**Assessment Report Feedback 2012**

**For** **Instructional Design and Technology Department**

This Assessment Report is reviewed and requires some revisions before it can be approved. For a revision, if you would integrate answers (to the embedded questions) directly within your narrative and submit supporting documents to Share, it would certainly suffice. **Please submit a revised Report by September 14** via the SHARE website using a separate dropbox labeled, “Resubmission of revised departmental files.”

The Committee decided to *not* use the “SS,” “S,” “O,” “OO” scoring approach this year. The checklist and comments below are intended to make the evaluation process a little more transparent. The checklist was derived from the Template Instructions document posted in both [www.nmu.edu/aqip](http://www.nmu.edu/aqip) and the SHARE website. Comments on this page are a brief analysis of strengths and opportunities; detailed comments are embedded within your report that follows. Please take them into account as you undertake revisions. If you have questions, a member of the committee will be happy to meet with you.

*Service Assessment Committee*

This Improvement Plan is reviewed and approved. The committee appreciates your efforts at continuous improvement. The Committee decided to *not* use the “SS,” “S,” “O,” “OO” scoring approach this year. The checklist and comments below are intended to make the evaluation process a little more transparent.

Two things happen now:

1. It will be posted, without committee comments, to the NMU AQIP website under “Assessment,” “Service Unit Plans/Rpts”.

2. A new procedure for selecting future AQIP Action Projects is now in place. Each year one Service unit objectives with wide impact or directly tie to Systems Portfolio areas of need will be proposed as an AQIP Action Project. The potential list is developed in October of each year, after all Plans have been reviewed. If one of your objectives were suitable, you will be contacted before it is placed on the list. Being designated an AQIP Action Project adds some institutional leverage to your already planned activities.

3. When the matching Report is submitted next year, the committee will review these objectives in light of the data results and usage.

*Service Assessment Committee*

This Improvement Plan is reviewed and accepted. The Committee decided to *not* use the “SS,” “S,” “O,” “OO” scoring approach this year. The checklist and comments below are intended to make the evaluation process a little more transparent. The checklist was derived from the Template Instructions document posted in both www.nmu.edu/aqip and the SHARE website. The Committee sees a few items that could be improved in future plans. They do not warrant revision this year, but please read them now and before filling out next year’s report. If you have questions, a member of the committee will be happy to meet with you.

Two things happen now:

1. It will be posted, without committee comments, to the NMU AQIP website under “Assessment,” “Service Unit Plans/Rpts”.

2. A new procedure for selecting future AQIP Action Projects is now in place. Each year one Service unit objectives with wide impact or directly tie to Systems Portfolio areas of need will be proposed as an AQIP Action Project. The potential list is developed in October of each year, after all Plans have been reviewed. If one of your objectives were suitable, you will be contacted before it is placed on the list. Being designated an AQIP Action Project adds some institutional leverage to your already planned activities.

3. When the matching Report is submitted next year, the committee will review these objectives in light of the data results and usage.

*Service Assessment Committee*

Since the Objectives and Means of Assessment were evaluated when the Plan was submitted last year, they were not re-evaluated. However, the committee did re-read them in light of the reported results.

|  |
| --- |
| General Comments: |
| The objectives appear to have been met, but the documentation of results needs more detail. Separately submitting reports that are probably available would be one solution. If so, please submit them to the Share site or provide a URL if they are available online. Please take more time with the reflection on lessons learned and, most importantly, what is specifically going to change because of them. This goes into the Usage section. Again, it’s not committee assumption that no reflection is occurring, just that it’s not documented. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effective Summary of Data Collected meets the following criteria** | Obj #1  Met? | Obj #2  Met? | Obj #3 Met? |
| Includes a narrative summary that states whether the objective was met. If details are attached in separate file, this should still contain a summary. (Please start with one sentence to indicate whether or not the objectives were met, then go into the narrative) | Y | Y | Y |
| For on-going measured goals, trend data for multiple year data are given, preferably in a row/column format. If the data is complex, lengthy, or in chart format, a separate document (clearly labeled with unit name and title) was submitted | N/Y | Y | N/Y |
| For a measured goal, data is summarized here. If the data is complex, lengthy, or in chart format, submit a separate document (clearly labeled with unit name and title) |
| For a process or product development or a study indicates, item by item, whether the planned steps were accomplished. If not, briefly states why. Submits copy of finished product (URL, report, policy, handbook) or URL to posting on website. |
| For surveys, provide sample size, response rate/size, and distribution of answers for key items. |
| Compares to peer institutions/programs or normed values, when applicable | N | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effective Actions Taken to Improve Program(s) based on data meets the following criteria** | Obj #1  Met? | Obj #2  Met? | Obj #3 Met? |
| States what was learned by analyzing the data. Identifies strengths and areas to improve. | Y/N | Y/N | Y |
| Supplies evidence of past or planned use of data analysis to improve or assess whether past intervention was successful. | N | N | Y |
| Assesses the collection process (acceptable and to be continued, sample judged too small to be valid and suggests new measures, etc.) or the steps taken to complete the task (should plans be more detailed in the future, were dates reasonable, etc.?) | N | N | Y |
| Explains how the data are shared within the department and/or between departments. (Too often reports get filed w/o enough exposure, reducing the likelihood of changes, i.e. we work in silos.) | N | N | N |
| States process used within the unit to analyze the outcome or data, e.g. unit head, committee, entire unit staff? Was this part of a regularly scheduled meeting or strategic planning discussion? Etc. AQIP is particularly keen to know how decisions are made and shared. | N | N | N |

(Your report and detailed comments begin on the next page)

**Northern Michigan University**

**OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN/REPORT FORM**

**Administrative or Educational Support Unit**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Department or Unit | | Instructional Design and Technology | | | |
| This document is the | 🞎 PLAN or 🗹 REPORT for July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 | | | Date Submitted: | 10/5/2012 (revised) 8/9/2012 (original) |
| Submitted by (Unit Representative) | | | Matt Smock | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department or Unit Mission Statement: Was this mission statement revised this year? Yes \_x\_ No** |
| AIS’s Instructional Design and Technology unit supports teaching and learning in online and classroom-based environments by providing resources, tools, and services that enable faculty to innovatively use technology to deliver and enhance pedagogically sound courses and programs. |

**Functions within the University:**

|  |
| --- |
| In addition to being part of NMU’s continuous improvement process, outcomes assessment plays a direct role with the AQIP Systems Portfolio (100-page document submitted every four years). To increase awareness and help gather Portfolio information, **please type “X” for all AQIP categories directly related to your unit’s core mission**. Some functions appear in more than one category. This is a first round collection of this information so do the best you can with the selection; if you want help, ask S. Poindexter. (Note: this section of the form is short-term; it will be deleted once functions have been mapped between units and the Systems Portfolio.)  **X** AQIP Category 1: Helping Students Learn documents the curricular and co-curricular processes and student learning support.  **🞎** AQIP Category 2: Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives documents the key non-curricular functions by which NMU serves the region, e.g. community engagement initiatives of students and employees, and department outreach.  **X** AQIP Category 3: Understanding Students’ and Other Stakeholders’ Needs documents how NMU builds relationships with students, alumni and employers and identifies, targets and meets their needs.  **🞎** AQIP Category 4: Valuing People documents NMU personnel recruitment, training, satisfaction, services and programs.  **🞎** AQIP Category 5: Leading and Communicating documents processes that guide NMU in setting directions, making decisions, seeking future opportunities, and communicating decisions and actions.  **X** AQIP Category 6: Supporting Institutional Operations documents student and administrative support services, safety, and facilities.  **🞎** AQIP Category 7: Measuring Effectiveness documents IT systems and institutional research NMU employs to collect, analyze, and distribute, and how departments use them to manage improvement, e.g. use of charts, “cubes,” dashboards.  **🞎** AQIP Category 8: Planning Continuous Improvement documents NMU’s strategic and administrative planning processes.  **X** AQIP Category 9: Building Collaborative Relationships documents how NMU works with external organizations from which we receive students (school systems) or goods and services (vendors and utilities), send our graduates (schools and employers), and support or regulate our programs (agencies).  (A full description of the Portfolio’s categories and its detailed topics are available at [www.nmu.edu/aqip](http://www.nmu.edu/aqip) under the Current Document tab.) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Administrative Objective #1** |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** |
| Provide and support key educational technology tools in the classroom and online. Key tools include the university’s course management system, multimedia delivery systems, and classroom audio-visual systems. Support will be provided in a timely and effective manner.  **\* Objective met \*** |  | On an annual basis, assessment criteria for this objective include the following:   1. IDT staff will fulfill 100% of EduCat course requests prior to the first day of classes provided the request is made by 5:00 p.m. of the Wednesday before each semester starts. Late requests will be fulfilled within two business days. 2. IDT staff will identify, prioritize and (in cooperation with our information technology partners) implement at least three enhancements to online tools during the assessment period. 3. IDT will maintain the inventory of projectors in general use and general use/departmental preference classrooms such that:    * All projectors receive general maintenance annually.    * Projectors are designated for replacement before they exceed 5 years in service or 3000 – 5000 lamp hours of use (depending on projector model). 4. IDT will offer an average of at least two educational technology-related professional development opportunities (e.g., workshops, webinar viewings) for instructors each month (i.e. 24 total). |
| **Summary of Data Collected** *(Provide trend data and summarize)* |  | **Describe how results were used to improve services** |
| 1. Target timeframes for fulfilling EduCat course requests were met. An EduCat course request is any request made (via the online request form) for a course section to use EduCat in a given semester. If a course shell already exists, IDT maps the request to it. Otherwise a new shell is created. There were 198 requests for the Summer 2011 semester, 1080 requests for the Fall 2011 semester, and 1056 requests for the Winter 2012 semester. IDT’s software does not have reporting capability for tabulating late requests or completion percentages. Staff members monitor requests during processing to verify that they are meeting fulfillment goals. 2. Enhancements to online tools implemented during the assessment period included: expanding the capabilities of the embedded librarian in EduCat, improved sorting of e-reserves in EduCat, and integrating photo rosters into the EduCat gradebook. These enhancements were requested by faculty. Also during the period, the decision was made to upgrade EduCat to Moodle 2 for the fall semester, with a small group of early adopters using the new version beginning in June. 3. Projectors in 62 GU and 31 GU/DP classrooms were maintained and replaced as planned. New projectors were installed in 30 rooms. 4. IDT offered several professional development opportunities each month, exceeding the minimum target of 24 total. Those facilitated by IDT staff included workshops covering EduCat, podcasting, interactive whiteboards, active learning technology, classroom response systems, cameras, video editing, and audio editing. Workshop topics were selected by targeting commonly used tools supported by the CITE and frequently asked questions. In addition, IDT helped facilitate active learning workshops led by outside presenters and hosted group participation sites for online webinars presented by ELI, Sloan-C, and TLT. It would be useful to collect additional data on session attendance and to gather more feedback from participants, which we will plan to do in future years. |  | This ongoing administrative objective encompasses several of IDT’s regularly provided core support services and gauges whether we are meeting our support standards. The results indicate that we are.  a. We will continue to monitor course requests and our ability to meet fulfillment time targets. While our request system provides only aggregate data, we can attempt to separate late requests by taking the request number on a specified date and then getting the total number of requests at a specified later date. This will help us determine how many “late” requests are received and the extent to which we may need intervention strategies to reduce the number of late requests.  b. Enhancements to the online tools were developed in response to faculty requests. We continue to monitor such requests for feasibility and broad applicability. An EduCat support team reviews the requests. Information Technology provides programming support for EduCat and is involved in the review process. Enhancement requests are prioritized within their online project management software.  c. Projector maintenance and replacement is coordinated in collaboration with Learning Resources Division/Audio-Visual and Academic Affairs (funding). Room use and lamp hours are taken into account in addition to equipment age (based on inventory). Data about GU and GU/DP classrooms is becoming more consistently collected and as equipment is updated, it is easier to collect this data in a broader range of learning spaces.  d. The number of sessions offered met our objective for this year. Session topics paralleled the most frequently used online tools and questions asked in the CITE. While this did meet our goal, it would be helpful to learn more about whether we are on target with these sessions. Although not part of the objective for this year, gathering attendance data and feedback from participants would help us determine if the number of sessions and topics are on target for our users. Therefore, attendance data and feedback from participants needs to be collected and reviewed in order to determine workshop topics, frequency and method of delivery. |
| **Administrative Objective #2** |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** |
| *Objective* :  Implement NMU’s first high tech active learning classroom. This 63 seat, student-centered studio will have 7 round student tables, each with technological tools to help facilitate active learning.  **\* Objective met \***  Note: This objective is part of a larger, cross departmental “Active Learning Catalysts” project, funded partially by an NSF TUES grant.  *Rationale (Why you are setting this objective; mark with “X”)*:  X Effectiveness/quality action Efficiency/cost action  Compliance issue Satisfaction measure Create baseline  Other (explain):  *Does this objective relate to a Road Map goal? (Refer to last page for the Road Map goals). If yes, type the related Road Map codes here*:  ML-3, CA-1 |  | *Describe timetable plans to achieve objective*.   1. Equipment specifications finalized by June 1, 2011 2. Equipment bids out by June 30, 2011. 3. LRC 108 renovation plan finalized with Facilities and Engineering by July 30, 2011. 4. Electronic equipment on site by August 31, 2011. 5. Furniture on site by September 15, 2011. 6. Renovation complete by September 30, 2011. 7. Equipment installation complete by October 15, 2011. 8. At least two technical training workshops and two pedagogy-focused workshops will be held for faculty by the end of the Fall 2011 semester. 9. During the Winter 2012 semester, the first courses will be offered in the newly renovated room. 10. During the Winter 2012 semester, usage and reliability data will be gathered for the equipment in the room.   Data collection will continue into the next academic year, thus this assessment objective has a two year time frame. Year 1 will focus on getting the room up and running and on initial data collection. Year 2 assessment may include measuring increase in demand for the room and on related adoption of active learning activities.  *Beyond completing the above steps, how will you judge whether the objective was a success?[[1]](#endnote-1)*  In addition to completing the project on schedule, other gauges of its success will be whether it is completed within the planned budget and whether changes from the original equipment and renovations plans are minimal. |
| **Summary of Data Collected** (*Summarize the evidence)* |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** |
| (Fill in only for the REPORT at the end of the year.)  a-d. Target dates were met.  e.-g. Construction on the renovation fell behind, which also delayed furniture and equipment installation. Construction was completed in early October, furniture arrived at the end of October, and equipment installation was completed in early November.  h. Pedagogy workshops were held in September and November; technical training workshops in November and December.  i. Three courses moved into the room for the last several weeks of the Fall semester. The room was fully scheduled for the Winter 2012 semester.  j. Usage and reliability data was gathered as planned; heaviest usage was whiteboards and LCD monitors. The Winter 2012 usage summary is attached to this report as Appendix A. Reliability issues would be identified via equipment work orders; work orders for LRC 108 were focused on minor issues such as replacing connecting cables and did not highlight any equipment reliability problems. This is an instance where no data is indicative of reliability (i.e. no work orders generated regarding reliability issues). |  | (Fill in only for the REPORT at the end of the year.)  The project stayed reasonably within the budget parameters. Only minor changes to equipment and renovation plans were needed (for example, an originally planned cable route could not be used due to previously unknown infrastructure; this in turn required buying a signal booster so that a longer cable route could be used).  On a general level, this project provided IDT with experience in managing complex classroom technology and furniture projects that can also be applied to our smaller scale classroom upgrades (e.g., managing—and timing to as great a degree possible—multiple purchase orders). We confirmed that the best laid plans do go awry -- as shown by needing to use an alternate cable route due to infrastructure not indicated on building as-built drawings and a surprise to everyone that was discovered once renovation was underway – but that adjustments don’t impact the timeline too badly.  At a specific level, this project provided IDT and our collaborators in LRD and Facilities with valuable experience in implementing an active learning classroom. This experience is likely to be put to use when planning and implementing classrooms in the new academic building. As this classroom is used, we continue to gather information to help us meet the NSF grant obligations and to assist with local classroom design, especially in the new academic building.  Note: Due to other priorities, we are electing not to have an objective focused solely on this classroom in our 2012-2013 plan. However, aspects from this objective are being shared with Facilities and the new building committee members, and will carry over into new classrooms configurations objective,  Comments: It is still important to state with whom the final grant report was shared. |
| **Administrative Objective #3** *(State a 1-2 year objective intended to improve a unit process, service, or output.)* |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** |
| *Objective*:  Refine process for evaluating and selecting educational technology equipment using portable document cameras (multimedia visualizers) as a pilot.  Note: This objective began in May 2011, but the majority of it will be completed during the assessment period.  **\* Objective met \***  *Rationale (Why you are setting this objective? Mark with “X”)*:  X Effectiveness/quality action Efficiency/cost action  Compliance issue Satisfaction measure Create baseline  Other (explain):  *Does this objective relate to a Road Map goal? (Refer to last page for the Road Map goals). If yes, type the related Road Map codes here*:  ML-3 |  | Describe timetable plans to achieve objective.   1. Between June and August, 2011, establish evaluation criteria; identify models for “on paper” evaluation;   identify models for hands-on evaluation; obtain demonstration units from vendors; and complete hands-on evaluations.   1. Purchase and install selected units by beginning of Fall 2011 semester. 2. During 2011-2012 school year, assess units’ durability and solicit user feedback on their usability and performance. 3. At end of school year:    1. If assessment and feedback indicates problems, determine what (if any) changes to the evaluation/selection process would likely have identified them up front.    2. Modify process as needed.   *Beyond completing the above steps, how will you judge whether the objective was a success*?1 |
| **Summary of Data Collected (**Summarize the evidence) |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** |
| (Fill in only for the REPORT at the end of the year.)   1. IDT staff established evaluation criteria as planned, with input from Catalyst project PIs. Several document cameras within price target were researched against those criteria. Units made by Lumens, Qomo, Avervision, and Samsung were selected for hands-on evaluation and demonstration units of each were obtained. The Qomo QPC60 was selected for purchase based on overall feature set and quality of image. The evaluation matrix is attached for reference as Appendix B. 2. 13 Qomo QPC60 units were purchased. 8 were installed in the LRC 108 active learning classroom, 1 was installed in WS “B,” and 4 were made available for checkout and classroom delivery. 3. Three units had operational problems upon delivery, leading to concerns about reliability and durability. However, the replacement units functioned properly and none of the 13 units put into operation required maintenance or replacement during the entire year.  Faculty who had taught in a room with an installed camera or checked one out during the year were surveyed at the end of the winter semester. 8 of 9 respondents reported using a unit regularly. The majority indicated high satisfaction levels. Survey did show some issues with ease-of-use. 4. Overall, the durability and user feedback validated the choice of the Qomo QPC60 and the process used to select it. Ease-of-use issues would likely have been similar on other cameras evaluated, which had similar basic feature sets and controls, so those issues point out a need at the implementation state rather than in evaluation process.   This section does describe the accomplishments of a particular instance of equipment selection, but please see comment under Usage of Data |  | (Fill in only for the REPORT at the end of the year.)  As noted in the summary, the results validated the selection process itself, but also identified needs at implementation. We will follow a similar process when evaluating new tools in the future (we already did with touch screen monitors late in FY2012). In general, the “ease of use” issues pointed out a need to work with specific faculty more closely when rolling out a new tool. In this particular case, producing “quick start” documents and making sure that all faculty using the cameras had a copy would have helped (we did offer training sessions, but not all affected faculty attended).  The evaluation process document established through this objective is attached as Appendix C. Procedures for selecting specific equipment and vendors are discussed with Purchasing as needed on a case-by-case basis. In general equipment models are selected at the unit level and bid to various vendors through Purchasing. |

Many service units already use an evaluative measure and this approach is now more common in assessment theory– not everything we try works out the way as hoped and creating a target and/or success/bail out threshold is appropriate. In cases where this is a new approach for a unit, in the 2011-12 Plan consider how you *might* measure the added value of an objective; however, it is not yet a requirement. The OA committee will provide suggestions in its feedback for this year. During the year, dialogues, additional resources, one-on-one meetings and/or seminars will be held to evolve our OA process.

**Road Map Codes to Tie to Unit Objectives**

Some unit objectives may address specific operational issues. Other unit objectives are strategic initiatives that align with goals in the University strategic plan - Road Map to 2015. These latter unit objectives are potential AQIP Action Projects – giving a little more recognition to unit efforts. Listed below are Road Map categories and goals, preceded with a code. Use these codes when describing Objectives #2 and #3. (Note: Even if your objective is not an exactly itemized as a Road Map priority, still use the code if it applies to that goal.) The full Road Map is at [www.nmu.edu/roadmap2015](http://www.nmu.edu/roadmap2015).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Road Map to 2015 Goals*** | |
| ***Code*** | ***Innovation Goals*** |
| **I-1** | Balance successful programs with new offerings |
| **I-2** | Professional development program that rewards innovation and collaboration |
| **I-3** | A growing portfolio of corporate collaborations that exploit NMU’s technical expertise, enhance academic programs and facilitate global engagement for students and faculty both on campus and abroad |
| **I-4** | Develop the financial resources to support innovation and student success |
|  | ***Meaningful Lives Goals*** |
| **ML-1** | A Liberal Studies Program that provides students with the abilities and knowledge necessary for lifelong learning and effective citizenship in a challenging and rapidly changing world |
| **ML-2** | Develop a new academic advising system that integrates the advising assets of academic departments and student services to contribute to a new, effective retention management network—similar to our enrollment management network |
| **ML-3** | Integrate the highest possible level of information technology skills and competencies throughout the university |
|  | ***Campus Attributes Goals*** |
| **CA-1** | Utilize the Campus Master Plan and related initiatives to continue to build and develop a greener and more learner-centered campus |
| **CA-2** | Enhance processes throughout campus operations to guide the use of resources and inform resource allocation |
| **CA-3** | Enhance the portfolio of academic programs, research and other activities that leverage the university’s location |
| **CA-4** | Be a model community for sustainable education and practices |
|  | ***Community Engagement Goals*** |
| **CE-1** | Include all units of the campus in the process of community engagement for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. |
| **CE-2** | Increase faculty, staff and student involvement in the Superior Edge program, academic service learning and other community engagement and leadership development initiatives. |
| **CE-3** | Put into action a commitment to be an inclusive community where differences are recognized as assets of the institution, respected attributes of the person and a valuable part of the university experience |
| **CE-4** | Increase collaboration with local communities, schools, governments, development groups and other partners to enhance community and economic development in the Upper Peninsula. |

**Appendix A – LRC 108 Usage Data**

**Appendix B – Document Camera Evaluation Matrix**

**Appendix C – IDT Product Evaluation Process**

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)