

CTLA Assessment Report for AY 2008-2009 May, 2010

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 2: Resources for improving teaching and learning

Outcome 1: Faculty will use resources provided by CTLA to improve their teaching.

We would assess Goal 1, Outcome 1 by giving attendees in our training classes—including *Oncourse for Your Course*—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 post training to assess whether and how well the attendees had implemented the technology they had learned.

We would assess Goal 1, Outcomes 2, 3, and 4, by the number of faculty who used "IF-AT" test technology provided by CTLA to support students' learning, student engagement, and prompt feedback to students. These faculty attended the 2007 Team-Based Learning Workshop or the 2007-2008 Faculty Learning Community on Team-Based Learning or both and applied the Team-Based Learning instructional strategy to courses.

For Goal 2, Outcome 1, we would assess two aspects CTLA provided. One is assessment of the program and development outcomes for the 2008-2009 Faculty Learning Community program to Create Significant Learning Experiences through Course Design rated by faculty who attended. The second is to determine how many faculty made use of the CTLA faculty and staff computer lab for working with our lab technology resources.

II. Assessment Methods

Goal 1, Outcome 1: We assessed some of our technology training courses by having the attendees do some tasks that were taught during training. We were able to do this assessment in the *Oncourse for Your Course* full-day technology training. We were also able to complete a limited number of these embedded assessment tasks for some of the other technology training classes, and results are reported. For these, the trainers tracked whether the attendee was able to do the task alone, do the task with help, or not complete the task.

Goal 2, Outcome 1: To assess the faculty use of our instructional resources for the Faculty Learning Community facilitation and book, we used an adaptation of a survey assessment for Faculty Learning Communities called the FLC Participant Assessment Survey and developed by Milton D. Cox, Miami University, Ohio, 2008. The survey asked participants to rate both program core components and developmental outcomes on a scale of 1 to 10 (with a N/A choice as well) where 1 signifies a weak impact and 10 signifies a strong impact.

To assess faculty use of the resources in the CTLA computer lab, we collected usage measures from the sign-in sheet for individual users and rosters for training class taught in the lab.

III. Assessment Results

Goal 1, Outcome 1:

CTLA staff members embedded assessment tasks in their *Oncourse for Your Course* technology training to directly assess whether trainees were or were not able to do the tasks.

Ten learners responded to these tasks. Nine were faculty and one was a student employee who was preparing to assist faculty with Oncourse use during the school year. Ability to complete tasks on own averaged 89% which surpassed the benchmark of 80%.

Course Management System Tasks to Perform	Could complete on own	Did not complete
Create a gradebook item	10	0
Identify where to choose how to show grades as percentages	10	0
Identify where to enter course grading scale	6	4
Identify where faculty control whether to show cumulative or running grades	4	6
Identify where to select whether or not to use gradebook categories	10	0
Identify which tool to use if faculty are using complex calculations for grades	10	0
Add a tool to the site	10	0
Add a syllabus	8	2
Add a student to the site*	9	0
Add a discussion Forum*	9	0
Add a question to a test	10	0

*One faculty participant was called away to a meeting and was not present for this assessment.

Often other technology training classes are so small (1 - 5 participants) that the instructor is able to tell immediately who is having difficulty and intervene readily. Participants included resident faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff. These were results for a variety of tasks assessing skills for all participants across 21 training classes. These results did not reach the 90% benchmark level.

	Could complete on own	Could complete with help	Did not complete
Embedded tasks	51 (81%)	10 (16%)	2 (3%)

Goal 1, Outcomes 2, 3, and 4

From the Faculty who attended the 2007 Team-Based Learning Workshop and/or the 2007-2008 Faculty Learning Community on Team-Based Learning, five faculty designed courses to use the Team-Based Learning instructional strategy in 2008-2009 and used IF-AT technology test resources provided to them by CTLA. A benchmark was not set for this measure.

Goal 2, Outcome 1:

Resources to Improve Teaching and Learning: Faculty Learning Community

Eight program core components and seventeen developmental outcomes were rated by the faculty who completed a Faculty Learning Community (FLC) using a version of the assessment questions from Milton D. Cox, Miami University, Ohio, *FLC Program Director's and Facilitator's Handbook*, © 2008, with modification for local use and subject. The following list shows the average ratings of impact of the FLC on participants. Higher numbers indicate stronger impact.

Program Components	Average rating
The collegueship and learning from the other community participants	9
The facilitation of the group	8.6
Opening workshop by Dr. Virginia Lee on Integrated Course Design for Significant Learning	8.4
Your FLC individual project	8.4
Book you received for teaching and learning support	8.4
Periodic sessions of the group	8.2
One-to-one partnerships that formed during the program	8
Funds you received for teaching and learning support	4.8

Developmental Outcomes	Average rating
Your ability to select significant learning outcomes for your course.	8.4
Your interest in the teaching process	8.4
Your ability to design a course for significant learning	7.8
Your ability to apply a systematic course design process	7.6
Your ability to provide feedback and support to fellow members	7.6
Your view of teaching as an intellectual pursuit	7.6
Your ability to study the results of your teaching change in a scholarly way	7.4
Your comfort as a member of the University community	7.4
Your ability to design a way to assess the results of your course change	7.2
Your total effectiveness as a teacher	7.2
Your technical skill as a teacher	7.2
Your understanding of and interest in the scholarship of teaching. Any plans for publications or presentations?	6.8
Your perspective of teaching, learning, and other aspects of higher education beyond the perspective of your discipline	6.6

Your awareness of ways to integrate the teaching and research experience	6
Your understanding of the role of a faculty member at our University	5.6
Your research and scholarly interest with respect to your discipline	5.25
Your awareness and understanding of how diversity may influence and enhance teaching and learning	5

A benchmark was not previously set for this measure. This was the first assessment of a FLC using this instrument and can provide comparisons with future FLC assessments.

Resources to Improve Teaching and Learning: CTLA faculty and staff lab as a resource

To track the usage of our CTLA equipment and software, we use a sign-in list at the entry to the CTLA lab. We also use training records from classes conducted in this lab. During 2008-2009, our lab measured the following usage:

- 27 non-duplicated resident faculty; usage ranged from one to eight visits each
- 15 non-duplicated adjunct faculty; usage ranged from one to 26 visits each

IV. Using Assessment for Program Improvement

Goal 1, Outcomes 1: Taught primarily to new faculty, Oncourse training is attended by a larger, more diverse group in terms of comfort and knowledge of technology, so embedded assessment is an important mechanism for feedback to the instructors. Although encouraged to complete, 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 chooses to work on something else instead of the task. Using a benchmark of 80% under these assessment circumstances seems reasonable to us for technology training.

Our challenge is that other technology training classes, other than Oncourse, were often centrally prepared by the University Information Technology Services IT Training without an assessment component or without time included for assessment. Under those circumstances, it is difficult to extend time for participants and add to already lengthy training. In some cases, time for this kind of assessment cannot be accomplished. In others, portions of the training lend themselves to an assessment purpose and results can be tracked. Like the Oncourse training, this assessment is not required and participants can choose not to participate in it.

Goal 1, Outcome 2, 3, and 4

In the future, we are likely to assess how many of all faculty use the IF-AT technology test resources to support the Team-Based Learning instructional strategy, not just faculty who attended our sponsored workshop and FLC. As faculty help introduce other faculty who are newer to the method, we will be more interested in usage of that resource by all faculty using Team-Based Learning. Some are using it for multiple courses.

Goal 2, Outcome 1

We did not set a benchmark for the results of the assessment of the FLC program components and developmental outcomes. We customized a national measure instrument for our local

learning community topic and schedule. Results can be influenced by the topic of the FLC study. All measures of impact were above 5 out of a possible 10, except the impact of the funds received for teaching and learning support (funds for completing the FLC.) This gave some indication of higher impact of intrinsic over extrinsic rewards.

We did not set a bench mark for the results of the measure of faculty who make individual use of our CTLA lab. Tracking the usage of our lab can inform us the usefulness of these resources, especially because more of the software that used to be unavailable in faculty offices have become part of the standard build of office computers. Examples are Adobe software, such as Acrobat, Photoshop, Captivate, and audio software. Resources available more broadly for faculty may diminish the demand for usage of some of our lab software or equipment, such as scanners. Our lab continues to offer software for faculty that is not generally available in their offices, such as Raptivity for creating online learning modules, Snag-IT for screen capture and editing, or AceHTML for creating online forms.