

Evaluating a Blended Program

Steve Kapp, PhD

Associate Dean for Academic Programs

Jennie Marsh, LMSW

Director of Field Education

Objectives

- Participants will develop an understanding of how context can impact the questions to be answered by a blended program evaluation.
- Participants will learn one model of evaluation design and implementation as used by this blended program.
- Participants will understand potential uses of evaluation data.
- Participants will learn about the implications of future evaluation and lessons learned during this evaluation process.

Context

- KU School of Social Welfare MSW Program
 - Campuses
 - Lawrence
 - Edwards
 - Hays
 - Garden City
 - Levels
 - Foundation
 - Advanced level- Clinical
 - Advanced level- Administration and Advocacy


Context

- Resistance to blended/online courses
- Overcoming resistance
 - University incentives \$
- Rollout- Fall 2009
 - Contracted for training and support


Context

- 2011- Desire to continuing growing vs. resistance
- Direct response to both- Evaluation
- Exploitation of current data


Comparison of Blended v Traditional Format MSW Courses 2009-2015



% of MSW Classes in Blended Format 2009-2015






Who is teaching Blended Courses



Who is taking Blended Courses

- Traditional- Fewer than 3 blended courses during foundation or clinical curriculum
- Blended- 3 or more blended courses during foundation or clinical curriculum

Who is taking Blended Courses



Components of the Evaluation

- Student field evaluations
- Curriculum & Instruction (C & I) scores
- Faculty/adjunct survey

Demographics

- Examined
 - Race/Ethnicity
 - Gender
 - Age
 - Distance Traveled
 - Full time/Part time

Demographics

- Higher proportion of part time students choose blended over traditional.
 - Ex. 2013-14:
 - FT 68% traditional vs. 32% blended
 - PT 43% traditional vs. 57% blended
- Distance drivers are more likely to choose blended courses.

Student Field Evaluations Foundation

- Compared Traditional vs Blended
Foundation Level students

Year	Items	N
2010-11	37	115
2011-12	37	118
2013-14	40	78

Student Field Evaluations Foundation

- No significant findings- no difference between the field evaluations for students defined as “blended” and students defined as “traditional” during any of the three years studied.

Student Field Evaluations Clinical

- Compared Traditional vs Blended
Advanced Level Clinical students

Year	Items	N
2010-11	16	109
2011-12	16	138
2012-13	16	138

Student Field Evaluations Clinical

- One significant finding:
2011-12- *“Apply knowledge and understanding of agency, community and legislative advocacy”*
Blended students scored significantly higher than traditional students.
- Minor inconclusive differences when compared by campus

Using existing data

- Immediately available and expedient access
- “Competency data”
 - Assesses relevant classroom knowledge, attitude, and behavior
 - Targets the application of professional behavior
- All is self-report- students and field instructors
- No controlled study within groups

Curriculum & Instruction Scores

	Un-satisfactory	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent	Not Applicable
Question 1: In general, the goals and objectives of the course were met.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Question 2: Material on race, ethnicity, social class, age, and gender was integrated into the course in accordance with a commitment to the advancement of social justice.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Question 3: Overall, how effective was the instructor?	1	2	3	4	5	6
Question 4: Overall, how effective was the learning experience the course provided?	1	2	3	4	5	6

Curriculum & Instruction Scores

2010-11

	Followed Course Syllabus	Human Diversity	Instructor Effective	Course Effective
Traditional	4.42	4.40	4.31	4.27
Blended	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.28

Curriculum & Instruction Scores

2011-12

	Followed Course Syllabus	Human Diversity	Instructor Effective	Course Effective
Traditional	4.53	4.50	4.44	4.37
Blended	4.40	4.45	4.32	4.27

Curriculum & Instruction Scores

2013-14

	Followed Course Syllabus	Human Diversity	Instructor Effective	Course Effective
Traditional	4.49	4.56	4.45	4.37
Blended	4.47	4.45	4.44	4.37

Blended Faculty/Adjunct Survey

- Eighteen responses
- Anonymous
- Online survey tool

Blended Faculty/Adjunct Survey

- Your experience teaching blended:
 - 9 had positive experiences (ex. Forces me to be thoughtful about the process, Students enjoy it and need the flexibility, strong technology, it's not for every student)
 - 5 had mixed experiences (ex. Students like it but more difficult for the instructor, Students are struggling, sharp learning curve for faculty)
 - 3 had negative experiences (ex. No continuity, very challenging for clinical content, student not getting enough material)

Blended Faculty/Adjunct Survey

- Your thoughts about SSW utilizing the blended course option
 - Works well for some classes but not others.
 - Both options should be consistently used.
 - More traditional format classes should utilize Blackboard technology- it's not inferior!
 - Online learning is the way of the future/unavoidable trend/need it to keep up, etc.
 - Blended is something we should use very little.
 - Local students should not be allowed to take blended courses.
 - Blended courses should be more consistent- too much variation with how they are taught, according to students.

Blended Faculty/Adjunct Survey

- Suggestions for improvements/changes
 - First class should not be online.
 - Need instruments that evaluate a student's fit with the online approach.
 - Need master syllabi specific to blended format.
 - Keep class sizes smaller.
 - Best practice recommendations from the School about teaching in blended format.
 - Bring together faculty and instructors teaching blended periodically.
 - Listen to what students tell us about their experiences.
 - Some courses should be offered fully online.
 - Careful that the coming standardized assignments do not create a logistical problem with blended courses- format changes the natures of the assignment.

Using the Evaluation

- Presented to adjuncts, faculty, and university
 - Generated good buzz
 - Building respect for the format and methods
- Supporting the program
 - Keeping faculty invested
 - New faculty coming in
 - GTAs requesting blended format
 - Recruiting/marketing- brochure

Using the Evaluation

- Improving the program
 - Utilizing the “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education” (Chickering & Gamson, 1991)
 - Schedule change (Encouraging instructor/student contact, Communicate high expectations, Embracing diversity & learning style)
 - Accountability during blended weeks (Develop student reciprocity & cooperation, Active learning, Prompt feedback, Time on task, Embracing diversity & learning styles)

Using the Evaluation

- Improving the program
 - Organization is key
 - Seminars for new technology every year
 - No more tech support contractor- integrated
 - Student self-assessment*

Lessons Learned and Future Considerations

- Considering all student sub-groups
- Definitional tension- blended option vs blended program
- Faculty investment is crucial
 - New faculty hires
 - GTAs
- Keeping up with the technology

Bibliography

Batts, D., Colaric, S., & McFadden, C. (2006). Online courses demonstrate use of seven principles. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*. 3, 15-25.

Chickering, A. & Gamson, Z. (1991). *Applying the seven principles for good practice in understanding graduate education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thank you!

- For questions or a copy of the powerpoint, contact:

Jennie Marsh

jmarsh1@ku.edu