1. Description of Program Elements

Ohio State University-Mansfield’s 2015-2016 Local Lecturer Support Grant funded lecturer professional development workshops. Workshops addressed several key challenges Mansfield lecturers face and increased campus awareness for future support of lecturer professional development.

The planning committee that managed the 2015-2016 Local Lecturer Support Grant and organized 5 campus-wide workshops during January and March, 2016, consisted of Andrew Kinney, Wenfei Li, Cheryl Logan, Dianne Parker, and Chris Torres. The planning committee met a total of 6 times during autumn and spring semesters. Meetings were well-attended and collaborative. The committee began its work during autumn, 2015 by selecting workshop themes, searching for workshop facilitators, and creating promotional materials.

a. Workshops were held on Saturday, January 23rd; Saturday, March 26th, and Monday, April 18th. Each workshop was approximately two hours long. The following describes workshop attendance, themes, and facilitators.

**Workshop 1 – January 23: Design and Delivery of Online/Hybrid Courses**

Attendance:
16 (3 facilitators, 13 participants)

Facilitators:
Ted Dahlstrand, OSU-Mansfield, Associate Professor Emeritus, History;
Teresa Johnson, Ohio State University, Assistant Director and Coordinator for Assessment and Curriculum Design, UCAT;
John Muir, Ohio State University, ODEE

**Workshop 2 – January 23: Active Learning**

Attendance:
16 (1 facilitator, 15 participants)

Facilitator:
Sue Sutherland, Ohio State University, Associate Professor, College of Education and Human Ecology
**Workshop 3** – March 26: Changing Student Populations

Attendance:
13 (2 facilitators, 11 participants)

Facilitators:
Renee Thompson, OSU-Mansfield, Director of Diversity and Inclusion;
Chris Torres, SUNY-Potsdam, Assistant Professor, Department of Community Health

**Workshop 4** – March 26: New and Emergent Resources

Attendance:
14 (1 facilitator, 13 participants)

Facilitator: David Au, OSU-Mansfield, Senior Systems Specialist, OCIO

**Workshop 5** – April 18: Outdoor Classroom

Attendance:
8 (2 facilitators, 6 participants)

Facilitators:
Adrienne Hopson, OSU-Mansfield, Lecturer, Education Teaching and Learning;
Allyson Leedy, OSU-Mansfield, Lecturer, Education Teaching and Learning

b. Workshop 5 deviated from the planning committee’s original plan. Due to weather and scheduling conflicts, the outdoor classroom and wetlands, which was initially identified as an emergent resource to be included in Workshop 4, became the basis for a 5th and optional workshop. Because of the day and time on which Workshop 5 occurred and because several lecturers already had attended a sufficient number of workshops in order to receive their stipend, Workshop 5 attendance was lower than expected.

Although not a change from the original plan, our last three workshops drew more heavily on campus and lecturer expertise. Chris Torres served on both the planning committee and co-facilitated Workshop 3 (Torres was a Mansfield lecturer during 2015-2016, but has since accepted a tenure track position at SUNY-Potsdam). David Au is OCIO staff on the Mansfield campus and both Workshop 5 facilitators teach in the Education T&L department on the Mansfield campus. Drawing on the expertise of local faculty and staff further increased campus awareness for local support.
2. Workshop Materials

Workshops 1-4 used a Carmen course site for sharing resources, posting participant work, and enabling communication among participants and workshop presenters. A sample of workshop materials are available below:

a. Workshop 1 participants used Google Drive. 17 items were created and shared by presenters and participants.

b. Workshop 2 presenter, Sue Sutherland, used and shared several documents (Appendix A).

c. Workshop 3 presenter, Chris Torres, shared research in progress (unpublished as of March, 2016 and available upon request).

d. Workshop 4 presenter, David Au, demonstrated and shared a list of resources (Appendix B).

e. Workshop 5 presenters asked participants to create posters during the workshop and provided materials within the space of the outdoor classroom (unpublished as of April, 2016 and available upon request).

3. Budget

Our grant application included the following proposed budget:

- Planning committee participation $300.00/member x 5 = $1500.00
- Workshop participation $200.00/participant x 15 = $3000.00
- Food $125.00/workshop x 4 = $500.00

   Total: $5000.00

The attached spreadsheet ("UCAT – Overview") was prepared by the Mansfield campus’ CFO, Carol Freytag, and provides a full accounting of spent and unspent funds.

4. Planning Committee

Mansfield’s grant proposal did not define or budget for a Lecturer Coordinator position. We used a committee model instead. Some of the tasks a coordinator might have performed were carried out by myself (I convened the planning committee; provided oversight of the planning committee; directed a variety of activities that were too difficult or unnecessary to delegate). However, most of the work associated with running this grant was completed collaboratively and the committee model, in my opinion, was both fair and effective.

The committee members were Andrew Kinney, Wenfei Li, Cheryl Logan, Dianne Parker, and Chris Torres. Some of the committee’s initial planning of our workshops occurred within this shared Google document. By the end of February, the second set of two workshops had been planned, so the document was no longer used.
Planning between committee members and workshop presenters mostly occurred over email and telephone. I met with Teresa Johnson and John Muir several weeks before Workshop 1 for planning purposes. Chris Torres and I met with Sue Sutherland for planning Workshop 2 content. Because Workshop 3, 4, and 5 presenters were local faculty and staff, planning workshop content was considerably easier for the committee to complete.

A final example of collaborative help the committee received is the attached flyer. Tammy Smith (Student Engagement) designed the flyer, which was shared on the lecturer listserv and used to estimate attendance at workshops and predict food costs.

5. Summary of Feedback
   a. Planning Committee member Dianne Parker designed the Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire (attached), used to solicit data from each of the five workshops. Following the Design and Delivery of Online/Hybrid Courses (January 23rd), two significant kinds of responses to questions 15 and 16 may be observed. The following responses are representative:

   - "Ironically, the workshop was impeded by poor on-line technology. It would work better face to face."
   - "The learning goals and objectives focus was way too basic—goes back too far for me. I had hoped for more tips and strategies for getting what I have more oriented to online class format."

   This particular workshop experienced some technology challenges. The presenters used Adobe Connect, and attendees joined remotely from a Mansfield classroom. After about 20 minutes these problems were resolved, but some workshop content was either removed or covered more quickly than would have otherwise been necessary. The second above comment also reflects a problem this particular workshop encountered. Several respondents expressed frustration with the too general approach to curricular design for online teaching. The principles of backward design that Teresa Johnson and John Muir draw on, although certainly appropriate for this workshop, may have been difficult, too, to condense in a two hour period of time, which following our technology problems was really nearer to 90 minutes.

   The committee also benefited by one other specific form of feedback. 6 of 19 respondents indicated a need to “provide better information before the workshop,” in response to question 14. Consequently, the committee provided March 26th participants with a fuller description of workshop content than was offered by the January 23rd RSVP flyer.

   Note: all original Workshop Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the planning committee are on file at Mansfield and available upon request.
b. Mean Quantitative Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
<th>W5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I was well informed about the objectives of this workshop.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This workshop lived up to my expectations.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The content is relevant to my job.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
<th>W5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The workshop objectives were clear to me.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The workshop activities stimulated my learning.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The activities in this workshop gave me sufficient practice and feedback.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The difficulty level of this workshop was appropriate.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The pace of this workshop was appropriate.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITATOR</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
<th>W5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. The instructor was well prepared.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The instructor was helpful.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
<th>W5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I accomplished the objectives of this workshop.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I will be able to use what I learned in this workshop.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELF-PACED DELIVERY</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
<th>W5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. The workshop was a good way for me to learn this content.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Lecturer Support

Based only on workshop participation, departmental/unit support by lecturers fell slightly from the January 23rd workshops to the March 26th workshops (from 16 to 13.5). And further still on the April 18th workshop (6). However, workshop facilitation by lecturers increased (both facilitators of Workshop 5 are lecturers). It's also important to note that the planning committee was made up entirely of lecturers. The only significant oversight of this grant by the Mansfield campus occurred at the point of application. Generally, lecturers commented informally, too, on the community building and opportunities for developing interdisciplinary collegiality among lecturers that these workshops afforded.
7. Reflection and Recommendation

Generally, the planning committee is very pleased by both the support we’ve enjoyed from UCAT and the Mansfield campus. Despite some of the challenges we faced in planning and coordinating workshops (mostly to do with assuring appropriate content and the use of technology) each workshop successfully promoted lecturer’s professional development and addressed key challenges Mansfield campus faces. Two achievements that particularly stand out were the interesting and carefully planned active learning activities facilitated by Sue Sutherland (Workshop 2) and outdoor teaching activities facilitated by Adrienne Hopson and Allyson Leedy (Workshop 5).

Our budget planning anticipated a slightly higher lecturer participation. We might have paid a few additional stipends. Planning committee members attended workshops, too, but did not receive a stipend for attendance because we were already compensated. Our grant application did not make explicit whether planning committee members would be eligible for both stipends, so the committee voted to protect our budget by avoiding double payment. The budget also failed to anticipate the cost of benefits (not a significant cost, but one that should have been anticipated in any case). Lastly, I would recommend future budgets make possible the compensation of lecturers who facilitate workshops, which the 2015-2016 budget failed to take into account.

I’m pleased that planning committee member Dianne Parker (Mathematics) and Professor of Mathematics, Gary Kennedy, are now leading the grant application and planning process for 2016-2017. It’s uncertain whether the planning committee model will be maintained, but I expect whatever model Parker and Kennedy use will meet with as much, if not more, success as last year. Based on informal conversation with Parker and Kennedy, I expect two kinds of progress are likely:

- Gary Kennedy was one of two regular faculty to attend 4 of the 5 workshops. His participation was valuable. I would like to see increased participation among regular faculty at future workshops, so his involvement in the application process suggests increased attendance of regular faculty is possible.
- Parker and Kennedy have asked a number of lecturers to serve as next year’s facilitators, suggesting they’re likely to draw more heavily on local expertise than seek off campus or Columbus facilitators. Workshop facilitation provides a different kind of professional development for lecturers (like Hopson and Leedy) who will benefit from designing, planning, and leading workshops of their own.

I look forward to working with UCAT in the future in whatever capacity is helpful. And on behalf of Mansfield campus’ lecturers, thank you for supporting us with the Local Lecturer Support Grant. I hope that support is able to continue for a second year at 50% and am confident further support will continue promoting lecturer professional development and achieving the goals of future workshops.
Respectfully Submitted,
Andrew Kinney, Lecturer

Appendix A
Active Learning Workshop
Sue Sutherland
January 23, 2016
Additional Resources

Web links for Active Learning
http://www.texascollaborative.org/activelearning.htm
http://web.calstatela.edu/dept/chem/chem2/Active/index.htm
http://www.cte.cornell.edu/teaching-ideas/engaging-students/active-learning.html
http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/tutorials/active/what/
https://www.merlot.org/merlot/index.htm
https://teachingcommons.stanford.edu/resources/learning/activities-boost-student-engagement
http://cei.umn.edu/support-services/tutorials/designing-smart-lectures

Web links for icebreakers and activities
http://www.wilderdom.com/games/
http://www.stcloudstate.edu/reslife/staff/documents/icebreakers.pdf
http://lc.wayne.edu/pdf/icebreakers_teambuilders.pdf

Web links for Teamwork and Group work
http://teamwork.umn.edu

Appendix B

OCIO Resources - https://ocio.osu.edu/

Self-Service (for ordering software, help and more)https://osuitsm.servicenow.com/selfservice/

ODEE Resource Center https://resourcercenter.odee.osu.edu/
Canvas Adoption Information https://resourcecenter.odee.osu.edu/adoptcanvas

U.OSU (web page building) http://u.osu.edu/

Mediasite (lecture capture and hosting) https://go.osu.edu/mediasite

Secured Media Library https://drm.osu.edu/media/

Tophat (live polling) https://go.osu.edu/tophat

PennState One Button Studio Concept http://onebutton.psu.edu/