Evaluation of Blended Learning Courses in the Faculty of Fine Arts – Fall/Winter Session 2011-2012

by

Ron Owston, PhD

Dennis York

Technical Report No. 2012-4

Institute for Research on Learning Technologies

July 2012

Executive Summary

Presented in this report are the results of a study on the first year implementation of the blended learning project in the Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA) that was supported by the Academic Innovation Fund. In five compulsory introductory FFA1900 courses face-to-face tutorials were replaced with online versions. We examined course Moodle sites, surveyed and interviewed instructors, and surveyed tutorial leaders. Students enrolled in three courses in the Winter 2012 session were also surveyed on their perceptions of their blended learning experience.

The Moodle sites for each course, including those of the tutorial sections, were analyzed on four criteria derived from the literature: (1) organization and layout; (2) instructional design and delivery; (3) communication, interaction, and collaboration; and (4) learner support and resources. The main course websites developed by instructors, with one exception, were well-organized, easy to navigate, and provided a variety of resources. However, some sites appeared to be inconsistent in the amount of resources available to students on different weekly topics and one contained an excessive amount of material on the home page. On the other hand, there was considerable variation in the quality of organization and content of the tutorial websites and fewer than half were judged to be structured well enough to support student learning.

The student survey results suggest that fewer than half were satisfied with their blended course and would take another course in the blended format. Students were not totally opposed to blended learning because when asked which of three formats they preferred—face-to-face, blended, or fully online—they were about evenly split between the first two formats (~40% each). Overall, students tended to feel that the blended format required more time and effort and that they were disconnected from other students. Most of the dissatisfaction appeared to be due to the tutorials.

Instructors were supportive of the blended initiative and willing to carry on in the next academic year, but felt the need for additional technical support. Although a relatively small number of tutorial leaders responded to their survey, they were generally quite negative about their experience and cited additional workload concerns and the lack of social contact with students face-to-face as reasons for their discontent.

Given the above findings, five recommendations below with respect to the blended initiative next year are offered.

1. Given that student satisfaction was less than 50%, the Faculty of Fine Arts should base all decisions made with regard to blended learning in the future on creating conditions under which students will find their learning experience much more positive.
2. The model of fully online tutorials should be discontinued or that no more than half of the tutorial classes be conducted online with the remainder being face-to-face.
3. A standard Moodle template should be designed for all 1900 courses and their tutorial sites to provide a more consistent learning experience for students.
4. Instructors should be provided with ready access to technical and pedagogical support either from FFA or university central services.
5. FFA should continue to explore ways of gaining copyright clearance for lectures that are captured for the web. This applies to recording of guest speakers as well as to various media that are shown in class for which only classroom rights are held.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1. Introduction

In the spring of 2011, the Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA) was awarded a grant from the Academic Innovation Fund to develop *blended learning*[1] versions of its compulsory core introductory courses. The Institute for Research on Learning Technologies (IRLT) was engaged to conduct an analysis of course Moodle website design, assess student perceptions of their blended courses, and examine instructor experiences in teaching in the blended format. This report presents the results of the evaluation of five introductory courses that were offered in the blended format in Fall and Winter 2012. Due to the start date of the evaluation in January 2012, student data could be collected only for three courses offered in the Winter 2012 term.

The framework used to guide the study was developed as part of the *E-Learning Business Case for York University*[2]. This framework uses four criteria to assess the merits of three instructional modes: web-enhanced learning, blended learning, and fully online learning. The criteria asked of the three instructional methods, how well they:

1. Increase York's ability to respond to enrolment pressures
2. Provide better experience for commuter students
3. Better engage students
4. Improve student learning

The criteria led to the development of the data collection instruments and are used as organizers for presenting the results of student and instructor perceptions sections of this report. The report begins with a description of the methods used to gather data, which is followed by an analysis of the content and design of the course Moodle websites. The student survey results are presented next and after this instructor experiences are presented. The report concludes with a summary and recommendations for future blended learning offerings in FFA.

---

[1] For the purposes of this study, blended learning courses are defined as those where a portion of the face-to-face time of the standard lecture is replaced with online activities.

[2] See http://irlt.yorku.ca/reports/E-learningcasefinalversion.pdf

The blended learning model used for the FFA courses consisted of the course instructor delivering weekly face-to-face lectures assisted by between 8 to 10 teaching assistants who conducted tutorial sessions fully online.

2. Methodology

The five courses in the study and the enrolments for Winter 2012 course as reported by the instructors are given in Table 1 below. Enrolments were not available for Fall 2011 courses.

Table 1: Courses Included in Study

Course Number	Course Title	Term	Enrolment
VISA 1900	Art in the City	Fall 2011	N/A
FILM 1900	Anatomy of the Feature Film	Fall 2011	N/A
THEA 1900	Intercultural Theatre	Winter 2012	220
MUSI 1900	Music in the City	Winter 2012	242
DANC 1900	Dance, Film and Culture	Winter 2012	304
Total enrolment of Winter 2012 courses			766

2.1 Analysis of Moodle content and design

We analyzed the content of the above five Moodle course websites. The framework employed was an adaptation of three existing evaluation rubrics frequently used to assess the design and delivery of online courses in higher education. These rubrics include: the *Quality Online Course Initiative (QOCI) Rubric*[3], the *Quality Matters Rubric*[4], and the *Rubric for Online Instruction*[5]. A brief comparison of mentioned evaluation rubrics is presented in Appendix A. Our rubric was specifically tailored for assessing blended courses and consists of four evaluation criteria as follows:

---

[3] Quality Online Course Initiative (QOCI) Rubric. An initiative sponsored by Illinois Online Network (ION) University of Illinois. Retrieved February 09, 2012, from http://www.ion.uillinois.edu/initiatives/qoci/rubric.asp

[4] Quality Matters[TM] Rubric Standards 2011-2013 (2011) developed by Quality Matters Program, Maryland Online Inc. Retrieved February 09, 2012, from http://www.qmprogram.org/files/QM_Standards_2011-2013.pdf

[5] Rubric for Online Instruction (2009). An initiative sponsored by California State University, Chico. Retrieved February 09, 2012, from http://www.csuchico.edu/tlp/resources/rubric/rubric.pdf

1. *Moodle course website organization and layout design*: refers to the use of Web pages, graphics, multimedia, and accessibility standards in the web pages of a course under the course instructor's control and within the Moodle specifications.
2. *Instructional design and delivery*: refers to the analysis of learning needs and the systemic approach to developing an online course in a manner that facilitates the transfer of knowledge and skills to the learner through the use of a variety of instructional methods, which cater to multiple learning styles, strategies, and preferences.
3. *Communication, interaction, and collaboration:* addresses how the course design, assignments, and technology effectively encourage exchanges amongst the instructor, students, and content.
4. *Learner support and resources:* refers to program, academic, and/or technical resources available to learners.

Each of the above criteria has three sub-criteria. A complete description of the rubric is given in Appendix B.

Our analysis consisted of writing narrative summaries of the extent to which the courses met the above criteria.

2.2 Student, instructor, and tutorial leader surveys

When developing the student and instructor questionnaires, we reviewed several existing instruments to determine how well they met the needs of this study. These included: the *Classroom Survey of Student Engagement* (CLASSE)[6], which is an adaptation of the National Survey of Student Engagement; the faculty and surveys in the appendices of Garrison and Vaughan's book *Blended Learning In Higher Education*[7]; the *Blended Learning Tookit*[8] developed at the University of Central Florida; and faculty and student surveys from Cook,

---

[6] Classroom Survey of Student Engagement (CLASSE). An adaptation of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) with permission from Indiana University. Retrieved November 03, 2011, from http://assessment.ua.edu/CLASSE/Documents/CLASSE_Student.pdf

[7] Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in Higher Education: Framework, principles, and guidelines* (Appendiices 5 and 6). Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

[8] Blended Course Student Survey | Blended Learning Toolkit, prepared by the University of Central Florida and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Retrieved November 03, 2011, from http://blended.online.ucf.edu/evaluation-resources/survey-instruments/

Owston, and Garrison's COHERE study[9]. Then we either adapted questions from these existing surveys or developed our own questions so that the four criteria cited in the *E-Learning Business Case* cited above were adequately addressed. Added to these were several other questions specific to the York University context. The resulting final questionnaires are given in Appendix C (Survey for Students) and Appendix E (Survey for Faculty).

A paper version of the student questionnaires was administered in class a week or two before the classes ended by either one or both of the authors. Prior to completing the questionnaires students read and signed an informed consent form that was approved by York University's Research Ethics Sub-Committee. Responses were anonymous, however students were asked to fill in their student numbers. The student numbers were used to award by random draw in each class a $25 gift card from the York University Bookstore. All students in attendance at the time of administration agreed to complete the questionnaire resulting in a total of 349 respondents.

The five instructors were invited to attend one of two face-to-face meetings we held where they were asked to complete their questionnaire. Afterwards an informal discussion was held that offered instructors an opportunity to elaborate on their responses or to discuss any other aspect of their experience teaching in the blended mode. One instructor could not attend the face-to-face meeting but completed the questionnaire at another time.

The tutorial leaders were asked to complete a brief open ended online survey that asked what they saw as the strengths of online tutorials, their limitations, and suggestions for future offerings of the tutorials. A total of 24 tutorial leaders were asked to respond, but only 7 did so.

---

[9] Cook, K., Owston, R. D., & Garrison, R. D. (2004). *Blended learning Practices at COHERE universities.* (Institute for Research on Learning Technologies Technical Report No. 2004-5). Toronto, ON: York University.

3. Analysis of Course Moodle Websites

Each of the five courses had its own Moodle site created by the instructor. Tutorial leaders assigned to each course also created their own individual website for their tutorial section. Table 2 below shows the number of Moodle sites created by the course directors for their lectures and the number created by the tutorial leaders.

Table 2: Number of Moodle Course Websites

Course title	Moodle Course Websites		Total
	Created by instructors (lecture-based)	Created by tutorial leaders* (tutorial based)	
VISA 1900A	1	8	9
FILM 1900A	1	10	11
THEA 1900N	1	8	9
MUSI 1900M	1	8	9
DANC 1900M	1	8	9
TOTAL	5	42	47

Next we present our analysis of course websites developed by both the course directors for their lectures and by tutorial leaders for their section.

3.1 Moodle course website organization and layout design

Lecture-based websites. Four out of five course websites examined were well-organized and easy to navigate throughout the sites. All five course websites used a York Moodle template. Four courses were set up using a weekly course format; one website contained only two course-related objects – course announcements and course outline. Two courses were quite consistent in their functionalities and visual representation; while other two course websites included minor inconsistencies throughout their websites, for instance, the lack of consistency in a list of items in each week of the course (e.g., some weeks had a large number of resources; other had none). In addition, one course website home page consisted of a large amount of information in the form of hyperlinks, audio files, YouTube videos, and extended descriptions that made the home page too lengthy and confusing to the student to navigate the website.

Most course websites displayed Word- or PDF-processed documents, PowerPoint presentations, and audio files as individual items that needed to be open in a separate window or even required the current version of software (e.g., MS Office) to be able to view or listen to the file. A few instructors attempted to embed document or media files into Moodle. As to multimedia elements, we observed two course websites containing lecture recordings in various formats (e.g., a combination of images and audio, a combination of PowerPoint slides and audio). Some instructors took advantage of external video service, such as YouTube videos. All audio/video files met minimum audio and video standards, such as clarity, length, and system compatibility.

Tutorial-based websites. Only 20 out of 42 tutorial websites examined were well-organized, functionally consistent, and communicated clearly online tutorial information throughout their Moodle websites. The rest of tutorial websites were insufficiently designed restricting the Moodle activity to a collection of discussion forums. Two tutorial courses were designed and actively maintained only during the first part of the course (i.e., up to the reading week); the rest of Moodle home pages were empty. It needs to be noted that tutorial websites of two courses appeared to follow an identical template, perhaps offered by their course director. These tutorial websites were equally designed and functionally consistent. However, only 10 tutorial websites of one course were designed in an appropriate format and provided evidence of high interactivity and support resources provided by tutorial leaders.

3.2 Instructional design and delivery

Lecture-based websites. During our examination of five course syllabi, instructors indicated that tutorials would be held online via Moodle. We did not find any information about blended course or about being a blended learner (e.g., possible challenges students may encounter while learning in a blended modality, suggestions or tips for students on how to structure and manage their learning in the blended course) either in a course syllabus or on a Moodle website. The analysis of course grading scales revealed that participation in online tutorial activities (i.e., online participation in discussion forums on Moodle) comprised on average 25% of a student's final grade. One course director assigned 20% of the total grade to online discussions and another course director seemed to assign 50% of the total grade to online activities (including online quizzes).

The content structure of all courses was sequenced and structured in a way to help students understand course organization and its main components. All courses provided a concise list of modules and learning activities, as well as a grading structure. Only one course provided consistently weekly expectations to the students over Moodle. In two courses, the course directors posted a code of conduct on Moodle (e.g., Code of Conduct for Online Forums or Online Code of Conduct). Academic integrity expectations were addressed in all five courses; however, only two course directors provided a link on Moodle to an academic integrity tutorial. Only four course syllabi contained information about assistance/services provided for students with special needs; one course website provided link to special needs services in a course announcement forum. None of course syllabi provided a list of technical competencies necessary for course completion (e.g., Internet skills, Moodle proficiency etc.) nor a list of technical requirements (e.g., connection speed, hardware, and software), except mentioning Moodle and Internet access in a few cases. Four course websites had a dedicated area for course-related documents (syllabus, information about assignments, course-related discussions etc.).

Three course websites contained varieties of multimedia learning objects, such as lecture recordings, lecture notes, course readings, links to external websites, articles, or online videos, and others. All course websites took advantage of course announcement Moodle function; one course director utilized a Moodle poll feature, and the other one used Moodle online submission for assignments and quizzes.

Tutorial-based websites. Despite the main focus of tutorial leaders on the development and facilitation of forum discussions, some tutorial leaders took initiative and provided students with supplementary resources, weekly helpers, assignment guidelines, and even provided weekly reflections on students' participation in forum discussions. In addition to forum discussions, four tutorial leaders exploited the interactive opportunities of Twitter. Two tutorial websites provided students with a document outlining discussion forum etiquette. The other ten tutorial websites used a separate forum discussion to clarify emerging issues about using a course forum.

3.3 Communication, interaction, & collaboration

Lecture-based websites. All instructors used the course announcement feature on Moodle to inform their students about course-related issues. In addition, one instructor created a Q&A

forum to encourage students to ask the instructor or other students about course-related concerns.

Tutorial-based websites. All tutorial websites used course announcements and discussion forums to facilitate interaction among students. Students were asked to introduce themselves in only six tutorial sections. When examining the contents of discussion forums, we noted that few TAs have managed to organize students' discussions in a clearly defined forum. Most forums, especially those where students interacted with the course content, contained multiple discussion threads making it difficult to follow the stream of collective exchanges (e.g., students shared their responses in separate threads within one discussion topic). Despite some challenges with proper organization of discussion forums, content-related discussions proved to be highly interactive in most tutorial sections. In a number of discussions, particularly course related forums, we observed active participation of TAs who either answered students' concerns or contributed their knowledge to facilitate communication. We were unable to access discussion forums on 16 tutorial websites due to their unavailability (e.g. some discussions were closed by TA at certain time during the course).

3.4 Learner support and resources

All lecture-based Moodle websites demonstrated evidence of providing students with links to institutional policies in their course syllabi, two courses had links on their websites in a designated area (e.g., links to academic integrity resources, special needs services etc.).

All lecture- and tutorial websites integrated Moodle-powered lists of links to tutorials and other Moodle support (e.g., getting started, recommended browsers, links to technical support), as well as to the York e-library, tutoring center, and other resources. A few course websites (e.g., 3 lecture and 12 tutorial websites) provided a customized list of course-specific resources (e.g., iTunes support, survival guide, course-related library resources).

3.5 Summary

Overall, all but one of the lecture-based course websites were well-organized and easy to navigate. Weighting of the final grade for online activities and participation appeared to range from 20% to 50%. Content was sequenced and structured in a way to help students understand course organization and its main components and most sites provided a variety of links and multimedia resources. The tutorial-based websites varied considerably in their content. Some tutorial leaders provided students with supplementary resources, weekly helpers, assignment guidelines, and even provided weekly reflections on students' participation in forum discussions; others were essentially a collection of discussion forums.

4. Student Responses to Blended Learning

In this section, the results of the student survey on blended learning are presented under the headings of: Increase York's Ability to Respond to Enrolment Pressures; Provide Better Experience for Commuter Students; Better Engage Students; and Improve Student Learning. Under each heading quantitative summaries to the multiple choice items and qualitative summaries of student written comments are given. Mean and standard deviations on all of them are provided in Appendix D.

4.1 Increase York's ability to respond to enrolment pressures

Multiple choice responses

Five survey items addressed York's ability to respond to enrolment pressures. Three items dealt with student satisfaction with their blended course and two dealt with cost factors. From Table 3 below, it can be seen that not quite half of the students indicated that they were satisfied with their course (Q1 49% Agree/Strongly Agree) and the same number would take another blended course (Q2 49% A/SA). When asked to choose their preferred format of instruction (Q23), slightly more chose face-to-face lectures (41.5%) than the blended format (57.6%), while17.5% chose entirely online.

Two survey items related to costs associated with blended learning. A majority of students were negative about their willingness to pay an extra $15 associated course fee to be able to download and keep video recordings of their lectures (Q27 53.6% Disagree/Strongly Disagree). The second item (Q7) dealt with York technical support which would be an additional cost to the university if the blended courses required additional support. Fortunately, a sizable group of students did not seek any technical support for their blended course as 41.1% responded Not Applicable to this item, while those that did seek support were neutral for the most part about the quality of support they received.

Table 3: Students Responses to Questions Relating to Enrolment Pressures (%)

Survey Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q1 (overall satisfied)	8.9	18.7	22.8	37.2	11.8
Q2 (I'd take another course)	11.2	15.5	22.6	32.1	16.9
Q27 (extra $15 fee for video lectures)	29.0	24.6	21.7	15.5	6.2
Q7 (York tech support)*	7.3	7.6	28.9	10.2	5.0
Q23 (course format preference)	Entirely face to face – 41.5 | Blended format – 40.6 Entirely online – 17.5				

* 41.1% responded as "Not Applicable"

Written comments

Students wrote 9 comments related to Q1 about their satisfaction. Surprisingly, given the tone of the responses above, all but 8 respondents were positive while the other respondent stated a preference for live discussions. Typical positive comments were:

- Really love this course and its format.
- Great choice of blending face-to-face and online components of course without losing focus on core concepts.
- Overall, I enjoyed this course and was able to succeed in the course. I would recommend it for the future.

4.2 Provide better experience for commuter students

Multiple choice responses

Responses to the seven survey items related to improving commuter students' university experience are given in Table 4. The responses suggest that fewer than half of students are not working (Q30 54%), while those who do work spend fewer than 19 hours per week (36.9%). Nevertheless, 55% responded to Q8 that they agreed or strongly agreed that a benefit of blended learning is that they do not have to come to campus as often. Fewer than half of the students also indicated that taking a blended course results in less travel time and lower commuting expenses (Q9 38.7% A/SA). Slightly more responded that their course Moodle sites

appeared to provide them with better access to course content compared to traditional courses (Q3 43.8% A/SA).

Response to other aspects of students' blended experience was less than positive. Nearly half of students responded that blended courses required more time and effort (Q21 49% A/SA). Well over half of students reported that they disagreed that they feel more connected with other students Q14 (60.5% D/SA), and just over a third of the respondents indicated that they felt isolated in their blended course (Q15 36.3% A/SA).

Table 4: Students Responses to Questions on Better Experience for Commuter Students (%)

Survey Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q8 (convenience of not having to come to campus)	8.6	10.1	17.9	26.8	28.2
Q9 (reduced travel and expenses)	11.0	13.4	25.3	18.9	19.8
Q3 (improved access to content)	7.2	16.3	30.7	29.8	14.0
Q21 (more time and effort required)	5.3	16.4	27.8	28.7	21.3
Q14 (feel connected with others)	25.9	34.6	23.1	12.1	2.6
Q15 (feel isolated)	7.5	19.0	34.9	24.5	11.8
Q30 (employment workload)	Not working – 54.0 | 1-9 hours – 18.0 | 10-19 hours – 18.9 20-29 hours – 6.8 | 30-39 hours – 1.2 | 40+ hours – 1.2				

Written responses

Eight written comments were made that related to improving the experience of commuter students. There were 2 comments concerning the convenience of the course format, both positive e.g. "This course is amazingly accessible – having materials and lecture recordings online is great because if needed be you can always refer back." Two comments were about the

excessive demands made on students with the blended format. The remaining 4 comments were about the assignments and/or the online component. For example, one student wrote:

> It didn't make sense to me that this course had a group assignment when tutorials were online. Having never met the members in my group it made it exceedingly difficult to get in contact with them. I would highly advise against an assignment like that in the future because it only provided extreme anxiety.

4.3 Better engage students

Multiple choice responses

Fifteen survey questions dealt with topics related to student engagement broadly defined (see Table 5). Of interest was that slightly more students felt that the online and face-to-face components did not enhanced each other (Q4 37.5% A/SA) compared to those who felt they did (34.4% A/SA), and nearly half did not feel more engaged in their blended course compared to others they had taken (Q10 48.1% D/SD). Four of the questions, Q12, Q13, Q16, and Q17, focused quantity and quality on interaction with other students in the class and between students and instructor. On all four of these questions most students disagreed or strongly disagreed that blended courses were superior. A slight majority of students were reported that their course Moodle site was well-organized and easy to navigate (Q5 57.5% A/SA), but fewer found the course web resources helpful (Q6 48.1% A/SA).

When students were forced to choose their most preferred lecture format, a plurality chose attending lectures face-to-face (Q24 48.1%) and a plurality also preferred in-class discussions (Q26 46.2%). Moreover, a plurality responded that face-to-face tutorials were preferred (Q25 44.3%).

Table 5: Students Responses to Questions on Engagement (%)

Survey Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q4 (online and F2F components enhanced each other)	11.7	25.8	27.5	23.8	10.6
Q10 (more engaged)	20.7	27.4	29.4	14.7	6.6
Q11 (likely to ask questions more)	15.1	30.7	29.6	15.9	6.4
Q18 (overwhelmed with information)	8.0	29.8	30.1	20.3	10.6
Q20 (feel anxious)	10.6	30.2	25.9	21.0	10.3
Q12 (S-S amount of interaction increased)	28.1	30.7	20.6	13.8	5.7
Q13 (S-S quality of interaction better)	24.5	28.2	29.1	12.7	2.9
Q16 (S-I amount of interaction increased)	23.3	28.8	25.4	14.4	4.6
Q17 (S-I quality of interaction better)	18.8	25.7	31.2	15.6	6.1
Q19 (trouble using technologies)	25.7	41.3	17.3	8.7	4.6
Q5 (Moodle organized)	9.8	10.9	21.3	35.9	21.6
Q6 (web resources helpful)	7.4	9.2	34.1	35.8	12.3
Q24 (lecture format preferred)	Attending lectures face to face – 48.1 | Accessing online videos of lectures – 22.0 | A combination of both – 28.7				
Q25 (tutorial format preferred)	Attending face to face – 44.3 | Participating online – 32.3 A combination of both – 22.6				
Q26 (discussion format preferred)	Class discussion – 46.2 | Online discussion – 32.5 A combination of both – 19.3				

Written Responses

A total of 89 written comments were made that relate to engagement. The vast majority were entirely negative; however some began by describing a positive aspect but then went into detail about a negative characteristic of the course. The students were mainly concerned about the way the nature of the tutorials and several complained about the tutorial leaders themselves. Representative comments about the nature of the tutorials are:

- This course was entirely unreasonable. The amount at which forums are worth is ridiculous and detrimental to the marks. Face-to-face allows for wiggle room and conversation which the online component takes away. I HATE THE FORMAT!!!
- I will not take online courses ever again. Online tutorials are confusing, demanding (time, extra work etc.) no tutorials make me feel alienated from my peers and mostly from my TA who doesn't get the chance to truly get to know me- hear me out = express myself face-to-face. The difference in my grade and ability to participate is immense and negative.
- It seemed odd that we had a group assignment for an online course when we had never met the members of our tutorials. I know that this resulted in a significant mark drop for a lot of people because of communication issues.
- The online component takes away some learning experience. I feel that a face-to-face lecture and tutorial would increase communication between students and enhance their experience in the classroom. At times I feel lost in this class.; that I cannot ask questions or communicate with a real person. I would not take or recommend a blended course to anyone.

Comments about the tutorial leaders included:
- Because this course was new, there were a lot of issues with structural organization. Also, the tutorial leaders refused to answer or help with anything. If I came up to them to ask for help I was dismissed.
- Really did not like the online. TA never replied to an emails gave no feedback and make it even harder to understand course material. Really poor class, felt like another York money grab!
- A huge part of this course depends on how effective your TA is. In the beginning of this course my TA was non-existent and unfair. Upon having my TA switched, my enjoyment with the course increased. I think a lot of answers you get will reflect quality of TAs and not the online components itself.

Despite their general criticism of the tutorials and their leaders, the few times students commented on their course directors they were positive saying they "enjoyed the class", the professor was "awesome", and the class was "great".

4.4 Improve student learning

Multiple choice responses

Only one question asked students their perceptions of whether the blended format helped improve their learning. This was Q22 in Table 6 below where slightly more students (35.2%) indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that their understanding of key concepts of the course better than previous face-to-face courses than those who did not feel that way. Just over half of students responded that they had strong time management skills (Q28 55% A/SA) and almost all said they were motivated to succeed (Q29 82.3% A/SA). The median reported GPA of students was in the B/B+ category.

Table 6: Students Responses to Questions on Learning (%)

Survey Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q22 (improved understanding)	11.2	18.7	34.0	27.1	8.1
Q28 (strong time management skills)	5.9	12.4	26.2	34.4	20.6
Q29 (motivated to succeed)	.6	2.4	14.1	39.4	42.9
Q31 (GPA)	A/A+ (8.0-9.0) – 17.4 | B/B+ (6.0-7.9) – 69.9 | C/C+ (4.0-5.9) – 10.9 | D+ and less (less than 3.9) – .9				

Written comments

Only four students made a comment related directly to learning. Two commended favourably about how the course director helped the student learn; one felt the course was too hard for non-majors, and the other wanted to have the online materials but to have face-to-face lectures and tutorials.

4.5 Summary

Overall, a picture emerges that students were not particularly satisfied with the model of having online tutorials blended with face-to-face lectures. Fewer than 50% of students responded that they were satisfied with their course or would take another blended course. Most students felt the blended format required more time and effort and they felt disconnected from other students. Their preferred mode of learning was traditional face-to-face lectures and tutorials.

The discontent clearly arose from the online tutorials because of the way they were organized and led. Moreover, only just over a third of the students felt that the blended format helped improve their learning.

5. Instructor Responses to Blended Learning

Survey responses

The instructor survey responses were grouped under the same four criteria that were used for student responses. Responses are summarized in Tables 7 to 10 below. With regard to issues related to York's ability to respond to enrolment pressures by offering blended learning, 4 of the 5 preferred the blended format in which to teach. The instructors disagreed that their blended course took about the same amount of time to develop as a new fully face-to-face course (Q6 4 D/SD). Two other question responses stood out: that designing a blended course gave them an opportunity to experiment with new teaching methodologies (Q1 5 A/SA) and they were neutral or disagreed that York's technical was effective (Q4 1SD/2 Neutral).

Table 7: Instructor Students Responses to Questions Relating to Enrolment Pressures (n=5)

Survey Item	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q25 (course format preference)	Entirely face to face – 1 | Blended format – 4 | Entirely online –0			
Q22 (students enjoyed this blended course more)	3	3	0	0
Q6 (With the support given by York, it took about the same amount of time to develop my blended course as it would have taken for a new fully face-to-face course)	(3 SD) 1	1	0	0
Q8 (blended learning gives me more flexibility in my work schedule)	(1 SD) 2	1	1	0
Q1 (designing a blended course gave me an opportunity to experiment with new teaching methodologies)	0	0	2	3
Q3 (designing a blended course gave me an opportunity to experiment with new technologies for teaching)	0	1	1	3
Q2 (York's pedagogical support to design this blended course was effective)	1	2	2	0
Q4 (York's technical support to deliver this blended course was effective)	(1 SD)	2	1	1
Q7 (TAs had adequate training to perform their duties in this course)	(1 SD) 2	0	2	0

From Table 8 below instructors diverged in their opinions on whether students collaborated online better after building a sense of community in a face-to-face context, a question related to building a better experience for commuter students.

Table 8: Instructor Responses to Questions on Better Experience for Commuter Students

Survey Item	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q13 (students collaborated online better after building a sense of community in a face-to-face context)	(2N/A) 0	2	0	1

As for issues related to student engagement, instructors were overall either neutral or slightly negative as can be seen in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Instructor Responses to Questions on Engagement

Survey Item	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q12 (more engaged)	1	4	0	0
Q14 (S-S amount of interaction increased)	3	2	0	0
Q15 (S-S quality of interaction better)	3	2	0	0
Q16 (S-I amount of interaction increased)	3	0	2	0
Q17 (S-I quality of interaction better)	4	0	1	0
Q18 (assessment of student achievement differed)	2	1	2	0
Q11 (teaching a blended course is a time-consuming experience)	0	2	1	2
Q19 (concerned about academic integrity in this course)	(1SD) 2	1	0	1
Q9 (students were reluctant to participate in online activities)	0	3	1	1
Q20 (concerned about low student attendance in this course)	(1SD) 2	0	1	1
Q5 (I have sufficient skills to make effective use of the technologies)	1	2	1	1

Finally, with respect to the student learning experience, Table 10 suggests that instructors were either negative or neutral in their responses.

Table 10: Instructor Responses on Questions Related to Learning

Survey Item	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q21 (quality of students' educational experience was better)	3	1	1	0
Q23 (I got to know students better)	(2SD) 1	1	1	0
Q24 (students' overall performance was better)	3	2	0	0
SQ10 (students lacked the ability to monitor their progress in this course)	4	0	1	0

Additional instructor comments

Instructors had the opportunity to provide written comments on the survey as well as express their opinions in a group interview with their colleagues. Two themes were dominant. The first was the need for more technical support for blended learning. They felt that more lead time was needed to learn Moodle properly, a person to call who can provide one-on-one support would have been helpful for Moodle, and more assistance with learning to use lecture capture software.

The other theme was more general responses to continuing with blended learning next year. All were willing to continue but one emphasized the importance of the spontaneity that comes from live lectures. Another wondered about copyright issues for materials when lectures are captured and copyright is cleared only for in-class use. Yet another commented that:

> I think the format of the course – online tutorials and mostly face-to-face lectures was responsible for many of the negative responses. First year students NEED face-to-face contact in small groups. I think they feel adrift without contact in small group.

Summary

Although there were a small number of instructor respondents, the overall sense was that they supported FFA's blended learning initiative and were willing to continue. More adequate continuing technical support is needed and the issue of copyright for webcasted materials needs to be resolved.

Tutorial leader feedback

The tutorial leaders were asked to comment on the strengths and limitations of online tutorials and to give feedback for planning next year. Seven of the 24 leaders responded.

As for strengths, 3 said outright that there are none. Two others commented on the valuable experience that the tutorial discussions give to students in terms of writing practice and access to course resources. The remaining responded said not having to come to campus was an advantage.

All seven leaders cited problems of student alienation, isolation, lack of social interaction, and the need for "face time" with leaders as drawbacks to the online tutorials. Other concerns were unclear expectations and lack of participation (one respondent said the participation rate was only 35% even though participation counted for 25% of the final grade). The greater workload and being inundated with student emails were other concerns cited.

Two leaders responded to the third question that online tutorials should be discontinued next year, while a third one would not accept the position next year if they continued to be online. Other suggestions were to decrease class size if they are online next year, make expectations much clearer, and reduce the number of student assignments.

6. Overall Summary and Recommendations

In this report, we present the results of a study on the first year implementation of the blended learning project in the Faculty of Fine Arts that was supported by the Academic Innovation Fund. Five compulsory introductory courses replaced face-to-face tutorials with online versions. We analyzed course Moodle sites, surveyed and interviewed instructors, and surveyed tutorial leaders. Students enrolled in the Winter 2012 session were also surveyed for their perceptions.

The Moodle sites for each course, including those of the tutorial sections, were analyzed on four criteria derived from the literature: (1) organization and layout; (2) instructional design and delivery; (3) communication, interaction, and collaboration; and (4) learner support and resources. The main course websites developed by instructors, with one exception, were well-organized, easy to navigate, and provided a variety of resources. However, some sites appeared to be inconsistent in the amount of resources available to students on different weekly topics and one contained an excessive amount of material on the home page. On the other hand, there was considerable variation in the quality of organization and content of the tutorial websites and fewer than half were judged to be structured well enough to support student learning.

The student survey results suggest that fewer than half were satisfied with their blended course and would take another in the blended format. They tended to feel that the blended format required more time and effort and that they were disconnected from other students. Most of the dissatisfaction appeared to be due to the tutorials.

Instructors were supportive of the blended initiative and willing to continue, but felt in need of additional technical support. Although a relatively small number of tutorial leaders responded to their survey, they were generally quite negative about their experience and cited additional workload concerns and the lack of social contact with students face-to-face as reasons for their discontent.

Given the above findings, we offer several recommendations below with respect to the blended initiative next year.

Recommendation 1: Student satisfaction

The Faculty of Fine Arts needs to be seriously concerned about the low level of student satisfaction with their blended experience this year as a rate of less than 50% is unacceptable and could harm future enrolments and the reputation of the Faculty. In the parallel blended initiative in Liberal Arts and Professional Studies and the Faculty of Health, the satisfaction rate was 73% and, in another study conducted by Owston several years ago of other Canadian university blended courses, similar satisfaction rates were found. Moreover, the University of Central Florida cites satisfaction in the 80% range for their blended courses. Therefore, as its prime objective, we recommend that FFA base all decisions made with regard to blended learning in the future focus on creating conditions under which students will find their learning experience much more positive.

Recommendation 2: Blended model

We recommend that the model of fully online tutorials be discontinued or that no more than half of the tutorial classes be conducted online with the remainder being face-to-face. If this is done, FFA may then wish to consider moving some of the regular lectures online, but we caution that this not be done in haste and that no more than half of the lectures be online given the concern expressed in Recommendation 1. Also at this time, we do not recommend that 1900 courses be offered fully online.

Recommendation 3: Moodle site design

We recommend that a standard Moodle template be designed for all 1900 courses and their tutorial sites. Such a template should not interfere with an instructor's freedom to design a course as they feel fit because they could adapt the template and populate it with resources of their choice. The template would provide a consistent experience for students since they are required to enrol in two of the courses and the corresponding tutorials. An instructional designer should be engaged to work with instructors to develop the templates.

Recommendation 4: Instructor support

Instructors should be provided with ready access to technical and pedagogical support either from FFA or university central services. Ideally, they should meet with the support staff well before their course starts so that issues can be resolved in advance. If any part of the tutorials

remains online, the teaching assistants need to be given training in conducting online discussions and in Moodle.

Recommendation 5: Copyright issues

Although copyright was not a significant issue raised by instructors in this study, we recommend that FFA continue to explore ways of gaining copyright clearance for lectures that are captured for the web. This applies to recording of guest speakers as well as to various media that are shown in class.

7. Appendices

Appendix A: Comparison of Evaluation Rubrics

	QOCI Rubric (2006)	Quality Matters Rubric (2011)	Chico's Rubric (2009)
Authors/Sponsors	Illinois Online Network (ION), University of Illinois	MarylandOnline, Inc.	California State University, Chico
Purpose	• to create a useful evaluation tool (rubric) to help faculty develop (design/redesign) and evaluate online courses (self-assessment); • to identify "best practices" in online courses; • to recognize faculty, programs, and institutions that are creating quality online courses	• to evaluate the quality of online courses (as part of a systematic approach) • intended for peer review	• to assist instructors in revising their existing courses to the rubric's suggestions (self-assessment); • to identify exemplary online instruction • to design a new course for online environment
Evaluation categories	• Instructional Design • Communication, Interaction, & Collaboration • Student Evaluation and Assessment • Learner Support & Resources • Web Design • Course Evaluation	• Course Overview and Introduction • Learning Objectives (Competencies) • Assessment and Measurement • Resources and Materials • Learner Engagement • Course Technology • Learner Support • ADA Compliance	• Learner Support & Resources • Online Organization & Design • Instructional Design and Delivery • Assessment & Evaluation of Student Learning • Innovative Teaching with Technology • Faculty Use of Student Feedback

Appendix B: Moodle Course Website Evaluation Checklist

Evaluation Criteria	Checklist items to interpret criteria

1. Course website organization and layout design

Refers to the use of Web pages, graphics, multimedia, and accessibility standards in the web pages of a course under the course instructor's control and within the Moodle specifications[1]

1.1 Ease and clarity of interface
- [2]The layout of the course website is well-organized throughout the site.
- [1]Font type, size, and color are readable and consistent throughout the site.
- [2]Aesthetic design presents and communicates course information clearly throughout the course.
- [2]All web pages are functionally consistent throughout the course website.
- [1]The course website is designed with the use of additional frames (or templates), other than those within the Moodle.

1.2 Ease and clarity of navigation
- [2]The course website is easy to navigate.
- [1]Navigation cues are present and clearly identifiable.
- [1]Course has no broken links.
- [1]Hyperlinks open in appropriate windows or frames that do not confuse users.

1.3 Use of images and multimedia
- [2]All web pages are visually consistent throughout the course website.
- [1]Images meet minimum standards.
  - Images are clear.
  - Image files are optimized for efficient loading.
  - Use of animated GIFs is limited to only those that contribute to the learning experience – supporting the course content.
- [1]*Audio files meet minimum standards* in the following areas:
  - Audio quality is clear.
  - Audio file length is adequate to meet the goals of the activity.
  - A written transcript is provided with all audio files.
  - Audio file length is adequate to meet the goals of the activity without adding unnecessary information.
  - Audio player required is compatible with multiple operating systems.
- [1]*Video files meet minimum standards* in the following areas:
  - Video quality is clear.
  - Video file length is adequate to meet the goals of the activity without being too large to restrict students' ability to download the file on computer.
  - A written transcript is provided with all video files.
  - Video file length is adequate to meet the goals of the activity without adding unnecessary information.
  - Video player required is compatible with multiple operating systems and requires only a standard, free plug-in.

2. Instructional Design & Delivery

Refers to the analysis of learning needs and the systemic approach to developing an online course in a manner that facilitates the transfer of knowledge and skills to the learner through the use of a variety of instructional methods, which cater to multiple learning styles, strategies, and preferences[1]

2.1 *Blended format, course website structure, and learning goals/objectives*	• [2,3]Course website clarifies the relationship between the face-to-face and online components; it clearly delineates the role the online environment plays in the blended course. • [2]Course website contains extensive information about being a blended learner. • [1]Content is sequenced and structured in a manner that enables learners to achieve the stated goals. • [2]Students can clearly understand all components and structure of the course. • [1]Course goals and objectives/outcomes are present and explicitly stated to the learner. • [1]Module objectives / outcomes are clearly presented to the learner and are aligned with the larger course objectives. • [1]Purpose of learning activities is clearly presented.
2.2 *Course information and course website components (provided on Moodle course website)*	• [1]A course description is provided. • [1]Instructor information is available to student with contact, biographical, availability information, and picture. • [1]Students are provided with a list of supplies such as textbooks and other instructional materials needed for the course. • [1]A clear concise list of modules and activities that will be completed within each of the course modules/chapters/topics is provided. [2]Learning activities are clearly integrated. • [1]Grading policy is provided including grading scale and weights. • [1]Calendar of due dates and other events is provided. • [1]A list of technical competencies necessary for course completion is provided. • [1]A list of technical requirements such as connection speed, hardware, and software is provided. • [1,3]A Code of Conduct including netiquette standards (i.e., for online discussions, email, and other forms of communication), or a link to current policies is provided. • [1,3]Academic integrity expectations are clearly stated, or a link to current policies is provided.
2.3 *Instructional strategies and use of multimedia*	• [1,2]A variety of teaching methods is applied and innovatively enhance student learning, and interactively engage students. • [2]Course provides multiple visual, textual, kinesthetic and/or auditory activities to enhance student learning and accessibility. • [1,2]Varieties of multimedia elements and/or learning objects, accommodating multiple learning styles, are available throughout the course.

3. Communication, Interaction, & Collaboration	
addresses how the course design, assignments, and technology effectively encourage exchanges amongst the instructor, students, and content[1]	

3.1 Interaction	• [3]Students are asked to introduce themselves to the class. • Course uses a variety of technology tools to appropriately facilitate communication. • [1,2]Learning activities and other opportunities are developed to foster *Student-Student* communication and/or collaboration. • [1,2]Learning activities and other opportunities are developed to foster *Student-Instructor* communication and/or collaboration. • [1,2]Learning activities and other opportunities are developed to foster *Student-Content* interaction.
3.2 Discussions	• [1]Course offers separate forums for Community, Course Questions, and Content. • [1]Discussions are organized in clearly defined forums and/or threads.
3.3 Group work	• [1]A statement of the group's overall task is provided with clear and concise outcomes that are appropriate, reasonable, and achievable. • [1]Benchmarks and expectations of group participation are clearly stated. • [1]A statement of how, when, and where the final product will be delivered is provided.

4. Learner Support & Resources	
refers to program, academic, and/or technical resources available to learners[1]	

4.1 Institutional/program support and resources	• [1]Links to institutional/program information and/or policies and procedures are provided. • [1]Links to tutorials and other CMS Support sites are provided. • [1]Links, E-mail Addresses, and/or phone numbers to technical support are provided. • [1]Statement of ADA Compliance and request for special services is provided.
4.2 Academic support and resources	• [1]Course provides a variety of course-specific resources. • [1]A list of academic resources with links to York's library, tutoring center, counselling services and other resources is provided.

Notes: [1]Illinois Online Network (2006). Quality Online Course Initiative (QOCI) Rubric & Checklist. Retrieved February 09, 2012, from http://www.ion.uillinois.edu/initiatives/qoci/rubric.asp

[2]California State University, Chico (2009). The Rubric for Online Instruction. Retrieved February 09, 2012, from http://www.csuchico.edu/tlp/resources/rubric/rubric.pdf

[3]Maryland Online Inc. (2011). Quality MattersTM Rubric Standards 2011-2012 edition with Assigned Values. Retrieved February 09, 2012, from http://www.qmprogram.org/files/QM_Standards_2011-2013.pdf

Blended Learning Survey for Students

Please indicate your response by darkening the appropriate bubble on the answer sheet. Your frank opinions will help us improve the design of courses at York in future. Your answers will not be seen by your course instructor.

How much you agree or disagree with the following statements:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
1. Overall, I am satisfied with this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
2. Given the opportunity I would take another course in the future that has both online and face-to-face components.	A	B	C	D	E	F
3. This course experience has improved my opportunity to access and use the class content.	A	B	C	D	E	F
4. The online and face-to-face course components of this course enhanced each other.	A	B	C	D	E	F
5. The course Moodle site is well organized and easy to navigate.	A	B	C	D	E	F
6. The web resources in this course are helpful.	A	B	C	D	E	F
7. When I encounter a problem with the use of the technologies in this course, the York technical support service helped me with my problem in a timely and effective manner.	A	B	C	D	E	F

Compared to typical face-to-face courses I have taken...	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
8. ...this course offered the convenience of not having to come to campus as often.	A	B	C	D	E	F
9. ...this course allowed me to reduce my total travel time each week and related expenses.	A	B	C	D	E	F
10. ...I am more engaged in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
11. ...I am likely to ask questions in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
12. ...I feel that the *amount* of my interaction with *other students* in this course increased.	A	B	C	D	E	F
13. ...I feel that the *quality* of my interaction with *other students* in this course was better.	A	B	C	D	E	F
14. ...I feel connected with other students in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
15. ...I feel isolated during this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
16. ...I feel that the *amount* of my interaction with *the instructor* in this course increased.	A	B	C	D	E	F
17. ...I feel that the *quality* of my interaction with *the instructor* in this course was better.	A	B	C	D	E	F
18. ...I am overwhelmed with information and resources in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
19. ...I have trouble using the technologies in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
20. ...I feel more anxious in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
21. ...this course required more time and effort.	A	B	C	D	E	F
22. ...this course has improved my understanding of key concepts.	A	B	C	D	E	F

Course Format Preferences

23. If the same course is being offered in different formats, which course format would you prefer?

    A. Entirely face-to-face course format
    B. Blended course format (meaning some face-to-face activities are replaced with online activities)
    C. Entirely online course format (with no face-to-face class time)

24. If you had a choice between attending lectures face-to-face or accessing lectures online which would you choose?
    A. Attending lectures face-to-face
    B. Accessing online downloadable videos of lectures
    C. A combination of both

25. If you had a choice between attending tutorials face-to-face or participating in tutorials online which would you choose?
    A. Attending tutorials face-to-face
    B. Participating in tutorials online
    C. A combination of both

26. If you had a choice between participation in classroom discussion or online discussion which would you choose?
    A. Class discussion
    B. Online discussion
    C. A combination of both

How much you agree or disagree with the following statements:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
27. Video recordings of the course lectures that I could download for my personal use would be worth an extra $15 course fee to me.	A	B	C	D	E	F
28. I have strong time management skills.	A	B	C	D	E	F
29. I am motivated to succeed.	A	B	C	D	E	F

Additional Information

30. How many hours a week on average are you employed?
    A. I'm not working
    B. 1-9 hours
    C. 10-19
    D. 20-29
    E. 30-39
    F. 40+

31. What is your current overall GPA?
    A. A/A+ (8.0-9.0)
    B. B/B+ (6.0-7.9)
    C. C/C+ (4.0-5.9)
    D. D+ and less (less than 3.9)

Please share any additional comments or suggestions about this course.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank You!

Appendix D: Means and Standard Deviations of Student Agree/Disagree Statements

Question	Agree/Disagree Statements	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
1	I am satisfied with this course	347	3.22	1.180
2	I would take another course in the future	349	3.22	1.306
3	improved my opportunity to access and use class content	349	3.21	1.203
4	Online and F2F components enhanced each other.	349	2.93	1.200
5	Moodle is well organized and easy to navigate	348	3.46	1.248
6	Web resources are helpful	349	3.32	1.113
7	York technical service helped me with my problem	343	1.74	1.674
8	Course offered the convenience	347	3.30	1.583
9	Course allowed me to reduce my travel time and related expenses	344	2.88	1.610
10	I am more engaged in this course	347	2.55	1.194
11	I am likely to ask questions in this course	345	2.60	1.176
12	Amount of my interaction with other students increased	349	2.34	1.216
13	Quality of my interaction with other students was better	347	2.33	1.139
14	I feel connected with other students	347	2.25	1.101
15	I feel isolated during this course	347	3.07	1.189
16	Amount of my interaction with the instructor increased	347	2.37	1.215
17	Quality of my interaction with the instructor was better	346	2.56	1.207
18	I am overwhelmed with information and resources	349	2.92	1.160
19	I have trouble using the technologies	346	2.18	1.120
20	I feel more anxious in this course	348	2.84	1.229
21	This course required more time and effort	342	3.42	1.178
22	This course has improved my understanding of key concepts	347	2.99	1.145
27	Video recordings would be worth an extra $15 course fee	341	2.36	1.293
28	I have strong time management skills	340	3.49	1.155
29	I am motivated to succeed	340	4.20	.879

Appendix E: Blended Learning Survey for Faculty

Please circle your response to each question and answer the open-ended questions as appropriate. Be assured that your responses will be kept confidential.

In this section, please rate the following statements:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
Designing a blended course gave me an opportunity to experiment with new teaching methodologies.	A	B	C	D	E	F
The <u>pedagogical</u> support given by York to help me design this blended course was effective.	A	B	C	D	E	F
Designing a blended course gave me an opportunity to experiment with new technologies for teaching.	A	B	C	D	E	F
The <u>technical</u> support given by York to help me deliver this blended course was effective.	A	B	C	D	E	F
I have sufficient skills to make effective use of the technologies in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
With the support given by York, it took about the same amount of time to develop my blended course as it would have taken for a new fully face-to-face course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
The TAs had adequate training/preparation to perform their duties in this course. (Circle N/A if not applicable.)	A	B	C	D	E	F
Blended learning gives me more flexibility in my work schedule.	A	B	C	D	E	F
Students were reluctant to participate in online activities in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
Students lacked the ability to monitor their progress in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F

Any Suggestions

What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving support in (a) designing and (b) implementing blended courses?

_____
_____
_____

Compared to typical face-to-face courses I have taught…	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
... teaching a blended course is a time-consuming experience.	A	B	C	D	E	F
… students are more engaged in this blended course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
… students collaborated online better after building a sense of community in a face-to-face context.	A	B	C	D	E	F
… I feel that the *amount* of *student-to-student* interaction in this blended course increased.	A	B	C	D	E	F
… I feel that the *quality* of *student-to-student* interaction in this blended course was much better.	A	B	C	D	E	F
… I feel that the *amount* of my interaction with *students* in this blended course increased.	A	B	C	D	E	F
… I feel that the *quality* of my interaction with *students* in this blended course was much better.	A	B	C	D	E	F
… assessment of student achievement in this blended class differed.	A	B	C	D	E	F
... I was concerned about academic integrity in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
... I was concerned about low student attendance in this course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
... the quality of students' educational experience in this blended course was better.	A	B	C	D	E	F
... students enjoyed this blended course more.	A	B	C	D	E	F
... I got to know students better in this blended course.	A	B	C	D	E	F
... students' overall performance was better.	A	B	C	D	E	F

Course Format Preferences

In the future, if you had a choice, which format would you consider teaching this course?

- A. Entirely face-to-face teaching
- B. Blended teaching (meaning some face-to-face activities are replaced with online activities)
- C. Entirely online teaching (with no face-to-face class time)

Please share any additional comments or suggestions about your course.

_____
_____
_____

Thank You!