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Objectives

1. Identify student perceptions of key issues facing students enrolled in dual-campus programs.
2. Discuss differences between faculty and student perspectives in delivering dual-campus educational programs as related to class cohesiveness and technology.
3. Highlight successful strategies for effective learning and teaching derived from student perspectives.
Purpose
This presentation describes our quality improvement (QI) project, based on student perspectives from dual campuses.

The QI focus is on key themes noted in the literature regarding synchronous dual-campus programs:
1) technology for delivery of education
2) class cohesiveness and communication

Part 1: Background
Operational Definitions of Terms
History of Dual-Campus Delivery at UNMC

Operational Definitions
Synchronous Distance Education
• Education same time, not at same place
Cohesiveness
• Unity, togetherness, solidarity, bond with classmates, peers, alums, faculty & staff
Community of Inquiry
• Model of learning though intersection of social, cognitive and teaching presence
Community of Inquiry
Adapted from Garrison et al., 2000

- Social Presence
- Cognitive Presence
- Teaching Presence
- Educational Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Presence</th>
<th>Key Elements for Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Communication, Cohesion of Group, Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Challenge, Problem Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Motivation, Building Understanding, Guiding Learning Experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why Dual-campus?
Increasing number of universities offer physical therapy professional education programs. Why?
- Student demand
- Opportunity to meet market needs
- Improvement in technology
- Overcome barriers of cost and distance
- Address shortages in geographic regions

Cook et al., 2003
Djuranglou et al., 2018
Hageman et al., 1998
Wilson et al., 2009
Why? PT Dual-campus Program @ UNMC
- 2nd site in central Nebraska opened in 2016
- Intent - address Nebraska workforce shortages consistent with Institution & Program Mission.

UNMC-Omaha
- 50 students per cohort

UNMC-Kearney
- 16 students per cohort

UNMC's PT Program
Campus Sites: Omaha & Kearney
Michael Sorrell Center
UNMC-Omaha

UNMC's PT Program
Campus Classrooms: Omaha & Kearney
UNMC-Omaha
UNMC-Kearney
UNMC's PT Program
Campus Lab Rooms: Omaha & Kearney

UNMC's PT Program
Pre-Planning for Implementation
Consultation
- 3 PT Programs using Multi-campus Distance Education

Messaging
- "One program, 2 campuses"

Technology
- Site-readiness

Faculty Resource
- Faculty at UNMC-Kearney site

Training
- Technology use

Issue Resolution
- KOR Team (Kearney-Omaha Response Team)

Part 2: Methods/Results
Round 1
- Survey
- Focus Groups

Round 2
- Survey
- Focus Groups
Quality Improvement (QI)
Why? Background of our QI focus?

Bower et al., 2015
Hortos et al., 2013
Moridani et al., 2007
Simlyanskie et al., 2015
Veerapan et al., 2010
Williams et al., 2006

Student Perceptions

Methods – Round 1
Class of 2019 DPT1s
Informed by Literature, CAPTE, KDR Team, Faculty and Student Feedback

Survey
Quantitative Data
• Fall Semester 2016

Focus Groups
Qualitative Data
• Spring Semester 2017

Methods – Round 1
Survey
Anonymous Online Survey via SurveyMonkey®
N = all students (50 in Omaha; 12 in Kearney)
Response rate = 97%

TECHNOLOGY
• Lecture Transmission
• Lab Transmission
• Online Testing
• Other

COHESION
• Access to Faculty
• Access to Peers
• Perceptions of Commitment

COMMUNICATION
• Inherent in the topics of technology and cohesion
Methods - Round 1
Focus Groups – Who?

Faculty
• Same for all groups

Student Groups
• Random selection by staff
• Students invited by Director
• Hosted on both campuses
• N = 20 in Omaha (40% of student body)
• N = 6 in Kearney (50% of student body)

Methods - Round 1
Focus Groups – How?

Ground Rules
• Everyone participates
• Honest opinion
• Privacy
• What is true for YOU

Introduction
• Goal: “facilitate collaboration…to maintain & improve
  program consistent with values & professional
  reputation of our program”
• Change should be managed
• Program history of managing change
• We are ALL Learning
• Offer opportunities for improvement

Methods - Round 1
Focus Groups – What?
Topics Based on Survey Results

TECHNOLOGY
• Lecture recordings
• When is site muted
• Ability to hear distance site
• Ideas for improvement
• Technology helps learning?
• Other

COHESION
• Balance unity / uniqueness
• Working together as a
team to ensure access to
similar (but not identical)
experiences
• Student organizations
• Role of class officers
Results – Round 1
Survey and Focus Group - TECHNOLOGY

Summary
- Disruptions
- Technology problems have negative impact on learning, creates miscommunication, effects feeling of UNITY.
- ECHO effective

Opportunities
- Train ALL faculty (core & other dept)
- Address technology
  - Microphones
  - UNMC-Omaha checklist when they are receiving site
  - More orientation for Omaha students prior to semester 1
  - ID students to troubleshoot

Results – Round 1
Survey and Focus Group - COHESION

Summary
- Cohesion important (100%)
- Focus groups noted because differences in campus experiences are reality, cohesion cannot be forced.

Opportunities
- Increase transparency at admissions & orientation about unique features of sites
- Use messaging to embrace unique opportunities
- Current class may help incoming students
- Improve student role clarity (e.g., SUN-APTA, Career Fair, etc)

Results - Round 1
THEMES – Most Important Thing Discussed Today?

Student Focus - Cohesion - Communication - Technology
Changes Implemented

Examples of responses to student feedback

- Admissions
- Messaging
- Orientation Activities
- Technology Training
- Student Technology Assist Team (STAT)
- Purposeful “Reaching Out”

Methods – Round 2

Class of 2019 DPT2s; Class of 2020 DPT1s

Survey
Quantitative Data
- Fall Semester 2017

Focus Groups
Qualitative Data
- Spring Semester 2018

Modified by multiple stakeholder feedback

Methods – Round 2

Survey – Condensed and Simplified

Class of 2019
- N = all students (50 in Omaha; 13 in Kearney)
- Response rate = 87%

Class of 2020
- N = all students (49 in Omaha; 15 in Kearney)
- Response rate = 68%

- TECHNOLOGY
  - Lecture Transmission
  - Lab Transmission

- COHESION
  - Access to Faculty
  - Perceptions of Commitment and Effectiveness
Methods – Round 2
Focus Groups – Who?

Faculty
- Same for all groups; same as prior year

Student Groups
- Classes of 2019 and 2020 held separately
- Random selection by staff
- Students invited by Director
- Hosted on both campuses
- N = 10 in Omaha from each class (20% of student body from respective class)
- N = 6 in Kearney (36% - 50% of student body)

Methods - Round 2
Focus Groups – How?

Ground Rules
- Everyone participates
- Honest opinion
- Privacy
- What is true for YOU

Introduction
- Goal: “facilitate collaboration... to maintain & improve program consistent with values & professional reputation of our program”
- Change should be managed
- Program history of managing change
- We are ALL Learning
- Offer opportunities for improvement
- Review of changes made based on prior year’s results

Methods - Round 2
Focus Groups – What?
Topics Based on Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNOLOGY</th>
<th>COHESION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to hear distance site/class discussions</td>
<td>Operationally defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for engagement of distance site</td>
<td>Implicit or explicit messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology specific to lab</td>
<td>Connect &amp; foster respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-face important when?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do student organizations enhance cohesion?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results – Round 2
Survey and Focus Group - TECHNOLOGY

Cross campus communication
• Similar – teacher & student behaviors, microphones, student hesitance to speak up
• Unique - none

Classroom
• Similar – active engagement important; less issue labs
• Unique – Class behaviors when distance site

Results – Round 2
Survey and Focus Group - COHESION

Operational definition
• Similar – appreciate provide feedback; no feelings faculty forcing; value other sites
• Unique – UNMC-Omaha students unaware they would be distant sites; UNMC-Kearney students concerned about community perceptions & admissions presence

Reaction
• Similar - is being achieved, emphasis on transparency, social events better at fostering cohesion than classroom activities
• Unique – UNMC-Omaha – cross campus group perspectives; UNMC-Kearney benefits with social events around other campus events & appreciates hospitality

Cohesion valued, and difficult

Results - Round 2
THEMES – Most Important Thing Discussed Today?

Cohesion
Communication
Technology
Part 3: Discussion: How do our Findings Relate to the Literature?

Discussion: Technology

- Technology can be an imposition for students, conscious of camera orientation or required to speak into microphone.
- Distance site students have complained about being uncomfortable as they feel as if they are being made the center of attention.

Cunningham et al., 2014; Rogers et al., 2003; Saeto et al., 2014a; Saeto et al., 2014b; Saeto & Cheng, 2014

Discussion: Technology

- Teachers over focused on remote students, and spending time troubleshooting technical problems.

Cunningham et al., 2014; Popov et al., 2009; Rogers et al., 2003; Saeto et al., 2014a; Saeto et al., 2015
Discussion: Cohesion

Studies indicate social & emotional connectedness cannot be taken for granted, but rather needs to be actively encouraged and fostered by teachers in synchronous learning environments; need deliberate strategies to bring that potential to fruition.

Butz et al., 2014  
Szeto & Cheng, 2014

Discussion: Cohesion

Teachers may tend to slow down teaching pace or read from slides due to teaching students in both modes at the same time

Teachers need added class time & energy encouraging remote students to contribute, as well as stimulating meaningful conversation & collaboration between the two groups

Park & Bonk, 2007; Rogers et al, 2003  
Szeto et al, 2014a; Szeto et al, 2015

Discussion: Cohesion

Students (from both campuses) need to reach out to each other.

Veerapan et al., 2010
Discussion - Themes

For student satisfaction, all sites must be perceived as equitable, yet each site can develop own identity

Veerapan & McAleer, 2010

Summary - Objectives

ID Student perceptions
Faculty & Student Perceptions re: Technology & Cohesion
Successful Strategies derived from Student Perspectives

Summary - Lessons

Transparency
Don’t Force Cohesion
Impact of student experiences
Ongoing training faculty & students
Questions?
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