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Purpose of the Study

To test assumption that blended learning has entered the mainstream in executive education

Contributing Factors

- Clients want greater application of concepts
- Companies want to reduce time away from work
- New communication technologies allow blending of traditional and technology-delivered elements
Research Methods

- **UNICON survey of business schools** (45 schools responded)
  - 51% of respondents represented smaller (\(\leq 7m\)) schools
  - 33% of respondents represented mid-size (\(8-29m\)) schools
  - 16% of respondents represented large (\(>30m\)) schools
  - 49% North America
  - 14% Latin America
  - 2% Africa
  - 23% Europe
  - 12% Asia/Australia

- **20 in-depth telephone interviews with associate deans, directors, corporate contacts, and consultants**

- **Review of selected published articles**
Blended Learning: any combination of traditional classroom instruction with non-classroom or non-traditional learning activities

“Hybrid learning”
“Distributed learning”
“Connected learning”
“Outside-inside learning”
Objectives for the Session

- Review survey data
- Present case examples from schools
- Provide schema for design decisions
- Identify critical success factors
Survey Results

71% of schools surveyed offer blended learning in both open and custom programs
Survey Results
Blended learning elements in open and custom programs

- Online communities and networks
- Web and/or mobile content delivery
- Action learning
- Executive coaching/mentoring
- Groupwork using blogs, wikis, etc.
- Webcast lectures
- Simulations/games outside of class
- Communities of practice
- Learning expeditions
- Virtual office hours

- Open
- Custom

#1: Action learning
#2: Executive coaching/mentoring
#3: Web and/or mobile content delivery
#4: Communities of practice
## Survey Results

### Technologies used to deliver blended learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Proprietary</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharepoint</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Connect</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Conferencing</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropbox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebEx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telepresence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video conferencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panoptics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe CS5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selectsurvey.net</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo 360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsilen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
~50% of respondents are **productizing** or **making a strategic commitment** to blended learning.

![Pie chart showing the stages of development with the following percentages:
- 36% for strategic plan
- 33% for small experiments
- 13% for ad hoc responses
- 18% for productizing](chart.png)
Corporate Trends 2008 vs. 2011
Change in use of virtual elements

With permission Duke Corporate Education
Blended Learning is NOT a Fad

Blended learning is mainstream in executive education

- Survey data confirm it
- Schools are doing it
- New technologies support it
- Clients want it
Objectives for the Session

- Review survey data
  - Present case examples from schools
  - Provide schema for design decisions
  - Identify critical success factors
Examples from Schools
Blended Learning

It’s all about design
Objectives for the Session

- Review survey data
- Present case examples from schools
  - Provide schema for design decisions
  - Identify critical success factors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-based activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronous?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asynchronous?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting technology?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course element 1

Course element 2

Course element 3

Thanks to Steve Mahaley at Duke CE for suggesting that the 1st design question should be individual? or collaborative?
## Design Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Off-the-shelf or LMS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tracking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Technical support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backup</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hardware and software</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>I n c e n t i v e s</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>Capture for future use</td>
<td>Off-the-shelf or LMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>T i m i n g</td>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>Tracking</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-team fertilization</td>
<td>C r o s s-t e a m fertilization</td>
<td>Company involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardware and software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Blended Learning Design Worksheet

### Design Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>Projects/ reflection</td>
<td>In-Class/ Virtual</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Off-the-shelf or LMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Teams/ Individual</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Capture for future use</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backup</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-team fertilization</td>
<td>Company involvement</td>
<td>Tracking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardware and software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Backup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see the **revised** and complete Design Criteria Worksheet in our final research report on the UNICON website. It will be available by the end of December.
Blended Learning Design Rubric

Example: Mid-Program Simulation

Ease of Use
Trust
Focus

Ease of Use
Trust

Focus

Ease of Use
Focus

Trust
Focus

Focus
Trust
Objectives for the session

- Review survey data
- Present case examples from schools
- Provide schema for design decisions
  - Identify critical success factors
Critical Success Factors

- Staff skills in program design and technological capability
- Faculty support
- Substantial IT support
- Correct technology
- Strategic relationships
Conclusion

- Make a plan
- Develop design processes and expertise
- Develop staff capability at all levels
- Work with faculty
- Acquire technology
- Build partnerships for IT support, services, etc.
- Experiment, learn, and redesign

- Thinking ahead: millennials, virtual programs ...
Questions or Comments?

Thank You

Marie Eiter
meiter@mit.edu

Toby Woll
twoll@mit.edu

Copy of presentation and report at
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