

Cuyahoga Valley Environmental Education Center
Postworkshop Survey Results
Fall 2001

Jennifer Kirby & Steven McGee, Ph.D.
Center for Educational Technologies®
Wheeling Jesuit University

Center for Educational Technologies® and Summit Education Initiative (SEI) conducted workshops in Akron, OH, in February, June, and August 2001 as part of the Master Cadre of Teachers of Technology (MCT²). The workshops trained teachers in the use of technology for problem-based learning. The teachers were asked how much their knowledge and proficiency increased as a result of the workshops. They also rated the quality of the workshops. The aggregate results from these three surveys are provided below. Overall, teachers felt that they increased both their understanding of and proficiency in the use of technology for problem-based learning. They also felt the workshops were among the best they had experienced.

There were two areas where teachers overall did not perceive as high an increase in proficiency and knowledge. These were “Meeting Ohio or SEI Academic Standards” and “Developing school-to-work skills and lifelong learning skills.” For the standards 18 percent of the teachers did not see any improvement in proficiency or were not sure, and 35 percent felt the workshop increased their understanding only somewhat to none. For the lifelong learning skills 20 percent of the teachers did not see any improvement in proficiency or were not sure, and 20 percent felt the workshop increased their understanding only somewhat. If these are important areas, the project team may wish to emphasize these topics more in future workshops.

Question 1. Have the MCT ² workshops increased your proficiency in the following areas?	Total Responses	Yes	No, I was very skillful before	No, I see no improvement	Not Sure
Expanding student-centered experiential education opportunities.	34	97%	3%		
Creating classrooms where the content pertains to environmental topic and issues.	34	100%			
Building a Summit County learning community of professional practice.	34	100%			
Using technology as a tool to acquire, manipulate, display, and communicate information.	34	82%	18%		
Empowering students to take charge of their own learning.	34	82%	15%		3%
Employing assessment alternatives.	34	82%	15%		3%
Using technology-based learning tools and resources.	24	88%	13%		
Integrating and applying technology-based tools in student-centered teaching and inquiry-based curricula.	34	97%	3%		
Understanding problem-based learning.	34	88%	9%		3%
Integrating technology into teaching and learning activities.	34	100%			
Meeting Ohio or SEI academic standards.	34	65%	18%	9%	9%
Managing distance learning/threaded discussions.	35	80%	14%	3%	3%
Incorporating problem-based learning. We will create active, collaborative learning environments in which students generate significant products that demonstrate critical thinking and understanding.	24	96%	4%		
Using technology to create opportunities for collaborative inquiry in the study of the Cuyahoga Valley National Park.	34	94%			6%
Creating new educational applications that exemplify the potential of technology as an adjunct and as alternatives to traditional methods of classroom instruction.	24	100%			
Teaching Earth system science as an approach to environmental education.	34	97%			3%
Identifying appropriate educational tasks that can be enhanced by the use of technology.	34	94%	6%		
Developing school-to-work skills and lifelong learning skills.	10	80%		10%	10%

Question 2. Have the MCT ² workshops increased your understanding in the following areas?	Total Responses	Greatly	Considerably	Somewhat	None
Expanding student-centered experiential education opportunities.	34	62%	32%	6%	
Creating classrooms where the content pertains to environmental topic and issues.	34	74%	24%	3%	
Building a Summit County learning community of professional practice.	34	53%	32%	15%	
Using technology as a tool to acquire, manipulate, display, and communicate information.	34	76%	12%	12%	
Empowering students to take charge of their own learning.	34	32%	44%	24%	
Employing assessment alternatives.	24	54%	29%	17%	
Using technology-based learning tools and resources.	34	65%	24%	12%	
Integrating and applying technology-based tools in student-centered teaching and inquiry-based curricula.	34	65%	29%	6%	
Understanding problem-based learning.	34	91%	9%		
Integrating technology into teaching and learning activities.	34	65%	24%	12%	
Meeting Ohio or SEI academic standards.	34	44%	21%	29%	6%
Managing distance learning/threaded discussions.	34	68%	18%	12%	3%
Incorporating problem-based learning. We will create active, collaborative learning environments in which students generate significant products that demonstrate critical thinking and understanding.	24	88%	13%		
Using technology to create opportunities for collaborative inquiry in the study of the Cuyahoga Valley National Park.	34	85%	12%	3%	
Creating new educational applications that exemplify the potential of technology as an adjunct and as alternatives to traditional methods of classroom instruction.	24	67%	21%	13%	
Teaching Earth system science as an approach to environmental education.	34	82%	15%	3%	
Identifying appropriate educational tasks that can be enhanced by the use of technology.	34	68%	24%	9%	
Developing school-to-work skills and lifelong learning skills.	10	70%	10%	20%	

	Total Responses	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Question 3 - How do you rate the week?	31	87%	13%		

	Total Responses	Among the Best	Comparable to Most	Not as Good
Question 4 - How would you rate MCT ² training as compared with other professional training you have had?	34	100%		

Teacher Demographics

<p>Of the 24 teachers who reported their gender: 83% female 17% male</p> <p>Of the 24 teachers who reported their ethnicity: 4% African American 92% Caucasian 4% Other</p> <p>Of the 24 teachers who reported their teaching experience: 8% first year 17% 2-5 years 29% 6-10 years 13% 11-15 years 33% 16+ years</p> <p>Of the 24 teachers who reported their highest degree attained: 4% associate's 25% baccalaureate 71% master's</p> <p>Of the 24 teachers who reported their school affiliation: 92% public 8% private</p> <p>Of the 21 teachers who reported their school location: 76% urban 19% suburban 5% rural</p> <p>Of the 24 teachers that reported their grades taught: 60% K-4 40% 5-8</p> <p>Total number of students taught = 1,693</p>

Teacher Feedback on Workshop

Statement	Average Rating
The program was a valuable experience.	4.8
I expect to apply what I learned in this program.	4.7
The workshop was well organized.	4.6
I was satisfied with the overall quality of the presentations.	4.7
The program staff was excellent.	4.9
The program was excellent.	4.8
I would highly recommend this program to someone who asks me about applying.	4.9
What I have learned in this program is important to the educational process.	4.8
This workshop adequately prepared me to implement this program immediately.	4.6
Ratings are based on 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neutral, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree	