User Advisory Group: Pilot Benchmark Report
Spring 2019

Executive Summary

Per the process specified in The UAG Report on Pilot Benchmarking, the UAG has prepared the following Spring 2019 Pilot Benchmark Report for the Learning Analytics Dashboard pilot. The report is based on combined survey results from faculty users and instructional technologists.

This was the second semester of the Learning Analytics dashboard pilot; 12 instructional technologists and 12 faculty members responded to surveys, with results as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 18</th>
<th>Spring 19</th>
<th>TARGETS, S19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume of Use</td>
<td>43 sites (sections)</td>
<td>61 sites</td>
<td>50 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2579 participants (29 faculty; 2550 student)</td>
<td>4523 participants (47 faculty; 4476 student)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.3 Ease of Provisioning</td>
<td>2.8 Ease of Provisioning</td>
<td>4.0 Ease of Provisioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0 Ease of Support</td>
<td>2.7 Ease of Support</td>
<td>4.0 Ease of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0 Ease of Scaling</td>
<td>2.3 Ease of Scaling</td>
<td>4.0 Ease of Scaling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.2 How Well Met Needs</td>
<td>2.5 How Well Met Needs</td>
<td>4.0 How Well Met Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)</td>
<td>3.9 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)</td>
<td>4.0 How Well Met Needs (compared to similar tools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Users</td>
<td>3.7 Importance of Tool to Teaching</td>
<td>3.3 Importance of Tool to Teaching</td>
<td>4.0 Importance of Tool to Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 Importance of Integration</td>
<td>3.8 Importance of Integration</td>
<td>4.0 Importance of Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported Impact on Learning</td>
<td>3.3 Facilitated Learning</td>
<td>3.1 Facilitated Learning</td>
<td>4.0 Facilitated Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to the LA Dashboard, both among faculty and instructional technologists, declined somewhat from its reception in the fall. There was a significant difference in the responses of instructional technologists from different schools, with those serving Steinhardt giving significantly lower scores than those in FAS or GPH; this may have to do with closer coordination by FAS and GPH with the LA team. The tool does not yet seem fully to be delivering what faculty feel they need from analytic data to improve teaching and learning.
(though they aver that even the current state is more useful than what they might have used in
the past); this is not the fault of the LA team, but the inherent difficulties of aggregating and
displaying data across multiple platforms in a timely fashion (the need to access via VPN has
been another technical drawback). Indeed, the current iteration might better be considered a
beta release than a pilot.

The potential of the service is clear - faculty indicated in both fall and spring that the tool was
superior to any previous analytics tools they employed - so we recommend that the University
continue to run the service as a beta/pilot for at least F19, coordinating its use closely with
instructional technologists in the relevant units for the time being, and asking the UAG to
develop a User Needs report around analytic data. As the development team itself recognizes,
Learning Analytics is too important a project for a premature move to the enterprise level;
making the tool generally available at this time would likely lead to levels of dissatisfaction that
would significantly delay its eventual adoption as a core tool for teaching and learning.
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