Finding Opportunity in Crisis: How the Pandemic Reshaped Faculty Development Programming at the United States Air Force Academy[1]

Kim Hosler and Marc Napolitano

The sudden need to shift from a face-to-face delivery mode to an all-online format, necessitated by SARS-CoV-2 (the COVID-19 virus), compelled the Center for Educational Innovation at the United States Air Force Academy to reconsider two key faculty development initiatives: its Course Director Workshop and its New Faculty Orientation. As well as providing faculty the opportunity to be an online participant in what is traditionally a bricks and mortar institution, moving these two programs to an all-online format resulted in deeper and more thoughtful engagement from the participants. In this article, the authors describe their programing changes and observations resulting from this pivot to an all-online delivery format.

Introduction

During the COVID-19 pandemic, higher education has had to grapple with sudden changes to traditional teaching methods, and by necessity, move teaching and learning practices to an all-online format. This abrupt pivot to online teaching requires a quick and nimble response by centers for teaching and learning (CTLs) to meet the needs of faculty and instructors with little or no online teaching experience. At the United States Air Force Academy, a traditional bricks and mortar institution that has never offered online classes to cadets (undergraduates), this situation posed a significant challenge for faculty development programming offered through the Center for Educational Innovation (CEI). This paper discusses examples of how two

---

[1] Approved for public release: distribution unlimited PA#: USAFA-DF-2020-353. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the United States Air Force Academy, the Air Force, the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

comprehensive faculty development efforts shifted quickly to online delivery due to a sense of urgency (Kotter, 1996) created by the pandemic.

Prior to the pandemic, our CEI offered the established staples of faculty professional development such as half-day workshops, one-on-one consultations, and web-based resources. As Beach, Sorcinelli, Austin, and Rivard (2016) found, these three approaches were the most used among developers when offering faculty development services. Their research confirmed that hands-on workshops ranging from one to three hours and individual consultations, all completed in a face-to-face format, were the most frequently mentioned approaches to faculty development.

Shifting quickly to an all-online format forced many faculty to reexamine how they were teaching, and it prompted centers for faculty development to reexamine the delivery of their programming. Another challenge is that many faculty are used to teaching the way they were taught—in a classroom environment that is teacher-centered (the transmission model of teaching) rather than learner-centered. However, evidence-based practices, such as regular, clear, and compassionate communication with students, flexibility to navigate the changing learning environment, and transparency, are fundamental to good pedagogy, whether one is teaching online or in the classroom.

Weber and Barth (2016) write, "Instructors moving from a face-to-face classroom to the online or blended environments are faced with the challenge of redesigning activities that engage their students while being physically separate from them" (p. 97). Kenzig (2015) notes that in the online format, the instructor becomes more of a guide and that content needs to be redesigned so learners can move easily through the course and feel well supported. He discussed the tension that exists because instructors are still "learning how to effectively adapt their courses to ensure that face-to-face and online learners have equivalent outcomes" (p. 626). At the academy, questions about how to present content effectively, how to adapt quizzes and exams for online delivery, and how to best engage cadets online dominated conversations in the Spring, Summer, and Fall semesters of 2020. Intensifying the shift to online teaching was the need to prepare some instructors to be effective course directors.

The Course Directors Workshop

Course directors at the Air Force Academy are responsible for establishing the course's textbook and readings, course sequence, quizzes, final exams, and projects, as well as the syllabus. They are responsible for making sure the course is created and facilitated in a sound pedagogical manner; additionally, course directors fulfill various administrative duties. The academy uses a course director model to assure consistency and continuity across course sections. Because cadets move in a somewhat lock-step manner through their four-year education, multiple sections of the same course are offered each semester. For example, it is not uncommon to have six or seven instructors each teaching several sections of a core course in management, chemistry, or behavioral sciences.

The shift to a fully online faculty development initiative at the United States Air Force Academy, compelled by the Coronavirus pandemic, affected the bi-annual Course Director's Workshop (CDW). Prior to the academy's pivot to all-online teaching, this workshop was offered in a face-to-face format to support newly appointed course directors, and it consisted of two, half-day in-person sessions. The workshop included various modules on key topics—such as creating good learning objectives, assessment strategies, learning-centered teaching, and inclusive practices—all of which were facilitated by the Director of Instructional Design and other members of CEI.

In order to meet the needs of the instructors who would serve as course directors for Fall 2020, the CDW was redesigned to be facilitated and completed in an online, asynchronous manner. The change in program delivery served two purposes: It met the needs of course directors who were now working remotely, and it provided them an opportunity to be an online learner. Weber and Barth (2016) reported a similar experience, noting "Incorporating current innovations and technologies into online and blended faculty development programs . . . allow facilitators to more deeply engage instructor participants while modeling best practices around the use of innovative techniques and technologies" (p. 98). Despite the compressed time frame from design to implementation of online learning environments (spring of 2020) and the urgency of the situation, every attempt was made to model best practices for online teaching and learning within the revised course director workshop.

The redesign necessitated rethinking the needs of course directors, while instructing them in the staples of writing good course objectives, aligning learning activities with objectives and activities, and implementing effective assessment strategies. Course director time to participate in a workshop was also a major consideration. Redesigning the workshop to an all-online format, while considering the stressful circumstances under which course directors were working, meant granting them maximum flexibility to complete the workshop. Thus, the two-half-day, face-to-face workshop became a five-week asynchronous course composed of various readings, videos to watch, a required discussion post due each week, and one written assignment due each week. For example, relevant reading assignments (usually two articles and/or a video) were assigned and the thoughtful completion of one discussion question was required. Additional requirements included sharing ideas and observations with at least two others via the discussions and submitting a written assignment. The written assignment for each module purposefully asked participants to apply what they learned in that module. For example, one "practical application assignment for submission" (as they were titled) had participants review their course learning objectives from their syllabus, identify (underline or highlight) objectives that did not offer clear, measurable and observable outcomes. Then, using a worksheet, they were tasked with rewriting the objectives to be clear, measurable, and aligned with the course description. These assignments and learning activities replaced the previous half-day classroom format of short presentations followed by small-group work, followed by large-group discussion, followed by another short presentation, and so on.

CEI members facilitated online discussions to directly engage with the course directors and deepen their conversations with one another. The written assignments were reviewed, and guiding feedback provided. These assignments were not formally graded but had low point values assigned to them to encourage participation. To incentivize course directors to complete the online workshop (including all assignments), CEI offered participants a certificate of completion along with a free book about best online teaching practices. This text was selected based on its relevance to the topics and discussions found in the asynchronous course.

Out of 24 soon-to-be course directors, 18 completed the CDW and earned their certificate and free book. While the content of the asynchronous workshop was similar to the face-to-face workshop, creating it was not simply a matter of porting the content to online delivery. Rather, implementation of the asynchronous workshop required the CEI team to construct an online

space that was easy to navigate, that provided clear instructions and directions, that presented the content in a variety of formats, and that created opportunities for student-to-student, student-to-content, and student-to-instructor interactions. In addition to the staples of writing course objectives, aligning learning activities, and creating effective assessment strategies, the redesigned workshop included a section on how to quickly switch from face-to-face to all-online teaching, as well as content about hybrid and flipped course approaches. These topics were addressed in a module titled "Nimble Course Design," which assumed Fall 2020 would start with mostly face-to-face courses or hybrid learning environments, but then move quickly to all-online teaching and learning should the need arise. Effort was made to employ best online teaching and learning practices, while using a variety of technologies to present content (e.g., videos, flip book, podcasts, narrated slide deck).

Upon review and reflection of the discussion posts found in each unit of the asynchronous course, the CEI facilitators discovered significant interaction among the participants as they shared their questions, challenges, and insights with each other. The level of engagement, depth of discussion posts, and collegial sharing of ideas and experiences was remarkable. As a result, the CEI facilitators did not need to interject much to deepen or extend the dialogue. The work of these course directors far surpassed work and activities completed in the face-to-face workshop in the spring of 2019. During the spring 2019 in-person workshop, contributions were spontaneous, with set times for the activities and small-group interactions. These constraints (and others) may have limited the depth of exploration, application, and exchange of ideas in the face-to-face workshop.

The improvements found in the asynchronous online CDW may be partly due to the immediate need for these course directors to fully understand and implement news ways of teaching and designing a course demanded by the pandemic. They may also be due to course directors having more time to process and synthesize content and to reflect on how they can apply what they learned. While the spontaneity found in a face-to-face workshop is missing from the online environment, online learners have more time to reflect, compose, and revise their thoughts and responses to discussions and to each other. It is possible course directors may be experiencing the disinhibition effect, as they loosen up, feel more uninhibited, and express themselves more openly than they would have in a face-to-face learning environment (Suler, 2005). This sort of effect is especially likely in a military service

academy, where rank is visibly seen on one's uniform in a face-to-face work-shop but is invisible in the online environment. Observing one's rank could make individuals more deferential toward those of a higher rank.

New Faculty Orientation

Designing and facilitating the New Faculty Orientation (NFO) program is one of the chief responsibilities of the CEI staff (specifically, the Director of Faculty Development). The increasing prominence of this program is in keeping with national trends regarding CTL programs, as Beach, Sorcinelli, Austin, and Rivard (2016) have indicated (p. 53). By creating and supervising NFO programs, CTLs have an opportunity to connect with all of the institution's new faculty members and to help those faculty members acclimate. Perhaps more significantly, centers can establish the centrality of teaching and learning to the institutional mission and familiarize faculty with best practices regarding teaching and learning (Moore, 2020, p. 68). Finally, the CEI can conceive the NFO program in the context of a larger framework of faculty development programming, essentially utilizing NFO as a springboard for subsequent faculty development activities such as faculty learning communities, certificate programs, book groups, etc.

Over the past several years, the CEI staff have endeavored to frame the United States Air Force Academy's (USAFA's) NFO program as the beginning of a professional journey toward teaching excellence. USAFA presents several unique challenges regarding this undertaking, chiefly because there is a significant amount of turnover at the academy. Junior military faculty typically teach at the academy for two or three years before rotating out; senior military faculty could theoretically be reassigned to another duty station depending on the larger needs of the Air Force. As such, it is necessary to continuously update faculty development programming (including NFO and the Course Director Workshop) to meet the needs of the new faculty, all of whom arrive with varying levels of professional experience.

The recent transition to an online NFO course was prefigured by several important shifts regarding the USAFA's NFO program; whereas the shift to an online medium in the wake of COVID was fairly abrupt, elements of the transition to a fully-realized NFO "course" felt like a natural evolution based on more gradual developments regarding the program. Firstly, CEI made a deliberate attempt over the past several years to move NFO from an information-based program to a learning-centered program. Traditionally, NFO focused mainly on providing faculty with information about the history,

context, and culture of the academy, as well as day-to-day procedures and operations. Briefings and presentations (i.e., lectures) were the dominant format for conveying this information. Recently, the CEI staff revised NFO completely and moved away from an information-based program to a program that revolved around teaching and learning. The programming shifted from briefings to workshops, panels, and small-group activities. The CEI staff likewise attempted to personalize NFO and to create a more individualized experience for each faculty member. Whereas the lecture/presentation model treated the entire faculty cohort as one big block of new instructors, the transition to a learning-centered model necessitated customizing different pathways for faculty based on their level of teaching experience, their personal/professional interests, etc. Instead of requiring all faculty to attend all sessions and receive big blocks of information, the staff developed smaller "breakout" sessions based upon subtopics connecting to the overarching NFO outcomes and themes. This "conference" model gave faculty the flexibility to choose their own pathway during NFO and to thus create a more personalized learning experience for themselves based on their priorities and needs.

These shifts were prophetic given the transition to the fully online version of NFO necessitated by COVID-19. The staff was determined not to revert back to an information-based model despite the ease with which one might set up an online course consisting entirely of big blocks of information in the form of videos or documents. It was likewise essential to preserve the elements of personalization and individualization, and indeed, to push those elements even further by taking advantage of the flexibility and customizability of the online learning environment. Finally, the staff saw the potential of pushing the small-group learning even further by using collaborative learning tools like discussion boards and synchronous group chats.

The online NFO course consisted of six distinct week-long modules and ran from late June through early August of 2020. The first module served as an introduction to the program, and each subsequent module consisted of a series of learning activities designed to help faculty build knowledge and develop proficiencies relating to an overarching NFO outcome (see the Appendix for an abridged NFO syllabus). The asynchronous format was meant to provide faculty with flexibility and to promote faculty autonomy; furthermore, the significantly lengthier time frame for completing the asynchronous course (traditionally, the face-to-face NFO runs for five half-days) al-

lowed more time for the new faculty to reflect on the course themes and materials, similar to the experiences observed in the online course director workshop.

The goals of autonomy and flexibility—fundamental to the re-conceptualizing of NFO—align with the documented benefits of asynchronous/online faculty development programming (Rizzuto, 2017, p. 78). However, despite the largely asynchronous format, the course contained specific due dates and required faculty to participate in certain synchronous activities. This approach familiarized faculty with the different forms online learning can take in anticipation of their engaging in online learning with their students (Moore, 2020, p. 67). Moreover, the course was closely facilitated by staff members of the CEI and by faculty volunteers, who helped supervise small-group activities and discussions with individual learning communities. This active approach to facilitation was intended to help faculty realize the necessity of being keenly involved in both the design and execution of remote teaching experiences. As Moore (2020) notes, "facilitator presence models the type of teacher presence that can help students in one's own classes" (p. 69), an especially important consideration given the predominance of online teaching and learning at USAFA in the fall of 2020.

When designing the NFO course, it was necessary to avoid the temptation to build the learning experience around the transfer of information. While the CEI staff had successfully shifted NFO away from an information-based experience steeped in history, context, and operations, the online and asynchronous framework lent itself to an information-based approach (e.g., posting videos and readings that students are expected to peruse on their own). It would have been easy (and ironic) to create a lengthy video lecture on active learning, though the faculty's learning experience when engaging with that video would have been utterly passive. As such, each module included various discussion, reflection, or assessment activities designed to help the faculty engage and apply the information that constituted the module. For example, the module on cultivating (and promoting) a growth mindset included a pre- and post-module knowledge survey that not only primed the learner for the module but also familiarized them with an online learning tool that they might adopt and adapt when creating their own courses. By having faculty engage with the course materials in different ways through different types of activities, the CEI staff broadened the participants' understanding of what can be done to facilitate learning in an asynchronous course.

To foster a personalized NFO experience, the staff created a series of "optional follow-up" activities within the course (specifically, within each individual module). These activities—building upon the foundational module activities and introducing various subtopics that faculty might explore in relation to those modules—were designed to provide greater depth on topics that individual faculty members might find especially interesting or relevant. As always, it was important to consider the widely different backgrounds and experience levels of the faculty, and to ensure that each faculty member would be able to explore specific ideas or themes. The formats of the activities varied widely and included synchronous chat sessions and panel discussions, individualized reading and reflection activities, and electronic "assignments" the likes of which an undergraduate student might complete in an online course. For example, Module 5, "Creating a Respectful, Inclusive and Engaging Learning Environment," included the following optional follow-up activities:

1) Completing a "Best Practices for Inclusive Teaching" quiz.
2) Reviewing a video and a written statement by the Air Force's Chief Master Sergeant and Chief of Staff on the subject of racial unrest in the United States and completing a reflection-based worksheet in response to these interviews.
3) Filling out the Social Identity Wheel worksheet published by the University of Michigan.
4) Having a conversation with a colleague about inclusion and posting written documentation of the takeaways from that conversation.
5) Writing and revising an inclusive teaching statement to be published on a syllabus.

The diverse formats and focal points of these activities allowed faculty who had specific lingering questions on the overarching topic of inclusivity to explore more resources and ideas relating to the topic, while simultaneously familiarizing them with different types of online assignments.

To further incentivize faculty to participate in these activities, the CEI staff incorporated some gamification into the course design. By completing optional follow-up activities, faculty could earn "bonus points" that they could subsequently trade in for faculty development related prizes (e.g., copies of canonical texts on teaching and learning; funding for purchasing software licenses; etc.). These follow-up activities included work such as participating

in live video discussions with experienced faculty and/or CEI subject matter experts, providing feedback to CEI (via a survey) about that specific module, responding to a reflection prompt, or reading an additional article or watching a related video and responding to reflective questions.

These bonus points were likewise connected with digital badging, which was highlighted as another potential tool/method for faculty to utilize in their own online classes in the fall. While it is unclear to what extent the gamification promoted faculty involvement in follow-up activities, the overall participation in these follow-up activities was encouraging, as more than half of the new faculty cohort engaged in at least three optional follow-up activities.

As in the case of the course director workshop, the CEI staff ultimately discovered that the depth of the faculty reflections throughout this year's NFO—as captured in the online discussion forums and through the use of "exit ticket" assignments—exceeded that of previous incarnations of NFO. In past versions of NFO, reflection mainly took the form of small-group conversations following workshops or panels; the advent of the conference format in 2019 allowed for more written reflection, as each new faculty member was provided with a printed program that included several blank journal pages for written reflection. The small amount of space within the printed program journal pages limited, however, the overall profundity of these written reflections. Most faculty who completed the journals wrote in short phrases or bullet points, as opposed to engaging in sustained written reflection. Conversely, the use of digital written mediums (discussion boards, e-worksheets, etc.) during the summer 2020 NFO prompted a more sustained and complex engagement with both the themes of NFO and with other new faculty members, all of whom were expected to reply to one another within their small-group discussion boards in the larger NFO course. The fact that the digital writing space created no limitations regarding the length of faculty's written reflections resulted in longer and generally more meaningful written reflections in contrast to the short, clipped "scribblings" in the printed program journal pages. Moreover, the digital "trail" that faculty created throughout NFO—consisting of their discussion postings, assignments, and reflection-based exit tickets—laid the foundations for writing a statement of teaching philosophy and assembling a teaching portfolio.

After NFO concluded, there were some noteworthy trends in the faculty feedback surveys. Among these trends were almost universal praise of the use of learning communities/small-group discussions throughout the program. Whereas the in-person versions of NFO placed significant temporal

limitations on these activities, the asynchronous nature of the online course allowed new faculty members to sustain lengthy discussions over time through the online discussion forums; these discussions—in concert with sporadic synchronous conversations through Blackboard Collaborate—ensured that there was far more collaborative learning in this version of NFO. Perhaps even more significant was the praise for the "practical" elements of the program. In the past two incarnations of NFO, one of the most noteworthy "points for improvement" cited by faculty was that the program felt too abstract and philosophical: Topics like inclusivity, learning-centered teaching, and growth mindset were all well and good, but how should these topics actually shape day-to-day classroom practices? The online NFO program— most likely because of its broader scope and greater diversity of learning activities—ostensibly allowed faculty to develop more concrete strategies for applying the lessons and philosophies gleaned from NFO in their classrooms.

These successes regarding reflective thinking and faculty autonomy prompted discussions amongst the CEI staff about ways to leverage asynchronous online faculty development programming during future orientations and in other aspects of the center's programming. The hope is to resume some face-to-face activities, but the online and asynchronous format seems potentially more conducive to serving the diverse needs of the various incoming faculty. The ability for both the CEI staff and the new faculty to archive digital materials ensures that the activities constituting NFO are rendered tangible, and that the activities and learning outcomes thus endure after the NFO program has concluded.

Finding Opportunity in a Pandemic

There is nothing like a sense of urgency to drive change and the genesis of new approaches to teaching and learning (Kotter, 1996). As Kotter (1996) stated, "Visible crises can be enormously helpful in catching people's attention and pushing up urgency levels" (p. 45). It is an understatement to say that the pandemic caught people's attention, but in doing so, it presented an opportunity for change. These two examples of how the pandemic reshaped faculty development programming at the Air Force Academy offer evidence of the benefits of change and how having the right environment within which to make the change is necessary. The pandemic triggered that right environment.

Perhaps one of the most unexpected and beneficial results of the shift to online programming has been the opportunity to create continuity between the various programs. As noted, the online activities that constituted NFO primed the new faculty for the writing of teaching statements and the archiving of portfolio materials. By compiling the written reflections and other documents they produced during NFO, faculty could begin constructing teaching portfolios that they might later use for the purpose of academic promotion. The continuity between the online NFO program and the online course director's workshop has resulted in a significant number of new faculty members (25% of the new cohort) enrolling directly in other faculty development offerings. Ultimately, the online format—and the bridging of different online courses through the central LMS—has allowed for continuity of experience for those faculty who perceive their own development as a continuous and ongoing process.

In 2019, these shifts in faculty development programming would neither have been developed nor embraced as they are now because there was no sense of urgency or compelling reason to move to an online format. The pandemic provided the CEI the unique opportunity to reexamine and retool two of the academy's key faculty development efforts, as well as wrestle with the question of how to ensure that online learning programs are learning-centered rather than information-centered. These efforts resulted in not only deeper and sustained levels of faculty engagement, but also a new delivery framework for future faculty development efforts.

References

Beach, A. L., Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., & Rivard, J. K. (2016). *Faculty development in the age of evidence: Current practices, future imperatives.* Retrieved from http://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Kenzig, M. J. (2015). Lost in translation: Adapting a face-to-face course into an online learning experience. *Health Promotion Practice, 16*(5), 625-628.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Moore, C. (2020). Creating new faculty orientation online with limited time, staff, and resources. *Journal of Faculty Development*, *34(2)*, 67-72.

Rizzuto, M. (2017). Design recommendations for self-paced online faculty development courses. *TechTrends*, *61*, 77-86.

Suler, J. (2005). The online disinhibition effect. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies, 2*(2), 184-188.

University of Michigan. (2020). Social identity wheel. Retrieved from https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/inclusive-teaching/sample-activities/social-identity-wheel/

Weber, N. L. & Barth, D. J. (2016). Motivating instructors through innovative technology and pedagogy. *Journal of Faculty Development*, *30*(2), 97-105.

_____

Dr. Kim Hosler *is the Director of Instructional Design at the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA) in Colorado Springs, CO. She previously worked in the Office of Teaching and Learning at the University of Denver and teaches part time for University College at the University of Denver. Her academic areas of expertise include online teaching and learning and learner-centered instructional design. At USAFA, she facilitates and leads the bi-annual course director's workshop, consults with faculty individually on course design, and facilitates other workshops related to the design of effective and efficient instruction. Contact email: kim.hosler@usafa.edu.* ***Dr. Marc Napolitano*** *is the Director of Faculty Development and an assistant professor of English at the United States Air Force Academy. He previously taught at the United States Military Academy, West Point. His academic areas of expertise include the long nineteenth century, the rise of the novel, and life and works of Charles Dickens. At USAFA, he administers the dean's teaching certificate program and runs the new faculty orientation program. He has led workshops and presentations at the Lilly Institute about using personal narratives to promote inclusive teaching. Contact email: marc.napolitano@usafa.edu. Both* ***Dr. Napolitano*** *and* ***Dr. Hosler*** *work in the Center for Educational Innovation at the Air Force Academy.*

Appendix A
New Faculty Orientation 2020 Syllabus (abridged)

Course Description: This year, NFO will take the form of a largely asynchronous Blackboard course facilitated by the CEI staff and other USAFA faculty members. Though there are several reasons why an online course is advisable at this time, an added benefit to this approach is that faculty participants will become familiar with various best-practices regarding remote teaching and educational technology. This fall, every USAFA class will include some component of online instruction; please contact your course director and/or department executive officer (XO) for more specific details regarding your courses. It is our hope that this NFO course can serve as a model of what constitutes a well-facilitated remote learning experience.

This year's new faculty cohort is composed of many different types of people with varying levels of teaching experience, military experience, familiarity with USAFA, et cetera. Whether you are new faculty or returning faculty, officer or civilian, first-time teacher or experienced educator, it is our hope that you will find this course meaningful. Recognizing the different needs of different faculty members, we hope you will take advantage of the opportunity to blaze your own specific trail within NFO; there are many different optional follow-up activities from which to choose based on your specific interest in various topics. While all of the new faculty will complete certain activities, your overall NFO experience will depend largely on which optional follow-up activities you decide to complete. It is our hope that you will find the NFO program sufficiently flexible to meet your individual needs.

NFO Learning Outcomes:

By completing NFO, faculty will be able to…

1) Describe the distinctive context of USAFA and analyze the ways in which that context shapes teaching and learning.
2) Adopt and adapt evidence-based, learning-focused teaching practices (supported by instructional technology) that faculty will subsequently apply in their classes.
3) Approach teaching in a deliberate and intentional way, by aligning

learning outcomes, learning experiences, and assessments.

4) Develop strategies for creating a respectful, inclusive, and engaging learning environment in their classroom.

5) Cultivate a growth mindset regarding teaching, and develop strategies for fostering a growth mindset in their students.

6) Develop strategies for remote teaching based on evidence-based best practices of online learning.

Format—Asynchronous and Collaborative Learning (w-Sporadic Synchronous Sessions):

The NFO Blackboard course is made up of six modules; the first module serves as an introduction to the program. Subsequent modules consist of a series of learning activities designed to help faculty build knowledge and develop proficiencies relating to an overarching While the asynchronous format provides faculty with flexibility, faculty will be expected to adhere to a course-wide schedule (see below) and to do their best to meet various due-dates associated with that schedule.

The course will also revolve around collaborative learning, as new faculty will be placed into learning communities (LC's) on Blackboard; each LC will have its own discussion forum, and each module will include a discussion posting activity that requires the members of the learning community to reply to one another and offer each other feedback. These learning community discussions will be facilitated by an experienced USAFA faculty member. Interacting with peers throughout NFO will help to build community within the new faculty cohort; it will likewise serve to foster learning by allowing faculty to cultivate diverse perspectives on key issues and ideas relating to teaching and learning. By considering these topics together in the online discussion forums, faculty will help one another to synthesize knowledge. Finally, the LC's will be composed of faculty from different departments. NFO will thus provide new faculty with an opportunity to get to know colleagues whom they might not otherwise encounter.

In addition to utilizing the discussion forums, each LC will participate in informal, synchronous video chats via Blackboard once a week. These sporadic, synchronous video chats will allow for further community- building and dynamic interaction within the group (see the Synchronous Activities section below).

Synchronous Activities: Most of the synchronous activities held during NFO will be optional, due to varying schedules and different time-zones; completing optional follow-up activities grants you the opportunity to earn points that you can trade in for prizes (see the **BONUS POINTS AND PRIZES section**). However, as noted above, there is an expectation that faculty will participate in synchronous video chats with their learning communities once a week beginning the week of 29 June.

The facilitator will work with the group to coordinate these video chats so they take place at a time when all of the LC's faculty can participate live via Blackboard Collaborate. These synchronous video chats are important for creating a sense of immediacy and engagement within the Learning Community; they are also an opportunity to build community by placing names with faces, hearing colleagues speak on subjects, et cetera. When teaching an online asynchronous course, it is helpful to carve out opportunities for synchronous engagement (perhaps as a class…perhaps in small groups…perhaps one-on-one). The synchronous LC chats will grant you the opportunity to truly get to know your new colleagues (and your facilitator), and to learn from one **another** in "real time."

Bonus Points and Prizes: Each NFO module includes several optional follow-up activities; these activities will help you to learn more about specific topics and subtopics. By participating in these activities and submitting an "exit ticket" (that is, a reflection-based exercise that provides closure to the overall activity), faculty can earn bonus points that they will be able to trade in at the conclusion of NFO for prizes associated with faculty development, including books on teaching and learning, funding to participate in a webinar or conference, et cetera. The more bonus points you earn, the greater chance of your "leveling up" to attain the next prize. Please see the syllabus for each module for more details on these optional follow-up activities (and the required exit tickets).

The faculty member who earns the most bonus points during NFO (or the first faculty member to reach the maximum number of bonus points) will receive a coin from the Dean.

Level	Points	Prize	Description
Bard	25	CEI Swag Bag	All faculty who earn the Bard badge will receive a CEI tote bag containing a padfolio, lanyard, and other goodies.
Rogue	50	A Book on Best Practices in Teaching and Learning	All faculty who earn the Rogue badge will receive a CEI Swag Bag and one of the following books (they can choose from any of the texts listed below…see the last page of the syllabus for recommendations): *What the Best College Teachers Do* by Ken Bain *Small Teaching* by James Lang *Active Learning: A Practical Guide* by Magna Pub. *Essential Teaching Principles* by Magna Pub. *The Missing Course* by David Gooblar *How Learning Works* by Susan Ambrose
Paladin	100	2 Books on Teaching and Learning	All faculty who earn the Paladin badge will receive a CEI Swag Bag and two of the following books (they can choose from any of the texts listed below…see the last page for of the syllabus for recommendations): *What the Best College Teachers Do* by Ken Bain *Small Teaching* by James Lang *Active Learning: A Practical Guide* by Magna Pub. *Essential Teaching Principles* by Magna Pub. *The Missing Course* by David Gooblar *How Learning Works* by Susan Ambrose
Cleric	175	"ViP" Experience during SoTL Forum 2020 and Ed Innovation Week 2021	All faculty who earn the Cleric badge will receive a CEI Swag Bag, two books on teaching and learning, and an invitation to participate in a ViP Experience. During the academic year, DFEI hosts two important conferences: the SoTL Forum (traditionally held in October or November), and Education Innovation Week (traditionally held in April). These conferences include prominent key-note speakers who have developed national reputations in the realm of teaching and learning. ViP participants in the SoTL Forum and Ed Innovation Week will have the opportunity to participate in a 45-minute informal conversation with our guest speakers prior to their workshop/keynote. **The first 10 faculty to achieve the Cleric badge will likewise receive a copy of the speaker's monograph or an**

			analogous publication on the topic of the speaker's keynote.
Warrior	225	$100 in Faculty Development funding	All faculty who earn the Warrior badge will receive a CEI Swag Bag, two books on teaching and learning, a ViP Experience during the SoTL Forum and Ed Innovation Week, and funding for faculty development. The Center for Educational Innovation is happy to provide funding for faculty to participate in teaching and learning conferences, attend seminars or webinars, purchase texts or software that will allow them to develop learning-centered activities for their students, et cetera. Faculty who earn the Warrior badge will receive $100 in faculty development funding to be directed toward any of these types of activities. The first 10 faculty to achieve the Warrior badge will receive $100 in funding; subsequent faculty who achieve the Warrior badge will receive $50 in funding.
Wizard	275	$200 in Faculty Development funding	Faculty who earn the Wizard badge will receive a CEI Swag Bag, two books on teaching and learning, a ViP Experience during the SoTL Forum and Ed Innovation Week, and funding for faculty development. The Center for Educational Innovation is happy to provide funding for faculty to participate in teaching and learning conferences, attend seminars or webinars, purchase texts or software that will allow them to develop learning-centered activities for their students, et cetera. Faculty who earn the Wizard badge will receive $200 in faculty development funding to be directed toward any of these types of activities. The first 10 faculty to achieve the Wizard badge will receive $200 in funding; subsequent faculty who achieve the Wizard badge will receive $100 in funding.