**Historical and Contemporary Synopsis of the Development of Field
Education Guidelines in BSW, MSW and Doctoral Programs**

The Evolution of Building Community Among Faculty on Virtual and Ground Campuses

George, Schwartz, and Parga

The use of internet technology in the delivery of social work education is a rapidly evolving phenomenon. As of 2016, over 80% of accredited Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) and Master of Social Work (MSW) programs around the United States offer some form of hybrid or online programming (Robbins, Coe Regan, Herbert Williams, Smyth, & Bogo, 2016). Faculty in some virtual education programs can live far from campus, teaching courses, hosting office hours, and attending faculty meetings through online platforms. In these types of education models, remote faculty often face unique challenges for facilitating connections with the ground campus and building community with colleagues.

Community, in the context of the work environment, refers to employee sense that one belongs to the wider population of people all working to achieve the organizational mission and vision. Employee sense of community and connectedness plays an important role in the development of morale, work engagement, productivity, and commitment to organizational goal achievement (Schwartz, Weiss. & Wiley, 2018; Schwartz, Wiley. & Kaplan, 2016). Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder's (2002) Community of Practice Model addresses the many roles played by organizational communities in facilitating knowledge management, learning innovation, and outcome achievement.

Community building in hybrid workspaces or within a network of remote employees requires the use of techniques that differ from traditional, fully ground-based organizations. For example, meeting documents must be electronically distributed rather than handed out during meetings, and technologically sophisticated rooms must be able to manage workgroups during meeting times in order to facilitate the inclusion, engagement, and participation of virtual employees. Wenger et al. (2002) offer several insights into building effective communities of practice in geographically distributed communities that include building structures and processes that promote connections and community building.

Nine schools within a large private University provide online education with varying modalities of asynchronous (self-paced) and synchronous (live web-cam facilitated class sessions or minimal in person) delivery. Through these programs a combination of over 100 degrees or certificates are offered for students both nationally and internationally. Each program is structured with faculty residing near campus or remotely throughout the country.

The largest online school within the University launched their online graduate program in 2010. The school employs close to 50 full time faculty and over 200 part-time remote faculty, who are geographically dispersed throughout the United States. As a rule initially, faculty who lived within a 50 mile radius of the campus were required to commute and attend meetings and events physically in person, while remote faculty were provided a live stream option sometimes without audio rights or video access. The solutions provided to remote faculty in meetings or events included to text a colleague physically present, watch the recording, and email questions. As the online programming and student body continued to grow, these types of bandaid approaches to remote faculty inclusion were not enough. Remote faculty realized their participation and connection to the campus community required additional technology and effort so they could participate in meetings in real time.

In the fall of 2015, in an attempt to integrate remote faculty who lived 50 miles away from campus and beyond, Hybrid Meeting Protocols were developed and disseminated. The protocols included the rationale and purpose of said guidelines and specifics on how to facilitate hybrid meetings beginning from days before the meeting, the day of the meeting, and during the

Stephanie George, EdD, MSW, Director MSW at University of Denver
Sara Schwartz, PhD, MSW, is a Clinical Assistant Professor at University of Southern California
Jen Parga, MSW, is a Clinical Assistant Professor at University of Southern California

meeting. Specific examples include making sure remote participants have any documents emailed ahead of time which will be shared during the meeting, being mindful of camera placement and the presenter's backside, doing introductions of all virtual and in room guests so everyone is aware of who is 'in the room', etc. The hope of the protocols was to literally connect folks who had historically been isolated because of their remote status and create a meeting experience which would foster connection between both ground and remote faculty.

As more meetings and events began to offer remote faculty access (visual, audio. or both), the disparity between the quality of a meeting following the Hybrid Meeting Protocols became more apparent. The irony of on campus folks hosting and managing hybrid meetings is that most had not participated in a hybrid meeting as a virtual participant. The facilitator's ability to effectively manage attendees in a physical space and in a virtual space directly impacted the effectiveness and outcome of the meeting. The technology available on campus began to impact whether or not remote faculty were able to attend; it was no longer a personnel issue but an organizational issue. The authors, after one particularly challenging hybrid meeting, decided to start their own virtual programming. The following is an overview of the authors' attempt to build community among remote faculty and the outcomes from each program.

In the fall of 2016, the authors realized connection to community for both faculty and students extended beyond proper connection to a hybrid meeting. Connection had to bring people together in both formal and informal ways that reflected opportunities provided on campus. Several initiatives were launched in 2016, including, "Connect over Coffee" (aka, Virtual Water Cooler) and the Virtual Impact Panel (VIP). Connect over Coffee provided a shared space in an online platform to come together to have informal interactions and conversation. The aim was for faculty to be able to have connections that would normally be made on campus in a break room or stopping by someone's office as you walk down the hall. More detail on the design

and process of Connect over Coffee (Virtual Water Cooler) can be found in "Redefining the Water Cooler: Relationship Building and Collaboration in Virtual Education" (Parga, Schwartz, & George, 2018). The Virtual Impact Panel brought faculty and students together around a specific social topic with a panel of presenters and audience participation with questions, comments, and reflection. In developing these initiatives, the authors paid close attention to the remote audience being able to have two-way communication so their perspective of only being able to "watch" was improved.

After the first semester of offering several Connect over Coffee, the authors noticed that remote faculty looked to the hosts of the virtual room to start the conversation or deliver an agenda. Coming together to have informal conversation organically posed a challenge. The authors surveyed faculty on their initial experience participating in Connect over Coffee and received peer feedback on changes to improve the time together. The following semester, dates and times of Connect over Coffee with guiding topics were sent out to faculty. Pop-up sessions were also provided, giving faculty space to talk about current political events or other national news stories that impacted our nation, school, profession, or personal lives. Providing these sessions to remote faculty who were normally electronically isolated, or "e-solated," began to create a stronger sense of community and connection.

The initial Virtual Impact Panel brought faculty and students together to watch a short documentary on racism followed by a discussion with the writer-producer. This event mirrored campus-based documentary viewings that remote students and faculty did not have the opportunity to attend. An invitation and RSVP were sent out to the remote student body with the date and time of the documentary viewing and question/answer segment. The authors provided a link to the documentary for participants to watch on their own and also played the documentary through screen sharing on the virtual platform. Following the documentary, the writer-producer of the film spoke to his inspiration of the story and answered

questions of participants. While the intention of the documentary was appreciated, the authors encountered several challenges hosting the event, such as slow internet connection creating spotty viewing of the film and small student turn out (despite an initial large RSVP response).

Hearing feedback that remote students and faculty still voiced interest in having virtual events available to them, the authors continued with Virtual Impact Panels throughout the academic year. Topics hosted in a virtual panel format included HIV Awareness, Invis-Ability, and Veterans Experiencing Homelessness. To further promote remote student and faculty inclusion, the authors worked with various school committees to ensure a virtual option was available mirroring campus-based events. Virtual presence grew within the school as virtual book and journal clubs were created as well as virtual participation in the annual campus walk-a-thon and reflection sessions held for remote students after an annual All School Day event. If a campus-based initiative was being launched, the authors were the voices asking and advocating for how it could be done virtually.

The aforementioned programming built community between remote faculty which extended beyond state and faculty lines; however, at a more institutional level, requesting others to include virtual access to meetings, events, or services was not making any significant headway. In 2019, the authors shifted their focus from creating opportunities to build community between remote and campus-based faculty within their own department to exploring the possibilities for an institutional level integration of remote faculty. For example, the authors offered technical support and consultation for another department's first hybrid event, even offering the other department the use of their virtual classrooms and their department's IT services.

Those at the University, intentionally or not, had not acted in a way which demonstrated they had ever thought about including remote faculty. There was more of an effort to connect campus to campus faculty, but this effort never encompassed faculty who could not physically be on a campus.

This effort occurred across departments and services across the University: Center for Excellence in Research; the Provost Office; Human Resources; Center for Excellence in Teaching; Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Office; etc. The request to virtually attend or make events and/or services virtually accessible were met with various responses: we don't have the IT bandwith to successfully do this, we are not focusing on virtual attendance, we want to promote in person networking, we can record the session, etc.

One author was able to sit on and eventually co-chair a University Committee which explored the technology needs of faculty. One of the collective needs the Committee for FY18-19 focused on was identifying the capacity of various collaborative platforms. As a result, the committee reviewed and tested a different platform every month and provided feedback on ease of use, meeting capacity, sharing documents, etc. The year end result was that Zoom and Microsoft Teams seemed to be the most accessible. There is currently a proposal in with the Provost to make a formal adoption of one or both of these collaborative platforms. Creating a formal adoption of a technology platform built to host virtual meetings would alleviate some of the challenges of technology accessibility.

As an educational institution operating in a time where 43% of the workforce is working remotely (Chokshi, 2017), it seems imperative to connect local and remote faculty and understand how to prepare graduates to have the capacity to think about clients, co-workers, and eventually leadership which may or may not arrive in their office every day.

References

Chokshi, N. (2017, February 15, 2017). Out of the office: More people are working remotely, survey finds. *The New York Times*, p. 15.

Parga, J., Schwartz, S. L., & George, S. (2018). Redefining the water cooler: Relationship building and collaboration in virtual education. *Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education*, 21(1), 61-64.

Robbins, S. P., Coe Regan, J. R., Herbert Williams, J., Smyth, N. J., & Bogo, M. (2016). From the Editor: The future of social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 52(4).

Schwartz, S. L., Weiss, E. L., & Wiley, J. L. (2018). Innovative strategies for community building among faculty who teach in virtual environments. *Advances in Social Work*, 18(4), 1103-1112. doi:18060/21619.

Schwartz, S. L., Wiley, J. L., & Kaplan, C. D. (2016). Community building in a virtual teaching environment. *Advances in Social Work*, 17(1), 15-30. doi:18060/20875.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.