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Principles that guide our evaluation

- Evaluation should conform to the culture of the institution.
- Uncollected data cannot be analyzed.
- Data do not equal information.
- Qualitative and quantitative approaches must complement each other.
- We must show an institutional impact.
- Our results may not be generalized beyond UCF.
Distributed Learning Impact Evaluation

Students
- Success
- Retention
- Reactive behavior patterns
- Generational comparisons

Faculty
- Online programs
- Writing project model
- Higher order evaluation models
- Theater
- Student evaluation of instruction
- Large online classes

Satisfaction
- Demographic profiles
- Strategies for success
- Information fluency
A top down and bottom up approach to distributed learning
Student Results
Student satisfaction in fully online and mixed-mode courses

- **Fully online (N = 1,173):**
  - Very Satisfied: 51%
  - Satisfied: 42%
  - Neutral: 8%
  - Unsatisfied: 7%
  - Very Unsatisfied: 2%

- **Mixed-mode (N = 867):**
  - Very Satisfied: 37%
  - Satisfied: 32%
  - Neutral: 12%
  - Unsatisfied: 7%
  - Very Unsatisfied: 2%
Students’ positive perceptions about blended learning

- Convenience
- Reduced Logistic Demands
- Increased Learning Flexibility
- Technology Enhanced Learning

Reduced Opportunity Costs for Education
Students’ less positive perceptions about blended learning

- Reduced Face-to-Face Time
- Technology Problems
- Reduced Instructor Assistance
- Overwhelming
- Increased Workload
Student Generations
### Some characteristics of the generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Matures (prior to 1946) | • Dedicated to a job they take on  
                          • Respectful of authority  
                          • Place duty before pleasure |
| Baby boomers (1946-1964) | • Live to work  
                          • Generally optimistic  
                          • Influence on policy & products |
| Generation X (1965-1980) | • Work to live  
                          • Clear & consistent expectations  
                          • Value contributing to the whole |
| Millennials (1981-1994) | • Live in the moment  
                          • Expect immediacy of technology  
                          • Earn money for immediate consumption |
Students who were very satisfied by generation

- Boomer (1946-1964): 55% (n=328)
- Generation X (1965-1980): 38% (n=815)
- Millennial (1981-1994): 26% (n=346)
Better able to integrate technology into their learning

- **Boomer** (1946-1964) 67% (n=328)
- **Generation X** (1965-1980) 48% (n=815)
- **Millennial** (1981-1994) 34% (n=346)
Because of the web I changed my approach to learning.

- **Boomer** (1946-1964): 51%, n=328
- **Generation X** (1965-1980): 37%, n=815
- **Millennial** (1981-1994): 23%, n=346
Success in blended courses by gender and generational membership

Success (N=18,732) 93%

Female (N=12,184) 94%
- Mature-Boomer (N=1,800) 98%
- Gen X (N=6,431) 95%
- Millennials (N=3,913) 90%

Male (N=6,548) 90%
- Mature-Boomer (N=5,521) 95%
- Gen X (N=3,809) 92%
- Millennials (N=2,182) 83%
Success rates by generation and course level

- Baby Boomer: 83%, 93%, 96%
- Gen X: 81%, 91%, 94%
- Millennial: 75%, 90%, 95%

Lower Undergrad: 83%, 81%, 75%
Upper Undergrad: 93%, 91%, 90%
Graduate: 96%, 94%, 95%
Classroom modality preferred by generations

N = 1,149

p = .000
Students’ description of whether they learn better alone or with others

P = .000

N = 1,149
Student Ratings
## Student Ratings by Modality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=628,623)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=6,632)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>40.60</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=11,450)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=5,435)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITV</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>26.20</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=3,218)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A decision rule based on student evaluation responses and the probability of faculty receiving an overall rating of *Excellent*

If...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitation of learning</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication of ideas</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Then...

The probability of an overall rating of *Excellent* = .93 &

The probability of an overall rating of *Fair* or *Poor* = .00
A comparison of excellent ratings by college unadjusted and adjusted for instructors satisfying Rule 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Overall % Excellent</th>
<th>If Rule 1 % Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;PA</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=441,758)  (N=147,544)
A comparison of excellent ratings by course modality—unadjusted and adjusted for instructors satisfying Rule 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Modality</th>
<th>Overall % Excellent</th>
<th>If Rule 1 % Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITV</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=709,285 N=235,745
Student Behavior Types
Research on reactive behavior patterns

- Theory of William A. Long, University of Mississippi
- Ambivalence brings out behavior patterns
- Provides a lens for how “types” react to different teaching styles
Resources

- Personality
- Emotional maturity
- Sophistication level
- Level of intellect
- Educational level
- Character development
A description of Long behavior types

- Aggressive Independent
  - high energy
  - action-oriented
  - not concerned with approval
  - speaks out freely
  - gets into confrontational situations

- Passive Independent
  - low energy
  - not concerned with approval
  - prefers to work alone
  - resists pressure from authority

- Aggressive Dependent
  - high energy
  - action-oriented
  - concerned with approval
  - rarely expresses negative feelings
  - performs at or above ability

- Passive Dependent
  - low energy
  - concerned with approval
  - highly sensitive to the feelings of others
  - very compliant
A description of Long behavior traits

- **Phobic**
  - exaggerated fears of things
  - often feels anxious
  - often sees the negative side
  - doesn’t take risks

- **Compulsive**
  - highly organized
  - neat, methodical worker
  - perfectionist
  - strongly motivated to finish tasks

- **Impulsive**
  - explosive
  - quick-tempered
  - acts without thinking
  - frank
  - short attention span

- **Hysteric**
  - dramatic and emotional
  - more social than academic
  - artistic or creative
  - tends to overreact
Distribution of Long Types and Traits for Mixed-Mode Students

(N=472)
Distribution of Long Types and Traits for Composition I Students

(N=1,054)
Research Initiative for Teaching Effectiveness
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