

Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Faculty and Student Contact

CETL maintains data about faculty support and interactions across multiple activities, and these are documented in this report by category:

Faculty development programming

During academic year 2015-16:

- **300** faculty attended the **40** lunchtime seminar series workshops that were scheduled
- Group based instruction:
 - “Introduction to hybrid/blended learning” **3** times in a hybrid/blended mode of delivery
 - “Introduction to flipped courses” **2** times in a flipped mode of delivery
 - “Exploring online learning” **4** times in an online mode of delivery to prepare **60** faculty to develop and teach online courses; in 2014-15, this program was offered **3** times to **55** faculty from various departments
- **400** faculty attended the **29** faculty development workshops including **125** faculty who attended the day long May-Day Teaching Workshop
- **>100** faculty attend the full-day Writing Teaching Orientation
- **48** faculty participated in the book talk series discussion of “Teaching at its Best”
- **92** faculty attended the President’s Series on Teaching Excellence
- **26** faculty were awarded Provost’s mini-grants to facilitate teaching innovation
- In academic year 2015-16, **196 new** teaching assistants attended a day-long teaching orientation; in academic year 2016-17, **329 new** teaching assistants attended a day-long teaching orientation
- All teaching assistants have completed Tier One of the Teaching Assistant Development Program, Tier Two begins in Spring 2017 (Topically Focused Professional Development Workshops), and Tier Three is the ongoing Graduate Certificate in College Teaching and Instruction
- In academic year 2015-16, **36 new** faculty attended a day-long teaching orientation; in academic year 2016-17, **84 new** faculty attended a day-long teaching orientation

Department/School/Regional campus level programming designed for faculty:

In addition to programming and support that is provided to groups of faculty in a more interdisciplinary context, we also do a great deal of similar programming that is context (i.e. school, department, or discipline specific) throughout the year.

During academic year 2015-16:

- Literature, cultures, and languages department (Topic: Flexible teaching strategies)

- School of Pharmacy: 100% of Department of Pharmacy Practice faculty in attendance (Topic day 1: Course outcomes and assessment alignment; topic day 2: Flexible teaching and learning strategies)
- School of Nursing: 60% of faculty in attendance (Topic: Flexible teaching and learning strategies; Getting the Most out of HuskyCT)
- School of Social Work: 50% of faculty in attendance (Topic day 1: Flexible teaching and learning strategies; topic day 2: Flipping and blending courses)
- Avery Point campus (Topic day 1: Flexible teaching and learning strategies; topic day 2: Online teaching and learning)
- Waterbury campus (Topic: Flexible teaching and learning strategies)
- Hartford campus (Topic: Flexible teaching and learning strategies)
- Stamford campus: 15 faculty (Topic: Online teaching and learning)
- School of Engineering: Lunchtime keynote on best practice: effective and flexible teaching strategies and developments in cognitive science and how students learn
- Marketing Department School of Business (Topic: Developments in Online Learning, Strategies for optimizing asynchronous and synchronous learning)
- School of Fine Arts: All Staff/Faculty Meeting (Topic: Developments in Online Learning and Flexible Teaching Strategies)
- School of Engineering: 17 faculty (Topic: Flipping and blending courses)
- School of Nursing: 75% of faculty (Introduction to Quality Matters)
- Department of Mathematics (Topic: Online teaching and learning)

One-on-one teaching consultations (The majority of these consultations are initiated by the faculty member who is motivated to ‘improve and enhance’ their teaching effectiveness. We also work with a smaller number of faculty who have been identified as needing focused support, most often as a result of low Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) scores <2 , and we work collaboratively with department heads to implement a systemic ‘teaching enhancement plan’.

During academic year 2015-2016:

- 106 faculty were assisted through one-on-one consultations
- 18 faculty who self-identified with low student evaluation (i.e. $SET < 2$) of teaching scores were assisted through one-on-one confidential consultations
- Consultation time varied from 2 hours to 50 hours
- 6 faculty had weekly/bi-weekly meetings to work on English pronunciation with our ESL specialist who also assists Teaching Assistants
- 23 faculty received formal classroom observation, including pre- and post-observation meetings, creation of formal report, and multiple observations (if needed)

Instructional design and development (Our core instructional design staff do most of their work supporting faculty in the development of fully online courses. They also consult with our faculty development staff to support teaching enhancement plans for specific faculty and deliver many of the professional development workshops. Approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ of all ID engagements are now in the area of flipped, hybrid, and blended course/faculty support.

During academic year 2015-16:

- Assisted faculty with the design and development of **28** new undergraduate online and hybrid/blended courses
- Assisted faculty with the design and development of **22** new graduate level online and hybrid/blended courses
- Maintained ongoing support of **over 300** online courses, including the ongoing design and maintenance of courses and support of the faculty teaching these courses

Educational technology support (Our Educational Technology staff provide faculty support for a suite of technologies including our Learning Management System (HuskyCT), lecture and content capture (Mediasite), Classroom Response Systems (iClickers), Distance Learning (WebEx), Video production, and Video recording and embedded quiz technologies (Lightboard/Zaption).

Since July 2016:

- An average of **13** requests per day are made by faculty for assistance with educational technology
- **484** faculty assistance interactions have been managed by CETL's educational technology staff
- **36** faculty attended the HuskyCT (Blackboard LMS) Basic training workshop (multiple sessions)
- **29** faculty attended the HuskyCT (Blackboard LMS) Advanced training workshop (multiple sessions)
- **25** faculty attended the iClickers classroom response training workshops (multiple sessions)
- **8** faculty attended the Mediasite desktop lecture and content capture training workshop
- **14** faculty attended the WebEx (distance education) training workshop

During academic year 2015-16:

- **50** faculty have been trained to and currently use the UConn Lightboard (<http://cetl.uconn.edu/educational-technologies/lightboard/>)
- **260** new faculty users were trained to use Mediasite
- **10** faculty have been trained to and currently use the Collaborative Learning Classroom
- **45** faculty have been trained to and currently use WebEx (distance education)
- **1100** visits and **2000** page views per month to our HuskyCT resource page with **67%** being new HuskyCT users
- CETL's educational technology staff had more than **2,000** distinct support/contact instances with faculty
- **35** presentations to schools and/or academic departments from Storrs and the regional campuses on educational technology
- **30** faculty and department heads engaged our video producers to help record high quality video to support flipped and hybrid class design

Student-facing services

During academic year 2015-16:

- >**4500** tutorials at the Writing Center
- **741** students reaching through First Year Experience program by Writing Center
- **21,426** tutoring visits by **3,662** students to Quantitative Learning Center
- **63** review sessions attended by **2012** students in Quantitative Learning Center
- **42** training workshops for student tutors in the Quantitative Learning Center

Exemplars (these two specific use cases are meant to illustrate the often transformative impact that faculty experience through their interactions with CETL staff)

Exemplar #1

Rachael Lynch worked with the eCampus group to design and develop both a hybrid/blended and an online course. When she first worked with us to transition her in-person course to a hybrid/blended offering, she was self-admittedly unsure of her technical skills or of the potential benefits of adopting a new method of teaching. After a few consultations with an instructional designer, she realized that the redesign of the course started with the pedagogy and learning outcomes. She immediately took to the process and redesigned her in-person course from meeting 2 days a week in person to a hybrid/blended course now taught in-person 1 day a week and online asynchronously for the remaining hours. Using HuskyCT and Mediasite, she created a rich interactive online environment that she now feels is more effective in teaching and communicating with all of her students when compared to how she taught in the past. Rachael carried the momentum from this experience into the development of a fully online course which by all accounts met with similar outcomes. Rather than be less engaged, her students found increased flexibility and more opportunities to interact with each other and with Rachael. Rachael felt more connected than ever with her students. Her satisfaction with our support can be summed up in a quote from an email she sent the instructional designer with whom she collaborated. “I just want to tell you how profoundly grateful I am for your wisdom, expertise, and patience. I have had so much to learn, and I absolutely would not be where I am without you. I know I have a long way to go, but I am feeling far more empowered than I was. Thank you very much indeed.” Her successes point to the synergy that occurs when motivated faculty partner with highly trained instructional designers to transform their courses.

Exemplar #2:

Professor X is an Associate Professor in CLAS who reached out to CETL regarding a 1000 level course. After speaking with Professor X and reviewing his syllabus, other teaching materials, and student evaluation of teaching (SET) from the previous semester, Professor X worked with our faculty development staff to increase student engagement during class while further emphasizing critical thinking and in-depth analysis of the course content. He enhanced his slides, introduced more engaging relevant examples through videos, and utilized small group discussions even though this was initially a little outside of his comfort zone at first. Professor X worked to enhance assessment of learning in his course. During previous semesters, the final course grade was based almost entirely on 3 in-class exams with multiple choice, true/false and short answer questions. Some students struggled on the exams. Many students reported that

they needed guidance on how to prepare for the exams; others felt the exams did not measure their learning. For some students it seemed like the exams were getting in the way of their learning and leading to a negative experience with the course. He added 7 low-risk quizzes to assess learning throughout the semester to give students more opportunities to practice answering questions in the course. He added take home essay questions to the exams in order to better assess critical thinking. In order to increase student focus on the most important course concepts and lessen anxiety and confusion, Professor X created test banks, study guides and review sessions for each exam.

An additional component of Professor X's Teaching Enhancement Plan involved using mid-semester formative assessments in order to gauge student perceptions of learning, reactions to various components of the course, and opportunities for improvement and change. Professor X used the feedback to make 6 key adjustments to his course for the 2nd half of the semester including a number of changes to the small group and full class discussions, taking into account student concerns, course learning outcomes, and his desire to establish an effective classroom learning environment. On the end of the semester student evaluation of teaching, in response to the question "What was the most positive aspect of the way in which the instructor taught this course?" one student wrote: "He was willing and comfortable to take into consideration students' feedback from the mid-term of the course. He had asked us what we liked and wanted to change/improve in the classroom. We asked for more questions on the quizzes and more group discussions and people sharing their thoughts and he started implementing that." On the student evaluation of teaching, the overall rating of Professor X's teaching improved from a 2 to a 4 (scale of 5).