



## Less than/more than: Issues associated with high-impact online teaching and learning

**Ricardo Montelongo, Ph.D.**  
Sam Houston State University

### Abstract

*The increased presence of online education in higher education in the United States continues to challenge educators in their perceptions of teaching and learning experiences in virtual environments. While critiques of online education typically focus on its “less than” shortcomings, this literature review encourages educators to take a “more than” approach when providing institutional support. Online education provides beneficial outcomes for faculty, students, and administration when viewed for its potential in providing innovative teaching and learning. The financial challenges involved in providing these practices are addressed to justify investment in faculty effort, organizational support and professional development, and equitable student support.*

**Keywords:** Online Learning, Finance, Teaching Pedagogy, Faculty Engagement, Student Learning, Technology

In his opinion article on digital learning for *Inside Higher Ed*, Sean Michael Morris makes an interesting argument on the need to change perceptions and use of online education in higher education (2018). Morris claims online learning is viewed more for its “ideology of efficiency,” rather than its possibilities to provide rigorous and transformational learning experiences. He believed self-actualization opportunities were possible for online learners if online courses were viewed as more than just rudimentary and less personal forms of learning (2018). Too often, many in the higher education community come with this “less than” lens when approaching online education (Morris, 2018).

As higher education institutions consider online learning as a strategy to increase access, improve student outcomes and lower tuition costs, there needs to be more reflection towards making online digital learning equal to the physical classroom learning occurring on campus. While online education does provide a “bend in the cost curve” (Deming, Goldin, Katz, & Yuchtman, 2015, p. 500) in providing more courses for student enrollment, it also provides challenges in how one effectively teaches and learns in digital space. A review of the literature in online education focused on high-impact instruction and learning practices is provided to give a framework for potential financial issues associated with enhancing online learning.

### Creating High-Impact Online Education

Online and distance learning has emerged to become a common form of course delivery in institutions of higher education. In 2015, more than six million students in the United States were enrolled in some variation of an online or distance education course (Allen & Seaman, 2017). Public and not-for-profit institutions of higher education have embraced the online learning market, accounting for 86% of all

student enrollments (Allen & Seaman, 2017). Students likely experience online education in various combinations of hybrid courses, fully online courses, or mixing of physical and online learning as part of their pathway toward a degree. In 2015, it is estimated that 30% of students enrolled in higher education took at least one online course (Allen & Seaman, 2017).

### **Online Teaching Pedagogy**

As a professor who teaches in a fully online master's preparation program, the author has developed relationships with colleagues across the country who provide either fully online programs, or who offer various courses through online and distance education. Anecdotal evidence from discussions with these colleagues suggests that partial or fully online education is becoming an increasingly popular option for preparing graduate students. Growth trends in online learning are also evident within graduate education. There were over one million graduate students enrolled in online and distance education courses in 2015 (Allen & Seaman, 2017). Despite the interest and trend of offering graduate coursework through distance and online learning, there remains a limited amount of research regarding pedagogical practices employed by faculty in programs delivered in online or hybrid formats (Conover & Miller, 2014; Montelongo & Eaton, 2019; Westbrook, 2014). An increasing group of online educators recognizes the importance of developing a critical online pedagogy to reassess how online education questions equity, social justice, and transformative learning experiences in virtual learning spaces (Conover & Miller, 2014; Montelongo & Eaton, 2019; Morris, 2018). McGinley, Osgood, and Kenney (2012) point out that online course design, instructor effort to include higher-order thinking (especially opportunities for debates and discussions), and clear course objectives lead to overall online learning satisfaction for graduate students. There is still a need to increase research on student experiences in online and distance education courses (Holzweiss, Joyner, Fuller, Henderson, & Young, 2014; Shackelford & Maxwell, 2012). Understanding faculty pedagogical practices and student experiences in online courses are important areas to consider when discussing financial support and investment in online education.

Crawford-Ferre and Wiest (2012) reviewed literature regarding online learning in higher education, noting that faculty continued to remain wary of online learning due to lack of knowledge and general unease about pedagogical practices on, and through, digital learning spaces. Unlike the earliest forms of online education, which resembled correspondence courses, online learning has transformed itself to make use of new digital technologies (Montelongo, 2018) and applications (Major, 2015; Montelongo & Eaton, 2019). Effective online educators utilize various technological tools for content delivery, faculty-student and student-student interaction, and for providing insights, feedback, or discussion of course assignments and activities (Baran, Correia, & Thompson, 2011; Herie, 2005). The challenge of online education is motivating faculty to explore the potential of teaching in digital learning spaces.

Multiple studies confirm that effective online teaching requires more time than face-to-face instruction (Gabriel & Kaufield, 2008; Kenny & Fluck, 2017). Effective online content delivery, for example, goes beyond mere lecturing. A study of graduate students enrolled in multiple colleges at a South Texas university found most have favorable views of online courses (Fedynich, Bradley, & Bradley, 2015). However, these students believed being self-motivated increased success in such courses. The researchers raised the question that online instructors, course design, and delivery of materials are crucial for instilling this motivation (Fedynich, Bradley, & Bradley, 2015). Faculty needed to incorporate opportunities for student reflection, think about multiple mediums for content delivery (podcasts, videos, infographics, and other means of presenting), and be highly visible and engaged in the learning management system, as well as through other digital tools (e-mail, chat, phone, video conferencing). Adjustment to the time demands of online learning can often confound and frustrate faculty new to distance and online education.

Both asynchronous and synchronous components are vital for effective learning and engagement (Bailey, Schneider, & Vander Ark, 2013; Crawford-Ferre & Wiest, 2012; Major, 2015; Montelongo & Eaton, 2019). While learning management systems serve as structured conduits for the asynchronous posting of course materials, lectures, and tracking of student progress, there is an increasing number of synchronous tools available within such platforms. Chat rooms, live video meeting spaces, interactive whiteboards, and virtual reality tools are only some of the increasingly common features of learning management systems. Faculty need to be highly engaged in the digital environment (Crawford-Ferre & Wiest, 2012; Major, 2015).

**High-impact teaching practices.** Online education continues to transform what is considered the traditional learning environment. It is necessary to learn how to define the online learning experience. By understanding how online learning occurs, educators can use the information to foster student success. Having this awareness will provide vital information to understand the activities, interaction, and engagement that comprise online learning. Such information can be used to identify areas of importance for financial support as higher education institutions continue to increase online education offerings.

Casement (2013) stated, “how far the transformation from traditional to virtual classrooms will go remains to be seen, but it’s well underway” (p. 15). An understanding of pedagogical strategies to use in virtual classrooms is important if this stated transformation continues to increase on college campuses, which requires financial investment for its growth. In the higher education literature, there is a large body of work on effective teaching practices and their influence on learning outcomes and student development. However, ideas on the effective pedagogy on student learning is through the lens of traditional college classroom environments and spaces, which rely on the brick-and-mortar physical environment. While these strategies are described in traditional classroom settings, a growing body of knowledge is looking at how these are applied in online education.

High-impact teaching and learning has been one area which have been investigated for improved student success in college courses. High-impact teaching practices are usually defined as efforts by instructors to create meaningful engagement with course content (Fink, 2016). As a critique to “High Impact Practices” offered by Kuh (2008) from the National Survey of Student Engagement, Fink (2016) noticed that these practices focused more on institutional and curriculum practices and not teaching. As a result, Fink created a list of teaching practices based on forty years of working in the field. High-impact teaching practices include the following:

1. Helping students become meta-learners
2. Learning-centered course design
3. Using small groups in a powerful way
4. Service-learning/community engagement – with reflection
5. Being a leader with students (Fink, 2016, p. 3)

Ideas stemming from the high-impact teaching practices listed by Fink have been expanded into online education environments. For example, high-impact teaching practices have been used to achieve course objectives in creating community engagement for online courses (Montelongo & Eaton, 2018).

Fink noted that part of high-impact teaching is being a leader to one’s students, which centers on interaction with students. The interaction is focused on building relationships with students (Bain, 2004). Elements of this interaction are considered to be the following: showing care to students, motivating them to learn and achieve goals, and using dynamic communication (Bain, 2004; Fink, 2016). As online

education enrollment continues to increase, so too does the numbers of students from culturally, linguistically, racially, economically, and other diverse backgrounds. Recent thinking on online education with regards to interaction has paid attention to culturally relevant teaching ideas.

**High-context learning.** Culturally relevant pedagogy, most robustly articulated by Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995), seeks to think of pedagogical practices along a series of continuums. These include: how teachers conceive of self and others; how teachers build social relations with students; and where and how teachers conceive of sites of knowledge. Culturally sustaining pedagogy explicitly centers and sustains cultural pluralism by valuing and integrating linguistic and cultural elements into academic courses, seeking to create a more democratic, engaging, and anti-oppressive space (Kumashiro, 2000; Paris & Alim, 2014). High-context communication and relationship building within online course modules is described as an initial strategy.

One area to consider for culturally relevant teaching is the recognition of low-context and high-context learning (Westbrook, 2014). These types of learning reflect the cross-cultural communication between individuals within a classroom setting. High-context cultures use both verbal and nonverbal communication to guide cultural norms, whereas low-context cultures rely on written and spoken word (Westbrook, 2012). In educational settings, these contexts are expressed in how instruction and interactions are delivered and received through nonverbal cues. Awareness of such learning styles is important for effective teaching across diverse groups of students. When considering high-context communication, attention is placed on communication, visual cues, and relationship building. Montelongo (2017) described the use of high-context teaching in online graduate student instruction. Specific strategies used to create high-context learning environments in online courses included:

- Video introductions – placing videos describing faculty knowledge and interest in the course topic,
- Weekly overviews – placing video at the start of lesson modules to provide students the professor’s ideas on content,
- Video grade feedback – placed in the grade book to hear and see the professor’s reactions,
- Synchronous live meetings – structured and planned opportunities during the semester for live student and faculty interactions, particularly related to difficult course material,
- Point of view camera use – immersive videos to bring course content “to life,”

These strategies provided high-context communication opportunities in online learning spaces. A main element used in these strategies was video, where students and the instructor engaged in visual conversations in the online course and multimedia resources created dynamic, not static, lesson modules to enhance online learning. Understanding and applying high-context communication components in online courses is seen as an effective strategy in implementing a high-impact online educational experience.

### **Implementing High-Impact Online Education: Financial Challenges**

Specific strategies and practices in creating high-impact online education allow for an examination and discussion on what resources are needed for effective and impactful online course delivery. As mentioned earlier, higher education in the United States serves a student population numbering in the millions (Allen & Seaman, 2017). The continued call to use online education as a strategy to make college more accessible (Meyer, 2010), to increase enrollments (Sun & Chen, 2016), and to improve student outcomes (Bailey, Vanduganathan, Henry, Laverdiere, & Pugliese, 2018) has created an interesting question – does online

education produce the same cost-effective experiences and outcomes as those afforded at the traditional face-to-face brick-and-mortar campus setting?

How one answers this question influences how online education is approached, as a college student, educator, or administrator. Chief academic officers note the importance of addressing technology issues, listing technology support for instruction and use of technology in academic programs as top concerns at community colleges (Cejda & Leist, 2006). One could assume these similar concerns are found at other institutions. The dynamic nature of online education makes it apparent that its continued growth will continue to challenge leaders of higher education.

These perceptions of online education being “less than” or “more than” have a direct connection with financial questions linked to this form of higher learning. High-impact online teaching and learning require a great deal of effort and support. High-impact online education values interaction in digital learning spaces and avoids the advancement of impersonal and disengaged course formats. Providing such forms of online education requires attention to faculty perceptions of online education as part of their professional development, familiarity with the use of digital pedagogical tools, and ease with using these resources to foster engagement. Three areas are identified to discuss the financial challenges facing the advancement of high-impact online education: investment in faculty effort, organizational support and professional development, and equitable student support.

**Investment in faculty effort.** To promote online education in the “more than” lens that reflects high-impact teaching and learning, institutions need to invest in the effort provided by faculty in developing and implementing rigorous and impactful online learning. The application of high-impact online teaching practices requires concern for the time and resources needed by faculty to construct online courses with these high-engagement qualities (Budhai & Skipwith, 2016; Tallent-Runnels et al., 2006). Specifically, faculty need time to effectively develop course modules and to communicate regularly with students enrolled in courses. Chief academic officers need to invest in the professional development of online educators to make sure their technological competence matches the demands of high-impact online learning (Cejda & Leist, 2006).

High-impact online education focuses on communication, visual cues, and relationship building (Fink, 2016; Morris, 2018; Shackelford & Maxwell, 2012). The interaction occurring in a high-impact online course is not only consistent but also utilizes high-context communication and learner-centered course design (Conover & Miller, 2014). Skills beneficial to providing such communication include:

- Knowledge of using videos to assist students to hear and see the instructor’s thoughts on course content;
- Awareness of how to use multimedia resources, like those found on YouTube, Spotify, and other video and audio streaming services for instructional purposes;
- Exploring different formats of course assessment, such as the use of infographics, podcasts, and visual media (Eaton & Montelongo, 2018; Westbrook, 2014).

Thus, the argument can be made that providing all these components in online education requires quite a great deal of attention from faculty. Faculty course loads should be re-evaluated in this age of increased demands for online education. Crawford-Ferre and Weist (2014) argued that faculty teaching loads demanded a reduction due to most instructors being new to online teaching with little or no preparation or training.

Bailey, Vaduganathan, Henry, Laverdiere, & Pugliese (2018) believed one of the positive impacts of online education for institutions was reduced instructional delivery costs – between \$19 to \$67 per student credit hour – resulting from higher student-to-instructor ratios for online courses.

Does this increased student enrollment in online courses come at a risk of teaching quality? The answer depends on whether institutions are willing to invest in adequate resources for faculty development, training, and support, which could range between \$1 million to \$9 million, according to Bailey et al. (2018). Based on the author's own experiences as a full-time faculty member in a fully-online graduate program, time and resources needed to achieve the goals of high-impact online teaching is important, and if institutions continue to view faculty workloads in the lens of the traditional brick-and-mortar campus, perceptions of online education in the "less than" mode continue to prevail. This is not to say that face-to-face instruction is better compared to online instruction (Cavanaugh & Jacquemin, 2015); the point is high-impact online education requires knowledge of current technological resources, use of innovative tools for instruction, and time to produce and place these tools within the online lesson modules.

Faculty workloads should reflect the efforts needed to implement high-impact online education. Further analysis and investigations need to occur to understand how much time is spent to create online courses, which include strategies reflecting high-impact teaching. Online education viewed from a "more than" approach will see opportunity in providing faculty time to create a learning environment. While more research needs to be done on outcomes connected to high-impact online education, there appears to be evidence that more favorable online learning experiences are provided when faculty use such practices (Bailey, Schneider, & Vander Ark, 2013; Conover & Miller, 2014; Koc & Liu, 2016; Montelongo & Eaton, 2018).

**Organizational support and professional development.** Financial considerations need to take into account the support necessary to not only provide online delivery of courses, but also the professional training and development of faculty. Despite the increasing prevalence of online education, organizational structures are still organized according to brick-and-mortar, face-to-face models. Successful online education should include a "central team of instructional designers, web designers, multimedia personnel, data analysts, quality assurance experts, and student support services staff" (Bailey et al., 2018, p. 29). As mentioned earlier regarding faculty effort, such creation and financing of this team required budgets well into the millions for most institutions.

Organizational support needs to understand what it means to instruct and learn in a digital space. Institutions need to provide funding for faculty professional development so that they can navigate a landscape of continually proliferating technological changes. Major (2015) discussed the importance of faculty technological knowledge, where faculty needed to become comfortable with utilizing a variety of technological tools used to enhance student learning and engagement. Professional development can be provided at a local, regional, and national level. Examples of such professional development can be found regionally at Sam Houston State University's Digital Education Summit and nationally at the Digital Pedagogy Lab held at the University of Mary Washington.

Additionally, the financial impact of online education has typically looked at the cost benefits on the course level and not at the administrative and program-cost levels (Bailey et al., 2018; Meyer, 2010). To provide high-impact online education, there needs to be a technological infrastructure in place to support robust online learning. Institutional support needs to provide faculty with the tools necessary for this type of instruction. Delivery of online course content starts with a learning management system (LMS) that is functional, reliable, and secure. To move online education towards high-impact levels, there also needs to be institutional support for tools outside the prescribed LMS for course instruction such as video



production services, instructional content designers, and additional applications and programs to enhance the LMS' online instruction (Budhai & Skipwith, 2016; Herie, 2005; Montelongo & Eaton, 2019).

Bailey et al. (2018) described strategies used by six colleges and universities in the United States to create successful digital learning environments, including findings on the economic outcomes of having high-impact online education. Their report found that supporting high-quality online learning required an investment of \$2 to \$14 per student credit hour in online operations for the institutions in the report (Bailey et al., 2018). The report mentioned economic benefits for the institutions reflected in the reduction on their need to provide and maintain physical campus learning spaces. This cost reduction "ranged from \$12 to \$66 less per student credit hour at four of the six institutions in the study" (p. 29). The return on investment included increased student retention, graduation rates, and other positive outcomes for institutions in the report.

Interestingly, faculty in the report stated that by having the strong institutional online education support, they were able to create online courses that were more rigorous and challenging compared to face-to-face courses (Bailey et al., 2018). Organizational support and a well-developed strategic plan that includes professionals who assist faculty and students in their online experience appears to have positive institutional outcomes while also providing a reduction of costs in delivering online education. Both faculty and students benefit from this investment in online instructional support. This is in large part in viewing online education more for its potential rather than its shortfalls (Bailey et al., 2018; Meyer, 2010).

**Equitable student support.** As universities develop more robust online course delivery options, as well as fully online programs, conflicts begin emerging over academic and non-academic service delivery. What responsibilities does the university have for providing equitable student services for online students? How do we ensure that students have access to support systems such as writing centers, counseling, health centers, and other engagement initiatives? How do we develop fee structures for online students that are parallel or differ from face-to-face students based on student service delivery?

These questions are among a growing list connected to the growing presence of online education and the experiences encountered by students enrolled in these courses (Koc & Liu, 2016; McGinley, Osgood, & Kenney, 2012). If high-impact online education is to be promoted, equitable support services for students enrolled in online education has to be provided. Academic support for online students should include access to tutorial services for specific subjects and opportunities to interact with academic writing coaches. According to Bailey et al. (2018), "institutions need to a network of remotely accessible support structures adapted to the needs of online learners" (p. 6). Their report of colleges with high-impact, high-support online education noted the use of adaptive software that provided learning analytics to instructors identifying students who are in need of help in specific areas (ex. writing skills). The presence of such support is just one example of how online education can provide a personal approach to digital learning. The presence of such examples of student support in online education "may allow instructors to tailor education to the individual in a way that may not be possible in a traditional classroom" (McKeown, 2012, p. 7). The technology involved in online education allows individualized student assistance opportunities offered through queries on progress, immediate snapshots on performance, and other tools depending on the LMS or other courseware supported by the institution.

Equitable student support also carries over into the social environment of online learning. Providing extracurricular opportunities should also be afforded to online students, considering their unique presence in the overall college environment. Online education should not mean that students enrolled in these courses are barred from opportunities of personal development and growth. High-impact online education also offers opportunities for students to interact with each other within their digital learning

space and outside the boundaries of their LMS. Outside of courses, student support should be considered with regards to extracurricular activities and campus programming. McKeown (2012) discussed the idea of providing the “full college experience” for online learners and found that when supported by institutions, online students can receive the experience and to a greater degree compared to students at traditional campus settings. The growth of virtual student communities and the presence of social media and various apps used to create these communities are being used more on campus, thus, breaking down the barriers that students can only socially interact in physical spaces. Institutions who are increasing their online educational presence should consider these areas in their financial discussions. However, these discussions need to have awareness of the characteristics of the online student. Fee structures for student services using the model of students enrolled on actual physical campuses may not apply for someone enrolling in courses from afar or at some distance away from the campus, which makes it unlikely that regular use of services is cost-efficient for the student.

### Discussion

The information described in this literature review offers the position that high-impact online teaching and learning should be considered in future investment in online education growth. As colleges and universities continue to increase the number of online courses, more research is needed to learn which pedagogical practices are effective in course delivery and which financial issues need to be addressed to effectively deliver online courses. The author has initiated studies with a colleague to learn more about student experiences in high-impact online courses and to describe pedagogical strategies to create such courses (Eaton & Montelongo, 2018; Montelongo & Eaton, 2019). These studies will contribute to specific areas to consider in financial discussions involving online education. More studies are needed to transform online course delivery into one that provides student connection and rigor.

Online educators have long struggled with the static and constrictive nature of the online learning modules found within many learning management systems (Budhai & Skipwith, 2016; Major, 2015). More work needs to be done to conceptualize the pedagogical practices that are most impactful. This leads to an important point regarding faculty knowledge of technology and overcoming the limitations of most learning management systems. Faculty should feel comfortable with utilizing technological tools outside the structured online learning space. Web-based tools, such as collaboration hubs like Slack, social community forums similar to Google+ Communities (shut down as of April 2019), and the video and audio conferencing platforms found in Google Hangouts and Zoom, are just a few examples of applications that have provided online educators additional technology to supplement online course instruction beyond the LMS. The development of high-impact online education requires continuous professional development for the faculty and staff connected to online courses and the LMS. For faculty, opportunities are available to learn more about critical digital pedagogy and using online education to transform how learning is perceived in higher education. Investment in such professional development, where faculty learn about current technologies and practices, provided favorable returns in the form of institutional retention and graduation rates (Bailey et al., 2018).

The importance of faculty presence and engagement is supported by previous research (Bailey et al., 2018; Crawford-Ferre & Wiest, 2012; Major, 2015). Engaged faculty need to be equipped for success and become partners in digital learning. Online students still appreciated qualities found in face-to-face courses despite learning in asynchronous spaces. Professors who provided regular guidance and check-ins on discussion boards and other course tasks helped create interactions that created a personal touch to the online learning experience. The return of investment for providing faculty support for high-impact online teaching is seen through faculty who create learning environments that provide rigor and challenge



students to become learners who reach self-actualized levels of academic achievement (Casement, 2013; Morris, 2018).

The faculty need to be hyper-engaged in challenging students, providing thought-provoking questions in discussion forums and through synchronous learning spaces, and in offering critical and timely insights on student assignments. Further, the faculty need to consistently encourage students to engage with the course material, with each other, and to push outside their comfort zone. While online course delivery makes this work different, this review supports the notion that this important work is not impossible within online and distance learning environments. Thus, financial support of high-impact online education needs to also include serious discussions on the time and effort being asked by faculty to achieve such goals. A re-evaluation of how course loads are evaluated and assessed should be considered if institutions see online education as the future direction of course instruction and a strategy to increase college accessibility and enrollments. The process of making high-impact online courses asks the faculty to work extensively in the digital environment, but recognition of time spent in creating courses with these qualities results in the faculty becoming partners in the building of successful online education programs (Bailey et al., 2018).

The use of additional technological tools beyond the LMS appear to enhance student learning. Faculty teaching online requires knowledge of technological tools, and a willingness to experiment with how those tools may enhance or detract from learning. Experimentation, strategizing against technological distraction, and a willingness amongst the students and faculty to evaluate new technologies and their impact on pedagogical practices is vital. A certain level of investment in the technology infrastructure of an institution is required to make online education run effectively and smoothly. High-impact online teaching and learning benefits from smooth running technology and infrastructure. As suggested by several reports (Bailey et al., 2018; McKeown, 2012; Meyer, 2010), the cost-effectiveness of online education is aided by the investment in the people and processes that help make it run to its fullest potential.

Despite online learning being marketed and viewed as an individualized and self-pacing educational process, students in the author's course example expressed a desire for more synchronicity (Eaton & Montelongo, 2018). The opportunity to interact with faculty and peers in real time is important for enhancing courses offered in an online environment. Fortunately, technological tools are available for such synchronicity to occur. Faculty teaching online courses should think critically about balancing the asynchronous and synchronous portions of the course. Students in online programs still value the flexibility offered by distance education, but also clearly value relationships and real-time engagement. High-impact online education requires the financial investment of tools to make this happen. Successful online education programs are sustained by having dedicated institutional support for continuous improvement and enhancement of their instructional components used in course delivery and design.

### **Conclusion**

As higher education continues to support the growth of online education as a cost-reduction strategy for enrollment, caveats are provided that say such strategies with evidenced cost-benefits diminish the quality of education when courses are offered online (Deming, Goldin, Katz, & Yuchtman, 2015). For example, in a comparison of grade-based outcomes between online and face-to-face courses, struggling students with lower grade point averages tend to fare worse in their online courses compared to face-to-face courses (Cavanagh & Jacquemin, 2015). Findings like this influence how faculty approach content delivery in online spaces. Individual perceptions on whether online education provides a "less than" or

“more than” form of higher learning influences this direction (Morris, 2018). The literature needs more descriptions of high-impact online learning experiences.

While the cost-effectiveness of online education is found in the literature, the supposed shortcomings of online education are also found. Finding detailed descriptions of the online learning experience by students and faculty are not common in the current literature. Student experiences with online teaching practices that promote impersonal communication and detached interaction promotes the widely held perception that online education is “less than” when it comes to possible academic and personal outcomes. Online learning that includes elements of high-impact teaching, which includes increases in faculty-student interaction, influence overall course experiences and outcomes (Fink, 2016).

Online education has been argued to “shake up pedagogical routines” and be a tool to create collective communities of learners (Larreamendy-Joerns & Leinhardt, 2006, p. 597). Central to debates in online pedagogies are the issues concerning whether technology drives pedagogical choices, or whether pedagogical choices drive technological choice and innovation (Herie, 2005). The choice taken by faculty raises questions on how institutions promote high-impact online learning and if they are willing to financially support faculty who choose to produce courses with this quality. Institutions should consider financially what it means to promote high-impact teaching, especially in the growing area of online education.

### References

- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2017). *Digital learning compass: Digital education enrollment report 2017*. Babson Park, MA: Babson Research Group.
- Bailey, J., Schneider, C., & Vander Ark, T. (2013). *Navigating the digital shift: Implementation strategies for blended and online learning*. Digital Learning Now! Retrieved from <http://www.digitallearningnow.com/policy/publications/smart-series/>
- Bailey, J., Vaduganathan, N., Henry, T., & Laverdiere, R., & Pugliese, N. (2018). *Making Digital Learning Work*. The Boston Consulting Group, Inc. Retrieved from <https://edplus.asu.edu/what-we-do/making-digital-learning-work>
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baran, E., Correia, A. P., & Thompson, A. (2011). Transforming online teaching practice: Critical analysis of the literature on the roles and competencies of online teachers. *Distance Education*, 32(3), 421-439.
- Budhai, S. S., & Skipwith, K. (2016). *Best practices in engaging online learners through active and experiential learning strategies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Casement, W. (2013). Will online learning lower the price of college? *Journal of College Admission*, 220, 14-18.
- Cavanaugh, J. K., & Jacquemin, S. J. (2015). A large sample comparison of grade based student learning outcomes in online vs. face-to-face courses. *Online Learning*, 19(2), n2.
- Cejda B. D., & Leist, J. (2006). Challenges facing community colleges: Perceptions of chief academic officers in nine states. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30(3), 253-274. DOI: 10.1080/10668920500322343

- Conover, G., & Miller, J. (2014). Teaching human geography through places in the media: An exploration of critical geographic pedagogy online. *Journal of Geography*, 13(1), 85-96. DOI:10.1080/00221341.2013.846396
- Crawford-Ferre, H. G., & Wiest, L. R. (2012). Effective online instruction in higher education. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 13(1), 11-14.
- Deming, D. J., Goldin, C., Katz, L. F., & Yuchtman, N. (2015). Can online learning bend the higher education cost curve? *American Economic Review*, 105(5), 496-501.
- Eaton, P. W., & Montelongo, R. (2018). *Online learning: Engaged content delivery & innovative assignments*. Presentation at the SHSU PACE Teaching & Learning Conference, Huntsville, TX.
- Fedynich, L., Bradley, K. S., & Bradley, J. (2015). Graduate students' perceptions of online learning. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 27. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1056187.pdf>
- Fink, L. D. (2016). Five high impact teaching practices: A list of possibilities. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching*, 9, 3-18.
- Gabriel, M. A., & Kaufield, K. J. (2008). Reciprocal mentorship: An effective support for online instructors. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16(3), 311-327. DOI:10.1080/13611260802233480
- Herie, M. (2005). Theoretical perspectives in online pedagogy. *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, 23(1-2), 29-52. DOI: 10.1300/J017v23n01\_03
- Holzweiss, P. C., Joyner, S. A., Fuller, M. B., Henderson, S., & Young, R. (2014). Online graduate students' perceptions of best learning experiences. *Distance Education* 35(3), 311-323. DOI:10.1080/01587919.2015.955262
- Kenny, J., & Fluck, A. E. (2017). Towards a methodology to determine standard time allocations for academic work. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 39(5), 503-523. DOI: 10.1080/1360080X.2017.1354773
- Koc, S., & Liu, X. (2016). An investigation of graduate students' help-seeking experiences, preferences and attitudes in online learning. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 15(3). 27-38.
- Kuh, G. (2008). *High-impact educational practices*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational research*, 70(1), 25-53.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Larreamendy-Joerns, J., & Leinhardt, G. (2006). Going the distance with online education. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 567-605.
- Major, C. H. (2015). *Teaching online: A guide to theory, research, and practice*. JHU Press.
- McGinley, V., Osgood, J., & Kenney, J. (2012). *Exploring graduate students' perceptual differences of face-to-face and online learning*. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 13(3), 177-182.

- McKeown, K. D. (2012). *Can Online Learning Reproduce the Full College Experience?* Center for Policy Innovation Discussion Paper. Number 3. *Heritage Foundation*.
- Meyer, K. A. (2010). If higher education is a right, and distance education is the answer, then who will pay? *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 14(1), 45-68.
- Montelongo, R. (2018). More than a field trip: Using point of view action cameras for online courses. *College Teaching*, 66(2), 84-85. DOI: 10.1080/87567555.2017.1413535
- Montelongo, R. (2017). *Culturally responsive teaching in online learning environments*. Presentation at the Texas A&M University Galveston Conference on Inclusion & Diversity in Higher Education, Galveston, TX.
- Montelongo, R., & Eaton, P. W. (2019). Strategies and reflections on teaching diversity in digital space(s). In L. Kyei-Blankson, J. Blankson, & E. Ntuli (Eds.), *Care and culturally responsive pedagogy in online settings* (pp. 41-62). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Montelongo, R., & Eaton, P. W. (2018). Beyond geographical space: Online learning and community engagement initiatives. In H. Evans (Ed.), *Community engagement best practices across the disciplines: Applying course content to community needs* (pp. 89-102). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group.
- Morris, S. M. (2018, April 4). *Online learning shouldn't be "less than"*. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/views/2018/04/04/are-we-giving-online-students-education-all-nuance-and-complexity>
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85-100.
- Shackelford, J. L., & Maxwell, M. (2012). Sense of community in graduate online education: Contribution of learner to learner interaction. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 13(4), 228-249. DOI:10.19173/irrodl.v13i4.1339
- Sun, A., & Chen, X. (2016). Online education and its effective practice: A research review. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 15.
- Tallent-Runnels, M. K., Thomas, J. A., Lan, W. Y., Cooper, S., Ahern, T. C., Shaw, S. M., & Liu, X. (2006). Teaching courses online: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(1), 93-135.
- Westbrook, T. P. (2014). Global contexts for learning: Exploring the relationship between low-context online learning and high-context learners. *Christian Higher Education*, 13(4), 281-294.

#### About the Author

**Ricardo Montelongo** ([rxm059@shsu.edu](mailto:rxm059@shsu.edu)) is Assistant Professor of Higher Education Administration at Sam Houston State University. He received his Ph.D. in Higher Education from Indiana University and a M.S. in Student Affairs Administration and B.S. in Psychology, both from Texas A&M University. His primary research interests include educational outcomes associated with college student involvement and the impact of Latina/o/x college student organizations on members. Additional areas of interest include diversity issues in higher education administration, online learning, and digital pedagogy. He has twenty years professional administrative experience in the areas of student success, undergraduate academic support services, academic advising, Student Support Services/TRiO, institutional research, career development and residence life.