CTLA Assessment Report for AY 2005-06
October 31, 2006

I.   Brief Summary of Assessment Plan
       CTLA goals and outcomes as established by the director and staff are:
             Goal 1: Technology training and resources.
                    Outcome 1: Faculty and staff will be able to implement new technology (i.e., new to
                    them).
                           Component 1: Has basic knowledge
                           Component 2: Can identify potential application(s)
                           Component 3: Has implemented the technology
                    Outcome 2: Faculty will report that they use technology to support their students'
                    learning.
                    Outcome 3: Faculty will report that they use technology to increase student engagement.
                    Outcome 4: Faculty will report that they use technology to increase prompt feedback to
                    students.

             Goal 3: Orientation of faculty to career development processes and milestones
                    Outcome 1: New faculty will be able to identify campus sources of important information
                    regarding their roles and responsibilities.
                    Outcome 2: New faculty will feel a sense of connection to the campus community.

       Our 2005 plan stated that we would assess only Goal 1, Outcome 1. We said, "CTLA staff will assess
       whether faculty and staff in their technology training courses are able to use the technology being taught
       in that course. In tech camp, we will use embedded assessment–giving the attendees a task to complete,
       and then assessing whether they were able to complete that task on their own (with notes), with help from
       a staff member, or not at all. In addition, we are writing a follow-up questionnaire designed to assess
       whether and how they have implemented the technology they learned. This questionnaire will be sent to
       participants in any of our tech training courses approximately one month after the training."

       For the embedded assessment, we planned to tally how many faculty/staff were able to complete the task
       on their own (with notes), how many needed assistance from someone else (another classmate, a staff
       member), and how many did not attempt the task.

       In order for us to say that our training is successful, we suggested a that 80% of the tech camp participants
       should be able to complete the embedded assessment tasks without help. For the questionnaire that we
       will administer one month post-training, we would like to see 75% of our participants indicating they see
       a use for the technology in their work, and 60% indicating they have implemented the technology.

       Change in the plan: The goals and outcomes did not change from our original plan.

II.   Assessment Methods
       Change in the Plan: Originally, we planned to implement assessment in Tech Camp. Unfortunately, it
       became clear at the beginning of August (just prior to Tech Camp) that the promised improvements to the
       new Oncourse would not be made in time. So CTLA staff had to quickly change the curriculum of the
       Tech Camp from the new Oncourse to the old Oncourse. So we had no time to develop embedded
       assessment tasks. So this part of the assessment plan was not implemented.

       Goal 1, Outcome 1: We were able to assess Goal 1 Outcome 1(that faculty will implement new
       technology) in a different way than we had originally planned, by anonymously surveying faculty who
       had participated in training on the use of the Student Response System ("clickers"). In addition, we were
       able to assess Outcomes 2 - 4 in this survey. In August 2006, we asked 9 faculty to complete the survey,
       and 6 responded. CTLA staff reviewed the results in a staff meeting.

Goal 3, Outcomes 1 & 2: Although we did not mention it in our original plan, we also indirectly assessed Goal 3, Outcomes 1 & 2, via surveys of new faculty members completed anonymously immediately after each new faculty orientation session. The survey asked two questions: (1) How much did you know about the topic of this session, and (2) How useful was this session in helping you in your role as an IU Kokomo faculty member. The director developed the survey and reviewed the results (staff are not involved in new faculty orientation).

III.   Assessment Results

Goal 1, Outcome s1-4: Five (83%) of the faculty said they had used the clickers in at least one course. All six faculty agreed that the training they received from CTLA had enabled them to identify future potential applications for clickers in their classes, but only 5 of the 6 (83%) agreed that CTLA training permitted them to use the clickers successfully in their classes. Only three (50%) said that using clickers had increased student engagement, two (33%) stated that the clickers increased their ability to give prompt feedback to students, and only one (17%) stated that using clickers in class had increased student learning.

Although the survey results exceeded the benchmarks we set for faculty being able to implement the technology, we are still concerned about how few faculty found them useful for increasing student engagement and student learning, which is the primary reason for using clickers.

Goal 3, Outcomes 1 & 2: There were 8 new faculty in 2005-06. Because this was not part of the original plan, no benchmarks have been established. The table below shows how many attended each session, how many stated that they knew little or nothing about the topic, and how many thought the topic was useful to them. (Note–on most dates there were more than one session.)

Date (Session)	# attending (# surveys completed)	# who knew _____ about the topic			# stating the topic was...	
		little or nothing	some	a lot	very useful or useful	not very or not at all useful
August 17, 2005 (1)	8 (6)	1	5	0	6	0
August 17, 2005 (2)	8 (6)	4	1	1	6	0
August 17, 2005 (3)	8 (6)	4	2	0	6	6
August 17, 2005 (4)	8 (6)	3	3	0	6	0
October 5, 2005 (1)	8 (7)	1	5	1	7	0
October 5, 2005 (2)	8 (7)	3	3	1	7	0
November 2, 2005 (1)	5 (5)	0	5	0	5	0
January 18, 2006 (1)	8 (6)	3	3	0	6	0
February 15, 2006 (1)	4 (3)	1	2	0	3	0

Although all of the faculty completing the surveys said that all of the sessions were useful, this does not tell us whether new faculty orientation is meeting its outcomes ("New faculty will be able to identify

campus sources of important information regarding their roles and responsibilities" and "New faculty will feel a sense of connection to the campus community"). I am exploring ways to more directly assess these outcomes, so I can get a better sense of how effective the New Faculty Orientation sessions really are.

IV.   Using Assessment for Program Improvement

Re Goal 1, Outcomes 1-4 (Implementing Technology): At this point, CTLA staff will continue to offer clicker training as faculty ask for it, but we will change our training to include more information about the kinds of questions to ask, and how to use the clickers to increase student learning and student engagement. From what we can see at this point, however, most faculty are not asking for this training, so we are putting our training efforts elsewhere (especially the new Oncourse).

Re Goal 3, Outcomes 1 & 2 (New Faculty Orientation): Although ratings were positive, I am looking for ways to assess whether faculty are really getting what they need in New Faculty Orientation. I met with Academic Council in summer, 2006, to see whether they thought CTLA should do more with pedagogy and/or organize a formal mentoring program. The chairs and deans wanted to provide their own mentors for new faculty and preferred that CTLA not be involved in that process. They also stated that the pedagogical expertise of the new faculty is quite varied, and so more individualized training and support in pedagogy would be more effective. Therefore the CTLA will not, at this time, implement more training in pedagogical issues in New Faculty Orientation.