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Letter from the Director

I am pleased to provide the following information on the activities of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). The CTL is dedicated to the development of extraordinary teaching and learning at the University of South Dakota. This 2013-14 Annual Report marks the seventh year of our existence. Faculty and staff continue to rate the CTL’s services highly, and the objectives and outcomes described in this report show that our programs have enhanced the educational experiences of both our faculty and our students. Innovation and collaboration are at the heart of our mission, and these core values propelled us to some notable successes this year:

- We completed 1,353 requests for individual assistance, an increase of 38.5% from last year, far exceeding our expected goals.
- 85% of the respondents to our Center for Teaching and Learning Service Survey indicated that our one-on-one assistance to solve specific problems related to technology was “Extremely Effective” (56.7%) or “Effective” (28.3%).
- Faculty who have gone through the full teaching consultation process (including classroom visitation) have gained an average of 15.52 percentile points on the IDEA form for “Excellent Instructor” and 16.03 percentile points for “Excellent Course” when the semester prior to consultation is compared to the semester after consultation.
- 84% of online instructors rated the CTL as very helpful or helpful in the Online Faculty Early Alert Survey.

As we look to the future, we are fully committed to contributing further to the success of this University. I wish to thank the faculty, chairs, deans, and campus administrators who have pledged their support and, most importantly, their time, to help the CTL. The successes detailed in this report are really yours. Finally, to those of you who have come forward to share your expertise in teaching and learning, I offer my most gracious appreciation.

Sincerely,

Bruce Kelley
Director, Center for Teaching and Learning
Professor of Music
The CTL and USD’s 2012-2017 Strategic Plan
The CTL is enthusiastically committed to the development of vibrant educational experiences at the University of South Dakota, and provides integral support for the strategic themes established by the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan.

Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional Student Experience
The CTL supports all three goals in this theme. The CTL encourages and empowers effective teaching, and cultivates an institutional climate that values teaching excellence. The CTL provides demonstrably effective development opportunities for faculty and instructional staff at all academic levels. Numerous workshops teach best practices related to student engagement and the implementation of rich academic experiences. Data show, for example, that participation in our most intense developmental events, such as our course redesign fellowship, results in higher IDEA evaluation scores. Our internal grants have supported speakers and guest artists that have addressed key university initiatives such as diversity, first-year student success, service learning, mobile computing, and the math emporium model.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work
The CTL fully supports the goal to expand interdisciplinary research, scholarship, and creative work, with a focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning. Our internal grants program has fully or partially funded 76 faculty presentations and creative activities since its inception, funding activities that have ranged from state meetings to international conferences. The CTL serves as a force multiplier in research, allowing faculty to present their scholarship and creative activities to wider audiences than may have otherwise been possible. The CTL also engages in its own scholarship, and has presented and published in numerous venues, including the top journals in faculty development.

Liberal Arts and Learning
CTL programming directly supports the university’s goal to graduate globally aware students and students who are capable of complex reasoning, critical thinking, and effective self-expression. The course redesign fellowship, for example, takes faculty through a two-week training regimen that requires them to develop opportunities for significant learning in the acquisition of foundational knowledge, application and integration of new concepts, learning how to learn, developing new feelings, interests, and values, and in how the topic impacts oneself and others.

Diversity and Inclusiveness
The CTL has worked closely with faculty, staff, and students to promote a holistic approach to diversity and inclusive excellence. We routinely offer workshops on how to promote diversity in the classroom, and have focused in the past four years on how to best serve students with disabilities, student veterans, and Native American Students. The CTL at USD is recognized as a national leader in its development of programs to help faculty and staff better understand student veterans. The CTL also strives to model inclusive excellence in every way—from our conviction to treat everyone who walks through our door with
honor and dignity to our attempts to practice inclusive excellence when hiring GTAs and Techfellows. Diversity and inclusiveness are central components of the values of the University of South Dakota. Our office accepts the principles and values outlined in the University of South Dakota Diversity and Inclusiveness Statement. Our services are inclusive of gender, race, ethnicity, disability status, religion, sexual orientation, nationality, age, veteran status, and other important social identities.

Community and University Relations
The CTL’s outreach to the community is secondary to its primary mission, and yet the CTL supports this strategic theme in a number of ways. CTL staff members teach a number of community education workshops related to basic technology, and have also gone out to the public schools to provide technological training.

Kathy LaPlante, Jean Yockey, Ken Green, and Rob Turner present during the Course Redesign Fellowship workshop. Tim Heaton in foreground.
Center for Teaching and Learning Performance Objectives

The following section of this report outlines the objectives and outcomes measured by the CTL in 2013-14. This is the fourth year of measuring our effectiveness with outcomes-based measures. Data from these assessments are incorporated into the CTL’s own strategic planning guide, and are used to make specific decisions regarding our use of time, money, and personnel.

Participation Objectives

To be effective, the CTL must be seen as a “go-to” resource, and faculty and staff should be willing and eager to seek us out.

Objective 1: Sustain the number of events we sponsor or assist, sustain the number of unique individuals and sustain the total number of registrants, despite losing a staff member.

Figure 1: Participation in CTL Events, AY 2009-2014

![Participation in CTL Events](image)

Analysis and Action: Both overall and unique participation in CTL-sponsored events declined this year, despite the number of workshops that were added. We believe several factors influenced this drop. The closing of the Fides program and the concomitant loss of a staff member did hurt our numbers, particularly because that program regularly drew statewide audiences, and thus large numbers of unique participants. In addition, the “Catch the Wave” program, which reaches out to high school students with disabilities (and for which we do technological training), was moved to Brookings for a year. That represented over 200 of our unique participants last year. More than that, however, I believe that we have reached a saturation point for our technology and pedagogy workshops. This is the seventh year of the center’s existence, and the fourth year of the MCI program. We have reached most of our faculty with our basic workshops, and our focus is switching more and more to 1:1 assistance with specific pedagogical and technological problems. Last year’s goals reflected this trend, and as objective 2 shows, our 1:1 assistance increased dramatically. Our
goal for AY15 is to reach 800 unique and 1600 total participants in CTL-sponsored or – assisted events, and to maintain the number of events we sponsor or assist.

Objective 2: Increase our one-to-one assistance to our constituents, as measured by the task logs, by 5%.

Our “task logs,” which record phone calls, walk-ins, and individual appointments, have increased dramatically since we began tracking this data in 2009, and rose 38.5% last year, far exceeding our expected goal:

Figure 2: Task Log Entries

![Task Log Entries Graph]

Analysis and Action: As indicated above, we believe that we are reaching a point in our technological and pedagogical training where many of our constituents are needing individual help for more advanced challenges. We will begin to focus more on this, intentionally limiting the number of events we sponsor or assist, so that we have more time to devote to 1:1 assistance. The goal for AY15 will be to again increase our task log by 5%, and to add the following metric from the new CTL Service Survey: 90% of the respondents to the CTL survey will indicate that one-on-one assistance to solve specific problems related to technology was “Extremely Effective” or “Effective.” Baseline data from the AY14 survey indicated that 85% of the respondents believed our one-on-one assistance was “Extremely Effective” or “Effective”.

Mobile computing-related objectives
Faculty development is an essential part of the BOR’s Mobile Computing Initiative (MCI). If we are effective in our MCI-related developmental programming, faculty should become more comfortable and proficient in using educational technology.
Objective 3: Students will indicate that the University as a whole will show growing proficiency in the use of educational technology, as measured on Question 47 of the IDEA form, and that the percentage of courses scoring 3.5 or higher will not drop below 95% for each semester.

Question 47 on the IDEA form states that “The Instructor used educational technology to promote learning.” The question is measured by a 5-point Likert scale, where a rating of 1 indicates “Definitely False” and a rating of 5 indicates “Definitely True.”

Figure 3: Percentage of courses scoring 3.5 or higher for IDEA Question 47, by semester

Analysis and Action: We had believed that we were reaching the upper limits of this metric—but there was an interesting downturn in the ratings this year. There was a fairly significant public discussion about faculty failure to use D2L (article in the Volante, new D2L policies), and we wonder if that had an impact on student perception of technology use. Unfortunately, with the change in IDEA forms, we will no longer be able to track this metric in the future. We will retire this objective and survey instrument, and replace with data from the “Center for Teaching and Learning Service Survey.” The new Objective 3 will be as follows: 75% of the respondents to our CTL Service Survey will indicate that they use technology to enhance their face-to-face classroom. Baseline data from AY14 indicate that 71.9% of the faculty use technology to enhance their face-to-face classroom.

Objective 4: Faculty who participate in MCI workshops will make greater use of technology to promote learning in their classes than the USD average, as indicated by a higher percentage of their courses being rated 3.5 or higher on IDEA question 47.

This is measured through Question 47 on the IDEA form—“The Instructor used educational technology to promote learning.” The question is a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 = Definitely False and 5 = Definitely True
Analysis and Action: Faculty who attend MCI workshops are generally rated more highly on question 47 than faculty who do not. Faculty who attended 3 or more MCI workshops scored much higher than the university average. Unfortunately, with the change in IDEA forms, we will no longer be able to track this metric in the future. We will retire this objective and survey instrument, and replace with data from the “Center for Teaching and Learning Service Survey.” The new objective 4 will be as follows: 75% of the respondents will rate workshops about the integration of technology into teaching as “Extremely Effective” or “Effective.” Baseline data for AY14 indicate that 70.7% of the respondents rate our technology integration workshops as “Extremely Effective” or “Effective”

Objective 5: Students who are in MCI courses with faculty who have attended MCI workshops will answer more positively to the following questions on the MCI student assessment than will students in MCI courses with faculty who have not attended MCI workshops. This objective is being measured through the CTL-administered MCI assessment, which measures questions on a five-point scale, where 1= ”strongly disagree” and 5=”strongly agree.”
Figure 5: MCI Assessment “I understand the content of this course more thoroughly because of the use of technology”:

![Bar chart showing results from Fall 2010 to Spring 2014 for instructors who have attended 1 or more MCI workshops and those who have not attended any MCI workshops.]

Figure 6: MCI Assessment “My class experience was enhanced by the use of technology”:

![Bar chart showing results from Fall 2010 to Spring 2014 for instructors who have attended 1 or more MCI workshops and those who have not attended any MCI workshops.]

Figure 7: MCI Assessment “I learned more effectively or more efficiently in this course because of the laptops/tablets/SMARTBoards”:

![Bar chart showing results from Fall 2012 to Spring 2014 for instructors who have attended 1 or more MCI workshops and those who have not attended any MCI workshops.]

Analysis and Action: The results of this survey have been generally positive. This particular assessment, however, has been difficult to deploy in numbers that we feel provide us with sound data. We will retire this objective and survey instrument, and replace with data from our newly designed “Center for Teaching and Learning Faculty Survey.” The new objective 5 will be as follows: 75% of the respondents to our CTL Survey will indicate that they Agree or Strongly Agree with the following statements:
• My students used technology to meet the learning objectives for the courses I teach (AY14 Baseline: 91.6%)
• My students understood the content more thoroughly because of the use of technology (AY14 Baseline: 73.4%)
• I felt confident creating technology-enhanced learning experiences for my students (AY14 Baseline: 73.8%)

Objective 6: Overall faculty use of D2L will rise to 35% by 2015. Measure: D2L course activation statistics. One of the easiest ways to incorporate technology in the classroom is through the features of D2L, and it is a technology that is ubiquitous within the system and fully supported by IT.

Figure 8: Percentage of Courses Activated in D2L, by semester

Analysis and Action: We are making acceptable progress here, although we are troubled by the downward trend this past fall and spring. The new policy mandating use of D2L in 100- and 200-level courses should boost this in the coming semesters. We will continue to measure this outcome, and the goal remains unchanged.

Objective 7: Faculty who participate in the two-week MCI course redesign fellowship will show improvements in their teacher evaluations by scoring an average of 5 percentage points higher on the IDEA forms the two semesters after the workshop is complete. The IDEA forms are in imperfect measure of student learning and teacher effectiveness, but one of the goals of the course redesign fellowship is to design courses that are active and that engage students. Research has shown conflicting results in terms of course design and student evaluations. On one hand, the courses (should) become more interactive and student centered, which increases student engagement and student evaluation scores. On the other hand, active learning techniques also place more responsibility and a greater workload on students, and because of this can cause downward movement in course evaluations. Our
goal, despite the conflicting evidence, is to see overall improved scores in the IDEA forms for course redesign fellows, as measured the semester before and two semesters after the fellowship. The following figure examines the four primary scores on the IDEA summary sheet: Progress on Objectives, Excellent Teacher, Excellent Course, and Overall Summary. The scores are an average of the percentiles scored by each cohort two semesters prior to and after the course redesign workshop.

Figure 9: Average IDEA percentiles for faculty who participated in the 2-week MCI course redesign fellowship AY11-AY13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Progress on Objectives, Raw, IDEA Percentile average</th>
<th>Excellent Teacher, Raw, IDEA Percentile average</th>
<th>Excellent Course Raw, IDEA Percentile average</th>
<th>Overall Summary, Raw, IDEA Percentile average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-12</td>
<td>59.49</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>50.56</td>
<td>51.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>51.37</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>50.33</td>
<td>50.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+1</td>
<td>54.27</td>
<td>51.23</td>
<td>53.04</td>
<td>51.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+2</td>
<td>55.12</td>
<td>53.18</td>
<td>54.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis and Action: The program as a whole shows improvement in all scores between F-1 and F+2:

- Progress on Objectives: +2.66
- Excellent Teacher: +1.84
- Excellent Course: +2.68
- Overall Summary: +2.51

Our results were positive, and slightly better than last year, but the numbers are still low enough that individual performances can have a significant impact on the overall scores. We revised the CRF this past year, and hope that this year’s cohort will show more even progress in this area.

**Objectives for online teaching and learning**

One of our core responsibilities is that of training and maintaining quality online instructional practices. This includes our newly-developed Online Faculty Orientation, the Quality Assurance process, technology training, 1:1 assistance, and more. Several of the objectives in this area will have to be retired due to the change in IDEA forms, and we’ve developed two new objectives to replace these and to take advantage of new data sources.
Objective 8: 95% of the courses taught by faculty who have just completed the New Online Faculty Orientation course will score 3.5 or higher on Question 1 of the IDEA form (“The instructor displayed a personal interest in students and their learning.”) the semester after training is complete. Measure: IDEA Form.

Figure 10: Percentage of faculty scoring 3.5 or higher for question “The instructor displayed a personal interest in students and their learning”:

Analysis and action: We came close to meeting our goal on this objective. We will continue to stress ways in which instructors can display personal interest in their students in the online environment. This objective will be retired in 2014 due to the change in IDEA forms, see “New objectives” below.

Objective 9: 95% of the courses taught by faculty who have just completed the New Online Faculty Orientation course will score 3.5 or higher on Question 17 of the IDEA form (“The instructor provided timely and frequent feedback on tests, reports, projects, etc. to help students improve.”) the semester after training is complete.

Figure 11: Baseline Data, Percentage of faculty scoring 3.5 or higher for question “Instructor provided timely and frequent feedback”:

Analysis and action: We came close to meeting our goal on this objective. We will continue to stress the importance of timely feedback to the new instructors, and will provide faculty
with strategies to manage the flow of assessment (both graded and ungraded). This objective will be retired in 2014 due to the change in IDEA forms, see “New objectives” below.

Objective 10: Online teachers who go through the QA process will have IDEA evaluations that match or exceed university face-to-face averages for both “excellent instructor” and “excellent course.” Measure: IDEA student survey of teaching

Figure 12: Percentage of Online Faculty who are at or above average on the IDEA evaluation for “Excellent Instructor.”

![Graph showing percentage of Online Faculty who are at or above average on the IDEA evaluation for “Excellent Instructor.”](image)

Figure 13: Percentage of Online Courses that are at or above average on the IDEA evaluation for “Excellent Course.”

![Graph showing percentage of Online Courses that are at or above average on the IDEA evaluation for “Excellent Course.”](image)

Analysis and Action: We believe that different modes of education should have similar outcomes in terms of student evaluations. This has been a sustained focus for our staff this
past year. The new online faculty orientation, the addition of a second online program manager (who shepherds faculty through the course design process), and collaboration with departments to address individual teaching challenges have all had an impact. This fall, online courses performed better on “Excellent course” than did face to face courses, and performed well in the spring, with more than 80% of these courses scoring an average of 3.5 or higher on the IDEA form for that rating. “Excellent instructor” remains a more difficult goal to reach. Scores are moving upward, however, since we began to focus on this challenge. We are glad that the percentage of face-to-face courses scoring an average of 3.5 or higher is also growing, and accept the challenge that provides in achieving this goal. One trend that we have been able to substantiate is that there is a positive correlation between overall instructor ratings and the amount of time between training and the start of classes. Faculty who are trained at least a month prior to the start of their course score better on student evaluations throughout their career than faculty who are trained closer to the start of the academic term:

Figure 14: Percentage of courses that are at or above average on the IDEA for “excellent instructor”, differentiated by days between training and first day of course.

Note that these figures are cumulative for every course taught by the professor. It seems that insufficient initial training may be a long-term concern. We will work with CDE and the departments to reinforce the importance of timely hiring and training.

**New objectives for online teaching and learning.**
The change in IDEA forms has eliminated our ability to measure Objectives 8 and 9. We will replace them with the following:

**Objective (New):** 85% of the new online instructors will agree or strongly with the statement “I received adequate training.” Measure: Early Alert Survey, Online Faculty, all semesters/terms combined.
Figure 15: Baseline Data, Percentage of new online instructors agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement “I received adequate training.”

"I received adequate training"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are establishing baselines for this objective. For Spring 2014, 71.9% of instructors said they received adequate training prior to teaching an online course.

Objective (New): 80% of the online instructors will rate the CTL as very helpful or helpful.
Measure: Early Alert Survey, Online Faculty, all semesters/terms combined.

Figure 16: Baseline Data, ratings of CTL by online instructors:

**Online faculty rate the CTL as. . .**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhelpful</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very unhelpful</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are establishing baselines for this objective. For Spring 2014, 77% of online instructors rated the CTL as very helpful or helpful.
Objective (New): 80% of the new online instructors will rate the CTL as very helpful or helpful. Measure: Early Alert Survey, Online Faculty, all semesters/terms combined.

Figure 17: Baseline Data, ratings of CTL by new online instructors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhelpful</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very unhelpful</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are establishing baselines for this objective. For Spring 2014, 84% of online instructors rated the CTL as very helpful or helpful.

Objectives for the overall effectiveness of CTL programming.
Our focus on technology and online learning is a critical element of our mission, but the Center’s activities reach far beyond these initiatives. The following objectives measure the broader effectiveness of the CTL’s events.

Objective 11: Students will indicate that 80% of the Faculty who participate in the full CTL faculty consultation process will show improvement the semester of and the semester after consultation in the category of “Excellent Instructor” (Raw Score All Courses) and “Excellent Course” (Raw Score All Courses) on the IDEA form, compared to the two semesters previous to consultation.

90% of the faculty who participated in a full faculty consultation (which includes classroom observation) in the past three years have shown improvement the semester of and the semester after consultation in both the categories of “Excellent Instructor” and “Excellent Course.” Average percentile improvement has been remarkable, although small numbers make this a volatile measure (N=10).
Figure 18: Average IDEA percentiles for faculty who participated in a full consultation
Average IDEA score, “Excellent Instructor”, raw, all courses. Measured two semesters prior to consultation, the semester of consultation, and one semester after consultation.

Faculty who have gone through the full consultation process have gained an average of 15.52 percentile points on the IDEA form for “Excellent Instructor” and 16.03 percentile points for “Excellent Course” when the semester prior to consultation is compared to the semester after consultation. This is clearly one of our most successful activities.

Objective 12: CTL workshop assessments will show an average (by workshop) of 4.0 (5 point scale, 1 = not useful, 5 = very useful) for the statement “Rate the content of this session”, and an average of 4.0 for the statement “This workshop was useful”. In addition, 90% of the faculty will indicate that they plan to implement one thing from the workshop they attended, and 80% will be able to identify a specific plan to implement. Measure: CTL Program Evaluation Form.
MCI data:
4.68 average rating for “Rate the content of this session”
4.69 average rating for “This workshop was useful”
99% answer yes, they plan to implement something from the workshop
80% identify a specific plan to implement

Non-MCI CTL workshops:
4.41 average rating for “Rate the content of this session”
4.42 average rating for “This workshop was useful”
93% answer yes, they plan to implement something from the workshop
90% identified a specific plan to implement

Analysis and Action: We are reaching all of our goals on this objective. We will continue to monitor with the target outcomes unchanged.

**New objectives related to inclusive excellence.**
The CTL is fully supportive of USD’s mission of inclusive excellence. As such, we are implementing the following objectives:

Objective (New): 70% of the respondents to our CTL Service Survey would indicate “Effective” or “Very Effective” for the question “Workshops that help faculty and staff understand a specific student population.” Measure: CTL Service Survey

Objective (New): CTL workshop assessments for those events identified as “Inclusivity Focused” will show an average (by workshop) of 4.0 (5 point scale, 1 = not useful, 5 = very useful) for the statement “Rate the content of this session”, and an average of 4.0 for the statement “This workshop was useful”. In addition, 90% of the faculty will indicate that they plan to implement one thing from the event they attended, and 80% will be able to identify a specific plan to implement. Measure: CTL Program Evaluation Form.

**New objective related to the development of our first MOOC.**
Objective (New): 60% of the participants that finish our MOOC will Agree or Strongly Agree with the following statements: “The course materials have a positive impact on my learning experience” and “The course activities have a positive impact on my learning experience.” Measure: Canvas’ User Experience Survey
Retired objectives:

We use a variety of measures to evaluate the effectiveness of our programming. This is the fourth year that we have used outcomes-based measures, and we have begun to evaluate the objectives themselves for the amount of meaningful data that they generate. The following objectives have been eliminated:

Objective: USD will be a state leader in the use of Collaborate, defined as having a higher percentage of individual users and number of sessions than any other BOR institution.
Discussion: Collaborate usage patterns by both individual users and by number of sessions.
Analysis and Action: Collaborate was integrated into D2L in the fall of 2011, and at that time instructors could begin to create and manage Collaborate within their own course shells. It is not possible for ITS to track Collaborate usage by institution within D2L when instructors choose this option. This past year a critical percentage of D2L users migrated to this option, and we no longer view this data as a reliable. We will discontinue this outcome.

Objective: 80% of the faculty who participate in Fides workshops will report that they have implemented changes in their teaching that reflects the influence of the workshop.
Objective: Faculty would become more familiar with the challenges student veterans face, and familiar with the resources that are available to assist both the faculty members and the students as a result of attending Fides workshops.
Discussion: The Fides grant has concluded, so we are eliminating the objectives related to that program.

Objectives based on the IDEA Diagnostic form. Several objectives identified above will be changed or retired due to the change in the IDEA form. Such are noted above.

Professional Achievements by the CTL staff 2013-14:

Book Chapters

Journal publications
Conference presentation

National Web Seminars

DVD Productions (Teaching and Learning)

Consulting

Professional Service
Chen, W. Guest Speaker of a two-week 2013 Summer School “New Media and Learning,” a medium-sized MOOC hosted by Peking University, China. Altogether 503 Chinese students from all over the country were enrolled, and 297 earned a certification.
Chen, W. Reviewer for "Knowledge Management & E-Learning: An International Journal" since 2013
Chen, W. Sub-conference Program committee member for GCCCE (Global Chinese Conference on Computers in Education) 2014: “C4: Technology in Higher Education, Adult Learning, and Human Performance”
Chen, W. Track Program Committee Member for Track 17. Knowledge Management in e-Learning of the 14th IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT2014)
Chen, W. Expert peer reviewer panel member for American Educational Research Association (AERA) 2015 Annual Meeting
Haggar, Faye. POD Electronic Communications and Resource Committee (ECRC) Chair-Elect
Haggar, Faye. (2013). Author, wikiPODia, the POD national wiki page.
Haggar, Faye. NRMERA South Dakota Representative, Executive Board Member
Kelley, Bruce. Associate Editor, College Music Symposium (Journal of the College Music Society).
Kelley, Bruce. Reviewer: To Improve the Academy (Journal of the POD Network).

The Team
The Center for Teaching and Learning relies on a team of Faculty, Staff, and Students to run its services. The following people each contribute substantially to the operation of the CTL:

Staff:
Weichao (Vera) Chen, Ph.D, Educational Technology Integrationist
Faye Haggar, MS, Educational Technology Integrationist
Bridget Ihnen, Senior Secretary
Darin Jerke, MA, Program Manager, Online Education
Bruce Kelley, Ph.D, Director
Eric Mosterd, MM, MA, Associate Director and Coordinator of eLearning

CTL Faculty Liaison:
Kathryn Birkeland, Business

Graduate Teaching Associates:
David Alexander, Rachel Kludt, Ryan Los, Molly Luebbe, Taya Norlander

CTL Grants Task Force: David Alexander, Greg Huckabee, Istvan Gombocz, Kevin Reins, Patricia Downey, Stacy Smallfield, Grigoriy Sereda, Faye Haggar, Weichao Chen
