University of La Verne

External Reviewer's Report
on
Program Review of the Center for Teaching and Learning

July 8, 2010

Prepared by
External Reviewer

Hye Ok Park
Director of eLearning
Division of Instructional & Information Technology
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

This External Reviewer's Report is based on:

- The draft program review and self-study, dated June 7, 2010, prepared by Lisa Rodriguez, Director, Center for Teaching and Learning, received by the reviewer on June 8, 2010
- The site visit with the program department on June 8, 2010
- The final version of the program review and self-study, dated June 10, 2010, received by the reviewer on June 24, 2010

Program Goals and Objectives

The Vision and Mission Statements were provided clearly and followed by five Department Goals and Objectives that were well-articulated, deemed realistic and appropriate for the type of service organization the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is. Their goals are in line with the stated mission of supporting faculty, students, and staff of the university with their use of academic technology; the objectives speak to the specifics on how to achieve the stated goals to improve faculty use of technology in the classroom and online teaching and to increase student learning outcomes. Each of the goals is well-aligned with the University's Strategic Goals.

Program/Department Capacity, Strengths and Challenges

As described in the report, the CTL has evolved from the Instructional Technology Center (ITC) providing instructional media production and audio-visual support in 2004 to its current program, merged with the distance learning program in 2005. The current location, although temporary and transitional with the possibility of "eventual relocation" in late 2011, has a pleasant layout, conducive for face-to-face consultation for faculty. It is, however, removed from the main campus by a few blocks, requiring the users to make a conscientious effort to visit the center. Had it been located near the center of the campus, it might be able to attract higher volume of foot traffic and visibility. The instructional facility, located in the Wilson Library, does provide convenience to the faculty attending workshops.

The organizational structure with the CTL Director reporting directly to the AVP for Academic Student Retention Services under the Provost and VP of Academic Affairs puts the center in a great position to be in line with other academic support units and provides with opportunities for the Director to regularly attend meetings and collaborate with her peers and partners such as the university library and OIT.

The staffing level of the CTL is a bit below the average of comparison institutions with only one instructional designer, although very well-qualified, who serves as the Assistant Director and the lead instructor for the certification for teaching hybrid and online courses, supported by one other instructional administrator who oversees and maintains the CTL facility, relying heavily on student assistants. As the operation appears to be running very efficiently with limited resources, additional staffing may be warranted in order for the center to expand its reach to serve more faculty and students adequately.

The description of the programs and services is very well articulated, giving a clear picture of:

- Workshops and faculty presentations on various timely topics provided
- Instructional design and certification for hybrid and online teaching programs supported
- Blackboard Help Desk and training on Bb use and media production provided

The annual operating budget of $349,669 in 2009-2010, as presented in the report, seems adequate to support the CTL, although it is not clear how much of it is spent on directly supporting the Center's operation, Blackboard and other contracts. The mention of monies being spent on Wilson Library's Lexis/Nexis subscriptions, Smart Classroom installation, and remote campus labs leaves the reviewer with an unclear understanding of the budget allocations.

Methods and Procedures to Assess Program Effectiveness

Assessment method by employing numerous faculty and staff surveys conducted over the past five years, either on campus or as part of national surveys, such as ECAR Survey, student technology measurements, faculty certification, post-certification annual progress assessment, workshop evaluations, and technology use surveys have yielded abundant data and findings to guide the CTL in self-assessment and planning for the future.

The findings, as articulated in the report, indicate an overall satisfaction of the faculty and students who use CTL's services on Blackboard support, workshops and presentations. The report specifically mentions the challenges and effectiveness of supporting adjunct faculty as a "distant population" at Regional Campuses of ULV. Through the efforts of the CTL over the past few years, however, 83% of the adjunct, remote faculty responded positively on their satisfaction of technology training they have received.

The certification process for faculty in the pedagogy and practice of hybrid and online teaching is remarkable in terms of numbers of faculty already certified and in process, considering the fact that only one instructional designer with occasional support of the Director is responsible for the entire process.

Action Recommendations

The recommendations, presented in order of priority in the self-review report, are found to be appropriate for the program and will undoubtedly enhance its current strengths and enable the CTL to grow and to expand its reach in the coming years.

Respectfully Submitted,

Hye Ok Park,

Program Review Assessment Rubric

Rating scale

4 = Exceeds Expectations (All elements of the criteria are met with exceptional clarity and specificity, content is very well organized, easy to follow and appropriately documented when needed)

3 = Meets Expectations (All elements of the criteria are met, with adequate specificity and documentation when needed, and content is fairly well organized and easy to follow)

2 = Needs Improvement (Most elements of the criteria are met with some specificity, documentation when presented is not always clear, and the content is adequately organized but difficult to follow in places)

1 = Unsatisfactory (Elements of the criteria are mentioned with significant pieces missing or lack specificity, and documentation when presented is mostly unclear, and content is lack cohesion and is difficult to follow)

Criteria

A. Executive Summary

Criteria	4	3	2	1
A1. Organization and flow	**④**	3	2	1
A2. Listing of learning outcomes	4	**③**	2	1
A3. Description of the assessment process	**④**	3	2	1
A4. Summary of findings	4	**③**	2	1
A5. Identification of action recommendations	**④**	3	2	1

B. Learning Outcomes and Goals

Criteria	4	3	2	1
B1. Appropriately specific	**④**	3	2	1
B2. Phrased using action words	**④**	3	2	1
B3. Stated in measurable terms	4	**③**	2	1
B4. Includes institution-wide learning outcomes	4	**③**	2	1

C. Capacity and Program Description

C1. Qualifications and roles of full-time faculty _Staff_   (4)   3   2   1

    are described

C2. Engagement and role of adjunct faculty _Staff_   4   (3)   2   1
    are described

C3. Academic majors, minors, graduates and FTE   4   (3)   2   1

    students are tracked

C4. Advising process and load issues are evaluated   4   3   2   1   N/A

C5. Curriculum map (Alignment of learning outcomes   4   3   2   1   N/A

    with courses) is presented

C6. Course rotation and scheduling of courses are evaluated   4   3   2   1   N/A

C7. Resources and facilities are evaluated   (4)   3   2   1

D. Learning Outcome Assessment Procedures

D1. Use of at least 1 or 2 direct performance measures   4   (3)   2   1

    (Comp exams, senior project, performance

    judgments, etc) are described

D2. Senior exit surveys address learning outcomes   4   (3)   2   1

    and capacity issues

D3. Alumni surveys address learning outcomes and   4   3   2   1   N/A

    career advancement

D4. Data sources and assessment methods are reliable   4   (3)   2   1

D5. Stakeholder (other than students) input is   4   (3)   2   1

    obtained regarding learning outcomes

    and program capacity

E. Findings

E1. Each learning outcomes is explicitly addressed   4   (3)   2   1

E2. Data are presented clearly in easy to read format   4   (3)   2   1
    and narrative

E3. Degree of attainment of learning outcomes are   (4)   3   2   1

       Appropriately inferred

E4. Areas that need improvement are identified   (4)   3   2   1

F. Action Recommendations

F1. Action recommendations are evidence based   (4)   3   2   1

F2. Action recommendations are aimed at improving   (4)   3   2   1

       the program

F3. Action recommendations address capacity   (4)   3   2   1

       issues as well as learning outcomes

G. Appendices

G1. Appendices are labeled clearly   4   (3)   2   1

G2. Appendices add value to the text   (4)   3   2   1

G3. Appendices are referred to in the text   (4)   3   2   1

H. Comments and suggestions

No additional comments.

Submitted by,
Idye Ok Park
July 8, 2010