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ABSTRACT

Universities are increasingly moving classes to online environments and compelling programs to rethink how content traditionally taught face-to-face courses could be moved to an online environment. This trend is particularly challenging for both novice and experienced faculty, as diverse student bodies make it necessary for faculty to engage in more meaningful, culturally responsive ways to teach students. Thus, as universities increase their online courses, faculty and instructors are confronted with the challenge of providing this cultural responsiveness in an online environment. Using faculty interviews, we examined the need for an increased focus on professional development for online faculty, and we highlight the need for strengthening the development of pedagogical strategies around cultural responsiveness for faculty teaching online and transitioning courses to online environments.
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INTRODUCTION

All professions recognize the need for continuous development in their field to keep pace with an increasingly changing and diverse world. In higher education, one increasingly popular trend is the move towards distance education or online learning environments. Universities are moving more classes to online environments and compelling programs to rethink how content traditionally taught face-to-face could be shifted to an online environment. Moreover, despite a decline in on campus enrollment, the number of students taking online courses at public institutions has steadily increased over the last decade (Allen and Seaman, 2016). In some cases, to support student demands for online learning, institutions are allocating resources to invest in departments, centers, and programs aimed specifically at improving best practices and the quality of online teaching (Herman, 2012; Mohr, 2016). Yet, with an array of professional development options available to faculty, many of them still feel ill-prepared to teach online (Lackey, 2011), which results in a lower quality experience for students.

With the increase of faculty teaching online comes the inevitable decrease in the opportunity and ability of faculty to connect with their students. The research also indicates that students’ perceptions of their instructor’s presence significantly affects both student self-efficacy and student learning satisfaction (Russo & Benson, 2005). Understanding faculty voices can mitigate many of the challenges in providing an enriching professional development experience (Baran & Correia, 2016; Golden, 2016; McMutry, 2016). As a result, universities will want to be proactive and provide their faculty with not only professional development for teaching online, but also equip them with the tools to effectively connect with students in online spaces. One potential area of focus is helping faculty develop a culturally responsive approach to the content and instruction in their online environments. Using faculty interviews, this research examined the need for increased focus on professional development...
for online faculty and highlighted the need for strengthening the development of pedagogical strategies. Cultural responsiveness is explored as an approach to support faculty teaching in and transitioning courses to online environments.

The Importance of Professional Development for Faculty Teaching Online

Faculty enter online teaching with varying skill levels in using online tools, technology, and facilitation techniques for the online environment (Anderson, 2015; Elliott et al., 2015; Grover et al., 2016). As a result, institutions may have various levels of support that can be used in different ways to support faculty. Some institutions have instructional design staff or teams who partner with faculty to develop and design all online course content without faculty needing to understand online design or pedagogy (McGee et al., 2017). Other institutions expect faculty to teach a course online that they did not develop, influence, or organize. As a result, faculty may not feel satisfied and connected to the content (Bollinger et al., 2014). Still other institutions expect their faculty to come into the institution with the online expertise to teach content and develop independently or in concert with a course developer course materials as well as create exams or other assessments of students’ learning (Frankel, 2015). The amount of training or professional development (PD) may be based on skill level, challenges, ongoing needs, or any number of additional factors. Many of these challenges can be addressed through comprehensive professional development training mindful of faculty perspectives, needs, and the customs of the institution.

The most common PD training offerings are geared towards novice faculty so they understand how to navigate the online environment and fit into the role of an online teacher (Herring et al., 2016; Kearns, 2015). The focus of these PD offerings is heavily centered on getting the faculty up to speed on the learning management system, teaching faculty technological skills for functioning as an online instructor, and transitioning the instructor role from face-to-face teaching to a new educational environment (Anderson et al., 2013; Henry, 2014). As faculty mature in skills and training over time, PD instruction may not be differentiated to account for experience and expertise (Rhode et al., 2017). Yet throughout their tenure teaching online, faculty continue to seek professional development to meet their specific needs and appreciate support systems that will advance their instructional skills over time (Aust, et al., 2015; Elliott et al., 2015).

When considering PD as a way to support faculty, well-crafted offerings may require administrators and faculty developers to consider a continuum of online faculty skill level that includes faculty’s prior experience, challenges, and ongoing needs (McLoughlin & Northcote, 2017; Mohr, 2016; Mueller et al., 2013). Faculty development includes a range of activities that institutions use to assist faculty roles (Baker et al., 2018). Research indicates that experienced online faculty generally want to explore and expand their understanding of pedagogy to increase student engagement, improve collaboration, and improve their knowledge of multimedia tools beyond basic functions and strategies (Hale, 2012; Kennedy, 2015). However, universities need to develop more than just formal professional development and discover informal methods for engaging faculty who often spend less time on campus.

Various informal support systems for online faculty are found in most institutions. Some examples of informal support cited in the research include faculty having opportunities to connect with their peers in other academic departments and building a community of practice to support their needs (Mueller et al., 2013; Wenger-Trayner et al., 2014). These informal systems help mitigate some of the challenges of online teaching and help faculty navigate the online teaching experience. However, the research indicates that such social networks
and informal support systems have limited benefits because they do not address sustained challenges faced by online faculty in practice (Kearnes, 2015). Professional development training can be offered as a formal support and when combined with other informal supports, it provides a holistic, sustainable opportunity to meet online faculty needs (McLoughlin & Northcote, 2017).

Faculty training and professional development is necessary as different technology, pedagogy, and content are being introduced to meet student learning outcomes. Even in the current climate of tightening budgets resulting in shrinking support for professional development, it is imperative that institutions invest their limited resources in the faculty development initiatives that will produce the greatest gains (Elliot et al., 2015). Hill et al. (2007) stated that for faculty development to be effective, universities must “address the principles and practices of teaching at the individual, departmental, curricular, and institutional levels, facilitating communication within and across departments” (p. 17). Research provides some insight on the desires of faculty for PD workshops. They want training that supports and encourages personal and professional growth, covers topics that are relevant to faculty needs, and provides the opportunity to network with colleagues (Steinert et al., 2010).

One of the aims of designing professional development sessions is to offer new knowledge and help in areas where faculty have a need. Programs that fail to incorporate faculty needs will fall short of achieving meaningful outcomes (Frankel, 2015). When planning for these supports at an institutional level, faculty professional developers and administrators have many considerations to consider such as faculty skill levels and their learning needs, challenges, and ongoing needs (Mohr, 2016). Research indicates that faculty prefer personalized instruction to the extent that their motivation to participate in professional development is contingent upon their involvement in the decisions about how and what they want to learn (Grover et al., 2016). One particular pedagogical skill that K–12 teachers are using, and higher education faculty can benefit from, particularly online faculty, is the development of a culturally responsive approach to teaching. Culturally responsive teaching goes a step further and asks faculty to consider a student’s experiences and understanding in their teaching practices to amplify student motivation and thus provide a framework to instruction to improve outcomes.

Understanding Cultural Responsiveness

Cultural responsiveness derives its foundations from “critical consciousness,” a mindset stemming from liberation for oppressed populations. Brazilian philosopher Paulo Freire coined the term and developed the idea in the 1970s. Freire (2007) used the term conscientizacao (Spanish for “consciousness”) to describe the multidimensional process of reflection and action as a tool to challenge inequitable social structures and systems that perpetuate injustice, oppression, and exploitation—specifically those within the education system. Accordingly, Freire challenged the “banking model” of education in which the all-knowing teacher treats students as mere receptacles void of personal critique, inquiry, and insight. Since the original use of the term, Freire’s conceptualization of critical consciousness has been examined (Giroux, 1983), expounded upon (Diemer & Blustein, 2006), and critiqued by scholars in an attempt to deconstruct its key components (Jemal, 2017). The literature suggests that critical consciousness, a foundation of cultural responsiveness, is both a process and an outcome incorporating critical reflection, dialogue, sociopolitical efficacy, and action (Godfrey & Grayman, 2014; Jemal, 2017). Therefore, without learning how to be intentional in their process, faculty may potentially miss the opportunity to authentically engage their students.

Critical reflection refers to one’s ability to critically analyze the relationships between individual social realities and broader social, political, and economic institutions that maintain structural oppression. For members of marginalized groups and communities this means actively thinking about the interconnection of history, policy, and law. It is with this understanding that faculty can develop processes for incorporating critical reflection, dialogue, sociopolitical efficacy, and action. Within this context, “dialogue” refers to group conversations about the meaning of injustice, inequity, and oppression. More specifically, dialogue is centered on both “divergent” and “convergent” experiences with the aim of illuminating multiple perspectives of a topic (Seider et al., 2017). “Sociopolitical efficacy” refers to an individual’s
perceived capability to be a change agent, while “action” refers to an individual’s orientation toward agency and sociopolitical action to effect change. Without the sociopolitical efficacy, it is often difficult for action to occur. Examples of action include leadership roles in social movements, voting, and community organizing (Watts et al., 2011; Watts & Flanagan, 2007). Utilizing these purposeful processes can lead faculty to an increased level of cultural competency, an important factor in being culturally responsive.

Cultural competency is regarded as an essential component of promoting social equity in the delivery of services and is the manner in which issues of diversity are responded to and addressed in agencies (Lopez-Littleton & Blessett, 2015; Reger et al., 2008; Rice, 2008). Lonner (2007) described cultural competency as a continuum without fixed endpoints, meaning that there is neither an exact bottom nor an exact top for total cultural incompetence. If one was to operationalize cultural competency, it would be how effectively an individual appreciates or respects people from other cultures and is capable of applying appropriate behaviors and considerations in cross-cultural situations (Borrego et al., 2012; Rice, 2008). Wu and Martinez (2006) identified six principles and recommendations for cultural competency implementation: (a) community representation and feedback at all stages of implementation; (b) cultural competency integration into all systems of the organization, particularly quality improvement efforts; (c) ensuring that changes are manageable, measurable, and sustainable; (d) making the case for implementation policies; (e) commitment from leadership; and (f) ongoing staff training. In educational settings, the potential for cultural conflict resulting from diverging values requires educators to be mindful of how their practice and decisions impact their students. Therefore, educators are responsible for creating an environment where subcultures can collaborate synergistically. Applying cultural competency to classroom spaces is an important practice and skill that instructors will want to develop through high quality PD.

Implementing Culturally Responsive Practices to Online Courses

As the diversity of higher education classes continues to increase, faculty will want PD that can support their ability to connect with their students (Aust, et al., 2015; Elliott et al., 2015). This is particularly prudent for faculty teaching in an online environment, where connections with students can be more challenging to develop. Culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) is a widely regarded body of literature in response to equipping teachers to effectively serve students of different cultures. CRP or culturally responsive teaching is a multitheoretical framework that draws together and extends noted concepts regarding strategies for improving the learning outcomes of culturally diverse students. The concepts making up CRP include cultural congruence (Au & Kawakami, 1994), caring (Noddings & Shore, 1984; Valenzuela, 1999), hidden curriculum theory (Wren, 1999), cultural synchronicity (Irvine, 1989), and cultural relevance (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995). Developing this awareness also aligns well with the literature that suggests that faculty’s needs and skills will have to develop as they grow in the profession (McLoughlin & Northcote, 2017; Mohr, 2016).

Gay (2002) described culturally responsive teaching as using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of diverse students as a means for adequately teaching them. Gay further argued that teachers must become skilled at recognizing, acknowledging, and capitalizing on the multidimensionality of their student’s various cultural identities. This sentiment is important for faculty teaching adults online because they bring a layered prior self to the course that must be respected, challenged, and developed throughout the course. Gay went on to emphasize that this knowledge supports all aspects of instructional planning. Proficiency in doing this work includes significant on-the-job training facilitated by the children themselves and the support of school leaders who recognize the importance of doing this work well. The task for teachers is to become available, willing, and receptive to student voices and then to respond appropriately to the students. Research highlights that experienced online faculty desire to broaden their understanding of pedagogy around student engagement (Hale, 2012; Kennedy, 2015), and, therefore, providing PD in this area aligns well with the current needs of faculty at various types of institutions and levels within the profession.
Faculty also want PD that encourages personal and professional growth (Steinert, et al., 2010) and culturally responsive pedagogy that provides an opportunity for both. Howard (2003) claimed that culturally relevant pedagogy challenges teachers to acknowledge how deficit-based notions about diverse students continue to permeate traditional school thinking, practices, and placements. Further, CRP prompts teachers to critique their own ways of thinking to ensure they do not reinforce prejudicial behavior. Culturally relevant pedagogy recognizes the explicit connection between culture and learning and sees students’ cultural capital as an asset (Durden, 2008). In higher education, using the culturally relevant frame will increase the likelihood that educators will be better equipped, in the way that Gay (2002) suggested, to confront the challenges that come along with institutions that are becoming increasingly diverse.

Higher education faculty face challenges with designing and delivering online teaching that demonstrates their ability to be inclusive and address the cultural diversity of their students (Woodley et al., 2017). Ensuring that culturally responsive practices are included in an online environment first requires instructors to be deliberately aware of the need for a supportive and inclusive environment for students. Being able to understand this need, and then make considerations on design and teaching, is one key consideration in the future of forward-thinking online teachers and course designers. Similar to face-to-face course formats, thoughtful professional development for educators of online courses leads to better prepared, higher quality educators. Sallee’s (2010) findings suggested that for participants in effective professional development, there is a statistically significant correlation between professional development and high student achievement. Likewise, Liu et al. (2011) found similar results generated from a study including 40 educators in five states in the United States. Therefore, engaging faculty in high-quality professional development on any topic increases educator self-efficacy and strongly impacts students’ performance in the classroom (Lee et al., 2013).

Understanding what culture is and then interpreting how to be responsive in online teaching practice has layers of challenges with implementation. There are a significant number of cultural differences that are nuanced and multifaceted and need to be factored into online instruction. There is no all-encompassing way of addressing the range of cultural implications that can affect practice. However, a baseline of considerations can be developed and considered to include several cultural markers such as the relationship expectations between students and teacher, technological access and dependability, design interpretations (e.g., the use of certain colors may mean nothing in one country but be significant in another country), and confusion with communication and symbols (Rogers et al., 2007). Other considerations may include how some cultures emphasize individual achievement and responsibility (e.g., the United States) while others like China and Korea support collective and group achievement and responsibility (Wang, 2008). There are also technical considerations that come along with the use of a learning management system (LMS). An LMS is used to deliver online courses but there is a limited ability to organize or deliver online courses that is based on the tools available within the system. The subtle interplay and overlap between pedagogical, content, and technological knowledge for online faculty as they gain experience, highlights the complexities of teaching online and doing it in a culturally responsive manner.

METHODS

We utilized a case study research design for this study because a case study is best for investigating and developing an in-depth understanding of the needs of a specific case that can be either an event, problem, program, or person (Yin, 2014), or a situation where differing points of views are recognized and subjective views of reality are accepted (Creswell, 2014; Stake, 1995). More specifically, we employed a descriptive case study process with the hopes of understanding and discovering connections, themes, and patterns related to online faculty PD needs (Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2014). This approach allowed faculty to share their experiences and perspectives on the need for having their voices heard in developing PD and identifying various types of PD that they need. We used two primary sources of data collection: semistructured interviews and a survey administered to participants who have completed a professional development training.
To best understand faculty perceptions, semistructured interviews were conducted with the participants, a common method for data collection in case studies (Hancock & Algozzine, 2017). The interview questions focused on faculty perceptions of professional development related to online teaching, the challenges of teaching online, areas of training and support in online teaching, the exploration of other training content, and the support the participants perceived as useful for online teaching.

The selected research design allowed us to capture the voices and views of teaching faculty that are important in shaping the future of training for faculty teaching online. Many of the studies that described faculty voices in the design of professional development used a qualitative approach to identify best practices (Henry, 2014; Mohr, 2016), to understand what format and delivery options work best for faculty at a particular institution (Grover et al., 2016; Schmidt et al., 2016; Slinger-Friedman et al., 2014), and to understand how to train faculty on pedagogy (Alexiou-Ray & Bentley, 2015; Henry, 2014; Kennedy, 2015; Zulegler, 2013).

The site for this study was a four-year public institution in the Midwest with approximately 450 faculty members (including adjuncts). We employed purposeful sampling and thus data collection was bounded within faculty who had taught in an online environment for a minimum of three years and had participated (or planned to participate) in professional development over the next two school years. This approach yielded 49 survey participants and 15 interviews. Additionally, faculty participants for this study included only faculty who teach fully online courses and have taught a minimum of six courses online. Training at the institution is currently offered with a “one size fits all” approach without any training distinctions for the courses that faculty teach.

Each interview was collected through semistructured interviews with the online faculty conducted in person or by phone. For analysis, we utilized general terms and themes related to faculty professional development, including but not limited to content, pedagogy, technology, and the learning management system. From these broad categories, we narrowed categories and sub-categories were then developed.

At the time of this study, we worked as staff at the institution. While we did not have a personal relationship with any of the participants, and moreover had not previously met them, they were approachable and eager to share feedback on their professional development needs. We were careful to not allow any participant bias and remained focused on the interview questions to stay on track without creating a conversation (Harding, 2013).

**FINDINGS**

Examining faculty perspectives of their experiences with professional development can help PD developers and administrators improve online teaching practices and increase their comfort in the online environment. Our research captured faculty perceptions through semistructured interviews to gain insight on faculty experience with professional development and increasing access to pedagogical development, including faculty responsiveness to all types of students.

The final data reflect thoughtful insights that connect faculty perspectives to online teaching challenges and successes. In their responses to the interview questions, faculty offered perspectives related to improvements with their online teaching practices, their observations of fellow faculty, and their experiences with institutional PD in general. Table 1 outlines faculty’s experience with PD (N=57), and the results indicated that 56% participated in PD related to technology or the LMS, 26% participated in PD related to pedagogy, and 16% participated in PD in content related topics.

Learning to use the LMS and the technology used in an online environment is critical to the success of faculty, and therefore it is understandable.

**Table 1. Professional Development Related to Topics in Technology, Pedagogy, or Content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content related topics (PD specifically for the type of course content you teach, i.e., Science, Math, Business, History, Art, etc.)</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy related topics (PD on best practices, strategies, or learning theories, etc.)</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology related topics (Web 2.0, Google docs, Twitter, Skype, etc)</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Learning Management System (LMS), e.g., Blackboard, Moodle, D2L, etc.</td>
<td>29.82%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that 56% of the faculty focused their PD in this area. However, with over a quarter of the faculty focusing on pedagogy, our research sought to understand faculty needs with respect to pedagogy and learn how to better meet their needs through professional development for engaging and connecting with students. The following provides feedback from faculty on their feelings towards the PD available to them through their university. From this data, we identified a need for culturally responsive teaching practices along with other desires for pedagogical related topics as indicated.

Brian, a full-time faculty member who admitted that he does not come to campus every day, shared more details about aligning PD to faculty’s need given his limited time to join trainings on campus:

In general it’s just ... you need to make it easy for faculty no matter what. And PD should be customized to give faculty the specific help or skills they need most. Like I would be inclined to attend PD about engagement or culture and diversity in online environments, not technology basics.

Even for an experienced online instructor, PD at some level can be beneficial. Yet, another faculty member, Charles, shared that PD has not necessarily been relevant to him as an advanced faculty member because his needs were slightly different at this point, as he shared:

(In the beginning) I was probably an eager faculty member so I was more willing to go to any kind (of PD) even though I was experienced ... although training didn’t feel like it was necessarily helpful to me ... my main challenge has always been connecting with the diversity and expectation of students online. Where are the classes on that?

One faculty member in particular, Erica, felt that PD explaining how to teach online was overdone. Rather than learning how to facilitate, she stated there would be more value in understanding how to “design and build online courses that truly engaged all her students.” Faculty participants also mentioned the idea of having informal PD through conversations and communities of practice. Sue said the following statement about her informal PD experiences:

I think we need to exploit existing communities of practice more. So, divisions, departments, people teaching the same class can collaborate. These are existing, really practical, communities of practice. And, that’s where the learning takes place, you know because it’s those neurons firing and those synapses connecting ... that’s what makes lasting learning and you need a social context to do that. In these spaces we can focus less on the technical aspects and more on learning to connect with each other and how to better connect with our students.

The feedback highlighted here is consistent with other faculty in the study. Each of them struggled with the misalignment of their needs and the training offered, as all of them wanted to participate in PD that helped them further engage students and develop methods, like cultural responsiveness, that would allow them to better connect with the diversity of the students, particularly in online spaces. It was clear that all faculty felt like the PD provided to them has value depending on your career level. Nevertheless, there was a sentiment that most of the trainings did not go deep enough and truly stretch their pedagogy. This faculty feedback offers some clear takeaways for universities and their departments that provide online professional development.

**KEY TAKEAWAYS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

These findings highlight three important pieces of information that are salient to our research:

1. The first key takeaway is that even after faculty have experience teaching in online platforms, they still have a lot of areas of deficit and want support in areas they believe will help them continue to improve their practice. This provides an opportunity for universities to rethink how they offer online professional development regardless of faculty years of teaching experience. Knowing that faculty will both want and need on-going professional development, universities may consider creating policies to mandate regular training. Additionally, they can even consider incentivizing faculty to provide some of the training, increasing both a sense of community and ownership of collective growth. King and Aperstein (2015) asserted that faculty need ongoing
support to ensure that they can use the most appropriate technology and maintain a contemporary knowledge of current teaching practices. Both of these approaches would ensure that faculty are getting the on-going support they desire and require.

2. Another area where teachers expressed a need for deeper knowledge was on engaging a diverse student population online. This leads to the next key takeaway: There should be more opportunities provided by universities to create training on developing progressive online learning environments. The participant faculty desired an increased understanding of the implementation of learning activities to diminish challenges associated with cultural differences. From this outcome, online trainers and instructional technology developers can ascertain that there is a need for increased training content that is connected to student engagement. In these trainings, faculty can learn, but also develop and share, best practices on culturally responsive pedagogy, student engagement, instructional design, and other areas key for developing a progressive learning environment. Zuleger (2013) discussed several areas of pedagogical support required for faculty to overcome the differences in the online environment. One area is creating learning environments where students’ culture is represented in the design and creation of the learning space, and they feel connected to the faculty, learning content, and their classmates. Consequently, this highlights an imperative pedogeological development area for universities in giving weight to the importance of aligning course designs with the foundations of culturally responsiveness.

3. One of the benefits of teaching online courses is that faculty do not need to be on campus or even come to campus as frequently as other faculty. The final key takeaway is that universities must diversify professional development offerings (both formal and informal) because online faculty often miss opportunities to participate in on-campus faculty professional development. Accordingly, many faculty who teach in online programs encounter challenges when navigating the merging of teaching and the available technology support. Faculty participate in a wide variety of PD offerings and desire access to them, even if the subject of the PD was not explicitly designed to address the needs of advanced faculty. While full-time faculty working on campus noted that they could easily participate in on-ground PD or workshops, they also appeared to have more asynchronous PD offerings. Similarly, adjunct faculty noted the need to have more PD offerings that were asynchronous to fit their schedules. Additionally, both on-ground and adjunct faculty stated that they enjoyed informal PD opportunities like peer-to-peer discussions, mentoring, and consulting with an instructional designer. Hence, training and instructional design departments may have to consider and provide multiple modes of PD offerings if they want to increase opportunities for participation and skill development.

The participants in this study expressed the need for PD training to be offered utilizing various delivery modes and to allow access at times when convenient for them. Flexibility is needed for both part-time and full-time professors, and, as Elliott et al. (2015) highlights, to ensure universities meet the needs of faculty who are not connected to campus, training programs must provide flexibility with varying content and multiple modes of delivery including synchronous, asynchronous, tutorials, and webinars. This was particularly accurate for the advanced faculty in our research. The level of support felt by faculty can be bolstered by an institution’s willingness to create formal and informal support opportunities having the ultimate goal of developing faculty to best serve students.

CONCLUSIONS

Over the years as universities have gotten less funding from state legislatures and as the price of attending college in traditional higher education institutions has increased, this has led the way for universities to grow their online offerings. As the proportion of students attending universities through online spaces increases, the
needs of online students must become more of a priority. Thus, the needs of online faculty must also be prioritized and nurtured. This is the case for both new and advanced faculty. With both groups, the need to develop culturally responsive practices is the foundation of developing online courses and programs that meet the needs of a variety of learners entering universities today and in the future. Consequently, it is incumbent upon university faculty, charged with shaping future leaders, researchers, and policymakers, to create educational spaces that are relevant and responsive to students’ lived experiences.
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