Teaching With Sakai Innovation Award
Course/Project Submission Form

Thank you for taking the time to complete this submission. The information you provide will assist the judges in performing a complete evaluation of your entry's key strengths.

INSTRUCTIONS:

- *Confirm your eligibility for a course or project award.*

  - ✓ Entries for the award must be from an accredited academic institution. (**Note**: The accrediting agency or organization must be recognized as such an authority.)

  - ✓ Sakai CLE or Apereo OAE must be the **foundational delivery system** for the course or project of all entries.

  - ✓ Entries must fall into one of the [four course or project award categories](#).

  - ✓ Nominations from parties who are not the primary deliverer of the course or project will be accepted provided the lead faculty/instructor will be available to participate in the TWSIA process if the entry is selected.

- *Enter the information requested below and then add your self-assessment, which should include text as well as embedded screenshots.*

- *Save the completed document as a PDF file. (**Note**: Be sure to include your name and submission date in the PDF file name.)*

- *Upload the PDF as part of your TWSIA submission.*

1. Entrant Name(s) (last name/first name):

Nagurney, Alexander PhD
Smith, Patrick

2. Contact Info:

Nagurney:

Smith:

3. Affiliated Institution(s):

Nagurney:

Faculty at University of Hawaii at Hilo

Smith:

Instructional Designer at Texas State University

4. Course or Project Name: PSY 100 – Survey of Psychology

5. Course or Project Award Category (select one):

 X Traditional Higher Education (including web-enhanced courses)

6. Brief Summary or "Elevator Speech"

Effectively implementing a game-based, or "gamified" approach to instruction can seem like an overwhelming task for educators…but does it have to be? For this project, Dr. Alexander Nagurney, from University of Hawaii at Hilo, and Patrick Smith, from Texas State University, collaborated to determine if implementing simple, game-based elements into a traditional higher education instructional model would improve student attendance, performance, and satisfaction. They designed and delivered a gamified design of a freshman level Psychology course against its non-gamified counterpart, and are excited to share their experiences, as well as discuss implications for future offerings.

7. Description of Course or Project
Describe your course or project using the following outline. Avoid use of technical language or jargon.
(500-word maximum)

PSY 100 (Survey of Psychology) is a 15-week course that serves as University of Hawaii's introductory course to the psychology program. It is a general education requirement for all students who are seeking bachelor's degrees from the university. Maximum enrollment in each section of the course is 50 students. When Dr. Nagurney taught the course being considered for this award, 50 students began the semester and 42 completed the course.

Dr. Nagurney has taught PSY 100 several times in the past, and had noted that the students' level of motivation, engagement, and attendance was less than ideal. Patrick Smith, an instructional designer with research interests in the area of game-based learning, collaborated with Dr. Nagurney to embed game-based elements into the course design with the goal of improving attendance, performance, and student satisfaction. Dr. Nagurney taught two sections of PSY 100 in the spring of 2014: one section was taught using the "gamified" version of the course, while the other was taught using his previously existing course design. Results were measured by comparing the control and experiment groups in several areas, including final grade distribution, attendance records, and student satisfaction survey data.

The University of Hawaii's instance of Sakai, called "Laulima," was used to enhance the gamified version of PSY 100. Digital badges were created and aligned to specific performance goals associated with the course. These badges, displayed using the **Web Content** tool, were awarded to students who met the stated performance goals. The students were publically congratulated using messages sent from the **Mail** tool. In addition, the **Forums** tool was used to give students the opportunity to discuss course assignments and topics asynchronously. For example, in one of the optional "Side Quest" assignments, students were asked to break a social norm in public and have a friend video the responses of the people around them. The

students were then asked to post their videos to the Forums tool and discuss their findings with one another. **Resources** was used to house several important course documents, including instructions for the competitive "Defend the Island" team activity and rules for successfully completing the course's "Reading Challenges." Finally, the **Gradebook** tool was used to implement a game-based accrual grading policy where students earned points and "leveled up" throughout the semester, rather than seeing their grade average increase or decline based on their most recent performance.

Sound instructional design models were used in the design and development of this course, with careful attention being paid to the creation of observable learning objectives that were aligned to appropriate assessments. Elements from game-based learning were also applied to the course design. These include the inclusion of student autonomy in the course, balancing competition and reward systems, application of a clear progression system, and consideration of how students may fit into Bartle's gamer archetypes.

Dr. Nagurney and Patrick Smith were the main consultants on this project, although both their universities provide excellent support for faculty and staff who use their respective Sakai LMS's.

8. Self-Assessment
All award applicants are asked to evaluate their course or project by applying the same scoring rubric the judges will use for evaluation. This approach facilitates a transparent award selection process and also provides an opportunity for you to highlight your entry's strengths.

For each criterion, review the corresponding TWSIA rubric, as well as the following *TWSIA definition of innovation*:

- An innovative method, practice or strategy is one that, by design and execution, engages and challenges students, resulting in greater student interest, a deeper level of understanding and/or a lasting change in the students' perception of an issue or topic.

- This innovation may not be new in the world, but its implementation may be out of the ordinary in your field of practice or new to you. Innovation in teaching and learning involves more than simply using new technologies; rather it is an approach to teaching and learning that results in a much-enhanced, even transformative, educational experience for students.

Complete your self-assessment for each criterion by following these steps:

A. In the **Rating** section, indicate your entry's effectiveness in meeting the criterion by adding an "X" for the appropriate rating.

B. In the **Evidence to Support Your Rating** section, provide a summary of evidence for the criterion by adding a descriptive narrative (250-word maximum). If your evidence includes an innovative practice, be sure to describe that practice. *Note: It is not expected that you will have an innovative practice for every criterion in the rubric.*

C. In the **Additional Supporting Evidence section**, insert screenshots and include other supporting evidence for the criterion. *Note: We recommend including student feedback as part of your supporting evidence. Please limit screenshots to two for each criterion.*

TWSIA Course/Project Self-Assessment
Criterion #1: Student Engagement and Community Building

Not Applicable	TWSIA applicant explains persuasively why this criterion is not applicable to this entry.
Not Evident	There is no evidence of applicant attention to this criterion.
Somewhat Effective	• Instructor encourages exchange of information among students (e.g., bio, background, experiences) designed to increase communication and social rapport. • Students are encouraged to collaborate, share learning resources, and assist each other with learning, but explicit supports are not provided. • 60% or more of the students reply to messages from the instructor and other students, both when required and on a voluntary basis. Replies are usually on topic but often are brief, wordy and rambling. *Note: messages include all communication forms—synchronous and asynchronous (email, discussion forums, wikis, chats, web conferences, instant messaging, recorded messages, etc.).*
Effective	• Instructor encourages exchanges of information among students and also interacts with students on a social/peer basis to model community. • Some structures (technologies and strategies) are provided (e.g., links and other resources) to support collaborative student learning in group communities.

	• 80% or more of the students reply to messages from the instructor and other students both when required and voluntarily. • Replies are usually on topic and sometimes contain additional resources to other readings, community agencies, or links to other course/project/job experiences that can be shared for the good of the class members.
Excellent	• Instructor encourages exchange of information in both student to student and instructor to student interactions through a variety of ongoing course/project structures designed to promote social rapport and community. • The course/project is designed to support collaborative student learning with clearly defined technologies and strategies. • Links to outside resources and both structured and ad hoc internal and external learning communities are supported. • 90% to 100% of the students reply and initiate messages to the instructor and classmates both when required and voluntarily. Replies are thought-provoking and on topic and frequently contain information on other readings, community agencies, or links to other course/project/job experiences that can be shared for the good of the class members. • Students are encouraged to bring their own interests and discoveries into the course/project when relevant. • Student reflection on their learning is built into the course/project. • Student and instructor engagement with shared outside resources are evident. • Students assisting each other and learning from each other is evident.

TWSIA Course/Project Self-Assessment
Criterion #1: Student Engagement and Community Building

A. Rating

___Not applicable
___Not evident
___Somewhat effective
___Effective
_X_Excellent

B. Evidence to Support Your Rating (250-word maximum)

Several of the game-based elements that were embedded into PSY 100 were chosen to build a sense of "team" amongst the students, and speak to Bartle's "socializer" gamer archetype.

For example, students were given the chance to form teams early in the semester and complete in an activity called "Defend the Island." Teams were asked to choose a topic from a list posted in Resources and make themselves experts on that topic. The teams would then get the chance to teach their classmates about their chosen topic…but wily classmates would have already done some research of their own, as once the presentation ends then the defense begins. Each "invading" team has the chance to ask one topic-related question to the defending team. Correctly answered questions earn the defending team points, while the invading team earns a point for stumping the defending team. This activity fostered weekly student-to-student and student-to-instructor communication and collaboration.

Additionally, students were given the opportunity to collaborate on several of the course's "Reading Challenges." These quiz-like activities were designed to enhance students' intrinsic motivation to attend class and collaborate with their teammates, as teams whose members were all in attendance on the days of unannounced Reading Challenges would receive extra points for their loyalty. Students could also earn two different "healing" badges for being in attendance to support their teammates.

Students were given autonomy in choosing how to demonstrate mastery of the objectives for several of the "Side Quest" activities that were added to the course. Students used several creative methods, such as songs, original artwork, videos, and even a gelatin mold to demonstrate their understanding of several course concepts.

C. Additional Supporting Evidence

Data from our student post-test, scores based on a 4-point Likert scale, where 1=strongly disagree and 4=strongly agree:

- Because my team earned extra points on reading challenges if everyone on the team was present, I was more motivated to attend class each week.

  o Mean 3.27 SD = .90

- I liked the fact that I was able to choose the way I demonstrated my knowledge to the instructor on several game-based assignments.

  o Mean 3.20 SD = .88

- Working with my team to complete our Defend the Island activity and our research paper made me feel like I was an important part of the learning process.

  - Mean 3.08 SD = .80

- 18 students identified Side Quests
- 3 students identified Defend the Island
- 1 student identified Reading Challenges

TWSIA Course/Project Self-Assessment
Criterion #2: Communication

Not Applicable	TWSIA applicant explains persuasively why this criterion is not applicable to this entry.
Not Evident	There is no evidence of applicant attention to this criterion.
Somewhat Effective	• The instructor provides sufficient opportunities for instructor to student communication. However, the course/project offers limited opportunity for communication from student to student. • Standards for instructor responsiveness and availability to students are loosely defined (e.g., turn-around time for email, grade posting, assignment feedback, etc.). • Lag time between student questions /assignment submission and instructor response may be lengthy (e.g., turn-around time for email, grade posting, assignment comments, etc. exceeds 48 hours or is undefined).
Effective	• The course/project provides an instructor introduction to students. • Standards for instructor response to student queries are somewhat defined with basic contact information/ hours provided. • Turnaround time between student question and instructor response is generally within 48 hours (e.g., for email, grade posting, assignment comments, etc.). • Instructor provides somewhat regular analysis of student contribution/work and suggestions for improvement. • Technologies are used for two-way asynchronous communication exchanges of primarily written information (chat, wiki, Google Docs, blogs, etc.) relating to specific course/project topics.

	• In addition to instructor-to-student communication, standards for student-to-student interactions are somewhat defined. This may include netiquette, responsiveness requirements to postings, as well as group work (e.g., peer reviews, discussion participation, etc.)
Excellent	• The course/project is structured with multiple technology options for communication from instructor to student and student to student with the aim of community building. These may include a variety of one-way and two-way written, voice, and visual communications tools. • Standards are clearly stated for all interactions. • Evidence is offered of instructor-to-student, student-to-instructor, and student-to-student interactions both replying to and initiating messages. • Options are available for students to control interactions (e.g., presentations, leading discussions, sharing group work). • Expectations for both student and instructor responsiveness and availability are clearly articulated both in engagement with material and individual assignments, as well as in group work (e.g., turn-around time for emails, peer review of assignments, participation in discussions, etc.) • Instructor provides rapid feedback, including analysis of student work and suggestions for improvement.

TWSIA Course/Project Self-Assessment
Criterion #2: Communication

A. Rating

___Not applicable
___Not evident
___Somewhat effective
___Effective
 X_Excellent

B. Evidence to Support Your Rating (250-word maximum)

Student-to-student and student-to-instructor communication were greatly enhanced in the design of this course. As mentioned earlier, student teams were given the chance to present topics to their classmates. In addition, students were asked to participate in asynchronous online discussion forums as part of completing certain Side Quests.

Great care was taken in drafting detailed instructions explaining how students and teams could successfully complete their coursework, and how to communicate effectively with teammates and their instructor. Perhaps most importantly, students were asked to complete a "Team Norms, Rules of Engagement, and Conflict Resolution Plan" at the beginning of the semester. Teams were asked to identify the "norms" for how the team will operate throughout the semester. They were then asked to decide how they'd like to communicate when working collaboratively on assignments (for example, Google hangouts, Laulima chat forums, email, etc.). Finally, the teams drafted a conflict resolution plan that would address how the team would handle an issue (such as a non-performing team member), should one arise. The conflict resolution plan must state how the teammates would address the issue with the team member in question, and at what point they would involve the instructor in the conflict resolution process.

Teams also met with the instructor before their Defend the Island presentation to rehearse and receive formative feedback on their presentation.

These elements of student-to-student, student-to-instructor, and instructor-to-student communication were key in the success of the gamified course design.

C. Additional Supporting Evidence

Data from our student pre-test, scores based on a 4-point Likert scale, where 1=strongly disagree and 4=strongly agree:

- Working with a team to solve problems makes me feel like I'm an important part of the learning process.

  - Mean 3.14   SD = .75

Instructions for the Team Norms, Rules of Engagement, and Conflict Resolution Plan:

Part I: Team Goals

Come up with at least 3 clearly stated goals that articulate what your team would like to achieve by working together. As you write your goals, consider:

- The grade you would like to achieve on the upcoming team project.

- The kind of performance in terms of deadlines you would like to achieve.
- How to avoid "group think," in which team members try to minimize conflict and reach consensus without evaluating alternative ideas or viewpoints.
- How you will measure the goals you set.
- Whether your goals are realistic and whether everyone on your team agrees to them.

Part II: Rules of Engagement

The purpose of writing rules that you and your teammates agree to live by is to help you develop team cohesiveness and prevent negative conflict. Consider the following as you develop your rules of engagement:

- How will you work to create a positive group experience?
- What rules do you want to create for how the team will operate?
- By what methods will communication be maintained across group members? For example, how often will you meet and what technologies will you use? How will you coordinate your schedules?
- How will you determine what tasks need to be done to complete an assignment and by when? Remember that you will get more out of collaborating with team members and create better work products if you build in time for brainstorming, bouncing your ideas off one another, and giving one another feedback.
- How will you determine team member assignments and ensure that everyone completes the tasks they committed to in a timely manner?
- How will you make decisions? Will the majority rules if consensus is not reached?

Some example guidelines are listed below, but you should expand upon these and make sure you address the points above:

- Respect other's needs, feelings, and rights through civilized disagreement.

- Keep all commitments by the agreed upon due date.

- Check email and the discussion forum every day and respond within 24 hours.

- Honor our commitment to the team rules.

Part III: Conflict Management Plan

Include with your charter the steps you will take to try and resolve team problems if they arise. For example, you might first approach the person you're having trouble with. If that doesn't work, email the instructor; and if that doesn't work, request a phone conference with the instructor.

Instructions for the Defend the Island activity (to demonstrate level of detail in communicating with students):

Defend the Island

Once during each week of the course, a team will have the chance to earn points by staking their claim, and then defending their island from invading teams.

Successfully defending your island will grant your team up to **50 points**, which is 5% of the total possible points in the class. Here's how it will work:

Step 1: Sign up

Your team must sign up for a topic and a class period during which you will defend your island. Your team may sign up for your topic and time by emailing me, or seeing me in office hours or before/after class. Topics will be given to a team on a "first come, first served" basis. If another team has already signed up for the topic and time you wanted, your team will have to choose another topic and time.

Make sure to discuss with your team and come to a consensus on the topic and date you'll be presenting before signing up for that date and topic. Once your team has signed up for a topic and date, the selection is final.

Step 2: Prepare

In preparation for your defense, your team should make themselves **experts** on the assigned topic. I'd recommend not only reading the textbook, but also researching the web and other academic sources so that you're well prepared to fend off the invading teams.

Step 3: Meet with the instructor

One week before your defense, your team must meet with me to review your planned presentation. Your presentation should be complete, as I will use this meeting as a chance to give your team feedback on how to improve your presentation before you step in front of the class.

Step 4: Present

On the day of your scheduled defense, your team will present your topic to the other teams. Your presentation should be **10 – 15 minutes in length**, and effectively teach the teams about your assigned topic. More details regarding the specifications for your presentation are provided later in this document.

Step 5: Defend

After your presentation, it will be time for you to defend your island from the invading teams. Each team will get the chance to ask **one question** regarding the topic to the presenting team.

If the invading team is able to stump the defenders with their question, then the invading team will earn **1 extra credit point**. This means that *wise* invading teams will also do some research on the topic being presented so they can try to score points for their team by asking a challenging question!

However, for each question that the defending team answers successfully, the defending team will earn **1 extra credit point**!

Presentation Guidelines (for Defending Teams)

Your presentation to the other teams should be **10 – 15 minutes** in length and effectively cover your assigned topic.

I recommend using creative and interesting ways to deliver your presentation, such as using PowerPoint or Prezi, and including multimedia (pictures, videos, etc.), or even using role play, when applicable.

Here are the guidelines I'll use to score the presentation:

- Content (20 points)

  Your information should be accurate, and you should be able to provide supporting evidence for your information (citing the textbook, articles, etc.). The class should feel like they've learned about your topic from your presentation!

- Delivery (15 points)

  Your presentation should follow a logical sequence, and make sense in the order the slides are presented. Presenters should feel confident in the topic they are presenting. Your presentation aids (slides, pictures, videos, etc.) should enhance your delivery.

- Peer Evaluation (10 points)

  I would like to see each member of the team taking an active role in the research of the assigned topic, the preparation of the presentation, and the delivery of the presentation to the other teams.

  On the day that your team defends your island, you will complete a **Peer Evaluation Form** to score your teammates' work on this assignment. I will take the average of the scores your teammates give you and record that as your Peer Evaluation score on this activity.

- Meeting with instructor (5 points)

  Your team will receive 5 points for meeting with me one week before your scheduled defense to review your presentation.

Question Guidelines (for Invading Teams)

As mentioned earlier, each Invading Team will have a chance to ask the Defending Team **one question** after they've finished their presentation. Approach this activity wisely: do some research on the topic being presented *before* the day of the presentation! Your team only gets to ask **one question**, so make it count!

Your team's question must be **on topic** and not trivial in nature. For example, if the topic being presented is "Stanley Milgram's Obedience Experiment," an **inappropriate** question would be "What color pants were Milgram's wife wearing on her 44th birthday?"

An **appropriate** question might be, "What other well known Psychologists have followed in Milgram's footsteps, researching obedience?"

I would like your team to devise its own question. Please do not simply copy the questions found within your textbook. By the end of the class period before each Defend the Island activity, the Invading Teams must each present me with the question they'd like to ask the Defending Team during the activity. If your team does not hand in a question, then you will lose your chance to earn the extra credit point, and the Defending Team will automatically earn a point for your team's forfeit.

TWSIA Course/Project Self-Assessment
Criterion #3: Learning Materials and Strategies

Not Applicable	TWSIA applicant explains persuasively why this criterion is not applicable to this entry.
Not Evident	There is no evidence of applicant attention to this criterion.
Somewhat Effective	- The course/project provides few structural or easily identifiable learning components, and/or navigation beyond a Sakai tools menu is difficult such that the components are not easily found. - There is little evidence of interactivity in the design of learning activities. - Sequencing and expectations around access and use of materials are minimal or unclear. - Technologies are primarily used for two-way asynchronous exchanges of primarily written information (e.g., Wiki, Google Docs, blogs, discussion forum, etc.)
Effective	- Navigation is clear, and key components of the course/project content are identified and easily accessible, such as the Syllabus, a reading list, assignments and due dates, basic contact information. - There is some basic interactivity built into the course/project (e.g., interactive presentations, short quizzes that follow a learning sequence). - Instructions as to sequencing and expectations are provided. - Basic resources are provided to meaningfully enhance the content. - In addition to technologies used for written two-way asynchronous communication, additional technologies for two-way voice and/or visual communication of learning materials are used.
Excellent	Navigation is clear, and key components of the course/project content are identified and easily accessible. Additional aesthetic visual cues are provided to increase ease of use for the student.

	• Active learning strategies are built into the course/project. Instructional activities focus on learner input, and reward paired with group interaction.
	• Students are expected to explore and use primary sources in as wide a range of media as possible, along with secondary sources such as books and articles.
	• Student reflection is an integral part of the course/project. Via the visual design, as well as written material, students can clearly understand all components, structure, sequencing, and expectations.
	• Roles are clearly delineated in written, auditory, and visual form.
	• Resources are provided to address the content in multiple ways, taking into account student learning styles or abilities and levels.
	• Technologies allow for a variety of one-way and two-way written, voice, and visual communications between instructor and students and among students relating to specific course/project topics.

TWSIA Course/Project Self-Assessment
Criterion #3: Learning Materials and Strategies

A. Rating

___Not applicable
___Not evident
___Somewhat effective
___Effective
_X_Excellent

B. Evidence to Support Your Rating (250-word maximum)

Active and collaborative learning strategies were used throughout the course. Not only were student learning styles taken into consideration, but Bartle's gamer archetypes were also considered to provide a balanced game-based learning environment for all students.

Students attended face-to-face sessions each week where they'd hear lectures and presentation from classmates and instructor alike. The students were also able to find detailed assignment instructions within the course Resources tool.

Instructions were clearly written and easy to follow, most were organized into cognitive "chunks" to help students better comprehend the task at hand.

Navigation of the course Laulima site was kept clean and simple.

As mentioned earlier, a digital badge system was implemented using the Web Content tool. This helped boost students intrinsic motivation to perform well by providing them with non-tangible rewards that were delivered electronically.

C. Additional Supporting Evidence

Data from our student post-test, scores based on a 4-point Likert scale, where 1=strongly disagree and 4=strongly agree:

- Earning small rewards, like the achievements Dr. Nagurney announced, or seeing my name on the "Top Performer" list motivated me to work harder.

    - Mean 3.08   SD = .89
        - Note: This increased from a mean of 2.95 on the pre-course survey.

My Workspace | PSY-100-001 [HIL.14544.SP14] | PSY-100-002 [HIL.13223.FA13] | PSY-100-002 [HIL.14545.SP14]

Unpublished Site

(Publish Now)

Home
Announcements
Syllabus
Forums
Resources
Achievements
Gradebook
Mailtool
Roster
Site Info
Help

PSY-100-001 [HIL.14544.SP14]: Welcome to PSY 100!

Welcome to the Laulima site for PSY100, Introduction to Psychology.

I hope that throughout the semester you'll be able to learn not only more about how psychology influences you and those around you, but also that you'll be able to obtain a deeper understanding about yourself as a person and what makes you tick.

Please let me know if I can help you at any point through the course. Good luck!

Dr. Nagurney

Laulima

| My Workspace ⌄ | **PSY-100-001 [HIL.14544.SP14]** ⌄ | PSY-100-002 [HIL.13223.FA13] ⌄ | PSY-100-002 [HIL.14545.SP14] ⌄ |

PSY-322-001 [HIL.12119.SU14] ⌄

Unpublished Site

(Publish Now)

Home 🏠

Announcements 📢

Syllabus 📖

Forums 💬

Resources 📁

Achievements 🏅

Gradebook 📋

Mailtool 📧

Roster 📇

Site Info 🖼️

Help ❓

PSY-100-001 [HIL.14544.SP14]: Achievements

Master Healer

Students who were present to support their team during all Reading Challenges.

(+5 points on total Reading Challenge score for the semester - stacks with Team Support)

TWSIA Course/Project Self-Assessment
Criterion #4: Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Not Applicable	TWSIA applicant explains persuasively why this criterion is not applicable to this entry.
Not Evident	There is no evidence of applicant attention to this criterion.
Somewhat Effective	• Course/project objectives and outcomes are vague or incomplete. Alignment of outcomes with content and assignments/assessment is not always evident. • Course/project provides limited activities to help students develop critical thinking/judgment, and problem solving skills, and digital literacy as they relate to the course/project objectives/outcomes and at the appropriate level of skill. • Opportunities for students to receive feedback about their own performance are infrequent and sporadic.
Effective	• Course/project objectives and outcomes are clearly defined and aligned with content and assignments/ assessment. • Some activities are designed to develop critical thinking/ judgment, problem solving skills, and digital literacy as they relate to the course/project objectives/ outcomes and at the appropriate level of skill. • Opportunity is provided for student feedback about their own performance. • Students are encouraged to share their knowledge with others. • There is some opportunity for students to relate the learning to real-life applications.
Excellent	• Course/project objectives/ outcomes are clearly defined and aligned with content and assignments/ assessment. • Interaction and communication between students, peers, faculty, and content are provided in a variety of ways with choices sometimes available. • Activities to help students gain critical thinking/judgment and problem-solving skills are integrated into every aspect of the course/project. This includes opportunities for students to relate the learning to real-life applications. • Multiple assessment strategies, including ones that attend to student styles and needs, are used to measure content knowledge, attitudes, and skills. • Feedback about student performance is frequent and timely throughout the course/project, and provides clear opportunities for improvement and encouragement to excel.

	• Students are required to become self-reflective learners and are given feedback on their reflection. Other forms of feedback such as peer review or feedback from experts are encouraged. • Students are encouraged to generate course/project content using traditional or new media.

TWSIA Course/Project Self-Assessment
Criterion #4: Learning Outcomes and Assessment

A. Rating

___Not applicable
___Not evident
___Somewhat effective
___Effective
_X_Excellent

B. Evidence to Support Your Rating (250-word maximum)

As part of the instructional design approach used for this course, clear and observable objectives were identified and matched to assessments that would serve as proof of the students' mastery of the objectives. The instructor provided timely feedback using several rubrics and grading forms which were designed specifically for the activities in this course. Students were assessed in a variety of ways throughout the course. These methods include written essays, quizzes, creative projects (using new and/or traditional media), presentations, and online discussions.

Students were frequently asked to think critically and apply their understanding of theory to real-world situations. Several of the Side Quest activities gave students to make choices based on their understanding of the course content and their areas of interest. Students were also asked to reflect on their own performance, and on the performance of their teammates.

C. Additional Supporting Evidence

Neuron Transmission – 25 points

In chapter 2 of the textbook, you read about neurons and how they fire. In this Side Quest, **you** are the one who gets to explain neuron transmission.

You must find a *creative* way to describe or show the neuron transmission process. For example, you could create a hand drawn illustration of the process, or you could make a brief video in which your friends play the part of a neuron chain, and you demonstrate what happens during neuron transmission.

The format of the project is yours to choose, but it must be more creative than simply writing a description of neuron transmission.

I will award points based on the following criteria:

- Accuracy of Content (20 points)

    Your information should be accurate, free of errors, and the process of neuron transmission should be clearly illustrated or explained in your project.

- Creativity (5 points)

    Your project should be completed in a creative fashion, using something more inventive than words to describe or illustrate the process of neuron transmission.

Please see the course syllabus for this Side Quest's due date.

Instructions for Side Quest #4 (example of real world application):

Men are from Hawi, Women are from Waimea – 25 Points

In chapter 10 of the textbook, you read about motivation related to human sexual behavior. In this Side Quest, you will get the chance to gather some data concerning gender differences in standards for partner intelligence!

For this quest, you will be recreating the study that we discussed in class, originally conducted by Kenrick and his associates in 1993. In the study, participants were asked to rate the minimum percentile of intelligence that was acceptable for different partner categories.

To complete this quest, you must do the following:

1. Use the form on page 2 of this document to gather data from **10 participants** regarding standards for partner categories.

2. Analyze the data you collect, looking for specific trends based on the gender of your participants. Specifically, note whether or not your replicated the findings of the original study.

3. Write a summary of your findings to share with the instructor and hand it in with the data collection form.

I will award points based on the following criteria:

- Data collection (10 points)

  Data must be collected from 10 participants. Each participant's data must be complete (all sections of data form are filled out for each participant). Participants should be a nearly equal mix of male and female.

- Quality of the summary and analysis (15 points)

  Your summary provides an overview of the trends in your data and relates the trends back to the original study.

Please see the course syllabus for this Side Quest's due date.

Peer evaluation and reflection form:

Since collaborative activities require the entire team's participation to succeed, each student will complete an evaluation of his/her teammates that reflects each person's contribution to the team effort on the Defend the Island assignment.

Teammates will evaluate the quality of contributions to and participation in team activities using this form. I will average together your ratings from each team member and convert the result to a final score.

Your evaluation of your teammates is completely confidential, so please score your teammates honestly.

1. List each member of your team in the table below.

2. Use the scale from 0 to 2 to rate your teammates' performance based on the criteria below.

<u>**Point Values:**</u>

1.5 - 2 = Outstanding

1 – 1.5 = Above average

0.5 - 1 = Average

0 - 0.5 = Below average

<u>**Criteria:**</u>
Quality = Completed all assignments at the level of quality expected by the group
Responsibility = Completed all assignments in a timely manner
Teamwork = Worked well with other team members and followed ground rules set by the team
Contribution = Contributed to the group equitably
Attitude = Projected a positive attitude throughout

Team Members' Names	Quality (0-2)	Responsibility (0–2)	Teamwork (0–2)	Contribution (0–2)	Attitude (0–2)	Total Points

Student Name:

Team Name:

Presentation Date:

	Score	Feedback
Content (20 points)		
Delivery (15 points)		
Instructor Meeting (5 points)		

Peer Evaluation (10 points)		This score is an average of the peer evaluation scores your teammates submitted for you.

TWSIA Course/Project Self-Assessment
Criterion #5: Learner Support

Not Applicable	TWSIA applicant explains persuasively why this criterion is not applicable to this entry.
Not Evident	There is no evidence of applicant attention to this criterion.
Somewhat Effective	Course/project contains limited information on digital literacy requirements for the course and on the availability of campus resources.
Effective	Course/project contains basic information on digital literacy requirements for the course and on the availability of campus resources.
Excellent	• Digital literacy requirements for the course/project are evident and ample resources for student support are provided. • Online orientations, practice technical/learning assessments, and/or a mechanism for supplying on demand support material is developed/ provided throughout the term as needed.

TWSIA Course/Project Self-Assessment
Criterion #5: Learner Support

A. Rating

___Not applicable
___Not evident
___Somewhat effective
_X_Effective
___Excellent

B. Evidence to Support Your Rating (250-word maximum)

While the course does not state its digital literacy requirements upfront, the students are well supported in their learning environment.

Since this course asks students to submit assignments in various forms, including video and/or other multimedia formats, the students were introduced to University of Hawaii's Office of Campus Technology (OCT) early in the semester. The OCT provides excellent support for students who are using various types of technology for their coursework.

On assignments where it was anticipated students may need OCT support, the contact information was provided within the instructions for the assignment itself.

C. Additional Supporting Evidence

Sample instructions for an assignment where OCT support may be needed:

Classically Conditioned – 25 points

In chapter 7 of the textbook, you read about Ivan Pavlov's research in **classical conditioning**. In this Side Quest, you will get the chance to run a classical conditioning paradigm of your own!
For this quest, you will be classically conditioning a roommate, friend, family member, or pet and capturing the results on video. Here are some important guidelines for completing this quest:

Setting up the paradigm:

Before beginning the quest you will need to define the following for your particular paradigm:
- Who your subject will be
- The Unconditioned Stimulus (US)
- The Neutral Stimulus (NS)
- The Unconditioned Response (UR)
- The Conditioned Stimulus (CS)
- The Conditioned Response (CR)

These factors need to be explained at the beginning of your video.

Running the trials:

Capture video of yourself running each trial. It may take several trials for your subject to achieve the desired CR, so be prepared to capture several trials for your video.

Submitting your video:

To earn points for your video, you must upload it to YouTube and provide the instructor with a link to your video. YouTube accounts are free, and easy to sign up for.

If you've never uploaded a video to YouTube before, I'd recommend you watch this tutorial before your first attempt: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SzSwnbxb9TY

You can always get technology assistance from the OCT Help Desk. You can contact them at (808) 932-7040 or visit their site: http://hilo.hawaii.edu/helpdesk/

I will award points based on the following criteria:

- Quality of the paradigm (20 points)

  Your project must be well thought out, with a clear US, NS, UR, CS, and CR explained at the beginning of your video. Your trials should follow the stated plan for your experiment. Ideally, the CR will be naturally achieved by the end of your trials, however if it is not then you may record an explanation of why you think conditioning was not achieved.

- Quality of the video (5 points)

  Your video is assembled in a way that makes sense to the viewer (follows a logical sequence). Trials are filmed so that the viewer can clearly see what's happening. Video does not need to be "Hollywood" quality, but should show that you put time and effort into the overall quality of the final product.

PLEASE NOTE: No friends, family members, or pets should be harmed in the completion of this Side Quest.

Please see the course syllabus for this Side Quest's due date.