog posts, articles, forums)
    e. Online Faculty Learning Communities
    f. Book circles
    g. One-on-one consultations

14. If you are interested in conducting additional follow up research on the impact of the changes you made to your course based on what you learned in FTSS please reach out to the Center for Teaching and Learning or the eCampus Center.