User Advisory Group: Pilot Benchmark Report

Fall 2018

Executive Summary

Per the process specified in The UAG Report on Pilot Benchmarking, the UAG has prepared the following Fall 2018 Pilot Benchmark Report for five pilots: Ares, the Learning Analytics Dashboard, PollEverywhere, TopHat, and Zoom. The report is based on combined survey results from faculty users and instructional technologists.

With the exception of Zoom, all the tools evaluated in this report were in pilot for the first time in Fall 2018. As in the past, it has been a challenge to obtain a sufficient volume of data from faculty to make well-founded recommendations on the outcome of these pilots; for the most part, the instructional technologists who support tool use have been more forthcoming, especially keeping in mind that a single instructional tech might support use for a number of faculty members. Here are the response figures for Fall 18:

Ares: 1 instructional technologist; 4 faculty; 3 students
Learning Analytics Dashboard:10 instructional technologists; 8 faculty; 1 student
PollEverywhere: 8 instructional technologists; 6 faculty; 126 students
TopHat: 5 instructional technologists; 5 faculty; 1 student
Zoom: 16 instructional technologists; 39 faculty; 2 students

Compounding the light faculty response, not all faculty who noted that they had used the tool continued on to answer the survey questions about tool satisfaction; e.g., only 2 faculty members completed the Ares survey, though four indicated they had used the tool. We recommend, as we have in the past two benchmark reports (Spring 18 and Fall 17) that stronger steps be taken to label pilots as such to participating faculty, making it clear that their feedback is expected in exchange for their access to the pilot tool.

Note that, in the tables below, responses on “Administrative Satisfaction” come from a survey of instructional technologists; those for User Satisfaction, Importance to Users, and Reported Impact on Learning from a survey of faculty using the pilot tools. For PollEverywhere, responses by students are reported in the “Student Response” row; no other tool had sufficient student response to be meaningful. All questions used a 1-5 Likert scale, with 1 the lowest and 5 the highest; see Appendix for text of questions and responses.

Table of Contents

Ares

X Sites (awaiting data)
X Participants (awaiting data)

Only 1 instructional technologist supporting Ares, 2 faculty members using it, and 3 students completed the survey on Ares, making it impossible to draw any conclusions besides the obvious one that the tool is either under-publicized or does not fit existing user needs.

Learning Analytics Dashboard

	Fall 18	**TARGETS, S19**
Volume of Use	43 sites (sections) 2579 participants (29 faculty; 2550 student)	50 sites 2750 participants
Administrative Satisfaction	3.3 Ease of Provisioning 3.0 Ease of Support 3.0 Ease of Scaling	4.0 Ease of Provisioning 4.0 Ease of Support 4.0 Ease of Scaling
User Satisfaction	3.2 How Well Met Needs 3.7 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)	4.0 How Well Met Needs 4.0 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)
Importance to Users	3.7 Importance of Tool to Teaching 4.0 Importance of Integration	4.0 Importance of Tool to Teaching 4.0 Importance of Integration
Reported Impact on Learning	3.3 Facilitated Learning	4.0 Facilitated Learning

As the pilot results reflect, the Learning Analytics project is still very much in development; it cannot be held to the same standards as a fully-mature platform. In addition, only 6 faculty members in the pilot completed the survey, making it hard to generalize on the user experience. We recommend that it remain in pilot for spring ‘19. Comments from both users and instructional techs praised the Learning Analytics team, while noting current limitations like needing to use VPN to access the dashboard from off campus and having to design course sites with use of the tool in mind for data to be collected properly.

PollEverywhere/TopHat

	Fall 18 Poll Everywhere	Fall 18 TopHat	**TARGETS, S19**
Volume of Use	X sites (awaiting data) 8 participants (faculty) (awaiting data; course in pilot were large)	31 sites 1873 participants	TopHat 50 sites 2000 participants PollEverywhere X sites (awaiting data) X participants (awaiting data)
Administrative Satisfaction	2.9 Ease of Provisioning 3.3 Ease of Support 3.8 Ease of Scaling	3.2 Ease of Provisioning 3.2 Ease of Support 3.0 Ease of Scaling	4.0 Ease of Provisioning 4.0 Ease of Support 4.0 Ease of Scaling
User Satisfaction	2.8 How Well Met Needs 3.3 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)	3.5 How Well Met Needs 4.7 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)	4.0 How Well Met Needs 4.0 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)
Importance to Users	3.2 Importance of Tool to Teaching 3.6 Importance of Integration	4.3 Importance of Tool to Teaching 4.3 Importance of Integration	4.0 Importance of Tool to Teaching 4.0 Importance of Integration
Reported Impact on Learning	3.5 Facilitated Learning	4.3 Facilitated Learning	4.0 Facilitated Learning
Student Response	4.3 Ease of Use 3.2 Importance to Learning 3.5 Recommend Use in Other Classes		

The results of the surveys on PollEverywhere and TopHat - only 3 faculty members responded to the question asking how well the tool met their needs regarding TopHat, while 5 answered the same question for PollEverywhere - are too sketchy to draw any conclusions. It appears that both tools have advantages and drawbacks; that instructional technologists saw PollEverywhere

as more scalable suggests it is easier for faculty to use on their own, while TopHat may have additional features that are useful in some circumstances. We recommend that both platforms be integrated through the LMS for Spring 19, if the Classes team has sufficient time to do so, and that they remain in pilot until a better comparison of user satisfaction (both faculty and instructional technologists) can be made. This may require that, temporarily, central IT license both tools so that they can conduct the pilot under more controlled conditions.

Zoom

	Spring 18	TARGETS, F18	**Fall 18**
Volume of Use	38 Sites 407 Participants	50 Sites 500 Participants	226 Sites 2385 Participants
Administrative Satisfaction	4.1 Ease of Provisioning 4.1 Ease of Support 4.4 Ease of Scaling	4.0 Ease of Provisioning 4.0 Ease of Support 4.0 Ease of Scaling	4.4 Ease of Provisioning 4.4 Ease of Support 4.6 Ease of Scaling
User Satisfaction	4.6 How Well Met Needs 4.8 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)	4.0 How Well Met Needs 4.0 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)	4.1 How Well Met Needs 4.3 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)
Importance to Users	4.6 Importance of Tool to Teaching 4.6 Importance of Integration	4.0 Importance of Tool to Teaching 4.0 Importance of Integration	4.6 Importance of Tool to Teaching 4.3 Importance of Integration
Reported Impact on Learning	4.6 Facilitated Learning	4.0 Facilitated Learning	4.4 Facilitated Learning

Zoom easily met or surpassed all benchmarks for satisfaction; that some of the faculty responses diminished a little probably only indicates the much greater extent of the pilot (36 faculty members responded to the “How well did this tool meet your needs?” question in the Fall 18 survey, compared to 7 in Spring 18). The explosive growth in the number of sites using the tool suggests good word-of-mouth; rapid growth in tool adoption is the single greatest indicator of success. We recommend that the University adopt Zoom as an enterprise system; it has nothing more to prove in pilot.

Appendix: Question and Response Texts

Administrative Satisfaction Questions:

1) Please rate the ease of provisioning faculty with the tool (that is, helping them with initial set-up of the tool for use in their classes). Responses: 1=very difficult; 5=very easy (no intermediate labels)
2) Please rate the ease of supporting faculty in use of tool. Responses: 1=very difficult; 5=very easy (no intermediate labels)
3) Please rate how easily your unit could scale upward the use of the tool. Responses: 1=very difficult; 5=very easy (no intermediate labels)

User Satisfaction Questions

1) How well did the tool meet your needs? Responses: 1=not at all; 2=only partially; 3=moderately well; 4=very well; 5=extremely well
2) How well did the tool meet your needs as compared to other tools you have used for this purpose? Responses: 1=much worse; 2=somewhat worse; 3=about the same; 4=somewhat better; 5=much better

Importance to User Questions

1) How important was using the tool to your teaching? Responses: 1=extremely unimportant; 2=slightly unimportant; 3=neither important nor unimportant; 4=very important; 5=extremely important
2) How important was it for you to have the tool available through NYU Classes? Responses: 1=extremely unimportant; 2=slightly unimportant; 3=neither important nor unimportant; 4=very important; 5=extremely important

Reported Impact on Learning

1) How important do you think the tool was to student learning? Responses: 1=extremely unimportant; 2=slightly unimportant; 3=neither important nor unimportant; 4=very important; 5=extremely important