

Learner-Centered Education Grants

2 0 0 4 Final Report

1. Project Name and Project Director's Name. Include mailing address, phone and e-mail address.

Project Name: Tri-University Collaboration on Learner-Centered Practice: Creating Learning Communities Among Faculty & Students

Director Name: Judy Grace (Arizona State University); Linda Shadiow (Northern Arizona University) (Jeane Spada-Allgood named as NAU PI); Elizabeth Harrison (University of Arizona)

Address: c/o Faculty Development Program
Northern Arizona University
P.O. Box 4131
Flagstaff, AZ 86011-4131

Phone: 928-523-8883

E-Mail: jeane.spada-allgood@nau.edu

2. Brief Description of Project:

The intent of the current project was to develop a critical mass of faculty at the three Regents institutions who will engage in the study of learner-centered instructional practice, apply what they learn, assess the impact of what they learn, and share their learning with other faculty through workshops, mentoring, web-based materials, and videotapes at their own and each other's universities. They will also develop a plan to promote learner-centered instructional philosophies and practices to their own departments and colleges to ensure broader institutional commitment to and wider adoption of learner

3. Goals, Outcomes and Assessments

The primary goal of this project was for the three state universities to collaborate in a learning community comprised of faculty, academic professionals, graduate teaching assistants, and students to accomplish three major objectives: 1) Explore, identify, and implement learner-centered teaching strategies in a minimum of 70 classes by the Spring 2005; 2) Apply existing classroom assessment models and techniques to determine which instructional approaches best produce the desired learning outcomes; and 3) Develop a faculty development process model through which the continued exploration and implementation of learner-centered instructional practice can expand to become commonplace in higher educational environments in which the lecture method still dominates.

Secondary goals include:

- Increasing the use of learner-centered instructional strategies and understanding how learner-centered instructional strategies enhance student learning;
- Increasing faculty use of classroom assessment techniques to determine the effectiveness of their instructional practices;
- Stimulating dialogue on each campus and among campuses to gain insight about what factors would increase both the faculty's implementation of learner-centered instructional strategies and the use of classroom assessment strategies in the tri-university system.

Learner-Centered Education Grants

Outcomes and Assessment for each Goal:

Date	Project Goal	Objectives	Status
Feb/March 2004	Planning	Faculty development units at the participant universities work with each other and with first round participant faculty to develop the content and process for the second round.	Representatives from faculty development (LCE grant) units met together on 1/26 (at ASU), 3/5 (at Tucson), 4/26 (at ASU to plan the June retreat)
April 2004	Selection	Identify 12 new faculty, 3 returning faculty, 1 graduate student and 2 undergraduate students from each university.	New faculty and TAs, returning faculty and TAs identified at each institution. Selection processes were determined locally. No undergraduates were included.
May/June 2004	Initial learning community meeting	<p>Learning community convenes in Tucson for a two-day meeting in early June to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Learn LCE strategies, and then identify specific strategies that participants will explore in their Fall 2004 classes. 2. Explore and select appropriate assessment models for measuring student outcomes. 	<p>Retreat held 6/9-11 at El Conquistador Resort, Tucson.</p> <p>Sessions included: The Landscape of Learning, Understanding Learner Differences, Universal Design for Learning, LCE Instructional Strategies, LCE Assessment Strategies, The Learner-centered Syllabus, and small group working sessions on instructional and assessment strategies.</p> <p>Feedback from all participants was resoundingly positive.</p> <p>Organizers met 6/28 (at ASU) to debrief, plan Aug retreat. Participants in Tucson retreat: (faculty/TAs includes returnees) ASU—14 faculty/TAs, 6 staff NAU—13 faculty/TAs, 2 returnees, 1 staff UA—16 faculty/TAs, 10 guest faculty/TAs, 8 staff</p>
June/Aug 2004	Preparation	Participants refine their work plan and prepare materials for use when classes begin in August.	All faculty/TA participants turned in drafts of revised Fall 2004 course syllabuses by July 20 for feedback and use at the Flagstaff retreat.

Learner-Centered Education Grants

Date	Project Goal	Objectives	Status
Aug 2004	Summer Work Report Meeting	Convene in Flagstaff (two days) to report on the results of summer work and share and critique plans for implementation of learner-centered principles in Fall 2004 classes.	<p>Retreat held 8/8-10 at Little America Resort, Flagstaff.</p> <p>Invited guest: Mary Huba (ISU), national expert on LCE assessment, did sessions on LC Assessment in Your Courses, Formulating Intended Learning Outcomes, Using Rubrics to Promote and Assess Learning, and gave feedback on syllabus revisions.</p> <p>Other sessions included: LC Instructional Activities, Letting Students Do the Work in a Large Introductory Course, and a lunch working session on departmental and institutional challenges.</p> <p>Participants at Flagstaff retreat: ASU—14 faculty/TAs, 6 staff/facilitators NAU—13 faculty/TAs, 11 guest faculty/TA/staff, 3 staff UA—13 faculty/TAs, 1 guest, 6 staff</p>
Aug/May 2005	Sharing	<p>Use technology (active web site, possibly teleconferencing) to support inter-university collaboration such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sharing reports of participants' experiences are making. 2. Identifying challenges and possible solutions. 3. Providing peer support. 	<p>An LCE web site has been designed and posted at <http://lce.arizona.edu/> .)</p> <p>The site opening has been delayed due to decision of IRB on Human Subjects, but will open in August 2005.</p> <p>At UA, participants were required to attend 3 of 4 monthly meetings during the fall semester to discuss LCE issues. Meetings typically included a presentation related to LCE by a faculty or staff member and discussion of classroom LCE issues of concern to those in attendance. All but 1 of the regular participants attended the required number of meetings; several participants attended all four.</p>
Aug/May 2004	Individual Institution Activities	<p>Participants at each university:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attend and lead regularly scheduled 1 ½ hour meetings to discuss progress and problems. Invite other interested faculty and graduate students to attend. 2. Plan and lead two interventions per semester in which they advocate for the use of LCE principles in teaching. Examples: workshops for other faculty, presentations to and demonstrations for department meetings and administrators. 	<p>Meetings will continue in the spring semester, and participant faculty will be asked to plan and carry out one presentation or demonstration related to LCE for their respective departments. Participants will also help develop a plan/model for campus-wide implementation of LCE strategies.</p> <p>At ASU, in addition to informal meetings, participants attended a web cast on LCE and one on assessment.</p>

Learner-Centered Education Grants

Date	Project Goal	Objectives	Status
Jan 2005	Dissemination	Participants from both rounds met in Tempe (one day) to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present and discuss results of following LCE principles in their classes. 2. Plan an open forum to be hosted at each campus at which they will discuss what they have learned with interested faculty, graduate students, and administrators. 3. Host a poster session on projects with invited campus leadership 4. Develop a working model for advocacy of LCE on each campus. Note: NAU was snowed in for this event, but later met on their campus to review materials and do evaluation interviews.	Representatives met 10/4 (at ASU) to debrief Flagstaff retreat, plan for January 5 th retreat at ASU Sessions were determined through needs assessment after Flagstaff retreat and include breakouts on Critical Thinking, Enhancing LCE with Technology, Diversity in the Classroom, and Creating Accessibility Learning by Design: LCE through Universal Design Pictures available at cite.asu.edu/LCEretreat .
February 2005-May 2005	Individual Campus Activities		Participants met and/or hosted individual campus activities including on-line workshops given by Mary Ellen Weimer (on LCE) and Doug Elder (on Assessment); participants hosted brown bags on relevant topics; participants offered department-level workshops on LCE.
May 2005	Grant application for additional year	Expand impact of grant activities and encourage participation	Refunded for 2005-2006

Note: Representatives of the faculty development units from the three universities have worked together effectively and collegially to develop and implement the retreats for the grant program in learner-centered ways. For example, decisions about format and content at the retreats were based largely on needs expressed by participants and on feedback collected at the end of retreats (from both Round 1 & 2).

June, August, and January retreats received overwhelmingly positive feedback from participants.

Learner-Centered Education Grants
2004 ABOR Learner Centered Retreat Feedback/Evaluation

Flagstaff Retreat

Q#	Items	Rating	Total
1	Hotel Arrangements	3.72	On 4.00
2	Meals	3.42	On 4.00
3	Books provided	3.84	On 4.00
4	Handouts	3.81	On 4.00
5	Learning in Group Sessions	3.65	On 4.00
6	Application of Group Session	3.76	On 4.00
7	Activities of Group Session	3.13	On 4.00
8	Overall Retreat Rating	3.25	On 4.00

Tucson Retreat

Q#	Items	Rating	Total
1	Hotel arrangements	4.06	on 5.00
2	Meals	3.19	on 4.00
3	Books provided	4.21	on 5.00
4	Handouts	3.68	on 4.00
5	Learning in Group Sessions	3.41	on 4.00
6	Application of Group Sessions	3.46	on 4.00
7	Small Group	3.38	on 4.00
6	Overall Rating	3.02	on 4.00

Tempe Retreat

Q#	Items	Rating	Total
1	Hotel Arrangements	3.78	On 4.00
2	Meals	3.85	On 4.00
3	Handouts	3.50	On 4.00
4	Poster Session	3.38	On 4.00
5	Small Groups	3.46	On 4.00
6	Overall Retreat Rating	4.35	On 5.00

Learner-Centered Education Grants

4. Problems or Issues Encountered:

As with the past grant, most issues related to distributing costs and resources across institutions. We make some changes from the first grant period to facilitate the administration of the grant. For example, we had one institution buy all the books and then distribute them rather than have each institution buy books for the participating faculty.

We lost our staff person who was writing the evaluation, so we have asked an intern from ASU Educational Leadership and Policy Studies to assist us on this effort.

An overarching problem, that is philosophical and pragmatic is that faculty continue to perceive that the institutional rewards system does not favor investment in teaching. In our case, the Provosts from each institution came to the meetings held at their campuses, but P&T decisions are made at the department level.

5. Conclusions, Recommendations and Future Directions:

The work needs to be continued, and will be through the continuation of the grant. However, each institution needs to work to keep the practice of learner-centered teaching visible and have resources readily available to faculty.

6. Has this project led to sustainable change in your department/college? Describe:

The number of LCE resources available through our department, both in print and electronic format, has been increased.

This grant served as a catalyst for a learner-centered education model for faculty development offerings. Many of the workshops originally developed for this project have been expanded and made available to all campus faculty. Grant participants have facilitated some of these sessions as well as several at the department level. Additionally, the majority of sessions organized through our unit now incorporate LCE principles.

7. Impact:

a. Have other faculty been affected by this project? Yes No. If so, describe:

There is an increased awareness of and opportunity to develop learner-centered educational practice. The community created through this and the previous grant continues to grow and to share methods and ideas across disciplines.

Additionally, although not an intended outcome, one of the participating faculty from U of A was featured in a PBS documentary "Declining by Degrees." This faculty member was identified as one who had participated in the university faculty development efforts and had transformed his teaching.

b. Number of courses affected/involved.

Approximately 85 courses were directly impacted. It is hoped that additional impact occurred through participants' efforts at their department level.

c. Number of students affected.

Approximately 2250.

Learner-Centered Education Grants

8. Significant Outcome:

What was the most significant outcome based on learner-centered principles that occurred through your project?

On all three campuses, there is an increased literacy about learner-centered education. We see this in the questions we get from faculty about resources and opportunities related to LCE and in the nature of workshops being offered across campus.

The community building at the three retreats (and those from previous years) remains as the best evidence that LCE is of interest to faculty and that it does matter.