



Advancing Students' Professional Excellence with Certificates in Teaching Series

# ASPECTS

## Presenters' Debrief

Report submitted by  
Mark L. Decker

with assistance from  
Erika Gosser  
Suzanne Rhodes



# Aspects

---

Advancing Students' Professional Excellence with Certificates in Teaching Series

<i>Executive Summary</i> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>Process</i> .....	<b>5</b>
<i>Findings</i> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Facilities</b> —.....	<b>7</b>
<b>Sessions</b> — .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Scheduling</b> — .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Grading students</b> — .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Communications</b> — .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Support materials</b> — .....	<b>9</b>
<i>Next Steps</i> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Appendices—</b>	
<b>Appendix I: Presenters and Sessions</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix II: E-mail to ASPECTS Presenters 4/12/2005</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix III: Compiled Responses to E-mail Questions</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix IV: Session Evaluations by Series—Quantitative Data</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix V: Certificate Series—Goals and Associated Sessions</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix VI: Debrief Agenda</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix VII: Notes—Collected and Provided by Carolyn Thomas</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix VIII: Prioritized Recommendations by Category</b> .....	<b>29</b>

## Executive Summary

DIIA professional development opportunities for graduate student instructors (GSIs) were offered under the auspices of ASPECTS (Advancing Students' Professional Excellence with Certificates in Teaching Series) beginning on September 1, 2004.

From September 1, 2004 until April 19, 2005 there were 139 offerings of the 29 ASPECTS-affiliated sessions. Out of 263 unique ASPECTS registrants, 78 percent (N=204) attended at least one session. These 204 unique attendees attended on average 3.46 sessions for a total of 706 session seats. Each session had an average of 5.06 attendees. [This number is slightly skewed since many Teaching with Technology sessions (i.e., eGradebook, Blackboard, etc.) are also open to faculty attendees.]

As of July 28, 2005, eighteen ASPECTS certificates have been awarded.

The presenter debriefing session is a component of an ongoing program evaluation process. The goal of this session was to systematically gather feedback about program support from ASPECTS' presenters. Specifically, we wanted to know what worked well and what could have been better within the following support categories—*facilities, sessions, scheduling, grading students, communications and support materials*.

### Lessons Learned: An Overview of Opportunities for Improvement

The insights gained from the debriefing process illuminate several key opportunities for refinement and growth in the areas of student attendance, session location, session registration, and ASPECTS essay requirements.

- Creating and posting ASPECTS session attendance policy will help to cut down on the numbers of “late arrivals” and no-shows by session registrants.
- Consistency of session locations is a critical area for improvement. In order for students and presenters to find sessions easily and on time, presenters underscored the need for central, accessible classroom locations.
- Improving the ASPECTS registration system to enable students to track their ASPECTS session attendance will increase the program's overall efficiency.
- Clarifying student essay requirements for obtaining an ASPECTS certificate will help streamline the essay review and grading process.
- Revising the ASPECTS evaluation form to include a Scantron component will further increase program efficiency.

## Process

On June 6, 2005, Mark Decker and Suzanne Rhodes facilitated a debriefing session with the DIIA staff and other University personnel who had served as ASPECTS session presenters during the program's first two full semesters. This presenter debriefing session was an integral component of an evaluation plan designed to engage providers, stakeholders, and clients in an ongoing program review and improvement process.

All ASPECTS session presenters (see Appendix I: Presenters and Sessions) were invited to participate in the debriefing process. Several weeks prior to the actual debrief (April 12, 2005) presenters were sent an e-mail (see Appendix II: E-mail to ASPECTS Presenters 4/12/2005) asking them to respond to three questions:

- ⊗ *What has worked well--from marketing to registration to certificate--and what can be done to make it better?*
- ⊗ *What should we do that we are not doing?*
- ⊗ *What should we not be doing?*

An analysis of the responses (see Appendix III: Compiled Responses to E-mail Questions) to these questions resulted in the creation of six categories around which to focus the debriefing session— *facilities, sessions, scheduling, grading students communications, and support materials*.

Although post-session evaluations were not the debrief focus, as a professional courtesy, personalized reports were provided to individual presenters that included quantitative data based on all responses to the presentation skills' questions and compiled responses to several open-ended questions. All ASPECTS presenters were provided quantitative data (see Appendix IV: Session Evaluations by Series—Quantitative Data), grouped by series (see Appendix V: Certificate Series—Goals and Associated Sessions). In part, this data was provided to the presenters so that they would know that based on the post-session evaluations, attendees, overall, were satisfied with ASPECTS. Moreover, this approach reinforced the debrief purpose—to determine presenter satisfaction with support services offered by GSI Program staff.

Presenters were informed of these categories in a separate e-mail message which included a debrief agenda (see Appendix VI: Debrief Agenda).

As part of the debriefing process, presenters were asked “What worked well?” and “What could have worked better?” for each category. Responses were documented on large post-its that were placed on the walls of the conference room. Once all categories were explored, attendees suggested ideas for improving support. These suggestions were prioritized by presenters who had been given two “green dots” each and asked to place them on suggestions or issues that demanded immediate resolution.

Carolyn Thomas took comprehensive notes (see Appendix VII: Notes—Collected and Provided by Carolyn Thomas) during the debriefing session. Session facilitators used these notes, along with digital captures of the “post-its” to analyze presenter input.

## Findings

A key component of the debrief analysis was to examine and interpret the prioritized items by category. (See Appendix VIII: Prioritized Recommendations by Category for visual breakdown of this prioritization.)

**Facilities**—Presenters liked the fact that MAI 26 was easy to configure; however, the software on the room’s computer did not meet all presenters’ needs. Except for one small, inaccessible room, the ACES rooms were comfortable, and the technology in those rooms was easy to use. Presenters also appreciated that most rooms had whiteboards with erasers and markers.

Accessibility and consistency of ASPECTS session location are important issues for ASPECTS presenters. Locked rooms, particularly MAI 26, posed a challenge. Room location, as well, is important to consider when selecting classrooms for ASPECTS sessions. One room, ACE 2.404B, was reported as difficult for both presenters and students to locate.

Underscoring the theme of accessibility, all presenters recommended that ASPECTS sessions be held in one regular location. In fall 2004, many sessions were held in FAC 228D (with the exception of those technology sessions that were held in GSB 2.130, the DIIA Multimedia Lab). This allowed attendees and presenters to become comfortable with room location and setup. In spring 2005, due to renovations in FAC, sessions were distributed around campus. Sites included Main 26, ACE 2.404B, ACE 3.116, ACE 3.408 and the Life Science Library (MAI 220).

(Other sessions, taught by general libraries staff in fall 2004 and spring 2005, were consistently held in the PCL.)

**Sessions**—Presenters appreciated the diversity of the student attendees. This diversity resulted in rich discussions that helped minimize discipline-specific concerns. In addition, cultural challenges—personalized by input from international student attendees—highlighted challenges from the perspective of both the graduate student instructor as well as undergraduate students.

Presenters noted that some registrants, especially towards the end of the semester, did not show up for sessions or they showed up late, disrupting a session for the rest of the attendees.

Presenters also reported that some students were disengaged because they either knew the materials, or they believed that they knew the materials. Other students clearly attended sessions because they wanted a certificate, not because they necessarily wanted to learn.

There was some concern that some content overlapped across sessions. Students who frequented ASPECTS sessions tended to be cognizant of this overlap sooner than presenters.

**Scheduling**—Overall, ASPECTS scheduling was reported to be a smooth process. Presenters viewed access registrant lists prior to their presentations favorably. Communication from GSI staff in the form of reminder messages about upcoming sessions (i.e., “This Week in ASPECTS”) was also appreciated.

Presenters again cited the issue of student attendance as a major concern. Often, presenters would design a session and prepare handouts based on the number of students that registered only to find out that far fewer students actually attended the session.

The use of two registration systems posed some registration and scheduling challenges for presenters and support staff. Specifically, Teaching with Technology sessions—taught at the DIIA multimedia lab—were offered as an ongoing faculty professional development via the CIT training Web site. Overbooking of some sessions, coupled with a constant disconnect between the two separate registration systems, frequently necessitated additional work from presenters and support staff.

**Grading students**—Presenters were very pleased with the Grading Rubric (see [http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/gsi/aspects/scoring\\_rubric.pdf](http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/gsi/aspects/scoring_rubric.pdf)). Its use made grading easier and allowed for more consistency among graders. They also appreciated receiving the essays via e-mail from GSI staff. This helped them to easily add comments and return the graded essay.

The main issue that was raised in this category was related to the quality of some essays. Weak essays often shared similar traits, including unnecessary, ill-formed, and poorly integrated references to elective materials, with limited focus on core content.

**Communications**—By and large, presenters were very satisfied with communications related to ASPECTS. In particular, they noted that presenter support materials, attendance and evaluation forms, handout and presentation templates, and essay instructions and the grading rubric, were available online—<http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/gsi/presenters/>.

**Support materials**— Overall, the ASPECTS Web site was found to be very useful. Presenters were, however, concerned about ease of use in relation to the presentation template. They also suggested that the evaluation form be reworked, with an eye towards eliminating unnecessary questions. Their primary criticism was that students could not easily access their training history.

## Next Steps

### Facilities—

- ⊗ As possible, ASPECTS sessions will be held in one regular, accessible location on campus
- ⊗ If MAI 26 is needed for ASPECTS, GSI staff will procure a key and ensure that the room is accessible to presenters before sessions are scheduled to begin.
- ⊗ Where needed, signage will be posted to assist attendees in locating rooms.
- ⊗ A policy regarding late arrivals will be formed and placed on the ASPECTS registration site. Attendees will not be permitted to enter 15 minutes past the start of any session. [This policy will be included on any directional signage.]

### Sessions—

- ⊗ Post signage stating entrance policy.
- ⊗ Presenters will attend related sessions to minimize content overlap.

### Scheduling—

- ⊗ Develop an RSVP mechanism to encourage registrants to send timely notification of planned attendance changes.
- ⊗ Survey students to determine reasons for non-attendance.

### Grading students—

- ⊗ Clarify essay directions, emphasizing the importance of focusing on required materials.

### Communications—

- ⊗ Presenters will encourage attendees to attend other ASPECTS sessions.

### Support materials—

- ⊗ Refine registration system to facilitate student access to training history.
- ⊗ Determine presenter media needs in advance.
- ⊗ Modify evaluation form; develop Scantron to streamline data-entry.

*Appendix I: Presenters and Sessions*

Dr. Mickey Achacoso

**Students Behaving Badly**

Elizabeth Alexander

**Helping Your Students Become More Effective Learners**  
**Promoting Active Learning**

Dr. Judy Ashcroft

**Effective Public Speaking Techniques**

Pamela Brochhausen

**Introduction to eGradebook**  
**Introduction to the Technology Classroom Media Consoles**  
**Ongoing Course Assessment**  
**An Introduction to Blackboard**

Carolyn Thomas

**An Introduction to Blackboard**

Mark Decker

**Motivating Students to Learn**

Dana DeLoca

**Teaching with Video**

Dr. Lynn Jones Eaton

**Designing Effective Discussions**  
**Interactive Techniques for Large Classes**  
**Teaching in the Diverse Classroom**

Mario Guerra

**Teaching with PowerPoint**  
**An Introduction to Blackboard**

Dr. Joel Heikes

**Assessing Classroom Discussion**  
**Assessing Classroom Instruction**

Coco Kishi

**Designing Effective Instruction for Creative Work**  
**Evaluating Creative Work**

Janelle Hedstrom

**Integrating Library Research into Assignment Design**

Susanna Herndon

**Designing Effective Instruction for Creative Work**  
**Evaluating Creative Work**

A.J. Johnson

**Applying Critical Thinking to Researching on the Web**  
**Integrating Library Research into Assignment Design**

Dr. Karron Lewis

**Learning Styles and Implications for Instruction**  
**Planning the Course Syllabus**

Michele Ostrow

**Integrating Library Research into Assignment Design**  
**Preventing and Detecting Plagiarism**

Joe Sanchez

**Building an Online Community**

Morrie Schulman:

**Classroom Performance System**

Dr. Mary Steinhardt

**Stress Management for Graduate Students**

Dr. Marilla Svinicki

**Designing Effective Lectures for Learning**

Dr. Dawn Zimmaro

**Evaluating Student Learning in Large Classes: Designing the Multiple-Choice Exam**  
**Using Rubrics to Grade Student Performance**

**Appendix II: E-mail to ASPECTS Presenters 4/12/2005**

Hi all you loyal ASPECTS presenters,

We are nearing the end of our second semester of ASPECTS, and would like to get feedback from all presenters as part the review process. Your input, together with the data we obtained from session evaluations, the data we are currently gathering from focus groups, and the data we will soon request from graduate coordinators, will help guide the future of ASPECTS.

Without each of you and the hard work you put into preparing and delivering your ASPECTS sessions, there might not be a "particularly noteworthy activity by DIIA" embedded in the Legislative Budget Board's Management and Performance Review. [See p. 33 @--  
[http://www.lbb.state.tx.us/TSPRP/ut\\_austin/UTAustin\\_Performance\\_Review.pdf](http://www.lbb.state.tx.us/TSPRP/ut_austin/UTAustin_Performance_Review.pdf).]

The truth is that you, as a group, are the backbone of ASPECTS as well as its' tuning fork. As part of the evaluation process, we would like to have a debriefing session sometime during late May or early June--before everyone takes off for summer vacation. **To that end, please let me know when you are available for a 2-hour period from May 15th to June 7th.**

In order to prepare for this session, I would like you **provide me answers to the following questions by 5:00 PM, Wednesday, April 20th.**

- *What has worked well--from marketing to registration to certificate--and what can be done to make it better?*
- *What should we do that we are not doing?*
- *What should we not be doing?*

**Your response can be as long or as short as you want.**

Here are some (unsolicited) examples:

Liz suggested that we provide each presenter with a list of registrants, attendance forms and evaluation forms for each session. (I am betting that you each like that idea!)

Coco suggested that we update our Web information about the computer equipment in MAIN 26. (And that we let ITS know that they need to update their Web pages.)

We look forward to your input. After I receive your responses and information about your availability, I will set a date and send you the debriefing plan.

Thanks to you all!

### *Appendix III: Compiled Responses to E-mail Questions*

Question 1: What has worked well--from marketing to registration to certificate--and what can be done to make it better?

- ⊗ I have not been integrally involved in the whole process, but so far most of what I been a part of has worked well. I like having the presenter forms, registration information, etc. online, and have no problem sending attendance sheets, etc. by mail. The only thing that has not worked as well is attendance, although I know there is not necessarily much you can do about this. All but one class have had about 75% attendance, but at one class I had about 8 people signed up and only 2 or 3 came.
- ⊗ Registration for my sessions has been high but attendance is about 50%. Find out why GSIs are signing up but not coming.
- ⊗ Both semesters students seem unclear about the certificate. I mention it when they come to my sessions and most (less in spring) are learning about the certificate for the first time. Sometimes all the sessions have already been offered in that series and they cannot complete the certificate that semester.
- ⊗ Marketing (obviously - lol!), I don't know enough about registration to comment on that but certainly the website gave me everything I needed as an ASPECTS presenter...The certificates are certainly a draw for some students.
- ⊗ The planning and the collaboration of the instructors for the certificate series.
- ⊗ The standards for the awarding of certificates.
- ⊗ The marketing Llz did by word of mouth.
- ⊗ Staying touch with the Grad School and the International Office.
- ⊗ We need to limit the number of students in a session, even if it means more sessions.
- ⊗ Actually I'm not very familiar with what was done, so I don't know what has worked well, what hasn't. There seem to be a number of folks at each one, so I guess its working.
- ⊗ From all I can tell you guys are doing an excellent job. What I appreciated the most was the fast, friendly, flexible, and focused help that I received every time I had a question.
- ⊗ I've thought about the questions and I think that registration has worked well, at least from the instructor side. I really like how we can see online who is coming and what department they are from, since that helps us tailor our sessions a bit more to the audience. I'm not sure about marketing since I'm not at all involved in that side of things.

## Question 2: What should we do that we are not doing?

- ⊗ One of my biggest concerns is assessment, but from talking to you I get the idea that you are following through on the questionnaires, etc. The only other concern is the attendance problem.
- ⊗ You might also warn everyone that the computer in Mai 26 has a Windows machine, not a Mac as listed on the tech page. This machine does not have QT loaded on it and won't let you install anything, so we had to have someone run over a laptop for everyone to gather around to see the video we wanted to show. It would have been nice to have the correct information posted on both ours and ITS website!
- ⊗ Some students are using electives to double-count for another certificate. I think a better solution is warranted - perhaps two electives per year (instead of semester) and then any additional series sessions that are not electives for certificates.
- ⊗ Also, not sure if this change has been made - let students know the essay should only be written on the 3 series topics, not electives.
- ⊗ Again, I'm not sure. I haven't had any problems. Everything seems to work fairly smoothly from my perspective. The essays haven't been particularly good, so maybe they need more guidance?
- ⊗ Find dedicated premises so folks don't have to wander all over the place and have to try and find rooms like MAI 26! Also, ensure that the descriptions of the rooms are accurate - MAI 26 is certainly not a 40-seater capacity room. Have realistic caps on session capacity to reflect the nature of the session - mine are very interactive; I prefer to have 16 or less if possible. Ensure that presenters don't get burned out or lazy or whatever by repeating the same stuff over and over... think about revolving presenters - even within the DIIA there are some of us who could take on other sessions to give us a break from our usual ones - but that begs the question: how do we maintain consistency of approach while modifying the material and the presenters periodically? Another idea would be to have occasional presenter meetings - just once or twice a semester - in which we can share and exchange tips and support each other in an effort to maintain quality... I still would like to know how some presenters can comfortably stick to the 75 minutes and I find it a challenge.
- ⊗ Keep the program on all the agendas, keep it in the limelight, and talk about it wherever we are.
- ⊗ Maybe develop a brochure that certificate holders and participants can take with them to interview, etc.
- ⊗ We may want to recognize additional people in DIIA by bringing them in as co-presenters and backups.
- ⊗ I'm assuming you send the announcements to the graduate coordinators... I haven't heard the announcement or seen the emails from within our department.

### Question 3: What should we not be doing?

- ⊗ Don't use MAI 26 - unless room access issues are resolved.
- ⊗ Rest on our laurels (perish the thought!), ignore issues such as increasing numbers and limited spaces - as numbers grow it's going to become harder and harder for students to get the sessions that fit into their already-busy schedules... we need to be sensitive to that. I think we should also shave off the enforced 10-minute reflection time at the end... the essay is the time for reflection... it's cutting short invaluable face to face time and short-changes the students - and it's danged difficult to do anything deep and meaningful in what amounts to only 1 hour when you take out an additional 5 minutes for setting the stage at the beginning (figuratively speaking). I suggest we also drastically re-think using up resources for sessions that are only sparsely attended - and expanding others (like the public speaking session) which could become series in their own right.
- ⊗ Wish we didn't have to worry about space so often. I heard that the Knopf Room in Flawn no longer requires a guard. That from the Grad Dean. Hope it is true.
- ⊗ Nothing that I can see.
- ⊗ I'm sorry I don't know the program well enough to answer. I really enjoyed my two presentations with students!!!

### Other Issues:

- ⊗ What to do about "no shows" for ASPECTS sessions particularly now they are getting "full" - do we penalize no shows or just appeal to their common decency (i.e. email and cancel) by making this more prominent on the website/registration site?
- ⊗ Also, what to do about late arrivals (Mario G talked about this) - same this, inconsiderate to peers and difficult to handle within only 75 minutes.
- ⊗ How do we ensure higher attendance rate by those registered... what do we do about "no shows" - penalty or appeal to their sense of community? Maybe need to make a bigger issue of this on the website... also the importance of arriving promptly for a start at the appointed time... Difficult to deal with those coming in 10-20+ minutes after the session has started... maybe we need to state a rule for this also on the website...
- ⊗ One question I would like to address is whether or not there should be a minimum class size. For example, our first semester, I believe we had a class where only one person showed up. We went ahead and did the class, but it basically just turned into a research consultation. It's a little awkward doing a class for one or possibly even two people so I thought that might be a good topic to discuss with other instructors. I might be the only one who feels that way.
- ⊗ I wanted to call attention to one comment made on an evaluation of the OCA class. This person said that there was too much overlap with the class that Joel taught. This person said that they thought Joel's class should be changed, not mine. I know you have the copy of the evaluation somewhere. I didn't realize that Joel taught assessment classes and I would be interested to sit through them at some point.

### Appendix IV: Session Evaluations by Series—Quantitative Data

**Below each certificate series title** are the skill-oriented questions from the ASPECTS session evaluation forms and the mean score for each series.

#### Assessment

Questions:	Mean
1. Knowledge of the subject: $N = 63$	4.86
2. Identified the session objectives: $N = 63$	4.65
3. Met all of the session objectives: $N = 63$	4.57
4. Was well organized: $N = 63$	4.70
5. Engaged participants with interactive exercises: $N=62$	4.53
6. Maintained my interest: $N = 63$	4.60
7. Encouraged us to ask questions: $N = 63$	4.67
8. Helped me see how this material could be applied to different instructional areas/ settings: $N = 63$	4.57
9. Allowed sufficient time for reflection at the end of the session: $N = 62$	4.37

#### Creative Work

Questions:	Mean
1. Knowledge of the subject: $N=19$	4.63
2. Identified the session objectives: $N=19$	4.26
3. Met all of the session objectives: $N=19$	4.26
4. Was well organized: $N=19$	4.21
5. Engaged participants with interactive exercises: $N=19$	4.47
6. Maintained my interest: $N=19$	4.26
7. Encouraged us to ask questions: $N=19$	4.21
8. Helped me see how this material could be applied to different instructional areas/ settings: $N=18$	4.22
9. Allowed sufficient time for reflection at the end of the session: $N=19$	4.05

## Leading Discussions

Questions:	Mean
1. Knowledge of the subject: <i>N=122</i>	4.71
2. Identified the session objectives: <i>N=122</i>	4.66
3. Met all of the session objectives: <i>N=122</i>	4.45
4. Was well organized: <i>N=121</i>	4.53
5. Engaged participants with interactive exercises: <i>N=121</i>	4.64
6. Maintained my interest: <i>N=122</i>	4.40
7. Encouraged us to ask questions: <i>N=122</i>	4.44
8. Helped me see how this material could be applied to different instructional areas/ settings: <i>N=122</i>	4.39
9. Allowed sufficient time for reflection at the end of the session: <i>N=121</i>	4.06

## Lecturing

Questions:	Mean
1. Knowledge of the subject: <i>N=184</i>	4.66
2. Identified the session objectives: <i>N=183</i>	4.61
3. Met all of the session objectives: <i>N=183</i>	4.51
4. Was well organized: <i>N=182</i>	4.61
5. Engaged participants with interactive exercises: <i>N=182</i>	4.35
6. Maintained my interest: <i>N=184</i>	4.36
7. Encouraged us to ask questions: <i>N=184</i>	4.36
8. Helped me see how this material could be applied to different instructional areas/ settings: <i>N=182</i>	4.34
9. Allowed sufficient time for reflection at the end of the session: <i>N=182</i>	4.12

## Teaching with Technology

Questions:	Mean
1. Knowledge of the subject: <i>N=74</i>	4.81
2. Identified the session objectives: <i>N=74</i>	4.62
3. Met all of the session objectives: <i>N=74</i>	4.68
4. Was well organized: <i>N=74</i>	4.74
5. Engaged participants with interactive exercises: <i>N=74</i>	4.82
6. Maintained my interest: <i>N=74</i>	4.77
7. Encouraged us to ask questions: <i>N=72</i>	4.79
8. Helped me see how this material could be applied to different instructional areas/ settings: <i>N=73</i>	4.58
9. Allowed sufficient time for reflection at the end of the session: <i>N=74</i>	4.61

## Understanding Your Students

Questions:	Mean
1. Knowledge of the subject: <i>N=86</i>	4.57
2. Identified the session objectives: <i>N=86</i>	4.60
3. Met all of the session objectives: <i>N=86</i>	4.42
4. Was well organized: <i>N=86</i>	4.37
5. Engaged participants with interactive exercises: <i>N=85</i>	4.44
6. Maintained my interest: <i>N=86</i>	4.37
7. Encouraged us to ask questions: <i>N=86</i>	4.59
8. Helped me see how this material could be applied to different instructional areas/ settings: <i>N=86</i>	4.34
9. Allowed sufficient time for reflection at the end of the session: <i>N=83</i>	4.00

## Teaching Research Skills

Questions:	Mean
1. Knowledge of the subject: <i>N=41</i>	4.73
2. Identified the session objectives: <i>N=41</i>	4.49
3. Met all of the session objectives: <i>N=41</i>	4.44
4. Was well organized: <i>N=41</i>	4.41
5. Engaged participants with interactive exercises: <i>N=41</i>	4.24
6. Maintained my interest: <i>N=41</i>	4.37
7. Encouraged us to ask questions: <i>N=41</i>	4.63
8. Helped me see how this material could be applied to different instructional areas/ settings: <i>N=41</i>	4.49
9. Allowed sufficient time for reflection at the end of the session: <i>N=41</i>	4.29

## ***Appendix V: Certificate Series—Goals and Associated Sessions***

### **Assessment Topic Certificate**

#### Goal:

The Assessment certificate will enable the Graduate Student Instructor to appropriately use multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning objectives to assess student learning before, during and after instruction.

#### Sessions Offered in the Assessment Series:

- Assessing Classroom Instruction
- Using Rubrics to Grade Student Performance
- Evaluating Student Learning in Large Classes: Designing the Multiple-Choice Exam

### **Creative Works Certificate**

#### Goal:

The Creative Works certificate will enable the Graduate Student Instructor to develop assignments using principles of design and the creative process, provide critiques and feedback on creative work, and develop and implement evaluation criteria.

#### Sessions Offered in Creative Works Series:

- Designing Effective Instruction for Creative Work
- Evaluating Creative Work

### **Leading Discussions Topic Certificate**

#### Goal:

The Leading Discussions certificate will enable the Graduate Student Instructor to design, implement, and evaluate effective discussion.

#### Sessions Offered in the Leading Discussions Series:

- Designing Effective Discussions
- Promoting Active Learning
- Assessing Classroom Discussion

## **Lecturing Topic Certificate**

### Goal:

The Lecturing certificate will enable the Graduate Student Instructor to design lectures that are based on key communication skills and learning theory, consider the needs of the students, and increase student understanding through the use of appropriate active learning techniques.

### Sessions Offered in the Lecturing Series:

- Effective Public Speaking Techniques
- Designing Effective Lectures for Learning
- Interactive Techniques for Large Classes

## **Teaching Research Skills Topic Certificate**

### Goal:

The Teaching Research Skills certificate will enable the Graduate Student Instructor to apply best practices to library research assignments, teach students how to find, evaluate and synthesize information effectively and ethically, and structure courses to prevent plagiarism.

### Sessions Offered in the Teaching Research Skills Series:

- Integrating Library Research into Assignment Design
- Applying Critical Thinking to Researching on the Web
- Preventing and Detecting Plagiarism

## **Teaching with Technology Topic Certificate**

### Goal:

The Teaching with Technology certificate will enable the Graduate Student Instructor to design a course that incorporates technology to manage course materials, facilitate discussion, and promote active learning.

### Sessions Offered in the Teaching with Technology Series:

- An Introduction to Blackboard
- Building an Online Community
- Teaching with PowerPoint

## **Understanding Your Students Topic Certificate**

### Goal:

The Understanding Your Students certificate will enable the Graduate Student Instructor to design instruction that takes into account student differences in order to promote individual motivation for learning, accommodate different learning styles, and broaden use of more effective learning strategies.

### Sessions Offered in the Understanding Your Students Series:

- Motivating Students to Learn
- Learning Styles and Implications for Instruction
- Helping Your Students Become More Effective Learners

**Appendix VI: Debrief Agenda**

**Date & Time:** June 6th, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

**Location:** CBA 6.420

**ASPECTS Presenters:** Mickey Achacoso, Elizabeth Alexander, Judy Ashcroft, Pamela Brochhausen, Carolyn Thomas, Dana DeLoca, Lynn Jones Eaton, Mario Guerra, Joel Heikes, Coco Kishi, Susanna Herndon, A.J. Johnson, Karron Lewis, Michele Ostrow, Joe Sanchez, Morrie Schulman, Mary Steinhardt, Marilla Svinicki, Dawn Zimmaro

**Facilitators:** Mark Decker, Suzanne Rhodes

**Observers:** Elias Ponvert, Stephanie Weiler, Judythe Wilbur, Carolyn Thomas

**Agenda**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topics</b>
10:00-10:10	Coffee and donuts; meet & greet
10:10-10:20	Introduction to Debrief: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General overview of GSI and ASPECTS</li> <li>• Outline of purpose of debrief</li> <li>• Debrief outcomes:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) presenters realize their value to the program</li> <li>b) help GSI team craft the future of the program</li> <li>c) share ideas for improvement</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
10:20-10:25	Personal introductions
10:25-11:10	Hindsight is 20/20—Debrief Categories <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities—</li> <li>• Sessions—</li> <li>• Scheduling—</li> <li>• Grading students—</li> <li>• Communication—</li> <li>• Support materials—</li> </ul> For each category: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What worked well?</li> <li>○ What could have worked better?</li> </ul>
11:10-11:45	Ideas for Improvement – group brainstorm
11:45-11:55	Prioritization – in what order should we address improvements?
11:55-12:00	Wrap-up and thanks

**Appendix VII: Notes—Collected and Provided by Carolyn Thomas**

Date: 2005-06-06 10:08:07 -0500

Topic: 2005.06.06-Aspects Debrief

Mark - Intro to meeting, thanks to all presenters and those involved in developing presentations, sent individual responses, certificate series responses - students seem satisfied - focus groups, graduate school feedback

Debrief Categories:

**Facilities**

- + Liked MAI 26 (easy to configure)
- + Liked big ACES room
- + Having ASPECTS staff available
- + ACES nice (unlocked, all tech)
- + Whiteboards with erasers and pens
- + BioSci staff helped w/room
  
- Misinformation for computer (Mac display, PC computer, no QT)
- Room locked, no sign to get key
- Small ACES room - table hindered group activity (hard to find)
- Lg. ACES room - dogleg setup
- Memory stick difficulties (ACES)
- Too many students in rooms (Lynn's and Judy's sessions)
- Getting hold of media equipment
- Library facilities - one room without tables (PCL)
- Overhead, doc cam not available in all rooms

Ideas for Improvement

Get our own key for MAI 26

Post recommended ways for accessing information

One room for students to attend

Assistant to attend first few sessions

Map for room with building on web site

Find out media needs for each presenter

Signage for ASPECTS sessions (tape sign to door) - do not enter 15 minutes late

**Sessions**

- + Nice to have mix of students in a sufficient number to compare across disciplines (more open to hearing other ideas)
- + Looked at syllabi from each discipline and mix of students helpful
- + Pure joy of people who want to learn
- + Repackaging (renaming) course increased attendance (Students Behaving Badly)-very interactive, very lively
- + Students very accommodating and willing to try any of the tasks
- + Very focused on how they were going to use
- + Cultural diversity
- + Students thought about ways to help their faculty members

- Students late
- Low attendance (10 people registered, half came late, most didn't show up)-showed up to second part without attending first part
- Tape recorder and then left
- Overlap between courses (OCA and Joel's)
- International students (statement was interpreted as derogatory)
- Wasn't enough time for all they wanted
- Not enough sessions
- Lack of basic skills (web)
- Knowledge baseline differences
- Not enough time to apply skills
- Language barriers
- Motivation of students (only wanted certificate)
- Didn't follow spirit of ASPECTS sessions (not interactive, etc.)
- 398T instructors requiring them to attend (may not be part of ASPECTS) - supposed to recommend session or two (not require series)

#### Ideas for Improvement

Retitle others to increase attendance

Require attendance to prerequisite courses - better communication with students (rename course)

Cutoff time displayed (instructor can draw line when time) or pick up sign-in sheet

Possibly have ways to test out (or substitute sessions)

Pre-class assessment (web skills)

Sessions on overcoming nervousness, structuring (public speaking)

Presenters attend each others' sessions (tie materials together, reduce overlap)

Provide examples for non-academic repurposing

#### **Scheduling**

+ Went smoothly

+ Easy to schedule CIT lab

+ One in morning and one in afternoon (one on Tuesday, Friday, etc.)-variation

+ Personal communication with Erika and Daniel especially when had to reschedule

+ This week in ASPECTS

+ Profiles of students ahead of time (focus materials to dept.)

+ List of students with e-mail addresses

- 2 Registration systems

- Notification when students cancel

- Sessions during lunch times

#### Ideas for Improvement

Lot more no-shows later in semester

Sending out reminder week ahead

RSVP system

Did topics follow life in semester (grading-mid-term, late-April)

Should there be a cut-off if there are fewer than x number of students?  
Follow-up with students who aren't coming  
Let students know how to un-enroll  
Let presenters know when other sessions are scheduled  
Students (master's vs. doctoral) profile, already teaching  
Offering more sessions that had high attendance  
Communicate with students (confirm attendance, bring materials) - pre and post  
Limit enrollment  
Presenters have input on times  
Attendance patterns on various time slots  
Rethinking which sessions are required

### **Grading students**

- + Rubric was very good
  - + Getting essays by email
  - + Degree of consistency among reviewers
  - + Students get feedback of comments at end of document
  - + Lot of great options for students (courses can count later)
- 
- Ranking in comparison with others
  - What are other sessions about (in sequence)?
  - Clarify directions on required courses only for essay (intellectual bulimia)
  - Optional sessions not being incorporated well
  - What does it mean to apply what I've learned (not just regurgitate)?

#### Ideas for Improvement:

Multiple graders need to know what happens in other sessions  
Change requirements for elective sessions  
Watch proportion of certificates to students (238 students - 20 certificate submissions - 14 completed certificates)  
Really good essays - share "5" papers among graders  
Who came to all three but didn't complete essays  
Are we not getting them through the sessions? Are they not understanding what certificates mean? Were there not enough sessions available?

### **Communication**

- + Part of success of program is good communication with presenters and students (many stakeholders)
- + Instructors can go to website and get information they need
- + Resources available for presenters
- + This week in ASPECTS (personalized) - one for presenters and one for GC (quotes for graduate coordinators)
- + Other university listserves
- + Reminders to score essays

- 398T info to presenters

#### Ideas for Improvement

Encourage students to attend other certificate sessions  
Today's meeting part of ongoing process  
Presenters receive ASPECTS grad coordinator messages at well  
Community of instructors list  
What does certificate mean?  
Policies page  
Essay requirements

#### Support materials

- + Website very useful

- Students want to view their training history
- Classes with similar names
- Trouble with ASPECTS template

#### Ideas for Improvements

ASPECTS template  
Hard copy of registration form, attendance form, list of registrants  
(package of materials)  
Rework evaluation form (take off question about reflection)  
Scantrons for evaluations (few questions, couple of places for open-  
ended feedback)  
Web-based evaluation tied into attendance tracking  
Handouts online or URL for resources if materials are supplemental  
to workshop  
Session materials online (similar to conference)-preview for  
interest (where should materials reside)  
Resources for presenters - uniform quality for handouts (distribute  
on list first)  
Concern with grading if a lot of materials are placed online  
(electives vs. required)  
Revising materials  
Customized Scantron form (2 months lead time)

## ***Appendix VIII: Prioritized Recommendations by Category***

### **Facilities**

#### **Ideas for Improvement**

- Get our own key for MAI 26 ● [Ready access to rooms]
- One room for students to attend ●
- Find out media needs for each presenter ●
- Signage for ASPECTS sessions (tape sign to door)—do not enter 15 minutes late ●
- [Entrance policy]

### **Sessions**

- Low attendance (10 people registered, half came late, most didn't show up)- showed up to second part without attending first part ●

#### **Ideas for Improvement**

- Cutoff time displayed (instructor can draw line when time) or pick up sign-in sheet ● ●
- Possibly have ways to test out (or substitute sessions) ●
- Presenters attend each others' sessions (tie materials together, reduce overlap) ●

### **Scheduling**

#### **Ideas for Improvement**

- RSVP system ● ●
- Follow-up with students who aren't coming ● ● ●
- Students (master's vs. doctoral) profile, already teaching ●

### **Grading students**

- Clarify directions on required courses only for essay (intellectual bulimia) ● ●

#### **Ideas for Improvement:**

- Multiple graders need to know what happens in other sessions
- Change requirements for elective sessions
- Really good essays - share "5" papers among graders

### **Communication**

#### **Support materials**

- Students want to view their training history ● ●

#### **Ideas for Improvements**

- Rework evaluation form (take off question about reflection) ●
- Obtain presenter media needs in advance ●