January 2015

Highjacking the MOOC: Reflections on Creating/Teaching an Art History MOOC

Parme Giuntini
Otis College of Art and Design, pgiuntini@otis.edu

Jean-Marie Venturini
Otis College of Art and Design, jventurini@otis.edu

Recommended Citation

HIJACKING THE MOOC: REFLECTIONS ON CREATING/TEACHING AN ART HISTORY MOOC

Parme Giuntini[i] Otis College of Art and Design

Jean-Marie Venturini Otis College of Art and Design

INTRODUCTION

Our objectives with this article are to share through first-hand experience the initial challenges of conceptualizing and developing a MOOC within existing and ongoing job responsibilities as well as its integration into an already thriving academic environment. We approached the MOOC not as an obstacle, but as an educational platform that could function as an additional tool and resource for faculty within the classroom. Our intention is to discuss viewing the MOOC, not as an online replacement for face-to-face instruction, but as open and accessible content for the classroom that can also serve your institution in providing publicity by highlighting faculty expertise and reaching a global audience of interested learners an institution might not otherwise access. Doing so requires shifting the way we assess and view success in a MOOC. We would argue MOOCs should be reviewed and evaluated as their own entities rather than attempting to graft and overlay assessment practices developed for face-to-face and online course instruction as the MOOC presents different issues and structure by virtue of its open nature and massive audience.

BACKGROUND

For the last three years, the MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) has been an ongoing hot button issue on American college campuses. Scarcely a week has gone by without an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* or *Inside Higher Education* (two of the more popular American publications addressing emerging trends and best practices in higher education) charting the potential threats, advantages, and possibilities that MOOCs offer.[1] Depending on the perspective,

---

[1] See Venturini (2013) and Venturini (2014) for a chronological list of over sixty linked articles on the subject of MOOCs published between 2012-2014.

MOOCs were going to radically redefine the landscape of education, put many professors out of a job, offer an unprecedented educational opportunity to an unlimited cyberspace student population, improve the quality of instruction, create havoc with transfer requirements and course credit, and destroy the authentic learning associated with a traditional face-to-face classroom. Lewin (2012) notes

> "these massive open online courses, or MOOCs, harness the power of their huge enrollments to teach in new ways, applying crowd-sourcing technology to discussion forums and grading and enabling professors to use online lectures and reserve on-campus class time for interaction with students."

Lewin continues

> "the spread of MOOCs is likely to have wide fallout. Lower-tier colleges, already facing resistance over high tuition, may have trouble convincing students that their courses are worth the price. And some experts voice reservations about how MOOC learning can be assessed and warn of the potential for cheating."

It is a landscape of discourse that is both engaging and disconcerting, but all the more compelling because MOOCs emerged gilded with the elitist appeal of the most prestigious colleges and universities[2] while, at the same time, academic critics questioned the efficacy and trajectory of higher education and a stumbling economy dramatically impacted college costs, enrollments, and other cutbacks. My institutional involvement with MOOCs is rooted in the nexus of these issues.

The situation at Otis College of Art and Design typifies the experience at many independent art and design colleges in the reluctance to embrace online instruction. We are small, with low student to faculty ratios (7.5 to 1 as of fall 2013 Common Data set) and we emphasize hands on, individualized attention. As a member of the AICAD consortium (Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design), the college is aware of its peer institutions' online practices that include an emerging interest in providing online courses to meet current student needs, but also the consequences of decreasing face-to-face instruction. These are institutions where the selling points include a unique educational experience with small classes and attentive faculty. The historical core of art and design colleges is the studio department and those faculty that are rooted in the Beaux Arts model of education, what is commonly referred today as the "guide on the side" model in which students receive personal instruction, demonstration, and immediate feedback on classroom work in progress.

This is and remains the standard practice in studio classes, and many

---

studio faculty are reluctant to experiment with online instruction because they think that it jeopardizes the authentic learning experience. While some are not averse to making short instructional videos, there is considerable resistance to shifting from a face-to-face environment to online teaching, much less developing a MOOC course of any kind.[3]

The situation is somewhat different with Liberal Studies and Otis is no exception. There is a considerable interest and participation in technology and online instruction. In part, this is due to the decade long trend toward online instruction in the Humanities and Sciences which is fairly pervasive in many American colleges, but also a general scholarly familiarity with databases and electronic research, and, in the case of art historians, there is the added expertise with digital images and projection. Finally, there is the *perception* that academic professors are more technologically literate than studio faculty and that their courses are primarily lecture based and easily transferable to an online environment.

By fall 2012, the Liberal Arts and Sciences department (LAS) at Otis had established a decades' long reputation for beta testing and adopting new technologies. These ranged from early adoption of digital image databases in 2004 to a Learning Management System that included electronic portfolios for both students and faculty that launched in 2006. Although these are options available to all faculty, studio instructors prioritized the course management features and were far more reluctant to experiment with electronic portfolios or consider online instruction.

In collaboration with the Director of the Library who also supervised instructional technologies, the LAS department took the lead to encourage, support, and gradually mandate faculty adoption of emerging technology. This included the use of electronic portfolios to present dynamic, multimodal course content, and familiarity with best practices in online and hybrid pedagogy. Currently, our institution boasts approximately 1,804 faculty electronic portfolios in our Learning Management System with over 5,500 student electronic portfolios. An interest and growth in instructional technologies and online/hybrid education allowed the institution to further invest in faculty support by hiring an Instructional Designer in October 2012. A small group of LAS faculty working in conjunction with the library staff researched and created an online course, Bricks & Clicks, which provided in-house instruction on the pedagogy and emerging best practices for teaching online. Institutional support for this course allotted stipends to interested faculty to participate and then develop online or hybrid courses that the college would offer as part of its regular curriculum. By fall 2013, 65% of LAS faculty (part-time and full-time) successfully completed Bricks & Clicks and

---

[3] See Bender (2006) and Sheldon (2009) for discussions of resistance to online learning in arts education.

of that cohort, 50% successfully offered an online or blended (hybrid) course. The department had also migrated 20% of its total course offerings to online or hybrid models, accomplishing this with minimal financial impact and a primarily part-time faculty. Although the design departments were informed about these developments, they still remained convinced that online instruction would not be a viable avenue for exploration for their courses. Their participation in using the eportfolios was sporadic although some departments did encourage their faculty to have students post at least one assignment.

CONSIDERING/DEVELOPING THE MOOC

My involvement with technology began earlier with the shift from slide projectors to the Madison Digital Image Database in 2002 and the adoption of our Learning Management System in 2004. By 2012 I was the designated department "early adopter," and because I supervised the Art History courses,[4] which were heavily dependent on digital projection and online digital image databases, I promoted many new technologies in these courses. These new technologies began with creating a digital electronic portfolio not only for syllabus information, but lecture content as well. I then began creating online learning objects, short videos on specific issues in Modern Art History that could be used by any of our faculty in their courses. These videos were a logical extension of the usage of digital projection of images and integration of electronic portfolios, and served department and institutional interest in developing core Art History courses that could be taught online.

We were aware of reports like Jaschik (2013) discussing low MOOC completion rates and a general skepticism towards an instructional model with limited faculty participation, the potential for large international student enrollment[5], and marginal assessment mechanisms. Despite these concerns, my institution by January of 2013 was engaged in serious discussion on the advisability of developing and launching a MOOC. We saw great potential incorporating MOOCs into our existing Continuing Educational programs and the usability of content with current face-to-face courses, as a viable educational option for our disaster planning scenarios, and as an avenue for increasing the visibility of the institution. We saw the MOOCs as a natural evolution of open educational resources, digital lesson plans, and were interested in further exploring the flexibility the platform could offer to higher education. We had an

---

[4] The National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) requires 12 units of Art History credit out of 40 total units of Liberal Studies credit, which represents roughly 1/3 of Liberal Studies courses offered over four years, for the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree.

[5] Jaschik (2013) in this article discussed a Coursera MOOC on online instruction with an enrollment of 41,000 that crashed due to technical difficulty managing such a large enrolled population.

opportunity to reach a global audience as well as highlight and showcase our faculty expertise. Additionally, there was considerable interest in offering an Art History course since this was a discipline with a very low MOOC profile. I was a willing participant and already had a collection of online learning objects that could be readily adapted for use in a MOOC. From the beginning, we focused on ways to use the MOOC in conjunction with other courses and programs rather than as an end in itself. We immediately seized upon its "open" nature and in turn wanted to structure an online experience for all participants that would serve the greatest number of interests and engagements from those who simply wanted to surf around and browse, use our content modules for their own classes, or take the class from start to finish and enhance their own knowledge. Arguably, the impetus to move beyond a closed online course for Otis students was partially driven by administrative interest in raising the institutional profile of the college and increasing our online visibility.

Both the Instructional Designer and I enrolled in a few MOOCs to experience first-hand what it would be like. At the outset, we saw issues such as the length of video objects or an over dependence on video content that often featured a static instructor speaking into a camera, complicated work that was off-putting or difficult to achieve remotely, a lack of interaction with peers or faculty which in turn decreased student motivation, and complicated projects that learners could not achieve readily online. These experiences as well as our reading of many articles and attending multiple conference sessions allowed us to outline a clear set of goals for our MOOC as well as develop its structure. Collier (2013) outlined patterns within the population taking a MOOC. A majority she classified as explorers who early on will participate in discussions and will then drop off. A second majority were auditors who followed content, but typically did not engage in any types of activities or discussions. The third largest group dropped out due to time commitments, scheduling or because the content was too advanced. The smallest group was "very involved." Collier's information on participant types influenced the design of our MOOC in terms of keeping the course length short to avoid drastic declines in participation that can occur in later weeks, and remain freely navigable depending on interest and motivation. I decided specifically on five weeks based on the starting date, the amount of content that I already had and the projected amount that still needed to be produced. Participants could navigate openly throughout the five weeks, exploring each module independently or sequentially. No content would be blocked or hidden until a component had been completed. We emphasized that "open" nature in design recognizing that a vast majority of participants would likely fall into that "explorer" category. Furthermore, we discussed instructor engagement and what qualified as a reasonable time commitment. The course was listed for free with the intention of seeing how many individuals would enroll. The course would not be offered for

credit minimizing my involvement in grading coursework. It would be self-paced to offer the most flexibility to participants. I would leave general feedback in response to discussions and comment briefly on written student responses to weekly prompts. This approach would minimize my contact time, but still allow for feedback.

My proposal was accepted in mid-March of 2013 and the course was slated to begin in mid-June. I had only three months to prepare all the materials as well as carry on the requirements of my own job that included both administrative and teaching responsibilities.

My MOOC, *The Modern Genius: Art and Culture in the 19th Century*, was offered through Canvas.net, one of the newer and smaller platform providers through Instructure, making us one of only two art and design colleges offering a MOOC; the other was California Institute of the Arts which had recently offered courses through Coursera[6]. *The Modern Genius: Art and Culture in the 19th Century* attracted 817 students—not many by the Coursera and Udacity standards, but Canvas courses recommend closing at 1000 to support faculty engaging in a MOOC for the first time to keep that student population more manageable, and so these were quite respectable numbers. We had not used Canvas before on our campus, but were aware of the functionality through interactions with Canvas representatives at various conferences. We chose Canvas.net as our platform because it offered the most faculty support including a review by their in-house Instructional Designers and online courses on how to create a MOOC. We wanted a platform that was easy to use and met our aesthetic and technical needs.

Launching the MOOC was a collaborative process that went far beyond the creation of course content and this was new ground for me since, like most of the professoriate, I developed and delivered course content independently. Designing the MOOC required the assistance of both an Instructional Designer who handled all the technical aspects, uploading of content and formatting, organized the "to do" list, and liaised with Canvas.net, and the assistance of a video production manager who meshed my PowerPoint's with garage band voice-overs to turn them into videos, took care of the final editing, and posted the finished videos for the course on YouTube. There was no additional compensation for any of our preparation unlike some institutions or MOOC providers that designate and fund a team for producing online content that can easily expand to include filming and editing teams as well as recording and

---

[6] Three CalArts' classes were launched in Fall 2013: *Introduction to Programming for Digital Artists*, taught by Ajay Kapur, Ph.D, Director; *Music Technology: Interaction, Intelligence and Design* (MTIID) at CalArts; *Creating Site-Specific Dance and Performance Works*, led by Dean of CalArts Sharon Disney Lund School of Dance Stephan Koplowitz; and *Live!: A History of Art for Artists, Animators and Gamers*, with CalArts' Provost and Faculty in the School of Art Jeannene Przyblyski, Ph.D.

filming venues. Everything was accomplished in-house with existing personnel and resources; we added the MOOC preparation responsibilities to our existing work schedules. This was the only option at that time, but it is neither a desirable nor viable institutional model as MOOC development requires an investment of personnel, time and money at the outset.

The preparation for the MOOC was more demanding than any face-to-face class I have ever taught. It was complicated by the extremely short preparation period. Unlike some faculty who may be able to spend six months to a year designing and developing a MOOC [7], we accomplished everything in three months. Like most traditional face-to-face instructors, I was accustomed to a fifteen-week semester and, although students would have a complete syllabus with all assignments and readings from the start of the course, I still had the latitude to prepare and revise lecture material and class room activities within that time period. Teaching this MOOC required every lecture, video, PowerPoint, image, quiz, handout, reading, Internet link, and homework assignment-- everything to teach the class-- *in perfect shape and uploaded* the day the MOOC launched since we were allowing participants to navigate through the course content as they saw fit. We were concerned we might loose participants if the content was not available at the time they were exploring as they might not come back later.

Although the Bricks & Clicks course had prepared me for online pedagogy, it had not addressed the sheer volume of material needed to teach a MOOC. In my case that meant assigned reading and links to educational sites like Smarthistory and the Heilbrunn time line, quizzes and weekly writing responses, the creation of five Google Art Gallery modules, and learning objects. These learning object videos were the primary vehicle for content and they supplied the bulk of the visual imagery. I opted for learning objects based on PowerPoint slides with audio commentary rather than being filmed because I did not want to be the proverbial "talking head." With six videos already on YouTube, I knew making eight more would take about 150 hours to complete. That included researching and writing new scripts, locating images, making PowerPoint's, writing captions and often explanatory text or bullet points, before recording the voice over and handing that content to the video production manager.

Additionally, I also made a weekly impromptu video to address some of the more recurring misconceptions or assumptions that students were making without singling anyone out. Unlike the scripted and edited enhanced podcasts, these videos were casual, unscripted and less than ten minutes. My goal was to replicate the kind of commentary that occurs naturally in any face-to-face class through general classroom experience. I do not think it can be recreated online in

---

[7] Young (2012) in this article four professors share their experiences developing and teaching a MOOC.

a MOOC, nor is that entirely necessary, but since this was my first attempt, I wanted to make every effort to bridge that gap and, from the students' appreciative comments, I think the attempt was worthwhile.

Since student engagement with the material and each other was so important, I also developed weekly writing prompts and quizzes. This was not an online course being offered for credit so I could not require students to "do" anything. As the Instructional Designer reminded me, I was not being compensated and had limited time to devote in light of my other responsibilities. It was to my advantage to keep it a "low touch" course. Given the high enrollment, no one expected me to spend hours responding to students. Weekly writing prompts were optional and self-graded quizzes were acceptable solutions for encouraging student participation for those interested in engaging at that level while keeping the teaching load reasonable for me.

As I continued to meet with the Instructional Designer, it soon became apparent to us that we had to adjust our expectations, redefine what "success" meant within a MOOC context. Our goals and expectations were simple: we wanted to see how close to the 1,000 enrollment cap we came as that would indicate the overall popularity of our topic; we expected and targeted student participation in discussions and quizzes to be about 3% based on our research; and we were interested in how the online content was received and used by participants. We deliberately excluded an evaluation of "learning" within the MOOC because the short responses and weekly objective tests would not be accurate measurements of student mastery of complex material. In an online, for credit class the assignments would be more demanding, critiqued with a rubric, and would definitely involve research and a longer, more critical writing assignment. We were exploring the MOOC as open learning and as an opportunity to showcase the institution.

From my perspective, the weekly writing prompts turned out to be one of the most successful aspects of the course. Although the majority of students did not respond, there was a regular contingent of students who did write every week, sometimes more than once, occasionally commenting on another student's response. Overall, we had 510 student discussion posts, with a committed cohort of 40 students actively participating and responding consistently each week, and 740 quizzes submitted. Our student retention over all five weeks was roughly 15%, which exceeded our expectations. We calculated overall participation by looking at the number of participants who enrolled initially against the overall number of those who were still actively participating in discussions and quizzes Week 5.

What really mattered to us from a broad MOOCish perspective is that around 800 people took advantage of an educational opportunity they might not otherwise have had to access college level material on a subject that interested

them that was free, online, and self-paced whether they lived in California or China, whether they knew anything about art or came well prepared. I am reminded here of the keynote presentation that Daphne Koller, one of the Coursera founders, made at the WASC/ARC conference in May 2012. Her position was fairly straightforward. What was the value in keeping information from people who wanted and needed it but weren't enrolled students, might never be enrolled students? Given present technology, shouldn't these people have the opportunity to learn regardless of where they lived?

Content delivery is, however, quite different from learning which involves active engagement, reflection, application, critical thinking, questioning, and critique. It can be done alone; anyone doing independent research who has spent countless hours in a library or the equivalent drawing or drafting or designing or reworking the same project (and that encompasses just about everyone teaching in an art and design college classroom today) knows that sometimes learning is solitary, self-paced and still very rewarding. However, that is not the ideal way for most people to learn. The most successful online courses—and here I am thinking of courses with credit rather than MOOCs—are built around continuous student/faculty involvement: exercises, assignments, group activities and projects, collaboration, peer and faculty feedback. They take advantage of technology as an *aid* to learning, as a delivery system of information, but not as a one-way road to critically knowing and understanding any topic, subject, or discipline.

By the end of the course I realized that I had shifted my perception of MOOCs. I saw them more like cyberspace information pods, offering an array of disciplinary material, pedagogical practices, interesting assignments and projects with everything available at absolutely no cost to student or teacher. I found myself interested in how MOOCs can be adapted or customized to authentic learning and share space in a college curriculum, especially one designed around face-to-face learning. How could they be incorporated into my institution's current curriculum? How could my faculty utilize them? What would be the institutional or professional advantage to encouraging and funding faculty to design and deliver additional MOOCs? In other words, how could I hijack the MOOC?

HIJACKING THE MOOC: WHY? WHEN? HOW?

From the perspective of an administrator in an art and design college where close faculty involvement and hands on instruction are both expected and key to the educational experience, it made sense to re-conceptualize MOOCs as information sources rather than discrete courses targeting a global audience. Repositioning MOOCs as open educational resources that faculty and students can use and customize offsets the MOOC as a threat to faculty employment and offers faculty some advantageous options such as access to lectures from outstanding scholars

to innovative pedagogical approaches. Hijacking MOOCs would help address the growing interest in interdisciplinary instruction and critical thinking opportunities for faculty and institutions where financial resources often hamper team teaching options and guest lecturers. Essentially, I came to see MOOCs as free digital libraries where faculty and students can mine and integrate information into existing credit level classes.

There are two key advantages to hijacking the MOOC: the customization of disciplinary material and the pedagogy of active learning.

CUSTOMIZATION OF DISCIPLINARY MATERIAL

Although graduate training encourages the independent development of courses, we are all accustomed to casually sharing course ideas, lecture topics, readings, sources, and assignments with our colleagues. The Internet has expanded that practice to include many online sources from subscription databases, to YouTube, to disciplinary blogs, to educational resources such as *Smarthistory*. Perusing course syllabi, whether within a specific institutional Learning Management System or via the broader scope of an Internet search, is common practice for anyone interested in how colleagues are structuring their courses. Incorporating MOOC material in the form of lectures, readings, assignments or group activities that are accessible and free seems a logical extension of this practice. Rather than assign a chapter or article, faculty could direct students to a lecture, or series of lectures, on a specific topic as an alternative. Since so much weekly MOOC material is presented as a series of short (10-15 minute) lectures that are focused and specific, faculty can identify particular issues or positions that augment their own course content. This would not necessarily replace assigned readings, but students today are culturally acclimated to video presentations.

Accessing specific information that compliments course material, but is not particularly within the disciplinary expertise of faculty, is an obvious advantage of hijacking a MOOC. Faculty is expected to be expert in their field and courses are designed within disciplinary boundaries although that is somewhat counterintuitive to how ideas and events occur. An art historian teaching a survey course on Modern Art is not expected to have the same familiarity with corresponding advances in science, music, and literature any more than a historian teaching 20th century history is expected to have more than a nodding acquaintance with Modern Art movements and critique. Accessing MOOC material would add a higher level of interdisciplinary information and give students the opportunity to hear expert voices in other fields.

This is dicey ground that I am treading. Lectures are sacrosanct and faculty guard the right to "tell the students what they need to know," but technology is changing what and how we access information and our expectations about content delivery. There are many advantages to face-to-face learning, but

sitting in a classroom for an hour or more listening to an uninspired lecture is counterproductive to student engagement, especially students who increasingly expect information delivery to be both valuable and engaging. That model of "listen and write" is not a burden when the professor is brilliant and captivating, but this is not always the case. Additionally, students seem increasingly less inclined to sit and listen to class length lectures as the primary method of accessing new information. MOOC lectures are generally presented in short, topic specific modules, often accompanied by questions or a complimentary assignment. Students can access the material on their own time and pause or replay the lecture, which is a definite advantage for many students, especially non-native speakers who often need more time to understand the material.

There are various ways instructors could use MOOCs. Students and their instructor in a credit course would also enroll in one or more MOOCs. It could be a MOOC on the same topic as the class or a complementary one—consider pairing a Renaissance Art History course with a Political Science and a Literature course. Faculty would select the relevant lectures/readings/assignments and they would become part of their for credit course in much the same way that we link students to online readings. Much like inviting a guest lecturer or having a panel of speakers come to class, hijacking a MOOC means that instructors can mine them for relevant information that addresses their individual course goals, and supplements their own lecture and reading materials. Hijacking the MOOC means that faculty could more easily offer interdisciplinary courses without the added expense incurred for team teaching or guest lecturers. MOOC lectures may include information that is not necessarily available or as accessible in books or articles, and expose students to different positions on the same subject or issue. Although faculty may encounter logistical challenges depending on how far in advance courses are listed by MOOC providers and they will certainly need to review the material, I think that the advantages far outweigh the inconvenience.

I think the opportunity for exposure and sharing of interdisciplinary content is one of the most compelling reasons behind hijacking the MOOC since teaching students to be critical thinkers includes exposing them to different points of view. Assigning readings to that end is the typical way that faculty address diversity of position, but increasingly listening to the actual person, putting a face and a style to the information is more engaging for many students. Often, lecture material is presented in more accessible ways and that is helpful to undergraduates, especially the digital native generation, who are interested in not only the content but also the delivery system. MOOCs are free, and so students could also participate in this practice either individually or with a group. As long as the information is free, MOOCs function much like libraries or databases, offering college level information along with an array of college professors. For students today who are accustomed to accessing information through videos and

websites rather than an exclusive focus on print, MOOCs seem a natural source of information without undermining or challenging professorial authority. They may even be more appealing as a research source for undergraduates in lower division introductory courses who are often frustrated with scholarly sources in books and journals that are too complex. That same information may be easier to understand and access when it appears in short video lectures.

THE ACTIVE CLASSROOM OR FLIPPING THE CLASS

Flipping the classroom basically means putting lecture material online as part of class homework and using class time for active learning rather than passive listening. This means a shift from a traditional classroom environment where students sit, listen, and take notes to one in which the classroom time and space becomes an area of engaged involvement. Perhaps the single greatest difference is that in an active learning situation, students can and should be speaking and interacting as much as the instructor. Students in a flipped classroom access course content online, which can range from written lectures to enhanced podcasts, and can include links to readings and websites as well. There are pedagogical advantages[8] to flipping the classroom, to eliminating the traditional lecture based format and shifting to activities such as group work, problem based learning projects/assignments, peer to peer learning, and presentations. Dedicating class time to lecturing is the traditional academic information delivery system, although presentation styles run the gamut from riveting to reading notes in a monotone for an hour. Professors hope students take copious notes (somewhat problematic given the array of mobile devices and student tendency to surf the net during class) and ask questions. The latter is problematic as well. Large lecture classes, especially introductory courses, where the material is completely new are not necessarily the best venues for learning. Students are simultaneously listening, taking notes, trying to understand the material, and are still expected to formulate and raise questions. The situation can change dramatically when students walk into a class already familiar with the lecture content assigned as homework. As discussed in Enfield (2013), students have had time to read, critically engage the material and, perhaps, respond to a writing prompt that can vary from an essay response to posting questions.

The "flipped classroom" is an active classroom with engaged learning. Rather than lecturing, instructors dedicate significantly more class time to discussion, group work, critical supplementary material, projects and presentations. For an art and design college this would align the learning

---

[8] Bonamici (2013) offers an overview of the value of a flipped class in repurposing class time into a workshop where students can inquire about lecture content, test their skills in applying knowledge, and interact in hands-on activities.

environment of Liberal Studies courses with their studio counterparts, who are already using the Beaux Arts model, and offer the hands on learning experience associated with Problem Based Learning,[9] which is frequently used in Math and Science departments as discussed in Savery (2006). In a roundabout way, MOOCs may very well be an encouragement to faculty to redesign their classroom around "less talk, more action."

Increasingly, I think we are going to see a shift to faculty making podcasts or videos and uploading their lectures as homework (or accessing MOOCs) and using classroom time to rethink teaching. I do not see that as a negative consequence, although I do recognize that it is going to impact how we train, hire, and evaluate faculty. The potential for faculty being replaced with a Coursera course taught by an Ivy League professor was the fear factor that MOOCs initially raised among faculty. I strongly doubt that the future of education and educators will be so narrowly focused. Nevertheless, there is no reason not to take advantage of courses taught by prestigious faculty which is where the wise strategy of hijacking the MOOC comes into play. It makes far better sense to use that MOOC content, assign it as homework, and then turn your classroom into the space for commentary, supplementary instruction, critical thinking activities and authentic learning. MOOCs are essentially repositories of information, just like libraries, and any professor can learn how to use and manipulate them as sources.

CONCLUSION

What does the future of "hijacking the MOOC" offer to Otis faculty and other faculty beyond the obvious informational source? What kinds of issues will MOOCs, hijacked or not, raise for faculty?

Much like educational blogs, college websites, and self-publishing, MOOCs offer an intriguing new platform for scholarly exchange in the digital age where the internet is increasingly a space for sharing knowledge outside of more traditional publication venues. At the very least, developing and teaching a MOOC is one way to showcase your disciplinary expertise and particular pedagogical approaches to topics. While some academics may raise the specter of intellectual property as in Porter (2013), I think it is more realistic to recognize that material covered in lectures is no longer exclusive to time and space, the nature of ownership changes as discussed in Rivard (2013). This kind of "lecture" information has already been documented and circulated in student recordings, lecture notes—informally or sold—and YouTube videos. The notion that

---

[9] Savery (2006) distinguished Problem Based Learning models as instructional (and curricular) learner-centered approaches that empower learners to conduct research, integrate theory and practice, and apply knowledge and skills to develop a viable solution to a defined problem.

information should be protected and doled out to specific audiences in particular courses and colleges is increasingly difficult to defend and no longer consistent with the prevailing educational focus on critical thinking, analysis, and communication.[10]

As the Internet increasingly becomes a venue for scholarly exchange, MOOC courses will also have the advantage of enhancing institutional visibility because all MOOC courses clearly identify the institutional affiliation of the instructor and that was certainly a consideration for my college. As the Internet increasingly becomes an accepted space for scholarly exchange, it seems reasonable to assume that more academics will want a cyberspace presence and MOOCs are one way to accomplish that.

As MOOC providers increase their courses in number and disciplinary range, as faculty and students take advantage of the free content, and as accreditation agencies determine how college credit can be determined, the natural consequence would be a growing interest, if not institutional support for more faculty to develop MOOCs. The extensive preparation and expense needed to develop a MOOC remain inevitable issues for faculty and institutions. Fain (2013) notes that "while most Coursera partners have deep pockets, the courses come with costs, including a professor's time and salaries for videographers and other assistants who help run the courses. At the University of Washington, for example, creating a MOOC for Coursera costs about $15,000 to $30,000, said David Szatmary, the university's vice provost of educational outreach."

As noted earlier, my MOOC was developed within the existing job responsibilities of everyone involved and with minimal compensation,[11] but that is not, nor should be a feasible working model for faculty. That may very well limit those able to make MOOCs to institutions able to receive grant funds or willing to fund development and production costs. It may also influence faculty selection to those who offer the best MOOC fit, both in terms of time, content, organization, and presentation. This may work to the advantage of faculty who can arrange funding or course release time, are committed to rethinking and revising their current lecture material into video or podcast format, and project appealing, even charismatic, onscreen personalities. While it is somewhat heretical to raise the specter of personality or self-presentation as criteria for consideration in an academic activity, we do live in a media influenced culture. Everything from TED Talks and Khan Academy to professionally produced

---

[10] Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) announced 2012/2013 five core competencies for higher educational institutions to address as part of the accreditation process: Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning and Written Communication.

[11] I did receive a $1200 stipend to make the first six Modern Art Learning Objects, but they were developed for the college before the MOOC proposal.

videos shape our perceptions and assumptions on how information can be effectively disseminated, and everyone remembers the agony of sitting through a required lecture delivered by an accomplished scholar who is not also an effective speaker.[12]

MOOCs produce more questions than answers, more opportunities than fixed paths. They are not for everyone (faculty or students); nor do they offer the silver bullet to mass education. Nevertheless, it is impossible to put this genie back into the bottle. The extraordinary publicity MOOCs created with their dramatic entrée into online education, their Ivy League associations, the on-going dialogue about accessible learning, alternative learning models and the ubiquitous influence of the Internet in all areas of academe has guaranteed MOOCs standing room at least in the classroom. As faculty, we have an opportunity to shape the MOOC and ensure its quality. Rather than approach MOOCs as a fait accompli or reject them as the end of authentic learning, faculty and institutions need to consider how to participate in them, which may very well mean hijacking the MOOC and using it to our advantage to further enhance and engage our students.

As this goes to press, I have agreed to teach my MOOC for a third time. Obviously, there is relatively little preparation at this point so my focus can be on responding to writing prompts. If possible, it would be worthwhile to include an option for a longer writing assignment, perhaps one that includes some research aspect. This would mean preparing some material on information literacy and providing a rubric for written communication and critical thinking. It would offer interested students the opportunity to move beyond the course material, apply what they have heard in the podcasts, and share their positions with the class. From my college's perspective, running the MOOC a third time increases the educational and institutional opportunities. As an art historian and an educator, I am interested in exploiting the MOOCs' potential and meshing the best of face-to-face teaching to reach an audience of students who occupy my classroom in cyberspace.

REFERENCES

(2012) Stanford U. Releases New Open-Source Online-Education Platform. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved September 13, 2012, from http://chronicle.com/blogs/ wiredcampus.html

(2013-2014) *Common Data Set*. (Rep. No. 6). Los Angeles, California: Otis College of Art & Design, Registration and Admissions Office.

Bender, Diane M., & Vredevoogd, Jon D. (2006). Using Online Education Technologies to Support Studio Instruction. *Journal of Educational*

---

[12] Randy Pausch's (2007) last lecture "Achieving Your Childhood Dream" is an example of a dramatic and engaging speaking style that translates to video.

Technology & Society, Vol. 9. (pp.114-122). Retrieved March 1, 2014, from http://www.ifets.info/ journals/9_4/10.pdf.

Collier, Amy. (2013, February). *You Can't Stop the Signal Mal and Other Great Lessons From Stanford MOOCs.* Paper presented at Educause Learning Initiative, Denver, CO.

Bonamici, Andrew, Diaz,Veronica, McDaniel, Sarah, Getman, Joan, & O'Neill, Edward R. 7 Things you should read about flipped classrooms. *Educause Learning Initiative (ELI).* Retrieved August 8, 2013, from http://www.educause.edu/library/resources.html

Enfield, Jacob. (2013). Looking at the impact of the flipped classroom model of instruction on undergraduate multimedia students at CSUN. *Tech Trends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning,* 57(6), 14-27.

Fain, Paul. (2013). Paying for Proof. *Inside Higher Education.* Retrieved March 12, 2014, from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013.html

Jaschik, Scott. (2013). MOOC Mess. *Inside Higher Education.* Retrieved March 23, 2014, from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013

Lewin, Tamar. (2012). College of Future Could Be Come One, Come All. *The New York Times.* Retrieved February 20, 2014, from http://www.nytimes.com

Pausch, Randy. (2007). Last Lecture: Achieving Your Childhood Dreams. *Carnegie Mellon.* Retrieved December 5, 2010, from https://www.youtube.com/

Porter, James. (2013). MOOCs, "Courses," and the Question of Faculty and Student Copyrights. *The CCCC-IP Annual: Top Intellectual Property Development of 2012.* Retrieved October 10, 2014, from http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CCCC/ Committees/TopIP2012Collection.html

Rivard, Ry. (2013). Who Owns a MOOC? *Inside Higher Education.* Retrieved March 20, 2013, from http://www.insidehighered.com

Savery, John R. (2006) Overview of Problem-based Learning: Definitions and Distinctions. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning.* 1(1). 9-19. Retrieved April 5, 2012, from http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/ijpbl/vol1/iss1/3/.html

Sheldon, Kathryn Elizabeth. (2009). International trends and techniques used to teach studio art courses through distance education. *Masters Abstracts International.* Retrieved March 3, 2014, from http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost

Venturini, Jean-Marie. (2013). The Mad Mad MOOCs. Otis Blogosphere. Retrieved February 1, 2014, from http://blogs.otis.edu/library/2013

Venturini, Jean-Marie. (2014). Enough About MOOCs. Otis Blogosphere. Retrieved February 2, 2014, from http://blogs.otis.edu/library/2014

Young, Jeffrey. (2012). 4 Professors Discuss Teaching Free Online Courses for Thousands of Students. Retrieved February 2, 2014, from http://chronicle.com/article/4-Professors-Discuss-Teaching/132125/

---

[i] **Dr. Parme Giuntini**: After completing her doctorate at the University of California, Los Angeles, with a focus on eighteenth century English portraiture, gender and domestic representation, Parme Giuntini joined the faculty of Otis College of Art and Design in 1995. In 2003 she became the Assistant Chair of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Otis College of Art and Design and began directing the Art History program. She has been instrumental in teaching, designing, and supervising courses that address both fine art and visual culture. Her involvement with studio faculty from the Otis School of Fashion led to an interdisciplinary collaboration with Kathryn Hagen, who was directed the Illustration program there, and resulted in the 2007 publication of GARB: A Fashion and Culture Reader. For the past five years her scholarly focus has been curriculum design, educational technology, and pedagogy for both traditional and online learning environments. She has designed and taught Art History MOOCS for Canvas and is a contributing editor to Art History Teaching Resources.org. She is currently working on an essay for The Early-Modern Child in Art and History, ed. Matthew Averett which will be published by Pickering and Chatto.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Parme Giuntini, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Otis College of Art and Design, Los Angeles, CA, 90045, United States. Contact: pgiuntini@otis.edu.