Executive Summary

In the spring of 2003 CCNMTL conducted a client survey. The goals of 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. Three hundred randomly selected clients were sent an invitation to participate in a 20-minute in-person survey interview; 68 participated in the study.

Survey Results Highlights

- 94% of respondents said 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.

- 97% rated the overall quality of service either excellent (52%), very good (28%), or good (17%).

- 98% rated the pedagogical advice and direction provided by CCNMTL either excellent (35%), very good (44%), or good (19%).

- 77% said that the investment of working with CCNMTL definitely (42%) or likely (35%) improved their classes.

- 40% either always (30%) or somewhat frequently (10%) used a technology-enhanced classroom.

- 60% indicated that the classroom lacked an adequate technical infrastructure.

Observations

The results of the survey show that CCNMTL is viewed as performing at acceptable to high levels in most areas. We have learned much in the process of conducting the survey, including the importance of reopening communications and re-engaging with old clients. We will review our outreach and workshop programs using the survey results to make improvements. This survey will be an important part of our August staff development day in reshaping our 2003/4 outreach strategy.
Rationale
As an organization, CCNMTL believes in the benefits of measuring the effectiveness of effort. CCNMTL routinely conducts evaluations of its major projects, but we were yet to conduct a comprehensive client survey to understand their perception of our services. The goals of 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
Three hundred names were randomly selected from the CCNMTL client database, which contains more than 1400 records collected over four years from all University schools. These randomly selected clients were sent an invitation to participate in a 20-minute in-person survey interview.

We conducted in-person interviews to ensure the quality of data collection and to reduce the level of self-selecting bias of online or paper surveys. Graduate students with a background in statistics were recruited to administer the survey.

Faculty were contacted by the graduate student interviewers in response to CCNMTL’s invitation. Interviews were conducted with 68 clients—a response rate of 22.6%. This sample represents 4.9% of CCNMTL’s total client population. In statistical terms, the results reported are indicative of our client population.

SPSS was used to tabulate the data and calculate all statistics.
Quantitative Findings

Service – Value, Familiarity and Use

- 94% of respondents said 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. 19% were not very familiar with our services, and 10.3% were not familiar at all.

- 62% of our sample used our services at least once in the past year. 18% of our clients used our services five times or more. 12% used our services ten times or more. 35% did not use our services last year.

CCNMTL offers a variety of services to our clients, ranging from course Web site development to providing pedagogical assistance. Clients typically used more than one service.

- 76% received assistance with a CourseWorks or custom Web site.
- 48% called or had an in-person consultation with a CCNMTL staff member.
- 37% attended a CCNMTL training session or workshop.
- 29% received pedagogical assistance with using technology in the classroom.
- 19% received advanced services project support.
- 16% developed video materials.
- 15% created audio materials.

Service Quality

We asked respondents to evaluate the quality of CCNMTL services.

- 97% rated the overall quality of service either excellent (52%), very good (28%), or good (17%). 3% rated the quality of service as poor.
• 96% rated the accessibility of staff either excellent (74%), very good (19%), or good (4%). 4% rated the accessibility and availability of staff as fair (2%) or poor (2%).

• 98% rated the pedagogical advice and direction provided by CCNMTL either excellent (35%), very good (44%), or good (19%). 2% rated the pedagogical advice and direction as poor.

• 96% rated the technical advice and direction either excellent (53%), very good (27%), or good (16%). 4% rated the technical advice and direction as poor.

• 96% rated the quality of staff work either excellent (63%), very good (30%), or good (3%). 4% rated the quality of staff work fair (2%) or poor (2%).

• 83% of clients surveyed indicated that they would use CCNMTL services in the future. 11% indicated they were neither likely nor unlikely to use services in the future. 6% said they were somewhat unlikely to use CCNMTL services in the future.

• 77% said that the investment of working with CCNMTL definitely (42%) or likely (35%) improved their classes. 23% were either uncertain (12%) or thought that working with CCNMTL did not improve their classes at all (11%).

Teaching and Technology

We asked our clients to rate their proficiency with technology. 31% described themselves as beginners, 46% as intermediate, and 24% as experts. Virtually all clients had computers with Internet connections at both home and work. We also asked faculty to indicate how frequently they used different technology in the classroom.
• 92% used e-mail in their courses, either always (72%) or somewhat frequently (21%); 5% were indifferent, and 3% used e-mail somewhat infrequently.

• 23% either always (12%) or somewhat frequently (11%) used electronic bulletin boards in their classes, while 12% used them neither frequently nor infrequently. 66% never (54%) or somewhat infrequently used bulletin boards.

• 40% either always (30%) or somewhat frequently (10%) used a technology-enhanced classroom.

• 59% either always (50%) or somewhat frequently (9%) used CourseWorks. 8% used CourseWorks neither frequently nor infrequently, and 35% used CourseWorks never (29%) or somewhat infrequently (5%).

• 44% either always (35%) or somewhat frequently (9%) used electronic library services. 12% used electronic library services neither frequently nor infrequently.

We asked our clients to comment on barriers that might prevent them from using technology in their classes. Researchers coded their spoken responses into standard categories.

• 60% indicated that the classroom lacked an adequate technical infrastructure.

• 44% reported that they had “too much other work.”

• 29% were not sure it would improve their teaching.

• 28% reported that there was not enough technical support.

• 22% were not sure how to integrate technology with the curriculum.

Outreach
Respondents were asked how they heard about CCNMTL.

• 38% received an e-mail message from CCNMTL.

• 27% were referred by a colleague.

• 21% heard about CCNMTL from a departmental administrator.

• 8% learned about CCNMTL either through the CU Record (3%), the CCNMTL Web site (3%), or the Columbia Spectator (2%).
Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Respondents were asked, “What additional services would you like CCNMTL to provide?”

- Increase its faculty outreach through greater personal contact and well-established communication channels with the departmental administrators.

- Tailor presentations to address the individual needs of the different schools and departments.

- Organize training sessions that cater to the different levels of faculty technology proficiency. Advertise these levels prominently in the e-mail messages. One respondent commented that she is intimidated by the computer skills of other faculty members and would be more willing to attend training sessions if they were oriented towards absolute novices.

- Workshops for advanced users and additional workshops when new software programs come to market.

- Follow-up workshops after training sessions and projects that help maintain a relationship between CCNMTL and faculty members.

- Summer training sessions.

- Advanced CourseWorks workshops and a more flexible CourseWorks Web site that allows the use of foreign scripts (i.e. Arabic, Chinese, etc.). Respondents also asked for access from other operating systems besides Windows and Mac OS.

- Place a greater priority on working with larger classes. For example “The Center should make it easier to combine different sections of the same class in CourseWorks and hold training sessions that cater to faculty of large core classes.”

Respondents were asked, “Does CCNMTL provide a valuable service to the University? Why?”

- The primary reasons given by respondents were the ubiquity of technology and the Center’s ability to facilitate the faculty’s keeping up with this constantly changing field. One professor stated that; ‘if the Center did not exist, then the University would be “out of the loop,”’ and that CCNMTL services are “expected as part of pedagogical services of the University.”
• Faculty said they would not create such media-based projects on their own, and one faculty member commented that the guiding hand of CCNMTL is appreciated.

• Many respondents said that the services of CCNMTL allow professors to catch up with the technology skills of students and this, in turn, facilitates a stronger relationship between professors and students.

• One professor stated that the services of CCNMTL “make a huge impact on teaching” and that “students are more actively involved in class discussions.”

• CCNMTL is a centralized location for faculty that offers one-on-one support not available anywhere else in the University.

• CCNMTL facilitates learning and improves the visual presentation of information and materials.

Respondents were asked, “Do you have any other suggestions on how CCNMTL can improve its services?”

• CCNMTL should establish better communication channels with each department and maintain contact to receive direct feedback on training sessions and projects.

• Establish contact with new faculty members and organize an orientation session or open house for them at the beginning of each semester.

• CCNMTL needs to do a better job at marketing and advertising its services.

• Display concrete evidence of its successes and that the faculty’s time investment was worthwhile.

• Make a greater effort to involve students in project planning thereby providing an “incentive for them to use it.”

• CCNMTL should periodically send e-mail messages to faculty members as reminders of CCNMTL’s existence. Furthermore, the messages should be sent out at the beginning and not middle of the semester.

• CCNMTL should make presentations on how media can be used in the classroom, “not as a marketing session but education.”
Respondents were asked “Do you have any final comments for us?”

- The majority of respondents described the Center as doing a good job and as having strong customer service, but some are not convinced that their investment has been worth the effort.

- The gap between what CCNMTL does and the University’s technical infrastructure must be resolved.

- Center feels very project oriented.

- CCNMTL should have basic Websites for new instructors that serve as an introduction to the Center.

- Training sessions were too short.

- Involving students in information sessions would create a greater demand for CCNMTL’s services.
Appendix 1

About the Survey Instrument
The survey consisted of 21 structured questions, organized in five sections, which measured 56 variables, plus five 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 consists of nine questions and measures the awareness of CCNMTL services, the frequency of use and the quality and value of services provided.

Teaching and Technology
The questions in this section provide descriptive statistics on the technological proficiency and habits when it comes to using technology in the classroom and potential barriers to more effective use.

Outreach
This section measures 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 provides us with information about the pedagogical characteristics of respondents, including how long they have been teaching, the amount of time spent on research activities and class preparation, and the number of classes taught by the respondent per semester.

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