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The iCE Platform & App

ICE or the Interactive Curricula Experience Platform & App is a content delivery system designed specifically for the iPad but available to any learner with a web-enabled device.

Background

The platform officially launched in September 2015, following a period of development and beta testing. Prior to and up to the technology’s launch in September, a wide variety of sponsored programming introduced members of Thomas Jefferson University to the platform. Beginning in December 2014 and ending in June 2015, these events included:

- 3 “Train the Trainer” early adopter sessions facilitated by digitalwave Technologies
- 8 “Introduction to iCE” experiential workshops conducted by the Center for Teaching & Learning
- 2 iCE information sessions during Fall and Spring Faculty Days
- 1 all-day collegiate retreat for SKMC delivered exclusively on iCE
- Registrations for the various events indicated widespread participation from all of Thomas Jefferson University, including faculty from each of the six colleges as well as staff, administrators, and affiliated members across the enterprise
- CTL staff members also provided individual consultations and demonstrations of ICE for interested TJU community members.

Survey

The CTL collaborated with the Office of Institutional Affairs and the Office of Academic Affairs to develop a short survey to gauge attitudes toward the technology, as well as its use and adoption.

The survey was designed and deployed in November 2015 via SurveyMonkey. To 346 faculty, staff, and students at Thomas Jefferson University who had either attended an information session or participated in an experiential workshop.

A total of 86 users completed the survey for a 26% response rate.

Table 1: Percentage of Respondents by Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson College of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson College of Health Professions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson College of Nursing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson College of Pharmacy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson College of Population Health</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Kimmel Medical College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Unit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Percentage of Respondents by Affiliation (Figure 1), length of service at TJU and respondents’ familiarity with iCE (Figure 2) for all respondents.

Please indicate the statement that best describes your familiarity with ICE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have no knowledge of ICE.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have seen ICE demonstrated.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the ICE Platform and App.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have attended an ICE workshop or consultation.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 81 | 100

Figure 2: Familiarity

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I plan on using ICE to deliver content to learners in the future.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not be using ICE to deliver content to learners.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am currently using ICE to deliver content to learners.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not responsible for developing or delivering course content.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 53 | 100

Figure 3: Use and Adoption

For those with self-reported familiarity, the survey presented three additional items, including actual or intended use (Figure 3), an ordered scale assessing attitudes and perceptions of ICE (Figure 4), and one open-ended question soliciting comments.

Key Findings

Overall, ICE has been well received by faculty who attended a hands-on workshop or a demonstration of the content delivery platform. The closed-ended questions provided insight into the TJU community’s response to ICE but the most valuable insights were found in the response to the open-ended question.

Many of the respondents seem to understand the real power in iCE is the potential to re-think the ways that we package learning experiences for student.

One respondent commented:

“T would suggest ICE is a platform and that how faculty develop learning activities determines how interactive it is, and how connections between instructional materials are made.”

Use

A small percentage (13%) indicated they had used the platform to design learning content and of the experience said:

“I know that is can do far more than I am doing with it this year.”

“I used this platform for a recent presentation. I did not create it, but it was well received. I recognize that there is a significant time investment to create the learning experience, but I do believe that it is worth it in the long run.”

Adoption

The majority of survey respondents (60%) reported the intent to use ICE to deliver content in the future.

While there was a bit of a learning curve as to how lessons and information can be transmitted, most respondents reported they were not planning to use ICE, and some open-ended comments indicated the reasons why:

• “One more thing to learn... not enough time to do so.”
• “My perception is that a transition to ICE would have quite a bit of work on the front end—and we don’t have staff to help do this (and would have to learn how to do it enough to train them to do it).”
• “When I attended a demonstration last spring, I was not convinced of its value for my course.”

Moving Forward

With careful attention and construction, the end result is a seamless experience for the learner. Recent ICE adoptions have integrated quizzes and blogging in learning experiences, and future workshops will highlight those accomplishments.

Other respondents simply asked for additional capabilities in ICE that far exceed any capabilities currently offered by TJU technology such as never-ending access to course content and hiccup-free technology.

Moving forward, the CTL has developed templates that help content developers capitalize on best pedagogical practices, including linking existing knowledge with new knowledge, providing remediation and advanced materials for self-paced learners, and contextualization of knowledge through application of concepts.

Barriers

Some faculty remain skeptical of the technology’s ability to deliver a better learning experience.

About 20% of the respondents indicated that they were not planning to use ICE, and some open-ended comments suggested the reasons why:

• “One more thing to learn... not enough time to do so.”
• “My perception is that a transition to ICE would have quite a bit of work on the front end—and we don’t have staff to help do this (and would have to learn how to do it enough to train them to do it).”

• “When I attended a demonstration last spring, I was not convinced of its value for my course.”
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