

Affordable Learning Georgia Textbook Transformation Grants

Final Report

Instructions:

A. Your final report submission must include four separate component files:

1. Completed report form. Please complete per inline instructions. The italicized text is provided for your assistance; please delete the italicized text before submitting your report.
2. Syllabus, organized chronologically (day and/or week and unit), with links to materials as used per assignment. For each resource, give the title, author, Creative Commons licenses (if appropriate), and freely accessible URL to the material. Include all open-access links to all adopted, adapted, and newly created course materials.
3. Supporting data on the impact of your Textbook Transformation (survey, analyzed data collected, etc.)
4. A photograph of your team and/or your students for use in ALG website and materials.
 - a. Photograph must be 800x600 pixels at minimum (length x height).
 - b. Photograph must be taken together: individual team member photographs and website headshots not accepted.

B. Go to http://affordablelearninggeorgia.org/site/final_report_submission to submit these four components of your final report. Follow the instructions on the webpage for uploading your documents. You will receive a confirmation email. Based on receipt of this report, ALG will process the final payment for your grant. ALG may follow up with additional questions or to request your participation in a publication, presentation, or other event.

Date: Dec 18, 2015

Grant Number: #68 – ALG Round 2

Institution Name(s): Columbus State University

Team Members (Name, Title, Department, Institutions if different, and email address for each):

Stephanie P. da Silva – Associate Professor, Department of Psychology,
dasilva_stephanie@columbusstate.edu

Katherine White – Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology,
white_katherine2@columbusstate.edu

Project Lead: Stephanie P. da Silva

Course Name(s) and Course Numbers: Research Design & Methodology 1 (PSYC 3211)

Semester Project Began: Spring 2015

Semester(s) of Implementation: Fall 2015

Average Number of Students Per Course Section: 17

Number of Course Sections Affected by Implementation: Four

Total Number of Students Affected by Implementation: 35 students used OER in fall 2015

1. Narrative

A. Describe the key outcomes, whether positive, negative, or interesting, of your project. Include:

- **SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE & ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

The experience overall was positive and the students were appreciative of the time and work involved in providing them with free resources to use. We did not realize that the materials we create/use would need to be openly available to the public until we attended the February kick-off event. At that point, we had to change our original plan to use of D2L for housing OER materials to a new plan that would allow our OER materials to be public. After considering several options (e.g., Google web pages, MERLOT), we decided to use a LibGuide to house our course materials. The time required to create and update the LibGuide was an unexpected part of the project and it had an effect on how much time was devoted to the creation of new lab activities. Otherwise, the project occurred as planned.

Dr. da Silva participated in an open library forum at CSU to share information about ALG grants and the LibGuide with other faculty who are interested in using OER materials.

- **IMPACT ON INSTRUCTION:**

The impact of the no-cost materials on instruction were minimal. Both instructors, who vary in teaching style, were able to incorporate the materials using active learning strategies, lectures, hands-on lab sessions, etc. The one change noted by Dr. da Silva is that she was more likely to use/show/display the LibGuide and the OER textbooks in class compared to her prior use of hard-copy textbooks.

A full-time instructor of psychology will use the LibGuide we created for PSYC 3211 for two sections of the course in spring 2016. This will guide/impact his instruction, and another 36 students in the course will be able to take the class without having to purchase textbooks. This additional use of our no-cost-to-student materials was

one of our goals of the project: to create a ready-made set of materials for others who teach PSYC 3211 (Research Design & Methodology 1).

Additionally, another professor from Business contacted Dr. da Silva to ask permission to re-use her LibGuide template, so the established LibGuide is helping other instructors create a platform for housing their OER materials.

- **IMPACT ON STUDENTS AND PERFORMANCE:**
Similar improvements in student learning occurred across both semesters (one semester with costly resources and another semester with no-cost resources) regardless of whether or not materials were free or purchased. Students also rated the materials similarly across semesters in terms of their accessibility and helpfulness.

B. Describe lessons learned, including any things you would do differently next time.

- The class meeting schedule for Dr. White and Dr. da Silva was slightly different. During fall 2015, Dr. da Silva taught the course as a MWF class with a Wednesday lab and Dr. White taught the course as a MWF class with a Friday lab. These different lab meetings schedules created difficulty in following the same schedule/outline for course material. In the future, I would align the class and lab meeting times to ensure that the same course schedule could be followed. The reason for the need to have a similar course schedule is so the LibGuide can be organized in the same order for all sections.

2. Quotes

- Provide three quotes from students evaluating their experience with the no-cost learning materials.

“Working together, they really helped me understand the material. I definitely appreciate this and I found having a variety of textbooks was helpful- different authors and perspectives made it easier to get stuff read. (Side note, the study guides were a HUGE help!!)”

“The textbook made the class easier and more convenient due to having to purchase books for other courses. The online textbook was a great idea, and should be used in the future.”

“I need a physical book that I can access with me at anytime, so it was not helpful. and staring at a computer screen for hours at a time weakens your eyes anyway.”

“The textbook materials were great. It was easy to follow and understand and the in class practice tied everything together.”

3. Quantitative and Qualitative Measures

3a. Overall Measurements

Student Opinion of Materials

Was the overall student opinion about the materials used in the course positive, neutral, or negative?

Total number of students affected in this project: **35 students used no-cost materials**__

No-Cost STATISTICS textbook:

- Positive (3.5 or higher on 1-5 scale): **__60%__** of **15** number of respondents
- Neutral (2.5-3.4 on a 1-5 scale): **__26%__** of **15** number of respondents
- Negative (less than 2.4 on 1-5 scale): **__7%_** of **__15__** number of respondents

Ten students rated the Statistics textbook positively, four rated it neutrally, and one rated it negatively.

No-Cost RESEARCH METHODS textbook:

- Positive (3.5 or higher on 1-5 scale): **__60%__** of **15** number of respondents
- Neutral (2.5-3.4 on a 1-5 scale): **__13%__** of **15** number of respondents
- Negative (less than 2.4 on 1-5 scale): **__13%_** of **__15__** number of respondents

Eleven students rated the Research Methods textbook positively, two rated it neutrally, and two rated it negatively.

Student Learning Outcomes and Grades

Was the overall comparative impact on student performance in terms of learning outcomes and grades in the semester(s) of implementation over previous semesters positive, neutral, or negative?

Student outcomes should be described in detail in Section 3b.

Choose One:

- Positive: Higher performance outcomes measured over previous semester(s)
- Neutral: Same performance outcomes over previous semester(s)
- Negative: Lower performance outcomes over previous semester(s)

Student Drop/Fail/Withdraw (DFW) Rates

Was the overall comparative impact on Drop/Fail/Withdraw (DFW) rates in the semester(s) of implementation over previous semesters positive, neutral, or negative?

Drop/Fail/Withdraw Rate:

0.3% of students, out of a total 35 students affected, dropped/failed/withdrew from the course in the final semester of implementation.

Choose One:

- Positive: This is a lower percentage of students with D/F/W than previous semester(s)
- Neutral: This is the same percentage of students with D/F/W than previous semester(s)
- Negative: This is a higher percentage of students with D/F/W than previous semester(s)

3b. Narrative

- *In this section, summarize the supporting impact data that you are submitting, including all quantitative and qualitative measures of impact on student success and experience. Include all measures as described in your proposal, along with any measures developed after the proposal submission.*
 - The impact of course materials on student success and experience was assessed using both quantitative and qualitative measures. Student success was assessed via performance on course exams, final course grades, and performance on an 18-question pre-/posttest assessment developed by Drs. da Silva and White. Values on these variables were compared between students who used the no-cost resources and students who purchased textbooks in a previous semester (Spring 2015).
 - Student experience was assessed via an online survey (developed by Dr. White) which gathered both quantitative and qualitative feedback on the course materials. Quantitative data was collected by asking students to indicate how frequently they used the course materials and rate the usefulness, accessibility, and cohesiveness of the materials. Qualitative feedback was secured via an open-ended question that asked students to provide feedback on their experiences with the materials. Survey data was collected and compared between students who used the no-cost resources and those who purchased textbooks in a previous semester (Spring 2015). This survey was also used to gather basic demographic information (e.g., age, ethnicity, classification) about the student samples.

- *Include measures such as:*
 - *Drop, fail, withdraw (DFW) delta rates*
 - *There was no relation between Type of Materials (cost or no-cost) and Type of Grade (Productive or Nonproductive) as indicated by a Chi-Square Analysis*
 - *Course retention and completion rates*
 - *Course retention and completion rates did not differ across semesters. (23/31 students made C or higher in spring; 24/35 students made C or higher in fall)*
 - *Average GPA – Course percent scores did not differ across semesters.*
 - *Dr. White: Student average for spring (with cost materials)=71%*
 - *Dr. White: Student average for fall (with no-cost materials)=73%*
 - *Dr. da Silva: Student average for spring (with cost materials)=77%*
 - *Dr. da Silva: Student average for fall (with no-cost materials)=77%*
 - *Pre-and post-transformation DFW comparison*
 - *This repeats the first analysis in this list. There was no change in DFW when no-cost materials were used.*
 - *Student success in learning objectives*
 - *Change scores (posttest-pretest) were calculated for all students both semesters. There was no difference in the improvement on this test. In other words, the amount learned (as indicated by the posttest scores minus pretest scores) did not change when no-cost materials were used.*
 - *Surveys, interviews, and other qualitative measures*
 - *Students reported positive and negative aspects of the no-cost materials. Some reported appreciation for their cost, their availability, etc. Others reported that they prefer hard copies of reading materials so that they can make notes, etc.*
- *Indicate any co-factors that might have influenced the outcomes for better or worse.*
 - *No significant confounding factors could be identified at this time. Comparisons were made between students enrolled in the course in Spring 2015 and Fall 2015. No-cost materials were used in the fall and factors other than course materials were held constant between semesters, including the course instructors and their overall teaching methodology/approach (e.g., Dr. White used a flipped-classroom model both semesters). Dr. da Silva did note, however, that she taught the material in a slightly different order in the fall in an effort to unify the materials across sections of the course that semester.*

- *When submitting your final report, as noted above, you will also need to provide the separate file of supporting data on the impact of your Textbook Transformation (surveys, analyzed data collected, etc.)*
 - *File is included and is described in 3 sections*
 - *Survey for feedback regarding course materials.*
 - *Course performance/grades.*
 - *Student Learning – pretest-posttest scores*

4. Sustainability Plan

- *Describe how your project team or department will offer the materials in the course(s) in the future, including the maintenance and updating of course materials.*

Dr. da Silva plans to use and maintain the LibGuide for the PSYC 3211 course at least for the next year (through 2016). As stated previously, the LibGuide will be used by another psychology faculty in spring 2016 to reach another 36 psychology majors. The LibGuide will be shared with everyone in the Department of Psychology at CSU and at other institutions (using the ALG system and conferences, etc.).

5. Future Plans

- *Describe any impacts or influences this project has had on your thinking about or selection of learning materials in this and other courses that you will teach in the future.*

Dr. da Silva is thinking of other courses that might benefit from additional free resources. Her next step likely will be to utilize the OpenStax Psychology textbook for the General Psychology (PSYC 1101) course in Maymester of 2015.

We will be sure to iterate to students that they can print the no-cost materials so that they are available in a format similar to the format of the hard copy textbooks they are accustomed to using.

- *Describe any planned or actual papers, presentations, publications, or other professional activities that you expect to produce that reflect your work on this project.*

Dr. da Silva already participated in a CSU open forum (hosted by the Libraries) about OER materials and ALG grants. She also plans to present a poster of this project in April 2016 at the USG Teaching & Learning conference. Based on feedback received, the poster could evolve into a manuscript.

6. Description of Photograph

- *List the names of the people in the separately uploaded photograph and their roles.*

The photograph contains two people: Dr. Stephanie da Silva (LEFT) and Dr. Katherine White (RIGHT). Both worked to find and implement the no-cost-to-student materials and both were instructor of record for separate sections of the PSYC 3211 course.