

# Converting My Course Converted Me: How Reinventing an On-campus Course for an Online Environment Reinvigorated My Teaching

Lester Ruth

Asbury Theological Seminary

**Abstract.** *The challenge of learning to teach online leads a junior faculty person to achieve greater levels of teaching satisfaction and proficiency overall. For this professor transitioning an on-campus pastoral liturgy course to an online environment brings about serendipitous discoveries that allow him to do more than survive as a frustrated teacher. The transition creates a revolution in one professor's whole approach to teaching.*

One of the best things that ultimately advanced my teaching felt initially like a setback of a sort: being required to think through the issues to convert my on-campus pastoral liturgy course to an online environment. This transition came with some degree of hesitation and trepidation. It came about because of the circumstances of my employment. I was contractually obligated to teach online. I had to do it. Although having to teach online was nothing I grasped with initial eagerness, in retrospect, it has resulted in an improvement in my teaching overall. More than tolerating online teaching, I have benefited from the conversion.

I teach at Asbury Theological Seminary, a large, independent seminary whose constituencies are mainly in the Methodist or Wesleyan traditions. Its main degree program is a Master of Divinity for which I offer pastoral liturgy courses at Asbury's Kentucky and online "campuses." Asbury has worked hard to develop its online program in recent years. Much of its curriculum is available online. Several hundred students take courses online each semester. Asbury's M. Div. degree requirements lead most students to take a pastoral liturgy course at the 500 level, the lowest level of courses at Asbury. When I arrived at the seminary, this basic pastoral liturgy had not been offered online. I would be breaking new ground. I arrived having been a seminary professor at another institution for only two-and-one-

half years. I had never taken as a student nor offered as a professor any course in an online format.

In the 2000–2001 school year, my first at Asbury, I taught my original version of the course only on-campus. I designed the course with the general aim of giving students familiarity with my "greatest hits" about pastoral liturgy with respect to readings and lectures. "These are the best things I could ever hope to tell you about worship" might have been an accurate, unofficial title for the course. I also used much videotape to introduce them to a wide variety of worship. Being somewhat intimidated by the size of on-campus classes my first year at Asbury (two of the first three sections I taught that initial year had more than sixty students), I relied upon lectures and objective exams as the basis for the course. Discussion in the course was unscheduled and often developed into tense moments. For example, baptism was a contentious issue when students and I argued different baptismal positions. My directness made students think I was trying to force them to adopt my position on infant baptism and the efficacy of the sacrament, for instance. According to my student evaluations, my general handling of even tame discussions was not satisfying for them. This initial version of the course disappointed both students and me. After only two semesters, frustration had become my middle name. I hesitate to wonder what students might have named me. Change was called for but I did not know what to do.

## Starting Over to Move Forward: Online Training

Providence then smiled on me. Training for teaching online began at the end of my first year at Asbury. The result was a pastoral liturgy course converted for an online environment – and a new experience of teaching

– that has converted me as a teacher. Much of what I have learned in that initial conversion and in the subsequent development of three other online pastoral liturgy courses transforms what I do in all of my classes. Indeed my thinking has been so transformed that in developing a new class now I often begin by thinking through what it should be like in an online environment. Then I bring the best dynamics over to shape the on-campus version. Online teaching has revolutionized all my teaching. In this approach my experience is somewhat different from Richard Ascough's review of online teaching. Ascough cautions against being so enamored of technology that one forgets sound pedagogy (Ascough 2002, 17). He advocates that pedagogy come before technology. My experience has been that it was in an online environment that I first stumbled upon sound pedagogy.

That online teaching has revolutionized all my teaching still surprises me. When I was scheduled to undergo training to teach online, I did it because it was required of me. To be frank, I had not given much thought to what teaching online might mean although the requirement was contractual. In my first year I had been absorbed with the challenges of trying to teach on campus. I arrived for the in-house training at the end of my first spring semester disinterested, tired, and frustrated. I was not sure I wanted to be there.

The sharp differences between online teaching and what I knew as on-campus teaching struck me in the training. For one thing, lectures must have a different importance. In my online class there would be no regular classroom in which I could give lectures while students took notes for later regurgitation of data on objective exams. What do I do when there would be no face-to-face contact with students? For another, discussions had to be at the center of the class. Discussions were not some by-product intruding into my agenda for the course. They were the course. I had to manage them well.

In addressing the disjunctions between on-campus and online teaching, I had to become creative and rethink basic pedagogical approaches I had assumed as necessary. The nature of the differences between the two environments disconcerted me. I had no prior education experiences, either as student or teacher, upon which to draw. I felt confused and a little frustrated. How could my school expect me to teach online when I had never done so? But perhaps I drew too much from prior experience in teaching my not-too-successful pastoral liturgy course. The differences between on-campus and online teaching forced me to discard all of my assumptions about means of assessment, discussion, lectures, and my role as teacher, among other things. The difference in teaching environments called for wholesale change, not a minor adaptation. I could not have done what I had previously done even if I had wanted to. And I did not want to. Thus the initial jarring of the challenge of

teaching online ended up being a boon rather than a bane. It forced me to make a major revision of my pastoral liturgy course rather than make a little tweaking. Since that time, I have found that many of the things that online teaching has led me to are approaches suggested by recent pedagogical writers. The result has been a conversion in all my teaching.

### Transitions: Foundations

The first two new online teaching phrases I learned showed me that I was entering a new world. Instead of "lecture schedule" or "class schedule," Asbury's staff spoke of "modules." Instead of "classroom" my online instructors spoke of "discussion centers" for threaded e-mail discussions. These new terms alone began to open up new vistas.

Thinking about organizing a class by modules rather than a schedule of lectures was revolutionary. I saw that my previous class had been topic-driven. I had decided which topics I wanted to lecture on and had laid out the class schedule based on the order I thought I should cover them. There was not much forethought to this schedule other my belief that theological concepts should be introduced earlier and less critical aspects of worship later.

Having to develop modules broke this line of thought. The online trainers encouraged me to think of organizing the course by modules: natural subdivisions of a course around which sources of information, assignments, and discussions could be clustered. Modules were necessary so the class could find some preliminary resolutions within the course material and thus avoid having the semester as one long, uninterrupted e-mail discussion.

What are the natural internal boundaries within a course's material? Considering this question no longer allowed me to think of the course as a monolithic whole or of individual lectures as autonomous entities. Instead I had to consider the flow of the course from start to finish, something I sometimes now call the course "plot." Consequently, rather than just diving into course data, the initial module sets up a perspective for the whole course. Thus the first module in my initial online course had the students watching University of Notre Dame football rituals on digitized video, which I had shot. This raw data became the basis for the first module's discussion about what it is like to participate in corporate public ritual and what makes such ritual function properly.

The task of developing modules led me to consider a corollary question: What should lead to what? What module should follow next and why? Developing online courses has led me to become much more aware of sequencing between modules and within modules. Subsequent modules built upon the first. Developing

modules and thinking about their flow forced me to become much more aware of the proper sequencing of disclosure, encounter, and student use of course content so that she/he achieves the course objectives. Thinking about these issues in my online course forced me to consider the best steps for students to achieve enduring understanding. The first online course I developed had thirteen modules, one for each week in the semester. Subsequent versions had between five and seven as I have seen the usefulness in allowing discussions to extend past a week. I have developed, too, a better sense of groupings for related issues.

Organizing a course by modules has worked so well that I have structured my on-campus sections in the same manner. Doing so has shown me that my initial on-campus approach was simply developing a list of topics that I had wanted to cover. There was little internal logic to the original course. Any sense of rhythm and flow in the old on-campus course was a by-product of my depending upon students to show up at the scheduled time in the appointed classroom. The new online approach, in contrast, intentionally emphasized issues more likely to achieve real learning: where to start, how to sequence, and preliminary and final resolutions in understanding. Although I did not realize it at the time, this new approach harmonizes with what Jane Vella calls for as an essential principle in adult learning. According to Vella, learning best takes place when the programming of knowledge, skills, and attitudes goes in order from simple to complex, from group-supported to solo efforts, and from smaller to larger tasks (Vella 2002, 101). Having to create modules in a plot broke me out of a pattern of thinking about comprehensively covering required topics. Modular thinking gave me a way to structure all my classes to better achieve the sorts of sequences Vella suggests.

Beyond achieving the benefit of using the same module structure for on-campus and online classes, resources and discussion exercises have become interchangeable. Thus, it requires little for me to cross over courses between online and on-campus environments. My job as a dual-environment teacher is simplified because the modules, media, discussions, and exercises overlap between the two versions of a course.

If the term "module" erased old teaching patterns, the term "discussion center" was even a stronger blow. Despite the fact that my lectures in the pastoral liturgy course were not going well, I was depending on them as my primary way of interacting with students in this course. It was where I felt the safest, considering it allowed me to demonstrate expertise in the field and considering how poorly class discussions often went. But now Asbury's online trainers told me that I no longer had a classroom in which to lecture; the primary arena for interaction was a "discussion center", an electronic space for extended e-mail discussions. Given my

experience with on-campus discussions, the name did not cause me to leap for joy.

With my safety blanket of lecturing taken away, I felt I was back at square one. With no classroom for lecturing, I had to reconsider a crucial question: as their teacher, what am I supposed to *do* with students? An inkling that my role was to prepare them to engage well in the discussion center's e-mail exchanges led me to conjure an image of a new role: creator of a learning environment. Since the dynamics of an online class prevented me from being primarily a conveyer of information, I had to do something else. If my online trainers told me that the heart of an online class was extended e-mail discussion, then I had to do what I could to make certain that these discussions were interactions where learning took place. I would create the best learning environment I could both before and within the discussions.

Consequently, I developed my first online course considering these issues: What do I want the students to encounter, when, and how? In other words, what work did I want them to do outside the e-mail discussion center to maximize learning *in* the discussion center? I was familiar with assigning selected readings to be done by a specified day, usually to coordinate with lectures. But what if the purpose of the reading was not so students could hear better but could discuss better? Could the same purpose apply to other sources of information, including lectures? Yes.

I became more conscious of the preparation I wanted from students so they would be ready to engage in fruitful discussions at certain crucial points, particularly at the beginning of modules. I selected the material to prepare students to discuss. Part of this was reading, whether in books, course packets, or, where copyright allowed, electronically provided texts. But I also began to think of lectures, worship videos, and worship music as other kinds of texts to prepare students for discussions. Several months before the semester, I videotaped lectures on the most critical elements of the prior course content. I also gathered up worship video and music. Asbury's technical support staff created multi-media CDs, organized by modules, from this material. Students checked these out of the library at the beginning of the semester. I provided some other pre-discussion material by setting up websites designed for the course. If there had been no way to produce the CDs, it would not have been an insurmountable obstacle. The principle of providing the right material at the right time in order to prepare students for discussion could stay the same. It just would have meant finding other options for delivery.

If having an e-mail discussion center as the course center meant that I transitioned from lecturer to environment creator, then online students likewise shifted from being listeners to users of course content. Discussion centers where students only repeat data would be

boring. E-mail discussion centers are arenas for students to explore various ways to use the material.

Having an arena for use of and discussion on course material has worked so well that I transferred the principle to my on-campus pastoral liturgy class. Since I already had the materials gathered and organized for online students, whether course packets, website material, or digitized multimedia, my on-campus students now purchase or borrow these alternative texts. That means my on-campus students have lectures to watch ahead of class just as they have reading to do to prepare for class. I now do very few real-time, on-campus lectures. This has freed up the entirety of on-campus class time for the same variety of discussions and exercises that my online students had been doing in e-mail discussion centers. With my on-campus students I now have time to explore how they might use course content when they are responsible for planning and leading worship.

Again, e-mail discussion centers converted me from treating students as passive listeners of course content. Finding a way to have them be active users of this content was a serendipitous discovery of what some pedagogical experts advocate. My original on-campus course had been noun-driven (my time with students was about transferring information, i.e., nouns), but becoming an online teacher has resulted in my courses being verb-driven (my time with students is about various uses of course content, i.e., verbs). Becoming aware of crucial verbs to describe classroom interaction was a small thing, but revolutionary for me. Consider how Kathleen Taylor, Catherine Marienau, and Morris Fiddler organize a review of useful exercises under certain helpful verb categories: assessing, collaborating, experimenting, imagining, inquiring, performing-simulating, and reflecting (Taylor, Marienau, and Fiddler 2000, 45–294). Jane Vella offers a related list of verbs for teacher and student use of course content: describing, identifying, reviewing, examining, distinguishing, practicing, and designing (Vella 2002). Before I had ever read this literature, creative scheming about the use of e-mail discussions had led me to these types of activities.

As the online venue shifted my role to that of environment creator when designing the course, I discovered a shift in roles, too, as I began to teach my first online course. I sensed that it would be irresponsible to just let students run amuck in the course environment without some direction. Consequently, I assumed the role of shepherd. My steady e-mail presence in the online course, sometimes initiating, sometimes prodding, sometimes reminding, sometimes affirming, is what provides an energy for flow and direction in the course.

Much of this shepherding occurs with respect to the e-mail discussions. It is my initial post in the discussion center that launches a module. The initial posts vary in

nature and how they ask for students to respond. Some call for a direct application of course content for that module. In launching a discussion of worship architecture, for example, I ask the students to describe their current space using the categories given in the reading and digitized lecture. I also ask them to suggest one thing they could do spatially to increase congregational participation. Sometimes my initial post posits a more complex appropriation of course content. “Given what you have read, seen, and listened to in the pre-discussion material,” my more-subtle music discussion starter asks, “was it a cop-out or word of wisdom when one consultant suggested to a church that it use whatever style of music best enables the congregation to do the basic actions of worship (intercede, confess, praise, etc.)?”

I choose the discussion starters based on what I see as the learning goal for that module. What will launch the students on a trajectory to achieve a module’s learning objective? Thus, thinking about the possibilities of extended e-mail discussion led me to discover how crucial it is for me to know what kind of understanding of knowledge I want from my students on a topic. Previous to teaching online, I would have always affirmed, “Yes, I want my students to understand course content.” But I never thought about different shades of understanding as in Wiggins and McTighe’s description of different facets of understanding: being able to explain, interpret, apply, have perspective, empathize with contrary perspectives, and have self-knowledge (Wiggins and McTighe 2001, 44–62). Creating different discussion starters led me to stumble upon this way to nuance.

A module’s goal might not be obvious in its discussion starter but it is something I have in mind for the anticipated flow of a module’s discussion. The discussion starter will launch us together on a path that can get to the learning objective if students and I stay active in the discussion. The other dimensions of how I shepherd discussions help this process. For one thing, I am aware of significant touchstones that I wish reviewed as the discussion progresses. While I allow great latitude in how the discussion unfolds, I stay attentive to how I might open up these touchstones. In the discussion of worship architecture, for instance, I believe spatial issues dealing with increased participation have to take note of sight, sound, and use of body. If these do not arise in the students’ postings, I will find some point within the postings to raise these issues.

As I have taught online I find that the shepherd’s hat within discussion management takes a variety of forms. It is shaped like an initiator as the module begins. Within the module it might be the hat of a pot stirrer, a provoker, a debater, a moderator, a referee between students, an introducer of students to each other in related postings, an explorer of unnamed dimensions, or a summarizer, as is needed. I might assume any of these roles

as I shepherd the developing discussions within a module. Sometimes I serve as guide, as I remind students whether the current discussion takes place in the all-class discussion center or in a discussion center for a small group. (Depending upon topic and objective, some discussions take place in a plenary format with the entire class and some occur in smaller groupings. Some discussions start in one locale and migrate to the other as I direct.) Sometimes I serve to prod the whole class if the discussion seems to lag. In these times I will ask something to blast away complacency and instill a new sense of significance to the issue in front of us. Occasionally I will do the online equivalent of pounding on the podium to get the students' attention: sending my e-mail post not only to the discussion center but also to each student individually. Leading online discussions meant questions I had not previously considered became central to my consciousness: When do I engage in the conversation? How best do I engage? When should I show restraint and keep silent? How do I respond? What goal do I have in responding?

I now see a variety of ways to engage in discussion on infant baptism and sacramental efficacy beyond directly responding with my orthodox position. Even before reading descriptions of various levels of understanding, the give-and-take of online discussions had allowed me to see different facets of students' evolving understandings of a tough subject like baptism. This give-and-take has developed in me a wider range of discussion postures I take with students and a variety of ways of expressing opinions before students. The luxury of writing replies in online discussions, reflecting on them before sending, gave me an opportunity to craft my words more carefully than a spontaneous class situation. I also understand more fully that I should not be the center of all class discussions.

My increased intentionality and variety in online discussions has positively affected what I do in on-campus discussions. It has to since I no longer lecture in the on-campus classes as described above. All the different roles I have learned in online discussions are carried over into my current on-campus class times. Previous discussions in my on-campus pastoral liturgy course were unplanned – even unwelcome – interruptions to my delivery of information. When I did schedule them, I wonder now if I had any intention for them other than to fill time, a chance for me to take a break from talking. That has changed now. Discussions are the backbone of my on-campus classes, often utilizing the same discussion starters and secondary questions that I have developed in my online classes. Discussions, whether online or on-campus, fulfill Stephen Brookfield's and Stephen Preskill's implication that critical discussion is not just a matter of having students talk to each other but of having students talk meaningfully (Brookfield and Preskill 1999, 6–7). I have benefited in additional ways

from leading online discussions. The online format has renewed my confidence in being able to teach in this manner. When a student directs the discussion at me, I have also learned to slow down, be less defensive, and ask questions that open up the discussion as a learning opportunity for the whole class. My online experience has shown me a variety of ways I can respond without having to try to give *the* convincing answer to a student, even in hot topics like baptism.

My learning to be a creator and shepherd in online teaching – instead of primarily a lecturer as in my original on-campus class – has led me to discover what Parker Palmer advocates as subject-centered classrooms (Palmer 1998, 116–118). I first made the discovery in my online classes through the changes described above. Once I had uncovered it there, bringing the changed pedagogy into my on-campus situation has created subject-centered classes there, too.

According to Palmer, a subject-centered classroom contrasts with a teacher-centered classroom. In the latter, the teacher assumes the role of the expert of knowledge, which is then given to the students. In the former, teacher and students alike are accountable to a “great thing,” which is a subject so real, vivid, vocal, and alive that it “transcends our self-absorption and refuses to be reduced to our claims about it” (Palmer 1998, 117). I am glad I stumbled upon this subject-centered approach through the adaptations I made in converting my on-campus course to an online format. Putting away my assumptions of class as an opportunity to lecture with the purpose of delivering information – my first shift in thinking about teaching online – led me to what Palmer advocates. The positive online student evaluations indicate that what I developed for online teaching achieves Palmer's description of a subject-centered classroom, an open “space where students can have a conversation with the subject and with each other” and the professor (Palmer 1998, 120). If I had not had to teach online, I am not sure I would have discovered how to make my on-campus classes subject-centered, too.

As online teaching led me to subject-centered classes, I learned to lecture and to use lectures differently. Teaching online has shown me that my old goals in lecturing were to cover a wealth of data and convince the students that my opinion was right. The online dynamic no longer allowed me to do those things. Because my lectures were to be viewed before class electronically, they needed to be focused. Due to time limits in watching someone talk in an electronic format, I was forced to become more selective about the material I would address in lectures. I became more efficient in my use of words. The lectures ran fifteen minutes or less. I used my lectures to explore topics that lacked good published material and to demonstrate a particular viewpoint in which I could evidence critical or alternative thinking. I

lectured to suggest connections between the readings or helpful ways to approach the readings. I did not know it at the time, but these choices mirrored suggestions by others like Stephen Brookfield who advocate being clear in one's reasons for lecturing (Brookfield 1990, 72–74). If I could find published material, which accomplished these goals, I tended not to lecture on that content. The results have been lectures that are one of several venues by which the students approach the “great thing” of a particular module.

Shifting my lectures to electronic format, which are viewed prior to class interaction, has contributed to the creation of a subject-centered classroom for my on-campus pastoral liturgy classes. In my own mind, I have brought over the term “discussion center” from the online courses and now use it to label what the on-campus classroom is. With lectures being only one dynamic of the course, we have time to do many other things now: role play, practice the kinesthetic aspects of worship, think through case studies, evaluate worship services, assess assignments, create, and discuss. In a discipline like pastoral liturgy, these activities are invaluable.

### Transitions: Other Discoveries

In addition to discovering the essential building blocks of a new way to teach, I have found several other useful pedagogical dynamics never considered before. One is the importance of student participation. I have become much more concerned about my role in facilitating equitable and helpful participation of students in all my classes. This role is a corollary to having a class whose heart is a discussion center. Asbury's training to teach online had made me aware of this crucial dynamic. In my online course my syllabus had to specify what *good* participation by students looked like and how I would assess it as the professor. The syllabus also had to say how participation affected the student's grade for the course. In my first online courses I used a strong quantitative method, literally counting every post a student made along with those that I considered especially strong. These tallies were measured against a minimum standard for number of posts that I had specified in the syllabus. For each student, I also calculated the ratio of superior posts to total posts for the semester. I assigned the participation grade based on these various numbers.

Since those early online classes I have made several helpful changes. For one thing, the qualities of poor and good preparation and participation are spelled out in the syllabus. I also rely much more on peer evaluation among students. A satisfactory participation grade has also become more of a threshold in order to pass the class rather than a certain percentage of the numeric grade. I keep a close watch on those students with

marginal participation grades. Working with them has become part of my shepherding role within online classes.

Regardless of the method, just having to consider student participation was a large shift for my on-campus classes. I had never put materials like this in any on-campus syllabus before nor used them for calculation of grades! They were not needed in a teacher-centered classroom. But with the changes in how we use on-campus class time, such considerations have become critical. I now use the same grading rubric for both online and on-campus environments, having students fill out peer evaluations for those with whom they worked that week. Online students do this in a Web format whose results are given to me anonymously. On-campus students do this by a prepared paper form. Just as careful preparation and participation is crucial for the success of the online class, so it has become for the on-campus counterpart.

Another discovery from my online classes, which has affected how I shape my on-campus sections, has been the importance of the individual student's context when taking the course. As Stephen Brookfield notes, citing Myles Horton, “unless adults were ready for learning and saw the point of it for their own lives,” a teacher's best efforts might still be less than effective (Brookfield 1995, 134). I realized this was a partial answer to a perplexing issue: Why did the student evaluations from online classes generally come back stronger than those from on-campus sections? The online evaluations were backed up by anecdotal evidence, too, as online students told me more often how much the pastoral liturgy class had meant to them. I could never figure out why the same students in the same school taking the same class could form such different opinions of it. The answer is clearer to me now: not only was I a different kind of teacher in the online classes but the students often were different kinds of students, at least in terms of their specific contexts.

It was an on-campus student who tipped me off to this possibility. The student suggested that perhaps part of the reason for the stronger online evaluations was that more of the online students had active responsibility for leading congregational worship while taking the course. Since receiving that suggestion, I have been conducting informal surveys of both online and on-campus Asbury students who took my class while being responsible for planning and leading worship outside of class. Many of these were student pastors in United Methodist churches. This student's tip seems true. Worship-leading students tended to have stronger learning experiences in a pastoral liturgy class than their counterparts.

This realization has influenced how I have adjusted my subsequent online and on-campus pastoral liturgy classes. Not able to place students in actual parishes, I

nonetheless recreate a congregational dimension for all students by developing a semi-fictitious congregation called a touchstone church. I use a worship videotape of a real congregation as the base. Then I develop the other dynamics that surround a parish: people, music, space, and so on. Part of this material is on a website for the class and part on multimedia CDs. I have the students imagine what it would be like to be responsible for planning and leading worship for that church. I then gear discussions, exercises, and projects toward applying course content for leading worship in that context. In this way, taking my required course might seem less than just a required course in that it addresses a more fundamental concern common to my students, namely, how do I learn to lead worship well?

Creating touchstone churches in both online and on-campus courses led me to another dimension of what Parker Palmer advocates in a subject-centered classroom. According to Palmer, creating the space to consider the great things of the central subject can lead to a counterintuitive move of teaching less “stuff” but doing so more deeply. As he poses, “Why do we keep trying to cover the field when we can honor the stuff of the discipline more profoundly by teaching less of it at a deeper level?” (Palmer 1998, 122). Palmer’s examples of doing this emphasize the benefit of “teaching from the microcosm,” as he calls it, in a way that engages the students at the level of their original motivation (Palmer 1998, 127).

But is there any “original motivation” in a required class? Yes, at least partly. And I believe the higher evaluations from online students, especially the student pastors, gave me a hint as to what it might be: learning to be effective ministers. My touchstone churches give a liturgical face to this desire.

## Conclusion

Things have come full circle as my online experiences have reshaped my on-campus teaching. The initial shock of relearning how to teach by transitioning to an online environment has led to many discoveries I now carry over into my on-campus teaching. To discover that

many are things advocated by writers in pedagogy is a welcome confirmation for the shifts I have begun.

But there were downsides along the way. Making these changes took time and energy as I have created four different versions of pastoral liturgy courses for on-campus and online versions. My methodology has placed a high demand on technological resources. Sometimes I have wondered if I was shortchanging my research and publication.

But my conversion in the online class environment has been beneficial for all of my students and for me. Positive student response, both on-line and on-campus, has been stronger, and frustration is no longer my middle name. Where would I be if not for having to teach online? I am not sure. I do know I would not have the level of satisfaction that I have in my current on-campus teaching. I no longer fear walking into the on-campus section of the pastoral liturgy course. I am a converted teacher. And so, is there anyone who would like to discuss baptism?

## References

- Ascough, Richard S. 2002. “Designing for Online Distance Education: Putting Pedagogy Before Technology.” *Teaching Theology and Religion* 5, no. 1:17–29.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. 1990. *The Skillful Teacher: On Technique, Trust, and Responsiveness in the Classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- 1995. *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. and Preskill, Stephen. 1999. *Discussion as a Way of Teaching: Tools and Techniques for Democratic Classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Palmer, Parker J. 1998. *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher’s Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Taylor, Kathleen; Marienau, Catherine; and Fiddler, Morris. 2000. *Developing Adult Learners: Strategies for Teachers and Trainers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Vella, Jane. 2002. *Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach: The Power of Dialogue in Educating Adults*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Wiggins, Grant and McTighe, Jay. 2001. *Understanding by Design*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Copyright of Teaching Theology & Religion is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.