

Personal Response Systems - PRS

- organised ways to involve all students in answering questions in class.
- Can be computer based or far simpler
- aka student response system
- aka audience response system
- aka group response system
- aka electronic voting/polling system
- aka classroom communication system


## Basic Characteristics of the "Clicker"

- each student has a wireless handset, like a TV clicker, which transmits responses to multiple choice questions posed by their instructor.

- possible answers and a summary of the responses are displayed graphically on a computer screen (which can be projected so that all can see).
- Radio-frequency systems introduced in early 2005.


## What I hope to illustrate...

- Student perceptions of clickers
- Correlations between grades \& participation
- Some trends in lecture attendance
- Opportunities for peer mentoring


## How familiar are you with clickers?

A. This is the first time l've heard about them.
B. I've heard about them, but want to know more.
C. I've seen/used them in a class/presentation.
D. I've used the technology in my course.
E. I could be giving this talk.

## Hurdles

> Expense
$>$ Instructor learning curve
$>$ Time needs to be allotted for regular use
$>$ Developing appropriate questions takes time
> Forgotten clickers
$>$ Technical issues
$>$ Cheating

## Use is Growing...

- particularly large university science courses
- as evidence for pedagogical value accumulates
- as competition drives technical improvements
- increasing user-friendliness
- decreasing prices
- i>Clicker system adopted at University of Guelph January 2007




## Getting to Know One Another

In what area do you teach?
A. Humanities \& Social Sciences
B. Business

Class Size?
A. $\leq 50$
C. Education
B. $\leq 100$
D. Science, Math \& Engineering
E. Other
C. $\leq 250$
D. $\leq 400$
E. $>400$

What level do you teach?
A. $1^{\text {st }}$ year
D. Multiple years
B. $2^{\text {nd }} y e a r$
E. Other
C. $3^{\text {rd }}$ or $4^{\text {th }}$ year
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| The Interactive Classroom <br> Evidence That It Works <br> Richard Hake (Indiana U.- Bloomington) <br> > 6542 student study comparing traditional versus interactive lectures <br> $>62$ introductory physics courses <br> > Pre- and Post-Instruction Testing <br> > Measured Normalized Gain $<\mathrm{g}>=\frac{\mathrm{S}_{\text {Post }}-\mathrm{S}_{\text {Pre }}}{100-\mathrm{S}_{P r e}}$ <br> American Journal of Physics v66 p64-74 ( 1998) |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Pedagogical Justifications for Clickers

- Promotes active learning through interaction.
- Provides immediate feedback to the lecturer on how well students are understanding concepts
- Quick and easy formative feedback for student promotes deeper learning
- Can be used to grade, promote attendance.
- Can be used anonymously to collect information.




## Student Feedback on Clickers

- "iclickers made a big difference in helping to understand and remember the things that were covered in the lectures."
- "The clickers helped a lot by keeping us paying attention."
- "...if there was something we did not understand in class we knew it right away and could look at it in more depth after that night when it was still fresh in our minds and not a week or two later when doing a quiz and then realize we don't understand it."


Potassium perchlorate can be prepared by this sequence of rxns:

1) $\mathrm{Cl}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+2 \mathrm{KOH}_{(\text {aq })} \rightarrow \mathrm{KCl}(\mathrm{aq})+\mathrm{KClO}_{(\mathrm{aq})}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{(\mathrm{l})}$
2) $3 \mathrm{KClO}_{(\mathrm{aq})} \rightarrow 2 \mathrm{KCl}_{(\mathrm{aq})}+\mathrm{KClO}_{3}(\mathrm{aq})$
3) $4 \mathrm{KClO}_{3}(\mathrm{aq}) \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{KClO}_{4}(\mathrm{aq})+\mathrm{KCl}(\mathrm{aq})$

How many moles of $\mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ are needed to prepare 2 moles of $\mathrm{KClO}_{4}$ ?
A) $8 / 3$
7\%
B) 4
14\%
Midterm: Correct Ans
C) 6
11\%
Clicker = 0
48\%
Clicker = 1
65\%
(D) 8

64\%
E) 24

4\%
W'08 MT - 61\% correct ans
4\% W'05 MT - 48\% correct ans

| Results |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Participation Score | \% of Class Participation | W'07 Ave. <br> Final Grade | W'08 Ave. Final Grade |
| 0 | 0-32\% | -15\% | -15\% |
| 1 | 33-59\% | -7\% | -5\% |
| 2 | 60-84\% | +2\% | 0\% |
| 3 | 85-100\% | +8\% | +9\% |




Reference: E. Zhu, CRLT Occasional Paper, 22, University of Michigan, 2007. Web Address: www.crlt.umich.edu/publinks/CRLT_no22.pdf 29
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