

CCNMTL Client Service Survey

Fall 2005

The Columbia Center for New Media Teaching and Learning (CCNMTL) is committed to providing the highest level of service possible. In an effort to evaluate how faculty perceive our work, we re-administered a client service survey, originally conducted in 2003, during the spring 2005 semester. Our goals for the survey were: to measure the quality of our service activities; to learn what modes of outreach have been effective; to improve current services; and to determine new directions.

Methodology:

We used a survey instrument that was similar to the instrument employed in 2003 with one additional question. We invited a random sample of 352 clients from our database of 2,500 clients, representing 7% of the CCNMTL total client population, to participate. Seventy-two clients responded to the survey. Three SIPA graduate students, previously unaffiliated with CCNMTL, conducted in-person interviews with clients, each lasting approximately 20 minutes.

Survey Highlights

- 87% of faculty responded that CCNMTL provides a valuable service to the University
- 96% rated the overall quality of service as either excellent (44%), very good (43%), or good (9%).
- More faculty used CourseWorks than before.

<u>2003:</u>	<u>2005:</u>
59%	67%
- There was a substantial increase in the use of Electronic Library services (reserves, e-journals) in courses.

<u>2003:</u>	<u>2005:</u>
44%	71%
- Faculty increased their use of technology-enhanced classrooms since 2003.

<u>2003:</u>	<u>2005:</u>
40%	57%
- Faculty reported a decrease in the barriers to using technology in their teaching since 2003.

<u>2003:</u>	<u>2005:</u>
60%	38%

The overall results of our survey indicated that faculty agree that CCNMTL continues to successfully deliver a valuable service. We also found that faculty have become more comfortable and experienced using new media and digital technologies in their teaching.

Quantitative Findings:

Numbers in this document have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Service – Value, Familiarity, and Use

As a service organization, we are always interested in learning how CCNMTL is perceived by the University community.

87% of faculty responded that CCNMTL provides a valuable service to the University.

71% of respondents were either very familiar or somewhat familiar with CCNMTL's services in general. 14% were not very familiar with our services, and 15% were not familiar at all.

60% of our sample used our services at least once in the last year: 24% at the beginning of a semester; 15% occasionally throughout the year; 14% multiple times throughout the year, and 7% once a week or more.

61% of faculty surveyed responded that they would definitely use CCNMTL services in the future.

CCNMTL offers a variety of services to our clients, ranging from CourseWorks training and support to pedagogical assistance. Respondents typically reported using more than one service element.

71%	Were assisted with a CourseWorks Web site
26%	Attended training sessions or workshops
25%	Received pedagogical assistance using technology in the classroom
22%	Used a custom course Web site developed by CCNMTL
17%	Visited faculty support facilities, either at 204 Butler or the Armory location
17%	Developed video materials with the assistance of CCNMTL
14%	Received project development support
14%	Developed image materials with the assistance of CCNMTL
10%	Scanned materials with assistance of CCNMTL
6%	Utilized wikis, blogs or other non-CourseWorks web tools
4%	Developed audio materials with the assistance of CCNMTL
3%	Other

Service Quality

We asked our faculty clients to evaluate the quality of CCNMTL services.

72% rated the **overall quality of service** as excellent (33%), very good (32%), or good (7%). 3% rated the quality of service as fair or poor. 25% of respondents answered “not applicable.”

74% rated the **accessibility and availability of staff** as excellent (47%), very good (22%) or good (5%). 4% rated staff accessibility and availability as poor. 22% of respondents answered the question “not applicable.”

66% rated our **technical advice and direction** as excellent (33%), very good (29%) or good (4%). 4% rated our technical advice and direction as fair, and 1% as poor. 29% of respondents answered “not applicable.”

66% rated **our work’s timeliness** as excellent (39%), very good (19%) or good (8%), while 1% rated it poor. 32% of respondents chose “not applicable” to the question.

66% rated the **quality of the staff’s work** as excellent (36%), very good (29%) or fair (1%). 0% rated it fair or poor. 33% of respondents chose to answer “not applicable.”

58% rated the **quality of the materials** developed by CCNMTL staff as excellent (31%), very good (21%) or good (6%). 3% rated it fair or poor. 40% of the respondents opted for “not applicable” as the most appropriate choice.

55% rated our **pedagogical advice and direction** as excellent (26%), very good (18%) or good (11%), while 1% rated it poor. 44% of respondents answered “not applicable” to the question.

CCNMTL Effectiveness

For this year’s survey, we asked a new question in an attempt to assess how effective our services are in improving teaching and learning at Columbia.

64% of respondents answered that CCNMTL services **improved the administrative organization** of their course, either definitely (37%) or likely (27%). 33% said our services neither likely nor unlikely improved their course, while 3% said our services definitely did not.

58% of faculty agreed, either definitely (28%) or likely (30%), that CCNMTL services **improved the course experience** for their students. 34% said it was neither likely nor unlikely, 3% said it was unlikely and 3% said it was definitely unlikely.

54% of faculty responded that CCNMTL services enabled them to make **more effective use of class time** (33% said definitely and 21% likely). 36% were unsure, while 6% said

it was somewhat unlikely. 3% said CCNMTL services definitely did not make class time more effective.

54% of faculty believe, either definitely (34%) or likely (20%) that CCNMTL services **cultivated communication between themselves and their students**. 38% were unable to say if it was likely or unlikely, 5% said it was unlikely and 3% said CCNMTL services definitely did not cultivate communication between faculty and students.

48% of faculty, either definitely (27%) or likely (21%) believe that CCNMTL has provided them with tools **to improve class discussion**. 39% were undecided, 6% believe it was unlikely and 8% said CCNMTL services definitely provide them with tools to improve class discussion.

35% of faculty believe, either definitely (16%) or likely (19%) that CCNMTL services **improved the quality of their students' work**. 47% said it was neither likely nor unlikely, 10% said it was unlikely and 8% said that CCNMTL services definitely did not improve the quality of their students' work.

Teaching and Technology

We asked our clients to rate their own proficiency with technology.

29% consider themselves expert users in some applications and are sought out by their colleagues for assistance.

40% reported that they use discipline-specific software solutions in addition to basic applications.

31% reported that they are only able to perform basic tasks, such as checking email, browsing Web pages and creating documents (papers or spreadsheets).

We asked our faculty clients how frequently they used technology in their courses and which applications they utilize.

	Always	Somewhat frequently	Neither frequently nor infrequently	Somewhat infrequently	Never
Email	72%	19%	2%	4%	3%
CourseWorks course pages	54%	13%	8%	6%	19%
Other Web sites, the Internet	54%	17%	11%	7%	11%
Electronic library services (reserves, E-journals)	53%	18%	7%	7%	15%
Technology-enhanced classrooms	38%	19%	8%	13%	22%
PowerPoint presentations	33%	18%	8%	8%	33%
Special or discipline-specific applications	31%	7%	12%	7%	43%
Course Web pages	28%	7%	7%	4%	54%
Image production and/or slideshows	19%	10%	10%	11%	50%
Audio/Video production and/or streaming	10%	10%	6%	11%	63%
Online Bulletin Board (Discussion Groups)	8%	13%	12%	6%	61%
CCNMTL-created site or technology (i.e. Multimedia Study Environment, Video Interactions for Teaching and Learning, etc.)	7%	1%	9%	4%	79%
Other	6%	1%	1%	0%	92%

Faculty expressed a variety of reasons that prevented their use of technology in their classes:

54%	No time to learn new technologies
40%	Too much work
38%	Inadequate technical infrastructure in classroom
29%	Not sure how to integrate with curriculum
25%	Not sure that it will improve my teaching
21%	Not enough technical support
21%	Not sure that it will benefit my students
19%	Other
18%	Not sure my students will use it
17%	No time to use technologies
15%	Little incentive

We asked faculty which other digital media or technology organizations with whom they have previously worked:

65%	Academic Computing Information Systems (AcIS)
20%	A/V departments
15%	Language Resource Center
0%	Curriculum Design Studios (Health Sciences)
0%	Media Center for Art History (MCAH)
0%	Columbia Digital Knowledge Ventures (DKV)

Outreach

Respondents were asked how they heard about CCNMTL:

- 33% Heard about CCNMTL from another source
- 27% Received an email from CCNMTL
- 27% Referred by a colleague
- 8% Referred by a departmental administrator
- 3% Visited the CCNMTL Web site
- 2% Referred by a dean or department chairperson

Responses to Open-Ended Questions:

Faculty clients were asked what additional services they would like CCNMTL to provide. The following represents a partial list of the response we received; only the responses which fall within the domain of CCNMTL are included in this report. (If suggestions are the responsibility of other technology departments on campus, they are not reported here.)

- “More focus on custom websites, better support for customization”
- “Interested in software packages of symbols with molecular shape, biochemical pathways, image of a receptor, cell (aids for visual pathway)”
- “Improve organization or develop private image databases for individual courses integrated into CourseWorks”
- “More proactive outreach and consulting”
- “More handouts on classroom bulletin boards and other things to improve classroom discussion.”
- “Enhancements to CourseWorks”
- “Closer links to CLIO and the libraries”
- “Workshops are not always compatible with working hours. Need simple, user-friendly directions for those who cannot attend the workshops.”
- “Scanning is very difficult process and needs to be made easier.”
- “Develop faculty web pages”
- “Interactive teaching device where students press buttons to respond”
- “Inserting video clip into a PowerPoint presentation”
- “I'd like to use more case study [interactive] materials; I'd like to do more than PowerPoint”
- “Specific text support for designing website, both pedagogical advice and direction and innovative program advice to teaching material preparation”
- “More training and more electronic classrooms”
- “A Center initiative to persuade professors to update their websites from year to year”

When asked to elaborate on the Center's work as a valuable service, the majority of respondents expressed appreciation for the Center's work to support their interests in incorporating new media in their teaching.

- “[CCNMTL] encourages faculty to use powerful technologies in a flexible way.”
- “Web-based course work and tools are the wave of the future. We need help implementing these things.”
- “We've been able to produce important course materials that wouldn't have been possible without the Center.”
- “Yes, the organization provides [an] appropriate level of technology and support. At the same time they give people an idea of what is possible...The organization is very customer-oriented and provides capacity-building.”
- “Because professors from a different age must keep up with technical advances to enhance teaching but I am so handicapped in many ways. I wish the Center would have ten times the resources and personnel in order to help. It's a fabulous current tool that we must make use of.”
- “Technical idiots, such as me, need the help.”
- “[I have] seen excellent projects developed for colleagues [and my] CourseWorks workshop was excellent.”
- “They're [CCNMTL] there when you need them.”

Others commented on the power of online tools (such as CourseWorks).

- “It is a much more effective way of communicating between groups of faculty, students, and administrators.”
- “We should be moving away from paper. This frees up inventive information-sharing and makes communicating much easier. I couldn't live without it.”
- “It's much easier to communicate with 20 people. The grading system is also very convenient.”
- “Making everything electronic allows easy accessibility to materials.”
- “The development and improvement of CourseWorks alone is a vital service.”
- “Students want to do everything online and it's easier for commuters. Plus, it's more practical for large courses than reserves, [because it's more] scaleable.”

CCNMTL Conclusion:

The survey results confirm that faculty continue to perceive CCNMTL as an organization that provides a high level of service to our clients, and that there has been a significant increase in the use of new media in Columbia courses since 2003.

We have learned that faculty—especially our current and past clients—would appreciate more frequent updates about our activities and about the technologies and services available to the University community. We plan to establish regular communications with all of our faculty partners to ensure they are informed about the full slate of service offerings provided by CCNMTL.

About the Survey Instrument

This blind survey consisted of 26 structured questions, organized in five sections, which measured 45 variables, plus four open-ended questions, each of which measured a particular aspect of our clients' use of CCNMTL services, their attitudes towards technology as a teaching resource, and their general characteristics.

CCNMTL Services

The first section consisted of nine questions that measure faculty awareness of CCNMTL services, the frequency of use and the quality and value of services provided.

Teaching & Technology

The questions in this section provided descriptive statistics on technological proficiency and habits, especially concerning the use of technology in the classroom and potential barriers to more effective use.

Outreach

This section measured the effectiveness of outreach efforts and the clarity of services provided by CCNMTL in relation to similar organizations at Columbia.

Academic Characteristics

The fourth section provided us with information about the pedagogical characteristics of respondents, including how long they have been teaching, the amount of time they spend on research activities and class preparation, and the number of classes they teach each semester.

Demographics

The last section of the survey provided us with general demographic information about the faculty including gender, academic rank, and department.