

ESSENTIAL LEARNING & ASSESSMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE 2015 Report, Recommendations, and Instructions for next reports

Introduction

The Essential Learning & Assessment Review Committee (ELARC) reviews assessment data from across campus and uses the data to make recommendations to improve teaching, learning, and assessment at UW-Whitewater. The committee focuses on data related to student achievement of the UWW baccalaureate learning goals, currently defined as the LEAP essential learning outcomes (see Appendix A; also available at <http://www.uww.edu/acadaff/assessment/elarc>) from the Association of American Colleges & Universities. The committee receives assessment summaries from the Colleges and other constituencies on campus and integrates the findings using the baccalaureate learning outcomes as the organizing framework. The ELARC recommendations discussed here reflect attention to blending the curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular student experiences. The recommendations can serve as a guide for allocation of resources so that our campus as a whole works toward common assessment goals.

This marks the third year that ELARC has reviewed assessment summaries from across campus. In addition to our usual summary and recommendations, this year's report provides a summary of progress noted across all three years as well as areas in which further work would be fruitful. After discussion of campus assessment activities over these years, the committee has changed the reporting timeline so that units have more time to implement their assessment projects, think about what the resulting data mean and how they might be used to improve program/unit effectiveness, and begin to implement data-based changes. The new reporting process is described later in this document.

During the academic year 2013-2014, ELARC received and reviewed assessment summaries from:

- College of Arts & Communication
- College of Business & Economics
- College of Education & Professional Studies
- College of Letters & Sciences
- Student Affairs
- Multicultural Affairs & Student Success
- Audit & Review (of programs reviewed during 2012-2013)
- Andersen Library
- Degree Qualifications Profile* project

Data on Student Learning:

In Spring 2010, UW-Whitewater adopted the LEAP essential learning outcomes as the campus definition of learning expected for all bachelors degree recipients. Departments, programs, colleges, and other units continue to integrate these learning outcomes into their systems for assessing student learning.

- As in the previous year's report, our most informative areas of direct assessment relate to writing, critical thinking, and information literacy. In addition, data are beginning to be collected on oral communication and quantitative literacy.

- The Open Pathways Project for the Higher Learning Commission provided campus-level data on writing, critical thinking, information literacy and general basic knowledge. Detailed analyses conducted by four programs extended our data collection to additional learning outcomes.
- A summary of Audit and Review self-studies submitted during 2012-2013 showed that across the 11 undergraduate programs reviewed, every ELO was assessed by at least half the programs. Almost three-fourths (73%) of these programs engaged in some form of direct assessment, and all but one program used indirect assessment methods in their assessment of student learning.

Appendix B provides brief descriptions of assessment results that are related to our campus baccalaureate learning outcomes, culled from reports received by ELARC during 2013-2014. It is clear that an increasing number of departments and programs are actively assessing student learning. Good progress has been made on several of the ELARC recommendations and some general themes are beginning to emerge from the data, as summarized.

Areas of Progress

Since ELARC's inception in 2011, significant progress has been made for several of the ELARC recommendations. These areas are summarized below.

Positive culture of assessment

There has been a shift in attitude across campus toward increased engagement, and a greater willingness to become part of departmental conversations about data and what it means for programs. Although assessment has been taking place to some extent for years, it seems that the overall view on campus is shifting towards greater acceptance of assessment. Campus personnel increasingly recognize the value of assessing student learning at program and campus levels, and they view the collection of data as less of a required exercise and more of a source of useful information. For example:

- All four colleges now have active assessment committees.
- Assessment awards are being planned in one college (L&S).
- The 2nd annual Assessment Day was held to celebrate assessment activities at all levels across campus.
- Additional ELARC reports were submitted this year from Andersen Library, Multicultural Affairs & Student Success Office, and from the *Degree Qualifications Profile* project.
- In the Division of Student Affairs, assessment is encouraged at the departmental level. Units conduct both annual assessment projects and specialized assessment studies.

Resource Allocation

Units across campus allocate resources to support assessment of student learning, including funds, staffing, and time. For example:

- The University made a significant investment in the campus-level *Degree Qualifications Profile* project, providing stipends for approximately 25 faculty/staff to conduct campus-level testing and in-depth department level assessment in four departments. Additional funds supported prizes for students who participated in the project.
- The University authorized and provided funding for a reorganized Office of Institutional

Research and Planning, including a new Director position.

- The university continues to fund an Office of Academic Assessment.
- Colleges provide support for assessment-related staffing.
- The University purchased software (TaskStream) to support the College of Education and Professional Studies' assessments to meet new DPI licensing requirements.
- Campus offices provided funds for six faculty/staff to attend the annual Indianapolis Assessment Institute.
- All four colleges provide support for assessment projects.
- A five-year strategic plan to advance assessment of the ELOs is being developed.
- The Provost's Office continued to provide funds for LEAP teams. Several of these teams indirectly support assessment of some ELOs (e.g., information literacy, critical thinking, diversity learning).
- A Strategic Initiatives grant was awarded to support the development of a campus Critical Thinking assessment rubric.
- Funding was provided by the Chancellor's & Provost's Offices to support a Task Force on Diversity. One result from this was the Diversity Learning assessment rubric (the rubric development was also supported by funding for a LEAP team).

Develop Rubrics

Significant progress has been made in developing, testing, disseminating, and using campus rubrics to assess students' skills. For example:

- There was further development of our two existing campus rubrics, Writing Matters and Speaking Well, including establishing baseline levels of performance and working with programs to contextualize the rubrics for their programs.
- Several more campus rubrics have been developed and tested including Critical Thinking, Diversity Learning, Research Matters, and Information Literacy.
- The Mathematics Department is actively laying the foundation for a Quantitative Reasoning campus rubric (through revisions in the focus, outcomes, pedagogy and assessment in MATH 141 – particularly the increased emphasis on critical thinking and quantitative literacy skills).
- The Writing Matters and Speaking Well rubrics continued to be disseminated to campus, including to students through New Student Seminar.
- Projects using the rubrics were presented at Assessment Day 2014.
- Work has begun on additional campus rubrics (visual literacy, sustainability, presentations).

Improve Students' Writing

- The College of Letters & Sciences Assessment Committee developed a definition of "writing intensive" when describing courses. This definition will be shared across campus and will allow us to have a common understanding of what is expected in courses with a 'writing intensive' designation.
- Three workshops were held to address developing effective writing assignments.
- Across campus, programs are adapting the WM rubric for more effective application within specific disciplines.
- The DQP project provided a campus-level assessment of students' writing. It included writing samples from three student levels (end of Sophomore year, Bachelor, Masters)

across four different majors.

- In L&S, Biology and History made curricular changes to strengthen disciplinary writing. Other programs reported an increased focus on writing instruction (e.g., Chemistry, Geography and Geology, International Studies, Women's Studies)
- The English program is creating a new upper-level Scientific Writing course and the existing Technical and Scientific Writing will be revised to become Technical and Professional Writing

Improve Students' Critical Thinking

- Workshops to score the Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT) were held as part of the DQP project.
- The workshop to develop the UW-Whitewater Critical Thinking rubric included a discussion of strategies for fostering the development of students' critical thinking.
- Individual programs reported an increased focus on critical thinking in their instruction (e.g., Finance & Business Law; Psychology; Ed Foundations; Math and English, in the proficiency courses)
- Core instructors in the General Education program attended campus workshops on critical reading and on critical thinking.

Additional Progress Needed

ELARC also identified several areas in which additional progress is needed.

- Develop university-level assessment awards. Conduct a survey of units across campus (e.g., college assessment committees, Student Affairs units, MASS, Andersen Library staff, etc.) to identify the types of awards that would be meaningful and motivating.
- Continue to work to explicitly include assessment in standards for tenure and promotion at the college level, for academic staff promotion, and in Faculty Senate Standard Classification of Performance data.
- Complete and disseminate a five-year strategic plan for assessment of ELOs.
- Establish a process for campus-level funding of assessment projects. Funding for assessment projects should include the requirement that the project be presented at Assessment Day and to college assessment committees.
- Continue to develop and use campus rubrics.
 - Complete the testing and dissemination of existing rubrics.
 - Encourage the integration and use of UW-Whitewater rubrics across campus.
 - Develop systematic strategies that allow all divisions to contribute to rubric development and use, including Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, and Student Affairs.
 - Emphasize the definition of a *progression of learning* and communication of campus *levels of expectations* for student performance at different levels (e.g., developing, competent, accomplished).
 - Emphasize support for and guidance in how to contextualize the rubrics so they are useful to individual programs but can also contribute to campus level summaries of progress on specific ELOs.
 - Develop a system to facilitate, track, and coordinate development of additional rubrics. Information gained from previous rubric development projects should be shared with new projects to identify areas of overlap in the skills assessed and share

- effective strategies for rubric development, testing, and dissemination.
- Provide faculty/staff development in best practices for instruction in ELO skill areas.
 - Investigate ways in which technology can be used to enhance student skills (e.g., writing, peer reviews).
 - Investigate the adoption of a campus-wide writing handbook.

Emerging Themes

Several themes have emerged from the committee's review of data across the past three years.

1. Students seem to have difficulty *evaluating information and evidence* and *integrating learning* (that is, connecting their knowledge and skills across courses and contexts). Students sometimes also have difficulty with *retention* and *application of skills and knowledge* to new problems. Evidence for these difficulties was found in assessments of writing, critical thinking, and information literacy in the campus DQP project, in other campus assessments of critical thinking and writing, and in reports from departments. To date, however, most of the evidence comes from comparing students in earlier years with different students in later years. A longitudinal approach of tracking the same students' learning over time could provide useful information about how these skills change, if some students face greater challenges than others in mastering them, and the kinds of instructional experiences that support the development of these essential skills.
2. As is clear from the list of skills above, students tend to have greater difficulty with higher-level skills. These take time to develop, and students would benefit from systematic and intentional support across courses using instruction that clearly addresses the targeted skills. It may be useful to offer opportunities for conversations and/or faculty development in areas such as:
 - a. Strategies to develop *well-designed assignments* that clearly instruct students in the desired learning outcomes.
 - b. Strategies to support *progressive scaffolding* of specific learning outcomes within programs, and to more clearly connect the desired learning outcomes with the foundation gained in General Education courses.
 - c. *Opportunities to develop expertise* in specific areas so individual faculty/staff can serve as mentors for others in their units and across campus and as resources for information on effective instruction and assessment of targeted learning outcomes.
3. Academic assessment efforts would advance from a more complete and strategic curricular mapping to show how the essential learning outcomes are addressed, practiced, and assessed across the curriculum and co-curriculum. This should include the creation of grids or maps that show how program learning outcomes align with the campus ELOs and how particular courses align with these learning outcomes. It would also be helpful to identify the specific tools/assignments used to assess learning for each outcome. This type of curricular mapping will ensure thorough assessment of student learning outcomes at the program level as well as good alignment with outcomes at the college and university levels.
4. There is a need for greater visibility of assessment efforts and assessment 'successes' across campus. Sharing assessment strategies, tools, and results contributes to a better understanding of our students' learning, provides information and support for faculty/staff in their efforts

toward continuous improvement, and helps our current students better understand why we focus on specific skills. It also provides valuable information to prospective students and parents, and to the public, providing a clearer picture of the kinds of skills students at UW-Whitewater will develop throughout their courses and experiences on our campus.

Many other activities and accomplishments were reported: See Appendix C for details.

ELARC Committee Recommendations for 2015-2017:

Recommendation #1

Assessment work is vital to our understanding of the strengths and areas for improvement in all areas of student learning—curricular and co-curricular. To be most meaningful, assessment work should be ongoing, occur as an integral part of campus life, and involve active engagement of faculty, staff, and students. To **enhance a positive culture of assessment** that facilitates engagement, we recommend that units create ways to acknowledge and reward faculty, staff, and students for their work on assessment, and that UW-W expand its array of annual university-wide awards to include assessment awards recognizing both individuals (a faculty, academic staff, university staff member) and one or more groups for distinguished contributions to the assessment of student learning.

Recommendation #2

As the university faces new fiscal challenges and greater budget uncertainty, we encourage institutional decision-makers to remain mindful of the centrality of assessment in university operation. Federal and state agencies and accrediting organizations will continue to monitor and review outcomes of academic assessment efforts—necessitating a **continued commitment of time and resources that support the completion of informative and useful assessment of student learning**.

Recommendation #3

We agree with the recommendation of the General Education Assessment Summit 2011 that campus should develop rubrics that **define learning** and the progression of learning (e.g., from freshman to senior levels) for the essential learning outcomes. There are now five such campus rubrics for writing, oral communication, critical thinking, information literacy, and diversity and intercultural awareness and knowledge. These rubrics have proven valuable for defining our campus consensus about learning, communicating our expectations to students across disciplines and across the curriculum and co-curriculum, and improving the collection and coordination of direct assessment data.

The campus should continue this good work, with a particular focus on a) enhancing awareness of the five existing rubrics among faculty, staff, and students through professional development and marketing activities and b) increasing the integration of these rubrics into instruction and assessment across the curriculum and co-curriculum.

In addition, the committee recommends that we continue to develop new campus rubrics for other key essential learning outcomes including quantitative literacy. The AAC&U VALUE rubrics can be used as guides or starting points.

Recommendation #4

Based on the emerging themes noted above, we recommend units develop strategies to **track student performance over time**. Collection and evaluation of data will allow units to understand difficulties students have with evaluation, integration, and application (those areas our data have indicated are difficult for UW-W students). Providing professional development resources to address student learning in these areas will allow campus units to examine courses, curriculum, organizational culture, etc. and to explore possible revisions needed for greater student learning and achievement.

Instructions for 2015 and 2016 Reports:

To provide more time for units to implement, evaluate and make use of their assessment initiatives, a new reporting timeline will begin with the Fall 2015 reports.

Each constituency listed below is asked to submit an assessment report to ELARC by the dates listed that addresses the questions below. Send reports to Dr. Joan Littlefield Cook, ELARC Chair, at cookj@uww.edu.

Submit report by November 1, 2015

- College of Arts & Communication
- College of Letters & Sciences
- General Education Review Committee
- University Audit & Review Committee
- Andersen Library
- Enrollment & Retention Services
- Student Affairs

Submit report by November 1, 2016

- College of Business & Economics
- College of Education & Professional Studies
- Multicultural Affairs & Student Success
- Office of Academic Assessment
- Office of Institutional Research & Planning
- Whitewater Student Government
- Any other constituencies that wish to report

Questions to address in the report:

1. How has your unit advanced, participated in, or responded to the four ELARC recommendations since your last report?
 - a. *Special item for 2015 and 2016 reports:* Please include information on use of the UW-Whitewater rubrics in your unit. How is your unit using the rubrics, either in their original form or as modified for your context?
2. How is your unit using assessment data to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of student learning related to our campus baccalaureate learning outcomes (LEAP essential learning outcomes)? **Describe the most important actions that your unit has taken since your last ELARC report that are based on assessment data related to the ELOs.** Be sure to address the progress your unit has made in implementing the recommendations and plans outlined in your 2013 report.

3. Summarize the assessment results that were collected within or pertaining to your constituency since your last report to ELARC that address student achievement of the baccalaureate ELOs. Examples include results of systematic assessments of student writing, critical thinking, intercultural knowledge, or other essential learning outcomes.
4. What are the most important actions that you recommend or plan to take that use the assessment results described in #3 above for the improvement of teaching, learning, and/or assessment of student learning?
5. What recommendations do you have for further data collection, analysis, or other assessment work within your constituency or elsewhere on campus that would lead to important improvements in student learning?

ELARC Members (2013-2015):

Joan Littlefield Cook (Chair)	Director of Academic Assessment
Greg Cook	Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Brent Bilodeau	Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
Liz Hachten	Coordinator, General Education
Sally Vogl-Bauer	College of Arts & Communication
Jane Ferencz	College of Education and Professional Studies (2014-2015)
Ellie Dickmann	College of Education and Professional Studies (2013-2014)
Rowand Robinson	College of Education and Professional Studies (2014-2015)
Lois Smith	College of Business and Economics
Jolly Emrey	College of Letters and Sciences (2013-2014)
Frank Goza	College of Letters and Sciences (2014-2015)
John Stone	Graduate Studies & Continuing Education
Mark Schroeder	General Education Review Committee (2013-2014)
Linda Yu	Audit and Review Committee
Kim Knesting-Lund	University Assessment Committee (2013-2014)
Tom Karthausser	Institutional Research & Planning (2013-2014)
Rochelle Day	Institutional Research & Planning (2014-2015)
Leda Nath	Academic Development Committee (2013-2014)
Denise Ehren	University Staff Council
Denise Ehlen/Amanda Howell	Academic Staff Assembly
Michael Heck	Whitewater Student Government (2013-2014)
Storm Walsh	Whitewater Student Government (2013-2014)
Nick Stahl	Whitewater Student Government (2014-2015)

Document last revised March 12, 2015.

APPENDIX A:
LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes

The Essential Learning Outcomes



Beginning in school, and continuing at successively higher levels across their college studies, students should prepare for twenty-first-century challenges by gaining:

★ **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World**

- Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts

Focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring

★ **Intellectual and Practical Skills, including**

- Inquiry and analysis
- Critical and creative thinking
- Written and oral communication
- Quantitative literacy
- Information literacy
- Teamwork and problem solving

Practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance

★ **Personal and Social Responsibility, including**

- Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global
- Intercultural knowledge and competence
- Ethical reasoning and action
- Foundations and skills for lifelong learning

Anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges

★ **Integrative and Applied Learning, including**

- Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

Demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems

Note: This listing was developed through a multiyear dialogue with hundreds of colleges and universities about needed goals for student learning; analysis of a long series of recommendations and reports from the business community; and analysis of the accreditation requirements for engineering, business, nursing, and teacher education. The findings are documented in previous publications of the Association of American Colleges and Universities: *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College* (2002), *Taking Responsibility for the Quality of the Baccalaureate Degree* (2004), and *College Learning for the New Global Century* (2007). For further information, see www.aacu.org/leap.

APPENDIX B:
Summary Table
Assessment Conclusions Related to Essential Learning Outcomes
For the 2015 ELARC Report

To help organize assessment conclusions from around campus, ELARC members reviewed the reports received from campus constituencies during Fall 2013 and identified conclusions about student achievement of ELOs that seemed warranted from the data described in the reports. The table below shows *brief descriptions* of these conclusions (with references to where they can be found in the reports). For this exercise, we relied primarily on the authors of each report to complete this table.

The purpose of this table is to demonstrate the learning areas where we can document assessment data or conclusions and to provide a general idea about the areas where we have the most and least assessment data or conclusions (as reported to date to ELARC).

Note: the Essential Learning Outcomes below have been endorsed as the learning outcomes that all UW-Whitewater undergraduate students are expected to achieve by the time of graduation, regardless of major, minor, college, or other program.

LEGEND: A&R = Audit & Review Report (of programs reviewed during 2012-2013)
 AL = Andersen Library Report
 A&C – College of Arts & Communication Report
 COBE = College of Business & Economics Report
 CoEPS = College of Education & Professional Studies Report
 DQP = *Degree Qualifications Profile* project Report
 L&S = College of Letters & Sciences Report
 MASS = Multicultural Affairs & Student Success Report
 SA = Student Affairs Report

AAC&U LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes	Brief description of conclusion	Report, p. #
Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World <i>Focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring</i>		
Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts	8 (62%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate to good; 2 programs reported lower means UW-W associate and bachelor degree level students scored below “the average” in English, Science, and Social Studies categories on the College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (CBASE). UW-W students completing the Mathematics portion of the CBASE performed above the national average—though the data suggests that there was no statistical difference in the performance between associate and bachelor’s level students.	A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B DQP, p. 2
Intellectual and Practical Skills <i>Practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance</i>		
Inquiry & analysis	ENGLISH 102, a sample of student research papers (N=51) was evaluated using the Writing Matters Rubric (WMR). The mean score for “conducting research” (which aligns with the Inquiry and Analysis ELO) was 2.1 (w/3 = competent) while the majority fell into the “developing” category. A sample of	CoLS 2013 ELARC Ann. Rep., pg. 9-11.

	<p>student papers from three 400-level ENGLISH classes (N=32), was also evaluated using the Writing Matters Rubric (WMR). Their mean score for “conducting research” was 3.3.</p> <p>PSYCHOLOGY 327, 345, 355 and 724, a sample (N=59) of major paper assignments from these classes was selected and analyzed using a rubric developed by the Psychology Department. That rubric has five dimensions. Scores ranged from a high of 93% in the “accomplished” and “competent” categories for the <i>Articulating Conclusions</i> dimension, to a low of 65% in the “accomplished” and “competent” categories for <i>Evaluating Evidence</i> dimension.</p> <p>9 (69 %) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate to strong.</p>	<p>CoLS 2013 ELARC Ann. Rep., pg. 12-13</p> <p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p>
Critical thinking	<p>MATH 141, a sample of students (N=88) was evaluated in four CAT areas. 85% were able to read graphs, 77% correctly identified solutions to real-world problems, and 63% understood linear models, while only 42% understood exponential models.</p> <p>ENGLISH 102, a sample of student research papers (N=51) was evaluated using the Writing Matters Rubric (WMR). The mean score for “constructing arguments” (a component of critical thinking) was 2.2 (w/3=competent) while the majority fell into the “developing” category. A sample of student papers from three 400-level ENGLISH classes (N=32), were evaluated using the Writing Matters Rubric (WMR). Their mean score for “constructing arguments” was 2.8.</p> <p>9 (69 %) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed some aspect of critical and/or creative thinking. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate to strong</p> <p>CoBE students scored 77 – 91% as “good enough” or “very good” on embedded assignments in core classes. They had the most difficulty with identifying the problem/issue.</p> <p>The <i>Critical-thinking Assessment Test</i> (CAT) was administered to 401 students and revealed that while there were improvements in student performance from associate, to bachelor’s, to master’s-level, the only statistically significant difference was in the performance between master’s level students and students at the associate and bachelor’s levels.</p>	<p>CoLS 2013 ELARC Ann. Rep., pg. 6-7.</p> <p>CoLS 2013 ELARC Ann. Rep., pg. 9-11</p> <p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p> <p>CoBE Appendix B, tab 4</p> <p>DQP, p. 2</p>
Creative thinking		
Problem solving	<p>9 (69%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed some aspect of teamwork &/or problem solving. Across programs, the level of performance was strong; 1 program reported lower scores</p>	<p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p>

Written communication	<p>ENGLISH 102, a sample of student research papers (N=51) was evaluated using the Writing Matters Rubric (WMR). The mean score was 2.5 (w/3=competent) while the majority fell into the “developing” category. A sample of student papers from three 400-level ENGLISH classes (N=32) was evaluated using the Writing Matters Rubric (WMR). The mean score was 3.3 or competent.</p> <p>INTERNAR 488, a set of 12 research papers was assessed using the WMR. 66% were scored as “competent” or “accomplished” and 33% were deemed less than competent.</p> <p>8 (62%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate to strong.</p> <p>On embedded assignments, CoBE students scored 80% - 98% as being “good enough” or “very good”</p> <p>Writing samples of 120 associate, 74 bachelor’s natives, 76 bachelor’s transfer, and 48 master’s students were scored using the <i>Writing Matters</i> rubric evaluating the following categories: Focus/Thesis, Analysis/Interpretation, Coherence & Organization, Evidence & Documentation, and Language Use & Convention. Problems with inter-rater reliability limits generalizability, but the scores suggest little differences between associate degree level students and bachelor-level degree students.</p>	<p>CoLS 2013 ELARC Ann. Rep., pg. 9-11</p> <p>CoLS 2013 ELARC Ann. Rep., pg. 11.</p> <p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p> <p>CoBE Appendix B, tab 3</p> <p>DQP, p. 3</p>
Oral communication	<p>A finding of Assessment efforts of the Office of Career and Leadership Development was that many student leaders indicated that they overcame their fear of sharing their opinion in front of their peers, and believe that they will carry this confidence into future settings.</p> <p>7 (54%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate to strong; 2 programs reported lower means for oral communication</p> <p>CoBE students scored 97-99% as being “good enough” or “very good” on oral presentations.</p>	<p>SA, p. 3</p> <p>A&R, Appendix B</p> <p>CoBE Appendix B, tab 3</p>
Quantitative literacy	<p>MATH 141, a sample of students (N=421) was evaluated over the Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 terms. They were scored on 10 items. The highest percentages of correct responses were for “interpreting a linear equation” (93%) and “making predictions from equations” (85%). The lowest were for “computation” (42%) and “interpreting exponential models” (41%).</p> <p>8 (62%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate to strong</p> <p>On normed Major Field Tests, CoBE students scored in the 84th percentile nationally on accounting and the 75th</p>	<p>CoLS 2013 ELARC Ann. Rep., pg. 8-9</p> <p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p> <p>CoBE Appendix A, tab 2</p>

	percentile in quantitative business analysis.	
Information literacy	<p>A project led by Andersen Library used the Research Matters Rubric (RMR) to score the quality of research citations in student papers from select 100-, 300-, and 400-level courses, scored from 1 (novice) to 4 (accomplished). Mean overall rubric scores were 2.86 in 100-level courses ($n = 52$ papers), 3.24 in 300-level courses ($n = 74$ papers), and 3.18 in 400-level courses ($n = 56$ papers).</p> <p>INTERNAR 488, a set of 12 research papers was assessed by librarians using the Information Literacy Rubric. The mean score for these papers was 3.0 or “competent.”</p> <p>9 (69%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate to strong; 1 program reported lower scores for computer skills</p> <p>A total of 333 undergraduate students completed the <i>iSkills Test</i> (measures information and communication technology literacy skills) ranging from a low of 80 to a high of 470—with an average score of 273.7 (out of a possible score of 500)—with the mean score of all undergraduate groups at about 50% of the total available points. (There is no normative data to compare to students at other institutions and there was no evidence of difference between associate level and bachelor’s level students.)</p>	<p>AL, pp. 1-3</p> <p>CoLS 2013 ELARC Ann. Rep., pg. 11-12.</p> <p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p> <p>DQP, p. 2</p>
Teamwork	<p>The Recreation Sports and Facilities alumni survey of 146 former employees revealed that the areas of greatest personal growth included the development of social competence, teamwork, and leadership.</p> <p>In the Residence Life survey of 115 former RAs, 71% reported that employment had a positive impact on the development of social competence and teamwork skills.</p> <p>9 (69%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed some aspect of teamwork &/or problem solving. Across programs, the level of performance was strong; 1 program reported lower scores</p>	<p>SA, p. 3</p> <p>SA, p. 4</p> <p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p>
<p>Personal and Social Responsibility <i>Anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges</i></p>		
Civic knowledge & engagement (local & global)	6 (46%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate to strong; 1 program reported low scores	A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B
Intercultural knowledge & competence	<p>A finding of Center for Students with Disabilities assessment efforts was that students acknowledged the importance of accepting themselves and others, and an awareness of diversity beyond disability.</p> <p>Assessment efforts of the Office of Career and Leadership Development found that when student leaders had the</p>	<p>SA, p. 2</p> <p>SA, p. 3</p>

	<p>opportunity to interact with others from identity backgrounds different than their own, students gain confidence in their ability to navigate more diverse environments.</p> <p>POLITICAL SCIENCE, the attitudes (levels of tolerance) of 344 majors and non-majors were compared across several dimensions. No meaningful differences were found as both groups were found to score quite high (at the 80% percentile) on the tolerance measures.</p> <p>7 (54%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate to strong; 1 program reported low scores</p> <p>On the Major Field Test, CoBE students scored in the 40th percentile nationally on international topics.</p>	<p>CoLS 2013 ELARC Ann. Rep., pg. 13-14.</p> <p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p> <p>CoBE Appendix A, tab2</p>
Ethical reasoning & action	<p>7 (54%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate to strong</p> <p>In course embedded assignments, CoBE students scored from 88 – 97% as “very good” or “good enough” in performance.</p>	<p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p> <p>CoBE Appendix B, tab 1</p>
Foundations & skills for lifelong learning	<p>7 (54%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was strong; 1 program reported lower scores for computer skills</p>	<p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p>
<p>Integrative Learning <i>Demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems</i></p>		
Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies	<p>8 (62%) of programs reviewed during 2012-2013 assessed this ELO. Across programs, the level of performance was moderate</p> <p>Four academic departments involved in the DQP investigation designed and administered direct assessment measures to evaluate integrative learning among students. In general, there were mixed results relative to indicating progress of associate degree level students to bachelor level students.</p>	<p>A&R, pg. 3; Appendix B</p> <p>DQP, p. 3-4</p>

**APPENDIX C:
Progress Related to the 2013 ELARC Recommendations**

Our 2013 ELARC report provided five areas of recommendation to improve teaching, learning, and assessment at UW-Whitewater. Those five areas are listed below along with brief notes about campus activity and progress as indicated.

Recommendation #1

*Assessment work is vital to our understanding of the strengths and areas for improvement in all areas of student learning—curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular. To be most meaningful, assessment work should be ongoing, occur as an integral part of campus life, and involve active engagement of faculty, staff, and students. To **enhance a positive culture of assessment** that facilitates engagement, we recommend that:*

Sub-Recommendation 1.a

- a. The campus divisions, colleges, academic departments, and other appropriate governing bodies and administrators review and if necessary revise personnel policies (e.g., job descriptions and reward structures) to support faculty and staff engagement in assessment.*

Reported Progress Made on Sub-Recommendation 1.a During 2013-14

- Three members of the College of Arts & Communication attended the IUPUI Assessment Institute in October 2013 (the Dean, the College Assessment Coordinator, and a faculty member in Theatre/Dance).
- In Spring 2013 the L&S Administrative Council discussed assessment work as an important component of service for tenure, promotion, and merit decisions and noted that assessment work could also figure into a teacher-scholar's research activities.
- The CoEPS reevaluated the roles and responsibilities of the COEPS Assessment Committee, and it encouraged increased engagement (and understanding) of faculty and staff in assessment structures at the College and University levels.

Sub-Recommendation 1.b

- b. Administrators support the positive culture of assessment in their various addresses and interactions on campus.*

Reported Progress Made on Sub-Recommendation 1.b During 2013-14

- During the Fall 2013 Arts & Communication College Orientation Meeting, assessment was a topic incorporated into the morning's presentations (the first time this had officially taken place as part of this meeting). The College Assessment Coordinator is also an active member of the College's Administrative Council.
- In the Division of Student Affairs, assessment work continued to be encouraged at the unit level. During 2013-2014, the Vice President for Student Affairs charged Career and Leadership Development, Center for Students with Disabilities, Recreation Sports and Facilities, and Residence Life to conduct specialized assessment studies. The results of these four studies have been shared within the Division and across campus in a number of workshop contexts, including the annual Assessment Day.
- The Audit & Review process continued to emphasize assessment as a tool for program's self-reflection and self-improvement. Many questions are raised in reports about details of assessment plans and specific data reported to provide constructive feedback to programs for areas of strength as well as those needing clarification or improvement. The review teams are very careful in how feedback is worded to encourage programs to continue in their assessment efforts. Thus far, there have been no reports of awards for assessment activities or information provided regarding how assessment activities are considered in faculty and staff reviews. A few programs list assessment-related activities in their faculty and staff service activities (e.g., member of department or college assessment committees; presented poster at LEAP or Assessment Day).
- Director of Academic Assessment chaired the Undergraduate Audit and Review Committee, completing reviews of eight programs and six progress reports. Follow-up meetings about progress reports from Spring 2013 were also held.

- Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Continuing Education chaired the Graduate Audit and Review Committee, completing reviews of three programs.
- LEAP Workshops were held for the 3rd year (2 days in January; 2 days in May). Assessment tools and strategies were introduced to the LEAP teams (e.g., AACU VALUE rubrics, embedded assessment, UW-W rubrics), and teams were encouraged to include assessment in their action plans. 154 faculty, staff, and students from both academic and student affairs units participated.
- CoBE uses a half-day of every annual retreat to review assessment data and make recommendations for improvements.
- CoBE established an Assurance of Learning (Assessment) Committee as a standing committee in the college.
- There was greater focus on assessment activities by the CoEPS Dean's Suite, and faculty and staff were actively engaged in assessment activities at the department level
- CoEPS faculty and staff participated in the DPI's Continuous Review Process.

Sub-Recommendation 1.c

- c. The campus establishes (and continues) an annual "Assessment Day" to recognize and share best practices and innovation in assessment.*

Reported Progress Made on Sub-Recommendation 1.c During 2013-14

- UW-W's second annual Assessment Day was held on February 25, 2014. The Keynote Address presented data from the campus DQP project. The event included a lunch (50 attendees), concurrent sessions with 9 faculty/staff presenters, 30 posters (poster topics included innovations in assessment, closing the loop, good assignments, embedding assessment, LEAP projects, unit/program/department assessment, and rubrics) that attracted 105 participants. Faculty/staff from all four colleges and the Division of Student Affairs participated.

Sub-Recommendation 1.d

- d. Colleges, departments, and other units create ways to acknowledge and reward faculty, staff, and students for their work on assessment.*

Reported Progress Made on Sub-Recommendation 1.d During 2013-14

- In combination with support from the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Continuing Education, the College of Arts & Communication allocated \$12,200 for summer assessment projects.
 - Support ranged from the further development of programmatic assessment plans to assistance for work being done in the Department of Art and Design for their upcoming NASAD report (due in Spring 2014).
- In combination with some remaining funds from a Strategic Initiatives Grant, the College of Arts & Communication supported a second round of assessment of students' oral communication skills at UW-Whitewater. A team watched 60 additional videotaped individual presentations given in COMM 110 to compare with baseline data of UWW students' oral presentation competencies analyzed in Spring 2013 using the Speaking Well Rubric.
- In L&S, the Assessment Committee continues to serve an important role in providing guidance, feedback, and support for departmental assessment representatives.
- L&S is continuing its successful program of providing summer stipends to support assessment projects that expand, revise, and/or significantly enhance existing assessment efforts. The college will expand this program to Winterim assessment projects starting in January 2014.
- In many L&S departments, the culture of assessment has begun to shift in a more positive direction as tools have been created, piloted, and data becomes available to help foster substantive discussions about improving student learning. Most L&S departments are incorporating discussions about assessment into their staff meetings each semester or year (if not more frequently).
- The L&S Assessment Committee will sponsor an Assessment Showcase at the annual L&S retreat starting in August 2014. The goal is to honor excellent work across the college while sharing results and best practices.

- The L&S Assessment Committee began developing guidelines for a new college assessment award.
- A grant stipend for work within departments on critical thinking in the major was established in CoBE.

New Sub-Recommendation 1.1 for 2013-2014 and beyond:

UW-W expand its array of annual university-wide awards to include assessment awards recognizing both individuals (a faculty, staff, classified staff member) and one or more groups for distinguished contributions to the assessment of student learning.

Reported Progress Made on New Sub-Recommendation 1.1 During 2013-14

- The L&S Assessment Committee began developing guidelines for a new college assessment award
-

Recommendation #2

Resources are important for enhancing and sustaining our assessment capacity on campus. The Provost's Office should collect feedback and suggestions about resource allocation for assessment, and work with colleges and other units to establish or revise budget lines and allocations for assessment work. We recommend that colleges/divisions and departments/units evaluate the resources they allocate or have available for assessment and work to determine the types and levels of resources they need to enhance their work.

Reported Progress on Recommendation 2 During 2013-14

- The College of Arts & Communication continues to allocate .50 FTE during the academic year to help coordinate, develop and assist assessment efforts in the College.
- For the first time, the College of Arts & Communication allocated \$10,000 for funding assessment-related work for the 2012-2013 academic year.
 - In total, \$5,600.00 in summer assessment projects were funded. Support was given to members of all departments in the College.
 - The College supported assessment-related travel in numerous ways: one person was funded to attend the IUPUI Assessment Institute; the Assessment Coordinator attended the AAC&U General Education Assessment Conference, as well as the Gateways to Completion Conference.
 - The College supported work examining students' oral communication skills at UW-Whitewater. A team is watching videotaped individual presentations given in COMM 110 to develop baseline data of UWW students' oral presentation competencies using the Speaking Well Rubric.
- The Dean of the College of Arts & Communication approved the reallocation of \$10,000 to go toward assessment-related work in the College for the 2013-2014 academic year.
- The CoEPS acquired resources to support a cohesive approach to collecting assessment data — Taskstream, and it acquired an ETS data management system.
- The CoEPS made a staffing request for a college assessment position.
- The College of Letters and Sciences budgets \$10,000 per year to support assessment projects and faculty development but regularly exceeds that amount in actual expenditures. In Summer 2013 alone, the College spent \$11,800 on summer assessment stipends.
- Through their comments and recommendations, the A&R review teams identify resources the program may need to develop/continue their assessment efforts (e.g., work with Director of Assessment; talk with Deans about funding small assessment projects). Two programs reviewed in 2012-2013 (Accounting; Psychology) received significant funding to support their participation in the DQP project; results will be included in these programs' next audit and review report.
- Office of Academic Assessment supported a campus team (4 attendees) to attend the Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, October 26-29, 2013.

- CoBE provided support for faculty to attend assessment-related conferences: CoBE faculty traveled to the Indianapolis Assessment Institute, five faculty and staff attended an AACSB Assessment Conference, and one faculty member attended a critical thinking conference.
- The Major Field Test was administered to all CoBE students enrolled in the capstone course in fall 2013. This exercise required substantial college financial and time resources.

***New sub-recommendation 2.1 from 2012-13:** The Academic Assessment Council prepare by May 1, 2014, a Five Year Strategic Plan that includes a statement of goals, strategies, and resource needs to advance assessment of the ELOs. This effort should be chaired by the Director of Academic Assessment, and include participation from the University Assessment Committee and representation from academic staff and classified staff assemblies.*

Reported Progress Made on New Sub-Recommendation 2.1 During 2013-14

- The Assessment Council and the University Assessment Committee began working on a five-year strategic plan for assessment. Work will continue throughout the Spring 2014 semester.

Recommendation #3

*We agree with the recommendation of the General Education Assessment Summit 2011 that campus should develop rubrics that **define learning** and the progression of learning (e.g., from freshman to senior levels) for the essential learning outcomes of critical thinking, intercultural knowledge and awareness, and quantitative literacy. The AAC&U VALUE rubrics can be used as guides or starting points. Using Writing Matters as a model, these new rubrics can be used to (a) define our campus consensus about learning, (b) communicate our expectations to students across disciplines, and across the curriculum and co-curriculum, and (c) collect and coordinate direct assessment data.*

Reported Progress on Recommendation #3 During 2013-14

Critical Thinking:

- The Office of Academic Assessment co-sponsored and co-led the development of the UW-W Critical Thinking Rubric Development Workshop, funded by a Chancellor's Strategic Initiatives Grant to Joan Cook & Jolly Emrey (\$35,935) and Office of Academic Assessment (\$5000). The workshop was held in August 2013, with further development during Fall 2013. Twenty faculty and staff from 17 different academic departments/units participated. Data collection and analysis to assess and further refine the rubric is ongoing.
- Faculty/staff from across campus participated in the CT rubric development workshop, including representatives from all academic colleges as well as Student Affairs.

Intercultural Knowledge & Awareness:

- The UW-Whitewater Diversity Learning and Intercultural Competence Rubric was developed and tested in workshops in January 2013, and August 2013. More than 30 faculty, students, and staff from eleven academic, student, and non-academic units participated in the design and testing of the rubric. The Provost's Office sponsored the rubric development and testing with a grant of over \$18,000. Pilar Melero led both workshops, as well as meetings in the spring 2013, to work out rubric details and plan the summer 2013 workshop. Pilar Melero has continued to work with Khyam Paneru on data analysis.

Quantitative Literacy:

-
-

Emerging Initiatives/Rubrics

Valuable work was launched during the reporting period to define campus learning outcomes for several other high-priority essential learning outcomes.

- A LEARN Center workshop was held in Spring 2013 that updated the campus on the work completed on the Speaking Well rubric.
 - A team of instructors videotaped students' informative and persuasive speeches from COMM 110 classes and scored them using the Speaking Well rubric to establish baseline parameters of our students' oral communication competencies.
 - Librarians in Andersen Library used the Research Matters Rubric to score bibliographies from papers in selected 100-level, 300-level, and 400-level courses.
 - Librarians created helpful resources to support information literacy: A LibGuide website, an Information Literacy Progression Rubric, information literacy rubrics customized for English 102 and the New Student Seminar, and an English 102 rubric translated into questions that students ask themselves as they self-check their research sources.
 - Communication Sciences Disorders and the Anderson Library Developed a Writing Rubric and an Information Literacy Rubric in 2012. They used scores from the rubrics to improve information literacy instruction in a ComDis course.
 - Programs in the CoEPS (Elementary Education; Health, Human Performance, Recreation; Health, PE, Coaching) are all working to develop rubrics to comply with the soon-to-be implemented EdTPA assessment process required for their college.
 - In 2011, OESH (now part of COBE) developed rubrics for presentation and paper grading. These rubrics were adopted in 2012 to increase the uniformity and quality of the feedback provided to students regarding their written work (not mandatory). Data is being collected and will be examined as it becomes available.
-

Recommendation #4

*Based on our review of data, and to **improve student writing**, the ELARC concurs with the recommendations from the Writing Still Matters 2011 assessment project to:*

Sub-Recommendation 4.a

- a. Define guidelines for "writing intensive" courses at the college and university level.*

Reported Progress on Sub-Recommendation 4.a During 2013-14

- The L&S Curriculum Committee has developed a list of essential elements of a writing intensive course along with recommendations to the campus to 1) formally adopt these guidelines, 2) develop a process for formally approving writing intensive courses and designating them as such in the curriculum, and 3) strengthen the university's writing proficiency in the major requirement in light of these guidelines. The guidelines and recommendations will be shared with other colleges and the UCC.

Sub-Recommendation 4.b

- b. Enhance department-level writing instruction and assessment projects.*

Reported Progress on Sub-Recommendation 4.b During 2013-14

- The primary work done in this area in the College of Arts & Communication took place as part of the campus Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) project. Specifically, the Communication Department Team analyzed applied writing assignments completed by students in two different department emphases, Public Relations and Advertising, using a modified version of the Writing Matters Rubric.
- This has emerged as a priority across L&S as the following examples indicate:
 - Biological Sciences: 1) a faculty team received funding in Summer 2013 and 2014 to develop a writing and critical thinking assessment for majors; 2) An extensive review of writing across the Biology curriculum led the department to undertake significant changes in how students meet the writing in the major proficiency requirement.

- Chemistry: In response to feedback from their Advisory Board and the ACS re-accreditation process, the CHEM 104 lab has been revised to provide more opportunities for students to improve writing skills by adding a second formal lab report and using the WM rubric to provide feedback to students. CHEM 470 and CHEM 471 uses a modified WM rubric to encourage the use of experimental results as the basis for arguments.
- Political Science: As part of an ongoing effort to assess and improve writing in the major, the department recently revised its writing guidelines (see Appendix) and is adopting the WM rubric as a tool for assessing writing across the political science curriculum.
- Three of the science departments in L&S (Biology, Chemistry, and Geography and Geology), have focused increased attention on writing instruction and assessment for their majors. As a result, the English faculty have developed a new upper-level writing course, ENGLISH 371 – Writing in the Sciences, which will be offered for the first time in Fall 2015.
- L&S faculty and staff are also contributing to the enhancement of writing instruction and assessment in other colleges and at the campus level. For example, as part of the DQP project, Marilyn Durham directed a group of 16 faculty scorers who assessed 381 papers using the Writing Matters rubric. And three faculty members from the English program scored student papers in a longitudinal assessment of written work of a small sample of majors in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (Spring 2013).
- The Audit & Review Committee encourage all departments and programs to assess student writing and use the data to improve teaching and learning for this learning outcome. Information about the UWW Writing Matters rubric and faculty/staff who are knowledgeable about the writing instruction is shared with programs during pre-A&R meetings and during discussions for progress reports.
- Of the programs that submitted A&R self-studies in 2012-2013, eight (62%) reported data on some aspect of student writing.
- CoBE began revising its business communication requirement and will be implementing a new business writing course in fall 2015, moving the communication requirement from the junior to the sophomore level and focusing more directly on writing specifically.

Sub-Recommendation 4.c

- c. Annotate the Writing Matters document to provide models of effective components of writing and to foster cross-disciplinary discussion.*

Reported Progress on Sub-Recommendation 4.c During 2013-14

- A team of faculty has prepared a document demonstrating how one might apply the rubric to a sample student paper, which will be placed on a Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) website that is currently under construction.
- As part of the Communication Department's participation in the DQP project, writing samples were collected from students in both entry level and advanced public relations and advertising courses. The goal was to assess how well DQP's interpretation of applied learning fit with the tasks students were engaged in. In the Communication Department, this assessment was expanded to also integrate several features of the Writing Matters Rubric in an attempt to learn more about students' overall writing competencies. Although the writing samples were small (either 12 or 14 samples per rank), this provided a first glimpse at what writing skills are being demonstrated by students in these two respective emphases. This modified version of the Writing Matters Rubric utilized a three-point scale, with 1 = developing, 2 = competent, 3 = accomplished.

Sub-Recommendation 4.d

- d. Facilitate faculty and staff professional development to enhance writing instruction.*

Reported Progress on Sub-Recommendation 4.d During 2013-14

- Dana Prodoehl presented a LEARN Center workshop on "Incorporating Low Stakes Writing into Any Sized Class" in January 2013.
- Marilyn Durham and Liz Hachten led a Spring 2013 LEARN Center reading group on John Bean's *Engaging Ideas: A Professor's Guide to Enhancing Critical Thinking and Writing*. Sixteen faculty and staff participated, including all the Secondary Education faculty from C&I.

- In response to assessment data about student writing in Freshman English, the Freshman English coordinator has organized a regular lunchtime workshop series for instructors that targets key instructional strategies.
- Marilyn Durham and several colleagues in Languages and Literatures received a Strategic Initiatives grant to launch an annual multi-day Writing Academy to enhance instructors' expertise in writing instruction across the curriculum. The first academy will be held in August 2014.
- Four CoEPS attendees at January 2012 edTPA training focused on written communication as it relates to the LEAP ELO. During this activity faculty were asked to consider existing program activities that address written communication, where it is addressed in the program, how the program could improve students' writing, and identify specific next steps to improve students' written communication.

Sub-Recommendation 4.e

- e. Create a structure through which faculty and staff representatives can work toward improving student writing across the curriculum and co-curriculum and in the disciplines.*

Reported Progress on Sub-Recommendation 4.e During 2013-14

- Dr. Dana Prodoehl was hired as a WAC specialist by the Department of Languages and Literatures and is beginning work on enhancing resources for writing across the curriculum, starting with a new website that is currently under construction.

Sub-Recommendation 4.f

- f. Explore ways that all divisions—Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, and Student Affairs—may contribute to Writing Still Matters recommendations, particularly in relation to student employment, student organization participation, and unit-driven initiatives.*

Reported Progress on Sub-Recommendation 4.f During 2013-14

-

Additional information on writing:

Recommendation #5

Based on our review of data, and to improve critical thinking in students, we recommend faculty and staff development sessions aimed at improving the instruction and assessment of critical thinking. Where appropriate, the focus should be on improving students' skills in summarizing patterns of results, evaluating and interpreting correlations, and separating relevant from irrelevant information. This effort should take into consideration student curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular experiences.

Sub-Recommendation 5.a

- a. Faculty and staff development sessions aimed at improving the instruction and assessment of critical thinking:*

Reported Progress on Sub-Recommendation 5.a During 2013-14

- The week-long workshop to develop a UW-W Critical Thinking Rubric held in August 2013 included review of data on students' critical thinking skills (national as well as at UW-W), discussion of student strengths and weaknesses, and discussion of instructional strategies to help foster students' CT skills. 20 faculty/staff from across campus participated.
- One faculty member attended a critical thinking conference and was part of a leadership team for a week-long workshop on developing a critical thinking rubric (CoBE). At the college retreat, a staff member presented his ideas for implementing critical thinking practices through case analysis.

- In August 2012, the annual Core Course Instructors' workshop focused on enhancing the critical thinking skills of students across the Core curriculum. At that workshop, instructors identified a particular need to strengthen our students' capacity to read critically as a prerequisite to improving critical thinking skills more generally. As a follow-up to that discussion, a workshop entitled "Reading – It's Critical!" was attended by approximately 35 Core course instructors in August 2013. Workshop attendees examined data on freshman students' reading abilities, discussed the implications of this information for teaching and learning in the core, and shared some best practices for enhancing critical reading skills.
- Four CoEPS attendees at January 2012 edTPA training focused on critical thinking as it relates to the LEAP ELO. During this activity faculty were asked to consider existing program activities that address CT, where CT is addressed in the program, how the program could improve CT instruction, and identify specific next steps to improve students' CT.

Sub-Recommendation 5.b

b. Focus on improving students' skills in summarizing patterns of results, evaluating and interpreting correlations, and separating relevant from irrelevant information.

Reported Progress on Sub-Recommendation 5.b During 2013-14

- A critical thinking test was developed and administered in refocused sections of MATH 141 in Spring 2013. Students were assessed on their ability to summarize the pattern of results in a graph; use and apply relevant information to evaluate a problem; and identify and explain the best solution for a real world problem. The results of this assessment are informing pedagogical changes in MATH 141.

In addition to the skills listed in the recommendation, other specific critical thinking skills have been investigated:

- ENGLISH 102 – constructing an argument.
- English majors (all tracks): construct arguments - execute well-structured, thesis-driven interpretations based on textual evidence.
- Psychology (DQP project): Formulate a question on a topic that addresses more than one academic discipline or practical setting, locate appropriate evidence that addresses the question, evaluate the evidence in relation to the problem's contexts, and articulates conclusions that follow logically from such analysis.
- Of the programs that submitted A&R self-studies in 2012-2013, nine (69%) reported data on some aspect of inquiry & analysis, and nine (69%) reported data on some aspect of critical & creative thinking.
- OESH (now part of COBE): SAFETY 481 takes students to selected industrial settings where they get acquainted with different production processes and engage in problem solving activities related to the recognition and abatement of workplace hazards.

Sub-Recommendation 5.c

c. Take into consideration student curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular experiences.

Reported Progress on Sub-Recommendation 5.c During 2013-14

-

Additional information on critical thinking:

- During the audit and review process, we support department and program efforts to define and assess critical thinking. Most of the programs that submitted assessment data on ELOs addressed critical thinking. The review teams offer feedback about the assessment used, including questions about how the information is used and how the data are used to modify instruction in critical thinking.
-

Other Assessment Activities

A number of departments/units, colleges/divisions, and working groups engaged in other assessment activities that support our baccalaureate learning outcomes. Evidence of exemplars of this work across the spectrum—from critical preliminary discussions to development of rubrics—was provided to ELARC.

College of Arts and Communication

- Four inter-campus teams (each having a member from the College) participated in the 2013 LEAP workshop. Other College teams completed their LEAP-related work from the previous year.
- Regular training sessions were held throughout the 2012-2013 academic year with Communication Department faculty and staff to help them complete assessment plans for the emphases in the department.
- Several meetings were held with the Chair of the Department of Art and Design to help the department organize the work they will be engaged in associated with their upcoming national accreditation and campus audit and review reports.
- The Department of Art and Design is working on changing how they assess events such as student-juried shows to link these activities with their departmental assessment of student learning.
- Preliminary conversations were held with Student Affairs staff to see how the College could work with them in examining students' oral communication competencies outside the classroom, potentially using the Speaking Well Rubric.
- Preliminary conversations are in the works to see how the College could work with the College of Business and Economics to help them examine their students' oral communication competencies.
- Individuals from the College participated in campus-wide initiatives associated with E-Portfolios and developing an Intercultural Awareness/Diversity rubric.
- Two individuals from the College participated in the Campus team that went to Baltimore, MD to discuss general education learning on campus in May/June 2012.
- A campus-wide General Education Mini-Summit was held in May 2013, with several individuals from the College in attendance.
- The Media Arts and Game Development (MAGD) program continues to improve its assessment practices in general, and specifically on how it uses external reviewers during the MAGD Expo event, a juried show of interactive entertainment, 3D, 2D, aural, virtual and animated creative work held annually in the Young Auditorium. Since 2012 when they started collecting assessment data at the Expo, they have worked to revamp how they assess these student artifacts. They are also working on their introductory and capstone courses, and will hopefully be able to glean additional insights into what students in the program are learning.

College of Business and Economics

- The Department of Accounting is moving towards accounting specific accreditation from AACSB. Part of the process involves improving assessment practices at the undergraduate level. The department has begun the process of developing a capstone exit exam for all accounting majors.
- The CoBE Undergraduate Curriculum Committee changed the international requirement to tighten content areas.
- CoBE offers many Supplemental Instruction sections in the gateway quantitative courses such as business statistics and accounting. Faculty are also expanding their use of online homework offerings to give students additional practice in working problems.

College of Education and Professional Studies

- The CoEPS began implementing edTPA, a comprehensive and intensive system of assessing student achievement of student learning outcomes in all programs that grant teaching licenses.
- Department of Educational Foundations: M. Jonas and six COEPS students presented at the April 2014 AAC&U conference on LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes and High Impact Practices.
- The CoEPS created a non-instructional program coordinator license.

- The Department of Educational Foundations is beginning lunchtime discussions centered around the assessment of student learning at multiple levels of cognition, but specifically focusing on assessing higher-order thinking in a variety of flexible and less time-consuming ways.
- The Department of Educational Foundations revised student course evaluation questions to improve the quality of information obtained, including specific questions related to critical thinking.
- To maximize the opportunities to impact the development of critical thinking in students, members of the Department of Educational Foundations are restructuring elementary and secondary licensing plans, with a specific focus on the development of two courses that will target the development of critical thinking during field experiences.
- The Future Teacher Program (FTP) accomplishes LEAP related learning outcomes through the intentional integration of high impact activities and student learning, self-reflection, and skill building. In 2013, the Office of Recruitment and Retention reviewed each strand of programming and assessed alignment with the LEAP ELOs. This assessment showed the most meaningful student learning is related to personal and social responsibility, intercultural knowledge and competence, critical and creative thinking, oral communication, and teamwork and problem solving.
- All leadership courses require Cadets and students to develop and present a myriad of oral presentations and oral/written briefings and papers on different course-related subjects. The department utilizes the Public Speaking & Oral/Written Presentation Skills rubrics. While faculty often use a rubric that has been developed, they are also allowed to modify as needed.
- Written communication skills were assessed as a part of the DQP project by Special Education.
- Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders assesses written and oral communication in a number of classes based on specific assignments.
- Communication Sciences and Disorders and Library personnel continue their collaboration to support students' development of information literacy, writing, and content knowledge in upper level Communication Sciences courses.
- Department of Educational Foundations: Written and oral communication, critical thinking, problem solving, inquiry and analysis, teamwork, and information literacy skills are integrated into all LIBMEDIA courses, and were further emphasized in the curriculum revision done through the IMLS grant. The LIBMEDIA program also has a practicum experience as a capstone in the initial level program. It requires students to synthesize and practice skills of the program in two real-world settings.
- Department of Curriculum and Instruction: Reading 361 and 461 students required to synthesize learning into projects that are shared with the community
- Department of Curriculum and Instruction and Department of Special Education: Early Childhood Students are engaged in service learning projects both in the US and Ecuador
- The mandatory capstone course of the OESH program (now part of CoBE), SAFETY 481 – Analysis & Design for Safety in Industrial Operations, offers students opportunities to integrate and apply the knowledge they acquired in their OESH course work.

College of Letters and Sciences

- Biological Sciences: 1) A team of instructors created and piloted an embedded test of critical thinking and writing that can be administered at several points across the curriculum. 2) Faculty voted to add a prerequisite of completion of MATH 141 with C or better for the gateway major courses (BIOLOGY 141, 142, & 251); previously, MATH 141 is a co-requisite. This decision was made based on assessment data showing a strong correlation between proficiency in MATH 141 and success in STEM fields.
- Chemistry: The Chemistry Department has taken several steps to enhance writing and oral communication skills in response to feedback from their Advisory Board and the ACS re-accreditation process. This includes revising the CHEM 104 lab and enhancing instruction and assessment of these skills in CHEM 470 and 471.
- History: The department created and implemented a new required course for majors: HISTRY 399 – Research Methods, which will provide students with a stronger base of skills in inquiry, information literacy, and oral presentation before students take the capstone HISTRY 499 course, which has been renamed Senior Writing Seminar. These changes were made in response to data collected from the recent writing assessments and feedback from students.

- Languages and Literatures/English: 1) The department created SLOs aligned with the ELOs for all major tracks and levels, along with rubrics for assessing embedded assignments. A curriculum mapping process led the department to restructure key elements of the curriculum in order to ensure a logical progression of skill and knowledge development. 2) In response to assessment data about student writing in Freshman English, the coordinator has organized a regular lunchtime workshop series for instructors that targets key instructional strategies.
- Languages and Literatures/Foreign Languages: In response to the recent assessment of majors' writing skills in the major (target language), the Spanish instructors are developing an upper-level writing course.
- Political Science: As part of an ongoing effort to assess and improve writing in the major, the department recently revised its writing guidelines and is adopting the WM rubric as a tool for assessing writing across the political science curriculum. The department is also actively reviewing the results from two administrations of the Civic Knowledge and Engagement assessment.
- Psychology: 1) A departmental working group is exploring ways to strength critical thinking skills as a follow-up to recent assessments; the group is particularly examining transferability issues. 2) A new course, PSYCH 101 – was created as a result of the DQP focus groups and to ensure basic information literacy skills early in students' programs. 3) The two LEAP teams are focusing on enhancing writing and information literacy skills in grad students and identification with the major among undergraduates.
- Sociology, Criminology and Anthropology: The departmental goal to strengthen the quantitative literacy skills of majors moved forward by offering the new requirement, Basic Social Statistics, for the first time in spring 2013. The need for this course was uncovered through assessment of quantitative skills in the Research Methods course. In addition, the department is now assessing all the intellectual and practical skills as well as personal and social responsible and synthesis/integration through assessments in SOCIOLGY 473, 476, and 493, as well as through exit exams for both Sociology and Criminology majors.
- Women's and Gender Studies: The department's assessment of the Advanced Seminar portfolios in 2011-12 indicated that while the students demonstrated competent critical thinking and writing skills, there was room for improvement in the area of research and analytical skills. As a result, the Advanced Seminar was revised to include a much more extensive and carefully designed research project.
- The Center for Global Education is considering adopting an assessment tool such as the Intercultural Development Inventory or the Global Perspectives Inventory to measure the impact of study abroad on students' **intercultural competence and global learning**. Such a tool could also conceivably be used to measure outcomes in the general education program (Global Perspectives/Historical Perspectives) or in majors such as International Studies, International Business and International Journalism.
- The LEAP team "Statistical Hipsters" (Chris Chapp, Political Science; David Havas, Psychology; Bill Mickelson, Math; Leda Nath and Charles Zhang, Sociology, Criminology and Anthropology) collaborated to create a common assignment for research methods courses that required students to attend the Undergraduate Research Day and critically evaluate one of the projects on display. In the process, the research methods students were applying their own **quantitative, critical thinking, problem-solving, and inquiry** skills outside the classroom. The team is continuing its collaborative work and plans to use the common assignment to generate useful assessment data about students' skills across the curriculum.

Student Affairs

Career and Leadership Development, Residence Life, Center for Students with Disabilities and Recreation Sports and Facilities undertook significant new assessment projects.

- In the Residence Life survey of 115 former RA's:
 - 54% reported that the position had a positive impact on their development of communication skills.
 - RA's, 71% reported that employment had a positive impact on the development of social competence and teamwork skills.
 - 53% reported that the position had a positive impact on their appreciation and understanding of diversity and 40% reported a positive impact on their ability to interact cross-culturally.
- Career and Leadership Development sought to better understand the learning that student leaders acquire through participation in department initiatives. 83 students in leadership positions participated in regular interview "reflection" opportunities provided by staff and an end-of-year survey. Student learning themes identified were confidence and self-efficacy, inclusive excellence and interactional diversity, developing

human relationship skills, developing practical skills, and integrative learning.

- Recreation Sports and Facilities surveyed 252 former employees to understand career and life benefits of student employment. Areas of greatest personal growth identified were the development of social competence, teamwork, and leadership; development of conflict resolution and dealing with others; and development of self-discipline.
- During the spring of 2013, the Center for Students with Disabilities (CSD) facilitated focus groups and one-on-one interviews with students who participated in CSD's summer transition programs. The goal was to understand factors that contributed to students' thriving in college. 32 students participated. The six success themes uncovered included resiliency, engaged learning, positive perspective, acceptance and diverse citizenship, social connections and real world connection (i.e. seeing education as linked to future job).

Other

- The ELARC Committee contributed to the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee (SPBC) effort for campus. Specifically, ELARC submitted a report to address Goal #3 of the SPBC Strategic Goals: *Develop an institutional approach to consider assessment data across campus units including strategies to evaluate the data, improve teaching and learning, set curricular and co-curricular goals and methods, and communicate the findings to the campus community.*
- Campus was invited to submit an application for the ACE/Fidelity Investments Award for Institutional Transformation (included information about campus LEAP workshops)
- The campus Senior Outcomes Assessment Survey was revised to align items with LEAP ELOs.
- SGSCE led a one-day professional development workshop for participating UW-Whitewater dual enrollment high school instructors—a session that included introductions to LEAP and campus initiatives that support it (including “Writing Matters” and “Speaking Well”).