CTLA Assessment Report for AY 2007-08
March, 2009

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 plan stated that we would assess Goal 1, Outcome 1 by giving attendees in our training classes (including tech camp) a task to complete, and recording whether they were able to do the task alone, with help, or not at all. We also stated we could follow up a month post training to assess whether and how well the attendees had implemented the technology they had learned.

We planned to assess Goal 1, Outcomes 2 - 4 by surveying faculty regarding their use of technology to support student learning, increase student engagement, and give prompt feedback to students.

For Goal 3, Outcomes 1 & 2, we planned to survey faculty in their first three years to determine their knowledge of campus resources and engagement in the campus community. In addition, we planned to collect satisfaction data after each new faculty orientation session.

Change in the plan: The goals and outcomes did not change from our original plan, but some of the assessment methods did (see below).

II.   Assessment Methods
Change in the Plan: We surveyed the faculty regarding their use of technology, but so few faculty responded that the results are not meaningful. In addition, we did not develop the survey for new faculty regarding new faculty orientation. However, we did assess our training session at Adjunct Faculty Dinner, which we did not describe in our plan. Those results are presented below.

Goal 1, Outcome 1: We assessed our training courses by having the attendees do several tasks that were taught during training. We marked whether the attendee was able to do the task alone, do the task with assistance, or not complete the task.

Goal 3, Outcomes 1 & 2: We 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 1:

Each year, CTLA sponsors an Adjunct Faculty Dinner, where we celebrate our adjunct faculty and offer a brief (20 - 30 minute) training session on a relevant technology topic. In August, 2007, we presented information on the new Office 2007. Office 2007 was loaded on the instructor workstations in the classrooms, and because there were some significant changes from the previous version of Office, we demonstrated some basic features for the adjunct faculty at the dinner. They do not have an opportunity to practice during this time, but we do supply them with handouts that they can work through on their own. We assessed their confidence in being able to use Office 2007 with a brief survey.

Item	N	Very Little	Some	A Lot
How much did you already know about Word 2007?	25	68%	28%	4%
How much did you already know about PowerPoint 2007?	27	67%	30%	4%
How much did you already know about Compatibility Pack for Office 2007?	27	78%	15%	7%
How confident are you that you will be able to open a student file saved in Word 2007?	27	7%	59%	33%
How confident are you that you will be able to launch a slide show in PowerPoint 2007?	26	23%	46%	31%
How confident are you that you will be able to save a file in the version you need (2003 or 2007)?	27	11%	48%	41%

These results indicate that most of the adjunct faculty knew very little about the topic. After training, most attendees stated they had some confidence they would be able to do the basic tasks that we demonstrated to them. Ideally, those who desired to practice would be given that opportunity, but the logistics of the adjunct faculty dinner do not make that possible. These results tell us that we were successful in choosing a topic that they did not know much about and would welcome some instruction on, and that our instruction was at least somewhat useful to them.

Both of the CTLA staff members embed assessment tasks in their training courses, including Tech Camp, in order to directly assess whether their trainees are able to do the tasks. In many cases, the training classes are so small (1 - 4 participants) that the instructor is able to tell immediately who is having difficulty and intervene readily. The data for those many course show that nearly all of the participants are able to do the assessment tasks without assistance.

Tech Camp, however, is a larger, more diverse group in terms of comfort and knowledge of technology, so embedded assessment is an important mechanism for feedback to the instructor. However, no participant is required to complete the assessment tasks, so we cannot tell whether non-completion is because the participant doesn't know how to do it, or simply chose not to.

For the 2007 Tech Camp, 65 - 86% successfully completed the various assessment tasks successfully. We also added a clicker-aided quiz assessing participants' knowledge of how to do certain tasks. Participants

had to correctly answer questions about how one would go about (for instance) showing grades as percentages, or how to change running grades display. Of the 7 quiz questions, 100% of the participants correctly answered only 1 of the questions. Percentage of correct responses ranged from 54% to 86% for the other items. Because the quiz was presented via clickers, the instructor was immediately able to correct any misconceptions before going on to the next part of the lesson.

Goal 3, Outcomes 1 & 2: There were 11 new faculty in 2007-08. 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–many dates had 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 14, 2007 (1)	11 (8)	0	0%	8	100%	0	0%	6	75%	2	25%
August 14, 2007 (2)	11 (8)	4	50%	3	38%	1	12%	8	100%	0	0%
August 14, 2007 (3)	11 (8)	4	50%	4	50%	0	0%	8	100%	0	0%
August 14, 2007 (4)	11 (8)	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	8	100%	0	0%
August 14, 2007 (5)	11 (7)	3	43%	4	57%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%
August 27, 2007 (1)	9 (9)	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	9	100%	0	0%
August 27, 2007 (2)	9 (9)	4	44%	5	56%	0	0%	9	100%	0	0%
September 24, 2007 (1)	6 (6)	2	33%	4	67%	0	0%	5	83%	1	17%
October 29, 2007 (1)	7 (6)	0	0%	3	50%	3	50%	6	100%	0	0%
October 29, 2007 (2)	7 (7)	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	5	71%	2	29%
November 26, 2007 (1)	5 (5)	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%
January 14, 2008 (1)	8 (8)	5	63%	3	38%	0	0%	8	100%	0	0%
January 14, 2008 (2)	8 (5)	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%
February 11, 2008 (1)	6 (6)	3	50%	1	17%	2	33%	4	67%	2	33%
February 11, 2008 (2)	6 (6)	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	5	83%	1	17%
March 17, 2008 (1)	5 (5)	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%

For 9 of the 16 topics, at least half of the faculty attending stated they knew little about the topic; for only 1 of the 16 topics did half the faculty say they knew a lot about the topic. had some knowledge of the topic; for the other three, they had little knowledge. Most faculty agreed that the sessions were useful to them. As in previous years, attendance dropped off as the year progressed.

IV.   Using Assessment for Program Improvement

Re Goal 1, Outcomes 1 (Implementing Technology): As with the year prior, we set a benchmark of 90% of faculty completing tasks taught in Tech Camp without help. This benchmark was met for one of the tasks, but not for the others. In retrospect, we believe the benchmark may have been too high for tasks that were not required–faculty who already knew how to do the task might simply have elected to work on something else rather than completing the task. In light of our findings from this and the previous year, we believe a benchmark of 90% for Tech Camp (though probably not for the smaller training courses, where nearly all of the participants complete the tasks) is too high and suggest a future benchmark of 80% for Tech Camp.

We did not set a benchmark for responses on the adjunct faculty dinner survey. However, given that the attendees simply heard a presentation and were not able to practice what they had learned, we believe that the session on Office 2007 was a success. Our challenge is continue to find topics for the adjunct faculty dinner that are timely, and that we can present in a brief period of time.

Re Goal 3, Outcomes 1 & 2 (New Faculty Orientation): Although ratings were positive, attendance dropped considerably over the course of the year, suggesting that we need to re-think the concept of a year-long orientation for new faculty. Although the Deans had suggested 2 years ago that we should not conduct a more pedagogically-oriented new faculty orientation, it may be time to look at this again.