DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.33846/hn40801
http://heanoti.com/index.php/hn

RESEARCH ARTICLE
URL of this article: http://heanoti.com/index.php/hn/article/view/hn40801

Challenges in Nursing Education in The New Normal: Basis For Faculty Enhancement Program

Edmelyn B. Cacayan[1], Ma. Elizabeth C. Baua,[2], Angelito E. Alvarado[3(CA)]
[1]Dean, Isabela State University, College of Nursing, Echague, Isabela, Philippines
[2]Program Coordinator of Graduate School and Faculty, St. Paul University Philippines, Tuguegarao City, Philippines
[3(CA)]Graduate School Student in PhD in Nursing Science, St. Paul University Philippines / Assistant Professor – I, Isabela State University, College of Nursing, Echague, Isabela, Philippines; docgel15@gmail.com (Corresponding Authors)

ABSTRACT

Education s vital to every Filipino especially the delivery of quality education without compromising the health and safety of the students amidst COVID 19 pandemic. With the current global health crisis and government pronouncements prohibiting the conduct of face-to-face classes both in basic education (DepEd) and Higher education (CHED). Isabela State University has decided to roll out and launched its new approach, called telEducation. It has ramped up its efforts in fully implementing flexible remote learning for its students to ease its transition to what might become the new normal for educational institutions. This study utilized a descriptive survey method of investigation to secure adequate and reliable data. The researcher used this design to gather necessary data, assess and determine the challenges facing nursing education in the new normal by the nursing faculty of Isabela State University, College of Nursing. The questionnaires were floated through the use of google forms as a platform. The respondents who participated in this study were 15 nursing faculty comprises of 7 permanent as core faculty and 8 instructors under a contract of service. This study concluded that inadequate instructor training for new normal education; limited time for the preparation of modules, exams, and other related to instruction is due to the limited time of the university administrators or concern authorities to conduct since the summer class has already implemented. The said interventions made it more difficult to conduct due to the implementing community quarantines. Furthermore, there are numerous nursing-related experiences/activities but limited time for implementation; Students find it difficult to comprehend some activities due to the absence of physical contact of the instructor/s; faculty experiencing physical problems (eg. eye strain and frontal headache) due to long hours of exposure on computer monitor or gadgets are noted concerns in relation to the delivery of instructions.

Keywords: nursing education; new normal; challenges

INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the keys for generations of Filipinos to become full-fledged, globally, and locally competitive, most of all to be productive members of society. New normal is a state of which economy, society, school, and other concerns settle following a crisis like the COVID-19 pandemic. This is why our country, the Philippine government specifically the Commission on Higher Education and Department of Education is looking at how they will go back to school this coming first semester School Year 2020 – 2021 without compromising the safety and health of the students. Educators are plagued by challenges as they come closer to that date of school opening. To address quarantine issues, the government with the collaboration of different sectors or department concerns proposed a flat form as a response to pursue education amidst the pandemic. Blended learning approaches such as the use of modules as instructional materials and online classes were introduced as a medium of instruction both in Higher education (HEI's) and Basic Education (DepEd). Teachers were trained to use these new avenues or modalities for education which was started last July. However, while the government is preparing for a massive shift in education, a big question to ask is if schools are ready and

prepared for the school opening this August. It all comes down to two major concerns: Internet connectivity, and the issue of the curriculum and educational materials that have to be adapted for use with a blended learning environment. Access to educational materials through the Internet doesn't worth much if the Internet itself is inaccessible due to lack of service or network infrastructure. Be it through provisions for budget, equipment, and commercial access to the Internet much has to be done to improve digital connectivity throughout the country. It would also be important to fast track the implementation of RA 10929, otherwise known as the Free Internet Access in Public Places Act, which mandates that public basic education institutions, state universities and colleges (SUCs), and Tesda technology institutions have free Wi-fi access.

According to Graham[(1)], blended learning (BL), or the integration of face-to-face and online instruction, is a widely adopted across higher education with some scholars referring to it as the "new traditional model"[(2)] or the "new normal" in course delivery[(3)]. The 2017 New Media Consortium Horizon Report found out that blended learning designs were one of the short term forces driving technology adoption in higher education in the next 1–2 years[(4)]. Also, blended learning is one of the key issues in teaching and learning in the EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative's 2017 annual survey of higher education[(5)]. As institutions begin to examine BL instruction, there is a growing research interest in exploring the implications for both faculty and students. This modality is creating a community of practice built on a singular and pervasive research question, "How is blended learning impacting the teaching and learning environment?" That question continues to gain traction as investigators study the complexities of how BL interacts with cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of student behavior, and examine its transformation potential for the academy. Those issues are so compelling that several volumes have been dedicated to assembling the research on how blended learning can be better understood[(6)(7)(8)(9)(10)(11)(12)] and at least one organization, the Online Learning Consortium, sponsored an annual conference solely dedicated to blended learning at all levels of education and training (2004–2015). These initiatives address blended learning in a wide variety of situations. For instance, the contexts range over K-12 education, industrial and military training, conceptual frameworks, transformational potential, authentic assessment, and new research models. Further, many of these resources address students' access, success, withdrawal, and perception of the degree to which blended learning provides an effective learning environment.

Currently, the United States faces a widening educational gap between our underserved student population and those communities with greater financial and technological resources[(13)]. Equal access to education is a critical need, one that is particularly important for those in our underserved communities. Can blended learning help increase access thereby alleviating some of the issues faced by our lower-income students while resulting in improved educational equality? Although most indicators suggest "yes"[(6)], it seems that, at the moment, the answer is still "to be determined." The Quality of education presents a big challenge, evidenced by many definitions of what constitutes its fundamental components[(14)]. Although progress has been made by initiatives, such as Quality Matters[(15)],

Blended learning forces us to consider the characteristics of digital technology, in general, and information communication technologies (ICTs), more specifically. Floridi[(16)] suggests an answer proffered by Alan Turing: that digital ICTs can process the information on their own, in some sense just as humans and other biological life. ICTs can also communicate information to each other, without human intervention, but as linked processes designed by humans. We have evolved to the point where humans are not always "in the loop" of technology, but should be "on the loop"[(16)], designing and adapting the process. We perceive our world more and more in informational terms, and not primarily as physical entities[(17)]. Increasingly, the educational world is dominated by information and our economies rest primarily on that asset. So our world is also blended, and it is blended so much that we hardly see the individual components of the blend any longer. Floridi argues that the world has become an "infosphere" (like biosphere) where we live as "inforgs." What is real for us is shifting from the physical and unchangeable to those things with which we can interact.

Floridi also helps us to identify the next blend in education, involving ICTs or specialized artificial intelligence[(16)(18)]. According to Balfour[(19)], learning analytics, adaptive learning, calibrated peer review, and automated essay scoring is advanced processes that, provided they are good interfaces, can work well with the teacher— allowing him or her to concentrate on human attributes such as being caring, creative, and engaging in problem-solving. This can, of course, as with all technical advancements, be used to save resources and augment the role of the teacher. For instance, if artificial intelligence can be used to work along with teachers, allowing them more time for personal feedback and mentoring with students, then, we will have made a transformational breakthrough. The Edinburg University manifesto for teaching online says bravely, "Automation need not impoverish education – we welcome our robot colleagues"[(20)]. If used wisely, they will teach us more about ourselves, and about what is truly human in education. This emerging blend wills also affect curricular and policy questions, such as what? and what for? The new normal for education will be in perpetual flux. Floridi's philosophy offers us tools to understand and be in control and not just sit by and watch what happens. In many respects, he has addressed the new normal for blended learning.

According to Garrison and Kanuka[(21)] and Picciano[(22)], several investigators have assembled an inclusive agenda of transformative and ground-breaking research issues for blended learning that can enhance

effectiveness. Generally, research has found that BL results in an improvement in student success and satisfaction[6][23][24], as well as an improvement in students' sense of community[25] when compared with face-to-face courses. Those who have been most successful at blended learning initiatives stress the importance of institutional support for course redesign and planning[26][27][22][28]. The evolving research questions found in the literature are long and demanding, with varied definitions of what constitutes "blended learning," facilitating the need for continued and in-depth research on instructional models and support needed to maximize achievement and success[27][29].

The impact of blended learning environments and its relationship to learning effectiveness[30][31][32][33][24][34]. Each of these studies has found small to moderate positive effect sizes in favor of blended learning when compared to fully online or traditional face-to-face environments. However, there are several considerations essential in these studies that impact our understanding of the generalizability of outcomes.

Dziuban and colleagues[6] analyzed the meta-analyses conducted by Means and her colleagues[24][33], concluding that their methods were impressive as evidenced by exhaustive study inclusion criteria and the use of scale-free effect size indices. The conclusion, in both papers, was that there was a modest difference in multiple outcome measures for courses featuring online modalities—in particular, blended courses. However, with blended learning especially, there are some concerns with these kinds of studies. First, the effect sizes indicating that there is nothing else going on in the blending that might confound the results. Although the blended learning articles[33] were carefully scrutinized, the assumption of independence is weak. There is an additional concern with blended learning as well. Blends are not equivalent because of the manner on which they are configured. For instance, a careful reading of the sources used in the Means, et al. papers will identify, at minimum, the following blending techniques: laboratory assessments, online instruction, e-mail, class web sites, computer laboratories, mapping and scaffolding tools, computer clusters, interactive presentations and e-mail, handwriting capture, evidence-based practice, electronic portfolios, learning management systems, and virtual apparatuses. These are not equivalent ways in which to configure courses, and such non-equivalence constitutes the confounding we describe. We argue here that, in actuality, blended learning is a general construct in the form of a boundary object[35] rather than a treatment effect in the statistical sense. That is an idea or concept that can support a community of practice, but is weakly defined fostering disagreement in the general group. Conversely, it is stronger in individual constituencies. For instance, content disciplines (i.e. education, rhetoric, optics, mathematics, and philosophy) formulate a more precise definition because of commonly embraced teaching and learning principles.

Many schools today face similar problems and challenges. All stakeholders should work together to provide training opportunities for learners to prepare them for the future[36]. Access to students and teachers in learning material and technology is an important issue worldwide. In this respect, they need culturally appropriate learning materials and technologies. For this new approach, which is thought to have an important potential for improving student learning by people who do research and practice in the field of blended learning, it is thought that it would be more appropriate to collaborate and develop universally. For this purpose, it is important to carry out detailed studies for each region to obtain specific information about the regional problems and specific solutions for each region, as well as to make transitions between different contexts. BL applications in different parts of the world develop various perspectives on common BL problems that can be applied and adapted to various contexts. Thus, more efficient improvements and better educational opportunities will be provided for students all over the world[37]. Although there is a wide variation of BL applications worldwide, there are also strategic similarities. Graham[1] stated that BL can be evaluated in three categories: (1) enabling blends (i.e., focus on addressing issues of access and convenience), (2) enhancing blends, and (3) transforming blends (i.e., blends that allow for a radical transformation of the pedagogy).

Academic institutions around the world are using Online Campus primarily in three ways: to quickly and easily add new online courses – and even whole subject areas – to their catalogs to attract and serve more students; to support faculty with more digital resources to incorporate into their classes; and to provide lifelong learning opportunities to faculty, staff, and alumni.

Faculty feedbacks differ as they turned to this medium from never having taught online before. Many have embraced it and are never going back, while others cannot wait to go back to the traditional approach. Based on the faculty that I have interviewed for example a colleague who, having revolved to remote teaching halfway through the semester, mentioned that his first online lecture was the most engaging lecture he'd given in the entire semester. There were more students attending class, they were more engaged and asked more questions, laughed (via emojis) at his jokes. And of course, they would retain the knowledge better as they would be able to revisit the lecture as many times as they needed, from anywhere, or at any time[38].

The challenges of blended learning are not entirely unique to blended learning. Culture, technology, infrastructure, and skills are challenges faced by learning professionals in general. Blended learning is not easy to adopt. Developing learning staff knowledge and skills, learning authority, funding, sufficient technology support and infrastructure, administration, resources, and change management all have to be addressed to

overcome the challenges associated with blended learning. There are many reasons that an instructor or learner might pick blended learning over other learning options.

The case for the effectiveness of blended learning derives from the observation that such courses offer students a greater range of affordances that enhance the learning experience beyond that of either online or face-to-face modes alone. Support is offered by Ramsden,[39] who argued that blended environments increase student choice and this can lead to improved learning. Oliver and Trigwell[40] also suggest that a blended environment may offer experiences that are not available in non-blended environments and that the nature of these different experiences promotes learning. While there is evidence to suggest the potential of blended learning, there is also considerable evidence that most blended learning courses fail to fulfill this potential[41][42].

This failure can be partially explained by the well-documented resistance of teachers to online learning, a common theme in the literature for at least 15 years[43], and a lack of adequate professional development[44]. The profusion of online and blended learning courses have become pervasive in the educational sector, driven by senior administrators who are more positive about the efficacy of online learning than teachers[45]. Faculty are often given a little option about incorporating online learning components into their classes, so it's not surprising that the results are frequently disappointing. While there is substantial blended learning literature on the student experience, course design, and even the professional development of teachers, a neglected area is teaching practice: how and why teachers balance the blend of online and classroom components[46]. In a literature review of over 800 articles, Torris-Steele and Drew found only one article, by Woods, Baker, and Hopper[47], on academic practice in a blended environment. Knowing more about what teachers do in their teaching practice when they are required to introduce online components may go some way to explaining the failure of blended learning to reach its predicted potential. Only by understanding current practice can we prepare to make changes to that practice.

Blended learning has been described as a mode of teaching that eliminates time, place, and situational barriers, whilst enabling high-quality interactions between teachers and students[48]. It echoes the practice of distance education that emphasized the flexibility of time, place, and pace of student learning. Research suggests that the student experience varies considerably and results in variable learning experiences[49], indicating a need to clarify how a blended approach can support learning.

The role of faculty in successful blended or online learning has been noted in several studies. Mayes and Morrison[50] found that, in addition to a well-managed program, it was important that teachers are both interested and competent in teaching in an online context. Bates and Sangra[51] argued that; "There is convincing evidence that online students do just as well if not better than students in face-to-face courses, but more importantly, the results depend on the conditions in which students are studying. All modes of delivery will suffer from badly designed teaching or inadequate resources".

Technology has increased the breadth and depth of access to education. This is significant because it has been a hallmark of western education that the co-location in time and space of teachers, students, and resources is the sine qua non of education. Changing from a classroom-only context to include a major online component requires adjustment for both teachers and students[52]. The speedy adoption of educational technologies is evidence that new forms of teaching and learning are possible. However, shifts of this magnitude need major changes in approach from faculty and administrators in education, especially in higher education, where the lectures still dominate teaching practice.

The emergence of blended learning is a major trend in tertiary education[53]. This trend is being fueled by the accumulation of evidence that points to the efficacy of a blended approach over either online or classroom alone[40]. However, there is a danger that blended learning courses will fall far short of the potential if teachers do not change their attitudes and practices for developing blended experiences.

In the main, teachers neither fully exploited the opportunities offered by online contexts nor integrated the two modes to make their courses coherent for their students. Only one teacher in this study recognized the importance of developing a course that fully integrated both online and classroom components. She thought about the strengths of both teaching modes and designed her course to fit with these. Other teachers added an online component to an existing classroom course. They expressed reservations about the role of technology and argued that the teacher should be the central actor, with technology playing a minor support role. These teachers seemed to view online technologies as being mainly for access and information delivery efficiency rather than to support students' learning experiences.

Developing content for two contexts increases teacher workload, and teachers complained about the time commitments necessary to develop even minimal online components. This is an issue that must be addressed by institutions. The benefits of a blended environment will only be realized when multiple engagement opportunities afforded by the two contexts are developed to present students with a range of different experiences, individually and collaboratively. A critical aspect of this development is the integration of the online and classroom components. As others have pointed out, the key to successful blended learning design is the "thoughtful integration of classroom face-to-face learning experiences with online learning experiences"[21].

Chen, Lambert, and Guidry[54] found that widespread use of the Web and other Internet technologies in postsecondary education has exploded in the last 15 years. An increasing focus of this trend is blended learning. So popular has the uptake of blended learning been, that it has been called the "new normal" in higher education teaching[3]. Blended learning contexts that integrate physical and virtual components are seen as critical strategies for higher education institutions[55]. This trend has intensified since the publication of a meta-analysis of 50 studies that found that while online students performed a little better than face-to-face students, students in courses that blended online and face-to-face components did much better than a straight online course, with an effect size of +0.35, $p < .001$[33].

On the study of Anderson[56], despite the clear demonstration of the benefits of using technology in education, there continues to be a marked reluctance by academics to engage with online learning. Heaton-Shrestha, May, and Burke[57] found teachers to be much less positive than their students about the learning benefits of an online learning component. Becker and Jokivirta also found that academics worldwide reported low enthusiasm for using technology in learning. More recently, a large-scale study (over 4,500 teachers) by Allen et al.[45] found that 65% of faculty were more afraid of teaching with technology than they were excited by the prospect.

Over the past 15 years, several factors have been identified as discouraging academic staff from teaching in online environments, including inadequate support and training, time for developing online materials, fears of failure, and beliefs about the value of technology in education. Mansvelt, Suddaby, O'Hara, and Gilbert[58] presented findings from an online survey of 408 teachers and 40 qualitative interviews ascertaining beliefs and experiences of staff regarding eLearning professional development. They found that managerial support, individual beliefs, and time allocation influenced the attitude of faculty in attending training to improve their use of technology in teaching. Allan also argued that using online learning for professional development would not be effective unless the account was taken of two factors: the extra time involved in networked learning, and for people new to e-learning to adjust to this type of study. Greener[59] reported that "online, the teacher's status can easily be eroded, as learners can compare teacher-designed resources with video lectures from across the world on similar topics and chat directly with experts in the field through their blogs." The potential for such comparisons inclined teachers to be reluctant to expose themselves to ridicule or unflattering comparisons.

Some studies by Aslı Özgün-Koca & İlhan Şen[60], MacCallum[61], found that beliefs about the usefulness and effectiveness of technology influenced whether teachers integrated technology into their teaching. Teachers argue their reluctance to use technology as stemming from a concern for the educational wellbeing of their students. For example, in the study of Heaton-Shrestha et al.[57], they claim that technology has no beneficial effect on learning and is even instrumental in maintaining students in a state of semi-disengagement. The same study reported concern by teachers that technology could decrease student interaction and result in greater social isolation for the student. Christie and Jurado[62] also found that being convinced of the effectiveness of technology was necessary before teachers would fully engage with it.

Teachers who fail to recognize the benefits of online learning are less likely to create effective blended courses. Negative or indifferent student response to poorly designed online components in a blended course may reinforce the teacher's belief that such additions to the traditional classroom have little value.

On the study of Jeffrey, Milne, and Suddaby[49], teachers commonly made three distinctions when discussing how they used classroom or online contexts as they saw lectures, tutorials, and online environments as serving different functions. Lectures were considered to be appropriate for teaching theory, and while these could be made more interesting with examples, the theory was described by teachers as being dry and abstract but "they're here to learn about theories as well as everything else, that's what university's about, so they've got to have that component.

Almost all teachers saw the lecture as the main forum for the initial teaching of content and tutorials as the consolidation of the lecture through activities. Most teachers also advocated the importance of the set text, for example, "I still like the idea of a textbook, a textbook is all you need"

Teachers considered that the most important function of their online sites was a central repository for resources, "So everything was online". Online content included core content, textbook publisher resources such as slides, PowerPoint notes to be downloaded for the next class, administration information, and other resources such as YouTube videos. Increasing student access to these resources was seen as a major advantage of using an online component[49].

Establishing a social presence in the classroom comes from the interaction between teachers and students. Most teachers described positive engagement with their students in the classroom and often made a concerted effort to develop a relationship with their students. For example, several teachers started the class by establishing a dialogue with students. This might involve them telling the students about themselves, for example, their interests and their experience and background in the subject area. Most teachers also expressed interest in finding out more about their students and would spend some time in class asking them questions, for example, about their motivation for taking the class and what they hoped to achieve. Two teachers scored quite low on the use of this social presence in the classroom. Both of these teachers seemed to hold quite negative

views about students and had issues interacting with students and managing their behavior. "So, I feel like I can't control the classes to the degree that I want to to enable them to be able to do what they can do". This teacher also described students as "lazy".[49]

Establishing a social presence online is much more difficult than in the classroom, so it was not surprising to find that social presence was largely underdeveloped in most of the study's online environments. All online sites had teacher contact details, a welcome message, and a discussion forum, but these took an informational tone and it was hard to get a sense of the teacher from them. Wang and Newlin emphasize the importance of the social presence of teachers, especially to those students vulnerable to dropping out. Social presence online is felt as a sense of immediacy and intimacy in the way teachers communicate with their students. Forums were used by all teachers to contact students, and this was an aspect of the online site that they valued, a finding that agrees with Aspden and Helm[63]. However, these messages were sent on an 'as-needed' basis, and Ryle and Cumming[64] suggest that they are most effective at embodying teacher presence when communication is frequent and regular.

Jeffrey, Milne, and Suddaby[49] found out that most teachers reported poor levels of class attendance, some as low as 25%. They felt this was due to the over-provision of online materials, which allows students to believe they didn't need to attend class. Several teachers favored reducing the online material but felt pressured by students to provide it. Teachers in a study by Heaton-Shrestha et al.[57] expressed similar concerns. They argued that uploading PowerPoint outlines influenced student decisions not to attend class. Agreeing with the teachers in this study, they claimed that such materials created boundaries for students about what content was important and so students failed to explore ideas or material beyond these narrow boundaries.

Unlike many schools that are just trying to attempt distance learning for the first time, Isabela State University has already been implementing technology-enabled learning by utilizing various online platforms and tools like Edmodo, zoom, and Google Classroom to deliver lessons even during pandemic were the summer class started.

With the current global health crisis and government pronouncements prohibiting the conduct of face-to-face classes both in basic education (DepEd) and Higher education (CHED). Isabela State University has decided to roll out and launched its new approach, called telEducation. It has ramped up its efforts in fully implementing flexible remote learning for its students to ease its transition to what might become the new normal for educational institutions.

Earlier this month, the school gathered hundreds of parents for a webinar wherein school academic officials and parents had a meaningful discussion about flexible remote learning, and the preparations the school has done to ensure the continuous and dynamic delivery of education for its students.

Flexible learning is a multifaceted approach to learning where students are given options on how, what, when, and where they learn. It is the overarching drive, philosophy, or approach behind the other methods of delivering instruction. It is student-centered because it encourages and empowers students to be autonomous or independent, which is a key attribute that enables them to manage the challenges in the 21st century. It combines and expands familiar approaches to teaching and learning. Face-to-face classes, blended learning and distance learning are part and parcel of flexible learning. Flexible learning draws on different approaches and methods of delivering instruction that is most suitable to the circumstances and needs of the learners.

Blended learning, meanwhile, refers to delivering the lessons through face-to-face and online classes. This means some lessons are taught in a traditional classroom set-up and others are taught online.

Distance learning, on the other hand, pertains to delivering instruction remotely. The key elements in distance learning are time and space. In this set-up, students are not in the same physical room with their teachers and classmates while learning.

Learning sessions will be conducted either synchronously or asynchronously.

Synchronous learning is conducting learning sessions where students and professors interact and collaborate in real-time. This can be done either through face-to-face classes or through remote or distance learning enabled by technology. This set-up allows immediate feedback because it facilitates the exchange of ideas and information in real-time.

In asynchronous learning, professors and students collaborate but not in real-time. The professors provide offline learning materials or resources that students study or work on in their own time. This includes tutorial videos, recorded lectures, and demonstrations, modules, learning guides, and other reading materials. Students and professors communicate through discussion boards, emails, or instant messaging. These tools are used for consultation and feedback.

Asynchronous learning has its benefits because, in this format, students develop self-discipline and a sense of ownership of their learning because they are given some autonomy on how to pace themselves. It allows them to spend more time on challenging lessons and work toward mastery. Students can still collaborate with their teachers and classmates through chat boxes and discussion boards.

Blended learning required immediate feedback to the students for their performance which can be achieved by combining assessment techniques with the use of the latest technological advancement. Blended learning techniques provide teachers to deliver the lecture as well as assess student learning using creative and innovative methods. Assessment is a very vital tool for determining the student's knowledge for the subject they enrolled at any level of education. The assessment determines how the teacher teaches the course and how the student understood the course. Assessment is no doubt one of the major tools in the teaching and learning process.

The term e-learning is currently widely accepted for all forms of technology-oriented pedagogical methods. Using a computer as a communication bridge as well as a learning tool is the key aspect of the e-learning system. Blended approach studies how to join the best feature of the face to face and online instruction. For example, advanced interactive sessions can be conducted to the students in the classroom while online sessions with multimedia-rich content of the course can be accessed by students anywhere, anytime through internet access. For a faculty, it is important to be familiar with the state of art of assessment methodologies along with its cons and pros to incorporate the latest assessment methodology or tool in their teaching and assessment technique in an organized and efficient manner.

METHODS

This study utilized a descriptive survey method of investigation to secure adequate and reliable data. The researcher used this design to gather necessary data, assess and determine the challenges facing nursing education in the new normal by the nursing faculty of Isabela State University, College of Nursing. The questionnaires were floated through the use of google forms as a platform.

The respondents who participated in this study were 15 nursing faculty comprises of 7 permanent as core faculty and 8 instructors under a contract of service.

In securing a permit to conduct the said study, the permit to conduct the study was requested and filed to the office of the Executive Officer through the dean of the college. After the approval, the researcher immediately proceeds with the actual data gathering through goggle online platforms. In administering the questionnaire, the researcher distributed the link of the questionnaire to the selected identified respondents to ensure a hundred percent retrieval and to attend possible queries that may arise. The researcher used a non-probability sampling in selecting the possible respondents. After the retrieval, the data were tallied, tabulated, and computed to facilitate the analysis and interpretation.

In the preparation of the questionnaire, the researcher considered the validity, briefness, interest, and appeal of the questions that will be asked; the depth of the responses, and convenience on the part of the respondents. To ensure a higher percentage of returns, the data gathering instrument was prepared in such a way that the items could be answered by a checkmark. The questionnaire checklist was designed by the researcher based on several readings such as periodicals and researches. It contains the following: Part I – Respondents' profile to some selected variables, Part II is the challenges facing nursing education in the new normal as to; 1. Technological challenges; 2.Challenges in instructional materials; and 3. Challenges in the delivery of instructions.

In the validation process, the tool used has undergone a pilot testing in which the ratings were subject to Cronbach Alpha to determine the internal consistency reliability of the experts' responses. The total scores of the rater were taken as well as its variance. These scores are used to identify the alpha coefficient. The ideal Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of a rank should be above 0.7[(65)].

For data analysis and qualitative interpretation, profile variables were analyzed using frequency and percentage while the challenges facing nursing education in the new normal by the nursing faculty utilized weighted mean. A 5-point Likert-typed scale was used with the corresponding qualitative description as follows:

a) Scale 5: Always encountered (range = 4.20-5.00)
b) Scale 4: Often encountered (range = 3.40-4.19)
c) Scale 3: Sometimes encountered (range = 2.60-3.39)
d) Scale 2: Seldom encountered (range = 1.80-2.59)
e) Scale 1: Never encountered (range = 1.00-1.79)

RESULTS

This section presents the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered through the use of the questionnaire in response to the problems of this study.

Profile of Respondents

Table 1. Respondents profile as to age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
55 – above	1	6.7
50 – 54	1	6.7
45 – 49	2	13.3
40 – 44	2	13.3
35 – 39	5	33.3
30 – 34	2	13.3
Total	15	100

The table shows that most of the respondents are at the age bracket of 35 to 39 years old with a frequency of 5 or 33.3 percent. 2 or 13.3 percent are at the age bracket of 45 to 49 years old, 40 to 44 years old, and 30 to 34 years old and 1 or 6.7 percent is at the age bracket of 50 to 54 years old and 55 above.

Table 2. Respondents profile as to sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	6	40
Female	9	60
Total	15	100

Data reveals that the majority of the respondents are female with a frequency of 9 or 60 percent and 6 or 40 percent are male. This is common among any teaching organization.

Table 3. Respondents profile as to educational attainment

Educational attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Post graduate	1	6.66
Post graduate (earned units)	6	40.00
Graduate school	7	46.66
Graduate school. (earned units	1	6.66
Total	15	100

Table 3 shows that majority of the nursing faculty are master's degree holder with a frequency count of 7 or 46.66 percent, 6 or 40 percent of them has earned their units in their doctoral while only 1 or 6.66 percent is conferred with a doctoral degree. Unfortunately, there is only one faculty who is currently pursuing graduate studies.

Table 4. Respondents profile as to marital status

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	1	6.7
Married	13	86.7
Widow/er	1	6.7
Separated		
Total	15	100

Table 4 reveals that the majority of the respondents are married with a frequency of 13 or 86.7 percent whereas 1 or 6.7 percent is single and widow/er. The data may imply that the faculty is family-oriented which drives and inspires them to be more dedicated to their current job in order to sustain their family's needs.

Table 5. Respondent's profile as to academic rank

Academic Rank	Frequency	Percentage
Instructor	10	66.7
Assistant Professor	4	26.7
Associate Professor	1	6.7
Total	15	100

Table 5 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondent's academic rank. It could be gleaned that 10 or 66.7 percent are instructors; 4 or 26.7 percent are assistant professors and only 1 or 6.7 percent have an academic rank of associate professor.

Table 6. Respondent's profile as to nature of appointment

Nature of Appointment	Frequency	Percentage
Permanent	7	46.7
Contract of Service	8	53.3
Total	15	100

Table 6 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to the nature of the appointment. It is note taking that majority of the respondents are under the contract of service as their nature of appointment with a frequency of 8 or 53.3 percent while 7 or 46.7 percent are permanent or tenured.

Table 7. Respondent's profile as to their years of teaching experience

Year of Teaching	Frequency	Percentage
21 – above	2	13.3
16 – 20 years	0	0
11 – 15 years	5	33.3
6 – 10 years	0	0
1 – 5 years	6	40.0
Below 1 year	2	13.3
Total	15	100

Table 7 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents as to their teaching experience. It could be gleaned on the above data that most of the respondents have 1 - 5 years of teaching experience which reflects a frequency counts of 6 or 40 percent, 5 or 33.3 percent are 11 – 15 years in teaching whereas there are 2 or 13.3 percent has below 1 year in teaching and 2 or 13.33 percent also posted 21 years above in teaching.

Challenges in Nursing Education in the New Normal

Table 8. Technological challenges

Technological Challenges	Mean	Description
1. There is limited/slow access to an internet connection.	3.00	Sometimes Encountered
2. Insufficient funds or load used for internet connection.	2.60	Sometimes Encountered
3. Insufficient available gadgets such as a laptop or smartphones to be utilized by the students for an online class.	3.40	Sometimes Encountered
4. Difficult to express or convey thoughts due to the absence of physical presence or contact.	3.47	Sometimes Encountered
5. There are interferences/distractors among the students and the instructor which diverts the attention of the students. (eg. The learning environment is noisy, doing household chores)	3.47	Sometimes Encountered
6. There is a huge ratio of students for online learning which makes it difficult for the instructor to effectively supervise and follow up or evaluate learning.	2.73	Sometimes Encountered
7. The availability of the students for one on one mentoring/attending their concerns.	3.33	Sometimes Encountered
Mean	3.14	Sometimes Encountered

It could be gleaned on the above data that in terms of technological challenges the respondents noted **sometimes encountered** such as; there is limited/slow access to an internet connection; insufficient funds or load used for internet connection; insufficient available gadgets such as a laptop or smartphones to be utilized by the students for an online class; difficult to express or convey thoughts due to the absence of physical presence

or contact; there are interferences/distractors among the students and the instructor which diverts the attention of the students. (eg. the learning environment is noisy, doing household chores); there is a huge ratio of students for online learning which makes it difficult for the instructor to effectively supervise and follow up or evaluate learning; and the availability of the students for one on one mentoring/attending their concerns.

Table 9. Challenges in instructional materials

Challenges in Instructional Materials	Mean	Description
1. Lack of teaching materials and resources to be utilized for an online class	2.93	Sometimes Encountered
2. Inadequate instructor training for new normal education	3.60	Often Encountered
3. Limited time for the preparation of modules, exams, and other related to instruction.	4.40	Often Encountered
4. Insufficient funds for the procurement of instructional materials(eg. reproduction of modules)	4.00	Often Encountered
5. An insufficient number of updated textbooks, e-books, and journals as resources and references.	4.07	Often Encountered
6. Insufficient materials that are necessary for return demonstration in their respective home.	4.33	Often Encountered
7. Insufficient time for pilot testing prior to the reproduction of modules as instructional materials to validate its effectiveness and reliability.	4.13	Often Encountered
8. Insufficient facilities of the college to conduct an online class.	4.20	Often Encountered
Mean	3.96	Often Encountered

Table 9 shows the mean and qualitative description of the challenges in instructional materials. It is note taking that the respondents **often encountered** challenges in instructional materials such as inadequate instructor training for new normal education; limited time for the preparation of modules, exams, and other related to instruction; insufficient funds for the procurement of instructional materials (eg. reproduction of modules); insufficient number of updated textbooks, e-books, and journals as resources and references; insufficient materials that are necessary for return demonstration in their respective home; insufficient time for pilot testing prior to the reproduction of modules as instructional materials to validate its effectiveness and reliability; and insufficient facilities of the college to conduct an online class. Whereas, it was posted ***sometimes encountered*** such as; lack of teaching materials and resources to be utilized for an online class.

Table 10. Challenges in the delivery of instruction

	Challenges in the Delivery of Instruction	Mean	Description
1.	Numerous nursing-related experiences/activities but limited time for implementation.	3.80	Often Encountered
2.	Students find it difficult to comprehend some activities due to the absence of physical contact of the instructor/s	3.73	Often Encountered
3.	Faculty experiencing physical problems (eg. eye strain and frontal headache) due to long hours of exposure on computer monitors or gadgets.	4.27	Often Encountered
4.	Students intolerance to the subject and limited attention span	3.93	Often Encountered
5.	It promotes sufficient time for review once units/modules/lessons are completed.	3.13	Sometimes Encountered
6.	The rate or transition of introducing a new concept is often either too fast or too slow.	3.60	Often Encountered
7.	Concepts are allotted the same amount of time whether they are easy or difficult to master.	3.27	Sometimes Encountered
8.	It is difficult to sequence instruction to ensure that students acquired necessary pre-skills before introducing difficult skills	3.93	Often Encountered
9.	Student finds difficult to grasp or master the necessary skills for return demonstration	3.67	Often Encountered
10.	Limited, inaccessible, or unavailability of the resources and materials for the nursing skills laboratory to be accomplished.	3.93	Often Encountered
	Mean	3.73	Often Encountered

Table 10 shows the mean and qualitative description of the challenges encountered by the faculty in the delivery of instruction. The respondents posted ***often encountered*** such as there are numerous nursing-related experiences/activities but limited time for implementation; Students find it difficult to comprehend some activities due to the absence of physical contact of the instructor/s; faculty experiencing physical problems (eg. eye strain and frontal headache) due to long hours of exposure on computer monitor or gadgets; Students intolerance to the subject and limited attention span; the rate or transition of introducing a new concept is often either too fast or too slow; it is difficult to sequence instruction to ensure that students acquired necessary pre-skills before introducing difficult skills; student finds difficult to grasp or master the necessary skills for return demonstration; and limited, inaccessible, or unavailability of the resources and materials for the nursing skills laboratory to be accomplished. Whereas, respondents ***sometimes encountered*** problems such as; it promotes sufficient time for review once units/modules/lessons are completed and concepts are allotted the same amount of time whether they are easy or difficult to master.

DISCUSSION

In terms of faculty educational attainment, it may entail that majority of the faculty are conferred with their degree in graduate studies which is a minimum requirement to teach nursing as provided in Article IV, Section 13. 1b of CMO'15, series of 2017, and Article IV, Section 11 of CMO 14, series of 2009. This further implies that most of the faculty members are well experienced and trained educators in the field of nursing education.

The data in terms of academic rank, it implies that most of the faculty are promoted to the higher academic rank in the university due to their continuous professional development, excellent performance, and gaining a higher degree in nursing education. This may imply that the respondents are seasoned and experienced educators in the field of nursing education in which they are strong enough to face any challenges they may encounter.

It is note taking that among the three identified dimensions of challenges in nursing education, it is evident that challenges in the delivery of instruction and challenges in instructional materials got the highest mean scores as often. These areas requires enhancement which is essential in the delivery of quality nursing education amidst of COVID-19 pandemic.

CONCLUSION

From the light of the aforementioned findings, the following conclusions were drawn; this study concluded that inadequate instructor training for new normal education; limited time for the preparation of modules, exams, and other related to instruction is due to the limited time of the university administrators or concern authorities to conduct since the summer class has already implemented. The said interventions made it more difficult to conduct due to the implementing community quarantines. Furthermore, there are numerous nursing-related experiences/activities but limited time for implementation; Students find it difficult to comprehend some activities due to the absence of physical contact of the instructor/s; faculty experiencing physical problems (eg. eye strain and frontal headache) due to long hours of exposure on computer monitor or gadgets are noted concerns concerning the delivery of instructions.

In response to the findings herein stated, the researcher proposes the following recommendations for possible implementation; Alternative teaching modalities such as the use of modules, video presentations, and other offline platforms should be encouraged and utilized as supplementary materials for learning by the concerned instructor to address and minimized their long hours of exposure to gadgets. Training in the form of webinars and limited face-to-face seminars should quarterly be conducted for instructors in order to enhance their skills and teaching methodologies in the new normal education. Essential nursing concepts should be given emphasis and priority by not compromising the quality of instruction of other least essential topics or concepts and instructions to ensure that students may acquire the necessary required knowledge and skills. Instructors should encourage their students to be more resourceful using a localized and contextualized learning approach for the nursing skills or laboratory to be accomplished. As nurses by profession, instructors as the primary source of knowledge are encouraged to adjust and adapt to the latest trends of new normal education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors avail the opportunity to express their deep sense of gratitude to the following persons, Dr. William R. Eustaquio, The Executive Officer of Isabela State University, Echague Campus, Echague Isabela for his approval to conduct the said study; To Dr. Ma. Elizabeth C. Baua, Graduate school program coordinator for masters and doctoral of nursing of St. Paul University Philippines, Tuguegarao City, for her unselfishly sharing her ideas in the conceptualization of this humble endeavour; To the dean of the College of Nursing of Isabela

State University, Echague Campus, Prof. Edmelyn B. Cacayan, for mentoring and sharing her administrative and leadership expertise and ideas in the field of nursing education on the corresponding author in the realization of this paper.

REFERENCES

1. Graham CR. Emerging practice and research in blended learning. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), Handbook of distance education. (3rd ed., pp. 333–350). New York: Routledge; 2013.
2. Ross B, Gage K. Global perspectives on blended learning: Insight from WebCT and our customers in higher education. In CJ Bonk, CR Graham (Eds.), Handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs. (pp. 155–168). San Francisco: Pfeiffer; 2006.
3. Norberg A, Dziuban CD, Moskal PDA time-based blended learning model. On the Horizon. 2011. 19(3), 207-216. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/10748121111163913.
4. Adams Becker S, Cummins M, Davis A, Freeman A, Hall Giesinger C, Ananthanarayanan V. NMC horizon report: 2017 higher Education Edition. Austin: The New Media Consortium; 2017.
5. EDUCAUSE. 2017 key issues in teaching & learning. 2017. Available from: https://www.EDUCAUSE.edu/eli/initiatives/ key-issues-in-teaching-and-learning
6. Dziuban C, Picciano AG, Graham CR, Moskal PD. Conducting research in online and blended learning environments: New pedagogical frontiers. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group; 2016.
7. Picciano AG, Dziuban C, Graham CR. Blended learning: Research perspectives. (vol. 2). New York: Routledge; 2014.
8. Picciano AG, Dziuban CD. Blended learning: Research perspectives. Needham: The Sloan Consortium; 2007.
9. Bonk CJ, Graham CR. The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs. San Francisco: Pfeiffer; 2007.
10. Kitchenham A. Blended learning across disciplines: Models for implementation. Hershey: Information Science Reference; 2011.
11. Jean-François E. Transcultural blended learning and teaching in postsecondary education. Hershey: Information Science Reference; 2013.
12. Garrison DR, Vaughan ND. Blended learning in higher education, (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Print; 2013.
13. Williams J. College and the new class divide. Inside Higher Ed July 11, 2016.
14. Pirsig RM. Zen and the art of motorcycle maintenance: An inquiry into values. New York: Morrow; 1974.
15. Quality Matters. About Quality Matters. 2016. Available from: https://www.qualitymatters.org/research
16. Floridi L. The 4th revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2014.
17. Floridi L. A defence of informational structural realism. Synthese. 2008;161(2):219–253.
18. Norberg A. From blended learning to learning onlife: ICTs, time and access in higher education (Doctoral dissertation, Umeå University). 2017.
19. Balfour SP. Assessing writing in MOOCs: Automated essay scoring and calibrated peer review. Research and Practice in Assessment. 2013;8:40–48.
20. Bayne S, Evans P, Ewins R, Knox J, Lamb J, McLeod H, O'Shea C, Ross J, Sheail P, Sinclair C. Manifesto for teaching online. Digital Education at Edinburg University; 2016.
21. Garrison DR, Kanuka H. Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education. 2004;7:95–105.
22. Picciano AG. Blending with purpose: The multimodal model. Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks. 2009;13(1):7–18.
23. Dziuban C, Moskal P. A course is a course is a course: Factor invariance in student evaluation of online, blended and face-to-face learning environments. The Internet and Higher Education. 2011;14(4):236–241.
24. Means B, Toyama Y, Murphy R, Baki M. The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Teachers College Record. 2013;115(3):1–47.
25. Rovai AP, Jordan HM. Blended learning and sense of community: A comparative analysis with traditional and fully online graduate courses. International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning. 2004;5(2):1–13.
26. Moskal P, Dziuban C, Hartman J. Blended learning: A dangerous idea? The Internet and Higher Education. 2013;18:15–23.
27. Dringus LP, Seagull AB. A five-year study of sustaining blended learning initiatives to enhance academic engagement in computer and information sciences campus courses. In Blended learning: Research perspectives. Vol. 2. Edited by Picciano AG, Dziuban CD, Graham CR. New York: Routledge; 2015.

28. Tynan B, Ryan Y, Lamont-Mills A. Examining workload models in online and blended teaching. British Journal of Educational Technology. 2015;46(1):5–15.
29. Bloemer W, Swan K. Investigating informal blending at the University of Illinois Springfield. In Picciano AG, Dziuban CD, Graham CR (Eds.), Blended learning: Research perspectives. New York: Routledge; 2015.
30. Zhao Y, Lei J, Yan B, Lai C, Tan HS. What makes the difference? A practical analysis of research on the effectiveness of distance education. Teachers College Record. 2005;107(8):1836–1884. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620. 2005.00544.x.
31. Sitzmann T, Kraiger K, Stewart D, Wisher R. The comparative effectiveness of web-based and classroom instruction: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology. 2006;59(3):623–664.
32. Bernard RM, Abrami PC, Borokhovski E, Wade CA, Tamim RM, Surkes MA, Bethel EC. A metaanalysis of three types of interaction treatments in distance education. Review of Educational Research. 2009;79(3):1243– 1289. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654309333844.
33. Means B, Toyama Y, Murphy R, Kaia M, Jones K. Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning. Washington: US Department of Education; 2010.
34. Bernard RM, Borokhovski E, Schmid RF, Tamim RM, Abrami PC. A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education: From the general to the applied. Journal of Computing in Higher Education. 2014;26(1):87–122.
35. Star SL, Griesemer JR. Institutional ecology, translations and boundary objects: Amatuers and professionals in Berkely's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39. Social Studies of Science. 1989;19(3):387–420.
36. OECD. 21st century learning environments. Innovation in Education, 108. 2006. Available from: http://www.oecd.org/education/innovation-education/21stcenturylearningenvironments.htm.
37. Spring KJ, Graham CR, Hadlock CA. The current landscape of international blended learning. International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning. 2016;8(1):84–102.
38. Agaarwal A. Blended learning is the 'New Normal' and here's why. 2020. Available from: https://blog.edx.org/blended-learning-new-normal/
39. Ramsden P. Learning to teach in higher education. London: RoutledgeFalmer; 2003.
40. Oliver M, Trigwell K. can'blended learning'be redeemed? e-learning and digital media. 2005;2(1):17-26.
41. Driscoll M. Blended learning: Let's get beyond the hype. 2002. Available from: http://www-07.ibm.com/services/pdf/blended_learning.pdf
42. Hofmann J. Why blended learning hasn't (yet) fulfilled its promises: Answers to those questions that keep you up at night. In Bonk CJ & Graham CR (Eds.), Handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs. San Fancisco, CA: Pfeiffer; 2006.
43. Heirdsfield A, Walker S, Tambyah M, Beutel D. Blackboard as an online learning environment: What do teacher education students and staff think? Australian Journal of Teacher Education. 2011;36(7):1-16.
44. Garrison DR, Vaughan ND. Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2008.
45. Allen IE, Seaman J, Lederman D, Jaschik S. Conflicted: Faculty and online education. Babson Park, MA: Inside Higher Ed & Babson Survey Research Group; 2012.
46. Torrisi-Steele G, Drew S. The literature landscape of blended learning in higher education: The need for better understanding of academic blended practice. International Journal for Academic Development. 2013;18(4):371-383.
47. Woods R, Baker JD, Hopper D. Hybrid structures: Faculty use and perception of web-based courseware as a supplement to face-to-face instruction. Internet and Higher Education. 2004;7:281-297.
48. Kanuka H, Brooks C, Saranchuck. Flexible learning and cost effective mass offerings. Paper presented at the Improving University Teaching (IUT). CA: Vancouver; 2009.
49. Jeffrey A, Milne J, Suddaby G. Blended learning: how teachers balance the blend of online and classroom components. Journal of Information Technology Education: Research. 2014;13:121-140.
50. Mayes T, Morrison D. You take the high road: National programmes for the development of elearning in Higher Education. Reflecting Education. 2008;4(1):6-16.
51. Bates AWT, Sangra A. Classroom assessment techniques. San Francisco: Josey Bass; 2011.
52. Swenson PW, Redmond PA. Online, hybrid, and blended coursework and the practice of technology-integrated teaching and learning within teacher education. Issues in Teacher Education. 2009;18(2):3-10.
53. Bliuc AM, Goodyear P, Ellis RA. Research focus and methodological choices in studies into students' experiences of blended learning in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education. 2007;10(4):231-244. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2007.08.001
54. Chen PSD, Lambert AD, Guidry KR. Engaging online learners: The impact of Webbased learning technology on college student engagement. Computers & Education. 2010;54(4):1222-1232. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2009.11.008

55. Cobcroft R, Towers S, Smith J, Bruns A. Mobile learning in review: Opportunities and challenges for learners, teachers, and institutions. Proceedings of Online Learning and Teaching (OLT) Conference 2006, 26 September 2006, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane (pp. 21-30).
56. Anderson C. Barriers and enabling factors in online teaching. International Journal of Learning. 2008;14(12):241-246
57. Heaton-Shrestha C, May S, Burke L. Student retention in higher education: What role for virtual learning environments? Journal of Further & Higher Education. 2009;33(1):83-92. doi: 10.1080/03098770802645189.
58. Mansvelt J, Suddaby G, O'Hara D, Gilbert A. Professional development: Assuring quality in e-learning policy and practice. Quality Assurance in Education. 2009;17(3):233-249. doi: 10.1108/09684880910970641
59. Greener S. e-Modelling - Helping learners to develop sound e-learning behaviours. Electronic Journal of e-Learning. 2009;7(3):265-272.
60. Aslı Özgün-Koca S, İlhan Şen A. The beliefs and perceptions of pre-service teachers enrolled in a subject-area dominant teacher education program about "Effective Education". Teaching and Teacher Education. 2006;22(7):946-960.
61. MacCallum K. Influences on the adoption of mobile technology by students and teachers. PhD thesis. Auckland: Massey University; 2011.
62. Christie M, Jurado RG. Barriers to innovation in online pedagogy. European Journal of Engineering Education. 2009;34(3):273-279.
63. Aspden L, Helm P. Making the connection in a blended learning environment. Educational Media International. 2009;41(3):245-252. doi: 10.1080/09523980410001680851
64. Ryle A, Cumming K. Reflections on engagement in online learning communities. International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning. 2007;3(3):35-46.
65. Agorilla YT. Development and validation of an inquiry based learning module on science investigatory I for grade 7 students. Thesis. North Luzon: Philippine Normal University; 2015.