

CIT 2002-2003 Faculty Fellows Orientation Evaluation



Sean Aery
CIT Staff Assistant
August 14, 2002

Executive Summary

For the entire week of May 13 – May 17, 2002, The Duke Center for Instructional Technology conducted an orientation for its 15 newly appointed 2002-2003 [Faculty Fellows](#). The [week's activities](#) were designed as a set of workshops and discussions about the Fellows program in general, introduction to pertinent and applicable technologies for classroom instruction, project idea generation and development, and individual consultation. The CIT staff's intention was to introduce the new Fellows to the program, and to give them guidance and a good foundation upon which to build their course projects to be implemented in the academic year.

11 out of the 15 Faculty Fellows completed a survey evaluating the orientation week, and all surveys were submitted within one week of completion of the orientation. The event was a success, by analysis of the surveys, and the aggregate results are indicated below.

Positive Comments

The CIT staff was by far the highest rated component of the orientation. Praise came from most of the Fellows, and there was no criticism of the staff. Quoting the responses, the Fellows found the CIT staff "extremely helpful," "sincere," "excellent," "thorough," "first-rate," "accessible," "patient," "good communicators," "resourceful," "enthusiastic," "wonderful," "friendly," and "professional."

Blackboard received much praise as well. The majority of the Fellows found it to be a useful, interesting, and exciting tool. The Fellows appreciated the consistency of using it every day throughout the orientation. Out of the three highest-rated workshops of the week, two were about Blackboard. *Hands-on Blackboard Practice* and *Blackboard Basics* (both on Monday afternoon) received average ratings of 5.80 and 5.75, respectively, out of a possible 6.00. On the survey, a rating of 6 meant "very satisfied," and 5 "satisfied."

The organization and logistics of the entire event were noted mostly positively. The majority of the Fellows were impressed by things running smoothly for the week, and nearly all felt that the length was ideal for what was to be accomplished. Their expectations were far surpassed in regards to the amount of work that was put into preparing and running the orientation.

All 11 of the responding Fellows felt that the orientation provided them with a **good introductory understanding** of the technology tools they could use to support their teaching. This was a thorough accomplishment. The general consensus was

that they were given a good, solid “starting point” and felt accomplished in terms of trying out a wide array of technologies to consider implementing in classes. All in all, they were happy to see “what’s out there.”

Negative Comments

On the flip side of providing an introductory understanding, many Fellows felt that what they learned in the week lacked **depth and specificity**. Some noted that they received a broad overview and not enough to get a good feel for specific technologies of interest. A few would have liked more time to practice and integrate tools with more extensive hands-on work, and felt the breadth of topics hindered this. Because the sessions throughout the week were not aimed at any particular discipline, some Fellows felt they were forced to sit through presentations that were neither relevant nor interesting to them.

In addition, more than half of the surveyed Fellows expressed that they did not accomplish the goal of **formulating an assessment plan** to determine whether or not their objectives in using new technologies are being met. Most felt this was too difficult of an assessment to make, whether quantitatively, objectively, and/or subjectively.

There were also some intermittent negative comments about **logistics**. Some Fellows would have preferred fewer room changes and more variety and higher quality food during the week.

Suggestions for Improvement

The following were suggestions made by Fellows for improving the orientation for next year’s group:

- Possibly hold all meetings in the same room for consistency
- Use more breakaway sessions so faculty can go further in depth with their specific interests
- Incorporate even more cutting-edge technology (beyond HTML & Word documents)
- Show practices of other Duke faculty (outside of just the group)
- Allow Fellows to talk to accomplished users of new technology in their specific discipline
- Assessment workshop should do more than skim the surface and be more hands-on
- Allot more time for brainstorming with other Fellows
- Focus more on hands-on experience during the sessions

- Switch order so “project plan” is done *after* examining existing websites from peers in respective field.
- Use more small group sessions – the faculty enjoy working with colleagues
- Have fewer lessons in pedagogy and more lessons in specifics
- Strategically move people around so they’re sitting next to new people every day
- Incorporate more one-on-one activities
- Post original CIT applications on Blackboard so Fellows can read what their peers are doing more formally
- Food – offer self-serve salad, assortment of sandwiches, and more non-bread based foods
- Move people away from computers when lecturing to avoid distractions
- Bring in Blackboard graduates to discuss their projects

The following were suggestions made by Fellows for improving the Fellows program throughout the academic year:

- Hold on-going workshops throughout the year
- Have Fellows give mid-year demos of what they’ve done
- Establish a Fellows discussion board and email list
- Hold informal brown bag lunches

Conclusions

The Faculty Fellows orientation week was very successful in that the responding Fellows believed they were given a good foundation for implementing their projects. All of the morning and afternoon sessions were rated favorably, as none averaged below a 4 (somewhat satisfied) out of a possible 6 (very satisfied) rating, and most were rated over 5 (satisfied). Mostly positive comments were made in short answer questions, and the suggestions for improvement did not as much address negatives as they did bolster and strengthen some of the already prevalent strengths.

Concerns over the lack of depth in some areas was to be expected. Between depth and breadth of topics covered, one must be sacrificed for the other, and the orientation was designed to show a very wide range of possibilities. The balance between the two should once again be considered carefully for next year’s orientation, but going into too much depth at this introductory point may detract from the ultimate goal.

It may be beneficial to look into spending more time on assessment planning, both for the remainder of this year, and for Fellows orientations in the future. While most felt they were not able to formulate an assessment plan, such a plan is essential in evaluating the efficacy of the classroom technology projects the Fellows will implement.

Appendix: Quantitative Survey Ratings

The following ratings given by Fellows measure the level of satisfaction with each orientation component. All attended the morning sessions, but the attendance at the afternoon sessions was discretionary and thus yielded fewer responses. The numbers indicated below are the mean of all responses to the respective questions. Surveyed Fellows were asked to rate each on a scale of 1 to 6 with the following corresponding values:



- 1 – very dissatisfied
- 2 – dissatisfied
- 3 – somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 – somewhat satisfied
- 5 – satisfied
- 6 – very satisfied

MORNING SESSIONS

(Presentations and Project Planning)

- 5.36 Copyright & Educational Technology Projects
 - 5.27 Beginning to Think About Project Design
 - 5.27 Taking Technology Into the Classroom
 - 5.27 Putting it all Together: Project Plans That work (pt 2)
 - 5.27 Finalizing Your Project Plan and Program Wrap-up
 - 5.10 Effective Use Of Communication and Collaboration Tools
 - 5.09 Planning for Project Impact: Choosing Your Goals and Objectives
 - 5.09 What's Technology Got to do With it? Matching Technology to Your Goals
 - 5.09 Putting it all Together: Project Plans That work (pt 1)
 - 5.09 Technology Resources for Course Support
 - 5.00 Projects That Work (Or Don't Work)
 - 4.91 Assessing Project Impact: Evaluating Your Project Goals
 - 4.90 Accessibility and the Web
 - 4.86 Preparing Images for the Web
 - 4.73 Assessment Tools and Strategies
 - 4.09 Collapsing the Distance Between Here and There: Videoconferencing and the Classroom
- 5.03 AVERAGE**

GENERAL ORIENTATION ISSUES

(Logistics and Organization of Week)

- 5.82 effective use of Fellows Blackboard throughout wk
 - 5.55 diversity of topics covered
 - 5.45 rooms used during orientation
 - 5.45 structure of typical day
 - 5.45 overall content
 - 5.27 relevance of topics to teaching needs
 - 4.91 amount of time dedicated to each topic
 - 4.64 food
- 5.32 AVERAGE**

AFTERNOON SESSIONS

(Hands-on Workshop Activities)

- 5.83 Digital Video for the Web
 - 5.80 Hands-on Blackboard Practice
 - 5.75 Blackboard Basics
 - 5.60 Online, On Demand Media Presentations
 - 5.50 Classroom Presentations with Technology
 - 5.20 Preparing Text for the Web
 - 4.80 Using Online Assessment Tools
 - 4.60 Creating Interactive Exercises
 - 4.25 Herding Cats: Planning Student Web Projects
- 5.29 AVERAGE**

For a complete schedule of the week's activities, click [here](#).