# Students' Evaluation Toward Online Teaching Strategies for Engineering Courses during COVID

Fan Yu, Johanna Milord, Sarah Orton, Lisa Flores, Rose Marra University of Missouri Columbia

#### **Extended Abstract**

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, courses at various educational institutions were suddenly migrated online in the Spring 2020 semester. For many of the instructors, this was their first experience teaching engineering courses virtually. Instructors applied a range of online teaching strategies to assist students in learning better. The purpose of this study was to gather student feedback on different teaching methods and uncover whether or not these approaches were used or were found to be supportive by the students. Our findings can benefit instructors of engineering courses in improving or changing their teaching methods in order to enable students to adjust to remote learning better.

The research team administered surveys during the final two weeks in the semester of Spring 2020. One hundred nineteen participants answered a series of closed questions related to the instructors' teaching strategies across 8 different engineering courses (Table 1). Specifically, based on the question "What things did your instructor do that was helpful for learning online," participants assessed whether instructors' teaching strategies were helpful or not. The criteria for evaluation were Not Helpful, Slightly Helpful, Somewhat Helpful, Helpful, Very Helpful, and N/A. N/A means the instructor did not use this strategy.

| No. | Instructors Instruction<br>Strategies   | Participants' Responses Frequency (f) |                     |                     |         |                 |     |              |
|-----|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------|-----------------|-----|--------------|
|     |   | Not<br>Helpful                        | Slightly<br>Helpful | Somewhat<br>Helpful | Helpful | Very<br>Helpful | N/A | Row<br>Total |
| 1   | Provided feedback<br>and/or answer questions<br>in timely manner              | 3                                     | 4                   | 16                  | 39      | 38              | 18  | 118          |
| 2   | Lectures delivered via recorded videos  | 1                                     | 3                   | 18                  | 32      | 46              | 16  | 116          |
| 3   | Interactive synchronous<br>class sessions delivered<br>via video conferencing | 2                                     | 8                   | 17                  | 42      | 32              | 17  | 118          |
| 4   | Provided<br>additional/alternative<br>sources for class<br>information        | 9                                     | 3                   | 7                   | 24      | 24              | 51  | 118          |

#### **Table 1: Frequency of Student Responses to Survey Questions**

| No. | Instructors Instruction<br>Strategies   | Participants' Responses Frequency (f) |                     |                     |         |                 |     |              |
|-----|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------|-----------------|-----|--------------|
|     |   | Not<br>Helpful                        | Slightly<br>Helpful | Somewhat<br>Helpful | Helpful | Very<br>Helpful | N/A | Row<br>Total |
| 5   | Provided opportunities<br>for student group<br>interaction via breakout<br>rooms or separate video<br>conferencing                | 6                                     | 7                   | 10                  | 27      | 29              | 39  | 118          |
| 6   | Discussion forums used<br>the learning<br>management system<br>Canvas   | 1                                     | 9                   | 11                  | 34      | 54              | 9   | 118          |
| 7   | Provided flexible deadlines   | 2                                     | 5                   | 10                  | 39      | 59              | 2   | 117          |
| 8   | Provided clear<br>expectations in<br>assignments  | 5                                     | 4                   | 13                  | 38      | 51              | 6   | 117          |
| 9   | Instructor messaged to<br>students (via pre-<br>recorded video, or text<br>announcements or<br>postings to discussion<br>forums)  | 5                                     | 4                   | 11                  | 32      | 30              | 36  | 118          |
| 10  | Used of other<br>technology tools such as<br>voice thread or<br>interactive online labs to<br>enhance instruction and<br>learning | 0                                     | 0                   | 2                   | 6       | 8               | 58  | 74           |
|     | Column Total  | 34                                    | 47                  | 115                 | 313     | 3/1             | 252 | 1132         |

Overall, participants generally indicated the instructors' teaching strategies to be very helpful (f = 371) or helpful (f = 313). A high number of N/A responses occurred for the categories of No. 4, 5, 9, and 10. This high number indicates that the strategies were not used extensively by the instructors of the courses. Among the strategies that had the highest very helpful responses, strategies No. 6,7, and 8 indicated that students appreciated discussion forums, flexible deadlines, and clear expectations. Strategies 4 and 5 had a higher number of not helpful responses indicating that the strategies of alternative resources and breakout rooms needed improvement. The conference presentation will breakdown the results to look at the responses in the individual classes and we as the faculty reflection on what they did (or tried to do) during the transition to online learning. In addition, the results will be put into context with other elements of the survey evaluating student self-efficacy and outcome expectations.

Our findings suggested that teaching strategies made students feel supported and indicated that discussion forums, flexible deadlines, and clear expectations were among the helpful.

## Keywords

student paper, Engineering Education, Online Teaching, Teaching strategies, COIVD

## Fan Yu

Fan Yu is a doctoral student at the School of Information Science and Learning Technologies at the University of Missouri-Columbia. Fan received her MS in Elementary Education Science and a graduate certificate in Curriculum and Instructions. Fan's research interests include STEM education and UX design in learning technologies. She concerns about how learning technologies encourage students from underrepresented groups to study and work in STEM fields.

## Johanna Milord

Johanna Milord is a Counseling Psychology Doctoral Candidate at the University of Missouri. She earned her Masters of Science degree in Mental Health Counseling. Her general research focus is marginalized populations' attainment of their desired academic and career outcomes. Her most recent projects have explored career self-efficacy and critical race consciousness interventions.

### Sarah Orton

Dr. Orton is an associate professor in Civil Engineering and is an active member of the American Concrete Institute and the American Society of Civil Engineers. Dr. Orton also serves as the Director of Undergraduate Studies for the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department at the University of Missouri. She has participated in several programs aimed at improving undergraduate education. Her research projects have involved the use of carbon fiber reinforced polymers to strengthen structures, analysis and testing for reinforced concrete frames under disproportionate collapse, and risk and reliability analysis of bridges and offshore structures. She is a registered professional engineer in Missouri.

## Lisa Flores

Lisa Y. Flores, Ph.D. is a Professor of Counseling Psychology at the University of Missouri. She has expertise in the career development of Latino/as and Latino/a immigrant issues and has 80 peer reviewed journal publications, 19 book chapters, and 1 co-edited book and presented over 200 conference presentations in these areas. She has been PI and co-PI on grants funded by NSF and USDA to support her research. She is Editor of the Journal of Career Development and past Associate Editor of the Journal of Counseling Psychology, and has served on the Editorial Boards of the Journal of Vocational Behavior, The Counseling Psychologist, Journal of Counseling Psychology, and Career Development Quarterly.

### **Rose Marra**

Professor Rose M. Marra is the Director of the School of Information Science and Learning Technology at the University of Missouri. She is PI of the NSF-funded Supporting Collaboration in Engineering Education, and has studied and published on engineering education, women and minorities in STEM, online learning and assessment. Marra holds a PhD. in Educational Leadership and Innovation and worked as a software engineer before entering academe.