

Lilly Fellows Impact Study 2010

Conducted by Kristin Moretto, Ph.D. Candidate, HALE, College of Education

Background

At the request of Deborah DeZure, Assistant Provost for Faculty and Organizational Development, Kristin Moretto (HALE, Ph.D. Candidate) was asked to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the impact of the Lilly Teaching Fellows experience on early career faculty participants. An online survey designed to evaluate the impact of the Lilly Fellowship Program was conducted using Survey Monkey during the summer of 2008. In 2010, the 2009 Lilly cohort was also surveyed in the same manner as the previous cohorts. The results of the 2009 cohort survey were integrated into the data analysis and representation of findings.

The Lilly Fellowship has operated at Michigan State University since 1991. From 1991-2004, the Fellowship was designed and facilitated by Dr. Karl Smith. Since 2004, the program has been designed and facilitated by Deborah DeZure. Because several changes were made to the Lilly Fellowship under the direction of Dr. DeZure, it was decided to ask the same questions of all the Lilly Fellows, and to cluster and compare the responses by those who participated in the earlier cohorts with Dr. Smith (1991-2004) with the responses of those who participated in the later cohorts with Dr. DeZure (2004-2009).

Methodology

The survey was administered by email invitation to all Lilly Fellowship participants since the program's inception in 1991 through the 2007-2009 cohorts (111 of 119 total participants) for whom we had valid email addresses. Two identical surveys

were used, one for those who participated in the program from 1991-2004 under the leadership of Dr. Karl Smith, and an identical survey for those who participated in the program from 2004-2009 under the leadership of Dr. Deborah DeZure.

Survey questions were designed to reflect the explicitly stated goals of the Lilly Fellowship Program. Questions probed the impact of participation in the Lilly Fellowship Program on teaching, scholarship, networking, and attitudes about MSU. The following questions were included in both surveys:

- What was the impact of the Lilly Fellowship Program on:
 - **Your beliefs about teaching and learning?**
 - **Your practice of teaching and learning?**
 - **The effectiveness of your teaching?**
 - **Peer evaluations of your teaching and learning?**
 - **Your SIRS, SOCT, or other student evaluation forms?**
 - **Your research on your own teaching?**
 - **Your research on teaching and learning (beyond your own teaching)?**
 - **Your scholarship and/or creative endeavors other than the scholarship of teaching and learning?**
 - **Your publications?**
 - **Your conference presentations?**
 - **Your grants (internal or external) about teaching and learning?**
 - **Your scholarly recognitions (e.g., awards, citations) other than conference presentations, publications, and grants?**
 - **Your networking with administrators across the university?**
 - **Your networking with faculty and other academic staff?**
 - **Other professional collaborations at MSU and beyond?**
 - **Your views about MSU?**

For each of these questions, participants were asked to identify an example or clarifying comment.

Sample

Email invitations were sent to 71 participants in the Lilly Fellowship Program from 1991-2004, with 36 people (50.7%) responding to the email and completing the

survey. Email invitations were also sent to 40 participants in the Lilly Fellowship Program from 2004-2009, with 25 respondents (62.50%) completing the survey.

- 1991-2004 cohorts
 - Survey invites sent to 71 people
 - 36 responses (50.7%)
- 2004-2009 cohorts
 - Survey invites sent to 40 people
 - 25 responses (62.5%)

Demographics

Gender:

- Survey Respondents 1991-2004 (*3 people skipped this question*)
 - Percent Males: 43.8%
 - Percent Females: 56.3%
- Lilly Participants 1991-2004
 - Average percentage of Males: 44.5%
 - Average percentage of Females: 55.5%
- Survey Respondents 2004-2009 (*2 people skipped this question*)
 - Percent Males: 34.8%
 - Percent Females: 65.2%
- Lilly Participants 2004-2009
 - Average percentage of Males: 51.75%
 - Average percentage of Females: 48.25%

Race/Ethnicity:

- Survey Respondents 1991-2004 (*5 people skipped this question*)
 - African American/Black: 3.3%
 - Asian: 10%
 - Caucasian/White: 80%
 - Hispanic/Latino/Chicano: 6.7%
- Survey Respondents 2004-2009 (*2 people skipped this question*)
 - African American/Black: 4.3%
 - Asian: 4.3%
 - Caucasian/White: 82.6%
 - Hispanic/Latino/Chicano: 4.3%
 - Unknown: 7.1%

Citizenship:

- Survey Respondents 1991-2004 (*4 people skipped this question*)
 - U.S. Citizen: 90.3%

- Permanent Resident: 9.7%
- Survey Respondents 2004-2009 (*2 people skipped this question*)
 - U.S. Citizen: 87.0%
 - Permanent Resident: 8.8%
 - Foreign National: 4.3%

Data Collection and Analysis

Because several changes were made to the Lilly Fellowship under the direction of Dr. DeZure, it was decided to ask the same questions of all the Lilly Fellows, and to cluster and compare the responses by those who participated in the earlier cohorts with Dr. Smith (1991-2004) with those who participated in the later cohorts with Dr. DeZure (2004-2009).

The survey was administered by email invitation to all Lilly Fellowship participants since the program's inception in 1991 through the 2008-2009 cohort for whom we had email addresses [See Appendix A]. Quantitative data from Likert-scale questions were collected and graphed separately for the 1991-2004 participants and for the 2004-2009 participants. To provide a visual comparison between the two cohorts for each question, the data have been presented together on the same graph [See Appendix B].

To assess the impact of the Lilly Fellowship program for all participants from 1991-2008, the data from both cohorts were combined for each question and summarized in graphic form [See Appendix C].

Qualitative responses were gathered by asking for an example or clarifying comment for each question. This was optional for survey respondents. The summary for qualitative responses is presented separately in Appendix D.

Summary

In reviewing the survey responses, it is evident that since its inception, the Lilly Fellowship Program has had a dramatic impact on participants. Overall, the program has benefited participants in all four areas that were surveyed: teaching, scholarship, networking, and attitudes about MSU.

While all Lilly Fellowship participants have benefited from their experience, this analysis focused on comparing the earlier and later cohorts to assess the value added of programmatic changes since 2004. Analysis focused first on the total percentage of responses to each question that were found to be “modest,” “significant” and “very significant.” Comparisons of the responses from the earlier and later cohorts indicate that the impact increased for the later cohort on eleven of the sixteen questions including:

- Beliefs about teaching and learning
- Effectiveness of their own teaching
- Research on their own teaching
- Research on teaching and learning (beyond their own teaching)?
- Publications
- Conference presentations
- Grants (internal or external) about teaching and learning
- Networking with administrators across the university
- Networking with faculty and other academic staff
- Other professional collaborations at MSU and beyond
- Views about MSU

Analysis then focused on areas in which responses found to have a “significant” and “very significant” impact from the later cohorts increased by 10% or more include:

- Research on their own teaching
- Research on teaching and learning (beyond their own teaching)
- Scholarship and/or creative endeavors other than the scholarship of teaching and learning
- Publications
- Conference presentations
- Grants (internal or external) about teaching and learning

- Views about MSU

It is important to note in interpreting the data that there has been a steady increase in expectations for selection into the Lilly Fellowship Program. Successful applicants in the later cohorts have had to demonstrate increasing levels of commitment to excellence in teaching and knowledge of the research literature on teaching and learning. The number of participants seeking selection into the program for remediation purposes has decreased in later years due to clearer expectations and better understanding on the part of chairs and supervisors about the nature and purpose of the Lilly Fellowship so that chairs now nominate only the strongest and most able teacher –scholars to participate. Consequently, the impact of the Lilly Fellowship Program on beliefs about teaching and learning and the practice of teaching is more dramatic in the earlier cohort in part because participants in the earlier years may have entered the program less aware of the research on effective teaching and learning. In contrast, the later cohorts had more dramatic increases on topics related to the scholarship of teaching and learning which may have been new even to these skillful and reflective teachers, such as impact on their research, other scholarship, publications and conference presentations.

Conclusion

In summary, throughout its history, the Lilly Fellowship Program has had a significant impact on participants in their teaching, scholarship, networking, and attitudes about Michigan State University. A comparison of earlier and later cohorts reveals that there has been a dramatic increase in impact in later cohorts particularly with regard to the scholarship of teaching and learning, including their research, other scholarship, publications, and conference presentations.