

UW System Curricular Redesign Clicker Project
Faculty Responses (% responded)

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Learning Technology Center
lrc@uwm.edu

	(1) Strongly Disagree	(2) Disagree	(3) Neutral	(4) Agree	(5) Strongly Agree
Clickers increased student participation in the course			12.90	48.39	38.71
Clickers have been beneficial to my students' learning			25.81	48.39	25.81
Clickers provided new pedagogical strategies		3.23	3.23	54.84	38.71
My overall experience with SRS was a positive one	6.45		12.90	48.39	32.26
I have been at my current institution for an extended period of time	12.90	19.35	3.23	25.81	38.71
I was familiar with SRS at the beginning of the grant	19.35	16.13	12.90	19.35	32.26
The clickers did not increase student participation in the class	38.71	54.84	6.45		
Clickers had little impact on my students' learning	32.26	45.16	22.58		
The clickers were not helpful in creating active learning activities	32.26	51.61	12.90	3.23	
Clickers were not pleasant	35.48	38.71	9.68	12.90	3.23
I have shared or will share my experience with my departmental colleagues			3.23	48.39	48.39
I participated in the grant project to improve the interactions in the classroom	3.23	3.23	3.23	29.03	61.29
Clickers increased student engagement in the classroom			6.45	58.06	35.48
Clickers helped increase my students' overall performance in the class		6.45	35.48	51.61	6.45
Clickers allowed me to assess student knowledge acquired from reading	3.23	9.68	25.81	41.94	19.35
I would recommend SRS to other faculty members			19.35	41.94	38.71
I have no plans to discuss my use of clickers with others in my department.	48.39	38.71	3.23	9.68	
I participated in the grant project to lessen my work in the classroom	61.29	25.81	6.45	6.45	
The clickers did not facilitate student engagement	38.71	51.61	6.45	3.23	
My students' performance in my course had little to do with their use of clickers	12.90	48.39	32.26	6.45	
The clickers were not helpful in assessing student knowledge	25.81	64.52	9.68		
I would find it difficult recommending this	41.94	41.94	12.90		3.23

technology to other instructors					
I will be able to influence others in my department to use SRS	6.45	9.68	32.26	41.94	9.68
Clickers facilitated good interactions among students in the class	3.23	6.45	22.58	51.61	16.13
Clickers allowed me to access student knowledge on a particular concept				67.74	32.26
I have accepted SRS as a permanent part of my course	6.45	6.45	22.58	19.35	45.16
My opinion about the clickers will have little impact on whether or not others in my department adopt the new technology	19.35	41.94	22.58	16.13	
Clickers did not stimulate interaction among students	35.48	51.61	9.68		3.23
Clickers allowed me to assess students' complete knowledge of course		25.81	25.81	41.94	6.45
I will not use clickers in the future	51.61	29.03	12.90	3.23	3.23
My department chair is aware of my involvement	3.23			45.16129	51.6129
The grant project diminished my willingness to use of SRS in the future	54.84	29.03	9.68		6.451613
Clickers increased student attendance		12.90	25.81	48.3871	12.90323
The clickers failed to assist me in assessing students' knowledge of course materials	29.03	58.06	6.45	3.225806	3.225806
No one in my department is aware of my use of clickers	61.29	35.48			3.225806
The grant project allowed me to increase my expertise of SRS		3.23	6.45	32.25806	58.06452
Attendance in my class did not increase by using clickers	12.90	48.39	19.35	19.35484	
Clickers allowed me to stimulate class discussions based on data received		3.23	16.13	51.6129	29.03226
Clickers did not stimulate discussion	25.81	51.61	22.58		
I did not have enough support in integrating clickers	32.26	48.39	6.45	9.677419	3.225806
Clickers allowed me to be able redesign the course based on formative assessments		22.58	29.03	38.70968	9.677419
Clickers allowed me to be able to intervene on poor performers	6.45	51.61	22.58	19.35484	