CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

I am an accidental MOOC scholar.

My training, teaching, and scholarship are firmly rooted in composition and rhetoric. Pedagogy and distance education are key issues in the field, though we tend to approach these concerns differently than scholars who study education, particularly those interested in education policy or online pedagogy. I have taught writing courses online since 2005 but never courses that were "open" to anyone outside of my university. They were typically capped at twenty students, certainly never "massive."

So, how did I get here?

Well, the focus of both my teaching and scholarship has been the connection between writing and technology, and, following the lead of scholars like Walter Ong and Cynthia Selfe, I begin with the assumption that literacy itself is a technology. While my work has of course required computer hardware and software, and I identify myself as being in the loosely defined academic communities of "computers and writing" and "digital humanities," I also study older and now less novel technologies, especially as they pertain to the teaching of writing—pens, paper, chalkboards, correspondence courses, and so forth. This history has taught me that massive open online courses are a continuation of the instructional and distance education technologies that have been part of higher education since the late nineteenth century.

My interest and experience in online teaching (albeit in small, closed, credit-bearing online courses) piqued my curiosity about the emerging phenomenon of MOOCs. I enrolled as a MOOC student to get a view of just what was going on in these courses, blogging about a series of MOOCs, most actively in 2012–2013 but continuing today. Curiously, my blog writing about MOOCs was what solidified my standing as a "MOOC scholar." I wrote about my MOOC experiences, received positive feedback from readers, and wrote more. As I wrote more, I was approached to give presentations and to write journal articles about my experiences as a MOOC student. These opportunities and more blogging about MOOCs led to more positive feedback, and before I knew it, I was an expert.

In March 2013, while attending the Conference for College Composition and Communication (the annual flagship academic meeting for composition and rhetoric scholars), I discussed the idea of an edited collection of essays about MOOCs with my colleague and ultimately co-editor Charles Lowe and the publisher of Parlor Press, David Blakesley. This was during the zenith of hype surrounding MOOCs in the academic and mainstream media, the height of the "MOOC moment." Among the thousands of writing scholars and teachers attending that year's conference in Las Vegas, there was a palpable fear that MOOCs were going to roll in and replace general education courses like first-year writing and that many of us were either going to be working for "the machine" or be out of a job entirely. The moment was right for a collection of essays, particularly a collection that approached MOOCs from the point of view of students, teachers, and scholars and decidedly *not* from the point of view of pundits, administrators, and entrepreneurs—that is, not from the point of view of the voices that had been most prominent in the media up to that point. The collection, *Invasion of the MOOCs: The Promises and Perils of Massive Open Online Courses*, was published in 2014, less than a year later. Through that project I connected with a number of faculty around the country who developed and taught MOOCs, particularly writing courses, and those connections led to interviews with faculty about their experiences developing and teaching MOOCs.

This journey into the realm of massive open online courses that began by chance a few years ago has led me here, to *More than a Moment*. Back in 2013 or so, the phrase "the MOOC moment" appeared in dozens (if not hundreds) of titles and headlines for presentations, blog posts, chapters, academic articles, and mainstream media pieces—certainly in part because of the words' alliterative qualities but also because the phrase neatly described for many observers what was happening. MOOCs appeared to come from nowhere and in an instant. Then, when MOOCs failed to transform higher education as we know it, the phrase "the MOOC moment" was rolled out in titles and headlines to note the temporary and past-tense status of MOOCs. The moment had passed.

More than a Moment argues that MOOCs were never an entirely new phenomenon and that MOOCs and their influences are far from over. This book explores the context around and within MOOCs, both in terms of the history of higher education that enabled MOOCs and also the situation within MOOCs themselves. The speed of the rise and fall of MOOCs was unprecedented, but the pattern is not. There have been numerous innovations and experiments in distance education over the past 150 or so years in American higher education, most of which

promised to extend the opportunity to attend college to people who do not have the means or access to a traditional college education. These experiments have threatened the existing structure of higher education and have also emboldened education entrepreneurs focused on turning a profit. MOOCs and their futures demonstrate the ways higher education depends on centuries of tradition while simultaneously challenging the methods of delivery, the roles of students and instructors, and the shifting definition of "education" itself.

More than a Moment asks:

- Where did MOOCs come from, and how have they followed and deviated from the history of distance education technologies?
- What can we learn from the experiences of MOOC students and teachers about their future potential for both "learning" and "institutional education?"
- How can we learn from the MOOC phenomenon to recognize the opportunities and threats of future innovations in distance education and in partnerships between nonprofit institutions and for-profit educational entrepreneurs?

WHERE I'M COMING FROM AS A COMPOSITION AND RHETORIC SCHOLAR IN SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN

Before I outline the chapters in *More than a Moment*, I want to describe my disciplinary background and my assumptions about what makes education work—specifically, what makes a system of institutional education different from a learning experience. I think it's important to do this because I am assuming an audience of readers who are educators, administrators, and entrepreneurs interested in distance education generally and MOOCs in particular but also readers who aren't necessarily familiar with my field, composition and rhetoric. Besides that disciplinary filter, my understanding and analysis of MOOCs are also shaped by my locale in terms of the university where I work and my assumptions about the required elements for what it takes for a system of institutional education to work.

When I tell people (and this includes academics in other disciplines) I'm a professor specializing in composition and rhetoric, they frequently ask "what's that?" I usually answer this question with another: "Do you remember freshman composition?" "Of course," most answer, since the experience of first-year writing is almost universal for Americans who were college students in the United States. And often enough, people then tell me the story of their first-year writing course as tremendously inspiring, tremendously awful, or, oddly, a bit of both.

While the "freshman comp" experience has been a part of higher education in the United States since the late nineteenth century, the academic specialization known as "composition and rhetoric" is comparatively new, not really emerging in full at the PhD level until the late 1970s–early 1980s, and it wasn't acknowledged as a distinct field (rather than a specialization within English studies) until the 1990s. Composition and rhetoric programs have been moving away from literary studies for some time now, and there has been an increase in recent years in free-standing writing programs and departments where the long-standing first-year writing course—often along with undergraduate majors and graduate programs in writing studies—are independent of an English department. The study of composition and rhetoric at the graduate level can be traced to first-year writing pedagogy, but the field has grown well beyond that. We teach and study about rhetoric, professional and technical writing, media studies, writing across the curriculum, and, of course, writing pedagogy designed to prepare future writing teachers. Further complicating matters (especially relative to MOOCs) is that composition and rhetoric as a discipline is primarily an American phenomenon: that is, while there is interest in writing studies around the world, the notion of a universal writing requirement at the first-year level and the study of the theory and pedagogy of writing in graduate school are almost completely unknown outside of the United States and Canada, and only a handful of universities outside the United States offer advanced undergraduate or graduate study in the field. So, while MOOCs are an international phenomenon, my discipline is not.

Broadly speaking, the widely assumed best practices in composition and rhetoric are at odds with the pedagogical approaches of MOOCs. Two often-repeated guiding principles in the field, which I will return to in the coming chapters, seem particularly at odds with the ways MOOCs work. The first is the "student-centered classroom." The ideal writing course should not be about the "sage on the stage" star lecturing professor depositing knowledge into listening students. Rather, the role of a writing teacher is to create and foster a classroom environment in which students are active in constructing their learning, and the students' writing projects are the primary texts of the course. The second closely related principle is "writing is a process," meaning writing is not a content area where knowledge can be delivered to students, nor is learning about writing merely a matter of producing the final product of writing—a grammatically correct (albeit boring and regurgitative) paper for the teacher to grade. Rather, learning to write is a social activity that depends on practicing and thinking about the

steps in the writing process (such as brainstorming, drafting, research-ing, and revising based on feedback from others), and it also depends on teachers encouraging their students to engage with each others' writing processes with feedback and participation. These principles are closely related to the sort of critical pedagogy advocated by Paulo Freire, Ira Shor, and Henry Giroux (among many others, of course). To enable this pedagogy, writing courses are small, typically somewhere between fifteen and twenty-five students. The assumptions behind this approach, as Stephanie Odom and Leslie Lindsey write, are that "a low student-to-teacher ratio is critical because effective writing classes are not information-oriented or lecture-focused, but rather guided oppor-tunities for students to practice the writing process and receive appro-priate feedback." Odom and Lindsey (2016, 333) go on to say that the interaction and rapport between teachers and students in writing classes is necessary to effectively learn about writing.

Interestingly, because first-year writing is almost universally required of all college students in the United States, and it is not at all unusual for even medium-sized universities to offer dozens of twenty- to twenty-five-student sections of the course (my own university typically offers about sixty sections of first-year writing a term), it is cost-prohibitive to staff so many different sections with tenure-track faculty who are composition and rhetoric specialists. As a result, individual sections of first-year writ-ing end up being taught by graduate assistants and part-time and full-time (but not necessarily tenure-track) faculty who are not necessarily trained in the field. Tenure-track faculty who *are* specialists in composi-tion and rhetoric often act in the quasi-administrative role of "writing program administrator," loosely supervising and mentoring dozens of non-tenure-track instructors. The specifics of how this plays out at dif-ferent universities vary, but, generally speaking, these staffing practices make first-year writing courses "ground zero" in discussions about the reliance on disenfranchised teachers and otherwise non-tenure-track faculty in higher education today.

Because these and other guiding principles of my field are at odds with presumptions about how MOOCs work, I began my involvement with MOOCs as a skeptic. MOOCs involve thousands of students fol-lowing along closely the lectures of the "star" professor leading the course. *Maybe this could work for university courses that are taught in lecture hall formats now. But how,* I thought (presumably, just like most of my col-leagues in composition and rhetoric), *can you expect students to learn about writing in an environment like that?* As I think becomes clear throughout *More than a Moment,* I remain skeptical about the potential of MOOCs

to *replace* what we do in small classes in first-year writing (and similar courses across academia). But it is useful to consider how MOOCs raise questions about the pedagogical presumptions most scholars in the field hold dear. For example, does the massiveness of MOOCs really impede the social and interactive process we believe is only possible in small writing courses? Can student peer review stand in for faculty feedback? Does assessment of student writing completed in MOOCs scale?

"Massiveness" aside, I did not begin this project with the same skepticism about the online nature of MOOCs. And just to be clear: MOOCs and online courses are not the same thing. I've been teaching a variety of advanced undergraduate and graduate writing courses online since 2005, and I think I've been able to teach them effectively. In my experience, small and closed (that is, courses only available to registered and tuition-paying students) online courses can be just as effective as face-to-face courses, with two important caveats. First, students need more experience, discipline, and self-motivation to succeed in online courses. The students I have had in my online classes who did not succeed often made the mistake of thinking the online class was going to somehow be easier than the face-to-face version. I often compare registering for an online class to registering for a gym membership—it only works if you actually go—and when students do not succeed in online classes, it is typically because they overestimated their abilities to stay self-motivated and disciplined about keeping up with an online class.

Second, it's not useful to compare online courses to face-to-face courses in terms of which is "better"; rather, the consideration should be about the *affordances* of these different forms of delivery. Online courses have the advantage of bending (though not necessarily eliminating) the specifics of meeting times and meeting spaces, while face-to-face courses have the advantage of being able to exchange a great deal of information between teachers and students efficiently. The point is this: I began this project with a lot of experience about how online teaching works; indeed, as I think will be clear in recapping the interviews I conducted with MOOC faculty, I began my time as a MOOC student with a lot more experience with online pedagogy than many faculty members who have been tasked with teaching MOOCs.

My perspectives on MOOCs are also a result of my experiences as an academic on the lower to middle end of the clear but unspoken hierarchy of higher education. David F. Labaree describes this non-organized order of things in the United States in his book *A Perfect Mess: The Unlikely Ascendancy of American Higher Education* (2017). Labaree's basic thesis is that many of the problems that continue to plague higher education

in the United States—such as the debate about college being for the betterment of society and the pursuit of intellectual ideals versus being for an individual pursuit for a credential attractive to employers, the often-blurry lines between nonprofit and public entities and for-profit and private companies, and the inequalities among institutions—have been problems for well over 150 years. Further, much of the reason why most of the best universities in the world are in the United States is because of the institutions' relative autonomy from government control and their reliance on student tuition and alumni support. It's a book that is at times counterintuitive and paradoxical but always interesting and persuasive.

Labaree points out that in the United States, we "make universities both accessible and elite by creating a pyramid of institutions in which access is inclusive at the bottom and exclusive at the top." This current system, which both "extends opportunity" while it simultaneously "protects privilege," has created "a structure in which universities are formally equal but functionally quite different, where those institutions that are most accessible provide the least social benefit, and those that are the least accessible open the most doors" (Labaree 2017, 5). The accessible base of this pyramid emerged in the twentieth century from what were called "junior colleges" but are now known as community colleges. The next tier consists of universities that have largely evolved out of nineteenth-century "normal schools," which were originally established to prepare teachers for the increasing number of secondary schools (Labaree 2017, 11). Second from the top tier are the universities that emerged from the land-grant colleges that also came into place in the nineteenth century, institutions that expanded "access for a broader array of students and offer . . . programs with practical applications in areas like agriculture and engineering" (Labaree 2017, 10). At the top of the pyramid are Ivy League colleges that "emerged in the colonial period, followed by a series of flagship state colleges" and other elite research universities (Labaree 2017, 10). Interestingly, Labaree specifically brackets in a different category colleges and universities with an explicit religious mission because these are institutions that exist at all levels of his hierarchy, and he also does not include for-profit proprietary institutions in his system.

I live and work in a county where Labaree's academic pyramid is clear and obvious. I am a professor at what Labaree would categorize as a "third-tier" university, Eastern Michigan University. EMU has a few PhD programs and many master's degree programs, but we are mainly focused on undergraduate education. We're an "opportunity granting"

institution in that many of our students come here because we accept over two-thirds of the students who apply, and we are affordable. We are a regional university, and almost all of our students are from southeast Michigan and the Detroit metropolitan area. About a third of our students are people of color, many of our students transfer here from area community colleges, and many are first-generation college students from lower-middle-class/working-class backgrounds. In other words, while I (mostly) love working at EMU for all kinds of different reasons, it's just one of 300 or so similar institutions in the United States, many of which are recognizable by the inclusion of a direction in their names. It is personally special to me because of my colleagues and my students, but statistically, it's not at all above average.

In contrast, EMU is 7 miles away from the main campus of the University of Michigan. The suburban sprawl between Ypsilanti and Ann Arbor is continuous, and the borders between the cities and townships are only clear to locals. Depending on your route from EMU's campus to UM's, you might pass by two other institutions in Labaree's hierarchy, Washtenaw Community College and Concordia University (which is associated with the Lutheran Church). Michigan is an elite research university, routinely ranked as one of the top twenty-five universities in the world, and it is one of the best public universities in the United States. It has about 29,000 undergraduates and 15,000 graduate students, and it is highly selective. The students are mostly white and upper middle class, and they come from all over the world. In fact, over half of the students attending the university aren't from the state of Michigan, and those out-of-state students pay about two-and-a-half times more than in-state students. And, of course, UM was one of the elite institutions MOOC providers partnered with from the beginning. In short, while EMU and UM are close to each other geographically, we are very, very far apart.

I mention all of this for two related reasons. First, institutions like my own—and not the elite schools that have partnered with the likes of edX and Coursera—have traditionally reached out to students who wouldn't otherwise have access to higher education because of an inadequate academic record from secondary school, because of the cost of attendance, because of the location of the institution, and so forth. While MOOCs have made the idea of online coursework palatable to elite institutions like UM, institutions like EMU have been offering online courses and programs for decades. In other words, institutions like EMU have long been doing what MOOC providers say they are trying to do in terms of "extending opportunity" to otherwise disenfranchised students.

Second, as I will discuss more in the closing chapter, if the future of MOOCs represents a potentially existential challenge to higher education as we know it, then it is institutions like mine that are the most vulnerable. Elite universities are in no danger from what is emerging after the MOOC moment or by any system of certificates or badges offered in lieu of a college degree. I predict that students in 2068 will still be attending UM in ways similar to the way they are attending the university today (albeit with different majors, modes of delivery, kinds of students, and so forth), and UM will still be considered one of the leading institutions in the world. I'm not as certain about the future of my own institution. If what comes after MOOCs gains traction in higher education in the future, will the EMUs of higher education continue to exist as the main institutional support for opportunity-seeking students?

WHAT "LEARNING" AND "INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATION" MEAN TO ME

To understand the reasons why MOOCs failed within higher education but continue to succeed outside of it, it's important to parse through the differences between "learning" versus "institutional education." Perhaps this is common sense, but it's worthwhile to spell out these differences explicitly in my introduction because I will be referring to them throughout this book.

Learning is about gaining knowledge or skills, and we learn in lots of different ways—through play, practice, experience, experiments, and study. There are few required components necessary to enable a learning opportunity; all a learner needs is some motivation and desire and some kind of content. Sometimes, particularly in play, the content of learning is other learners or even imaginary; sometimes the content includes whatever is in our environment; and sometimes it includes some of the more formal delivery systems of content, things like books, television, film, the internet, and so forth. Learning doesn't have to involve a teacher, and all of us can think of things we've taught ourselves or learned with/from friends, but teachers (in the form of friends, peers, coaches, parents, and yes, actual teachers and professors) are often present so that they can make learning more efficient by virtue of both their advanced knowledge of whatever is being learned and also of their pedagogical approach.

I think humans are learning animals in that we need to learn things to survive, and we generally find learning pleasurable and fulfilling. Obviously, not everyone likes learning the same things, an assertion

that's based on both my years of trying to teach writing to frequently resistant students and also my own dislike of learning things involving mathematics. But I do think people pursue learning simply because they enjoy and benefit from the experience. It's fun.

In contrast, institutional education is the formal schooling apparatus that enables the delivery of various kinds of evaluations, certificates, and degrees through a recognized, organized, and hierarchical bureaucracy. It's a technology characterized by specific roles for participants (e.g., students, teachers, professors, principals, deans) and where students are generally divided into groups based on both age and ability. Generally speaking, we divide institutional education in the United States into three groupings based on age and complexity: elementary, secondary, and higher. The division of students by age is particularly present in the early stages of institutional education, where "grades" of elementary students (first grade, second grade, and so forth) are based on the age of students rather than their specific abilities. These divisions shift toward complexity and ability as students advance through institutional education and particularly in higher education, but first-year college students still tend to be younger than fourth-year students, who tend to be younger than graduate students. In this country, children are required to participate in the institutional education system (and in most US states, those who opt out with an alternative, like home schooling, need to notify the government of this decision), at least through the middle of secondary education, better known as high school; and around 80 percent of Americans today graduate with a high school diploma. While that means that a significant 20 percent or so of Americans drop out of high school, the graduation rate from high school has made remarkable progress since the early twentieth century—in 1909 less than 20 percent of the US population graduated from high school (Bidwell 2015).

In the United States there are a variety of public, private, and for-profit institutions that fall generally into the category of "higher education." In addition to the unspoken hierarchies described by Labaree, there is also the more codified Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. This system, developed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and in place since 1970, has seven categories of institutions, with many divisions within those categories. For example, Washtenaw Community College is in the category "Associate's Colleges: Mixed Transfer/Career and Technical-High Nontraditional," and EMU was recently reclassified into the category "Doctoral Universities: Moderate Research Activity." The certifications or "degrees" students receive from higher education institutions are similar and widely

recognizable in the culture by other colleges and universities, employers, the government, and citizens: that is, a bachelor's degree from EMU in a particular subject area is the same kind of credential as a bachelor's degree in a comparable subject area from UM or any other recognized university. Further, these degrees and their credits are transferable in different ways. For example, while there are always specific institutional constraints, it is possible for students to take courses at EMU and then transfer them to a different degree program at UM, and vice versa. And while the somewhat arbitrary cultural value of a bachelor's degree from EMU is probably less than a bachelor's degree from UM in a similar field, both credentials would be sufficient for meeting the requirements of applying to graduate school or a particular job requiring that applicants have a college degree.

Institutional education at all levels is regulated by the government, particularly at primary and secondary levels. In fact, many primary and secondary school educators have argued that there is an overemphasis on this regulation in the form of being required to "teach to the test." Local school boards and community members frequently intervene down to the level of specific curricular choices, particularly in the case of controversial topics (sex education and the teaching of evolution immediately come to mind). While there are currently no mandated examinations for students in higher education analogous to what has been happening for decades in primary and secondary education, higher education institutions are also regularly reviewed by officially recognized and government-sanctioned accreditation bodies. Essentially, accreditors assure that the degrees offered by a particular institution are in line with that accreditor's standards, that the curriculum is sound, and that the institution falls into the realms of normal practices for the type of institution in question. Among many other things, universities need to be accredited for their students to be eligible for federal student aid and loan programs, and losing accreditation is usually the beginning of the end for that institution.

The point I'm belaboring here is that learning and institutional education are not the same thing. Learning and institutional education overlap like a Venn diagram, and every educator I've ever interacted with values learning and is also often frustrated with the aspects of institutional education that don't necessarily have much to do with learning. It is difficult to disagree with Sean Michael Harris and Jesse Stommel's (2017, 179) critique that too often institutional education is too engaged in the apparatus of delivering instruction based on particular outcomes and assessments: "Pedagogy, on the other hand, starts with learning as

its center, not students or teachers, and the work of pedagogues is necessarily political, subjective, and humane." At the same time, learning alone is not enough for institutional education to continue to function.

A specific example of this frustration is grading. I have never met an educator at any level who enjoys grading, and this is particularly true in my field where grading is time-consuming and usually requires an instructor to read and comment on hundreds of pages of student writing. Even in fields where evaluation and grading are more automated, grading is usually seen as an unwelcome but necessary by-product of the labor of teaching. At the same time, evaluating student performance in courses is critical to the credentialing function of institutional education. When we speak of college students as "customers" (a highly problematic metaphor, of course), we're fundamentally talking about how they are paying for the commodity of a degree, and that commodity is made possible in large part because of assessment and grading. An instructor's grade for a student is her certification regarding that specific course; when students gather enough of these certifications in the form of passing grades in courses from a set curriculum (majors, minors, general education) and earn enough credit hours from those courses, the institution grants the student the appropriate and widely recognized degree. Students would probably not enroll in courses or at universities where they didn't feel they were learning anything, but they certainly would not *pay* for those courses if there was no credit toward a degree associated with them.

Many critics have argued that educational credentials are a waste of time and money, that we ought to not require a bachelor's degree almost universally for white-collar jobs, and that we ought to have an alternative system of training outside of systematized higher education. I have sympathy with some of these critiques. But besides the fact that these critics themselves have college degrees (and often advanced degrees from elite universities) and that changing this reality would involve persuading employers who now require a college degree to reverse those practices, I like to think that there is value in the credentialing offered by institutional education. As an educator, I'm biased. But I'd argue that the employee who is required to earn a college degree to get her job is likely a better employee as a result of learning some things while passing through the system of institutional education. Further, I go through my day-to-day life reassured that the bureaucracy of institutional education trained, assessed, and credentialed my physicians and nurses, my lawyer, the engineers who helped design the car I drive, the scientists who helped develop the medications I take, and the teachers who educate my child.

So, how do MOOCs—both as they exist now and as they are likely to exist in the near future—problematize this relationship between learning and institutional education? Can MOOCs and their progeny provide a learning environment that is a noticeable improvement over other learning delivery systems, things like television, radio, films, or books? Can something like MOOCs ever become a credible tool in terms of granting the credentials of institutional education, credentials that are compatible with (or an alternative to) traditional colleges and universities? Will learning and institutional education change because of innovations beyond MOOCs, or will entrenched assumptions about learning and institutional education end up limiting future possibilities?

OUTLINE

This book's first chapter, "MOOCs in the University Context: The Rapid Rise, Fall, and Failure of MOOCs in Higher Education," offers an overview of the meteoric rise and fall of massive open online courses. I describe their beginnings as a relatively limited Canadian experiment in hybrid face-to-face and online teaching to their swift rise as a threat to the ongoing existence of universities and higher education, which was just as swiftly followed by their dramatic fall. I outline this trajectory and then offer my explanation as to the ways MOOCs proved to be ineffective as a way of delivering institutional education.

Chapter 2, "MOOCs as a Continuation of Distance Education Technologies," is a selective history of some of the key innovations in distance education that preceded MOOCs: correspondence study of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, radio and television courses in the middle of the twentieth century, and the first wave of online courses and degree programs in the late twentieth century. Despite the claims from MOOC entrepreneurs and enthusiastic media pundits, MOOCs are not entirely "new"; rather, MOOCs emerged from these distance education technologies, all of which either continue as an accepted means of delivering higher education or, in the case of public radio and television, have found relevance beyond institutional education.

Following the historical overview of these two chapters, I shift to an analysis of the contexts within MOOCs. Chapter 3, "MOOCs in the Student Context," is about my own experiences as a student, beginning with my active enrollment and participation in MOOCs in 2012 and concluding with my most recent (albeit incomplete) MOOC studies in 2017. This is followed by chapter 4, "MOOCs in the Faculty Context," which is based on interviews I conducted in 2015 with faculty and

graduate assistants involved in the development and teaching of six different MOOCs. The faculty perspectives here are importantly different from those of those MOOC enthusiasts who tend to be administrators or entrepreneurs, and I also think these interviews say a lot about teaching practices in more conventional university settings too.

I conclude with "The Present and (Fuzzy and Difficult to Predict) Future of MOOCs and Beyond." As that mouthful of a chapter title suggests, I qualify my predictions of what's next because too many predictions of the inevitability of MOOCs disrupting higher education have been spectacularly wrong. Still, I am willing to predict that the future of MOOCs will continue to be important, particularly outside of higher education. The concerns and fears of MOOCs that preoccupied many academics from about 2012 to 2014 have passed. But the increasing role of Online Program Management companies in the marketing, development, and delivery of distance education threatens to make the distinction between nonprofit universities and for-profit educational companies even more complicated.