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The challenges of student engagement on GDL blended learning

Tina Hart, Melanie Fellowes & Abdul Jabbar
Aims of this paper

- To share our pedagogical experiences in Blended learning
- To recognise the importance of Bloom’s taxonomy and the QAA framework in relation to the GDL student
- To reflect upon our rationale for the changes made to the GDL course in 2010/11
- To recognise student and staff challenges
## QAA benchmark & Bloom’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blooms Taxonomy</th>
<th>QAA Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of the principal features of the legal system(s) and foundation subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 Application</td>
<td>Application of knowledge to a situation to provide arguable conclusions for concrete problems (actual or hypothetical).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4 Analysis</td>
<td>Recognise and rank items and issues in terms of relevance and importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5 Synthesis</td>
<td>Bring together information and materials from a variety of different sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6 Evaluation</td>
<td>Produce a synthesis of relevant doctrinal and policy issues in relation to a topic make a critical judgement of the merits of particular arguments Present and make a reasoned choice between alternative solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate autonomy and the ability to learn independently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inspiring tomorrow’s professionals**
Data collection

- Staff interviews
- Student questionnaires
- Student panel meetings
- Feedback via ‘Elluminate’
- University evaluation

Inspiring tomorrow’s professionals
What Happened

• Satisfied our objective to widen participation

• Students liked the dynamic nature of the modules

• Students preferred flexibility in the feedback process

• Student engagement was low

• Student reflection was limited

• The staff – student relationship became disconnected

Inspiring tomorrow’s professionals
Student Views

I have enjoyed the course and being able to study from a distance has been ideal for me.

I wanted flexibility from the course and an appreciation of a mature student’s commitment. I felt the course met those expectations.
I was disappointed with the lack of personal interaction.

Content and materials exceeded expectations but I wasn't happy with the absence of contact with tutors.

I expected discussion forums with the module leader, at least monthly.

I don't have time to write reflective blogs - they are only useful if you are really struggling.

I wasn't happy with the absence of contact with tutors.

I don't have time to write reflective blogs - they are only useful if you are really struggling.
Staff views

It is good to keep the practice that the student automatically receives the suggested answer as this avoids students having to wait up to two weeks for feedback.

The quizzes work well and these need to be built upon.
Staff views

At the start student contribution was good but this has tailed off towards the end of the year.

Student engagement in face to face sessions has been poor.

I feel less engaged as a tutor on the course as there is much more limited contact with the students.

Not having to mark every tutorial has saved a lot of time. However the downside to this is the automatic release of answers has disengaged the tutor from the student.
Overview of staff questionnaires

Students

Questions

Answers

Feedback

Years

Many notes

Students: blog

Course: tutorial

Effort: automatic

Distance: previous

Exam: given

Learning: face

Exam: new

Analysis: grade

Engineering: support

Graduates: expected

Tutors: tutor

Submissions

Individual: answer

One: approach

Reduced: submitted

Effort: automatic

Analysis: coursework

System: board

Improving: resources

Engagement: feedback

Understanding: give

Giving: think

Support: use

Number: in

Generally: little

Direct: depends

Sessions
The challenges faced

Providing more interactivity for the students through multimedia elements such as screencasts & podcasts

To help students feel part of the institution and to be able to integrate with other students

Developing student engagement within an impersonal environment

Training staff to develop moderation and technical skills

Inspiring tomorrow’s professionals
Conclusion

Don’t underestimate ……

Inspiring tomorrow’s professionals