
# Blended Learning

**Report on Spring 2013 Faculty Survey**
**May 17, 2013**

Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment
Sharon A. La Voy
Amanda Bowsher
Stephanie David
Wayne Taliaferro

# Table of Contents

## Overview

On Friday, March 8, 2013, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA) invited all full-time faculty (tenured/tenure-track and non-tenured/tenure-track) to participate in an on-line survey exploring their experiences with and opinions of blended learning. They were informed that the Provost was interested in this topic, and that their responses would also be shared with members of the Provost's Commission on Blended and Online Learning, among others. Non-participants were reminded twice, and the survey closed on March 18.

The population invited to participate in the survey included 1736 faculty; 537 completed and submitted a survey, resulting in a 31% response rate. The respondent group generally reflected the demographic breakdown of the population, with a few minor exceptions. The following groups are slightly overrepresented in these responses: females; white U.S. citizens; lecturers/non-tenure track faculty; and faculty from the College of Information Studies and the School of Public Health. The following groups are slightly underrepresented in these responses: males; Asian U.S. citizens; non-U.S. citizens; assistant professors; tenured/tenure-track faculty; and faculty from the A. James Clark School of Engineering. See the Appendix for a specific breakdown of respondent demographics.

Below are tables with responses from all items on the survey. All numbers represent percentages of valid responses, and unless otherwise indicated, the number of responses (n) for each item are at or very close to 537 (that is, very few respondents skipped items). Items are grouped in tables according to topic area and then by descending order by the furthest left column. These topics include faculty experience with teaching courses in various formats, as well as their perceptions about instructor effectiveness and student learning in blended environments. This report also addresses respondents' proficiency with and interest in incorporating various technologies into the classroom (e.g., blogs, wikis, multimedia files). Where differences are indicated by group (e.g., tenured/tenure track vs. not), tables include only items where the "strongly agree + agree" response pattern was significantly different between groups. In some cases, totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

The survey also included an open-ended comment box inviting respondents to provide comments about blended learning; 205 faculty provided open-ended responses. Those data are being analyzed by the Provost's Commission on Blended and Online Learning. However, several comments illuminated a difference in the way respondents may have utilized the "neither agree nor disagree" response option. It appears that faculty familiar with blended learning may have chosen that response as a way to indicate a more complex answer (i.e., "The item is too simplistic, and the answer would depend on the circumstance"), whereas faculty who are less familiar with blended learning utilized it as an "I don't know" response. This phenomenon suggests the obvious conclusion that the topic of blended learning is a complex one, and should the university move forward with these types of initiatives, we should continue to investigate faculty perception and support.

Survey results show that the majority of faculty have not taught blended courses during fall or spring semesters, but are familiar with the concept. A fair number of all faculty report being open to teaching a blended course, with non-T/TTK faculty and faculty who have taught blended courses generally more positive about the idea. Many faculty appear to not be sure about specific benefits of this pedagogy, and are also concerned about the technological support that UMD would be able to provide.

## Format of Courses Taught

Table 1: Format of Courses Taught

| How many courses have you taught during fall and spring semesters AT UMD in the past two academic years (i.e., in the current and last academic years) for credit that are: | % | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5+ | 2-4 | 1 | 0 or skipped* |
| Traditional (no web content): Lectures, discussions, and activities are exclusively face-to-face; no course material is online. | 12 | 12 | 4 | 73 |
| Traditional (web-facilitated): Lectures, discussions, and activities are face-to-face; some course materials (e.g., syllabus, readings, videos, supplemental discussions, assignments) are online. | 30 | 44 | 5 | 21 |
| Blended: Lectures, discussions, and activities are a combination of online and face-to-face interactions; a portion of content is delivered online, with a corresponding reduction of face-to-face class time. | 1 | 9 | 8 | 82 |
| Fully online: Lectures, discussions, and activities are completely online; no face-to-face interaction other than the option of proctored tests. | < 1 | 2 | 2 | 96 |

* Many respondents skipped these items in varying patterns, suggesting that they skipped the items for which the appropriate response would have been '0.' Therefore, '0' and skipped responses are aggregated in this table only.

Of the faculty surveyed, only 18% reported that they have taught at least one blended course, and just over 4% reported teaching at least one fully online course. Although this implies that blended and online course formats are rarely used at UMD, just over three-quarters of faculty reported integrating web-facilitated components into their course designs in two or more courses over the past two academic years; thus, the majority of faculty have utilized technologically-supported course designs.

## Demographic Profile of Blended and Web-Facilitated Course Instructors

Table 2: Types of Courses Taught by Appointment and College

| | Number of respondents (n) | Taught Blended% | | Taught Web-Facilitated% | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Appointment | | | | | |
| Tenured/Tenure-Track (T/TTK) | 431 | 15 | 85 | 90 | 10 |
| Non-T/TTK | 106 | 32 | 68 | 83 | 17 |
| College | | | | | |
| AGNR | 42 | 12 | 88 | 94 | 6 |
| ARCH | 8 | 25 | 75 | 100 | 0 |
| ARHU | 119 | 16 | 84 | 92 | 8 |
| BMGT | 42 | 17 | 83 | 85 | 15 |
| BSOS | 67 | 19 | 81 | 86 | 14 |
| CMNS | 114 | 11 | 89 | 91 | 9 |
| EDUC | 33 | 36 | 64 | 77 | 23 |
| ENGR | 45 | 10 | 80 | 95 | 5 |
| INFO | 12 | 58 | 42 | 91 | 9 |
| JOUR | 9 | 11 | 89 | 78 | 22 |
| PUAF | 6 | 33 | 67 | 100 | 0 |
| SPHL | 33 | 30 | 70 | 75 | 25 |
| SVPAAP | 5 | 0 | 100 | 80 | 20 |
| UGST | 2 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 0 |

## Opinions on and Perceptions of Blended Teaching and Learning

Table 3: General Opinions about Blended Learning

| | Agree + Strongly Agree% | Neither Agree nor Disagree% | Disagree + Strongly Disagree% |
|---|---|---|---|
| I am familiar with the concept of blended learning. | 83 | 9 | 8 |
| Blended learning initiatives at UMD are a good idea. | 49 | 36 | 16 |
| Blended learning initiatives in higher education, in general, are a good idea. | 47 | 38 | 15 |
| I have been encouraged to develop a blended learning course in my program. | 26 | 30 | 44 |
| I have felt pressure to add more web-enhanced components to my classes. | 25 | 29 | 46 |

Among the faculty surveyed, more than 80% reported having some familiarity with the concept of blended learning course designs; though only about half saw this as a positive initiative to embark upon at UMD. Roughly a quarter of respondents agreed that they have been encouraged to develop a blended learning course, and a quarter reported feeling pressure to implement added web-based components to their classrooms.

Table 4: General Opinions about Blended Learning by T/TTK and Non-T/TTK

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK |
| Blended learning initiatives at UMD are a good idea. | 45 | 62 | 17 | 11 |
| Blended learning initiatives in higher education, in general, are a good idea. | 44 | 58 | 16 | 10 |
| I have been encouraged to develop a blended learning course in my program. | 23 | 38 | 48 | 37 |

Table 5: General Opinions about Blended Learning by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended |
| I am familiar with the concept of blended learning. | 79 | 100 | 9 | 0 |
| Blended learning initiatives at UMD are a good idea. | 43 | 73 | 18 | 5 |
| Blended learning initiatives in higher education, in general, are a good idea. | 42 | 69 | 17 | 5 |
| I have been encouraged to develop a blended learning course in my program. | 19 | 59 | 49 | 22 |

In general, non-tenure track respondents and respondents who previously taught a blended course have positive impressions about blended learning. These respondents agreed that blended learning initiatives at UMD and in higher education are a good idea at higher rates than their respective peers. However, tenured/tenure track faculty and faculty who have not taught blended courses were less likely to agree that they have been encouraged to develop a blended learning course in their program.

## Interest in Teaching Blended Courses

Table 6: Interest in Teaching Blended Courses

| | Agree + Strongly Agree% | Neither Agree nor Disagree% | Disagree + Strongly Disagree% |
|---|---|---|---|
| I am willing to teach a blended version of one of my existing courses. | 57 | 20 | 22 |
| I am willing to teach a blended version of a new course. | 51 | 26 | 23 |
| I am interested in reducing seat time using technology. | 33 | 32 | 35 |
| In the last 5 years, I have participated in a workshop/training session/institute on teaching blended courses. | 28 | 8 | 64 |
| I would only consider teaching a blended course if it were a new course, not one of my existing courses. | 10 | 28 | 62 |

Fifty-seven percent of respondents indicated that they would be willing to teach a blended version of one of their existing courses and slightly fewer (51%) indicated willingness to teach a blended version of a new course. Respondents were split with regard to their interest in reducing seat time using technology; about a third each indicated interest, disinterest, and neither, in this idea.

Table 7: Interest in Teaching Blended Courses by T/TTK and Non-T/TTK

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK |
| I am willing to teach a blended version of one of my existing courses. | 53 | 76 | 25 | 11 |
| I am willing to teach a blended version of a new course. | 47 | 69 | 25 | 13 |
| I am interested in reducing seat time using technology. | 29 | 50 | 38 | 25 |
| In the last 5 years, I have participated in a workshop/training session/institute on teaching blended courses. | 24 | 43 | 67 | 50 |

Table 8: Interest in Teaching Blended Courses by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended |
| I am willing to teach a blended version of one of my existing courses. | 49 | 94 | 27 | 1 |
| I am willing to teach a blended version of a new course. | 42 | 89 | 27 | 3 |
| I am interested in reducing seat time using technology. | 27 | 57 | 40 | 15 |
| In the last 5 years, I have participated in a workshop/training session/institute on teaching blended courses. | 23 | 48 | 69 | 39 |
| I would only consider teaching a blended course if it were a new course, not one of my existing courses. | 12 | 1 | 56 | 86 |

Paralleling the response patterns for general perceptions toward blended learning, non-tenure track faculty and faculty who taught a blended learning course were more likely to respond positively to statements about teaching blended courses. And though, in general, tenured/tenure track faculty and those who have not taught a blended course responded less positively to statements about teaching blended courses, still around half of these respondents reported being willing to teach a new or existing course in a blended format, and over a quarter are interested in reducing seat time using technology.

## Intellectual Property in Blended Learning

Table 9: Intellectual Property

| | Agree + Strongly Agree% | Neither Agree nor Disagree% | Disagree + Strongly Disagree% |
|---|---|---|---|
| I am concerned that I would lose intellectual control of my course materials in a blended environment. | 26 | 32 | 42 |
| Current UMD policies and practices adequately protect intellectual property rights for digital teaching materials. | 10 | 73 | 17 |

About a quarter of surveyed faculty expressed concern that they would lose intellectual control of their course materials in a blended course environment, and only 10% reported that current UMD policies protect their intellectual property rights for digital teaching materials. Still, 73% of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement that UMD policies protect their digital intellectual property, which suggests that respondents may either not be familiar with the university's policies in this domain or may be indifferent toward them.

Table 10: Intellectual Property by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended |
| I am concerned that I would lose intellectual control of my course materials in a blended environment. | 28 | 16 | 38 | 59 |

## Instructor Effectiveness and Engagement in Blended and Online Learning

Table 11: Instructor Effectiveness and Engagement

| | Agree + Strongly Agree% | Neither Agree nor Disagree% | Disagree + Strongly Disagree% |
|---|---|---|---|
| I am a more engaging instructor in an actual classroom than I would be in an online environment. | 66 | 26 | 8 |
| My overall engagement with students would be lower in a blended class. | 45 | 28 | 27 |
| I would be a less effective teacher in a blended course. | 23 | 39 | 38 |

Responses to survey items intended to gauge faculty perceptions about their engagement with students in different course environments produced varied, and somewhat contradictory, responses. Two-thirds of faculty reported that they would be a more engaging instructor in an actual classroom than in an online environment, yet under a quarter indicated that blended course formats would lower their ability to be effective instructors. Almost half of respondents, however, agreed that their level of engagement with students would be lower in a blended course.

Table 12: Instructor Effectiveness and Engagement by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Agree + Strongly Agree% | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree% | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended |
| I am a more engaging instructor in an actual classroom than I would be in an online environment. | 69 | 51 | 6 | 16 |
| My overall engagement with students would be lower in a blended class. | 50 | 22 | 22 | 52 |
| I would be a less effective teacher in a blended course. | 26 | 6 | 30 | 72 |

The overall response pattern showed that faculty who have taught a blended course are less likely to have negative perceptions about instructor engagement in a blended course environment. Interestingly, however, half of the faculty who have taught a blended course agreed that they are a more engaging instructor in a classroom than in an online environment and about a quarter agreed that their overall engagement would be lower in a blended course.

## Perceptions of Student Learning and Engagement in Blended and Online Learning

Table 13: Student Learning and Engagement

| | Agree + Strongly Agree% | Neither Agree nor Disagree% | Disagree + Strongly Disagree% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students would skip or skim too much material presented online. | 40 | 43 | 18 |
| High-quality learning can take place without face-to-face instruction. | 38 | 25 | 37 |
| A blended course could be better for students who would otherwise struggle to learn material in a course taught face-to-face. | 36 | 40 | 24 |
| Students learn better when course materials are presented online so that they can go through it at their own pace and revisit as necessary. | 25 | 48 | 28 |
| Blended courses can provide higher-quality learning than traditional courses. | 20 | 47 | 33 |
| The quality of the educational experience for students is comparable to or better in a blended course than in a traditional course. | 19 | 42 | 40 |
| I believe students would be more engaged with others, myself, and the subject matter in a blended course. | 17 | 37 | 46 |

When responding about the quality, engagement, and support offered by blended and online courses, faculty showed almost no consensus. Throughout most of the items in the table above, about 40% to 50% neither agreed nor disagreed with statements about whether these types of courses would have any positive or negative effects on student learning. Faculty were less likely to select "neither agree nor disagree" for the item asking whether high-quality learning can take place without face-to-face instruction, but responses were split between agree and disagree.

Table 14: Student Learning and Engagement by T/TTK and Non-T/TTK

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK |
| High-quality learning can take place without face-to-face instruction. | 35 | 49 | 40 | 26 |

Table 15: Student Learning and Engagement by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended |
| Students would skip or skim too much material presented online. | 44 | 20 | 13 | 38 |
| High-quality learning can take place without face-to-face instruction. | 34 | 54 | 39 | 26 |
| A blended course could be better for students who would otherwise struggle to learn material in a course taught face-to-face. | 31 | 58 | 26 | 13 |
| Students learn better when course materials are presented online so that they can go through it at their own pace and revisit as necessary. | 20 | 44 | 32 | 10 |
| Blended courses can provide higher-quality learning than traditional courses. | 16 | 36 | 37 | 14 |
| The quality of the educational experience for students is comparable to or better in a blended course than in a traditional course. | 12 | 51 | 45 | 14 |
| I believe students would be more engaged with others, myself, and the subject matter in a blended course. | 13 | 38 | 51 | 23 |

The broad response patterns for faculty who have taught a blended course to items about student learning and engagement in blended courses are similar to previous sections, with the exception of a few substantial differences. The largest discrepancies are in responses to items about the comparative quality and potential for student learning in blended and traditional environments. For example, more than half of the faculty who have taught a blended course agreed that the quality of the educational experience for students is comparable to or better in a blended course, as compared to only 12% of their peers. In addition, more non-tenure track faculty agreed that high quality learning can take place without face-to-face instruction.

## Assessing Student Learning in a Blended or Online Class

Table 16: Assessing Student Learning

| | Agree + Strongly Agree% | Neither Agree nor Disagree% | Disagree + Strongly Disagree% |
|---|---|---|---|
| UMD should have an online tool embedded in a learning management system to help instructors identify where students are having difficulty learning in blended courses. | 52 | 44 | 4 |
| I would be able to track student learning just as well as or better in a blended course as in a traditional course. | 32 | 39 | 30 |

While 52% of faculty respondents agreed that UMD should have a tool available to track student progress and performance in blended courses, 44% neither agreed nor disagreed about embedding student assessment technology. The second item displays a more consistent distribution of responses, showing that 32% agreed that tracking student performance would be more manageable in a blended course than in a traditional course, 39% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 30% disagreed.

Table 17: Assessing Student Learning by T/TTK and Non-T/TTK

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK |
| UMD should have an online tool embedded in a learning management system to help instructors identify where students are having difficulty learning in blended courses. | 48 | 69 | 5 | 2 |
| I would be able to track student learning just as well as or better in a blended course as in a traditional course. | 29 | 43 | 32 | 20 |

Table 18: Assessing Student Learning by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended |
| UMD should have an online tool embedded in a learning management system to help instructors identify where students are having difficulty learning in blended courses. | 48 | 68 | 4 | 4 |
| I would be able to track student learning just as well as or better in a blended course as in a traditional course. | 26 | 57 | 33 | 12 |

Despite differences in the response patterns among faculty groups by tenure track and experience teaching a blended learning course, many respondents agreed that UMD should have an online tool embedded in the learning management system to help identify where students are having trouble in a blended course. Additionally, a significantly higher percentage of faculty who have taught a blended course agreed that they are able to track student learning just as well or better in a blended course than a traditional course.

## Academic Integrity and Student Civility in Blended and Online Environments

Table 19: Academic Integrity and Student Civility

| | Agree + Strongly Agree% | Neither Agree nor Disagree% | Disagree + Strongly Disagree% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Students are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty online than in an in-class environment. | 36 | 52 | 12 |
| Students are more likely to be rude or disrespectful online than in an in-class environment. | 20 | 47 | 33 |
| It would be easier to monitor plagiarism and other integrity concerns in student work in an online environment. | 11 | 46 | 44 |

Over a third of respondents reported that students are more likely to be dishonest in an online environment, though 44% disagreed that this dishonesty would be easier to monitor in an online environment. The high percentage of neither agree nor disagree responses indicate, however, that opinions on academic integrity and student civility in an online environment are complex and that many individuals may be neutral, unsure or unable to respond in either direction to these matters.

Table 20: Academic Integrity and Student Civility by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended |
| Students are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty online than in an in-class environment. | 38 | 27 | 9 | 24 |

Although significant differences in response patterns for one item emerged for faculty with and without blended teaching experience, there were no statistically significant differences in responses for items about monitoring plagiarism and student civility in an online environment.

## Technology and Logistics of Blended Learning

Table 21: Logistics of Teaching Blended Courses

| | Agree + Strongly Agree% | Neither Agree nor Disagree% | Disagree + Strongly Disagree% |
|---|---|---|---|
| Responding to student email in a blended course would require more time than in a traditional course. | 60 | 25 | 15 |
| Keeping up with course discussions online (e.g., discussion boards, blogging) would be too much "busy work" for me. | 46 | 32 | 22 |
| Teaching a blended course would always require more time for the instructor than a traditional course. | 41 | 43 | 16 |
| Blended classes would allow more flexibility in my schedule. | 35 | 38 | 27 |
| After the first semester, teaching a blended course would require less time than a traditional course. | 21 | 41 | 38 |
| I could manage teaching more students in a blended environment than I do in a traditional environment. | 21 | 40 | 40 |

Many faculty respondents reported that blended learning courses would require more time to design (41%), more student e-mail to respond to (60%), and more "busy work" to perform (46%) than traditional courses. Perceptions that blended courses require increased investment in design and management may have translated into the 40% of respondents who disagreed with the idea that they could manage teaching more students in a blended course than in a traditional course, and the 38% who disagreed that after the first semester, teaching a blended course would require less time.

Table 22: Logistics of Teaching Blended Courses by T/TTK and Non-T/TTK

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK |
| Keeping up with course discussions online (e.g., discussion boards, blogging) would be too much "busy work" for me. | 49 | 34 | 18 | 39 |
| Blended classes would allow more flexibility in my schedule. | 31 | 50 | 30 | 15 |

Table 23: Logistics of Teaching Blended Courses by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended |
| Responding to student email in a blended course would require more time than in a traditional course. | 63 | 49 | 12 | 29 |
| Keeping up with course discussions online (e.g., discussion boards, blogging) would be too much "busy work" for me. | 51 | 24 | 19 | 39 |
| Blended classes would allow more flexibility in my schedule. | 30 | 55 | 30 | 17 |

Nearly half of tenured/tenure track faculty and faculty who have not taught a blended learning course agreed that it would be too much "busy work" to keep up with discussion boards and blogs. While more of those who have not taught a blended course agreed that responding to student email in a blended course would require more time than in a traditional course, almost half of faculty who have taught a blended course also agreed with this perception.

## Comfort with Technology

Table 24: Comfort with Technology

| | Agree + Strongly Agree% | Neither Agree nor Disagree% | Disagree + Strongly Disagree% |
|---|---|---|---|
| I would be comfortable teaching a blended course as long as the campus provided the necessary ongoing technological support. | 68 | 18 | 14 |
| I routinely integrate web-facilitated content into my existing traditional courses. | 67 | 13 | 19 |
| I would be comfortable teaching a blended course if someone helped me set up the technology. | 63 | 22 | 16 |
| I adapt easily to new technologies used for teaching. | 61 | 27 | 12 |
| I am proficient enough with online tools to teach a blended course. | 50 | 19 | 31 |
| I would consider teaching a blended course to increase my proficiency with technology. | 43 | 26 | 31 |
| Many of my program colleagues use technology-enhanced teaching practices. | 35 | 32 | 34 |
| I am confident UMD would be able to provide me with the start-up instructional support needed to develop a new blended course. | 32 | 29 | 38 |
| I am confident UMD would be able to provide me with the ongoing instructional support needed to teach blended courses. | 31 | 29 | 40 |
| I would be comfortable teaching a blended course even with minimal support from the institution. | 20 | 18 | 62 |
| I won't be as good of a teacher in a blended course because of my level of technology literacy. | 16 | 28 | 56 |

Sixty-one percent of faculty respondents reported that they adapt easily to new technologies used for teaching, and slightly higher percentages reported feeling comfortable enough with technology to teach a blended course as long as they were provided the necessary start-up (63%) and ongoing (68%) technical support needed throughout the course. Only about a third of respondents, however, reported feeling confident that UMD would be able to provide that level of support, and only 20% percent reported that they would be comfortable teaching a blended course with minimal support from the institution. Additionally, 16% reported limited technology literacy as a barrier to being an effective instructor in a blended course, suggesting the potential need for more intense support for certain faculty segments.

Table 25: Comfort with Technology by T/TTK and Non-T/TTK

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK | T/TTK | Non-T/TTK |
| I would be comfortable teaching a blended course as long as the campus provided the necessary ongoing technological support. | 66 | 79 | 15 | 10 |
| I am proficient enough with online tools to teach a blended course. | 47 | 62 | 34 | 20 |
| I would consider teaching a blended course to increase my proficiency with technology. | 39 | 61 | 35 | 13 |
| I am confident UMD would be able to provide me with the start-up instructional support needed to develop a new blended course. | 28 | 49 | 42 | 21 |
| I am confident UMD would be able to provide me with the ongoing instructional support needed to teach blended courses. | 27 | 48 | 44 | 24 |
| I would be comfortable teaching a blended course even with minimal support from the institution. | 18 | 27 | 64 | 51 |

Table 26: Comfort with Technology by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Agree + Strongly Agree % | | Disagree + Strongly Disagree % | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended | Did Not Teach Blended | Taught Blended |
| I would be comfortable teaching a blended course as long as the campus provided the necessary ongoing technological support. | 64 | 87 | 17 | 1 |
| I routinely integrate web-facilitated content into my existing traditional courses. | 62 | 91 | 22 | 5 |
| I would be comfortable teaching a blended course if someone helped me set up the technology. | 59 | 79 | 19 | 2 |
| I adapt easily to new technologies used for teaching. | 58 | 76 | 13 | 5 |
| I am proficient enough with online tools to teach a blended course. | 42 | 84 | 37 | 5 |
| I would consider teaching a blended course to increase my proficiency with technology. | 38 | 64 | 34 | 16 |
| Many of my program colleagues use technology-enhanced teaching practices. | 31 | 51 | 36 | 25 |
| I would be comfortable teaching a blended course even with minimal support from the institution. | 15 | 42 | 39 | 30 |
| I won't be as good of a teacher in a blended course because of my level of technology literacy. | 18 | 5 | 51 | 77 |

Overall, non-tenured/tenure track faculty and faculty who have taught blended learning courses reported being more comfortable with technology. Although a majority of all respondents agreed that they would be comfortable teaching a blended course with start-up and ongoing technological support from UMD, those who have taught blended courses and those who are not tenured/tenure track were more likely to agree. Tenured/tenure track faculty also reported being less confident than their colleagues that UMD would be able to adequately support these endeavors.

## Level of Proficiency with Particular Technologies

Table 27: Level of Proficiency with Particular Technologies/Activities

| | Expert% | Competent% | Novice% | Never Used% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dropbox | 26 | 35 | 20 | 19 |
| Uploading multimedia files for use in a course | 21 | 39 | 20 | 19 |
| Skype/Facetime/Google+ Hangouts | 18 | 42 | 24 | 16 |
| Facebook | 17 | 31 | 16 | 37 |
| Google Docs/Google Suites/etc. | 17 | 35 | 26 | 22 |
| Creating multimedia files (e.g., online videos, lecture capture) | 9 | 24 | 24 | 43 |
| Creating and monitoring blogs | 8 | 18 | 19 | 55 |
| Twitter | 8 | 12 | 16 | 65 |
| Creating and monitoring wikis | 7 | 18 | 18 | 57 |
| Canvas (current ELMS tool) | 5 | 47 | 32 | 16 |
| Clickers | 5 | 13 | 16 | 67 |
| Creating podcasts | 4 | 11 | 16 | 69 |

Overall, small percentages of faculty reported having expert levels of proficiency in the above technologies and activities, while higher percentages reported competent proficiencies. Three of the five technologies or activities for which faculty reported the highest levels of proficiency were file sharing technologies (i.e., Dropbox, Uploading multimedia files and Google Docs/Google Suites/etc.). Although between 50 and 60% reported being expert or component in these technologies, about 40 to 50% reported being novice or never using these tools. The proficiency responses from faculty for Canvas are also notable, as only 52% reported being expert or competent, and 16% report never using the university's main course management tool. This distribution, however, may not be surprising, given that Canvas was new to most in the spring 2013 semester.

Table 28: Level of Proficiency with Particular Technologies/Activities by T/TTK and Non-T/TTK

| | T/TTK | | Non-T/TTK | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expert/ Competent% | Novice/ Never Used% | Expert/ Competent% | Novice/ Never Used% |
| Dropbox | 63 | 37 | 51 | 49 |
| Skype/Facetime/Google+ Hangouts | 61 | 39 | 50 | 50 |
| Facebook | 45 | 55 | 57 | 43 |
| Creating and monitoring blogs | 23 | 77 | 38 | 62 |
| Twitter | 17 | 83 | 27 | 73 |
| Creating and monitoring wikis | 23 | 77 | 32 | 68 |

Table 29: Level of Proficiency with Particular Technologies/Activities by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Did Not Teach Blended | | Taught Blended | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expert/ Competent% | Novice/ Never Used% | Expert/ Competent% | Novice/ Never Used% |
| Dropbox | 58 | 42 | 74 | 26 |
| Uploading multimedia files for use in a course | 55 | 45 | 85 | 15 |
| Skype/Facetime/Google+ Hangouts | 57 | 43 | 71 | 29 |
| Facebook | 45 | 55 | 60 | 40 |
| Google Docs/Google Suites/etc. | 50 | 50 | 64 | 36 |
| Creating multimedia files (e.g., online videos, lecture capture) | 25 | 75 | 67 | 33 |
| Creating and monitoring blogs | 21 | 79 | 49 | 51 |
| Twitter | 17 | 83 | 29 | 71 |
| Creating and monitoring wikis | 20 | 80 | 44 | 56 |
| Canvas (current ELMS tool) | 48 | 52 | 65 | 35 |
| Clickers | 14 | 86 | 34 | 66 |
| Creating podcasts | 12 | 88 | 28 | 72 |

Faculty members on and off the tenure track differed with regard to their self-reported proficiencies with the above technologies. For example, tenured/tenure track faculty reported being expert or competent in Dropbox and Skype/Facetime/Google+ Hangouts at higher rates than their non-tenure track peers. Non-tenure track faculty, however, reported being expert or competent at higher rates for social media technologies (i.e., Facebook, Twitter), as well as for creating and monitoring blogs and wikis.

As might be expected, faculty who have taught a blended course reported higher expert and competent proficiencies in each of these technology areas compared to their peers. The greatest differences in these two groups' proficiencies relate to multimedia files, blogs, and wikis.

## Interest in Integrating Particular Technologies/Activities in Courses

Table 30: Level of Interest in Integrating Particular Technologies/Activities in Your Courses

| | Interested% | Neutral% | Not Interested% | Not Familiar with Tool% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Canvas (current ELMS tool) | 70 | 16 | 10 | 3 |
| Uploading multimedia files for use in a course | 68 | 20 | 9 | 3 |
| Creating multimedia files (e.g., online videos, lecture capture) | 58 | 21 | 17 | 4 |
| Dropbox | 37 | 35 | 20 | 8 |
| Google Docs/Google Suites/etc. | 35 | 34 | 25 | 6 |
| Creating podcasts | 32 | 30 | 31 | 7 |
| Creating and monitoring wikis | 30 | 27 | 33 | 10 |
| Skype/Facetime/Google+ Hangouts | 30 | 30 | 35 | 5 |
| Creating and monitoring blogs | 28 | 29 | 36 | 6 |
| Clickers | 26 | 26 | 38 | 10 |
| Twitter | 13 | 22 | 57 | 8 |
| Facebook | 12 | 23 | 59 | 6 |

Overall, a majority of respondents reported interest in using Canvas, uploading multimedia files and creating multimedia files in courses. In addition, over a third of faculty showed interest in utilizing file-sharing technologies, such as Google Docs and Dropbox. Respondents reported the lowest levels of interest in integrating social media platforms, with over half of faculty not interested in using Facebook or Twitter in a course.

Table 31: Level of Interest in Integrating Particular Technologies/Activities in Your Courses by T/TTK and Non-T/TTK

| | T/TTK | | Non-T/TTK | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Interested% | Neutral/Not Interested/Not Familiar% | Interested% | Neutral/Not Interested/Not Familiar% |
| Uploading multimedia files for use in a course | 66 | 34 | 77 | 23 |
| Creating multimedia files (e.g., online videos, lecture capture) | 55 | 45 | 70 | 30 |
| Google Docs/Google Suites/etc. | 33 | 67 | 44 | 56 |
| Creating podcasts | 28 | 72 | 48 | 52 |
| Creating and monitoring wikis | 27 | 73 | 45 | 55 |
| Skype/Facetime/Google+ Hangouts | 28 | 72 | 39 | 61 |
| Creating and monitoring blogs | 24 | 76 | 47 | 53 |
| Facebook | 11 | 89 | 18 | 82 |

Table 32: Level of Interest in Integrating Particular Technologies/Activities in Your Courses by Whether Respondent Has Taught a Blended Course

| | Did Not Teach Blended | | Taught Blended | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Interested% | Neutral/Not Interested/Not Familiar% | Interested% | Neutral/Not Interested/Not Familiar% |
| Canvas (current ELMS tool) | 68 | 32 | 80 | 20 |
| Uploading multimedia files for use in a course | 65 | 35 | 83 | 17 |
| Creating multimedia files (e.g., online videos, lecture capture) | 50 | 50 | 91 | 9 |
| Dropbox | 34 | 66 | 53 | 47 |
| Google Docs/Google Suites/etc. | 32 | 68 | 49 | 51 |
| Creating podcasts | 27 | 73 | 53 | 47 |
| Creating and monitoring wikis | 27 | 73 | 45 | 55 |
| Skype/Facetime/Google+ Hangouts | 26 | 74 | 48 | 52 |
| Creating and monitoring blogs | 25 | 75 | 43 | 57 |
| Twitter | 11 | 89 | 20 | 80 |
| Facebook | 10 | 90 | 20 | 80 |

Faculty respondents who have taught a blended course reported a higher degree of interest in incorporating each technology or activity listed above into their classes. Regardless of their tenure status and experience teaching blended courses, a majority of respondents reported interest in uploading multimedia files and integrating Canvas into their classes. Although it may not be surprising that the vast majority of instructors who have taught blended courses indicate interest in creating multimedia files for their classes, this high percentage contrasts with the 50% of faculty respondents without blended learning experience who indicate interest in using this technology in their courses.

Table 33: Levels of Interest and Proficiency

| | Interested% | Novice/ Never Used% |
|---|---|---|
| Canvas (current ELMS tool) | 70 | 49 |
| Uploading multimedia files for use in a course | 68 | 40 |
| Creating multimedia files (e.g., online videos, lecture capture) | 58 | 67 |
| Dropbox | 37 | 39 |
| Google Docs/Google Suites/etc. | 35 | 48 |
| Creating podcasts | 32 | 85 |
| Creating and monitoring wikis | 30 | 75 |
| Skype/Facetime/Google+ Hangouts | 30 | 41 |
| Creating and monitoring blogs | 28 | 74 |
| Clickers | 26 | 82 |
| Twitter | 13 | 81 |
| Facebook | 12 | 53 |

Note: The percentages in this table represent results from two separate sets of items.

This table compares the percentages of faculty who reported interest in integrating particular technologies into their courses with those who reported either novice competency in or having never used the technology. Discrepancies in these two percentages might point to an area of need for further training. While response patterns show that, in general, faculty are interested in using Canvas, nearly half of respondents consider themselves either novices with the program or have never used it. A similar response pattern appears for uploading multimedia files. Although many faculty also reported having novice proficiency with or having never used social media (e.g., Twitter, Facebook) and informal file sharing technologies (e.g., wikis, blogs), fewer indicated an interest in integrating these technologies into their classrooms.

## Appendix: Respondent Demographics

| | % of Respondents | % of Population |
|---|---|---|
| Gender: | | |
| Female | *40* | *35* |
| Male | *60* | *65* |
| Race/Ethnicity/Citizenship: | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native: U.S. | <1 | <1 |
| Asian: U.S. | *5* | *12* |
| Black or African American: U.S. | 5 | 5 |
| Foreign | *1* | *3* |
| Hispanic: U.S. | 3 | 4 |
| Two or More: U.S. | <1 | <1 |
| Unknown: U.S. | 4 | 5 |
| White: U.S. | *81* | *70* |
| Appointment/Rank: | | |
| Assistant Professor | *15* | *18* |
| Associate Professor | 28 | 26 |
| Instructor | 1 | 1 |
| Lecturer | *18* | *15* |
| Professor | 38 | 40 |
| Tenure Track/Non-: | | |
| Non-Tenure Track | *20* | *17* |
| Tenured/Tenure Track | *80* | *83* |

Note: Significant differences italicized

| | % of Respondents | % of Population |
|---|---|---|
| College: | | |
| AGNR | 8 | 7 |
| ARCH | 1 | 1 |
| ARHU | 22 | 21 |
| BMGT | 8 | 9 |
| BSOS | 12 | 12 |
| CMNS | 21 | 21 |
| EDUC | 6 | 8 |
| ENGR | *8* | *11* |
| INFO | *2* | *1* |
| JOUR | 2 | 1 |
| PUAF | 1 | 1 |
| SPHL | *6* | *4* |
| SVPAAP | 1 | 1 |
| UGST | <1 | <1 |

| | Ns |
|---|---|
| Respondents | 537 |
| Population | 1736 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Response rate | 31% |