Hybrid Learning and the Residential Liberal Arts Experience
A Report on the April 7-8, 2016 Grantee Convening

The Teagle Foundation seeks to strengthen teaching and learning in the arts and sciences while addressing issues of financial sustainability and accountability in higher education. The Hybrid Learning and the Residential Liberal Arts Experience, launched in 2014, is one of the many initiatives through which the foundation delivers on this mission. The initiative, which has dedicated more than two million dollars to fund nine multi-year projects, identifies and supports models to integrate online education into the residential liberal arts experience, and aims to do so in a way that deepens student learning while addressing issues of institutional capacity.

The funded projects in the Hybrid Learning initiative fall in two broad categories: developing a roster of courses to share across participating institutions and creating curricular resources to support common introductory courses that can be dispersed more widely. Still, there is wide diversity in the Hybrid Learning initiative participants. The projects differ in their subject matter focus (e.g. lesser taught languages, laboratory sciences) and approaches to collaboration, course design, and hybrid learning. The projects are geographically dispersed in 16 states representing a range of metro areas, though one-fifth are in rural locations. Some constortia are building off of longstanding collaborative relationships, while others have only recently begun to work together.

Despite these differences, each funded project shares similar goals that relate to increasing capacity through collaboration and enhancing student learning through the use of new tools. In addition, participating institutions and consortia face several similar technical, logistical, and cultural challenges when it comes to accomplishing these goals.

So that grantees could learn from one another—as well as from leaders in the field— the Teagle Foundation convened a meeting on April 7-8, 2016 in New York City. In attendance were all Hybrid Learning grantees, Teagle Foundation staff, Ithaka S+R staff, and other higher education leaders. The agenda was dominated by discussion among participants to share successes and challenges, learn about related efforts to sustainably implement technology to enhance learning, and plan for consortium work for the coming

year. Participants also benefited from keynote presentations by MJ Bishop, director of the William E. Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation at the University System of Maryland, and Daniel Cohen, executive director of the Digital Public Library of America; a presentation on preliminary external evaluation findings by Ithaka S+R representatives Deanna Marcum and Richard Spies; and a panel of their fellow grantees moderated by George Anders, contributing writer at Forbes magazine.

The following report does not chronicle the convening proceedings but rather highlights, in narrative fashion, the substantive themes and takeaways that emerged from the group discussions and presentations. In particular, it outlines early wins, common challenges that grantees are facing, and key strategies that grantees have used to overcome these obstacles.

Redefining Technology and its Uses in Education

In her opening remarks, Teagle Foundation President Judith Shapiro cautioned against "innovation fetishism," and urged participants to think about the use of technology in nuanced and critical ways. MJ Bishop elaborated on this challenge. In her remarks, she defined technology as the "application of our knowledge about tools, techniques, and systems to solve practical problems," emphasizing a conceptualization of technology as a tool with affordances, rather than as a silver bullet solution or revolutionary force. Thinking about technology in this way, she argued, shifted questions about its use in education from how it would revolutionize course delivery to how courses and systems could be designed—using technology—to better solve the problems related to access, outcomes, and quality. Later in the evening, Dan Cohen's presentation on Digital Public Library of America, which has increased access and created new learning platforms for educators, researchers, and students of American history, provided an example of Bishop's model of technology.

....

> In her remarks, MJ Bishop defined technology as the "application of our knowledge about tools, techniques, and systems to solve practical problems."

....

The conceptualization of technology as an application serves as a useful frame through which to understand many conversations at the convening. Discussions amongst participants echoed these sentiments: for example, members of the Texas Learning Consortium (Concordia University Texas, Lubbock Christian University, Schreiner

University, Texas Lutheran University, and Texas Wesleyan University) discussed how HD-video conferencing and other online tools allowed students to enroll in courses that they otherwise would not have been able to access. Participants involved in the Modeling Collaborative Curriculum Development Project (Bryn Mawr College, Albright College, College of St. Benedict & St. John's University, Santa Risa Junior College, Swarthmore College, St. Mary's College of California, and Wesleyan University) described how digital materials would provide students with increased personalization and support as they mastered concepts in psychology research methods and statistics. A subset of members of the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges (University of Alberta-Augustana, University of Minnesota-Morris, Eastern Connecticut State University, SUNY-Genesco, Truman State University, and University of North Carolina-Asheville), which has developed the Hybrid Course Sharing in Native American Studies project, reflected on how they had established a sort of virtual department that provided students new opportunities to receive a major or minor in indigenous studies, while including faculty in an newly formed, interdisciplinary community of practice. In each of these cases, participants spoke of technology as a means to an end that was specific to the goals of the liberal arts.

Technology Application as a Catalyst for Change

Another common theme emerged from both MJ Bishop's remarks and from participant conversations: though technology may not be a revolutionary solution to all of the problems facing higher education (or any industry, for that matter), adopting new tools does necessitate changes in practices, policies and mindset. Managing this change can be tricky, but can also serve as a useful process for enacting a larger scale transformation in institutional structures and culture. Bishop reflected on how USM's experience implementing a course redesign initiative broke down departmental silos, engaged system staff in an academic initiative for the first time, fostered infrastructure and support for innovation and assessment, and created a space to rethink how faculty and students should be organized for enhanced learning. Though the entry point for curricular redesign at USM was often relatively modest—in many cases it consisted of the adoption of an e-textbook—it established a process for innovation and created collaborative structures that could be leveraged for other innovations.

Participants, too, began to imagine what transformations— necessary for project success—might also emerge as longer term initiative outcomes. Most notably, participants agreed that inter- and intra-institutional collaboration was key to sustained improvement and innovation (both the consortia in which participants worked, as well as the convening itself, grew out of an understanding of the importance of collaborative work). Unfortunately, as panelist George Mehaffy of the National Blended Learning Consortium explained (and many participants echoed), institutional structures and

cultures such as tenure and promotion requirements, departmental silos, and what he called the "robust singularity of institutions," militated against this sort of work. The question of how to break down these barriers loomed large in many of the discussions during the convening. Participants understood that the projects in which they were involved, like USM's course redesign, would foster collaborative infrastructure necessary not only for success in the initiative at hand, but also for the success of future innovations.

Early Wins and Common Challenges

Participants were broken up into small groups on the afternoon of day 1 of the convening, and asked to discuss successes and challenges in their projects to date. Representative from different projects were distributed across discussion tables.

Early wins were varied, but many were related to achieving key project milestones or institutional changes. Wins included:

» Deciding on a common software platform

» Capitalizing on free technology and resources (such as open educational resources)

» Bringing faculty and administrators from disparate departments and institutions together for the first time; generating new discussions from these collaborations

» Establishing professional development opportunities for faculty and administrators working on the project

» Increased student engagement in blended learning

» Successfully incorporating the student perspective into course design

» Increased attention paid to assessment

» Increased productivity and efficiency in project work

» Reaching institutional consensus on the benefit of expanded course and curricular choice

When reflecting on common challenges—and how they might be addressed—participants were asked to categorize them using Bolman and Deal's (1991) framework on

organizational change and leadership.[1] These frames are structural, human resources, political and symbolic. Participants often found that the challenges they faced cut across multiple frames, revealing inertial forces that are deeply embedded into organizational culture, structures, and processes.

The most common challenges identified by the participants include the following:

» Identifying the right technical infrastructure for course delivery (including courseware and formats)

» Systematizing content management, preservation, and dissemination

» Identifying the right logistical infrastructure across institutions (including coordination across different academic calendars, time zones, staffing support systems, registration procedures, and tuition)

» Maintaining momentum in consortial collaboration and ensuring uptake among faculty

» Encouraging uptake among students

» Balancing customization with scaling and sustainability

» Assessing student learning and project success

Collective Strategizing to Address Challenges

On day 2, participants were again broken up into small groups, and each group was asked to discuss strategies for addressing one of the challenges identified the previous day. As in the previous breakout session, the composition of these groups was mixed across projects. After twenty minutes, participants were invited to leave their groups and circulate to other tables. Because some projects had already addressed some challenges in their early wins, their participants were in a position to offer direct advice and feedback when circulating amongst the groups. No project had overcome every obstacle, though, so the exchange helped to match up strengths amongst groups.

Strategies, along with richer descriptions of the challenges they were designed to addressed, are described below.

---

[1] Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, "Leadership and management effectiveness: a multi-frame, multi-sector analysis," *Human Resource Management*, 30:4 (Winter 1991), pp 509-534. Available online at http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hrm.3930300406/abstract.

Technical Infrastructure

As is often the case in discussions about the effective application of technology in education, technical challenges constituted only a fraction of the obstacles discussed at the convening (cultural and structural challenges took primacy, as you will see below). However, identifying the right technical infrastructure for course delivery, while integrating that infrastructure with other campus systems, does present a real challenge for all consortia. Some grantees had decided on a common technology platform through which to share or develop their courses, while others still used dissimilar technology platforms within and across campuses. Similarly, some consortia shared technical support services, centralizing and adding some consistency to technical capacity across institutions, while others reported more disparate capacity levels. This made matters particularly complicated for students. To solve this, participants imagined the eventual creation of a single sign-on interface for students who logged into course delivery or management systems, even if they were enrolled in courses at different institutions.

For those consortia still using different platforms, a concrete strategy and next step would be to move towards a common platform. Two project groups at the convening had recently implemented the fee-based Smart Sparrow, and had already begun to share their experiences with and insights about the platform with one another. Participants also shared with the foundation the platforms that they were using, and a list of these platforms is included in Appendix 1 of this report. Others are experimenting with the open source platform MyOpenMath – which is free, but because it's free, comes with a measure of unpredictability regarding its future availability.

In addition, noting the likely quick pace of change in educational platforms (be they learning management systems, adaptive courseware, or other tools), participants suggested that faculty remain flexible and institutions develop strategies for reinvestment. As faculty and staff learn and adopt new platforms, however, they need to break down silos, and to establish common definitions and implement common tools both within and across institutions.

Content Management

Related to challenges regarding technical infrastructure were questions about how to manage, preserve, and disseminate content created for consortia curricula, courses, and modules. The key distinction in questions related to content management, however, centered on how to find sustainable systems: while course delivery infrastructure could be changed or updated periodically, digital content would have to be preserved over time so it could be used in multiple contexts.

Participants outlined a number of issues that would need to be taken into consideration when thinking about what sorts of systems could preserve and disseminate the content that they were creating. They discussed cost and access, and thought through ways in which sustainable yet accessible content repositories could be supported and maintained (some participants discussed what a content model situated somewhere between open educational resources and a commercial repository might look like, and how that might offer possibilities for sustainability). Like participants who discussed technical infrastructure, participants in this group also discussed the importance of system interoperability, and concluded that the field was in need of systems in which collaborative content creation and sharing were made simpler.

Another key concern that emerged from conversations about content management related to intellectual property. Some participants had a clear understanding of the policies governing content creation and ownership at their institutions. Others felt less clear about who owned the content they were creating for their projects, how it would be archived, and what restrictions governed access. When participants met with their consortium project groups on the afternoon of day 2, many emerged with plans to solidify their understanding of how intellectual property was managed at their institutions and to explore Creative Commons licensing.

Logistical Infrastructure

Just as projects were at different stages of development when it came to technical coordination, so too were they at different stages of development in managing logistical hurdles to cross-campus collaboration. For example, the Five College Consortium (comprised of Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, Smith Colleges and UMass Amherst) has existed for nearly a century, and has accommodated cross-campus registration for decades. Additionally, all schools are within driving distance of one another, so communication across schools is easy.

For a newer and more geographically dispersed consortium like the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges, coordination has been more challenging. Like other project groups, the institutions within this consortium have different tuition structures (compounded by out of state fees for public colleges), academic calendars, credit hour policies, and registration policies. COPLAC participants even work in different time zones, so finding the appropriate times to offer shared courses or even set up project team meetings presents an additional challenge.

Various strategies were proposed to solve some of these logistical problems, each of which would require varying levels of structural change. One short-term solution to challenges regarding cross-registration and varying credit hour requirements was to

have cross-registered students officially enroll in an independent study course with an instructor at their home institution, and then participate in the online course provided by the other institution. Longer term solutions imagined a clearly defined and marketed consortial registration window for shared courses and more consistently aligned credit hour expectations across institutions.

Faculty Engagement

One common concern amongst participants was how to generate and maintain momentum for cross-institutional collaboration and hybrid teaching. Many participants had faced challenges garnering buy-in from faculty who worried—despite clear messages to the contrary—that online tools posed a threat to their jobs. In addition, there were widespread concerns about how projects and interinstitutional collaboration would fare once the grant period came to an end.

The group charged with discussing these issues came up with several strategies, organized around two themes. The first set of strategies focused on creating a culture that invited and celebrated innovation and risk-taking within institutions. Suggestions included launching a PR campaign around the hybrid learning, offering accessible professional development opportunities for faculty to learn more about blended and online learning (including one day or summer workshops), and strategic recruiting. Key mechanisms in implementing these strategies were administrative and departmental support.

The second set of strategies focused on building a collaborative infrastructure across institutions. Suggestions included regular meetings among institutional project leaders, creating more avenues for communication and community building amongst faculty across institutions, and, again, enlisting administrative support for consortium initiatives. To support and facilitate sustainable, collaborative course redesign, participants suggested the creation of a shared repository (or repositories) of content that partners could draw on even after the grant-funded portion of the project had come to a close. This strategy, which would also address issues related to dissemination and preservation, could potentially involve disciplines or scholarly associations playing a role in facilitating preservation and uptake by faculty.

Student Uptake

Faculty resistance or skepticism about hybrid learning did not come as a surprise to participants or convening organizers. Less expected, however, was the reported prevalence of student skepticism about online or blended learning. Frequently, calls for the increased use of technology in education argue that today's college students are

digital natives who are accustomed to consuming information in digital formats. Though this may be true, student expectations about education and course delivery remain more traditional, and students who attend liberal arts colleges may be especially invested in traditional, face-to-face modes of course delivery. In addition, because, when done well, hybrid learning is active learning, students might resist when they are accustomed to being passive recipients of information. For these reasons, garnering interest and enthusiasm from students and meeting necessary enrollment levels in blended courses, then, has been a challenge for many participants.

The group charged with developing strategies to encourage student uptake proposed a number of strategies. Many of these had to do with easing student concerns about how a different format might affect outcomes or learning. For example participants proposed that assignments be scaffolded to allow for low-stakes submissions and revisions, and that students have the opportunity to provide feedback on online or blended courses midway through the semester. Student champions can demonstrate the benefits to their peers, such as getting access to learning opportunities otherwise unavailable to them. For example, the COPLAC project has created a hybrid spring course in archeology followed by an in-person summer field school so students get the experience of excavating and studying for Native American artifacts. Who could be better ambassadors for a high-quality hybrid experience than the students enrolled in the archeology course? Another suggestion is to launch a hybrid learning center on campus, both of which would aid to normalize the notion of online or blended coursework.

Finally, participants discussed the potential to make hybrid learning a requirement for all students. Though aspirational, this suggestion was based in several arguments about the expected role of technology in the kind of professional development students are likely to encounter in their careers. The hybrid format of delivery, participants argued, mimicked more closely than face-to-face courses the sort of training students would receive in the workplace.

A more compelling reason to require hybrid learning from a liberal arts perspective is the notion, articulated in a morning panel by Rui Cao of the Texas Learning Consortium, that blended learning environments reconfigured student-instructor relationships and allowed students to assume a more active role in the classroom (virtual and physical). This sort of dynamic, as well as the opportunity that blended or online courses provide for students to engage with new sorts of media or ways of learning, all seem consistent with the goals of liberal arts education, and may be crucial selling points for skeptical students.

Sustainable Customization

If students, faculty, and institutions are going to buy into and participate in digital learning, then the format has to offer something new and valuable to the teaching and learning experience. One of the great aspirations for technology-enabled teaching, and blended learning in particular, is that it will allow for the greater personalization of content while increasing capacity and efficiency. One of the ways in which this is achieved is by creating easily sharable content that then frees instructors to give more personalized attention to students. Instructors can customize content or assessment to best fit their course goals and student needs, but do not have to reinvent the wheel.

Like the group that focused on content management, participants who discussed strategies for sustainably customizing content for faculty and students at scale outlined key issues that stakeholders would have to keep in mind as they negotiated this balance. These issues overlapped with many others that were surfaced in breakout group discussions: participants outlined the need for clear intellectual property agreements between institutions, consortia, and faculty members, and called for increased discussions about archiving and dissemination plans that would accommodate the reuse, remixing, and revision of content. Another key area of interest was how to mobilize faculty participation in customization —a challenge that would need to be addressed to demonstrate that technology-enabled course and content sharing actually could provide new opportunities for teaching and learning. Finally, participants focused on how customization differed depending on whether consortia were involved in creating modules, courses, or curricula. Participants suggested that the more modular the unit of content, the greater the opportunities for customization and faculty buy-in.

Assessment

A final challenge that surfaced during the day 1 working groups was how to assess student learning, as well as the consortial enterprise as a whole. Assessing and demonstrating student learning will be vital to the validity and sustainability of blended and online learning initiatives, and, like collaborative infrastructure, assessment infrastructure could be a key long-term outcome of these funded projects. Assessing the success of the consortial, course-sharing enterprise as a whole remains more elusive, but no less important for sustainability.

Several strategies were proposed for assessing student learning, many of which are similar to those used to assess learning in traditional courses. Participants suggested that institutions and faculty look at student self-reported data, collected through mid-term or final course evaluations, and stressed the importance of rubrics in assessing student learning outcomes. Participants suggested that these rubrics be made available to

students so that they had clear expectations in the course, and proposed that, rather than reinvent the wheel, institutions look to pre-existing rubrics such as the AAC&U VALUE rubrics for guidance. Other suggestions included a more rigorous implementation of pre- and post-outcome evaluations, in addition to quizzes and exams, as well as the use of scaffolded assignments to track student growth over time. Finally, participants implored that, as faculty and institutions continued to wrestle with these questions, they think carefully about how online platforms could aid in the assessment process, and how to create new measures that are uniquely tailored to the online learning environment and liberal arts outcomes.

To assess the enterprise as a whole, participants first made the case that project groups and their institutions needed to define what success would look like to them for these efforts. They suggested that project stakeholders think about the role that offices of institutional research might be able to play in assessment, and, to capture more qualitative data, they proposed surveys of students and faculty involved in hybrid learning. Other suggestions included measuring increased diversity in the classroom (if diversity was an intended outcome), comparing instances of early intervention in hybrid courses to traditional courses, and using national benchmarks to define and compare metrics related to costs and student learning.

Conclusion

Higher education faces real and growing challenges related to cost and access. Liberal arts institutions in particular are increasingly grappling with resource and capacity constraints, as well as questions about the relevance of their offerings.

As the presentations and conversations at this convening made clear, technology will not provide a silver bullet solution for any of these problems. In addition, the notion of online or blended learning in the abstract, divorced from its application to any real challenge, has little chance of gaining traction or catalyzing meaningful change. Where technology does have potential, however, is when it is used as a tool in a broader strategy to address a real problem. In the case of the convening, this strategy included the collaborative creation of courses and course content, and the sharing of that content across institutions to increase capacity and enhance learning.

Conversations at the convening surfaced other sorts of infrastructure that needed to be established in order for collaboration and content sharing—and its employment of technology—to be effective. These included inter and intra-institutional collaboration, assessment infrastructure, and buy-in from faculty, staff, and institutional leaders. Building this infrastructure presents significant challenges, but will be crucial not only for these initiatives, but also for future innovations and collaborations that aim to

improve institutional and student outcomes. When discussing their early wins, many participants highlighted ways in which they had already begun to accomplish this, and in their planning sessions, outlined ways in which they would continue to do so for the remainder of the grant period and beyond.

Appendix 1: Grantee Resources

Throughout the convening, participants shared platforms and resources they found helpful in navigating the challenges discussed. These are listed below:

Platforms and Online Tools

» MyOpenMath (adaptive learning platform): https://www.myopenmath.com/

» Smart Sparrow (adaptive learning platform): https://www.smartsparrow.com/

» Tagxedo (word cloud software): http://www.tagxedo.com/

» Cacoo (online diagram tool): https://cacoo.com/

» Padlet (collaborative project tool): https://padlet.com/

» Voicestream (audio broadcasting tool):
https://itunes.apple.com/us/app/voicestream/id1020547627?mt=8

» ComicLife (online storytelling tool): http://comiclife.com/

» Storybird (online storytelling tool): https://storybird.com/

» Wisewire (digital resources): http://www.wisewire.com/

Resources

» Association for Collaborative Leadership: http://acl.site-ym.com/

» Deanna Marcum and Clara Samayoa, "Leveraging Technology for the Liberal Arts: The Council of Independent Colleges Consortium for Online Humanities Instruction," Ithaka S+R (November 4, 2015), http://www.sr.ithaka.org/publications/leveraging-technology-for-the-liberal-arts/

» Creative Commons: https://creativecommons.org/

Upcoming Events

» Blended Learning in the Liberal Arts Conference, May 18 & 19, Bryn Mawr College: http://blendedlearning.blogs.brynmawr.edu/

Appendix 2: Course Redesign Study Handout

The following document was provided to participants by keynote speaker MJ Bishop.

Pushing the Barriers to Teaching Improvement
Findings from a Study of Course Redesign in Maryland

A longer summary of the Kirwan Center's research into the USM course redesign initiative appeared in the February, 2016 issue of *Liberal Education* https://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/2015-2016/fall-winter/ehrmann. The full report is available at http://www.usmd.edu/cai/course-redesign.

The University System of Maryland helped its institutions redesign large enrollment introductory and gateway courses during 2006-2014. Helped with a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation recently studied the direct and indirect benefits of that program, asking what conditions helped or hindered the spread of such innovations.

Course Redesign: The program targeted multi-section developmental and gateway courses with a history of high DFW rates. The goal: improve student success while freeing some of the faculty resources normally required for such courses. Redesigns often incorporated online tutorials, frequent formative assessments, small group work in class, and other active/interactive approaches. Faculty often chose to use trained undergraduate learning assistants to help with those approaches. The course redesign saved faculty time substituting online work for a weekly class meeting and/or by increasing section sizes. To develop and test the new designs, the System offered a matching grant of $20,000 for each course, along with workshops and consulting help for the faculty team.

The University System of Maryland offers an especially good opportunity to see how such change strategies play out. The system includes a dozen diverse degree-granting universities including, for example, research-intensive institutions, three historically black institutions, regional comprehensives, and one of the largest online universities in the United States. The smallest USM institution enrolls about 3,000 students, while the largest serves more than 80,000.

Direct Outcomes of course redesign: In 2006-2014, over 143,000 students received more active and supportive learning experiences. Based on comparison of DFW rates in old v. new designs, over 10,500 additional students passed those courses. Yet the new designs also freed over $5.8 million in faculty time for other activities, e.g., teaching upper division courses.

Indirect Outcomes: Beyond these immediate benefits, the initiative's successes encouraged new legislative support for academic transformation. Other indirect outcomes included continued work on course redesign at USM institutions, the creation of the USM's William E. Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation to support efforts across the USM, and the establishment of new roles in all system institutions to provide leadership for work on academic transformation.

Conditions Influencing the spread of learning-centered improvement: Extensive interviews with faculty and administrators and study of project documents illustrated how seven institutional "foundations" could aid or hinder the spread of improved instructional practices. Our research also suggested that each of these foundations could be strengthened; they need not be treated as unalterable limits to innovation.

Academic Leadership: Interviewees pointed to the importance of visible commitment from the provost to improving outcomes. Messaging from the USM about "cost-savings" encouraged administrative and legislative support for course redesign, but discouraged some faculty from joining in the program. If the cost messages had instead highlighted making education more affordable and saving instructors' time, the initiatives might have engaged more faculty.

Cross-silo relationships: For course redesign (or program redesign) to spread, faculty and staff with different backgrounds, roles, and perspectives need to work together. That can be difficult. In these USM redesigns, It was obviously helpful when players had some prior history together and had learned how they could rely on one another.

Core beliefs and teaching and learning: Conflicting beliefs about the nature of teaching kept some faculty from participating in redesign. Some faculty, for example, were skeptical that *any* change in teaching could produce lasting improvements in student learning. When some faculty realized that one goal of a redesign team was to agree on some common goals, assessments and assignments for different sections of the same

course, they saw such an agreement as an infringement of academic freedom. For institutions to make headway in spreading and sustaining significant changes in teaching and learning, such questions need to be openly discussed and debated.

Prior faculty experience with elements of the innovation: In the Maryland initiatives, redesigns usually had many elements, such as framing learning goals, backward design, use of rubrics, pragmatic use of technology to support new teaching approaches, more extensive group work in classes, and working with undergraduate learning assistants. Faculty were less likely to worry about the time required for a redesigned course when they were already using some of the elements in their own courses. For large-scale improvements to spread, it would help if more faculty had prior experience with the elements.

Institutional infrastructure and support systems: Appropriate classroom spaces, good technology support services, and the availability of courses to prepare undergraduate learning assistants made a difference to the progress of course redesign. The bold nature of the redesigns, changes in technology, and evolving online resources all made it important to continue tweaking the course design. So it helped when the department could invest in release time or a summer salary for the course coordinator.

Assessment-related services: These efforts to improve student success could be powered or limited by the availability of assessment information. For example, the course redesign process provided tools and training to help faculty assess the impacts of designs upon costs. On the other hand, many faculty proposed to redesign a gateway or developmental course in order to improve learning in later courses, too. But such evaluations of later courses did not seem to be in anyone's job description, so such studies were rarely done.

Faculty personnel policies and practices: Of course many faculty talked about whether or not efforts like this were likely to be noted when merit increases and promotion and tenure decisions were made. Second, the definition of teaching load turned out to be important: redesign sometimes led to major increases in section size. When teaching assignments are purely described as courses (a 3-3 teaching load), faculty are implicitly penalized for teaching larger sections. A third issue lay in adjunct contracts; they rarely mentioned the time adjuncts would need for professional development to stay up to date with changing materials and technologies in the course.

Appendix 3: Convening Agenda

The Teagle Foundation

Hybrid Learning & the Residential Liberal Arts Experience
Grantee Convening
Thursday, April 7-Friday, April 8, 2016
Marriott-New York East Side
525 Lexington Avenue, New York NY 10017

Thursday, April 7

12:00-12:30 PM	Registration & Luncheon
12:30-12:45 PM	Welcome *Judith Shapiro, President, The Teagle Foundation*
12:45-1:45 PM	Opening Address "Rethinking Technology's Role in Transforming Higher Education" *MJ Bishop, Director, William E. Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation, University System of Maryland*
1:45-2:00 PM	Break
2:00-2:30 PM	Overview of the "Hybrid Learning" Initiative *Loni Bordoloi, Program Director, The Teagle Foundation* *Desiree Vazquez Barlatt, Program Officer, The Teagle Foundation*
2:30-4:00 PM	Small Group Activity & Discussion What are the early wins and challenges that you are experiencing in your projects?
4:00-4:15 PM	Break
4:15-5:00 PM	Online Teaching and Learning Initiatives: Lessons Learned *Deanna Marcum, Managing Director, Ithaka S&R* *Richard Spies, Senior Advisor, Ithaka S&R*

5:00-5:30 PM	Cocktail Reception
5:30-8:00 PM	Dinner & Keynote Presentation "Large-Scale Digital Collections and the Small-Scale Classroom" *Daniel Cohen, Executive Director, Digital Public Library of*

America

Friday, April 8

8:30-9:00 AM	Continental Breakfast
9:00-10:00 AM	Insights from the Field: Grantee Panel *George Anders, Contributing Writer, Forbes Magazine (moderator)* *Barry Bandra, Midwest Hybrid Learning Consortium* *Rui Cao, Texas Learning Consortium* *George Mehaffy, National Blended Learning Consortium* *Anjali Thapur, Collaborative Curriculum Development Project*
10:00-10:15 AM	Break
10:15-11:30 AM	Small Group Activity & Discussion How can we use our collective wisdom to address common challenges?
11:30 AM-1:00 PM	Project Team Work Time (Boxed Lunch Available)
1:00-1:45 PM	Project Team Report Out Please share lessons learned through the convening that have sparked interest in applying new approaches or encouraged doubling down on existing efforts.
1:45-2:00 PM	Wrap-up & Acknowledgements