Username sthomaso@austincc.edu
Unit Review Leader: Susan Thomason
Unit Name: Instructional Development Services

1.

What improvements have been planned/implemented:

Modify service offerings to align with the needs identified by department chairs and faculty.
Examples would be:
*Additional targeted training that is department-specific
*Increase support for review and development of student competencies

2.
How did you decide that these improvements would benefit your unit or what weakness is
the unit trying to improve:

Our department was interested in improving the alignment between services offered and the
changing needs of faculty and department chairs to meet the demands of the Student Success
Initative and SACS accreditation standards. While we currently offer a variety of services
for faculty, out goal is to continuously review needs to ensure we are providing the right type
and quantity of support. In 2011 we developed a process to gather data from faculty and
department chairs through surveys as well as in-person meetings.

3.
Measures: what measures are going to be used to determine if the improvements were
successful.

100 % of department chairs and faculty will report instructional needs identified in 2012
survey and listed in their instructional development plans were successfully met or are being
addressed.

3a. Baseline data: the data used to determine improvements were needed

We will use final figures from the 2012 Department Chair and Faculty surveys to determine the
baseline. The number of requests and percentage of requests will be analyzied to determine
the services we will need to offer in the 2012-13 academic year.

Current survey figures, for example, show that 40% of faculty respondents would like to know
more about effective communication and interaction with students. The IDS approach would
include some training sessions, plans for implementing new strategies, with follow-up on
outcomes in the classroom.

Currently survey figures show that 30% of faculty would like help with development or review of
student competencies. The IDS approach would include meeting with faculty reporting these
needs to determine if needs are course-based or program-based. Recommendations and
services offered would depend on the scope. Follow-up would focus on completion of clear,
well-written, measurable student learning outcomes.

3b. Target goals: the data that shows your improvements have achieved your goals

By January 1, 2013, 100% of academic departments responding to the 2012 survey will have an instructional development plan from IDS that shows how we plan to meet their requests and needs as identified in the 2012 survey for (1) training (2) instructional design (3) project development.

3c. Current data: where you are currently in reaching your target

We are still gathering data from faculty and department chairs. However, based on some prliminary needs identified, we are already working with two departments on Hybrid Course development, two departments on Departmental Website redesigns, additional training in the areas of Instructional Website Design and Development of Student Learning Outcomes.

Narrative:

To date we have met with approximately 80% of department chairs and have completed surveys from 30% of department chairs. We have a total of 32 facutly surveys completed. We hope to get additional responses at the ACC General Assembly on August 24th.   Once we have finalized the data-gathering process, we will develop preliminary instructional development plans for departments and verify with department chairs to begin implementation.