# EOS-SEI Long-Term Plan, Metadata and Faculty Survey

### EOS-SEI LONG-TERM PLAN UPDATED DRAFT, STILL FLEXIBLE

P1 = first planning term; P2 = second planning term; T1= first teaching term, etc.

	2007 2008			2009			2010			2011			
TARGETED COURSES	Fall07	Spr08	Sum08	Fall08	Spr09	Sum09	Fall09	Spr10	Sum10	Fall10	Spr11	Sum11	Fall11
EOSC 114	P2&T1	P3&T2	P3	T3	T4								
EOSC 111	P2&T1	P3&T2	P3	T3	T4								
EOSC 221	P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	P3	T3					
EOSC 324	MLB												
ENVR 200	DS&SH												
EOSC 112		P1	P1	P2&T1	P3&T2	P3	T3	T4					
EOSC 220		P1	P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	P3	T3			
EOSC 212		P1	P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	P3	T3			
EOSC 210		P1	P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	P3	T3			
EOSC 116		SS											
ENVR 300		DS&KC	<b>)</b>										
332 (JM)				P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	P3	T3		
322 (GD)				P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	T3			
355 (CJ)				P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	T3			
EOSC 449				MLB									
ENVR 449				KO									
ATSC 201				RS									
EOSC 211 (RP)					P1	P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	P3	T3
EOSC 372 (SA)					P1	P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	P3	T3
EOSC 373 (MM/others)							P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	P3
EOSC 252 (FH)							P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	P3
EOSC 472 (KO)							P1	T1	P2	P2	T2	P3	P3
EOSC 321 (MK)								P1	P1	T1	P2	P2	T2
EOSC 331 (KH)								P1	P1	T1	P2	P2	T2
EOSC 326 (SS)								P1	P1	T1	P2	P2	T2
EOSC 329 (RB)								P1	P1	T1	P2	P2	T2
EOSC 222 (PS)									P1	P1	T1	P2	P2

Courses undergoing transformation w/o specific STLF help

Course sequence considers: logical progressions, breadth in EOS, faculty keenness

- aims for: maximum departmental involvement
- interfaces with: teaching assignments, scheduling, & sabbaticals

### **SUMMARY OF DATA: EOS-SEI**

		Assessments						Student		Sur-		
							<b>S</b>	Thin	king	veys		
COURSES	<b>Learning Goals</b>	Pre-Post	Diagnostic	Clickers	Quiz data	Exam data	Attitudes (SAESS)	Focus groups	Interviews	Middle-of-term	End-of-term	Other
ATSC 201	Х			Х			Х					JiTT
ENVR 200	X											CIQ
ENVR 300	X											
ENVR 449/	X											
EOSC 110	X	(GCI	)				X					
EOSC 111	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	
EOSC 112	X	X		X			X			X	X	
EOSC 114	X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X	Homework
EOSC 114-DE	X						X					
EOSC 116	X						X					
EOSC 116-DE	X											
EOSC 210	X			X			X	X	X		X	Lab revisions
EOSC 211	X							X				
EOSC 212	X		X		X							
EOSC 220	X						X	X	X	X	X	Lecture
EOSC 221	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	
EOSC 222	X											
EOSC 223	X	X					X					
EOSC 252	X											
EOSC 270							X					
EOSC 310	X				X		X			X	X	X
EOSC 310-	X						X					
EOSC 314							X					
EOSC 314-DE							X					
EOSC 315-DE							X					
EOSC 320	X											

EOSC 322	X				Х		Х	X	
EOSC 324	X				X		X		
EOSC 326	X				X				
EOSC 330	X								
EOSC 332	Х	X		X	X	X	X	X	JiTT
EOSC 350							X	Х	
EOSC 355	X	X	X	X			X		Teamwork
EOSC 355 EOSC 370	X	Х	X	X			Х		Teamwork
		X		X	X		X		Teamwork
EOSC 370	Х	X	Х	X	X		X		Teamwork
EOSC 370 EOSC 371	X	X	Х	X	x		X		Teamwork

## WHO'S INVOLVED?

(~62% of EOS faculty are involved at some level)

# FACULTY WHO ARE PRIMARY INSTRUCTORS of TARGETED COURSES:

S. Allen, G. Andrews, M.L. Bevier, M. Bostock, G. Dipple, E. Eberhardt, J. Finnis, R. Francois, M. Grey, S. Harris, W. Hsieh, M. Jellinek, C. Johnson, M. Kopylova, U. Mayer, S. Mills, J. Mortensen, R. Pawlowicz, R. Stull

### FACULTY INVOLVED in working groups,

### committees, or ad-hoc support:

P. Austin, M. Bustin, K. Grimm, L. Groat, P. Hammer, E. Hearn, K. Hickey, O. Hungr, M. Lipsen, M. Maldonado, K. Orians, K. Russell, J. Scoates, L. Ver, P. Smith, D. Steyn, S. Sutherland, P. Tortell

### STUDENTS INVOLVED:

L. Beranek, D.Cassis, J.Dohaney, R. Eso, L.Gurney, M.Halverson, K.Hodge, P.Lelievre, C.Leslie, J. Mcalister, J.Rhajiak, B. Smithyman

# FACULTY SURVEY

At the EOS Departmental Retreat, we asked for some feedback...19 faculty members responded.

- 12 people said they read the newsletter ("The EOS-SEI Times"). Of those, all but 1 said they learned something from them.
- About "Brown Bag" discussion sessions...
  - o 13 respondents have attended and found it useful
  - o 4 respondents have NOT attended but think it might be useful
  - o 1 respondent has attended and did not find it useful
- The "Brown Bag" topic areas that faculty are most likely to attend are:
  - o Practical teaching tips and tricks
  - o Colleagues discussing changes or "experiments" in their courses.

# EOS-SEI Mini-Retreat

We held a 3-hour mini-retreat with primary instructors of targeted courses, and anyone else who was interested.

### What faculty said was "exciting" in open statements in the first $\frac{1}{2}$ hour.

- Developing pre-post evaluations of learning.
- Active learning and projects in class were the most rewarding and an eye opener
- Students were very receptive, open, quite keen, stressed from the start collaborative effort with all folks,
- I'm most keen on what we are "planning" to do.
- Lots of feedback including one whole lecture.
- Very exciting was modified JiTT including weekly quiz, discovery that some lectures don't need lots of time which speeded up progress, and resulting ability to focus on problem areas.
- This large class is more interactive, group discussions, lectures are more focused
- Clicker feedback really helped identify what's important.
- With clickers, attendance went from 50-70 percent.
- Early in the process, course goals are developed. Exciting part is working with multiple discipline course.
- In past may not have known what the course is for. Maybe too many ideas
- This planning term with input from many is great.

- Evolution of course from entertainment to more focused content. Also still getting good teaching evals.
- Weekly posting of 12 key questions similar to exams without answers
- Learning goals (arrived at via consulting group, then module goals posted) have been helpful to focus on content.
- Discovery that I've been teaching towards the testing I'm familiar with. Pre/Post is thing looking forward to.
- In past, I've given up on content from text, but JiTT suggests I can back off on "content" in lecture. This needs to be looked into.
- Use of pre/post (online) based on GCI. Averages (bell shape) were ~55% & 66% for pre & post.
- Use of a new custom pre/post for 2nd yr field class. Nine questions were based on learning goals, (M.C. but with reasoning) and the average went from 33% 66%.
- Trying to write pre/posts forced us to think about questions that are at a pre-lecture level (no jargon, etc.). We can now ask some questions without jargon, and that's a good think it changes how we will be posing questions.

The subsequent 2.5 hours were spent discussing challenges and sharing ideas.