1. Briefly recap project objectives. Have implementation tasks to date caused any meaningful adjustments to the project’s original objectives?

There have been no meaningful adjustments to the project’s original objectives.

The objective of this project was to provide a hybrid orientation to new faculty and staff at University of Wisconsin – Superior in Fall 2015. The orientation was developed using best practices in teaching and learning, with Quality Matters rubrics as the framework. Best practices in the use of D2L and learning technologies were taught throughout orientation, in relation to topics on student engagement, learning strategies, course development and assessment, and student retention.

As a result of the orientation, participants will:

- Utilize student information to design appropriate learning strategies for use in the classroom/other.
- Identify appropriate strategies to assist with student retention and progress.
- Identify own expectations of students and impact on student engagement.
- Identify student expectations of instructors and impact on student engagement.
- Understand best practices and the role of Quality Matters and universal design when teaching a course.
- Identify methods to increase student engagement for learning in the classroom.
- Apply effective assessment strategies to course assignments.

2. What is the status of in-progress project tasks?

All project tasks have been completed. The hybrid orientation was completed on November 19, 2015; the short-term evaluation was completed in December 2015 to evaluate knowledge and early application of content, and there will be a follow-up evaluation of the application of knowledge in May 2016.

3. Compare the current status of the project with regard to scope, schedule and cost with the original submission. Please also describe the cause for any significant variance from the original plan.

There has been no variance from the original plan with the exception of the pre-assessment. A single pre-assessment was not completed as the scope of the skills and abilities was hard to formalize in a one paper evaluation. Instead, assessments were done at the beginning of each session to model classroom assessment techniques for the participants.

The scope of the project was to impact the new faculty and staff participating in the Promoting Excellence in Teaching and Learning (PETL) Orientation. All were involved in each unit of the
orientation. The schedule of activities and cost did not change from the original application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Proposal</th>
<th>Actual Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>All participants in PETL orientation were present and active in each unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intent was to impact new staff and faculty in the PETL Orientation.</td>
<td>Development took place as planned and the orientation was completed on November 19, 2015. The pre-assessment were moved from a single assessment to multiple assessments across sessions. The post-orientation evaluation was completed in December 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule</strong></td>
<td>The costs have been as expected; the only adjustment was printing costs, which has been $25 rather than $50 as more documents were moved to D2L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The orientation was to be developed (online and face-to-face sessions) and facilitated by November 19, 2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>$1250, with $250 matching funds from CETL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1250, with $250 matching funds from CETL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Risk Assessment**
   a. Describe any significant new or anticipated risks to the project's successful outcome with regard to scope, schedule or cost.

   There are no new or anticipated risks. The project was completed as expected.

   b. Describe the mitigation strategies to address these new or anticipated risks.

   Not applicable.