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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

Rock Chalk, JAYHAWK!
% 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Un-satisfactory</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1:</strong> In general, the goals and objectives of the course were met.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2:</strong> 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.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3:</strong> Overall, how effective was the instructor?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4:</strong> Overall, how effective was the learning experience the course provided?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum & Instruction Scores

### 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Followed Course Syllabus</th>
<th>Human Diversity</th>
<th>Instructor Effective</th>
<th>Course Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum & Instruction Scores

2011-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Followed Course Syllabus</th>
<th>Human Diversity</th>
<th>Instructor Effective</th>
<th>Course Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum & Instruction Scores

### 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Followed Course Syllabus</th>
<th>Human Diversity</th>
<th>Instructor Effective</th>
<th>Course Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Thank you!

• For questions or a copy of the powerpoint, contact:
  Jennie Marsh
  jmarsh1@ku.edu