

May 8, 2006

**TO:** Ed Tech Committee

**FROM:** Andrew Bonamici & Dale Smith

**SUBJECT:** Initial results from Ed Tech Survey: Instructors

Attached is a summary of the 2006 Ed Tech survey results, including open entry comments. Here is an overview of some of the highlights:

The survey was opened on March 17 and closed on April 14. All instructional faculty and GTFs were eligible to participate. Participation was solicited through a link on the UO Faculty-Staff homepage, Libraries home page, an article in the *Inside Oregon* faculty-staff newsletter, two e-mailings to Deans, Directors, and Department Heads, and direct campus mail to all faculty and GTFs.

We received 141 faculty responses, a return rate of 9.77%. In comparing response rates from various schools and colleges to the Fall 2005 *UO Profile*, we note higher than predicted faculty response rates from LCB (7.77%), CAS (5.68%), and JCOMM (4.8%). The median across all schools/colleges is -1.01% below predicted representation. We have not yet analyzed whether or not the CAS faculty response is representative across the three major divisions of Humanities, Sciences, and Social Sciences.

We received 24 GTF responses, a return rate of 1.97%. In comparing response rates from various schools and colleges to the Fall 2005 *UO Profile*, we note higher than predicted GTF response rates from all schools except Music (-1.83%) and the "Other" category. The median across all schools/colleges is 1.17% over predicted representation. We have not yet analyzed whether or not the CAS GTF response is representative across the three major divisions of Humanities, Sciences, and Social Sciences.

These response rates are disappointingly low. The University of Washington had a response rate of 34.4% for a comparable 2005 survey that was also open to all instructional faculty and graduate assistants. We suggest using a random sample for future faculty surveys to reduce the likelihood of selection bias. This being said, the distribution appears to be at least generally representative (median school/college response for faculty is -1.01% below predicted; for GTFs +1.17% above predicted).

#### **LAPTOP ACCESS FOR INSTRUCTION**

A relatively high number of respondents (**75%**) report having access to a dedicated laptop. Several open-entry comments reveal that lack of access to a decent laptop is a serious disincentive to use of technology in the classroom.

#### **GENERAL PERCEPTIONS ABOUT EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY:**

In regard to undergraduate teaching and learning within their academic disciplines, the vast majority of respondents are aware of colleagues at the UO or elsewhere who make effective use of educational technology in their undergraduate instruction (**89% agree; 2% disagree**), and believe that educational technology has potential for enhancing the undergraduate student learning experience in my area of expertise (**88% agree, 4% disagree**). Instructors are also comfortable learning to use the educational technologies needed for their UO teaching (**86% agree, 4% disagree**).

A much lower number of instructors indicate that their courses prepare students to use technology in their discipline or career field (**50% agree, 25% disagree**).

Respondents were positive about encouraging faculty to acquire at basic technology skills (**86% agree, 4% disagree**), and to inform students of the technologies required in each course (**82% agree, 4% disagree**). Respondents were negative about online quizzes and exams (**16% agree, 48% neutral, 31% disagree**) and accepting course assignments electronically (**37% agree, 36% neutral, 27% disagree**). Open entry comments suggest that concerns about academic integrity may underlie resistance to adopting these technologies.

Respondents are of mixed opinion concerning evaluation of instructors in their use technology: (**36% agree, 36% neutral, 23% disagree**). This closely mirrors the University of Washington's faculty response to the same question: (**35.3% agree, 34.7% neutral, 30% disagree**).

Most respondents do not find technology too difficult to use (**88%**) or time-consuming to incorporate (**76%**).

#### **LIBRARY RESOURCES:**

Instructors find online library resources easy to find and use (**69%**). This does not necessarily translate into curricular integration of library resources (**36% high importance; 33% low importance, 23% no opinion**) or full-text reading assignments (**37% high importance; 28% low importance, 26% no opinion**).

#### **CLASSROOMS:**

The majority of instructors report that their assigned classrooms are properly equipped with A/V equipment (**68% agree, 8% neutral, 17% disagree**). This is slightly better than reported satisfaction with equipment in offices and labs where instruction is prepared (**63% agree, 14% neutral, 19% disagree**). The majority of respondents also find classroom equipment generally easy to use (**59% agree, 17% neutral, 17% disagree**) and reliable (**58% agree, 18% neutral, 18% disagree**).

Other aspects of the classroom environment received lower ratings and a high number of open-entry comments. This includes adequacy of location and size of instructor consoles and podiums (**46% agree, 29% disagree**), classroom furnishings that accommodate preferred teaching methods (**43% agree, 34% disagree**), and basic facilities such as lighting and chalkboards (**49% agree, 30% disagree**).

#### **TECHNOLOGIES USED MOST FREQUENTLY/INFREQUENTLY:**

A few technologies are used by a majority of respondents at least weekly: computer in the classroom (**66%**), data or video projector (**62%**), course websites on Blackboard (55%), and presentation software such as PowerPoint (**51%**). Many other technologies are never used by the majority of respondents, including video conferencing (**91%**), 35mm slide projectors (**84%**), still images (**54%**), and online discussion boards (**54%**).

#### **SKILL LEVELS:**

The majority of instructors rate their own skill level as intermediate or higher with the tools that are most frequently used: computer in the classroom (**79%**), presentation software (**76%**),

data or video projector (**51%**), course websites on Blackboard (**58%**).

#### **ONLINE COURSE INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS:**

The majority of respondents reported online course syllabi (**63%**) and grades and progress reports (**55%**) as “very important or extremely important” to their students. On the other end of the spectrum, video archives of lectures (**59%**) and audio archives/podcasts (**59%**) were “not very important” or “not important at all.”

#### **COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT**

As mentioned above, the majority of respondents (**75%**) have access to their own wireless-capable laptop for use in the classroom. A lower number (**49%**) report a wireless-capable laptop as their primary computer. Operating systems are Windows (**55%**), Mac OS (**41%**), and Other (**4%**). The majority of computers (**55%**) were purchased with UO funds; however, a significant minority (**28%**) are privately owned by the instructor. The majority of computers (**55%**) are at least two years old.

#### **ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS, QUESTIONS, FOLLOW-UP RECOMMENDATIONS, AND ACTION ITEMS:**

Additional points that stand out in reviewing both the summary results and open-entry comments:

- there is strong opposition to mandating anything.
- instructors feel strongly that the appropriateness of technology depends on the course.
- although a substantial number of faculty (47%) report that putting lecture notes online is “important or very important” to their students, a substantial minority (25%) are opposed, and several provided very negative comments about this practice. This will be interesting to compare with student responses.
- There is general satisfaction with the quality of the support, but there's not enough of it.

1. What questions/issues should be followed up with focus groups?

2. What questions/issues should be probed in the follow-up student survey?

3. What specific immediate action items could be pursued based on these findings? Examples might include:

Classroom Committee: In response to relatively low satisfaction with consoles and podiums, involve a wider range of faculty end-users in this aspect of design, beginning with this summer's projects.

Libraries: In response to the relatively low use of online library resources and full-text reading assignments in the curriculum, provide more outreach, training, and support for integration of e-reserves and other online information resources into Blackboard.

Faculty, with support from Libraries CET, Academic Learning Services, and other academic support units: Explore opportunities to prepare students to use technology in their discipline or career field by integrating technology into the curriculum, beyond instructor use of presentation tools. [current example: Suzanne Clark's “New Research” symposium]

#### **OTHER IDEAS FROM COMMITTEE???**

