General Course Information

Faculty Name: Anthony Corte
Department: Managerial Studies
College: College of Business Administration
Course Name: Managerial Communication

Executive Summary:
Blended courses require more instructor time commitment than either face-to-face (F2F) or on-line formats. In addition to preparing the on-line component, instructors must prepare the lecture and activities for and attend the F2F sessions. For others who are planning a blended course, add in significant time commitment for developing and monitoring the on-line component.

To gauge expectations, I surveyed students:
- Only three of 58 students had either on-line or blended courses experience. All were taken through community colleges.
- Many students had little if any idea as to what constitutes a blended course and the expectations for this format. Even though details and expectations were discussed during the first session (F2F), few if any questions were raised. Additionally, several students fell two to three weeks behind in their studies due to this lack of understanding.
- For many of the students, the draw to my blended sections was based on a misconception that while the format required less F2F time, the expectations would be somewhat easier. In reality, the student must take a greater degree of ownership of the learning process requiring additional time commitments.
- Students would be more successful at blended and on-line course if they were required to participate in a training session devoted to success with this format. Instructors (D2L) were required to complete training and I believe students also.

Communication is key to the success of the course. Effective communication is time consuming. While I post announcements and updates in the BB Announcements section, I found it necessary to supplement these postings by sending to each student by e-mail.

Students need more feedback when using the on-line component. In the classroom the student and instructor are together for immediate feedback. However, with the on-line component, the student is by themselves and the urgency for feedback is enhanced.
Goals for offering course as blended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose for Blending</th>
<th>Corresponding Sloan-C Pillar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the teaching and learning/leverage technology to achieve pedagogical goals</td>
<td>Learning Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide accessibility for more students (make the course available to more students)</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Provide flexibility for students</td>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase faculty satisfaction (i.e., addressing work load issues, increasing flexibility of work hours, teaching in a new way, etc.)</td>
<td>Faculty Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address institutional issue such as limited classroom space, or inability to offer technology such as internet connection in classrooms</td>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Please specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Satisfaction:** Fewer F2F sessions required less travel time and expense for students.

**Summary of course design/redesign process and product:**
- All components of the F2F sections were included in the blended course.
- With over 10 years of blended and on-line course development, I always plan for twice the time spent on developing a F2F section for conversion to an on-line format. Anticipate new instructors would take considerable longer.
- Until the student is aware of the expectations of a blended course, it will be necessary for the instructor to ensure that all bases are covered and the communication is seamless.

**Results:**
Since both face-to-face and blended sections were offered during the same semester following the same outcomes, the goals for the blended were met. However, as a final thought, flexibility is a must when designing and monitoring the on-line component. Be prepared for the unexpected.