

2014-05-13

Pinning Down What We Do: Exploring and Planning an Assessment of an Educational Development Centre

Jeffs, Cheryl

Taylor Institute Teaching Community

<http://hdl.handle.net/1880/50344>

Downloaded from PRISM Repository, University of Calgary

The 2014 University of Calgary Conference on Postsecondary Learning and Teaching
May 13 & 14, 2014
Poster Presentation

Pinning Down What We Do: Exploring and Planning an Assessment of an Educational Development Centre.

Cheryl L Jeffs, EdD, Educational Development Consultant, Educational Development Unit of the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning, University of Calgary.

cljeffs@ucalgary.ca

Within Canada and countries worldwide, the scope, intent and goals of educational development are well documented. While the fundamentals of teaching development or designing an effective assessment tool are a mainstay, educational development can also be seen as an influencer or indicator of organizational change (Schroeder 2011). While much is known about the activities and expanding roles of educational development centres (EDC), there is little reported on the assessment or evaluation of these centres. This poster is about planning an assessment of an EDC, and outlines the three phases of identification, exploration, and implementation.

A newly established EDC is a natural opportunity to explore and plan an assessment, in a three phase process. The process planning model by Chen (2005), based in program theory, will guide the assessment. The evaluation of an EDC by Smith and Gadbury-Amyot (2014) will also be a reference for this study.

Three Phases:

Pinning down what the EDC does and its objectives are included in the first phase. A strategic plan is underway to identify the activities, purposes and evidence based practice. The second phase will consist of the exploring and selecting the appropriate assessment, tools and timeline. Implementing the assessment is the third phase and will consist of data collection, analysis and a report on the process and findings. This assessment will be a significant contribution to the knowledge about educational development.

Chen, H. (2005). *Practical program evaluation: assessing and improving planning, implementation and effectiveness*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cook, C., and Kaplan, M. (Eds). (2011). *Advancing the culture of teaching on campus: How a teaching center can make a difference*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Patton, M. (1998). Discovering process use. *Evaluation*, 4(2), 225-233.

Schroeder, C. and Associates, (2011). *Coming in from the margins: Faculty Development's emerging organizational development role in institutional change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Smith, D., and Gadbury-Amyot, C. (2014). Process evaluation of a teaching and learning centre at a research university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(4), 472-442.

Trigwell, K. Rodriguez, K., and Han, F. (2012). Assessing the impact of a university teaching development programme. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(4), 499-511.

Pinning it Down: Exploring an Evaluation Plan for the Educational Development Unit

Cheryl L Jeffs, EdD. Educational Development Unit, Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning

BACKGROUND

The University of Calgary Educational Development Unit (EDU) in the Taylor Institute of Teaching and Learning is a team comprised of educational and technological consultants, staff and faculty.

The EDU will enhance the university's vision to cultivate teaching excellence.

WHERE DOES THE EDU FIT?

- Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)
- Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning
- 'Eyes High' Vision
- Academic Plan
- Comprehensive Institutional Plan
- Integrated Framework for Teaching and Learning

ENHANCE 'LEARNING'

Exploring and planning an evaluation will assist the EDU to select a theoretical framework, consider the various models, and review existing literature.

“Through the very process of an evaluation, ‘learning’ occurs
(Patton, 1998)

EVALUATION WILL PIN DOWN

- EDU Strategic Plan
- Accountability
- Leadership
- Collaboration
- Institutional role

THE EVALUATION MODEL

Essential elements of a program evaluation:
Schonwetter, Dawson & Britnell, (2008)

1. Timing and timeline
2. Rationale: 'opportunity oriented' (Rothwell & Sredl, 1992)
3. Data collection and methods: what needs to be measured and how
4. Valid and reliable program assessment
5. Participants: Unit, Faculty, Institution, QAR
6. Resources and experts
7. Limitations
8. Dissemination

