

2017-18 SIIP Project Mid-Year Appraisal Academy for Excellence in Engineering Education

Part 1. Please provide us with feedback on the administration of SIIP. What are two or three helpful things that AE3 has done to support your team? What are two or three things that AE3 could be doing that would help your team?

Already helpful things: Initially, AE3 gave excellent advice in the initial feedback, including the inclusion of Neal Davis who has been an excellent collaborator. Also, AE3 additionally selected a very relevant liaison for our group. Jenny Amos has been very helpful at providing feedback and connecting us to resources on as well as off campus. Finally, I enjoyed the discussion activity that we did during the SIIP kick off on campus. It was helpful to speak to other faculty leading SIIP projects. Additionally, at the social gathering afterward

Potentially helpful things: Having the SIIP awarded was great, but having its budget cut was less great. It is a lot to ask faculty from other institutions to fund their trip here and those flights were cut from the budget. I understand that AE3 has finite resources, but it is a bit tricky to complete proposed work for less than proposed funds. For us, it was fine in the end because the faculty involved were excited and engaged. Perhaps fewer awards would have allowed full funding for all awards. Relatedly, as new faculty, I didn't know I needed to communicate the chart string to Neal in order for him to be paid the summer salary proposed. It'll work out fine in the end, but I suppose it would have been helpful for that chart string to have been communicated to both Neal and I.

2017-18 SIIP Project Mid-Year Appraisal

Academy for Excellence in Engineering Education

Part 2. Please provide an assessment of your team's progress in the categories below. Please use this exercise as an opportunity to step back and reflect on your progress.

Category	Rating	Comments
Administrative Support (how your department and the college have supported your efforts)	C	The department helped me make reservations at Allerton. Additionally, my department head attended the workshop kickoff workshop dinner to engage with the collaborators .
Collaborative Development and Ownership	O	The core feature of this project is a collaborative, co-owned model of shared work. We're doing great at collaboration and co-ownership in general. The github organization can be found at https://github.com/necx-org . It has a website where the product is being rendered https://necx-org.github.io/ .
Faculty Outcomes to date	I	<p>The kickoff workshop for this project spurred a very large fleet of ideas and enthusiasm. Starting up the actual work was a bit slow, particularly with respect to website rendering of the nodes (the PI was behind schedule). But, nodes are being added https://github.com/necx-org/nodes.</p> <p>We have worked together a great deal to discuss and identify processes (e.g. learning outcomes and assessments as well as the review process for the nodes).</p> <p>Because we're spread across campuses, we've shared a lot of insight with one another that couldn't have been found at our home institutions.</p>
Student Outcomes to date	S	Students have benefitted at numerous campuses from a more modular perspective on learning outcomes and assessments. All of us have begun to frame our thinking in the framework of the NECX paradigm. We did not complete the work in time to exercise the full model in the context of the NPRES412 course as hoped. However, improved learning objectives from this project are actively trickling down and shared learning materials may be implemented next semester.
Sustainability and Trajectory	C	<p>With an additional push next semester, the website will likely be populated with a large number of learning nodes which can, and hopefully will be maintained in the long term by the faculty who contributed them.</p> <p>This work will benefit from an open source software development model which is collectively maintained by invested stakeholders.</p>

2017-18 SIIP Project Mid-Year Appraisal

Academy for Excellence in Engineering Education

Each category is rated according to the following scale

O – Outstanding: Work was outstanding on all criteria. The team’s methods and outcomes deserve recognition.

C – Commendable: Work was consistently above the requirements in most areas. While the team has a few areas to work on, their commitment and contributions are appreciated.

S – Satisfactory: Work met requirements in most areas, but improvements can be made. The team should continue their efforts.

I – Improvement Required: Work meets only the most basic requirements of the project. While the team may have performed acceptably in most areas, performance should be improved.

N – Not Acceptable: Work is below basic requirements in the critical aspects of the project and immediate improvement is required in consultation with leadership personnel.

2017-18 SIIP Project Mid-Year Appraisal

Academy for Excellence in Engineering Education

Description of Categories

Some categories may be more pertinent for certain teams than others.

- There is strong, ongoing, visible, and consequential departmental **administrative support** for the team.
 - The administration publicly creates and reinforces messages of support for creating a culture of continuing, evidence-based improvement.
 - The administration is institutionalizing instructional change (e.g., rearranging teaching assignments, creating new positions).
 - The administration is promoting faculty participation in innovations (e.g., release time, counting involvement as service, and other rewards for participation).
- There is genuine commitment among participating faculty to the **collaborative development and ownership** of innovations.
 - Well-functioning and internally supportive faculty communities are initiated, nourished, and maintained.
 - There are established and accepted expectations for ongoing engagement of all team members, e.g., attendance at and active participation in regular meetings among all members of the team, including those who are not teaching that semester.
 - Multiple faculty collaborate on determining and shaping each innovation.
 - Change decisions are consensually made by the team or a subgroup thereof, and are well documented.
- The team is making progress toward stated goals for their team and for their project's impact.
 - Goals, metrics, and outcomes are specified and measured for the team, e.g., Faculty are adopting evidence-based teaching methods and have explicitly agreed to continue using evidence-based methods as members of their team.
 - Goals metrics, and outcomes are specified and measured for the students or other stakeholders, e.g., Participating students demonstrate improved learning outcomes, at levels above those prior to this intervention.
 - The team displays a commitment to collecting and using *ongoing evaluative feedback* toward continuous improvement of their own functioning and of the innovation. This feedback goes beyond satisfaction surveys.
- The team's interventions are **sustainable** and/or have a positive **trajectory** toward sustainability.
 - There is integrity of teaching methods across semesters, enabling evaluation and evidence-based modification of methods and content.
 - Innovations can survive changes in leadership, instructors, or funding.
 - Innovations in courses are making those courses more attractive teaching assignments.