**An Exploratory Study of a Novel Online Formative Assessment Tool to
Promote Students' Circuit Problem-solving**

Gregory K. W. K. Chung, Tammy Shel
National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST)
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)

William J. Kaiser
Electrical Engineering Department
Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science
UCLA

University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)
Graduate School of Education & Information Studies
National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST)
10945 Le Conte 1400C
Peter V. Ueberroth Building / Mailbox 957150
Los Angeles, CA 90095-7150
310.794.4392
greg@ucla.edu

1

Abstract

We examined a novel formative assessment and instructional approach with 89 students in three electrical engineering classes in special computer-based discussion sections. The technique involved students individually solving circuit problems online, with their real-time responses observed by the instructor. While exploratory, survey and interview responses from 26 students suggest the technique offers important instructional and assessment advantages: Compared to typical discussion sessions, a large majority of respondents reported being more engaged, learning more, and interacting more with the instructor. Students reported the anonymous mode allowed them to ask "dumb" questions. The instructor was able to address student problems and questions immediately, and the amount of formative assessment information from the interaction far exceeded what was available in typical settings.

1. Introduction

A cornerstone of undergraduate education reform is the shift in emphasis from teaching to student learning. A key effort in reform is promoting active learning. Active (or student-centered) learning refers to the set of practices and activities designed to promote students' engagement with content. Examples include collaborative learning (e.g., learning communities, group activities), undergraduate research, writing and oral communication across the curriculum, integrative learning experiences (e.g., capstone courses), self-learning activities (e.g., encouraging students to reflect on their learning), and activities that require students to engage in cognitive processes beyond memorization (Boyer Commission, 1998; Chickering and Gamson, 1987; Education Commission of the States, 1995; Ewell, 1998; National Research Council [NRC], 1995, 2003; National Science Board [NSB], 2003; Terezini and Pascarella, 1994; Tinto, 2002; Wulf, 1998).

Underlying student-centered learning is formative assessment. Formative assessments provide information on what, how much, and how well students are learning, for the purpose of improving the quality of student learning. Formative assessments require close observations of the student learning process, are ongoing, capitalize on the expertise and experience of instructors using the assessments, and respond to particularities of individual students, instructors, and class settings (e.g., Angelo and Cross, 1993; Baker, 1998; Black et al., 2003; Black and Wiliam, 1998; Brookhart, 1999; Cross, 1988, 1998; Ewell, 1998; Sadler, 1989; Wiliam et al., 2004). Using formative assessments can have a profound effect on instructors and their understanding of their students (e.g., Steadman, 1998), and there is some evidence that formative assessments improve student achievement (Brookhart, 1999; Olmsted, 1991). The promise of formative assessment is if instructors have timely information on whether students

are learning, then their instruction can be modulated with greater precision and accuracy, resulting in improved student learning.

Despite repeated calls for change in undergraduate education and encouraging findings when implemented, most colleges and universities have been slow to adopt the practices known to have real impact on student learning (Boyer Commission, 2001). Current instructional practices in the science and engineering fields continue to rely on the lecture. Chen (2002) reported that 83% of science and engineering instructors reported using the lecture as their primary method of instruction in at least one class. The problem with lectures is not that the format is inherently ineffective. It is just that other formats are likely to be more effective for more students (Terezini and Pascarella, 1994).

Several researchers have documented the undergraduate science and engineering student experience as an impersonal, anonymous, and competitive journey where students passively learn facts as they march through a rigidly structured curriculum taught by instructors who are boring, inaccessible, and intimidating (Kardash and Wallace, 2001; Lewis and Woodward, 1984; Seymour and Hewitt, 1997; Tobias and Raphael, 1996). Seymour and Hewitt found that one of the most common reasons directly contributing to decisions to switch out of the major was faculty pedagogy (e.g., poor teaching, help with problems, advising). Dissatisfaction with faculty pedagogy, more so than poor academic performance, led to student departure and remained a source of dissatisfaction with students who remained in the field (Adelman, 1998; Seymour and Hewitt, 1997). With a student departure rate of 40% (NSB, 2004), it is hard to envision how the demand for science and engineering graduates will be met.

Like Terezini and Pascarella (1994), we think the main issue with lecture classes is not the format per se. Rather, the learning environment, in the absence of effective instructional

supports, often leads to open-loop instruction: an instructor covering material with little or no (a) interaction with students, or (b) information on what students have learned or not learned. The main determinant of learning is the degree of cognitive processing of the to-be-learned content, regardless of instructional format (deWinstanley and Bjork, 2002; Mayer and Wittrock, 1996; Wittrock, 1989). Students who engage the material—who commit attention and cognitive resources toward comprehending and understanding the content—will learn more than those students who do not. The learning environment is a powerful mediating variable that affects learning indirectly by promoting or inhibiting meaningful engagement.

1.1 Formative assessment in lecture classes

Typical large-class instruction is one of "dead reckoning": Marching through the syllabus with little information on how well (or poorly) students are really doing and hoping for the best. Classroom assessment techniques have been developed to address this situation and specifically designed to minimize the data-processing load on the instructor. For example, the one-minute summary, muddiest point, and other techniques are easy to administer and summarize (Angelo and Cross, 1993). These assessments focus on asking students what was unclear to them during the lecture. Informative as they are, however, these assessments are indirect measures of learning as they do not ask students to perform on tasks that indicate understanding of content. Further, any feedback from the instructor is to the class and not individuals.

Increasingly, researchers are turning to technology to provide formative assessment information (e.g., Fitch, 2004; Griffioen et al., 1999; Heath et al., 2005; Kashy et al., 2001; Lieberman et al., 2001; Marks, 2002; Schaeffer et al., 2001; Twigg, 1999). For example, Web-based systems have been used to deliver homework and low-stakes quizzes. The basic idea is that online systems can provide rapid feedback and students benefit from immediate knowledge

of results and potentially, the opportunity for multiple practice trials. The impact of these systems on course outcomes has ranged from none (Bonham et al., 2003), some (Hall et al., 2004; Mestre et al., 2002; Paull et al., 1999), to large (Oakley, 1996; Woolf et al., 2000). The key difference among these systems appears to be the quality of the interaction. Oakley allowed scoring of assessments and multiple types of interactions with instructor and peers (e.g., posing questions and issues). Woolf et al. used an intelligent tutoring system, which presented leading questions to guide students' interaction with the system. In contrast, the other systems provided only knowledge of results. It appears Oakley and Woolf et al. used feedback effectively— providing knowledge of correct results and guidance on the action to take to close the performance gap (Black and Wiliam, 1998; Kluger and DeNisi, 1996; Sadler, 1989). Interestingly, while all of these systems were individualized, scalable, and focused on content and performance as measured by multiple-choice tests, only the Oakley system allowed students to ask questions. The capability to gather students' input on what they are not understanding can be very informative.

Finally, some approaches are based on real-time interaction technology such as personal response systems (i.e., clickers). These systems have been used to increase student interaction in large lecture classes (e.g., Dufresne et al., 1996; Fitch, 2004; Heath et al., 2005). Such systems provide an efficient and simple way of gathering student responses. While the newer response systems are easy to set up and use for instructors and students, they generally accommodate only selected-response formats (e.g., multiple-choice) and offer little or no support for observing students' problem solving or more complex communication modes. This latter capability is important if the process of solving problems is important. That is, it is often the case in engineering that how one solves a problem is more important than the final answer.

Our conclusion is that the most important elements of an effective formative assessment system are (a) the capability of the system to provide good information about what students know and do not know, and (b) the use of that information by instructors to provide feedback to students about their performance, and to adjust instruction. As with effective tutoring (Bloom, 1984) and instructional techniques that promote interaction and engagement (Hake, 1998), the fundamental enabling capability is the bidirectional flow of accurate information between student and instructor.

1.2 Research questions

Thus, our study focused on capturing student problem-solving responses when it was "hot." Our assumption was the accuracy and precision of the assessment information are highest when the students are engaged in the process of problem-solving. Our research was exploratory and focused on utility and feasibility: To what degree did students perceive that the system promoted learning, interaction, and engagement with the content? To what degree did the system provide the instructor with useful information about students' understanding?

2. Method

2.1 Participants

Because this study was exploratory, we intentionally did not conduct a controlled experimental study. The computer-based discussion sections were held during the instructor's office hours and participation was voluntary. We tested the system in three different electrical engineering (EE) classes: EE10 (Circuit Analysis I), EE115A (Introduction to Analog Circuits I), and BREES (Bridge Review for Enhancing Engineering Students). Five discussion sessions were held in EE10 and EE115A, and three sessions for BREES. The same instructor taught all courses.

Across all courses, 89 students participated at least once. The sessions were typically attended by around 20 students. In general, out of all students who attended, over half attended two or more sessions. Of all the participants, 26 participants responded to requests to complete a survey at the end of the quarter. Of the 26 participants, 8 agreed to participate in interviews. Thus, the findings should be interpreted as exploratory. Survey respondents were paid $10 for their time, and interviewees were paid $20.

Table 1 shows the participation rates by course. The table values show the number of times the same student attended the computer-based discussion section. For example, the computer-based discussion section was offered five times in EE115A, and 5 students attended all sections and 8 attended two sections. In general, about half of the participants attended only one section.

Table 1. Number of Times a Student Attended the Computer-based Discussion Section

Course	Number of times the computer-based section was offered				
	1	2	3	4	5
EE10	14	6	8	4	N/A
EE115A	24	8	2	9	5
BREES	1	0	8	N/A	N/A

2.2 Online formative assessment and instructional tool

The tool we used was Discourse (ETS, 2003). Each student used a laptop, which was connected wirelessly to the instructor laptop. The instructor would post a prompt (e.g., "Compute the voltage at node 1.") and circuit schematic. The student computer received the posting and displayed the prompt and circuit schematic. Students typed their responses in a text-entry area and could respond with an equation, or enter a question or other response. Figure 1 shows the

student user interface. While Discourse was designed with numerous formative assessment

capabilities, we used only its instructional capabilities, which included the capability for the

instructor to present a prompt and schematic and to observe students' real-time responses.

Write the node voltage equation at the node attached to the inverting input (Va - V-) / 72 + (Vb -V-)/120 + (Vc - V-)/450 - V-/600 - (V- - V0)/180 = 0

Answer:

Figure 1. Student user interface.

As shown in Figure 2, each student's anonymous response (keystroke level) was displayed

in a row on the instructor's computer, allowing simultaneous observation of all student responses

(large window). Students could also communicate via an anonymous instant messaging interface

to ask the instructor questions and receive an individualized response (small window). The

instructor could also use the whiteboard and conduct whole-group discussions, which were based

on the real-time information from the students.

Question:

Write the node voltage equation at the node attached to the inverting input (Va - V-) / 72 + (Vb - V-)/120 + (Vc - V-)/450 - V-/600 - (V- - V0)/180 = 0

Info	Name	OK	Tries	Response
	2001, EE10-	0	1	I don't understand operational amplifiers as of yet and was hoping to learn it today in office hours, but I will venture a (wild) guess: (va - v-)/72 + (v- - vb)/120 + (v- - vc)/450 + v-/600 + (v- - Vo)/180 = 0
	2002, EE10-	0	1	-V-/600+(Vo-v-)/180+(Va-V-)/72+(Vb-V-)/120+(Vc-V-)/450 I must admit I have still to review this type of problem.
	2003, EE10-	0	1	v- - vc/450 + (v- - vb / 120) + (v- - va/ 72) + (v- / 600) + (v- - Vo)/180 + v- = 0
	2004, EE10-	0	1	[Va - v-]/72 + [vb - v-]/120 + [vc - v-]/450 - (v- - vo)/180 - (v- / 600) = 0 where v- = v+ if ideal = vd
	2005, EE10-	0	1	(v- -)/450 + (v- - Vo)/180 + v-/600
	2006, EE10-	0	1	(V- - Va)/72 + (V- - Vb)/120 + (V- - Vc)/450 + V-/600 = (V- - V0)/180
	2007, EE10-	0	1	v/600+(v-Vo)/180+(v-vc)/450+(v-vb)/120+(v-va)/72 = 0
	2008, EE10-	0	1	-(V- - Vc)/450k - (V- - Vb)/120k - (V- - Va)/ 72k - v-/600k + (Vo - V-)/180k = 0
	2010, EE10-	0	0	

Figure 2. Instructor user interface.

2.3 Measures

Data were gathered from student surveys, student interviews, and instructor interviews.

2.3.1 Student surveys

The student surveys and interviews focused on gathering information on students' perceived impact of the experience, relative to other typical discussion sessions. The survey mainly consisted of selected-response, Likert-scale questions. In addition, participants were provided with space to write comments or specific examples.

Learning of course material. Participants were asked to indicate, on a 5-point Likert scale, how much more effective the computer-based discussion was compared to typical sections with respect to learning of course content (1 = *much more effective*, 2 = *more effective*, 3 = *similar*, 4 = *less effective*, 5 = *much less effective).*

Interaction. Participants were asked to indicate, on a 5-point Likert scale, how much more effective the computer-based discussion was compared to typical sections in terms of facilitating interaction with the TA or instructor (1 = *much more effective*, 2 = *more effective*, 3 = *similar*, 4

= *less effective*, 5 = *much less effective)*. We defined interaction as communicating or asking questions, or responding to the TA or instructor.

Engagement. Participants were asked to indicate, on a 5-point Likert scale, how much more effective the computer-based discussion was compared to typical sections in terms of facilitating engagement with the material that was being covered (1 = *much more effective*, 2 = *more effective*, 3 = *similar*, 4 = *less effective*, 5 = *much less effective)*. We defined engagement as how much students were thinking about or working on the course material, as opposed to doing homework for other classes, playing games, and engaging in other non-content-related activities.

Overall impression. This item was intended to gather participants' overall impression of their experience. Participants were asked to indicate their impression of the computer-based (i.e., Discourse) sessions on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = *very positive,* 2 = *moderately positive,* 3 = *moderately negative,* and 4 = *negative*).

Specific course outcomes. Finally, we asked students to report on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *very big effect,* 2 = *big effect,* 3 = *some effect,* 4 = *little effect*, 5 = *no effect*, and not applicable), how much of an impact the computer-based section had on the following outcomes:

- learning of specific analysis techniques
- development of circuit analysis problem solving skills
- completing homework assignments
- performance on exams
- performance on the course (EE10/EE115A/BREES)
- the student's improvement on attitudes toward electrical engineering
- the student's attitudes toward (EE10/EE115A/BREES) in particular
- the student's attitudes toward engineering in general

- the student's making new friends/networking

2.3.2 Student and instructor interviews

The student interviews were intended to gather in-depth responses to the issues of learning, interaction, and engagement. Interviewees were asked to elaborate on their survey responses. The course instructor and a TA were asked about their perceptions on the same issues, but from their perspective as instructors. Interviewees were free to elaborate on as many issues they saw relevant.

3. Results

Our first research question, to what degree did students perceive that the system promoted learning, interaction, and engagement with the material? was addressed with student survey responses to questions, written comments, and follow-up interviews. The second research question, to what degree did the system provide unique information about students' learning and understanding? was addressed with instructor interviews. While we did examine specific course outcomes (homework, exams, and grades), the results were inconclusive due to voluntary and transient student attendance and shortness of intervention (see Table 1). However, evidence from the student surveys and interviews was convergent and is presented next.

3.1 Students' overall impression

In general, participants perceived the computer-based section positively. Four rated the section as very positive, 16 as moderately positive, and 4 moderately negative. No one reported the experience as negative. While the student survey responses were encouraging, the follow-up interviews offered insight into the learning processes occurring during the computer-based section.

One of the most discouraging findings was an echoing of Seymour and Hewitt's (1997) findings of poor instruction in engineering in general. In most of the interviews conducted, students complained of the quality of instruction of most professors. Conversely, one of the most encouraging overall findings was students' reporting of a dramatic shift from passive to active learning. In regular discussion sections, students reported being passive compared to the computer-based section, where they participated and engaged in problem solving. One student reflected on this change of roles:

> At first I was kind of confused about what we were doing. After every session, I believe it was two or three times, it was actually kind of helpful. Because we did the examples and we actually had to participate in class, or were expected to participate and do the examples and give the answers and then check them.

Students reported being very satisfied with the section because they could visualize circuit analysis and see it more accurately on the computer. When asked if the computer-based discussion section had any impact on the level of comprehending circuit analysis, one student responded:

> Biggest impact because we were actually using it so that's a big impact. You understand it better than before because we were using it. We were doing concrete examples. I can see… if I make a mistake.… You can weed those out by doing problems there, then when you go to the exam, you pretty much know how to do the problems, because you've already done it before.

3.2 Students' perception of learning, interaction, and engagement

As shown in Table 2, when participants were asked to compare the computer-based section to typical discussion sections, the general response was positive. The computer-based section

appeared to have the largest impact on students' engagement with the material. In any case, student responses were generally positive across all three areas, with only two or three students reporting their experience in the computer-based section to be less effective than typical sections.

Table 3 shows perceived impacts on specific aspects of the course. Surprisingly, about one third of students reported the computer-based discussion section had a big or very big effect on course outcomes (homework, exams, grades). However, as mentioned earlier, no statistical relation was found between participation and course outcomes. Even more surprising was that the experience resulted in some students reporting impact on attitudes.

Table 2. Students' Perception of the Relative Impact of the Discourse Session (Compared to Typical Discussion Sections)

	Much more effective	More effective	Similar	Less effective	Much less effective
Learning course material	3	12	7	2	1
Interaction	5	11	7	2	0
Engagement	8	15	0	2	0

Table 3. Students' Perception of the Impact the Discourse Session had on Different Course
Outcomes

	Very big effect	Big effect	Some effect	Little effect	No effect
Learning of specific analysis techniques.	3	3	8	7	4
Development of circuit analysis problem solving skills.	2	1	11	7	4
Completing homework assignments.	5	7	7	2	3
Performance on exams.	2	7	9	2	4
Performance on the course.	2	4	11	4	3
Your improvement on attitudes toward electrical engineering.	2	3	13	5	1
Your attitudes toward EE10/EE115A/BREES in particular.	0	4	8	10	3
Your attitudes toward engineering in general.	3	4	10	6	1
Your making new friends/networking.	6	5	7	5	1

We interpret these results as students perceiving the computer-based discussion section as benign at worst, and in many cases more effective than typical discussion sections. In particular, students appeared to perceive engagement as the most powerful impact of the computer-based discussion section. In the following section, student interviews provide insight underlying the survey responses.

3.2.1 Learning of course material

The computer-based discussion section required students to understand every step and the professor to explain and clarify those steps. That made students feel more in control of material and to understand it thoroughly. While students reported that the discussions were helpful because it forced them to solve the problem, the technology alone did not constitute good instruction. One student said that "the fact that he [the professor] takes the problem and solved it on the board and explained it in detail. That's the most useful thing."

But this mode of instruction was not helpful for all students, particularly for those who were able to solve the problem quickly. One survey respondent commented: "The process of learning seems to be slowed down a little too much. Though the discussion can be changed to fit our learning needs, every example takes too long. This makes the class a little boring."

3.2.2 Interaction

One of the most important dimensions reported by students as a barrier for their learning was related to their social inhibitions. Nearly every student we interviewed had said that he or she felt intimidated in a large classroom and in the presence of a professor to raise their hands and ask to clarify incomprehensible material. Students expressed their concerns that professors would consider their questions to be stupid or inappropriate, and that professors would remember them as students who asked stupid questions.

For example... I'm hesitant to ask questions during class and since this is anonymous... the professor won't point anyone out or anything so he'll just be able to answer a lot of questions, and then you'll see a lot of students making common errors. So he'll be able to answer those specific ones.

In the computer-based discussion section, student responses were anonymous and an individual could correspond with the professor directly. Students felt that that was very important

and increased their level of understanding of the material. One survey respondent commented about the anonymity:

> I think that maintaining anonymity is very crucial in the interaction aspect of the discussion. Many, including myself, may feel a little embarrassed asking a "dumb" question but with this method, I don't feel that people will hesitate to ask those questions.

> While many students cited anonymity as important, not all students felt this way. A small

number of students reported that it simply would be easier to just raise their hands and ask questions.

3.2.3 Engagement

One important benefit of the computer-based discussion section was that it required students to solve circuit problems. While seemingly obvious, students' responses suggest otherwise. From the students' perspective, each person had his or her own laptop, and they were required to solve circuit analysis problems. When asking students about level of engagement, they all said that it improved significantly compared to typical discussion sections. For example, one student said,

> Definitely, ten times more engaged. You don't have to engage in a lecture or whatever's going on in class.… You can just sit there and do something else, do homework or whatever. But in that class, we didn't have any other papers around, we all had a terminal, and everyone else in the class was participating, and doing problems… and you couldn't do anything else but participate. So definitely more participation, definitely more.

Interestingly, the instructor also reported that his students were much more engaged than the typical class. When we asked him about his students' level of engagement he said that it was much more focused.

In a normal group, I would lose some people. They would fall asleep. I think if they're not

getting something, they'll just say, "I'm going home and study this." And you'd lose 10%

of the people at any given time. This session was not, at all. Everyone was very engaged.

Everyone was at full attention. When you work on a problem, everyone would be watching

the problem solution very intently. When the problem was assigned, everyone would be

really working on the problem. That was another very interesting point.

3.3 Monitoring students' performance

One of the most important benefits of the computer-based discussion section was the

capability for the instructor to simultaneously observe students' problem-solving responses in

real-time. Contrast this situation with the typical lecture class, where the instructor has little

feedback about whether the students are comprehending the material. Thus, the instructor could

determine how many students did or did not understand a concept and could address the situation

immediately. In the instructor's words:

What happens is that I get a chance to see exactly what people were doing, and if there was

an error... what I would then do is spend discussion time speaking about that particular

error, and instructing them about that particular problem, and I found that to be immensely

more effective than the alternative. Now, in EE10… we were able to provide a… set of

problems ranging from relatively simple to complex. And, at the beginning of the

Discourse session, the success rate of the class might only be like one third… correctly

solving the simple problems. But by the end of the class session, virtually the entire class

was… working through the most difficult problems. So, the progress over a one-hour

period was general. I would say, it could even exceed one-on-one office hours. Because,

even at the one-on-one office hours, I typically don't ask a student to solve a problem. I'll

do it for them, and ask them about it or they'll ask me how we move from step to step. And that's much better than a large group in terms of interaction and quality of interaction but even there we're not seeing what exactly the student does on their own. Because it's somewhat confrontational to ask them to solve a problem right there on the spot—they're nervous.

Interestingly, students also reported the benefits of the instructor's capability to observe students' responses. They reported the instruction being more targeted and individualized because the instructor was able to focus on what students were not getting correct. For example, in response to the question of what he had gained from the computer-based discussion section, one student remarked:

I can say the most I gained was a little bit better problem-solving skill as far as analysis was concerned. I think that professors sort of looked at mistakes we were making along the way.... So to get the idea at that exact moment where our mistakes [are] coming from and so he was able to more specify what he needed to teach, what the emphasis of learning should be on.

3.4 Students' perception of non-cognitive outcomes

Finally, one of the most unexpected findings emerging from the student interviews was the impact the experience had on students' non-cognitive outcomes. That is, the issue of a caring professor emerged—one who creates an open and non-intimidating atmosphere to ask questions. All participants said that the instructor's attitude had been one of the main reasons why they did learn better. The instructor taking time to teach and to explain fundamental material was one of the most important factors cited as leading to students' increase in the level of engagement and

understanding. It is essential to add that we did not prompt students for these comments on the instructor—all interviewees provided unsolicited feedback on the instructor.

Professor [X], he helped us out with that it felt a little bit better getting it from a professor than a TA. I don't know why but it just did. But he was real kind, kind at answering everything pretty much. He was able to answer... all my questions. I was happy with this computer thing.

4. Discussion

The most effective form of assessment is one that is continuous, that occurs as close as possible to the scene of the action in teaching and learning (the classroom), and that provides diagnostic feedback to both teachers and students—to teachers on how they can improve their teaching, to students on how they can improve their learning (Cross, 1988, p. 3).

Our assessment perspective embraces this idea. This study directly attempted to address the issue of improving student learning via an online formative assessment that provided continuous feedback to instructors about students' learning progress, who could then provide feedback to students about their performance and provide remediation as needed. Effective feedback to students is consistently cited as one of the most important components of an effective learning environment, and it has been found to increase not only student learning, but also confidence and attitudes (e.g., Angelo and Cross, 1993; Black and Wiliam, 1998; Bloom, 1984; Chickering and Gamson, 1987; Cross, 1988, 1998; McKeachie, 1998; Tinto, 2002; Twigg, 1999).

Students overwhelmingly reported positive outcomes for the computer-based discussion section. When asked to compare their experience with traditional discussion sections, students indicated the computer-based discussion section had superior engagement with the content, had

increased positive attitudes toward the course and engineering, and had increased learning of the material. Students felt they shifted from a passive role to a much more active and engaged role and felt they learned the material more thoroughly. Because students were required to solve problems step-by-step (vs. typical instruction where material was introduced broadly and students left on their own), students had to ask questions and "experience the equations." One of the most interesting findings was the bolstering of students' confidence in solving circuit problems and affective outcomes. The real-time feedback from the instructor, often individualized, was cited as critical not only to increasing content understanding but also because students felt they were receiving personal attention. Similarly, anonymity was critical because students felt comfortable asking "dumb" questions.

4.1 Limitations and future directions

The main limitation of this study was lack of an experimental design. This was intentional as we were investigating the feasibility and utility of the approach. The disadvantage of this tactic is that the findings of this study, suggestive as students' self-reports are, do not confirm the existence of a clear learning impact. However, given the provocative findings of the current study, a clear next step is to contrast students' performance on various course outcomes between students randomly assigned to the computer-based discussion section and a control group, controlling for instructor effect. Such a study would need to be of sufficient duration to allow the intervention to have a lasting effect.

The second line of future work is developing methods to allow scaling of the approach to large lecture classes. We have tested the system in classes with as many as 60 students (not part of this study); while still informative, attempting to observe all students' responses and to attend to individual questions or problems quickly becomes overwhelming. Thus, we are exploring

techniques that blend automated reasoning approaches (e.g., Bayesian networks) and other formative assessment techniques (e.g., self-ratings of level of understanding; muddiest point) to allow students to engage and participate, while also providing a mechanism that will allow partial filtering of responses and automated detection and summarization of student responses.

The lecture format is likely to remain a large part of undergraduate instruction for the foreseeable future, and consequently its impact on student learning will be pervasive. Our work is one step toward developing methods that are both compatible with existing institutional settings (thus more likely to be adopted) and focused on improving student learning.

References

Adelman, C., 1998. Women and men of the engineering path: A model for analyses of undergraduate careers. U.S. Department of Education and The National Institute for Science Education, Washington, DC.

Angelo, T. A., Cross, K. P., 1993. Classroom assessment techniques, second ed., Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Baker, E. L., 1998. Formative assessment for learning: New goals, new models, in: Black, P., Michel, A. (Eds.), Learning from pupil assessment: International comparisons (CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation, No. 12). University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation, Los Angeles, pp. 39-48.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D., 2003. Assessment for learning. Putting it into practice. Open University Press, Philadelphia.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D., 1998. Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education, 5, 7–74.

Bloom, B. S., 1984. The 2 sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. Educational Researcher, 13(6), 4–16.

Bonham, S., Duane, L., & Deardorff, R. J. B., 2003. Comparison of student performance using Web and paper-based homework in college-level physics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40, 1050–1071.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University., 1998. Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, NJ.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University., 2001. Reinventing undergraduate education: Three years after the Boyer reports. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, NJ.

Brookhart, S. M., 1999. The art and science of classroom assessment: The missing part of pedagogy. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (Vol. 27, No. 1). George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Washington, DC.

Chen, X., 2002. Teaching undergraduates in U.S. postsecondary institutions: Fall 1998 (Rep. NCES 2002-209). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, DC.

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F., 1987. Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. AAHE Bulletin, 39(7), 3–7.

Cross, K. P., 1988. Feedback in the classroom: Making assessment matter. Paper presented at the American Association for Higher Education Assessment Forum. American Association for Higher Education, Washington, DC.

Cross, K. P., 1998. Assessment to improve college instruction, in: Messick, S. J. (Ed.), Assessment in higher education. Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 35–45..

deWinstanley, P. A., & Bjork, R. A., 2002. Successful lecturing: Presenting information in ways that engage effective processing. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 89, 19–31.

Dufresne, R. J., Gerace, W. J., Leonard, W. J., Mestre, J. P., & Wenk, L., 1996. Classtalk: A classroom communication system from active learning. Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 7, 3–47.

Education Commission of the States (ECS), 1995. Making quality count in undergraduate education. ECS, Denver, CO.

ETS, 2003. Discourse (Version 3.0) [Computer software]. ETS, Princeton, NJ.

Ewell, P. T., 1998. National trends in assessing student learning. Journal of Engineering
    Education, 87, 107–113.

Fitch, J. L., 2004. Student feedback in the college classroom: A technology solution. Educational
    Research & Development, 52, 71–81.

Griffioen, J., Seales, W.B., & Lumpp, J. E., Jr., 1999. Teaching in real-time wireless classroom.
    Journal of Engineering Education, 89, 397–402.

Hake, R. R., 1998. Interactive-engagement versus traditional methods: A six-thousand-student
    survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses. American Journal of
    Physics, 66, 64–74.

Hall, M., Parker, J., Minaei-Bigdoli, B., Albertelli, G., Kortemeyer, G., & Kashy, E., 2004,
    October. Gathering and timely use of feedback from individualized on-line work. Paper
    presented at the annual Frontiers in Education conference, Savannah, GA.

Heath, B. P., Herman, R. L., Lugo, G. G., Reeves, J. H., Vetter, R. J., & Ward, C. R., 2005.
    Project Numina: Enhancing student learning with handheld computers. IEEE Computer,
    38(6), 46–52.

Kardash, C. M., & Wallace, M. L., 2001. The perceptions of science classes survey: What
    undergraduate science reform efforts really need to address. Journal of Educational
    Psychology, 93, 199–200.

Kashy, D. A., Albertelli, G., Kashy, E., & Thoennessen, M., 2001. Teaching with ALN
    technology: Benefits and costs. Journal of Engineering Education, 89, 499–506.

Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A., 1996. The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A

   historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory.

   Psychological Bulletin, 119, 254–284.

Lewis, K. G., & Woodward, P. J., 1984, April. What really happens in large university classes?

   Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association,

   New Orleans, LA., ERIC Document Services: ED 245 590.

Lieberman, D. A., Bowers, N., & Moore, D. R., 2001. Use of electronic tools to enhance student

   evaluation feedback. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 87, 45–55.

Marks, B. P., 2002. Web-based readiness assessment quizzes. Journal of Engineering Education,

   91, 97–102.

Mayer, R. E., & Wittrock, M. C., 1996. Problem-solving transfer, in: Berliner, D. C., Calfee, R.

   C. (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology. Macmillan, New York, pp. 47–62.

McKeachie, W. J., 1998. Feedback and reflection in facilitating further learning, in: Messick, S.

   J. (Ed.), Assessment in higher education. Erlbaum, Mahwah, pp. 57–61.

Mestre, J., Hart, D., Rath, K., & Dufresne, R., 2002. The effect of Web-based homework on test

   performance in large enrollment introductory physics courses. Journal of Computers in

   Mathematics and Science Teaching, 21, 229–251.

National Research Council., 1995. Engineering education: Designing an adaptive system.

   National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

National Research Council, 2003. Improving undergraduate instruction in science, technology,

   engineering, and mathematics: Report of a workshop. National Academies Press,

   Washington, DC.

National Science Board, 2003. The science and engineering workforce: Realizing America's potential (Rep. No. NSB 03-69). National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA.

National Science Board, 2004. Science and engineering indicators, Volume 1 (Rep. No. NSB 04-1). National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA.

Oakley, B., 1996. A virtual classroom approach to teaching circuit analyses. IEEE Transactions on Education, 39, 287–296.

Olmsted, J., III., 1991. Using classroom research in a large introductory science class. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 46, 55–65.

Paull, T., Jacob, M., & Herrick, R. J., 1999. Automated homework in electrical engineering technology. In Proceedings of the ASEE Conference (Session 3220), Charlotte, NC.

Sadler, R., 1989. Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. Instructional Science, 18, 1–25.

Schaeffer, E., Bhargava, T., Nash, J., Kerns, C., & Stocker, S., 2001, April. Innovation from within the box: Evaluation of online problem sets in a series of large lecture undergraduate science courses. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Seymour, E., & Hewitt, N. M., 1997. Talking about learning: Why undergraduates leave the sciences. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Steadman, M., 1998. Using classroom assessment to change both teaching and learning. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 75, 23–35.

Terezini, P. T., & Pascarella, E. T., 1994. Living with myths: Undergraduate education in America. Change, 26(1), 28–30.

Tinto, V., 2002, June. Establishing conditions for student success. Paper presentation at the annual conference of the European Access Network, Prato, Italy.

Tobias, S., & Raphael, J. B., 1996. In-class examinations in college-level science: New theory, new practice. Journal of Science Education and Teaching, 5, 311–320.

Twigg, C. A., 1999. Improving learning and reducing costs: Redesigning large-enrollment courses. Center for Academic Transformation, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Wiliam, D., Lee, C., Harrison, C., & Black, P., 2004. Teachers developing assessments for learning: Impact on student achievement. Assessment in Education, 11, 49–65.

Wittrock, M. C., 1989. Generative processes of comprehension. Educational Psychologist, 24, 345–376.

Woolf, B. P., Hart, D. M., Day, R., Botch, B., & Vining, W., 2000. Improving instruction and reducing costs with a Web-based learning environment. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Mathematics/Science Education & Technology (MSET 2000), San Diego, CA, 410–415.

Wulf, Wm. A., 1998. The urgency of engineering education reform. The Bridge, 28(1).