2015 SUMMER INSTITUTE OVERVIEW

79
TOTAL ATTENDEES

30
DEPARTMENTS & DIVISIONS REPRESENTED

27
SESSIONS AND TRACKS

16
HOURS OF PROGRAMMING

SESSION, TRACK, AND DISCUSSION TOPICS

- Be-a-Student Sessions:
  - Field Experiences
  - Tools & Technology
  - Service Learning
  - Applied Learning in the Classroom
- Group Reflection on Applied Learning teaching techniques
- Introduction to Applied Learning & ETEAL
- Applied Learning in Online, Hybrid, and Distance Learning
- Applied Learning & Sustainability
- Designing Better Intention & Reflection Prompts
- Research & Scholarship resulting from Applied Learning
- How to write a Grant for ETEAL Funding
- Dr. Tricia Kelley’s Keynote Address

- ALTC Welcome
- Critical Thinking and Assessment Design
- Practical Considerations & Problem Solving
- Logistics & Liability
- Applied Learning across disciplines:
  - Natural Sciences, Technology, and Math
  - Social Sciences
  - Professional Schools
  - Arts & Humanities
- Connections & Collaborations in Applied Learning:
  - Study Abroad & Travel-Related Projects
  - Connecting Staff and Faculty
  - Interdisciplinary Applied Learning
  - Applied Learning & the community
- Closing Remarks & Summer Institute Reflections
2015 SUMMER INSTITUTE SURVEY

SAMPLE AND DESCRIPTIVES

The sample for the 2015 Summer Institute survey consisted of UNCW faculty, administrators, and staff from 17 departments and offices across campus. Although the Summer Institute hosted 79 attendees this year, we received questionnaires from only 51 respondents with only 29 valid pre- and post-test pairs. The low rate of return could possibly owe to low attendee awareness of the survey, likely tied to an unexpected omission and subsequent delay of the initial survey announcement, and the more non-linear nature of the 2015 Summer Institute. Because of this low rate of return and lack of sufficient response pairs, the following descriptive statistics and analyses may not be accurately representative of the entire group of summer institute attendees.

Compared to 2014, in which 30 departments or divisions were represented in our survey results, only 17 departments or divisions are represented in the 2015 summer institute survey responses. Values are listed as a percent of total responses and only 44 of the 79 attendees responded to this question, meaning that nearly half of all potential responses are missing. In the chart above (Figure 1. Attendance by Department) we see that the proportion of departments represented in the actual respondent population poorly matches the actual attendee population as noted in the sign-in records. Nearly 20% of the departments present at the Summer Institute were not represented at all in this summer institute survey while others, such as English or Math, were proportionally over-represented in the survey compared to their attendance numbers.

A majority of respondents were faculty members with staff, administrators, and those in a dual faculty and administrative role making up less than 20% of respondents. For over two-thirds of respondents, this was the first summer institute they
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have attended and just under half of respondents had received ETEAL funding for a pedagogy initiative in the past. This does not accurately reflect the overall characteristics of all 79 summer institute attendees, but it will be important to consider these demographic characteristics of the respondent population when examining our results.

No overall correlation was found between the length of time an attendee had worked at UNCW and the number of Summer Institutes they had attended. While newer faculty and staff members were often attending the summer institute for the first time, there were also many faculty members who have been with UNCW for more than 9 years attending for the first time in 2015.

The only significant correlation found between respondent characteristics was between previous summer institute attendance and ETEAL funding status. On average, for respondents who have received ETEAL funding in the past this was the second summer institute they had attended with 52.4% of previously funded respondents having attended twice or more. Among respondents who have not received ETEAL funding in the past, 87.5% had never attended the summer institute before 2015 and the remaining 12.5% had only attended once before.

FINDINGS & ANALYSIS

The body of the Summer Institute survey consisted of 10 questions common between the pre-test and post-test questionnaires. Questions were designed to measures of a respondent’s confidence in their understanding of applied learning in other departments, in their own department, the risks, problems, and liabilities in applied learning projects and their respective solutions, their role within the Applied Learning Teaching Community (ALTC), and of how faculty and staff can collaborate in applied learning. Additionally, respondents were also asked how likely they were to carry out an applied learning project within the next year and whether or not they felt they had the resources and information they felt they would need to carry out such an applied learning project.

4. "This Summer Institute is my..."
5. The Effect of the Summer Institute on Attitudes, Opinions, and Future Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pre-test Mean</th>
<th>Post-test Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Is it Significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have a good understanding of the applied learning that goes on in my department or division</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>Yes^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have a good understanding of the applied learning that goes on in other departments and divisions across UNCW</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.172</td>
<td>Yes^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Feel that I know exactly what I need to do to submit a proposal for ETEAL Funding</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>Yes^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with commons risks and problems facing applied learning projects</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>Yes^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the solutions to common risks and problems facing applied learning projects</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>Yes^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am planning to work on or support an applied learning project within the next academic year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have all the resources and information I need to carry out an applied learning experience within the next year</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>Yes^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I know how to assess students’ critical thinking skills in a valid, effective way</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>Yes^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of how faculty and staff can collaborate in applied learning</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>Yes^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand my role in the Applied Learning Teaching Community</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>Yes^1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference in means calculated using a paired sample t test, cases with missing pair data excluded.
“I don’t know/Not Sure” coded as missing data, those responses were not factored in to this analysis.

Among the statistically significant findings, the greatest change in respondent attitudes, opinions, and future plans was observed in the understanding of applied learning that goes on in other departments or divisions. Responses in this category began low with 47.7% of respondents (41.4% among those who answered both pre and post-test questionnaires) answering with ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’. By the end of the institute, only 2.9% of respondents (0% among those who answered both pre and post-test questionnaires) answered with ‘disagree’. Within the population of this survey, then, the greatest impact of the 2015 Summer Institute was its ability to significantly and substantially increase understanding of applied learning in other departments or divisions.

Although the findings above are not representative of all Summer Institute attendees, there are still patterns in the data we were able to collect which warrants further attention. On certain items, particularly the understanding of applied learning in other departments or divisions, a large proportion of respondents answered in the ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’ range during their pre-institute questionnaire. Although many of these responses rose to ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ in the post test as seen in the chart above, the fact that the initial level of respondent awareness and confidence was so low is worth noting. Consider that almost a third of respondents replied that
they felt they did not have the resources or information needed to carry out an applied project within the next year, despite 92.9% of pre-test respondents stating that they were planning to carry out and applied learning project within the next year. Although we cannot be certain that the characteristics of this small sample are indicative of any larger pattern among summer institute attendees or UNCW faculty and staff as a whole, it would be prudent to investigate further to determine whether or not faculty and staff feel under resourced or under prepared to carry out applied learning projects. Additionally, almost half of pre-test respondents indicated that they did not have a good understanding of the applied learning that goes on in other departments or divisions, suggesting that there may be barriers to interdisciplinary exchanges and possibly even collaborations.

### QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM

#### PRE-TEST RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Pre-Test Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have a good understanding of the applied learning that goes on in other departments and divisions across UNCW</td>
<td>47.7% at Disagree or below, 2.3% Strongly Disagree, 45.5% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I know exactly what I need to do to submit a proposal for ETEAL Funding</td>
<td>31.8% at Disagree or below, 6.8% Strongly Disagree, 25% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with commons risks and problems facing applied learning projects</td>
<td>23.3% at Disagree or below, 2.3% Strongly Disagree, 20.9% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the solutions to common risks and problems facing applied learning projects</td>
<td>29.5% at Disagree or below, 4.5% Strongly Disagree, 25% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have all the resources and information I need to carry out an applied learning experience within the next year</td>
<td>29.5% at Disagree or below, 2.3% Strongly Disagree, 27.3% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I know how to assess students’ critical thinking skills in a valid, effective way</td>
<td>39.5% at Disagree or below, 14% Strongly Disagree, 25.6% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of how faculty and staff can collaborate in applied learning</td>
<td>54.5% at Neither Agree nor Disagree or below, 18.2% Disagree, 36.4% Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUALITATIVE DATA

The open ended portions of the pre- and post-test questionnaires were both designed as Intention and Critical Reflection prompts. The pre-test included two open ended questions: “What do you hope to gain from attending the summer institute?” and “How do you want to be involved in applied learning at UNCW in the coming year?” The post-test included three open ended questions: “What do you feel you have gained by attending the summer institute? Please list any specific lessons or insights,” “Did you learn anything at the summer Institute you did not expect?”, “Is there anything you hoped to learn or do at the summer institute that you did not have the chance to accomplish?”

At the start of the summer institute, respondent goals were distributed relatively equally. Similar proportions of respondents hoped to find networking & collaboration opportunities, gain new ideas in applied learning, learn about the state of applied learning and applied learning culture at UNCW, and find ideas and suggestions for implementing applied learning in their courses. The gains respondents reported at the end of the institute, however, were often very different.

While some respondents did report gaining networking and collaboration opportunities, new ideas in applied learning, a lower proportion of respondents reported these gains compared to those who listed networking and collaboration or new ideas as goals. Proportionately more respondents cited a better understanding of applied learning as one of their primary gains but the largest group of reported gains belongs to specific session or track
benefits. These specific benefits include comments on the usefulness of a specific teaching technique or approach, experience gained during one session that will be useful in a future course, or general compliments on the quality of specific tracks or sessions. While some of these specific benefits could be considered forms of applied learning implementation, there is no clear equivalency between the answers in these categories. See figures 7a and 7b for a more detailed illustration of the goals and gains listed by summer institute respondents.

While networking and collaboration was not reported as frequently in the post-test gains when compared to pre-test expectations, it was also one of the most frequently cited unexpected gains reported in the post-test. Although we cannot draw definitive conclusions from this data, it suggests that networking & collaboration opportunities were readily present at the summer institute despite the disparity in pre-test and post-test stated gains. The greatest unexpected gain listed, however, was increased understanding about applied learning projects in other disciplines, departments, or even within one’s own department. This reflects the quantitative data we gathered from the pre- and post-test questionnaires and serves as further evidence that the summer institute substantially increased its attendees’ awareness of applied learning at UNCW.

In the final open-ended item, respondents discussed the goals that they were unable to accomplish at the summer institute. While these varied widely and few respondents answered this question, we can and should use this information to develop further programming and improve next year’s summer institute. Some respondent suggestions include hosting a smaller number of longer, more in-depth tracks, providing more opportunities for semi-structured brainstorming with colleagues, longer and more detailed panel discussions, and more examples of applied learning projects, successful proposals, and proven pedagogical techniques. Several faculty also requested more opportunities to engage during the institute and craft or create something they could bring back to their classrooms. Increased representation from fine & performing arts and other campus departments was also suggested as a potential area for improvement.
DISCUSSION

CHANGES FROM THE 2014 SUMMER INSTITUTE SURVEY

After an additional review of 2014 Summer Institute survey data, a number of questions were found to have both high starting values and low variance between pre- and post-test responses. Because these questions were not able to measure any substantive or statistically significant changes, we opted to discard them in the 2015 survey. Three questions from the 2014 Survey remained on the 2015 survey: ‘I feel that I know exactly what I need to do to submit a proposal for ETEAL funding,’ and ‘I have all the resources and information I need to carry out an Applied Learning experience within the next year.’ While these revisions make it difficult to compare the data from 2014 and 2015, the 2015 questions focused more directly on variables of interest and so the decision was made to sacrifice longitudinal comparison for the sake of capturing more relevant information.

Unlike the 2014 survey, the 2015 pre and post-test questionnaires were prepared with ID codes ahead of time and placed in attendee packets. This insured respondent anonymity at the cost of our ability to follow up and locate delinquent questionnaires, a fact which has had a significant impact on our analysis. While the ID codes have made it easier to match pre and post surveys and ensure respondent anonymity, this has also made it impossible to follow up with attendees in order to track down errant questionnaires, such as in the case of a respondent who turned in their post-test questionnaire but simply forgot to turn in their pre-test survey. A general call went out to all attendees requesting any errant questionnaires to be handed in but this call only elicited one additional completed pair. In the future, we will likely use this format again but we will need to more intentionally structure time for completing the pre and post-test questionnaires into the summer institute itself.

PATTERNS, IMPACT, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Evaluation of the 2015 Summer Institute has revealed a number of potentially interesting patterns, with the caveat that our sample population is not necessarily representative of the larger group or of all UNCW faculty, staff, and administrators. Overall, attendance at the 2015 summer institute is linked to an increased understanding of applied learning, applied learning resources, related initiatives across campus, and applied learning implementation. The greatest increase reported by respondents in the sample group was in their understanding of applied learning in other departments and disciplines, while their plans for implementing an applied learning project within the next year did not vary significantly throughout the summer institute.

Understanding of Applied Learning

The most significant change, statistically and substantively, was in understanding of applied learning in other departments or disciplines. Qualitative data supports this as well. At the start of the institute, a large proportion of faculty and staff reported not knowing about the applied learning in other departments and a number even reported having a poor understanding of applied learning within their own department or discipline. By the end of the institute, however, most of these answers in the ‘Disagree’ or ‘Strongly disagree’ categories were shifted to ‘Agree’ or ‘Strongly agree’.

Despite these substantial gains, the large proportion of respondents who initially felt their understanding of applied learning was lacking does raise a number of questions. If these respondents had not attended the summer institute, would their levels of understanding still be just as low? What is the overall understanding of applied learning and resources available among faculty and staff at the University level? Is this lack of awareness and understanding an issue that ETEAL should take steps to address? If the results of the 2015 summer institute evaluation can offer any guidance, then it may be beneficial to first conduct a similar pre-test-only survey at the
University level and then, based on those results, design future workshops and programming to address the emergent areas of need.

**Previous ETEAL Awardees and the Summer Institute**

ETEAL Award status was the most reliable predictor of the frequency of a respondent’s summer institute attendance, along with having a general positive correlation with most of the 10 questionnaire items. This suggests that those who have previously been awarded ETEAL funding tend to have a greater understanding of applied learning and have attended the Summer Institute more frequently. We cannot say whether this relationship is causal, however, or which factors might lead this correlation. It is possible that those who have attended the summer institute multiple times are more knowledgeable about applied learning and thus more likely to receive an ETEAL award for a superior proposal. It is also possible that those who have received ETEAL awards gain more experience with applied learning thus increasing their understanding, and then attend the Summer Institute more often because of their commitment to ETEAL’s mission. There are a number of possibilities here, but the data we have cannot bring us to any definitive conclusion.

**Applied Learning planning and resources**

A large proportion of faculty and staff reported that they were planning to carry out an applied learning project within the next year but that they did not feel they had the resources or information needed to do so. While average understanding of resources and information did increase among respondents by the end of the summer institute, the final average for this metric was the lowest ending average of any of the survey items. Although we cannot be sure if this is indicative of wider departmental or University level patterns, it could be a matter of serious concern if so many instructors planning to carry out applied learning projects feel that they do not have the resources or information needed to do so.

Perhaps more significantly, this conflict persisted with a number of summer institute attendees. At the start of the institute, among those who reported that they planned to carry out an applied learning project within the next year, 59% of respondents either felt that they did not have the resources or information needed to carry out such a project, or they were unsure (‘neither agree nor disagree’ response). By the end of the institute, 35% of respondents were still either unsure or felt they did not have the resources or information needed to carry out an applied learning project within the next year. This was an improvement, but with almost a third of respondents who were planning to carry out an applied learning project leaving the summer institute still feeling unprepared, it should at the least give us pause.

**Respondent Goals & Accomplishments**

Respondent goals, as reported in open-ended responses, bear similarity to goals stated in 2014 Summer Institute pre-test responses. Among these, Networking & Collaboration opportunities and Applied Learning Implementation strategies were the two most commonly stated intentions. While fewer respondents reported finding networking & collaboration opportunities, few reported that they were unable to achieve this end and it may be that respondents did accomplish this goal and simply did not mention it, or that they did not count it’s incompletion as a significant detractor.

Respondents did offer a number of suggestions based on goals that they felt they were unable to accomplish or general observations at the summer institute. Several respondents requested, in one form or another, more content-based approaches with clear examples linking pedagogical theory to practice, more activities that allow attendees to craft or create something they can take back to their courses, and more practice-based exercises.
RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FALL ’15 AND SPRING ‘16

Areas of low initial understanding or confidence
In the coming academic year, it may be prudent to address some of the areas in which respondents initially reported low understanding or confidence. If their responses are representative of the larger University population, then the larger University population should receive the same opportunity to increase their understanding, awareness, and confidence in applied learning theory and practice. In particular, respondents most frequently said that they would ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’ when asked if they felt they had a good understanding of how to write a successful ETEAL proposal, how to assess students’ critical thinking skills, and of the applied learning that goes on in other departments.

Reaching out to Underrepresented departments and divisions
As seen in the sections above, and in more detail in Appendix A, there were a number of departments across campus which were not represented at the 2015 summer institute as well as several departments which were far more widely represented than others. Nursing, English, and Biology & Marine Biology were the three departments supporting the largest number of attendees and together, those three departments comprised 32% of all 2015 summer institute attendees as well as 40.9% of all survey respondents. The summer institute saw just five attendees from the Watson College of Education and only three from the Cameron School of Business. From the fine and performing arts, there were only two attendees, one of whom was invited as a panelist. Despite being hosted in the CIS building, there were no attendees recorded from Computer Science. In order to increase both representation across departments and the wealth of experience and insight available at the 2016 summer institute, we will need to reach out to these underrepresented departments and determine whether or not there are barriers hindering their participation.

Other departments not represented at the summer institute include Anthropology, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Creative Writing, Environmental Studies, Film Studies, World Languages and Cultures, Philosophy & Religion, Physics and Physical Oceanography (Though there were a number of faculty from Geography & Geology, and several of those faculty teach in Physics & Physical Oceanography as well), Theatre, Accountancy & Business Law, Management, Recreation Therapy, Athletic Training, Gerontology, PE and Health K-12, and Recreation Sport Leadership and Tourism.

Applied Learning publication & research support
Developing scholarship from applied learning projects was one of the areas of common interest that emerged in summer institute tracks and discussions. Although there was a single breakout track, offered three times, addressing publications that result from applied learning projects, some attendees wanted more in-depth workshops on the subject and the opportunity to work with others in outlining such publications. There was a general interest in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) among attendees and it may be beneficial to plan a workshop or event that addresses this interest. This may tie closely with the goals of the Applied Learning Research Collaborative.

Support for Applied Learning Collaboratives
The Research Educators Applied Learning Collaborative hosted its inaugural meeting at the Summer Institute with greater interest and attendance than expected. Likewise, the Applied Learning Research Collaborative was advertised in summer institute packets and the collaborative itself addresses several of requests for further
support for these collaboratives could then in turn allow them to present a wealth of experience and information at the 2016 summer institute. Each collaborative also addresses a number of the metrics in the summer institute survey, such as understanding of applied learning in other departments or understanding of the resources and information needed to carry out an applied learning project, within their goals & intent.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2016 SUMMER INSTITUTE**

**Plans for increased attendance & capacity**
The 2014 Summer Institute hosted 61 attendees across two days, most often with no more than 50 individuals in a single room at any given time. In 2015, however, the summer institute hosted 79 attendees, including facilitators, with over 70 individuals in a single room for several of the whole group sessions. Even if the summer institute does not grow at this rate in 2016, securing a larger space, designing an institute structure more suited to hosting large numbers of attendees, and finding a way to maintain the benefit of relatively small-group discussion sessions with a large attendee population.

**Increase representation from across campus**
As stated previously, increasing representation from the non-represented and underrepresented departments across campus will both increase the wealth of experience and information available at the summer institute through interdepartmental discussion and encourage more interdepartmental collaborations. In addition to reaching out to underrepresented academic departments, there were only three non-academic departments represented with almost all staff at the summer institute coming from Information Technology Services or the Office of e-Learning. With greater staff representation at the summer institute, networking and collaboration opportunities could potentially increase for all attendees, and attendees would definitely benefit for the additional perspectives and experiences that staff members can offer.

**Implement more intensive, practice-based workshop sessions**
The 2015 summer institute offered more hands-on, practice-based sessions than summer institutes in the past, but some attendees reported still wanting more of these opportunities. The Be-a-Student experiences at the start of the first day and the highly interactive keynote address were all largely well-received according to anecdotal and existing post-test qualitative reports. Offering more sessions like these and structure existing sessions to follow a similar format could provide higher impact experiences for attendees. Based on feedback we received from the open ended post-test items, the materials for the 2016 summer institute should include more concrete examples for successful ETEAL proposals, applied learning techniques & projects, and more on practical considerations & problem solving.

**Summer Institute Structure and Balancing Session Attendance**
Continuing the improvements made to the 2015 summer institute, the overall institute structure should be examined with the goal of providing relevant options for attendees, allows existing session to run longer or go further in depth, and to find better ways to balance session attendance. While sessions were generally balanced at the 2015 summer institute, we used multiple systems in attempts to balance morning and afternoon session participation. This could be improved through more intentionally structuring sessions, or may naturally improve if attendance increases at a rate consistent with the change between 2014 and 2015.
### A. Full List of Attendance by Department, From Sign-in Records

#### Attendance by Department (% of Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Attendance (Sign-in)</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Attendance (Sign-in)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Art History</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology &amp; Marine Biology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESTEM</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Studies</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Finance</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Office of e-Learning</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Technology, Foundations, and Secondary Education</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Information Systems &amp; Operations Management</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Public &amp; International Affairs</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Randall Library</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Public Health Studies</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography &amp; Geology</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>University College</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Criminology</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>World Languages &amp; Cultures</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Full Paired-Sample T Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have a good understanding of the applied learning that goes on in my department or division</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have a good understanding of the applied learning that goes on in other departments and divisions across UNCW</td>
<td>1.172</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I know exactly what I need to do to submit a proposal for ETEAL Funding</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with commons risks and problems facing applied learning projects</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the solutions to common risks and problems facing applied learning projects</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am planning to work on or support an applied learning project within the next academic year</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have all the resources and information I need to carry out an applied learning experience within the next year</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I know how to assess students’ critical thinking skills in a valid, effective way</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of how faculty and staff can collaborate in applied learning</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand my role in the Applied Learning Teaching Community</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the 0.01 level or beyond
*Significant at the 0.05 level
C. **Qualitative Methodology and Additional Qualitative Responses**

The Summer Institute survey collected qualitative data in two additional open-ended questions not discussed in the report above. The first question, on the pre-test instrument, reads “How do you want to be involved in applied learning at UNCW in the coming year?” The second, on the post-test questionnaire, asks “Did you learn anything at the Summer Institute you did not expect?”

### How do you want to be involved in Applied Learning this year?

- Work on or support AL Project
- ALTC Participation (Includes Workshops)
- Plan an AL Project
- Improve existing projects
- SoTL

Before discussing these findings, it should be noted that not all respondents who completed pre-test questionnaires answered the open-ended qualitative portion, and even fewer answered all parts of the open-ended section. Moreover, the responses indicated above are a representation of code frequency rather than representing individual respondent answers. Qualitative responses were first coded into specific themes and then grouped into broader categories. Specific answers such as “Participating in an ALTC Workshop” and “Applying for ALTC Fellowship” were grouped together into ALTC participation. Following this methodology, if a single respondent indicated plans to attend an ALTC workshop, collaborate on an ETEAL project, and publish research based on that project, their response was recorded as three separate codes. This chart, then, is a representation of the prevalence of ideas, rather than of individuals. It should be noted, however, that almost all respondents answered with a single intention.

As seen in the chart above, roughly 43.2% of the 37 responses to the question referenced working on or otherwise supporting an applied learning project in the 15-16 academic year. Following that, most respondents planned to participate in the ALTC either through workshops or application for fellowship/assistant fellowship (32.4%), and to construct their own applied learning project plan (16.2%).

While most of the open-ended responses fit easily into broader categories such as ALTC participation, the responses to the ‘Did you learn anything at the summer institute you did not expect?’ question were more widely varied and deviated from the subject of the question at times. It is worth noting that more respondents used this space to compliment specific sessions or give their review of the summer institute than to describe surprising things they learned.
Echoing the findings of the preceding question, ‘What do you feel you have gained from attending the 2015 summer institute?’, 27.3% of responses indicating learning about applied learning across disciplines or simply learning about other projects in general. The second largest portion of responses fell into the category of networking & collaboration, including responses such as meeting new people and forming new collaborative partnerships (22.7%). Other responses received only one to two mentions and were largely compliments or notes on the effectiveness of specific sessions or ideas.

D. ADDITIONAL QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

Correlations and other interactions

Overall there were moderate positive correlations between almost all pre-test response items (The 10-question comparison set) with two exceptions. Plans to carry out an applied learning experience within the next year were not correlated significantly with any other metric, suggesting that a respondent’s overall confidence in their understanding of applied learning, risks, solutions, and resources has little impact on whether or not they plan to carry out such an experience, and vice versa. Understanding of critical thinking & assessment was also only loosely correlated to a number of other metrics, suggesting that even those with high confidence in their understanding of applied learning did not necessarily feel as confidence in their understanding of critical thinking assessment.

This pattern changes slightly in the post-test metrics. Plans to carry out an applied learning project are correlated strongly and in a positive direction, but only with confidence in having the resources needed to carry out such a project, knowing how faculty and staff can collaborate in applied learning, and in understanding their role within the ALTC. There is also a loose positive correlation with understanding critical thinking assessment, suggesting that this and the aforementioned metrics may have encouraged respondents to advance their plans for carrying out an applied learning project. Interestingly, there was no statistically significant correlation between the number of sessions a respondent attended and their overall post-test responses, suggesting that attending more sessions did not necessarily result in greater confidence and understanding.