



Ohio Blended Learning Survey April 2015 / Preliminary Data







- Ohio Blended Learning Network
- The Learning Accelerator
- Clayton Christensen Institute





Determine scope and depth of blended learning in Ohio schools

Learn how blended learning is being implemented

Assess challenges and assistance needed

Approach



Harvesting 'quick' data to provide valuable information in fast-moving world

Survey not intended to support generalizations

2015 Responses



◆ February 1 – March 20, 2015

\bullet Written survey

On-line portal

PDF



\bullet 211 responses

21% of 994 school districts and charter schools.



Who Participated?





Superintendent

Principal

Asst. Sup/Director

Director of Curriculum & Instruction

CTO/Technology Director

Other



How many Ohio schools and districts are using blended learning?



How Many Are Blending?





211 districts & charters

Districts Blend More v. Charters The Learning Accelerator Districts Charters 66% 42% Yes No N=74 N=137

More Blending in Higher Grades





Most Use Local Funds





Local funds

- Mix of local funds with grant funding
- Short term grant
- Long term grant

Schools in Planning Stages to Blend





More Districts Than Charters Planning To Blend





More HS Than Elementary Planning To Blend





California: Larger Planning Pipeline than Ohio





Reasons for Implementing Ohio vs. California



Provide more course choices

Facilitate personalized learning

Improve academic outcomes

Create personalized learning

Improve access to content



Reasons for Implementing Ohio vs. California





Ohio: Other Reasons



- To increase student options for career related elective choices
- Credit recovery (4)
- Blended learning allows us to extend the school day
- ◆ To create 21st Century Classrooms
- To increase student options for career related elective choices
- Provide an option for students/families who want electronic schooling

Ohio: Other Reasons



 Provide flexibility for students who have barriers to daily in-school attendance

Drop-out prevention

- To provide students alternative ed opportunity rather than traditional classroom
- ◆To provide more engaging content
- To assist at-risk students in a self paced, personalized environment

Most Offered A la Carte & Rotation Blended Models





Most Offered A la Carte & Rotation Blended Models





Blended Models Comparison with California





Most K-5/K-8 Use Rotation Blended earning Model







Most K-12/9-12 Use A la Carte Blended Learning Model











How did Ohio schools and districts implement blended learning?



Most Planned Ahead







Planning Comments



- Administration met with staff in several meetings to discuss how to implement blended learning.
- We compared blended learning providers by interviewing them by phone and emails.
- Shopped around to see who gave the best program for the least dollars.

Planning Comments



- We created a team to investigate other districts, attended national conferences and developed an implementation plan.
- We began with a group of stakeholders representing teachers, administrators, and parents.

Planning Process?





Ohio Used External Partners / Consultants







Why No Consultant? Confidence In Ability (50%)



- Our district received a "blended learning" grant that initially was used to start the program. While some resources and networking were provided, the program appeared to fall apart toward the end of the grant.
- Shopped around to see who gave the best program for the least dollars.
- We have enough technical savvy in the district.

Most Consultants Offered Instructional Support



The Learning Accelerator

Nearly Half of Blended Instructors Received No PD





Most OBLN Blended Instructors Received PD





California Offered More PD Contact Hours



Professional Development Components



Professional Development Components

Online course delivery system (LMS) Instruction in blended learning definitions Tailoring instruction to each Student Data Use

97% selected multiple components

30

1()

40

50

60







70

Professional Development Providers



Central office

Teacher-led

- Consultant or technical provider
- Professional learning network
- Regional education service center
- Higher Education

DOE or state institution

California Professional Development Providers





The Learning Accelerator 73% In-person Online, asynchronous 42% In-classroom context coaching 30% Online, synchronous Peer study/teaming Professional learning network 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 0%

Delivery Methods





What challenged Ohio schools and districts implementing blended learning, and what did they learn?



Highest Priority Challenges



High quality PD for teachers Staff Buy-in Funding and/or finance The right personnel and partners Examples of successful models in Ohio Guidance in selecting content Measuring implementation / progress Reliable and sufficient Internet





Highest Priority Challenges

High quality professional development Blended learning not being a high High quality professional development Network or community of practice Buy-in of community Guidance and/or support in selecting High quality professional services/ High quality professional services/ Guidance and/or support in selecting



California: Highest Priority Challenges



()10 20 30 40 50 60

High quality PD for teachers Funding and/or finance Staff Buy-in Reliable/sufficient Internet connectivity The right personnel and partners Examples of successful models High quality PD for principals Support in selecting LMS Support in selecting content

California: Highest Priority Challenges





High quality PD for teachers Network or community of practice Services supporting implementation Measuring implementation and Community Buy-in High quality services supporting model Blended learning being low priority Guidance in selecting devices





Not enough time to shift to

Hard to get staff buy in

Professional development too expensive

Can't find technical

Cost of technology

More Want Planning, Network & Sharing Opportunities







- A professional network that meets regularly to share ideas, successes, and challenges.
- I would love examples and models from top performing blended model schools!
- Staff and community support
- More help in transforming an already existing system into a more blended model

Professional Development Comments



- This requires regular, high quality professional development.
- Ongoing professional development provided by ODE and the software provider.



Do Differently: Planning



- Start with a comprehensive plan and work backwards
- Slow down. Build more internal teacher leadership in blended learning before launching it district wide.
- The consortium concept is an excellent way to begin planning.
- Develop a comprehensive plan before moving forward.

Do Differently: PD



- I would have teachers participate in an online course to learn about the ideas and concepts behind blended learning by do it.
- Plan more professional development for teachers prior to implementation and get assistance in selecting content providers



- Conduct a comprehensive review of platforms and delivery models.
- Ensure that the infrastructure was adequate to provide a stable environment.
- More planning, more training, more time.



Ohio Blended Learning Survey April 2015 / Preliminary Data

www.SmarterSchools.net

Contact: AndrewBenson32@gmail.com Brian.Bridges@elearns.org

