

ICoP Summary Report – Submitted 7/25/07 by Leslie Owen Wilson (PI)

*The status of individual grant objectives are annotated on the "Timeline and Objective Sheet."

Number of participants –There were **27** professors and instructors from 17 different disciplines, **6** campus facilitators, **1** PI or **34** regular participants. The first seminar also utilized 5 UWSP students. The grant employed 2 student helpers.

Originally monies were procured for 24 participants, but the grant in all or in some part served 27. The UWSP pool included a split award as two professors from psychology were doing projects that were similar. Eau Claire chose to offer two additional awards at their expense for attendance and research stipends. The grant only paid for books, print materials and meals in those cases.

Participants' projects totaled 27, and there was another project report from the PI for a total of 28. The numbers of final reports collected were 27, 26 from participants, and 1 from the PI's project. One EC participant failed to submit a final report even though he completed a project.

Numbers of students impacted: Participants were asked to project numbers of students affected or impacted by this project over a 2 year academic period. According to the numbers reported, this project impacted **4,703** students in 2006-07s, and has the possibility to impact and additional **4,766** in 2007-08 as all but two participants indicated they would continue to use the technology in some form.

Numbers of students impacted by campus	2006-07	2007-08	Possible 2 year impact
Eau Claire	276	360	636 All (5) who submitted reports indicated "yes" for continue use (*One report not sent)
Green Bay	642	642	1284 All (4) indicated yes they would continue with all or part of tech in projects
La Crosse	460	530	990 All (4) indicated "yes" for continue use
Stevens Point	356	400	756 Four indicated they would continue use, two are unsure
Superior	185	50 See note	235 All (4) indicated they would continue to use. However, the lower number for the second academic year was due to one professor leaving the state, and another providing services to others, thus continued usage relies on requests for help.
Whitewater	2784	2784	5568 All (4) will continue to use or explore ways to use new technologies
Potential impact in student numbers over a 2 year period. Also, several participants indicated that they would use what they learned about technology or backwards course design to reconfigure or change other courses.			Totals: 9,469 students were impacted

Categorical breakdown: Here is the categorical breakdown of effects attributed to participation; types of technologies; and those participants who used the 100 stipend for books or project related materials or hardware.

Reactions to continued usage (see summaries under individual campuses for details).

Yes	Undecided or possibly	Other
25	2	1 no report

*Note in some reports participants used more than one technology. Some indicated they would not use one technology again, but would continue to use or explore others.

Helpfulness of seminar activities, reading materials, and technology sessions:

Participants received extensive print and reprint materials and books. They received:

- Educause's The NET Generation;
- Understanding by design,
- Views from the Bridge (gratis),
- Numerous article reprints and handouts on the Millennial Generation and Backwards course Design. and umbers

Reactions to the 2 seminars can be seen in the individual reports by campus. Reactions were varied but generally positive. Those who tended to find the seminar topics and materials helpful were enthusiastic about their projects and the interactions and materials. In areas where participants expressed ambivalence about materials, in many cases it is unclear if they were not interested, or simply didn't read and "no" was the easiest way to answer.

The continued admonishment by the social scientists in the group, especially those from one campus, in not liking the categorization of "Millennials" nor the broad generalizations that ensued was a bit hard to take. In this mindset I am not sure some folks listened as the point was continually emphasized during that seminar and related discussions that Millennial profiles and statistics are generally ones coming from the business and marketing world, and may not be from hard data or social research. Indeed, each participant was charged to go back to their home campus and look at the annual profiles and data from student engagement in order to better be able to grasp their particular Millennial populations and to notice the marked differences. For those participants who took that message to heart, and who used the initial seminar and related information to trigger meaningful dialogs with their students, there seems to be a much deeper level of satisfaction with the outcomes of their projects and the improvement in their interpersonal communication skills or teaching.

There were a number of people who were familiar with backwards design. Since this is a K-12 concept from an instructional design perspective it was encouraging to note the familiarity, but also to note that some folks didn't know what it was called but used it. In those cases that felt reassured. Too, some folks indicate that the principles in backwards design encouraged them to rework other courses or to apply the principles to the development of new courses.

The Technology session were generally well received. In some cases they caused participants to change the focus of their projects. s

Monetary expenditures: There was \$80,000 allocated for expenditures for this grant, and the initial budget was tight due to a projected fringe payment at 44.5% per person. There was an expended amount of **\$68, 534.33**, and as result **\$11,465.67** was returned to the State coffers. This is a rather large amount that could have been used for extra participants, facilitator travel, and a salary for much needed help for the PI.

However, one of the things that was discovered well into the grant was that the size of fringes is greatly diminished if stipends are paid in the mid-month pay period. Additionally, real fringes are not calculated until the end of the granting period.

Barring the direct costs of conducting the seminar with travel expenses, each UW campus had access to almost **\$9000** in stipends, honorariums, books, supply stipends, and paid fringe benefits.

Highlights – There were a number of projects that yielded very positive results. Several participants have already shared or written about their experiences and students reactions thus disseminating the project even further into the academic community. Examples of those types of projects are those of Robert Hoar, or Janis Hanson of La Crosse, Renee Pfeifer-Luckett of Whitewater, or Miki Henderson of Superior. Please see individual campus reports for details and attachments of those reports.

I have sent contact information to SoTL and professional development journals and state and national venues to some participants who expressed that they are very eager to share what they did. I will post that information for all of the participants to view at the end of August before the beginning of the 2007-08 school year.

A number of participants commented on the value of using insights developed as a result of the program and bringing those into the classroom for further discussions with students. Some also commented on the benefits of having discussions with members from other campuses but too expressed regrets that these types of interactions were not more regular events.