DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 653 IR 000 264

TITLE	Instructional Development; Summary Report.
INSTITUTION	William Rainey Harper Coll., Palatine, Ill.
PUB DATE	1 Aug 73
NOTE	32p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; Colleges; Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Development; *Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Design; Instructional Improvement; Instructional Technology; *Program Descriptions; Summer Institutes
IDENTIFIERS	Harper College; Illinois

ABSTRACT

The Instructional Development Project at Harper College from 1970 to 1973 is described. The objective of the project was to improve instruction by providing a framework and an inservice training program for faculty members. A total of 30 instructors participated in the project at a total cost of $35,223 including released time costs, and approximately 4,800 students were exposed to the improvements made in instruction. A number of curriculum materials were designed and implemented as a result of the project. Participants became familiar with a greater variety of media and gained increased sophistication with production processes and the application of learning resources. Among the recommendations made for the project are a long range development plan for each division, additional released time for faculty to permit development of a complete course and the establishment of an educational development coordinator position. Appendixes contain background information and evaluation information. (JG)

Instructional Development

Summary Report

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Harper College
Palatine, Illinois

August 1, 1973

Prepared for

Office of Vice President of Academic Affairs

By

Dr. George Voegel, Dean, Learning Resources

HARPER COLLEGE INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Introduction

Harper College has been committed to meeting the changing educational needs of the community it serves through effective and continuous improvement of the instructional processes. Several examples of this commitment include the Special Projects for Educational Development (SPED) committee and funding, the Innovative Travel project and fundings, summer faculty workshop, and many other individualized projects which have been encouraged in many instructional areas of the college. These have been devoted to the assistance of teachers who are aware and desirous of improving their instructional effectiveness.

During the period covered by this report, instructional development as an activity in colleges and universities emerged as a rather hazy concept into something that has become the focus of dedicated curriculum or instructional improvement. Several entire issues of national journals (see AVI, Dec. 1971; AVI Oct. 1972; and AVCR, Spring 1973) have been devoted to the topic of instructional development and three staff members of Harper College have had their materials in these journals. Many colleges and universities now have extremely active units within their academic areas organized around instructional development, with various types of full-time positions ranging from directors to vice-chancellors serving in these instructional leadership positions.

The intent of the Instructional Development Project at Harper College was to provide both a framework and an initial in-service training program which could be enlarged upon and continue the improvement of instruction. The overall objective of this project was to improve instruction and to further assist in the most appropriate and effective development of individual students. The realization of this objective was contingent upon the initial exploration of instructional development models, the development

of a Harper Model, and the training of a selected group of individual faculty members which could continue the further development of this project.

INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT 1970 - 1973

1970-71 Overview

A. Goals:
   1. To develop a Harper College model and system of instructional development.
   2. To create an instructional personnel and resource "pool" designed to support and enhance other faculty efforts to improve the quality of education.

B. Estimated Costs
   Consultant visitations, planning and training - $9,100

C. Actual Costs - $8,580

Achievements

Eighteen faculty (Appendix A) participated in the I.D. project and began using an I.D. model as a guideline for development work, although their beginning efforts were not as well refined as such a model might incorporate. A wide range of materials were produced based on stated objectives but improvement was needed in applying learning strategies. There were no dropouts and every participant voiced plans to continue development. Also, the participants were positive in their attitudes and outlook towards the instructional development approach (Appendix B & C).

One extremely successful by-product of this first year was the development over the summer of 1971 of the "Man and Environment" course. This was planned by Mr. DePalma and Mr. Stewart from the start with objectives, a unique learning sequence for the students, and the collections and production of supportive learning resources. This course continues to be effective and interesting for the students.

Also during this same summer, several Learning Lab staff members who were I.D. participants completed the full development of entire course modules for their 090 level courses. This increased the learning flexibility for the students so that they could go at their own speed through the materials, and also the teachers could detect the areas of the materials which particular students found difficult.

1971-72 Overview

A. Goals:
   1. To sustain and complete the efforts of I.D. participants from last year.
   2. To utilize feedback and expertise of some of the former participants.
   3. To acquaint all administrative and LRC personnel with the I.D. model.
   4. To acquaint and involve at least 15 to 20 different faculty in the I.D. process.

B. Estimated Costs
   Consultant visitations, supplies, secretarial support - $9,250

C. Actual Costs - $2,543

Achievements

The '70-'71 projects were completed and tried out with students to the extent possible. One participant left Harper and move out of state, while another was taken off his subject area I.D. project to work on the Man and Environment project. The total number of students reached by these various I.D. projects during this tryout period was 1,284, and it is assumed that this is a beginning figure since each successive semester adds a new group of students exposed to improved units of instruction or in a few cases improved full courses.

One faculty I.D. participant from '70-'71, Dr. Soter Kokalis, was chosen to work with new faculty participants. His role as a "teacher trainer" was to assist Dr. Voegel, the overall coordinator. As a successful I.D. participant from the first year, he was very

effective in helping the new participants to see the usefulness of I.D. model and how it would apply to their projects.

An administrators seminar on the I.D. model was conducted for two days in November and involved various levels of the organization. Areas of support and types of roles needed to assist instructional development were identified. Also ways to improve feedback in the instructional area of the college were examined to better provide reporting data on instructional improvement (Appendix D) which in current terminology would make a contribution to the growing problems of management information systems (M.I.S.).

For this year 12 faculty were chosen to participate in the I.D. program (Appendix E). There was more focus given to their projects although in the beginning seminars there was some confusion as to the direction they should be taking. Again, one participant moved out of state so that this expertise was lost, one participant was taken seriously ill in the spring semester and was unable to finish the program.

The estimated student exposure to course or unit improvements from this group of I.D. participants in the 1972 spring semester is about 350-400 since not all projects were ready for tryout.

1971-72 I.D. Projects Technical Review Summary

Using the Harper Criterion Checklist as the evaluation instrument, the I.D. participant projects were analyzed. Overall, the plans were judged to be excellent. However, the major area of weakness was in Stage II, Step 4: State Objectives of the Project Plans.

Of the eleven plans, three had not written their objectives in behavioral terms and two had not yet written objectives. Those participants whose plans contained poorly written objectives were assisted in improving them. For those participants whose plans

did not yet have objectives written, assistance was given to help them outline their objectives and clarify what each objective would contain in terms of behavioral indicators. The above was accomplished during the technical review session held May 1 and 2, 1972 (Appendix F). It was recommended that the format be modified for the I.D. program for 1972-73.

1972-73 Overview

A. Goals:
   1. To select a limited number of faculty participants to specialize on the development of individualized instruction for an entire course.
   2. To acquaint the faculty participants with the I.D. model and use it in conjunction with their projects.
   3. Continue to emphasize self-support of I.D. approach and de-emphasize reliance on outside consultants.

B. Estimated Costs
   Consultant visitation, supplies, etc. - $950

C. Actual Costs - approximately $100
   (outside consultants were not used at all)

Achievements

Eight faculty were selected as I.D. participants based on their interest in developing course materials along an individualized or self-study approach for the students (Appendix G). This approach called for far more development efforts than in the past. Two faculty participants resigned from Harper and moved elsewhere. In one case in the art area, the work started will be followed through by another participant from the art area, however in the other case in nursing, with new staff and a new curriculum pattern being suggested, it is uncertain how much of the developed materials will get a tryout with students.

Two participants from the Business Division had worked out individualized materials for their course, but due to budget constraints for equipment they will not be able to implement their program for

at least another year. Another tentative participant had hoped to use some commercially available materials and build around these, however, after receiving these and other source materials it was felt that they were not suitable, and no other materials were readily available, and to produce these at Harper would have been beyond the scope of the I.D. program.

Self-instructional units have been developed for the Office Practice course to be ready for use for the 1973 fall semester. Also the ATE 105 course has a completed workbook and the art course materials will begin to be used next fall. In English Composition a self-paced program is being developed for nine units.

With only a brief introduction by Harper staff and a one day seminar in the fall, these participants were able to use the I.D. model as a guideline to evolve and design their materials. Because of the scope of their projects the yield for the students is yet to be demonstrated. A review next spring needs to be done to see implications of the fall semester tryout.

Assuming another 1,000& students were exposed to the improved instructional units from the '70-'71 participants, and 2,620 students were exposed this academic year from the '71-'72 participant's projects. Also the entire Learning Lab courses are now self-paced as a result of this year's and past year's efforts and approximately 1,200-1,300 students have been through these materials this year. This is a total of 4,820 students who have been exposed to the I.D. efforts of faculty who were participants from 1970-73.

It has also been found that the I.D. participants were more sophisticated in their design and application of learning resources (Appendix H). While it is difficult to verbalize the effect of this observation, the following are categories of effectiveness:

a) Improved communication between faculty and LRC staff about their projects.

b) Because the intended use of the learning materials has been clarified, the "retakes", redesign, and redoings of media productions has dropped with I.D. participants, thus increasing both faculty and LRC staff productivity.

c) A wider variety of media formats used by faculty after I.D. program, thus offering greater learning varieties to the students.

Instructional Development Summary Overview

1970-71 - Harper I.D. approach implemented with 18 faculty participants. Cost: $ 8,580

1971-72 - '70-'71 projects tried out and 1,284 students exposed to improved instruction. Administrators were briefed on the I.D. approach and their roles in the process were refined. Twelve more faculty were started as I.D. participants and were assisted by a successful past participant. More media and a greater variety of media were used by the participants than before their participation. Cost: $ 2,543

1972-73 - '70-'71 and '71-'72 projects implemented and approximately 4,800 students were exposed to the improvements made in instruction. LRC production planning and design was improved due to increased understanding and knowledge about production processes. Eight faculty began individualized projects, several withdrew, and two had their projects postponed for a year, while the rest are still finishing the design-development phase. Cost: $ 100

About 30 Participants Cost:	$11,223
Estimated Release Time Costs:	$24,000
Total Costs:	$35,223

Recommendations

If the improvement of instruction and learning is going to have any lasting effect beyond some successful instructional units, then the instructional development process must be extended to full course development. The success of the Learning Lab courses which were fully developed, the efforts in one physics course, and individual instruction approach attempted by this year's participants, all point towards incorporating this approach in future efforts.

Another consideration for change or modification is the "reward system" for the faculty participants. One semester of three hours of release simply is not adequate when it has been shown the amount of work and effort that goes into development work, especially those projects beyond a unit or two. Where faculty have done development work during the summer as their sole task, the results (Man and Environment; Learning Lab courses; Typing) yield a total course product that is not fragmented by different development styles, or one that is viewed as a "pet project", rather than a cooperative project developed by several faculty that would be implemented in all sections of the same course.

With these considerations in mind, the following recommendations are made:

a) Each Division Chairman, with assistance from lead teachers, program coordinators, the educational development coordinator, and other staff that he might consider, design a long range development plan which would prioritize courses over the next five years. Such plans shall be forwarded by Dec. 15th to V.P.A.A. and the deans to be reviewed for consideration for summer development. By Feb. 1st appropriate faculty (about 6-10) will be notified as to their participating status.

b) During the spring semester, these selected faculty would

carry a full load, but be responsible for becoming knowledgeable in the instructional development process and design the pattern or structure in which their summer instructional development efforts would fit.

c) In the summer of 1974, these 6-10 faculty will commence full-time development of their courses to be completed by Sept. 1st.

d) That an educational development coordinator (E.D.C.) position be opened in the spring of 1974 to assist and coordinate these development projects, SPED, and innovative travel as proposed in the Harper Long Range Plan.

The estimated budget to carry out these recommendations is as follows:

a) 1973-74 Budget	
Educational Development Coordinator (see Appendix I, for rationale)	$14,000 - $17,000
b) 1974-75 Budget	
6-10 faculty @ approximately $2,650 each for 1974 summer development work	26,500
Total (assuming various support services will be able to handle projects within their capacity)	$43,500

1970-71 I.D. PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

NAMES & DIVISION	UNITS	OBJECTIVES
Sharon Alter Social Sciences	American Revolution; Civil War and Reconstruction three phases	Input, Decision-making, and output results.
Richard Bernstein Engineering	Electronic Technician Job Role	Develop Slide Presentation.
Diane Callin Communications		Develop materials to define kinds of independent learning; develop materi to define student response in this area.
Frank Christensen	Listening Skills Development	Two weeks instruction
Pauline Jenness Mathematics & Physical Sciences	Introduce Unit to Algebra: Common Fractions	Establish objectives, reorganize format, improve student achievement in MTH094 and 095.
Soter Kokalis Mathematics & Physical Sciences	Chem-Anal Spectrophotometer; Redox	Develop two videotapes and validate their instructional use.
George Makas Humanities & Fine Arts	The Melody Unit: One of 12 Units	
Frank McClintock Business	GNP	Prepare two units related to GNP to overcome misconceptions about
Rebecca McLoughlin Business	Horizontal/Vertical Centering; Block Business letter	Self-instructional upgrade typing skills for students with some deg of typing competency.

1970-71 I.D. PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

NAMES & DIVISION	UNITS	OBJECTIVES
William Punkay Engineering	Interation and Decision Making: A Design Case	Have students confront actual practice problems to be compared with professional engineer's decisions.
Joan Roloff Communications	Organize Material To Write; Develop Spelling Skills	
Meyer Rudoff Engineering	Computer Applications Zoning; C.A. Fire Resistive Construction	Design and develop zoning and codes matrix.
Ronald Stewart Social Sciences	What is Sociology; Culture	Define goals, develop objectives.
James Sturdevant Communications	Two Units of English Composition	To develop self-instructional units to allow students to progress at own rate.
Rose Trunk Business	Accounting Placement Test, Business 101	Design, develop and validate test fo selective student placement in appropriate accounting course.
Betty Windham Mathematics	Waves; Force, Mass, and Acceleration	Revision of Technical Physics Progr develop objectives, design lab and lecture materials.

PHASE I: PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

Question: As a result of this workshop (November 9, 10 and 11), do you feel better equipped to carry on your instructional development efforts?

19 Yes 0 No

Comments:
1. ID makes much more sense than any other means
2. Organized thinking
3. Helpful pattern
4. Total view
5. Specific and gives direction
6. A better framework
7. A comprehensive, specific set of criteria for developing and evaluating an ID project.

Phase I Reactions of Participants (If I were to tell a friend about what I did)

It was an introduction to a systems approach to the instructional process. We worked on plan and set objectives, most of the time, but the methods and the systems that we looked at and talked about make it more of a surefire method, rather than hit-and-miss.

The systems approach forces you to set objectives and to critically look at what will happen during the learning process. It sends up a "red flag" when things go wrong and helps to identify what went wrong, when and why.

I'm sold on what we've started. Not necessarily what we have or will have, but the process.

It was interesting to see how universal this approach can be. For the first time I saw technical teachers work with humanities instructors on common objectives.

*****

I would describe the ID Program as a valuable experience. The process discussed was not necessarily new, but provided valuable guidelines to the organizational process in developing one's educational or instructional procedure.

*****

The institute gave me a broad background in instructional development programs and the tools by which I could judge their merits. It provided us time as a group of faculty to evaluate the merits of these ID programs as applicable to the Harper College structure and program

The conciseness in the ABCD approach to behavioral objectives I found very helpful in learning to write good objectives. I also thought that the use of the "simulation game" was an excellent pedagogical tool for getting across the idea of ABCD approach in TPO and EO--very succinct and concise.

*****

In this workshop we were exposed to a systematized approach to a series of (instructional) concepts with which we were all familiar. The advantage of this systematized approach two-fold. First, we were supplied with comprehensive criteria for evaluating our solutions to our instructional problems. Second, we were able to construct a broad instructional development model from which we can formulate, evaluate, or re-cycle future instructional programs.

*****

What was very well done in this workshop was direct individual involvement in the formulation of behavioral objectives and in the evaluation of several approaches to systems analysis. Interesting is the fact that weaknesses within the program were evident (i.e., communication of the purpose of marketplace exercise). However, these weaknesses made it all the more apparent to the participants that application of a systems approach is a process, not ending but always continuing to be developed with flexibility. Although, at first, I questioned the practicality of the workshop, I later discovered that the original theoretical structure was necessary to even begin specific development.

PHASE III SUMMARY EVALUATION (Dr. Floyd Urbach, Oregon Teacher Research Division)

On the basis of the technical review and a review of all other worksheets, logs and tracers the following evaluative and interpretive statements can be made:

1. The Harper - ID model is being used as a general guidelines for developmental work.
2. There is a definite need for a more detailed guide, i.e., the criterion checklist (appendix 6).
3. Topics were uniformly selected on the basis of experience. Rarely were any formal needs assessment data cited. The topics ranged in complexity from very simple slide-tape presentations to extremely sophisticated integrations of many instructional components. There was no evidence of any external application of priority criterion other than during participant selection.
4. Few external resources were being used. The range of resources (for a community college) was disappointingly small to this investigator.
5. Most of the participants worked alone, using only the LRC staff in production roles. The team conduct was not operationalized in terms of the WRH - ID model philosophy.
6. Objectives were always stated. There is a major need for improving objectives along the ABCD format lines. There were several notable exceptions who really did an excellent job of both stating objectives and of conducting a thorough objectives analysis.
7. Learning strategies appeared to be largely intuitive or based on instructors preference. In only a few cases was any great concern voiced about the type of learning required or the type of practice needed by the student to in fact achieve the specified objectives.
8. A wide range of materials are in production. It is apparent that there is adequate technical expertise although a number of projects were blocked due to the limited number of LRC staff available to do the production work.
9. Only a few projects exhibited any serious planning for prototype testing at any level. A major effort will be needed to improve and to support the adequate evaluation of instructional techniques, learning materials and evaluation instruments.
10. There appear to be no dropouts. Every participant has voiced plans to continue development through to tryout (if they have not already completed their projects).

HARPER COLLEGE

INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

ADMINISTRATIVE FEEDBACK

In the November I.D. seminar conducted by Dr. Sparks of U.S.I.U. for the administrative team was asked to respond to the question:

> Once you have contributed to the team efforts of carrying on instructional development, how do you know this effort has paid off?
>
> A. How do you obtain data on your role?
> B. What kind of data do you need from? - the faculty.
> C. How do you report this data to the Board, students, taxpayers, and colleagues?

The descriptive listings below are the collective results of feedback from the administrators attending the I.D. seminar.

A. How do you obtain data to justify your role and the role of your staff in contributing to the learning process?

1. a. Developer
   b. Other members of team
   c. Feedback from my own staff
   d. Review of project in relation to other curricular modifications.
   e. From LRC utilization reports.
   f. Feedbacks during the development, implementation and evaluation of the process or project.

2. a. Compare list of administrative tasks development during review and planning of participants procedure to list of actual chairman's activities. After conference with administrator, participant fills out questionnaire with comments added by administrator.
   b. If a specific team member, then provide the involvement and assume specific responsibilities assigned or agreed to as a team member. Assemble data to show to your involvement and team effort.
   c. Teacher attitude remains positive.
   d. Resources are continually available.
   e. Procedure gets developed.
   f. Determine realism of parameter, re: success or failure.
   g. Feedback from faculty.
   h. Computer-Center resource utilization reports.
   i. Grade reports.
   j. Test reports.
   k. Pilot study results.
   l. Outside audit.

8. What kind of data do you need from your faculty to assess the learning process?

1. Data must be generalizable.

2. Teacher input - questionnaire. Conference re: objectives and outline.

3. Testimony of instructor in the light of his plan and of the nature of the product. These questions were my previously agreed on tasks accomplished? Where they essential to the program?

4. Look at objectives - are they achieved? Data from specialists - Linked to objectives. Written, relevant, reports of results, quantity and quality of teaching materials produced, units, course outlines.

Activities	Results	Teacher	Student
No. of hrs. spent Reports produced	Mat. produced LRC production Units Course outline Bibliographies Behavioral - objectives	Methods used	H.S. having his objective attitude as per comments. Control group.

5. Quantity and quality of work

		Results	
Inputs	Teacher	Student	Materials
money time supplies equipment team meetings reports conferences printing computer LRC contacts LRC time others time	attitude style methods terminal-objectives-identified criterion-checklist	test courses attitudes success in advanced courses control and experimental-groups teacher-observations national tests pre-test post-test results follow-up on transfer accomplishment of T.O.'s	slides T.V. Overheads Course outlines behavioral objectives

6. a. Utilization of IS. Services by teams
   b. Cost factors on development and production.

7. a. Analysis of level of skill development, awareness of role of computer in instruction, etc. from faculty.
   b. Hours of hardware and staff resources devoted to ID projects support.
   c. Analysis of cost savings affected through use of computer resources.

7. con't.

d. Degree of student learning affected by use of computer resources, i.e., pre-test, post-test, etc.
e. Opinion surveys from faculty and student, also initial analysis surveys from faculty and student.
f. Specific data in feedback information that is used to modify the project.

Once you have contributed, how do you know this effort has paid off? How do you report this data to:

(1) The College Board

a. 1. Basic philosophy and overall objectives of the program.
2. Exemplary projects with indication of results of these projects.
3. Overall results of ID over a period of time (1 year).
4. Prospectus

b. Annual reports:

1. Institutional use of computer resources.
2. Utilization reports, headcounts, supporting information for future staffing.

c. Representation samples, written report. Letters of testimonial.

d. Summary data from development program questionnaire.

e. Summarize the results of questionnaire by categories of administrators.

(2) Students

a. Newspaper, student grants

b. Individual reports

c. Can describe the impact of the curriculum innovation to prospective students in a counseling situation.

d. Student newspaper.

e. Presentation to test or control groups.

f. Initial communication of objectives, parameters of their involvement, etc. Communication of changes being made due to feedback and alternatives. Communication of progess made on an individual basis. Report of results (grades and overall).

(3) Taxpayers

a. Report to Board of Trustees in public meeting. Accountability report over period of time in newspapers, publications, etc.

(3) Taxpayers - con't.

b. News releases, open houses.

c. Career nights, parents nights, other PR activities - Open houses, news releases, etc.

d. News releases, facts, stories, testimonials.

e. Monthly newsletter.

f. Board report - summary.

g. News release from board.

(4) Professional Colleagues

a. Publications in professional journals, presentation or papers at professional seminars or conferences.

b. Highlight to colleagues on college tours.

c. Panels, Gt-70, Journals, director of meetings, etc.

d. Board report - summary.

e. Feedback regarding pros and cons of project.

f. Let them see summary of results of questionnaire - commentary.

g. Participants should be afforded the opportunity to discuss problems, plans for remediation of problems, results of effort within the plan, etc. Can and should be done in Division and other meetings, house communications, project and research reports, colloquia, etc.

1971-72 I.D. PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

NAMES & DIVISION	COURSE	STATEMENT
Carol Chamberlin Humanities	Art Appreciation/Art History	Tutorial work to supplement classroom work; expansion of independent studies.
Donald Collins Engineering	Architectural Tech. (ATE) 105	Computer mathematics for AT; develop outline for criteria.
Ben Dallas Humanities	Art Appreciation A105, Art History A111-A112	Develop instructional methods and techniques for student self-instruction in fundamentals.
Stephen Franklin, Humanities	Philosophy Dept. Experimental Class of 300	Develop a program to teach the most basic elements of applied logic - auto-tutorial used mostly as a supplement.
Lee Kolzow Communications	RDG 99 & RDG 104	Learning lab efforts for individualization at all levels.
X Frances Maguire Communications	English 102	EPIC - Combined large lecture, independent study, small group discuss using films and other pertinent methods and materials.
Michael Oester Math & Phys. Sci.	Chem 121 & Chem 122	Provide for more individualized instruction - technique utilizatio behavioral objectives, video-tape graphic materials, lab experimen
Leota Prokop Communications	American Literature 220	Composition and writing skills. Literature course.

1971-72 I.D. PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

NAMES & DIVISION	COURSE	STATEMENT
Edith Saute Social Sciences	American History 111	Making more effective use of large lecture halls using audio-visual methods; provide individualized instruction; self-study; discussion groups development.
John Thompson Life & Health Sciences	BIO 160, 161	Development of an audio-tutorial approach to Anatomy-Physiology; development of media to better prepare way for para-professional help.
Robert Tillotson Humanities	MUS 101, Music Fundamentals for Non-Majors	Coordinating the instructional objectives for all section of Music Fundamentals for Non-Majors to allow student to complete the course requirements on a "credit by exam" basis on his own at his own rate.
Jack Tippens Humanities	DESIGN I - The perceptual and design information applies to all the art courses.	Student Option System in Art Appreciation (See GT-70 Innovative Instr. presentation); exam, sustained writing, individual & group project and group discussion options. More visuals needed which explains perceptual phenomena; credit by portfolio.

A. Results of I.D. Participant Interviews

The results obtained from interviews conducted with the I.D. Program faculty (both 1970-71 and 1971-72) are summarized below:

1. Have you received the support you needed to develop your I.D. project?

Yes 21 No 2

Comments from I.D. Program faculty:

- Yes, haven't really needed much.
- Learning Resources Center staff very helpful.
- In some cases I thought the support was not there; but all I had to do was ask.
- LRC staff very helpful in helping me write my script.
- LRC staff really helped me to visualize the slides for my slide-tape presentation.

2. Do you feel the I.D. Program has been worthwhile?

Yes 23 No 0

3. What problems have you encountered?

- Having trouble implementing unit into course.
- Have been ill and, therefore, have not accomplished as much as I wanted to.
- Great difficulty writing scripts for video tape and slide-tape presentations.
- Having difficulty getting enough background information about students in my class.
- Change of curriculum greatly influenced use of my unit.
- Class overload has caused me to put off working on my units.
- No facilities immediately available when program was implemented.

B. Results of Questionnaire

The results obtained from the questionnaire administered to the Deans and Division Chairmen are summarized below:

1. Have you been directly involved with the I.D. Program participants? In what way?

Yes 5 No 2 Only Indirectly 2

2. Do you feel you could have been more involved? In what way?

Yes 5 No 2

Ways to be involved--rationale for scope of individual projects: more consulting; control incentives; initial planning.

3. Do you feel the I.D. Program is needed at Harper? Why?

Yes 5 No 1 Not Sure 1

Pro-Reasons: Productive people need support.

To aid in development of instructional materials new effective instructional modes will emerge.

Best approach to account for wide variety of student needs.

Needed because of accountability crunch.

Contrary: Not in its present form.

4. What are some viable alternatives to Instructional Development (I.D.)?

Performance contracting (2 responses); send faculty to N.L.H.E. in North Carolina.

5. In what way could the I.D. Program be improved?

. It will require time, but eventually nearly all faculty need to become involved.

. Concentrate it, releasing teachers completely for semester or summer. Expecting more output from faculty instead of splitting their effort. Now they can say "I didn't get it done because of teaching load." Also step it up--involve more faculty. Select some of our faculty to be leaders in the program.

. Time spend on developing a direction in instructional development that fits into an over-all strategy.

. Less detail, less trivia, more focus on the work the faculty members are interested in and less on the system.

. Closer control of development projects. Use of release time is too vague for purposes of accountability.

. By being in a position to control incentives (both pleasure and pain stimuli) for division faculty to achieve I.D. objectives.

. We shouldn't build the program around X numbers of teachers. Ideas don't come that uniformly.

. Closer coordination with teams of participants.

. Closer integration with the present, on-going programs.

1972-73 I.D. PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

NAMES & DIVISION	COURSE	PROJECT
Carol Chamberlin Humanities	FNA 111-112, Art History	Student self-instruction and completion of joint project from last year.
Don Collins Engineering	ATE 105, Comp. Math for Arch. Tech.	Completion of modules 3 & 4 for cours
Carol DeBiase Life & Health Sciences	PNR 060, Practical Nursing	Develop small learning modules with AV materials for self-pacing approac
Janice Howard Humanities	ART 105, Art Appreciation	Cultural Arts by self-study.
Charles Joly Social Sciences	PSYCH 216, Child Psychology	Develop into independent A-T progra with commercially available video-tapes (contingent on value of tapes to Psych. 216).
Dolores Samson Business	SEC 132, Office Practice	Individualize units for self-instruction.
Joseph Sternberg Communications	COMPOSITION 101	Contract composition, student self-pacing to meet objectives.
Robert Zilkowski Business	SEC 131, Business Machines	Individualize self-instructional approach for various machines.

LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS PRODUCTION QUESTIONAIRE SUMMARY

The production facility of the LRC (graphics, TV) has produced instructional materials for use in the learning process. These consist of video tapes, audio tapes, overhead transparencies, 35mm color slides, posters, charts, etc.

To help gain some insight into into the efficacy of the instructional materials produced, a questionnaire was devised and distributed to selected instructors. The questions were constructed to elicit the instructors opinion of the effectiveness of the material along a modified "Likert" scale.

It was also hoped that some insight might be gained into the reasons that prompted the instructors to answer as they did. Additionally, an attempt was made to find if there was any correlation to the mode of instruction used by the instructor and his use of the instructional materials produced by LRC.

Twenty-eight instructors answered and returned the instructional materials questionaire. There were a grand total of 101 responses to the question asking about the effectiveness of the produced instructional materials in the learning situation. Of these, 35 responses indicated that the instructional materials helped produce a great amount of learning while 48 responses noted that the materials were effective in helping to produce learning. These two categories accounted for 82% of the total responses, indicating an overwhelming favorable attitude on the part of the instructors toward the instructional materials.

Seven responses showed that the materials were of no use at a in helping to produce learning. However, upon analysis, it was found that this response was checked when the instructor did not use that particular instructional material.

As noted above, the responses indicated that the instructors were convinced that instructional materials produced by the LRC were effective in helping to produce learning. We were interested in determining what factors,if any, helped to influence the instructors to reach this conclusion.

The majority of instructors, 22 out of 28, or 90%, indicated that favorable student reaction influenced their answers. Nine instructors noted that they were also influenced by an increase in retention. Only three instuctors said that GPA increase in retention.

It was found that the majority of the instructors queried used the lecture-demo centers as well as classrooms. Twenty-two instructors said they used the lecture-demo classroom and/or self study and discussion groups while only 8 instructors noted use of regular classroom and/or laboratory, exclusively.

Conclusions:

1. More than 80% of the instructors who had instructional materials produced by the LRC noted that the materials either produced a great amount of learning or were effective in helping to produce learning.
2. The majority of the instructors answered as they did because they were influenced by favorable student reaction to the instructional materials.
3. The study suggests that instructors using a variety of modes of instruction are more likely to have instructional materials produced than instructors using the regular classroom and/or laboratory exclusively.

Question #2

In my opinion these instructional materials:	Television	Audio	Overhead Transparencies	35 mm Color Slides	Posters	Signs	Graphs & Charts	Films / Other B/W Slides / Lettering / Design	TOTAL
helped produce a great amount of learning	5	3	10	7	1	1	2	6	35
were effective in helping to produce learning	3	9	10	14	2	1	6	3	48
were moderately effective in producing learning		1	1		3	2	1		8
not very effective in helping to produce learning	1	1				1			3
were of no use at all in helping to produce learning	2*	1*		1*		2*	1*		7*
*not used TOTAL	11	15	21	22	6	7	10	9	101 / 101

Long Range Planning Committee

Recommendations for Promotion of Educational Innovation

The committee recommends that a new accountable organizational unit be established by July 1972 to coordinate all the educational innovative programs at the college. The innovative programs that would be included under this organizational unit would be Special Projects for Educational Development (SPED) funds, innovative travel funds, educational travel programs, cooperative efforts of GT/70 (Consortia of Ten Community Colleges), instructional development, in-service seminars or workshops, faculty exchange programs, major new course development or revision projects, use of course writer in computer-assisted instruction, and the use of auto-tutorial carrels.

There are two basic reasons for the need for such an innovative center. First, there needs to be some one person who is accountable for educational innovative efforts at Harper. Second, the innovative efforts need to be coordinated so a rational allocation of funds to various innovative efforts can be made.

This center should develop a five year plan for the total instructional innovation program at Harper by June of 1973.

POSITION DESCRIPTION

POSITION TITLE: Educational Development Coordinator (E.D.C.)

I. NATURE AND PURPOSE OF WORK

This position is responsible to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for the coordination and accountability of all the educational development and innovative programs. Such existing activities as the Special Projects for Educational Development (SPED), innovative travel, Innovative diffusion center, consortia efforts, seminars and workshops, as well as assisting in the planning and implementation of new instructional and learning techniques will all be part of the tasks of this job. This is a professional position with academic rank.

II. ILLUSTRATIVE TASKS AND PERCENTAGES

1.	SPED development and coordination.	15%
2.	Innovative travel supervision.	5%
3.	Innovative diffusion center management.	5%
4.	Instructional Development and improvement of instruction coordination.	40%
5.	In-service workshop planning and supervising.	20%
6.	General administration including correspondence, data gathering and report writing, liaison with faculty and other units within the college.	15%

III. KNOWLEDGE, ABILITIES, AND SKILLS

1. Ability to plan, organize, and coordinate the efforts of several development areas.
2. Must have initiative and enthusiasm about the job, along with skills in personnel relations.
3. Ability to make decisions and to follow through to completion the development projects.
4. Skill and ability to apply instructional system design, analyze learning sequences and tasks, assist in the development of learning specifications and objectives, and apply adoption strategies.
5. Be able to assist faculty and staff with development and utilization of measurement and evaluation techniques for improving the quality and increase the quantity of learning among the students.

IV. DESIRABLE EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING

Graduate degree in educational psychology or related major in instructional design and development field. Evidence of some successful teaching experience and application of instructional development techniques leading to the improvement of instruction. Administrative and management skills related to planning, coordinating, and directing educational development projects.

For Further Details, Contact:

Harper College
Roselle & Algonquin Roads
Phone# 312,397-3000 Palatine, Illinois 60067

JOB DESCRIPTION OF THE E.D.C.

The Educational Development Coordinator (E.D.C.) is responsible to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for performing the following services for the instructional area of the college:

1. Assists the Vice President, together with the Deans, in planning, organizing, and coordinating the education and instructional development, and the improvement of instruction.

2. Plan, organize and implement faculty in-service programs in cooperation with appropriate staff.

3. Suggests procedures for improved means and methods for measuring student achievement to promote consistency in assessing student achievement.

4. Helps design learning activities for implementation in various kinds of learning environments (lec-demo, classroom, carrels, individual and self-study).

5. To train faculty in the skills they need to use the I.D. model effectively, and provide them with leadership and developmental assistance.

6. Observes and describes to appropriate staff the total impact of the instructional system at each stage of revision within the I.D. model.

7. Helps with the continuous revision of courses by serving as a resource for faculty by helping them develop objectives, conducting instructional research and evaluation and compiling appropriate informational reports for faculty and staff.

8. Shares his knowledge of learning principles and theories and new instructional techniques from the behavioral sciences through effective management of the innovative diffusion center.

9. Serves as a consultant to the faculty for student learning achievement problems and assists the faculty in coordinating these activities with appropriate staff members in Student Affairs.

10. Assists with the evaluation of the results in terms of their impact on learning and provides data when decisions are made in learning-related areas and promotes decisions based on supportive data in all areas which affect student learning.

11. Acts as campus coordinator for the GT-70 consortium.

12. Coordinates the requests and follow-up reports of innovative travel of the staff and faculty.