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My focus today...

1. What is blended learning?

2. Why should it interest you?

3. Scaling up blended learning
1. So what is blended learning?

A. The course syllabus is online
B. The instructor uses PowerPoint in lectures
C. Class meets less often and has online activities
D. All of the above
E. None of the above
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of Content Delivered Online</th>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Typical Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Course with no online technology used — content is delivered in writing or orally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 29%</td>
<td>Web Facilitated</td>
<td>Course which uses web-based technology to facilitate what is essentially a face-to-face course. Uses a course management system (CMS) or web pages to post the syllabus and assignments, for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 79%</td>
<td>Blended/Hybrid</td>
<td>Course that blends online and face-to-face delivery. Substantial proportion of the content is delivered online, typically uses online discussions, and typically has some face-to-face meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+%</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>A course where most or all of the content is delivered online. Typically have no face-to-face meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sloan-C report Blending-In
Takes best advantage of both worlds

Source: Graham, 2006
2. Why should blended learning interest you?

Student perspective

Faculty perspective

Institutional perspective
Student Perspective: Blended learning clearly improves accessibility

Allows for flexibility in students’ study, work, and life balance
Students don’t want “all tech, all the time”

ECAR 2007 survey n= 27,675
Preference for blended course format at York University

- Fully online: 12%
- Blended: 48%
- Face-to-face: 40%

N = 2121
34 courses
Students indicated strong satisfaction in my survey of Canadian 8 universities (n=2,714)

“Overall, I am quite satisfied with this [blended] course” – average 70% (range 65-100%)

http://irlt.yorku.ca/reports.html
I would take another course in the future that has both online and face-to-face components [at York U]

- Disagree/Strongly Disagree: 24%
- Neutral: 20%
- Agree/Strongly Agree: 56%

N = 2121
34 courses
Taking this course increased my interest in the material [York U]

- **Strongly Agree/Agree**: 57%
- **Neutral**: 23%
- **Strongly Disagree/Disagree**: 20%

N = 2121
34 courses
BUT, what about improving learning/retention?

Success and withdrawal rates (Moskal et al. 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Success (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blended</td>
<td>69,436</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully online</td>
<td>188,776</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>839,028</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture capture</td>
<td>16,354</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended lecture capture</td>
<td>45,213</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Withdrawal (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture capture</td>
<td>18,037</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully online</td>
<td>188,916</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>933,846</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended lecture capture</td>
<td>55,665</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended</td>
<td>70,045</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1883 economics and business students at KU Lueven – 30 courses
Further evidence...

“Students who took all or part of their class online performed better, on average, than those taking the same course through traditional face-to-face instruction.”

(51 studies, effect size = +0.24)

US DoE, 2009
## Findings on student learning

\( n = 2094 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Year I</th>
<th>Year II</th>
<th>Year III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 (increased interest in subject)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 (improved understanding of concepts)</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 (developed better communication skills)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 (more opportunities to reflect)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Owston, 2014
A student’s perspective...
Faculty perspective on blended...

- High satisfaction
- Get to know students better
- Adds flexibility to your schedule
- Reinvigorates teaching
Institutional perspective...cost avoidance

Online and blended courses allowed UCF to avoid more than $7 million in construction costs $277,000 in annual operating costs (Hartman, 2007)

Our calculations show that 100 new courses will yield about $12 million in income and cost $1.5 million → ROI 8:1 (http://irlt.yorku.ca)
Improved classroom utilization

(Hartman, 2007)
So why is blended learning not scaling so well?
Challenges for students

• Transition – from a passive to an active learning approach

• Study and time management skills, esp. low achievers

• Expecting that fewer F2F classes equates to less work

• Accepting responsibility for completing individual & team activities
Challenges for faculty

- Workload/tenure issues
- Resistance to change—why bother?
- Time consuming initially
- Managing with scarce support for course redesign
- Learning to use new technologies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear indication/evidence that students would benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release time to design/redesign my courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence that the technology would work the way I planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A better understanding of the types of technologies that are relevant to teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct assistance from IT staff to support the technology I choose to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct assistance from an instructional design expert to design/redesign my courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges for the institution
Three phases of implementation

Awareness/exploration

Adoption/early implementation

Mature implementation/growth

Graham et al.
Importance of alignment

Alignment of institutional, faculty, and student goals essential

Moskal et al.
Engagement of leaders

Transformational change is predicated on engaged leadership

Garrison & et al.
Need for supportive culture

Bottom-up change cannot occur without supportive senior administration and institutional culture that values pedagogical experimentation

Katerina Carbonell et al.
Leading from the middle:
Andy Hargreaves

“Effective change is not only led from the top, it is led from many places, including the middle.”
My own perspectives

• Business case for elearning
• Incentive plans, locally, university-wide and provincial
• Institutional planning at York
In summary...

Blended learning can lead to greater student satisfaction and learning

BUT

Institutional support/commitment essential to scale

What can you do to help scale up blended learning?

Questions/comments?
Follow up ...

rowston@edu.yorku.ca

@RonOwston

http://ronowston.ca

Presentation at
http://www.yorku.ca/rowston/Aarhus.pdf