MAGNA ONLINE SEMINARS

Transcript

# How to Evaluate the Impact of Faculty Development Programs

A Magna Online Seminar presented on March 17, 2011 by **Sue Hines**, director of faculty development, Saint Mary's University.

In this seminar you will learn strategies for:

- Customizing a framework for program evaluation
- Measuring the impact of faculty development
- Implementing effective evaluation practices
- Examining expected outcomes
- Designing useful evaluation measures based on best practices
- Dealing with the challenges of measuring program effectiveness
- Determining the application of program evaluation, assessment and review
- Identifying situational factors impacting your evaluation plans
- Developing a plan to assess satisfaction and goal-achievement

**Editor's note:**

This is a written transcript of an audio recording. Our policy is to edit only the occasional unintelligible phrase. Everything else appears exactly as it was spoken.

*Rob Kelly:* Hello, and welcome to Magna's Online Seminar, How to Evaluate the Impact of Faculty Development Programs, who's sponsored by Magna Publications and *Academic Leader*. I'm Rob Kelly, editor of *Academic Leader*, and I will be today's moderator. Thanks for joining us.

Before we begin, I'd like to point out a few things about how the seminar works. If you have a question or comment for today's presenter, you could enter it in the chat Q&A box at the bottom of your screen, and the presenter will respond at scheduled breaks during the presentation, but you can send in your questions or comments at any time.

Today's seminar also includes polls. When it's time to participate, you will see the poll box on your screen, and we'll ask you to select your answer and we will then broadcast the results when we get them in. The seminar also includes handouts. If you haven't already printed them, click on the handouts box on the left of your screen, and then click on handouts and a PDF will open. If you experience technical difficulties during the presentation, please call our customer service staff at 800-433-0499, Extension 2.

And now I'm pleased to introduce Dr. Sue Hines. Sue Hines is the director of Faculty Development at Saint Mary's University of Minnesota and teaches in the university's Doctor of Education in Leadership program. She has more than 26 years of teaching experience in higher education, combined with several years of academic administration consulting and research. Her research focuses on faculty development programs. Welcome, Sue Hines.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Thank you. Welcome, everyone. As Rob said, I'm from Saint Mary's University, and I'm very glad to be here with all of you today. So let's jump in.

What we're trying to accomplish tonight or today, I should say, are four different objectives. First, we want to talk about the difference between program evaluation and program assessment and program review, their each different use for different things. Then identify situational factors impacting program evaluation planning, because each institution has their own structure, staffing issues that are different from others that need to be considered when you're thinking of program evaluation. We'll talk about developing a framework that's customized for your program, and then identify some methods to evaluate your services.

So what I'd like to tell you is that what you're hearing today is based on an ongoing study that I've been involved with in the past few years. It began with Nancy Chism, Ann Sabo, who was a dissertation student at the time. In 1997, they did a nationwide survey asking faculty developers how they evaluated their faculty development program, and they got 45 responses back. And they published their paper bearing their findings, which I repeated in 2007. But I repeated it in an interview opposed to a survey so I can get some deeper, richer responses and probe a little bit deeper into what the practices were and what some of the obstacles were as well.

And I discovered in that 2007 study that they were smaller institutions with smaller programs, because there was really some superficial practices going on. So I thought I'd repeat it, which I did in 2009-2010. It was a nationwide study. Again, it was an interview where I would talk on the phone with more mature centers that were established, centralized, full-time directors, full-time staff, funded by the university to see what kind of practices they had. So this model that I developed is coming out of this research.

So I'm curious as to why you're joining us today, and you can see the options there.

*Rob Kelly:* Top answer is A.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. Most of you want to learn how to evaluate faculty development as opposed to improve on your current practices, but again, a third of you seem like you have some practices and you want to improve on what you already have. Okay, good to know. And, Rob, here we go.

So the place to start here is to see what the difference is between program evaluation, program review, and program assessment. Program evaluation has many, many definitions if you look in the literature. And the definition that we're going to with is through Suskie, and Morrison, Ross, and Kemp, which is ongoing evaluation that's comprehensive in nature that judges the values of services and the need for improvement. So this is ongoing evaluation just to see the impact and the worth and merit of your program.

Program review is something that's done more every five years, every seven years. It's conducted by an outside team. It's comprehensive but it is more of a self-study of the practices and perceptions of your center. And program assessment, this is different again. It's done, at some practices, every year or every three years, where you are measuring the level to which the center has achieved its specific outcome and indicator that you've designed for your program. So again, we're talking a program evaluation that is ongoing and comprehensive.

First thing to think about is identifying the situational factors impacting your program evaluation, because each center is different and it's like a fingerprint. No two teaching and learning centers are the same, therefore evaluation planning cannot be the same. And the three main situational factors that need consideration is evaluation mindset, how you think about evaluation, the center's organizational structure, and then the center's purpose or mission or goal.

So the first one is evaluation mindset. And I found through this research that this is the main or number one impact on the quantity and quality of evaluation going on. It's what people believe and think, and the interactions between that value system and their thought processes that really impact how they act or how they evaluate, to what level they evaluate. This really needs deep consideration then. It's the initial place to start.

These are the top five comments that I got back from these studies. The centers that had limited evaluation, they tended to believe that just wasn't enough time to do it. Therefore, they thought that evaluation was quite time-consuming. Or because faculty developers come from a variety of disciplines, I commonly heard, well, it's just not done in my field. So they thought it was a specialized discipline, therefore they didn't have the knowledge or capability.

Or administration believes in this because they thought it was for accountability only. Or work comes first, therefore they thought it was a low priority. And many, a very common belief, and there's some truth to it as well. There's so many variables going into the impact of faculty development that it just can't be done.

Then there were some centers that had a lot of activity going on in regards to evaluation. They had more rigorous methods that they've designed and implemented. And more often than not, they believe that they were doing it because they want to see if they are meeting their goals. They felt it was very informative.

Some wanted to model it because it was valued at their institution, but they expected faculty to do this. They should be doing it as well. The provost expected it. Therefore, they believe it showed merit and administration believed it showed merit. It wasn't just for how did you spend money. Some believe that staff enjoyed it. It can be fun, and they thought it was fun. Especially the administrative assistants who were in charge of the surveying, they enjoyed reading the comments that came through.

And others believe that there is a cultural assessment. They just thought, that's what we do. With that type of a mindset, we saw a lot more evaluation going on.

So I'm curious. What belief have you heard most commonly in regard to faculty development?

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. Let me just broadcast those results.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Ah, this good to see, because the majority, over half of you, are evaluating because or you're interested in evaluating because you want to improve your services. Linda Suskie would say that you have an altruistic approach to evaluation, which means there's a very good chance that you would not only design but also implement evaluation plans. Very good.

The next situational factor is how your center is structured. And Dr. Minter at Walsh University recently published an article that talked about a continuum of faculty development structures that I thought was very useful. He believed on the very high end that there are mature centers, centralized university-funded centers with full-time directors and staff. And again, these were the centers that I targeted for my second study. The belief is that they have the time, resources, and the knowledge to implement faculty development evaluation.

The next step down would be more of a semi-structured led by part-time faculty, sometimes they're given release time, oftentimes they work out of their office. It's a rotating position. Sometimes the events are kind of ad hoc, planned as needed and as you go, and the majority of my earlier study consisted of those types of centers.

Then the next step down, this is more loosely structured. Department head might be in charge. The events come out of the budget from that individual department. The initiatives are focused on their strategic plan. And then, of course, the absence of faculty development, where faculty are just on their own.

So I'm curious as to what kind of structure you would have, A, B, C, or D.

*Rob Kelly:* And I'm broadcasting results.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. And again, most of you have the mature, the centralized centers, the Type A. Very good. So, so far we have the majority are altruistic mindset for evaluation, along with supposedly the resources and knowledge and perhaps the time to do evaluations.

The third situational factor is focused on the center's purpose or mission, why you have faculty development. And the study that I've done, more often than not it broke into these four categories to support faculty needs. They're there to serve the needs of faculty. Support institutional needs, so the advancement of academic quality perhaps. Promote academic quality.

And the last one, promote academic culture of some sort that you're trying to create.

And of all these, the first one, when you're trying to support faculty needs, I found more often than not that they relied often on satisfaction surveys, because it made sense. They want to know if faculty were satisfied and if the events were meeting their needs. But as you travel down this list, the evaluation practices got much more richer and deeper because they're more interested in knowing if they made an impact on teaching practices and learning.

So again, I'm curious as to what your center's purpose is. And it might be E, other, or a combination perhaps.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. And I'll just broadcast the results.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. And again, the majority are here because you promote academic quality. I can see there's other possibilities, then perhaps other means that you have a mix of A through D. Okay. So again, you're the perfect audience here overall, what we look for when we're trying to create quality practices.

So just a real quick recap. You really have to consider evaluation mindset and what direction that is leading you, along with how you are structured, if you have the right people, the right knowledge, the right resources to implement a quality comprehensive plan. It doesn't mean that you cannot if you have just an office of one. The mission and purpose really needs to be clearly looked at and clearly defined so you know what it is that you're trying to evaluate. Any questions at this point?

*Rob Kelly:* Yeah. We do have some questions. The first one, did your research identify any discrepancies between an espoused evaluation mindset and a practiced evaluation mindset?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* An espoused evaluation mindset and a practiced evaluation mindset. Interesting. So I interpret that as what their good intentions were versus what they actually did.

*Rob Kelly:* That's how I would interpret it as well.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. There was some discrepancy. It wasn't clearly black and white if they had an altruistic mindset, they always had a rigorous evaluation. So it really was a tendency for that but it definitely wasn't black and white, line drawn in the sand.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. We do have some other questions. How do you do satisfaction surveys at a deeper level?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* We're going to talk about the how to do, the methodology coming up. Just real quick right now, the deeper levels is more, I would say, in quality and quantity. In other words, they would seek out satisfaction levels at the event post-event, perhaps six months later, and then implement every one year or three year a campus-wide satisfaction survey. Others would go to the particular groups. If they had a teaching and learning . . . faculty learning community group, they would go to those individuals and have one-on-one or focus groups. That was probably more common when they had a more high-resource, high-impact event going on.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay, next question. Did you find different mindsets between research four-year or community colleges.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* There are four-year community colleges. The first study included five community colleges, and the mindsets tended to be the same, except for one. And what I saw is that was a lot of the Type B. They were rotating faculty. They took on the position of faculty developer for three years. More often than not in our system that we had at this particular state where the study took place, they kept saying over and over again, I never thought about it.

When I asked, why aren't you doing more evaluation? I never thought about it. I don't know how to do it. I'm just taking this role on part time. But one community college actually had the best practices of the entire study. And she took her role after a marketing individual had faculty development and picked up that person's practices and continued them. So she picked up someone else's mindset and practices from marketing.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay, next question. We have de-centered professional development services with three different offices offering different forms of support and development for faculty. Can this model work?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* I think it can work, but you will probably have to modify it to fit each of the different offices. As we travel through here, you're going to discover you need to customize it to fit what that individual center, even if it's one university but separate centers, what their needs are, what their attitude is, what their structure is, and what they have to offer, and what you're interested in finding out for those offerings.

That's the main message I want to keep giving, because you can look at professional development assessment or evaluation literature, and it talks about Kirkpatrick's Model often. And this too takes Kirkpatrick's Model, but one step further. It's customization. That's what's key. So you can implement it, you need to customize it to what it is you're interested in finding.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. Do you have time for one more question or do you want to move on?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Sure. Sure, sure.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. Did you find whether faculty learning communities tended to exist in one type of center, i.e., its purpose or mission, formal or informal, over another?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* I tended to find faculty learning communities at larger universities, whose purpose or mission was to serve faculty and academic quality, the blend of the two.

*Rob Kelly:* Well, great questions. There will be time for other questions as well, but I think we'll move on from here.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. The next place to go is developing a framework for our customized program evaluation plan. And again, by the time we're done, you will have sketched out just the framework that you can build on to build a more higher quality, quantity, comprehensive plan. At least that's our aim for today.

This is something that also came through over and over and over again. As you begin evaluation planning, start reframing how you organize or view your teaching and learning center. Try to see it through a curricular lens. And the reason for this is that faculty developers come from a wide variety of disciplines, but the one thing we all have in common is that we're involved with instructional development.

So if we already use a curricular mind when we're working with a faculty, that same mindset can be used for program evaluations. So using that type of mindset you can frame your program, because there's so many offerings, maybe large, small numbers, at any teaching and learning center. Look at the entire program as you would an academic degree program. Because academic degree programs have individual courses, as you know, and within the courses there's individual sessions, class sessions.

And you can use that same frame for looking at faculty development. You have a faculty development center. I would avoid calling it a faculty development program, I'd save that word, for what you are offering at your center. You have programs that are offered through your center. Perhaps you have a brown bag program, a grant program, a mentoring program. Everything should get lumped into a program, and just use that word for those categorizations. And inside those programs, you have individual offering.

But there's a big difference. Again if you use this framework from the academic curricular structure and you apply that to faculty development, one could argue, that's fine because students enter an academic program and then leave an academic program and complete the entire program. The faculty never do that. It's normally volunteer.

So they pick and choose what they want to attend. That's what makes it complicated. That's what makes the academic model usable and not usable. So because faculty pick and choose what they attend, then we need to pick and choose how we evaluate. I'm going to stop here to see if you have questions.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. There was at least one more. Let's see. Best way to get participants to do a thoughtful evaluation, questions, timing, encouragement . . .

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Best way to get participants to do a thoughtful evaluation, questions, timing, and encouragement. So participants in faculty development, how can we get them to do a more thoughtful, meaningful evaluation. I hate to put off the question, but again when we get to the methods for evaluation, I think you'll discover how. But to quickly answer it, they're finding that when you tie it to the faculty development event or opportunity they're participating in, that evaluation is part of it, they tend to get more involved with the process.

An example is faculty learning communities. Normally there is money involved. And if there is money involved, there is evaluation involved and there's an expectation for them to maybe complete a learning portfolio, some type of product in the end, because learning isn't free and faculty development is a more rigorous event that they're part of.

Another could be if they're involved with another grant project or teaching and learning project, that it's tied into that grant report. To get this money to do this project, we expect the evidence of growth in your teaching practices and student learning. I don't expect it on a workshop. I don't expect it at new faculty orientation or a brown bag. It's those deeper, richer, high-resource, high-impact events.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay, next question. Could you describe whether we are evaluating a center or, for the program or faculty development?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Yes. That's why the terminology is so key. If I say faculty development, it's a more general and safer place to stay. If I say program, it gets mixed.

You can have a faculty development program, a teaching and learning center that's called a program, but then what do you call those themed offerings within? Services? That's where it gets confusing.

So for this model you have to move away from calling your teaching and learning center a program, and focus that word on those themed offerings that you have. And overall, it's faculty development. I hope that answered the question, because that's so key to use the word program where it belongs for this model, which is a themed offering, not the teaching and learning center.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. Do you have time for one more question . . .

*Dr. Sue Hines:* I do.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. Let's see. Here's one more. If the most common method of participating is episodic, how does this relate to the assessment process relative to these pieces of the puzzle? We struggle with the immediate session's assessment versus the annual assessment, and what are the items of assessment, say logistics versus content versus delivery?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. And again, I'm not sure I'm going to directly answer this, but the word assessment I separate out from evaluation. There's overlap. But assessment, like I stated earlier, that definition is going to stay with program outcome. If you put together program outcomes for your center, that, and again I have the word program, center outcomes focused on perhaps faculty competencies and indicators that link back to those outcomes, you have designed your center around that and the events around that.

So you can see if your entire work is addressing and meeting that promise that you have that your center claims it's offering through these designed outcomes. So it's separate. Evaluation is now I have my center and my events planned, and I want to see what these events have done. I want to know, are people satisfied? I want to know, did I make a change in teaching, did I make a change in student learning, which connects to assessment, but assessment is a separate piece.

That's about program outcome. Evaluation's about the learning. Did they learn? Did they change their practice? Again that's, the problem is . . . I can't see your face and if you understand or not. But that's a good clarification to make. We're not talking about program assessment. This is evaluation, which I woke up to about a year ago. They're completely separate. Big overlap, but separate.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. Let's move on. I just want to remind participants that they can keep sending their questions at any time, and we'll have, we should have some time for more questions toward the end.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. So we're going to move on to levels of evaluation. And if you can visualize every time you have an offering or an event or even a service, it's like throwing a pebble into a pond. Sometimes the pebble is small, like a workshop, and you can't expect a big impact. Other times it's a big rock, I don't think a boulder but a big rock, and makes a bigger impact, such as a large course redesign where you really spent time and energy and got faculty involvement and had measures pre-imposed that you knew you were going to make a difference.

So think about what kind of impact you expect, small, big, and the measures should match along with that. So again, this is Kirkpatrick but it's modified to fit more of what we saw with the Chism and Sabo study and in this study as well. So you have an event, and there's going to be participation. Kirkpatrick doesn't include this in his model, but participation, faculty developers across the board in every study that I read participated in looked at participation.

You want to know who shows up. It's the lowest level. It's important. You want to know who's coming, who's not coming. And usage is the same. Who's using our resources, our online resources, who's not? And then satisfaction, or Kirkpatrick would call it reaction. They're all going to have a reaction. They like it, they didn't like it. It's a very low level, but we want to know because we're trying to create satisfaction. Maybe they see some weaknesses that we need to improve.

And then learning. This one tends to get skipped. We're not talking about student learning, we're talking about did the participant learn something. Did we offer a workshop and know there's evidence, direct evidence that they get it, that they learned it? We can do it through an activity at the event or we can do a follow-up with a survey and ask for perspective or perceptions of learning. It's much more impactful though to ask then and there at the event.

And then it moves beyond. These are more impacts. Did they change their teaching? Did student learning change as a result? And way out, did the institution, one way or another, see a change? So those very far-out, distant measures are much difficult, we all know that. There's a lot more noise, a lot more interference, interfering variables. It doesn't mean it can't be done. But if we want to implement a comprehensive plan, we should measure that far-out effect only if you think it's going to be seen. So we don't expect to measure all the way out on everything we offer. That's why it needs to be customized. Think about the impact you're trying to make.

So then think about what you want to know about your programs. And again, think of programs lumped into those themed offerings. If you have brown bag sessions, that's a program. If you have a grant program, obviously that's a program. A mentoring program. Think of each of those categories of offerings and how far out you want to measure. Where do you think you're going to make an impact? That's the point you want to travel out to.

Customized to meet your needs. Select evaluation levels for each program. Determine the timings. When do you expect to see that change? And then if you want deep evaluation, to implement it chances are you're going to have stagger the programs. Maybe one year you'll look at your mentoring program on the impact of student learning. Maybe the next year you'll look at the impact of your grant program. Not everything at once.

And then stage it out is another way. Perhaps you want to look at the impact on student learning only after you've determined there is teaching changes. And maybe you don't want to look at teaching changes until you determine they really did learn. So staging out for those events that you think you will see the impact, but not until a significant impact is seen at particular levels. It just makes it more customized, doable. The chances are that you will implement it if it's staged out, staggered, timed in such a way that's appropriate for your structure and level to which you want to measure.

So I'm hoping you have these handouts. You'll see that there's a case study so we can kind of understand a little bit better what we're talking about. There's two sheets. They each say case study. I believe the first one says case study, as you can see on the slide, ABC University. Then the second one is case study, evaluation planning framework, and that's page 6. A little out of order.

But first let's look at this case study where it says situational factors. Here's an example of a Type A center, which most of you are, with a director and full-time staff, and the focus is on supporting academic quality, which again is most of you attending this Webinar today. And let's say this center has an annual new faculty orientation. That's a program. Brown bag program that meets once a month, a consultation program, a grant program that's for teaching and learning projects, teaching and learning workshop program. That just changes. Workshops change year round. First year faculty mentoring program and large course redesign program.

And this was fairly common of what I found out there. So it's not an unusual list of programs. And then a little note down below, this large course redesign where they take courses where maybe 800 students attend, and they're trying to reduce the student dropout and fail rate of these introductory freshman courses. And this is real. This is, a couple of universities are actually trying to do this.

So if these were the programs, and you look at the evaluation planning framework, this is just to walk you through real quickly how it might look at a customized, with a customized approach. So you can see the programs on the left-hand side, and you can see participation is going to be determined on every single event they give, every single program, every time, because you want to know who comes and doesn't come, and it's not hard to do.

And satisfaction, it doesn't have to be done every time. It doesn't have to be done continually. You can determine timing for this that's most suitable to what you want to do, such as orientation. Perhaps you want to gather satisfaction data just three times and then stop. Because you know people are satisfied, you don't have to keep asking. But if you make a major change, then evaluate it again.

Brown bags. We don't expect a large impact with a brown bag session, so we'll do satisfaction maybe just once a year, or maybe you want to do it once a semester. You don't have to do it every time.

Consultation. This is the one-on-one, so chances are you probably want to know if people are satisfied or not. It is a customer service piece. And you want to know if they learned, but only if it's applicable. Some people go in for consultations that you really can't determine a learning level or not. But if it applies, then determine it.

Grant program. Grant programs, I'd like to say from what participants told me, are not hard to evaluate for all the way out for did they learn or not and was there impact on teaching, because a grant report can include that. I discovered in the first study oftentimes grant reports really was a write-up about how they spent the money and what they did. But the larger universities focused on academic quality included, you need to tell us and provide evidence that learning took place for you, that you changed your teaching practices. And you can extend it out to provide evidence of changes in student learning. Then the onus is on the grant recipient and not you.

Teaching and learning workshops. They do shift so much that you want to know who shows up and the satisfaction probably every time, but learning. I discovered oftentimes workshops were provided. They were informational and there was no check with an activity, even a clicker session, to see if they learned or not. So to imbed some kind of an assessment like you would a classroom, again that academic model, to see if your, quote-unquote, students actually learning.

And then impact on teaching perhaps you want to check once a year through a survey. Did it make a difference? But not every time. Mentoring program. Again this is a high-impact service . . . at least by many, many different teaching and learning centers, so they measured way out. But this is an example of fading out. Check the impact on teaching after 50 have participated. And then after that point, then you can see the impact on student learning.

And then large course redesign is so impactful and such a high-cost event that chances are you want to measure all the way out. But again, impact on student learning, you have to wait to see if it made a difference, so maybe that's just once a year. And the impact on the institution. Maybe you just need to stage, sorry, stagger that out every other year if it's an ongoing program. But that's just one example of how it could be customized.

Now it's your turn. If you can locate the evaluation planning workshop, and I'd like to give you three to five minutes to travel through this worksheet. And it's similar to the case study, planning framework. On the left-hand side, place an X next to the programs that you offer. These are a list that I thought was most commonly, covered the most common events at teaching and learning centers. And then travel across and place a checkmark on the level to which you really think you'd like to and could evaluate.

And if you could, try to note the timing that you would like to evaluate this. Is it every time or is it every semester, annually, or is there a year you're interested in? I'm really interested in your thought process. I'm going to give you three to five minutes to complete that. Maybe you can post on the Q&A once you've completed it.

*Rob Kelly:* Yeah. I actually have a quick question.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Sure.

*Rob Kelly:* What are some obstacles or factors that influence what level to which, to what level you can evaluate a program?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* The obstacles? I would like to say they vary. If you are trying to measure out to see if someone learned, it could be the length of time that you had to provide something at a workshop. But I'd like to argue, you can check for learning at everything you do. Just a quick and easy check for understanding. If you're traveling out to impact on teaching, it's the depth to which you're trying to find. If you want to get a response as far as a perception of, yes, I am practicing this, not much of an obstacle to that.

But when you want direct evidence, the obstacle is, how do you find those faculty, how do you get them to engage in the evaluation process? But the way to overcome that is to keep that deep evaluation for those high-resource events, that there's time and money spent where there's kind of a tie-in. Nothing is for free. I know I'm getting money from my faculty learning community to implement this project. So with that, we have to provide an assessment. It's kind of like a grant process. With money comes evaluation. So it's getting buy-in. That's the biggest obstacle, to get faculty buy-in.

And sometimes it's confidentiality. If you're working in the consultant area, how can we get faculty to provide feedback and keep it private, anonymous, and confidential? There's many. I'd like to stop right there.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. This question might be relevant to the activity right now. In regards to levels of evaluation, should the evaluation be conducted at the offering level, in program level, and center level?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* At the offering level, program level, and center level. Well, what's being asked? If you're going to evaluate at the offering level, it depends on what you're evaluating. So satisfaction yes, offering level learning, yes, offering level. The more evaluation to do, the more reliable it is. So satisfaction could be at the program level. You can have an annual evaluation and ask how satisfied are you with our program, and it should reinforce what you find at the event level.

Learning again could be program level. You can ask once a year, what learning have you attained from our services? And again, it should align or reinforce with what your event level is. So it depends on what you're, how far out you want to go and how rigorous you want your evaluation to be. And the more you can triangulate or get multiple measures, the better.

*Rob Kelly:* There are some questions about the worksheet itself. What does workshop intensives mean?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Oh, yeah. Workshop intensives is some universities are focusing on a particular initiative, maybe it's active learning, and faculty will attend for an entire week or maybe three weekends in a row. So it's not a one-time workshop. It extended out over several days.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. And then the question, what is SOTL on this worksheet?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Oh, a good question. That's scholarship of teaching and learning.

 

*Rob Kelly:* Yeah. I think those were all the comments or questions regarding this activity.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. Do you think people have completed it?

*Rob Kelly:* It's hard to say.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay.

*Rob Kelly:* Perhaps it's something that they can continue on their own as well?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Oh, because the next question is, what went into your decision making? And more importantly, it's you need to think about your thinking as you figure out your evaluation planning. Because much of it goes into what am I really interested in? Why was I interested in that? What do I believe I can do? It's really a self-reflective practice where you have to continually ask yourself, what do I believe with evaluation? Can I stretch myself further, or am I stretching myself to a place that's not reasonable?

Because we're pressured, it seems these days when we gather at conferences and talk even to administration, to show evidence that we're making a difference on student learning overall. How can we with all our events, when only certain events and programs have high impact? So the question is, what do you think about when you travel through this planning?

Is it feasible? Is it reasonable? Do you feel pressured to measure on everything? Do you feel you can only go to the learning and that's it? What are you thinking? What's impacting your decision making? And I don't know if you're comfortable posting your thoughts, though please do.

*Rob Kelly:* I don't see anything at this point.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. I found it interesting when I would ask people about their evaluation practices, that sometimes they would get defensive, as if it was a very personal question, which it can be. Because it is something that we want to do and can't always accomplish, and we can, we feel limitations of our own knowledge and capability and pressure from administration and maybe external faculty developers as well that we're supposed to be doing this.

And again I just want to reiterate, much of it is because it needs to be customized to what you can do and what you can't do. But you have to push yourself to see what is possible and move beyond satisfaction, if it's appropriate. And can I, are there questions coming in?

| | |
|---|---|
| *Rob Kelly:* | Yeah. Well, there is a comment, you know, the thought process, thinking that the process it not necessarily linear. |
| *Dr. Sue Hines:* | Right. It's not linear. And that's a good observation to make. |
| *Rob Kelly:* | Another comment. We might approach different levels of evaluation at different points. |
| *Dr. Sue Hines:* | Right. Any way you put a plan together, it might change at monthly, semesterly, yearly. You may try to implement it and then discover, no, no, that's not possible, and pull back, or discover you can go further. |
| *Rob Kelly:* | Then we had a question, I guess, about the worksheet. What does faculty writing mean? |
| *Dr. Sue Hines:* | Faculty writing. There was, this is kind of a common thing that popped up, so I did include it. Faculty publication, to provide workshops, an entire program to promote faculty publications, which is connected to scholarship and teaching and learning. |
| *Rob Kelly:* | Okay. There's some other questions that perhaps we should take at another point, but they're, you know, they're not necessarily related to this activity. |
| *Dr. Sue Hines:* | Okay. Should we move on? |
| *Rob Kelly:* | Sure. |
| *Dr. Sue Hines:* | Okay. So just to follow up on the impacts of planning your evaluation, some questions you might want to have in your mind that I think I mentioned along the way, but here is more organized. What is the effort designed to accomplish? So as you're designing perhaps brown bag sessions, why are you doing that? To what extent do you think it'll make an impact? What changes are you trying to make? What impact do you expect to see? Where and when do you expect to see it? And again, that helps you plan out evaluation. Or how will you know when it happens?<br><br>So if you expect to see a change, such as passive learning turns to active learning, where do you expect that to happen? When do you expect that to happen? What events led to that? Who were participating? Who were their students? How many students do they teach? Where can we go to gather that evidence? So five, how can you gather that evidence? And six, what is the most cost-effective manner to gather truthful evidence?<br><br>I have to admit when I put together a comprehensive evaluation plan, it took a long time. I designed it once. I did it with my committee. I tried to |

implement it. I redesigned it. It's an iterative process because it's not linear in nature at all. I make it sound plain and simple. I know it's not.

All right, lastly. What are some methods that we can use? So if you determine to what extent you want to measure, assuming you can measure these levels at the timing that you noted, in the center that you work with the staff that you have, keep in mind more measures increase reliability. One data point doesn't tell you as much as three data points.

Efficiency leads to greater likelihood. So I discovered what some other centers are doing to make efficient. Because if it's not efficient, they're not going to do it. And then staggering, year to year staging out from one level to the next will ease the load, and again increase likelihood.

So you have a handout. It's two pages, and it's titled Evaluation Methods. And what's listed here is not a complete list. You could add to it, I'm sure, but it's what I discovered through the two studies that I did that people were doing, methods that were being used to evaluate these different levels, and then methods that were being used to make it more efficient, because the time and resources is the number one obstacle to why people don't evaluate.

I don't really want to read this in its entirety to you, just to pick up some highlights. On the left-hand side you can see the different levels, participation all the way through impact on teaching. And the method is the next column over. I think you all track participation one way or another and usage. But to make it more efficient, some universities are using online registration. Using SharePoint is one way. Perhaps you have another process.

Developing customized databases so you can plug in this information and track it along the way, and then use that participation data for your annual reports along with reporting back to department heads, who's participating, who is not. Google Analytics I'm sure you know is great if you have website to see who's using what resources.

Satisfaction, someone asked about this. Here's a variety of ways to gather it at superficial and deeper levels, also at event levels, through program levels, and even center levels. So you can do at the event, annually, maybe every three years, focus groups on those high-impact events. And to use advisory boards if you have one, to look at some of your online resources. Since they're part of your work already and give you that extra outside view, then put them to work and have them look at your websites and other resources you may have.

To make it more efficient, use a clicker system. That's a great way to gather data and keep it at events. Standardize an online survey. Don't have multiple surveys, just one that you can capture satisfaction data. Perhaps you can do SharePoint to automate. When they sign up, it kicks in kind of a sequential process where an eval is kicked out at the end and perhaps six months later, six weeks later.

Then learning, I really can't stress this enough, to have opportunities to have direct evidence, demonstrate direct evidence that they did learn. Maybe it's pre/post-test. Maybe it's a clicker session. Maybe it's an application exercise and you have a rubric. I don't know. Something that you see at the event that they actually learned and, of course, follow up with surveys, but that's self-reported. Notations that they learned, which is, again, fine. I still would recommend some direct process as well.

I'm going to jump to impact on teaching and impact on student learning, and this is what most people are interested in, and you can see a long list. I just want to encourage you to have the participants work with you. So if you have a grant program, then imbed assessment into the grant report that's required. Same with the presentations that might be required along with grant projects.

The list of self-reports of changes in teaching through surveys and interviews and focus groups. I think you know that. You're probably already doing that. Student ratings, if you have access. And if you do, you can create a sample, a random sample. Data mine particular items. It doesn't have to be the entire evaluation, but I know it's hands off at many universities.

If you can have access to the students, again . . . access to the students, get some surveys back to see if the teachers are actually changing their practices. This is really connected, though, to small group and special diagnoses to help evaluate your consultant work that you're doing. Pre/post is big. There's one university in my study that was doing all kinds of pre/post, pre/post. She wanted evidence coming in was a certain level, leaving was a second level. But classroom observations, again if you have access. This is more for consultation services.

Review of teaching products. You can ask faculty, did you learn and can you provide evidence? They may not, but they may. Getting faculty buy-in is real important, and I know it's difficult. One university with their faculty learning community, they had a critical incident analysis where faculty participating in this had to create a critical incident analysis of how their thinking, how their teaching practices have changed, student learning has changed, and they created an ePortfolio for that, which is the next, the teaching portfolio.

And then experimental designs, which we know isn't easy but we know that provides more, shows causal relationships, control groups, experimental groups. You just keep those high-intensive evaluation practices, though, for those high-intensive programs that you have. Don't expect to do that for everything. Just focus. And then on the efficiency strategies, you can read through that.

But they're just different ways that makes it easier. Again, have the faculty work for you, if you can. Set up blogs, ePortfolios, online surveys. In fact, student learning is probably the hardest one, that most people argue it's impossible to do, and I share with you what other universities have done. For your consideration, again imbed it into the grants reports, imbed it into their presentations connected to grant-funded teaching and learning projects.

Have students self-report their learning changes. Again you have to get buy-in, though, from those who have participated, but you might be able to do that if it's a funded project. Again, survey the students in class, pre/post measure the student performance. This is typically GPAs. Maybe the faculty member can look at student products as well, pre/post measures.

If they're progressing, if there's prerequisite intro courses and they need to go to the next course and you see those students with the faculty who have participated in your certain programs and those students have a higher progression rate than they had before, of course you need a benchmark to measure against.

And the highest level, which few institutions do, universities that were in my study only did this with the large course redesign programs. They looked at attrition and retention and graduation rates. It was a requirement from the president of the university. A lot of money was put into it. So it was an accountability piece as well. Some are looking at . . . data, but more often than not I've heard that's really hard to move that data. I just put it in there in case you're interested and think you can find some differences.

And both have suggested to work with the Office of Assessment, on the right-hand side there. They're already doing part of our work, and we can piggyback onto what they're doing and collect, have them collect our data for us. So this is not a complete list. I'm sure there's many more that you could add to it, but perhaps it gives you some ideas of what you could start with.

Other questions?

*Rob Kelly:* Yes, we do have some questions.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay.

*Rob Kelly:* To what extent does survey fatigue become a factor in your full model?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Yeah, that was mentioned in the research as well, a lot of survey fatigue. And it does happen. It is possible. Ways that other universities have gotten around that is again to combine surveys. Instead of sending out separate ones, there's just one. Combining surveys with the Office of Assessment, asking faculty when they're participating, are they willing to complete a survey so you have buy-in. But it is a factor.

*Rob Kelly:* Next question. If you were evaluating student learning or impact on an institution, how do you control for noise?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Well, again, it's dependent on what you're measuring, what event, what program you are trying to measure. If you're looking for noise connected to programs such as learning communities or consultation services or even brown bags, it's hard to separate that out, very, very hard. So what you're going to get back won't be causal data unless you focus on some high impact, such as this large course redesign where you had faculty attending and part of being in this program, they had to provide baseline measures, pre-measures.

Institute, in this case was it was active learning techniques, and then follow up the following year, second year to have the post-data looking for those differences. And a control group, faculty who didn't participate. It's labor intensive. So oftentimes, you're going to get back data that's going to contain noise, oftentimes it's self-reports. But if you get more data points, such as student reports, faculty reports, student rating, if you can get that information, then combine that together and look for some pattern.

You can reduce or increase the credibility of your data might be a better way to say it. Otherwise, it's an experimental design if you truly want to control for interfering factors. And even then, you're not going to control for all of them. It doesn't mean we shouldn't try, though. Some people go down that road of, oop, too hard, I'm not going to try it. You just have to be honest with the possibility that it's there.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. Do you want to take more questions or do you want to move on?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Maybe because of time we'll move on.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay.

 

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. The last thing to look at, well, I'm sorry. On the slide, it says, lastly, think about staff evaluation duties, because you're going to have your, hopefully your plan put together. You'll see your programs, how far out you'd like to measure, how you want to measure, when you want to measure. But now it's, who is going to do these measurements? Because of the time and effort that goes into this, share the duties amongst the staff members, where it's appropriate for those who are able to implement what you're asking them to do. More hands make the load lighter.

But one successful story that was told over and over again is the survey duties. When it was given to one administrative assistant, one cook in the kitchen, it worked quite well. And that individual was responsible for the timing, the submission, the gathering of the data. And oftentimes, this individual enjoyed reading the information and working with it.

Collaborating with the Office of Assessment staff, which we talked about already, and hiring an assessment specialist. Three universities that I spoke with, that was their latest hire, and they're glad they did. And a fourth said the next time they get to hire a new position, that is who they will hire, because they're serious about doing this work. And when you have one person who has the knowledge and capability to do so and that's their sole responsibility, obviously it would greatly increase the chances of implementing.

So lastly, again these are frameworks, last name is perfect, just examples to get some ideas on how you might organize your thinking and an evaluation plan. You will see a comprehensive evaluation plan example. And what's provided to you here, maybe because of space if nothing else, you can see it on one page.

Here's a Type B center. So part-time faculty member working out of his or her office, maybe has an administrative assistant. Actually looks very similar to what I worked in. There is program-wise new faculty orientation, teaching workshops, instructional technology workshops. They're separated because they were determined to be separate programs. Blended delivery intensive, so there was several days' training to learn how to be an instructor in a blended delivery course. Teaching and learning academy where faculty traveled through a teaching and learning academy focused on a particular initiative.

And you can see there's two tiers. Up top is participation, satisfaction, and learning. Down below is impact on teaching, impact on student learning, and impact on institution. And real quick, as you glance at this, you can see it travels all the way out to impact on institutions for just one program, which is a blended delivery. And perhaps that's possible because we can look at, you can see the methodology chosen for impact on institution under blended delivery intensive.

The method was to compare the number of courses of incompletes and the program of completion rate with like face-to-face courses. So we looked to see how many courses, when it was the face-to-face compared to the courses that were blended, how many incompletes did we see, comparing the two. We found that in face-to-face there were many more incompletes, and in the blended there were more completes.

We're going to look at GPA as well and we're going to look at student evals, because we actually had the capability with that particular program to measure out that far. But none of the other programs are measured that far.

You can take your time on your own to look through this. It just helps to see how you can organize method, who's going to do it, you know, is staff in other words, when you're going to do it, timing, and then comments that you might want to make. Just kind of a template as to how it might look for you.

So just to finish up here, an effective comprehensive evaluation plan can measure up to six levels, but it needs to be systemized to fit your purpose and designed with consideration for your staff. Staging out and staggering the timing drastically reduces your load and makes it more doable. It provides truthful data in a very cost-effective manner if you do plan it out well, and is designed lastly, as Linda Suskie would say, with an altruistic evaluation mindset. You are determined to make measures to see are you making a difference or not, not because it's an accountability.

And the last slide kind of shows you kind of a one pictogram of how you might think about it, because there's six levels going out. It's based on systemizing a comprehensive plan, dashing appropriately, staggering, staging out, again all within an altruistic mindset.

I would like to say this is a beginning stage. It's what's been designed from the initial research. It's a place to springboard into something else. There is a need for this model or a model. This is my contribution to the need. Questions.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. We do have a few minutes for questions, so let's jump right into that. How do you measure faculty development communiqués sent for their development but no way to determine who is impact?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* How do you measure communication, what was that?

*Rob Kelly:* You know, I'm not sure I understand it. How do you measure faculty development communiqués sent for the development but no way to determine who's impacted?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* . . . the question in front of me here so I could . . .

*Rob Kelly:* Yeah, let's go on to the next. I'm not really . . .

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay.

*Rob Kelly:* . . . real sure exactly that's getting it. Perhaps the person who asked that could clarify. Do you have an example of a stellar community college doing this kind of evaluation work?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* I couldn't give you a name of a community college. I'm not sure if she'd be comfortable with me doing but, doing that. But there is a stellar community college doing this. It was the one who picked up the practices from this marketing person. I guess I'm not comfortable giving out a name. But what she is doing is obviously the level of participation satisfaction and learning with everything that they provide, but what she's trying harder to do is to gather evidence and artifacts linking back showing that faculty truly did learn.

And they're pushing for faculty portfolios where it's part of the annual individual development plan, where faculty need to bring in their portfolios giving evidence of what they're doing in the class, how it's changing, and how they're impacting student learning, and it's tied to the annual review process.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. And how do you encourage faculty to actually participate in an evaluation? What sort of incentives can you offer?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* All I can tell you is the most common ones that I've heard of, which is at the event ask, would you participate in evaluation for our work? We're trying to demonstrate our worth and merit so we can maintain our quality work. And then you have them sign up and they e-mail you. And then you follow up, and they tend to follow through with the evaluation because they volunteered to participate. And it's probably most effective way.

And the other, again, is when it's tied to money. Unfortunately, you cannot have your grant money to do your faculty learning community or your teaching and learning project unless you provide us evidence that you're going to make a change.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay. And let's take one more quick question. I like the idea of having programs that have distinct offerings within faculty development. Can you give examples of different programs you have seen at other colleges?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* That have adjunct faculty?

*Rob Kelly:* No, it doesn't mention adjuncts. I like the idea of having programs that have distinct offerings within faculty development. Can you give examples of different programs you have seen at other colleges?

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Again if we're going to use the same terminology, programs meaning seamed offerings. It's the, I think I've used many of them here on the examples, such as orientation, brown bags, consultation, grant programs. What I could do is send you the results of my study and it lists all of them. But the examples I gave you on the evaluation planning sheet provides many of them, if not 70% of them. Then the case study one I think has duplicated some of them.

So you have many of them. But if you want more, you can e-mail me and I can send you a complete list.

*Rob Kelly:* Okay, great. Well, that's all we have time for, for today. Thank you all for participating, and thank you, Sue, for this presentation.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Mm-hmm.

*Rob Kelly:* Participants, we would like to hear from you. If you have, your campus has received an e-mail evaluation form from us. Please fill it out and let us know what you think of today's program and what programs you'd like to see in the future. For complete information about our upcoming seminars and *Academic Leader*, go to www.magnapubs.com.

And there were a few leftover questions, Sue, so we will forward those to you.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay.

*Rob Kelly:* And we will send your answers, your responses to the entire group.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. Sounds good.

*Rob Kelly:* Thanks again for joining us, and have a great day.

*Dr. Sue Hines:* Okay. Thank you.