

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

To Improve the Academy: A Journal of
Educational Development

Professional and Organizational Development
Network in Higher Education

2004

A Vision Beyond Measurement: Creating an Integrated Data System for Teaching Centers

Kathryn M. Plank
Ohio State University

Alan Kalish
Ohio State University

Stephanie V. Rohdieck
Ohio State University

Kathleen A. Harper
Ohio State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad>



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Other Education Commons](#)

Plank, Kathryn M.; Kalish, Alan; Rohdieck, Stephanie V.; and Harper, Kathleen A., "A Vision Beyond Measurement: Creating an Integrated Data System for Teaching Centers" (2004). *To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development*. 610.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad/610>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in To Improve the Academy: A Journal of Educational Development by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

A Vision Beyond Measurement: Creating an Integrated Data System for Teaching Centers

Kathryn M. Plank

Alan Kalish

Stephanie V. Rohdieck

Kathleen A. Harper

The Ohio State University

Assessing the work of teaching and learning centers is crucial to maintain the support of our institutions; however, collecting and interpreting the right data can be a challenge. This chapter explores practical strategies for integrating assessment into daily work flow in order to generate information that accurately measures our impact, helps others understand and value our work, and enables us to improve what we do, without creating a major “add-on” task. We discuss ways to measure, track, and report work, and share means to use data for both summative and formative purposes that we hope will make the work of faculty developers easier, better, and appreciated.

INTRODUCTION

Documenting the impact of teaching and learning centers is more crucial today than ever. The very existence of centers may depend on it. Not surprisingly, we have seen a proliferation of sessions at recent Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD) conferences on assessment of faculty development, as well as several chapters in Volume 22 of *To Improve the Academy* (e.g., Bothell & Henderson, 2004; Milloy & Brooke, 2004). POD's Core Committee also emphasized the importance of assessment by making it the focus of the 2003–2004 POD grant competition.

However, while most faculty developers recognize the need for assessment, efforts to gather, organize, and make sense of the data can easily become overwhelming. This chapter explores practical strategies for designing an integrated data system that enables assessment, measures impact accurately, helps others understand and value the work of teaching and learning centers, and provides useful data for improving faculty development. We discuss a range of ideas about how best to measure, track, and report the work that centers do, and share our experiences and those of other centers with which we have been in contact on how best to use data for summative assessment and for formative purposes that we hope will make our work easier and better.

CONTEXT

There is not a large body of literature on the assessment of teaching and learning centers, yet this does not necessarily mean that centers do not assess their work. In their survey, Chism and Szabo (1997) concluded that "a substantial amount of evaluation activity occurs across programs" (p. 61). However, they also discovered that the assessment activities were not equally distributed across the services provided and often focused primarily on satisfaction surveys. They point out a number of obstacles that limit the depth and breadth of assessment done by centers.

Perhaps the most obvious obstacle is time. Just as some faculty fear that assessing instruction may crowd out the time needed to teach, teaching centers are also concerned "that the amount of time that would be needed to evaluate well would prevent staff members from serving their clients adequately" (Chism & Szabo, 1997, p. 60). How much assessment can we do and still do the work we are assessing?

In approaching these concerns about assessment, the staff of Faculty & TA Development (FTAD) at The Ohio State University realized that we could draw on the principles of assessment that we share with faculty. Although there is not much written about the assessment of our own work, our field has a rich collection of resources on the assessment of teaching and learning, much of which can be applied to the assessment of faculty development. For example, the American Association for Higher Education's (AAHE) *9 Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning* (1997) provides useful guidance for the process.

- 1) The assessment of student learning begins with educational values.
- 2) Assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional, integrated, and revealed in performance over time.

- 3) Assessment works best when the programs it seeks to improve have clear, explicitly stated purposes.
- 4) Assessment requires attention to outcomes but also and equally to the experiences that lead to those outcomes.
- 5) Assessment works best when it is ongoing, not episodic.
- 6) Assessment fosters wider improvement when representatives from across the educational community are involved.
- 7) Assessment makes a difference when it begins with issues of use and illuminates questions that people really care about.
- 8) Assessment is mostly likely to lead to improvement when it is part of a larger set of conditions that promote change.
- 9) Through assessment, educators meet responsibilities to students and to the public.

Allen, McMillin, Noel, and Rienzi (1999) and Banta, Lund, Black, and Oblander (1996) show how these principles can be applied in institutional assessment of learning. They provide useful models for teaching centers to consider as we make the connection from assessment of learning to assessment of our own practice.

In addressing the concern about the time necessary to assess our work, we realized it would be useful for us to listen to our own advice. When we talk with faculty about assessment of learning, we often quote Walvoord and Anderson's (1998) argument that we must integrate assessment into our teaching, that we can't "shove it to the periphery" (p. 13). If assessment is an additional task in the lives of already overburdened faculty, it will not receive the serious attention it needs to succeed. Likewise, assessment of the work of educational developers must be integrated into our daily work lives in order to be feasible, as well as useful and usable.

To achieve this integration, as suggested by Principles 2 and 5, we created a single data system that accomplishes as many of our office record-keeping functions and other administrative tasks as possible. We now use the same system to manage our work time, schedule appointments, track event registration, collect evaluation feedback, maintain our list of contacts, generate mailings, and produce monthly and annual reports. The goal is to have each piece of data entered only once, yet made readily available for a number of different outputs and purposes.

Improving the data collection system also enables us to collect the data that are most important, not just those that are easiest to collect. In applying the AAHE's first principle to institutional assessment, Banta et al. (1996) state that "institutional assessment efforts should not be concerned about valuing what can be measured but, instead, about measuring that which is valued" (p. 5). While it may once have been enough to count consultations and attendance, these methods do not reflect all that centers now do. We have added new procedures to assess the impact of what we do and to capture some of the work that often remains invisible and communicate it to others.

However, the most important element of this process is its collaborative nature. "There is, perhaps, no more important principle in the assessment literature than this: successful assessment requires collaborative efforts" (Banta et al., 1996, p. 35). To this end, the database system was made fully accessible from the start to all staff members through an office server that is accessible from each of their desktop computers. Consultants not only enter data from their own computers, but they also can search, sort, and print reports.

Discussions of how best to collect, categorize, and use data have become central to our staff development and strategic planning efforts. We have also been able to involve many stakeholders and users throughout the process. Active collaboration was and is crucial to aligning our goals with the goals of the university and assuring that the data system remains both useful and useable.

STATEMENT OF NEED

Chism and Szabo (1997) report that most centers do collect a substantial amount of evaluation data. Prior to this effort, our center was no different. We had a number of data collection processes in place for several years—each separately developed but not integrated with the others. However, like many centers, we have significantly changed the focus of our work over the past five years. Our old record-keeping system no longer fit our current activities and work style, and it was not efficient in gathering the data that it did capture. Add to that a major turnover in staff, and we were ready for change.

The first steps in our strategic planning process were to determine which data we were already collecting and locate the sources of these data. As is true of most of the centers in both the Chism and Szabo study (1997) and Chism's (2003) follow-up survey on the POD listserv, we were most complete in our tracking of information on events (workshops, seminars, etc.). Each term, faculty and teaching associates would register for our events on teaching, and our student assistants entered these registrations into a FileMaker Pro database, which was located on their computer only. This was a standard, flat-file

database (i.e., a simple database in which all data are recorded in a single table), which kept records of attendance by each participant for each academic year. For example, Professor Smith would have one record in the 2001–2002 academic year database, with a list of any university-wide workshops or events she attended that year.

However, attendance lists from unit-based events (i.e., invited workshops done within a department or college) were stored in a separate document that was part of our staff members' individual monthly reports. Other information about individual events—such as materials, agendas, evaluations—was saved as hard copy in file folders, usually by the staff member who facilitated the event. So even though we collected a lot of data about events, making use of it involved searching in a number of different locations.

We also kept track of other activities via monthly reports. At the end of each month, staff members submitted reports of their consultations to the director in a word-processed document listing consultations, service, research, publications, and planning time for all work done that month. This system was useful in keeping track of staff time and clients served that month. These reports were summarized for the director (how many consultations we all did collectively each month and with which units on campus) and printed out for our files. Different aggregations were used monthly and at the end of the year to generate numbers (counting by hand) for both our performance reviews and for our reports to administration.

As indicated, our office has always done a good job of keeping track of consultations, events, and service. Like the centers in the Chism and Szabo (1997) study, we collected a lot of data. However, one of the concerns we had about the way we were collecting and reporting the data was the tremendous amount of time it took all of us at each level—for consultants to complete the monthly reports and for our student assistants to enter event information and generate monthly summaries. Because we kept annual rather than cumulative records, much of this work had to be repeated each year. Also, despite the time invested in entering data, they were not easily accessible for everyday use. Because records were not cumulative and because much information was kept in staff files, searching for a client's history with the unit or for attendance and evaluation data for an event was difficult. In our discussions at POD sessions and in consultations with other centers, we learned that others faced similar difficulties in making good use of their data.

Another dilemma we had with the system was that as we developed new programs and offered new services, the monthly reporting system became cumbersome. The system worked fairly well in the past, but as we grew and

changed, we continually needed to add new fields, which made the database even more cumbersome. It grew by accretion without reorganization. One of the disadvantages of flat-file systems is that they can become very bulky when data only needed for some records must be attached to all records. The additional fields also required complicated and lengthy instructions for both the professional staff (to get agreement on how to report data) and for the student assistants trying to summarize data dispersed throughout individual staff reports and the event database.

More importantly, the system did not capture and communicate to others the full scope of our work. For example, like many centers, we did not keep robust data on all of the services we provided the university, such as serving on university committees, attending department committee meetings, or doing outreach both within the university and nationally. This work was a large part of what our office did, but was largely invisible in our reporting system.

Our annual report became even more of a challenge as the types of services grew and changed. Even without the new services, the program coordinator dedicated at least eight weeks every year to creating this annual report. It was a time-consuming process to go back to each individual staff person's monthly report and calculate by hand items such as how many consultations we did for faculty versus graduate teaching associates (GTAs) or the number of consultations versus the number of individual clients.

THE DATABASES

Relational Structure

Our solution was to create a system of relational databases (using FileMaker Pro) that would integrate all of our data collection into one easy system. Unlike a flat-file database, in which all data are stored in a single file, relational databases allow one to separate data among several files and to share between these files. Each file can focus on the data that are important for a specific category. For example, in our old flat-file database, each record was a person (e.g., Professor Smith), so all data had to be attached to a person. Information about a particular event (e.g., a list of the materials handed out) could not be stored efficiently in this database. With a relational system, we have one database organized around people and another organized around events. The appropriate data can be stored separately but shared between the files. Relational databases allow one to store more complete information in less space and with greater flexibility of use.

At the core of the system is our People database (see Figure 11.1). In this file, each record is a person our office has worked with. For example, Professor Smith will be entered as a record here, with her address, rank, department, etc. The key

is that Professor Smith will only be entered into the system once. Once we have her record, her information can then be shared with the other databases, so it never needs to be reentered. If we need to update her information, changes are made in the People database and it is automatically updated everywhere the record is used. Through a variety of layouts, we can print letters, address labels, nametags, attendance sheets, address lists, and a number of other forms that can now be generated almost instantly for any given group of people in our system.

FIGURE 11.1
People Database

The screenshot displays a software interface for a 'People Database'. At the top, there is a 'Close' button and a 'Calendar' section with navigation arrows. Below this is a toolbar with buttons: 'New record', 'Find records', 'Show all records', 'Sort records', 'Print reports', and 'View as list'. A status bar indicates 'Record 3 of 3 found'. The main form is titled 'Clients/Contacts' and includes an 'ID' field with a question mark icon. There are radio buttons for 'Active' and 'Inactive'. The form contains several input fields: 'First Name/Initial', 'Middle Name/Initial', 'Last Name', 'Suffix', and 'Nickname'. Below these are tabs for 'General', 'Groups', 'Consult History', 'Event History', and 'Interests'. The 'General' tab is active, showing fields for 'Dept.', 'College', 'Title', 'Room/Bldg.', 'Street Address', 'Campus', 'Phone', and 'Email'. A 'Position' section has checkboxes for 'Faculty', 'Graduate Student', 'Undergraduate', 'Administrator', 'Staff', 'Visitor', and 'Other...'. At the bottom, it shows 'Record created: 3/15/2004' and 'Last modified: 3/15/2004'.

This screen shot shows the front page of the People database. Information entered here is shared with the other databases. Information about consultations is automatically imported from the consultation database onto the "consult history" card. A list of events attended is imported onto the "event history" card.

Not only can information from the People database be used by other databases, but data from those other files can also be displayed within the People database. For example, we have a Consultations database in which every record is an individual consultation. If we meet with Professor Smith five times during the year, we will have five records for her in the Consultations

database. Each record will include information pertinent to that consultation, such as the consultant's name, type of consultation (classroom observation, office visit, etc.), date, time, time spent preparing, topics discussed, notes, and any materials provided.

These five consultation records for Professor Smith can be displayed in a portal in the People database. So when we call up her record, we see a listing of every consultation she's had with the office, even if with different consultants. A consultant can look up her record and access links to the actual consultation records in the Consultations database.

Similarly, from Professor Smith's record in the People database, we can see a list of all events that she has ever attended through another portal from the Events database. We replaced our old annual database with a cumulative Events database in which each record is an event, such as a workshop, seminar, or book group. This allows us to store information about events (e.g., topics, list of materials used) electronically so that it is easily accessible to everyone, which is particularly useful for those planning a subsequent event on similar topics.

The Events database has three other databases that feed into it (see Figure 11.2). The first, Registration, is used to register people for events, print attendance sheets, and so on. In our old system we were already registering people electronically, but with the relational system, the attendance information is automatically ported into the Events database and can be used in a number of ways. Now consultants can look at the Events database (from their desks) at any time to see how many people are registered for an upcoming event, including their departments and ranks. Likewise, we can quickly search for patterns of attendance by topic, time of day, location, or any other field (see Mullinix & Harr, 2003, for another system for using registration data).

Evaluations are typed into another database that is related to the Events database. It is easy for our student workers to enter them since the interface looks exactly like the paper evaluation forms. Averages of the quantitative responses are automatically calculated and displayed in the event record in the Events database, and the open-ended feedback can be printed out as well as viewed on screen. The time to input the evaluations is minimal, but the benefit is great. Whereas previously evaluations were kept by the staff member who facilitated the session, they are now easily accessible by all. It is useful, when planning an event, to be able to access quickly the feedback for previous, similar events. Having the feedback at hand makes it much more likely that we will actually use it in planning. We can also create summative reports quickly and easily for strategic planning purposes.

FIGURE 11.2
Events Database

The screenshot displays a software interface for an 'Events Database'. At the top, there is a 'Close' button and a 'Calendar' section with navigation arrows. Below this is a status bar showing 'Record 14 of 18 found'. The main area is titled 'Events' and contains fields for 'Event Code' (012204a) and 'Date' (01/22/04). There are radio buttons for event scope: 'Campus-wide' (selected), 'Dept./College', 'Course', and 'Group'. The 'Title of event' field contains 'Developing Effective Presentation Skills'. Below this is the 'Program/series' field with 'College Teaching Series'. There are also radio buttons for event type: 'Individual event' and 'Part of a series' (selected). A tabbed interface at the bottom has five tabs: 'General' (selected), 'Topics', 'Planning', 'Materials', and 'Feedback'. The 'General' tab shows 'Facilitators' (FTAD Staff, Kathryn Plank), 'Time' (3:30 PM to 5:00 PM), 'Location' (150 Younkin Success Center), and 'Co-sponsor(s)'. An 'Attendance list' button is present. On the right, it shows '# registered 59' and '# attended 41'. At the bottom, it says 'Thank you sent: 1/26/2004'. The footer includes 'Record created: 12/2/2003', a 'Registration' button, and 'Last modified: 3/15/2004'.

This screen shot shows the front page of the Events database. Clicking on the “plan-ning” tab reveals records ported over from the planning time database. Clicking on the “feedback” tab shows summary data from the evaluations database. The “atten-dance list” button takes the user to the registration database. The registration num-bers shown here are automatically calculated from the registration database.

The last of the three databases that feeds into the Events database is one that records the preparation time for planning an event. In our old system, staff members tracked their hours for their own staff evaluations. But in this system, the hours of all those involved are attached to the event. This practice has been very useful not only for accounting where our time goes, but more importantly, for what the cost of an event is. To do the kind of cost/benefit analysis recom-mended by Bothell and Henderson (2004), one must track the time invest-ment in an event as well as the monetary investment. With these three data-bases feeding information about attendance, evaluation, and planning time into the Events database, we now have easily accessible data that we can use to make decisions for strategic planning.

Using the System

We now have much more data to use yet spend less time collecting them than we did previously. Clients are now added into our database system only once, not each year or each time they come for a consultation as they were before because the data were not carried over. The ability to generate summative reports automatically reduces greatly the time spent on both monthly reports and annual reports. In addition, the databases function as an integrated part of our daily work life. We no longer need to wait until the end of the month, week, or even day to enter information on an event we are planning or on a consultation. The database system is easily accessible and user-friendly enough that we enter data through a calendar interface as we plan and make appointments.

Another advantage of the current system over our old reports is the use of value lists, or predefined menus. For example, in many fields, such as "department," users choose from a menu, which not only saves them time typing but also ensures consistency. We also use a value list to record topics (e.g., "teaching portfolio" or "collaborative learning"). This list of check boxes allows us to quickly indicate in a consistent manner the topic of a consultation or an event. Not only is this a useful reminder of past consultations, but it also can be used in summative analyses and needs assessment. Tracking entries entered as "other" allows the value lists to grow as needed according to observed demand.

Integration in Workflow

The new database system created a paradigm shift within our office in the sense of information ownership. For example, because files on consultations, event materials, and event evaluations were previously being housed in individual staff offices, getting information to help design an event was challenging. Also, knowing if a client had come in to see someone else for a consultation, and if so, what was discussed was difficult without asking outright. The new databases allow each of us to see immediately what services a faculty member or GTA has used (consults and events), what the overall purpose or result of a consultation was, and the planning time and materials used for any past event.

Obviously, confidentiality is a concern in our work. The databases are password protected and available only within our office, and we are careful in what we say in the notes section. We feel that sharing within the office does not violate confidentiality since our clients are clients of the office, not of us individually. Records must be kept, and electronic files are no less confidential than paper files.

Making Work Visible

Finally, one of the driving forces behind the creation of a new database system was to create a space to better include and highlight our organizational development efforts. Many assessment systems highlight individual consultations and events often because these activities are the easiest things to count. However, they are not always where we have our greatest impact or where we spend the most time. Through our Service database, we can keep track of all meetings and consultations with colleges and units on campus. Each month, we can instantly generate a report of our service, automatically categorized under headings such as "national outreach" and "university service." Previously, work such as serving on the evaluation of teaching committee could be invisible, or at least marginalized as "committee work," even if there had been a way for our office to influence change at the university level. Now such work can be captured and highlighted.

CLOSING THE LOOP

As with any complete system of evaluation, this system strives to make data available for both formative and summative purposes. Each staff member has regular access to all of the data on her or his activities and the feedback received from clients. We have already begun to use these data to inform our revision of various programs and to improve our individual consulting efforts.

The database has also become central to our team planning processes. As we discuss topics for events each term and what books to buy, we have been able to base a judgment of faculty interest on data regarding topics of inquiries and consultations. When deciding on what new major projects we wish to focus, we can base our estimates of staff time and costs on data from prior activities.

Perhaps more interestingly, an unintended outcome of the process of designing a data system to meet our specific needs has been that the entire professional staff of our center has spent time thinking about what we all do. We are more aware of each other's projects, and we spend time discussing the nature of our work. Discussions of whether a particular activity might be better classified as "outreach" for the center or "community service within the university," or whether a meeting was an "organizational development consultation" or "service on a college committee," leads us to a better understanding of what we do, how it fits into the fabric of our institution, and how we can best describe its value to our clients.

Summary reports of activities and feedback have also made it easier for each of us to provide specific evidence for the claims we make in our self-assessments for individual performance reviews. Data can be sorted by staff members and provide a much fuller and more detailed picture of our work than had been possible previously. This has made and will continue to make performance management both more efficient and more accurate.

Having access to all of these data also means that our budget requests can be supported by a wealth of evidence to show that the programming we ask to have funded meets actual needs and addresses published institutional goals. For example, when asking for funding for an initiative to support departments in providing ongoing teaching assistance to GTAs, we were able to demonstrate that the programming would require an additional staff member to succeed. The data enabled us to get that position funded.

The integrated data system has made generating the reports needed to document our work to various stakeholders—deans, chairs, advisory committee, and central administration—almost automatic. As we decided what information to collect, we took into account what questions about our work we had been asked. Also, we were influenced by a then-current institutional move to use the performance scorecard model (Chang & Morgan, 2000), which seeks to reduce the size of regular reports by aggregating large amounts of data into a few indices of success. The monthly and annual reports that were generated with so much effort prior to this system have been transformed into much briefer documents, but much more information is almost immediately available on request. The bottom line, though, is that our services be effective at meeting the stated goals of enhancing teaching and learning.

ASSESSING OUR IMPACT

Having an integrated data system also helped us see what additional data we needed to collect to meet those goals. For example, like most centers, we regularly collected evaluations at the end of programs to assess participants' satisfaction. We were less systematic, however, in following up to find out if participants ever tried anything new in their teaching as a result of the program, or whether such attempts were successful or not.

To collect such information, which we hope will document some of the outcomes of our work, we developed a general services survey that asked about all of our services, including events, consultations, and service (Appendix 11.1). We opted for a single survey covering all services for two reasons. One is that those who use a variety of our services would then receive only one survey to fill out, rather than separate surveys for events, consultations, and so on.

Second, clients who were unaware of the variety of resources offered by our offices would see what other services are available.

The survey asks clients to indicate in what ways they have interacted with us within the past year. The list includes such things as workshops, individual consultations, and assistance on grant projects. The client also selects the topic(s) addressed during the interaction, using the same list of topics as is in the database system. Next we ask them to describe in what ways, if any, they have modified their teaching as a result of the interaction. We provide a list but also supply ample space for them to add other actions.

The survey is distributed annually to one-fourth of that year's clients. The database system makes it easy to select a sample of the year's clients at random, print out the mailing labels for the distribution, and to record which clients were surveyed within a particular year. This last record prevents the same person from getting surveyed every year.

As with the databases themselves, the survey is a living document that has the ability to change as we rethink the way we operate. The information we receive back from clients helps shape decisions about event planning, resource allotment, and public relations efforts.

CONCLUSION

Given the recent history of eroding support for long-standing teaching support centers and the move toward more program assessment in other aspects of higher education, a need clearly exists for structured, systematic collection and interpretation of evaluation data on the work we do. Likewise, as the specific activities and services demanded of teaching centers and our staff members have changed over time, even the best system of assessment requires revision. However, we need to be sure that we do not spend so much time doing assessment that we cannot do the work we wish to assess.

The staff of FTAD has sought to use the principles of good practice in assessment and the available technology in database management to build a system that better meets our current needs and has the flexibility to grow and change with us. While some of the specific details of our data system are idiosyncratic, many of the elements of our system are transferable, and the process we have used to devise our system could be useful to other centers. For example, developing an integrated system that prevents duplication of effort is crucial, as is finding ways to make the system fit within daily work activities rather than be an additional layer of effort.

If the system is to aggregate the work of multiple staff members, it should be created in a collaborative process. This builds buy-in and also assures that

everyone will understand the categories of data so it will be collected consistently. More importantly, involving the entire team in the design process serves as staff development and strategic planning for the unit. A team approach also makes it much more likely that the evaluation will be used for formative purposes, both for improving individual performance and for connecting unit services to client and stakeholder needs. As with all evaluation, collecting data on teaching center activities and effectiveness should not be only for summative purposes; we must close the feedback loop and use the data to get better at what we do.

Finally, as we tell faculty all the time about evaluation of teaching, we can no longer (if we ever could) be excellent simply by assertion. The culture of evidence in higher education has spread to assessment of teaching quality, student outcomes, and academic programs. We should welcome it to the evaluation of the work of educational development programs, too. We know that teaching centers do outstanding work; we need to build the structures that let us prove it.

REFERENCES

- Allen, M. J., McMillin, J. D., Noel, R. C., & Rienzi, B. M. (1999, June). *Outcomes assessment for program improvement*. Paper presented at the California State University Teacher-Scholar Summer Conference, San Jose, CA.
- American Association for Higher Education. (1997). *9 principles of good practice for assessing student learning*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved May 6, 2004, from <http://www.aahe.org/assessment/principles.htm>
- Banta, T. W., Lund, J. P., Black, K. E., & Oblander, F. W. (1996). *Assessment in practice: Putting principles to work on college campuses*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bothell, T. W., & Henderson, T. (2004). Evaluating the return on investment of faculty development. In C. M. Wehlburg & S. Chadwick-Blossey (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 22. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 52-70). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Chang, R. Y., & Morgan, M. W. (2000). *Performance scorecards: Measuring the right things in the real world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chism, N. V. N. (2003, March 14). Summary of responses on user records. Message posted to POD electronic mailing list, archived at <http://listserv.nd.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0303&L=pod&O=A&P=7509>

- Chism, N. V. N., & Szabo, B. (1997). How faculty development programs evaluate their services. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development*, 15(2), 55-62.
- Milloy, P. M., & Brooke, C. (2004). Beyond bean counting: Making faculty development needs assessment more meaningful. In C. M. Wehlburg & S. Chadwick-Blossey (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 22. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 71-92). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Mullinix, B. B., & Harr, C. (2003). *Faculty-centered program development*. West Long Branch, NJ: Monmouth University, Faculty Resource Center. Retrieved December 11, 2003, from <http://its.monmouth.edu/trainingGuest/POD-BIA/Mullinix-Harr%20BIA-FacCentrDev-HO.doc>
- Walvoord, B. E., & Anderson, V. J. (1998). *Effective grading: A tool for learning and assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIX 11.1

SERVICE EVALUATION

1) What was your primary goal in contacting FTAD?

2) What topic(s) was/were addressed? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Modes of teaching (lecture, laboratory, cooperative learning, etc.)
- ☐ Evaluation of learning (testing, grading)
- ☐ Assessment of teaching (SEI, other)
- ☐ Course preparation
- ☐ Students (rapport, classroom management)
- ☐ Diversity
- ☐ Teaching with technology
- ☐ Scholarship of teaching
- ☐ Teaching portfolio/philosophy statement
- ☐ Professional development
- ☐ Other: _____

**3) Please indicate and rate the service(s) provided.
(Check all that apply.)**

	Value				
	Not at all			Extremely	
<input type="checkbox"/> Face-to-face consultation	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Consultation by phone or email	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Administer mid-quarter feedback activity	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Review of student evaluations of instruction	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom observation	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom videotaping and consultation	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Used information resources (library, web site, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Participation in Faculty Learning Community	1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Committee meeting(s) attended by FTAD staff	1	2	3	4	5

_____ Departmental consultation with FTAD	1	2	3	4	5
_____ Grant preparation assistance	1	2	3	4	5
_____ Attended unit event where FTAD participated	1	2	3	4	5
_____ Attended FTAD-sponsored event	1	2	3	4	5
_____ Other_____	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:**4) To what extent did you change your teaching as a result of your work with us?**

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 A great deal

5) Using the (non-exhaustive!) list below, please indicate any changes you made as a result of your interaction with us. (Check all that apply.)

- _____ Tried a new teaching technique
- _____ Modified presentation/delivery techniques
- _____ Modified student discussion techniques
- _____ Redesigned evaluation methods/materials
- _____ Implemented/changed methods of collecting and using student feedback
- _____ Redesigned course syllabus
- _____ Revised class policies
- _____ Implemented techniques to make classroom more inclusive
- _____ Took steps to create a more civil classroom climate
- _____ Used instructional technology a different amount or in a new way
- _____ Became more scholarly about my teaching/ designed and implemented a study of my teaching
- _____ Modified materials in my teaching portfolio
- _____ Devised a professional development plan

Other(s):

6) Please give examples of the one or two most important changes indicated in Question 5.

7) How can we improve our service?

8) Please circle your academic rank:

Full professor

Assistant professor

Graduate student

Associate professor

Lecturer

Other: _____