

LIS Blended/OWL Courses

Analysis of Spring 2014 Student Evaluations

July 24, 2014

Prepared by Bill Kules and Elizabeth Lieutenant

Summary

This report uses the data from spring 2014 Blended and OWL course evaluations. Starting in fall 2013 Blended/OWL evaluations were conducted separately. Prior evaluations combined both Blended and OWL responses.

Eighty percentage (80%) of OWL students and 87% of blended students were satisfied with their course. Noted strengths included F2F session content and organization and F2F interactions with instructors. Challenges pointed out by students included online discussions, and interactions with other students, both F2F and online.

Takeaways

- Comments indicated some instructors were unclear in articulating their expectations for coursework and student performance (Blended, pp. 6, 12; OWL, pp. 6, 13).
- Comments indicated some instructors did not provide enough communication or feedback (Blended, p. 6; OWL, pp. 4, 6, 13).
- Comments indicated a desire for more practical, hands-on learning opportunities during F2F class sessions. (OWL, pp. 13).

The respondent comments suggest several specific areas that LIS instructors should consider focusing on improving in our blended and OWL courses:

1. Clearly articulated directions and instructions for course assignments
2. Timely feedback on student progress
3. More F2F course time devoted to practical learning exercises

Quality of Course Elements

Summary (Blended, pp. 3-4; OWL, pp. 3-4)

Three quarters of the respondents indicated they were very satisfied with the F2F content and organization and interactions with instructors, the online availability of course materials, the organization and ease of use of the main course site and auxiliary course sites (if applicable), and the

	Spring 2014 Blended (N=31)	Spring 2014 OWL (N=39)	Spring 2014 Blended / OWL (N=70)	Fall 2013 Blended (N=11)	Fall 2013 OWL (N=41)	Fall 2013 Blended/ OWL (N=52)
Online and face-to-face work enhanced each other.	38.7%	38.5%	38.6%	36.4%	41.5%	40.4%
Online and face-to-face work were relevant to each other.	48.4%	43.6%	45.7%	63.6%	46.6%	42.3%
The connection between the two was not consistently clear.	0.0%	18.0%	10%	0.0%	17.1%	13.5%
There was little or no connection between the two.	12.9%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	4.9%	3.8%

Compared to fall 2013, overall satisfaction increased, with the spring blended courses rating lower than fall, and OWL courses rating higher than fall (Blended, p. 11; OWL, p. 10):

	Spring 2014 Blended (N=31)	Spring 2014 OWL (N=40)	Spring 2014 Blended / OWL (N=71)	Fall 2013 Blended (N=11)	Fall 2013 OWL (N=42)	Fall 2013 Blended / OWL (N=33)
Overall satisfaction with course (5 point scale)	4.26	4.08	4.20	4.55	3.74	3.91

Compared to fall 2013, the average desired number of face-to-face sessions remained stable for blended courses, and was lower for OWL courses (two outliers from Fall 2013 removed, Blended, p. 8; OWL, p. 8):

	Spring 2014 Blended (N=26)	Spring 2014 OWL (N=36)	Spring 2014 Blended / OWL (N=62)	Fall 2013 Blended (N=10)	Fall 2013 OWL (N=40)	Fall 2013 Blended/ OWL (N=50)
Ideal number of F2F sessions for this class	8	5	6.29	7.80	4.84	5.46

