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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 AY15 Annual Report marks the eighth 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:

- 1,593 total and 825 unique participants attended CTL workshops and events.
- The CTL developed and delivered the first MOOC offered through the University of South Dakota (and we believe the first offered by any higher educational institution in the state). 604 participants from almost every region of the world participated.
- The percentage of online courses that were rated at or above 3.5 on the IDEA evaluation for “Excellent Course” reached a five-year high for AY15, and 87% of SP15 online courses scored at or above 3.5 for “Excellent Course”.
- The TechFellow Program was featured prominently as an example of workforce training and development on SDPB’s South Dakota Focus.
- 92% of the respondents to the CTL service survey indicated that one-on-one assistance to solve specific problems related to technology was “Extremely Effective” or “Effective.”

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
Center for Teaching and Learning Performance Objectives

Excellence demands a realistic view of performance and goals. Data from the objectives outlined below are incorporated into the CTL’s 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 with, the number of unique individuals and the total number of registrants despite staff turnover.

Figure 1: Participation in CTL Events, AY 2009-2015*

Analysis and Action: The CTL replaced three of its five professional positions this past year and was not fully staffed from October through June. Despite this, the number of total participants in CTL events rose slightly, and the number of unique participants rose 16%. A portion of this total represents the number of faculty who go through our Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning (ITOTL) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes. These are a vital component of our support for online faculty, and we will begin to track these numbers as a subset of the data above. In AY15, 48 faculty members went through these CTL processes.

One of the strategic goals of the AY16 CTL Strategic Retreat was a re-evaluation and revision of our curriculum to optimize the timing and topics of our workshops and events. With a stable staff and a revised curriculum, my goal for AY16 is to increase the number of
unique individuals attending our events and the total participation numbers by 5% (to 866 unique and 1672 total, respectively).

**Objective 2: Increase our one-to-one assistance to our constituents, as measured by the task logs, by 5%.** The CTL task logs record the number of phone calls, e-mails, and in-person help requests we answer.

**Figure 2: Task Log Entries**

Analysis and Action: We experienced a downturn in the number of help requests we received this year. Staff turnover had a slight impact in this area, but this was also a relatively quiet year in terms of major product updates or mandated technology changes, which generate many of our help requests. This contrasts with AY14, where the new senate policy on D2L and the need to transition all faculty and organizational websites generated a large number of individual requests for help. I do think we can do a better job reaching out to departments, and if we do that I believe we will generate greater individual interest in technology that can enhance faculty effectiveness and efficiency. My goal is to increase the number of help requests we answer by 5% for AY16 to 1155.

**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 to enhance face-to-face instruction.

**Objective 3: 75% of the respondents to our CTL Service Survey will indicate that they use technology to enhance their face-to-face classroom.**
Figure 3: Percentage of faculty who report that they use technology to enhance their face-to-face classroom

Analysis and action: This is the first year for this objective, and data indicate that we are making progress toward our goal, although we have not yet reached it. We will emphasize to a greater extent the practical ways to use technology in face-to-face classrooms, and the ways in which technology can make teaching both more effective and more efficient.

Objective 4: 75% of the respondents to our CTL Service Survey will rate workshops about the integration of technology with teaching as “Effective” or “Extremely Effective.”

Figure 4: Percentage of respondents who indicate that CTL workshops on the integration of technology with teaching are “Extremely Effective” or “Effective”

Analysis and action: 35.6% of the respondents indicated that CTL technology workshops were “extremely effective” and 37.3% indicated that the workshops were “effective.” Data indicate that we are making progress towards this goal, although we have not yet met it. The curriculum revision described above should provide a more regulated “just in time” flow to our technology training, and staff will emphasize ways in which technology can make teaching both more effective and more efficient.

Objective 5: 75% of the respondents to our CTL Service Survey will indicate that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with the following statements: 1) My students used technology
to meet the learning objectives for the course I teach; 2) My students understood the content more thoroughly because of the use of technology; 3) I felt confident creating technology-enhanced learning experiences for my students.

Figure 5: Percentage of faculty who agree or strongly agree with the statement “My students used technology to meet the learning objectives for the courses I teach”

Figure 6: Percentage of faculty who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “My students understood the content more thoroughly because of the use of technology”
Figure 7: Percentage of faculty who agreed or disagreed with the statement “I felt confident creating technology-enhanced learning experiences for my students”

Analysis and Action: The results on this objective were mixed, although we met our goal in two of the three. We will continue to focus our technology workshops around student learning and to emphasize to faculty how learning can be enhanced through technology.

Objective 6: The percentage of courses activated in D2L will rise to 35% by 2015. 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 reached our goal for two of the three terms in AY15. We will adjust this goal in light of the new senate policy on D2L use and strive to have 80% of 100- and 200-level courses activated in D2L.

Objective 7: Faculty who participate in the two-week MCI course redesign fellowship will score an average of 5 percentage points higher on the IDEA evaluation of teaching two semesters after the fellowship is complete compared to the semester prior to the fellowship.
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 measuring the interaction between the commencement of student-centered learning and student evaluations. On one hand, the courses (should) become more interactive and student centered, which increases student engagement and commitment to the course (factors which tend to raise teaching evaluations). On the other hand, active learning techniques also place more responsibility and a greater workload on students (factors which tend to depress teaching evaluations).

Our goal, despite the conflicting evidence, is to see improved IDEA scores for course redesign fellows, as measured the semester before (F-1) and two semesters after the fellowship (F+2). 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.

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

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

- Progress on Objectives: +3.10 (up from +2.66 AY14)
- Excellent Teacher: +2.93 (up from +1.84 AY14)
- Excellent Course: +2.88 (up from +2.68 AY14)
- Overall Summary: +3.29 (up from +2.51 AY14)

Our results were positive, and improved from last year. The CRF has attracted both high-achieving instructors and those in need of more help. This makes improvement difficult to achieve (it is difficult for instructors who are already scoring in the 90th percentile to show improvement per the IDEA form), but it also enhances the success of the program, as highly skilled instructors are able to share their wisdom and techniques with the other members of
the CRF. We will continue to revise the program, with the goal of improving the average participant’s IDEA score by 5 percentile points.

**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 Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning, 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:** 85% of the new online instructors will agree or strongly agree with the statement “The preparation and support I received adequately prepared me to teach online” on the Online Early Alert Survey.

**Figure 10:** Baseline Data, Percentage of new online instructors agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement “The preparation and support I received adequately prepared me to teach online”

70% agreed or strongly agreed, down slightly from 71.9% last year (71.9%).

**Objective 9:** Objective: 80% of the online instructors will rate the CTL as very helpful or helpful on the Online Early Alert Survey.
85% of online faculty found the CTL helpful or very helpful, up from 77% from last year.

**Objective 10:** 80% of the new online instructors will rate the CTL as very helpful or helpful on the Online Faculty Early Alert Survey.

**Figure 11:** Baseline Data, ratings of CTL by online instructors:

![Bar Chart](chart1.png)

77% of our new online faculty rated the CTL as helpful or very helpful, down from 84% last year.

**Analysis and Action:** It is noteworthy that while new online faculty find the CTL very helpful, they do not always feel well prepared for teaching. We will analyze the comments sections of the related questions on the Online Faculty Early Alert Survey to see if they provide any clues to why this may be. We are also asking CDE to distribute a new Welcome Letter to all new online faculty; this welcome letter specifies where faculty go to get support in various areas (IT, CDE, CTL, or department). We’re hoping that helps them know where to direct their questions, providing them with greater service. Finally, we will adjust Objective 8 to 80% of new online faculty, to align with Objectives 9 and 10.

**Objective 11:** Online teachers who go through the QA process will have IDEA evaluations that match or exceed university face-to-face averages (defined as scoring 3.5 or above on the IDEA survey) for both “excellent instructor” and “excellent course.”
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. We are pleased that “Excellent Course” ratings for online courses are nearly equal to those of the face-to-face courses. “Excellent Instructor” remains a challenge, in part because face-to-face course ratings have steadily risen in the past five years. We implemented our online orientation process in 2013, and we believe that the rising scores in both areas are a direct result of this program. This is particularly positive in light of the increase in the number of online courses and the number of online instructors over the last five years. We have also been collaborating successfully with CDE and specific departments to work with individual
instructors. We believe that the dual focus on overall processes and individual attention is working, although we have not yet reached our goal of matching online and face-to-face scores.

One trend that we continue to monitor 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 three weeks prior to the start of their first online course score better on student evaluations throughout their career than faculty who are trained closer to the start of the academic term:

Figure 15: Percentage of courses that are at or above 3.5 on the IDEA for “excellent instructor”, differentiated by days between training and first day of course

We will continue to work with CDE and the departments to reinforce the importance of timely hiring and training.

**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 12: Students will indicate that 80% of the faculty who participate in the full CTL 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 semester previous to consultation.

Figure 16: 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
Figure 17: Average IDEA percentiles for faculty who participated in a full consultation
Average IDEA score, “Excellent Course”, raw, all courses; measured two semesters prior to consultation, the semester of consultation, and one semester after consultation.

100% of the faculty whom have participated in a full consultation have shown improvement for both “Excellent Instructor” and “Excellent Course” when comparing the semester before consultation (S-1) with the semester after (S+1). 78% of the faculty have shown improvement the semester of the consultation in both the categories. Average percentile improvement has been remarkable, although the small number of faculty who have gone through this process since 2012 (15) make this a volatile measure. Faculty who have gone through the full consultation process have gained an average of 13.95 percentile points on
the IDEA form for “Excellent Instructor” and 12.23 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. We do note, however, the slight drop off in S+2. Previous data have shown that faculty who participate in three or more CTL events after the consult semester maintain their elevated IDEA scores, whereas faculty who participate in only 1-2 CTL events show a drop in their scores. We will continue with the same objective, but reinforce to faculty who go through our process that continued participation in CTL activities will help them maintain stronger IDEA scores.

Objective 13: CTL Program Evaluations 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% who answer “yes” to the above will be able to identify a specific plan to implement.

MCI data:
- 4.58 average rating for “Rate the content of this session” (down from 4.68 AY14)
- 4.60 average rating for “This workshop was useful” (down from 4.69 AY14)
- 100% answer yes, they plan to implement something from the workshop (up from 99.0% AY14)
- 88.63% identify a specific plan to implement (up from 80.0% AY14)

Non-MCI CTL workshops:
- 4.60 average rating for “Rate the content of this session” (up from 4.41 AY14)
- 4.61 average rating for “This workshop was useful” (up from 4.42 AY14)
- 81.6% answer yes, they plan to implement something from the workshop (down from 93.0% AY14)
- 84.12% identified a specific plan to implement (down from 90.0% AY14)

Analysis and Action: We reached our goals on this objective for everything except the percentage of faculty who believed that they would implement something specific from the non-MCI workshops. We will institute a “so what” moment at the end of each workshop to suggest possible courses of further action/implementation.

Objective 14: 90% of the respondents to the CTL service survey will indicate that one-on-one assistance to solve specific problems related to technology was “Extremely Effective” or “Effective.” 90% of the respondents to the CTL survey will indicate that one-on-one assistance to solve specific problems related to teaching was “Extremely Effective” or “Effective.”
Figure 18: Percentage of respondents indicating that one-on-one assistance to solve specific problems related to technology was “Extremely Effective” or “Effective”

Figure 19: Percentage of respondents indicating that one-on-one assistance to solve specific problems related to teaching was “Extremely Effective” or “Effective”

Analysis and Action: We were able to meet our goal this year for the technology workshops, but fell far short in our pedagogy workshops. That will be an area of special emphasis for me this coming year. As indicated above, I plan to include a “so what” section of every pedagogical workshop so that faculty more readily see direct applications to their needs.

Objectives related to Inclusive Excellence.
The CTL is fully supportive of USD’s mission of inclusive excellence. As such, we are tracking the following objectives:
Objective 15: 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.

This is a new measure for us, so we are setting the baseline this year. For AY15, 69.5% of the respondents to our CTL Service Survey said that these workshops were “effective” or “very effective.”

Analysis and Action: We came very near to meeting this objective our first year. On further reflection, however, we’re not sure this question gets to the essence of what we are asking faculty (and somewhat duplicates the objectives below). We will change this question in the CTL Service Survey to ask, “How well does the CTL embody the principles of Inclusive Excellence.”

Objective 16: CTL workshops that had an Inclusive Excellence focus will show an average Program Evaluation score (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% of those who answer “yes” will be able to identify a specific plan to implement.

Workshops that had an Inclusive Excellence focus for AY15 included:
- Inclusive Excellence in Teaching for Honors
- Assistive Technology for PCs
- Assistive Technology for Macs
- Continuing Conversations (Michael Fire and Associates)
- Writing Pedagogy and the Student Veteran
- Autism Spectrum Disorder in Higher Education
- Serving Student Veterans (University Center Sioux Falls)

In addition, the CTL played a pivotal role in bringing Lionel Bordeaux, President of Sinte Gleska University and USD alumnus, to speak to the campus community. Evaluations of these workshops show the following:
- 4.69 average rating for “Rate the content of this session”
- 4.68 average rating for “This workshop was useful”
- 86.3% answer yes, they plan to implement something from the workshop
- 82.1% identified a specific plan to implement

Analysis and Action: We are meeting are goals in each of the areas except for the percentage of participants who indicate that they will implement one thing from the workshop. We will institute a “so what” moment at the end of each workshop to suggest possible courses of further action/implementation.
Objective related to the development of USD’s first MOOC.

Objective 17: 60% of the participants that finish our MOOC will Agree or Strongly Agree with the following statements on the Canvas User Experience Survey: “The course materials have a positive impact on my learning experience” and “The course activities have a positive impact on my learning experience.”

92% of the students who took the Canvas User Experience Survey indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “The course materials have a positive impact on my learning experience.”

Analysis and Action: The Canvas Course was a success, and we have been asked to offer it again; however we feel that it has taken us away from our core mission and is time intensive. We will not offer another MOOC this year, and will rather focus on enhancing our current processes and improving services as noted throughout the rest of this report.
Professional Achievements by the CTL staff 2014-15

Book Chapters

Mosterd, E. (accepted for publication in 2015). “Run-DMC.” In The 100 Best Bands of All Time. California: ABC-CLIO


Journal publications
Kelley, B. (September 15, 2014). “Strategies for Measuring and Communicating the Value of Your Faculty Development Centers.” Faculty Focus.

Conference presentations


Media Appearances

National Web Seminars


DVD Productions (Teaching and Learning)

Professional Service
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).
Kelley, Bruce. Faculty Member, POD’s New Faculty Developer Institute
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 contributed substantially to the operation of the CTL during AY15, although some are no longer with us:

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

CTL Faculty Liaison:
Kathryn Birkeland, Business

Graduate Teaching Associates:
Carlee Andress, Ethen Villeneuve, Ryan McCarty, Prosper Zongo

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

TechFellows:  Katie Barnett, Reanna Bertram, Bruce Biegler, Katherine Binder, Kelly Binder, Spencer Birney, Molly Cahoy, Mason Cahoy, Elizabeth Dailey, Brooke Doty, Alex Dysthe, Morgan Elefson, Regan Enos, Kara Ann Fischbach, Sarah Hansen, Shane Hansen, John Hausauer, Cassie Hilbrands, Andrew Holmstrom, Shelby Huber, Sam Jolley, Kasey Klatt, Emma McCarty, Janae Mehlhaff, Phillip Millar, Steven Payne, Matthew Preszler, Komal Shah, Aubrey Snell, Rebecca Stading, Kenan Tiahrt, Shane van de Berg, Collin Viereck

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 85 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 determination to practice inclusive excellence when hiring staff, 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.

Kathleen Brown-Rice, Chet Barney and Eli Carr celebrate their team win during the 2015 Course Redesign Fellowship workshop.