ESSENTIAL LEARNING & ASSESSMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
2017-2018 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 fifth year that ELARC has reviewed assessment summaries from across campus. This year's report provides an evaluation of progress toward accomplishing the Recommended Actions that, with minor revisions, have guided the Committee's work since its inception. Revised recommendations are provided for upcoming years (2017-2019).

During the academic years 2015-16 and 2016-17, ELARC received and reviewed assessment summaries from:

        Andersen Library
        Audit & Review Committee (of programs reviewed during 2013-2014 and 2014-2015)
        College of Arts & Communication
        College of Business & Economics
        College of Education & Professional Studies
        College of Letters & Sciences
        General Education Review Committee
        Office of Academic Assessment
        Office of Enrollment & Retention
        Office of Institutional Research & Planning
        Office of Multicultural Affairs & Student Success

Data on Student Learning

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

- As in previous years, 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.

- A summary of Audit and Review self-studies submitted during a three-year period showed that across the 27 undergraduate programs reviewed, every ELO was assessed to at least some degree. However, some ELOs (e.g., civic knowledge & engagement, quantitative literacy, information literacy) are assessed by fewer academic programs than other ELOs. Across all years, most programs engaged in some form of direct assessment and included at least a brief interpretation of the data. Far fewer programs discussed how the data were used to impact the program or instruction.

- Overall performance was judged to be moderate to strong but programs also identified relative weaknesses in several ELOs, including specific aspects of: Critical thinking (using evidence, drawing conclusions, providing sufficient justification); writing (use of proper terms and structure, analysis, interpretation, thesis/focus); quantitative literacy (conclusion, interpretation, communication); and integrative learning (understanding connections, recognizing bias). As noted above, more data are needed to reach conclusions about campus-level achievement of several ELOs.

- Units report a wide variety of assessment activities, as well as continuing support for assessment projects from colleges and from the university.

Appendix B provides brief descriptions of assessment results that are related to our campus baccalaureate learning outcomes, culled from reports received by ELARC during 2015-16 and 2016-17 years. 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 have emerged from the data as summarized in the Committee's 2015 report.

Evaluation of Progress on Recommended Actions

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.*

ELARC is happy to conclude that this recommendation has largely been accomplished. As noted in our 2015 report, 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. 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. Assessment-related discussions have become commonplace at meetings within colleges, departments, and committees. Evidence to support this conclusion includes:

- Faculty include a variety of assessment-related activities in their tenure and promotion portfolios, most often as an option to meet service requirements. Depending on the nature of the activities, they may be included as scholarship of teaching.
- All four academic colleges acknowledge and reward faculty and staff assessment activities through small grants. In addition, assessment awards are offered in one college, and the University Assessment Committee will offer a grant opportunity to support projects on assessment of student learning (to be launched Spring 2018; total of $6000 available).
- The annual Assessment Day continues to provide a way to celebrate assessment activities and share information. Some colleges also hold an Assessment Fair to highlight assessment activities and promote collaboration within their colleges.
- All 4 academic colleges and most academic programs have established assessment committees to help ensure ongoing and effective assessment of student learning within their units.
- The General Education program has prioritized assessment in recent years, and completed a major revision of its GenEd learning outcomes (GELOs) and its assessment processes. This effort involved numerous faculty and staff across multiple departments in developing and implementing signature assignments to ensure thorough and efficient assessment of this program, which impacts all undergraduates. A major effort is also underway to recertify all elective courses in the program.
- In the Division of Student Affairs, assessment is encouraged at the departmental level, and units conduct both annual assessment projects and specialized assessment studies.
- Feedback from the Audit & Review Committee indicates that the majority of academic programs have made good progress in establishing and implementing assessment plans.
- More detailed evidence is included in previous years' final reports and the individual reports to ELARC, available at https://www.uww.edu/assessment/elarc.

ELARC encourages campus to continue these and other practices that have established a positive culture of assessment on our campus. For example, campus might host a series of brownbag sessions on topics related to the new recommendations from this report and sponsor external speakers to provide training in certain assessment methods and to assess specific ELOs.

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**.*

ELARC is happy to conclude that this recommendation has also largely been accomplished. Units across campus allocate significant funding, staffing and time to support assessment of student learning. Evidence to support this conclusion includes:

- The University continues to support an Office of Academic Assessment and an Office of Institutional Research & Planning, and colleges provide support for assessment-related staffing.

- There has been significant investment in campus-level assessment projects to assess student learning (e.g., the Degree Qualifications Profile project; the VSA CAAP assessment project). Two colleges also provide significant investment in assessment to address accreditation and licensing requirements (CoBE's use of ACT's HEIghten assessments; CoEPS's use of TaskStream for EdTPA licensing requirements).
- The University provides grants and stipends to faculty and staff for a variety of projects related to student learning assessment including: Conducting assessment projects and participating in rubric development and scoring workshops, GenEd assessment initiatives, and LEAP Workshops (several LEAP teams have supported the assessment of ELOs such as information literacy, critical thinking, diversity learning).
- As noted above, all four colleges provide funding to support faculty/staff assessment projects. The investment becomes significant as these programs continue across years (totaling more than $25,000 in one college since 2013).
- The University regularly funds faculty and staff attendance at assessment-related conferences to support continued development of expertise. Some colleges also support attendance at college-related assessment conferences.
- Andersen Library supported the development of information literacy tutorial modules with built-in assessments, designed to be easily embedded within D2L modules.
- More detailed evidence is included in previous years' final reports and the individual reports to ELARC, available at https://www.uww.edu/assessment/elarc.

While this recommendation will not be included in future ELARC reports, the Committee strongly encourages institutional decision-makers to continue their support of informative and useful assessment of student learning. In particular, resources (both time and money) to enable faculty to carefully analyze data, work on "closing the loop," and share results should be continued.

Recommendation #3
*Campus should develop rubrics that **__define learning__** and the progression of learning for the essential learning outcomes. The campus should continue the good work that has been done in this area, 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.*

Significant progress has been made in this area but more work is needed to fully accomplish this recommendation (see Appendix B and the individual reports to ELARC for details). In particular, the Writing Matters, Speaking Well, and Critical Thinking rubrics are used/adapted for use in numerous courses and programs across campus, but many instructors and programs do not use campus rubrics. Instead, programs use a variety of different methods to score student performance, which makes it challenging to summarize data across programs. Programs also emphasize different ELOs at different points in their assessment plans, with some ELOs assessed by only a few programs. This variety of assessment methods and schedules results in a lack of data on which to base campus-level conclusions.

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.*

Added in 2015, this is the newest ELARC recommendation and will be continued. Overall, campus units do not systematically collect and evaluate data to track individual student performance over time. Several programs are beginning or planning to track student progress, but few have implemented these plans or have data recorded in a way that allows analysis of change over time.

To fully address this recommendation, campus should identify key points in students' academic career and design ways to assess students at those points. The current campus ePortfolio initiative might provide a way to collect and store data. Tracking students over time should be included as part of the campus assessment plan, and professional development resources should be provided to assist units in collecting, analyzing, and interpreting change data.

NEW ELARC Committee Recommendations for 2017-2019

Based on the data reviewed over the past five years, ELARC has developed a revised set of recommendations to be used by campus units as they plan and carry out their assessments of student learning.

Recommendation #1

The ELOs were adopted as campus baccalaureate learning outcomes in 2010. Since then, a great deal of data have been collected for some ELOs but very little for others, and a variety of different assessment methods and schedules are used. Campus would benefit from a discussion of priorities and direction going forward. The Committee recommends:

a) A campus discussion to gather feedback about the existing ELOs. A goal should be to identify which ELOs are of highest importance to campus and whether any existing ELOs should be revised or removed from the list.

   The campus discussion should consider less-assessed ELOs. If they are identified as important for campus, campus should define them, develop campus expectations, and develop ways to assess them. The AAC&U VALUE rubrics can be used as guides or starting points.

b) Development of a coordinated campus plan to ensure the ELOs are systematically assessed. The Committee recommends that ELARC collaborate with the General Education Review Committee (GERC) to develop a coordinated schedule for ELO assessment which will ensure that the same ELOs are assessed in GenEd and at capstone levels (within the majors). Campus would benefit from using multiple assignments across

a range of student levels for a given ELO, and the baseline and midpoint data from GE combined with capstone data within the majors can assist in tracking student progress over time.

Recommendation #2

Campus should continue to identify and use rubrics that **<u>define learning</u>** and the progression of learning for the essential learning outcomes. The Committee recommends that campus:
   a) continue to enhance awareness of the five existing UW-Whitewater rubrics and encourage integration of these rubrics into instruction and assessment across the curriculum and co-curriculum. These rubrics should be included in the assessment of HIPs as these efforts begin to address the new campus Strategic Plan; and
   b) investigate existing rubrics that can be used to assess other ELOs. The AAC&U VALUE rubrics can be used as guides or starting points.

Recommendation #3

Based on the emerging themes noted in previous reports, we recommend units develop strategies to **<u>track individual student performance over time</u>**. 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).
   a) Campus should identify key points of time in students' academic careers and design ways to assess students at those points, coordinating with the work of the campus ePortfolio initiative when possible.
   b) Tracking students over time should be included as part of the campus assessment plan.
   c) Professional development resources should be provided to demonstrate models of how this type of assessment can be done, and to help units develop assessment methods and tools to store, analyze and make use of longitudinal data.

Recommendation #4

Increasingly, ELARC reports have noted the potential usefulness of a common tool to serve as a central repository for data as well as enable efficient and systematic data collection, communication, and reporting. The Committee recommends an **<u>exploration of the need for a campus-wide electronic assessment management system</u>**, to include a study of campus needs and an exploration of potential options, and culminating in recommendations to campus.

Instructions for future reports:

For 2017-2018, only two reports will be reviewed. These two units are 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.

February 1, 2018:   Student Affairs
March 1, 2018:   Student Diversity, Engagement & Success

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. 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 last 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 (2015-2017):

Joan Littlefield Cook (Chair)   Director of Academic Assessment
Susan Elrod   Provost
Greg Cook   Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Brent Bilodeau   Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
Liz Hachten   Coordinator, General Education
Barbara Bren   Andersen Library
Jane Ferencz/Deborah Wilk   College of Arts & Communication

Ahmad Karim   College of Business and Economics
Rowand Robinson/Katy Casey   College of Education and Professional Studies
Frank Goza   College of Letters and Sciences
Lauren Smith   Graduate Studies & Continuing Education
Linda Yu/Dale Splinter   Audit and Review Committee
Beth Olson   GenEd Review Committee
Tammy French/Katy Casey   University Assessment Committee
Lynsey Schwabrow   Institutional Research & Planning
Vacant   Academic Development Committee
Denise Ehren/Kim Apel   University Staff Council
Amanda Howell   Academic Staff Assembly
Nick Stahl   Whitewater Student Government

Document last revised January 16, 2018.

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.

LEAP

APPENDIX B
Summary Table
Assessment Conclusions Related to Essential Learning Outcomes

To help organize assessment conclusions from around campus, ELARC members reviewed the reports received this year for ELARC 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 activities and to provide a general idea about the areas where we have the most and least assessment activity (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: AA= Office of Academic Assessment
AL = Andersen Library Report
A&R = Audit & Review Report (of programs reviewed during 2013-2014 and 2014-2015)
A&C = College of Arts & Communication Report
CoBE=College of Business & Economics
CoEPS=College of Education & Professional Studies
L&S = College of Letters & Sciences Report
E&R = Enrollment & Retention Report
GERC = General Education Review Committee
IRP=Office of Institutional Research & Planning
MASS=Office of Multicultural Affairs & Student Planning

AAC&U LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes	Brief description of conclusion	Report, p. #
Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World *Focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring*		
Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts	The History Department administered the Praxis II exam to over 100 BSE students. Their average score was 91%.	L&S, p. 21.
	COEPS: Teacher candidates in secondary programs (i.e., mathematics, science, social studies, language, art) completed the Praxis II exam in their respective areas of study. The pass rates on these exams were 100%, with exception of social studies which was 80%	COEPS, pgs. 34-36
	GERC: **Appreciation of the Fine and Performing Arts:** The majority of student work on the WOTA signature assignment was rated as proficient or exceptional, although Fall averages (55%) were significantly lower than in Spring semester 2015 (84%) . Scorers noted pervasive problems with the students' ability to analyze (as opposed to merely describe) works of art.	GERC p. 9
	A&R: 9 (56%) assessed this ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong; 2 programs reported lower means on exit exams (55 to 67% correct)	A&R p. 4
		Assessment, pg. 5,8

	Assessment: Across 2 years, items pertaining to knowledge of and appreciation their major, and knowledge that will be helpful in life were among the highest rated on the Senior Outcomes Assessment Survey (SOAS) (4.31 & 4.41; 4.39 & 4.34 out of 5).	

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

Inquiry & analysis	A & C: Art & Design students with a GPA below 3.3 in Core Foundation Courses participate in the **Foundations Portfolio Review**, which assesses their work in 3 Foundations courses. Additionally, students meet with the faculty committee and are assessed on their ability to articulate their knowledge of the concepts learned in the Core courses. This review is Pass/Fail. Results for FA 2013-SP 2016 (fewer students were required to participate after 2013-14): 2013-2014: 39 participants 100% pass 2014-2015: 16 participants 90% pass 2015-2016: 15 participants 80% pass A&R: 8 (50%) assessed this ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong. COEPS: Preliminary results from the alumni survey (n= 210) during the 2015-16 academic year found, 62% of COEPS alumni believe their education contributed "quite a bit," or "very much" to their skills associated with the Inquiry and Analysis ELO.	A & C Appendix A, p. 1 A&R p. 4 COEPS p. 9
Critical thinking	Assessment of English 271 papers during January 2014, using a modified version of the Writing Matters rubric showed that on a scale of (1=developing, 3= competent, and 5= accomplished), students scored 2.6 in argument construction. Student papers from four Film Studies courses were assessed during May 2015, using a Film Studies rubric. Results from 2014 were compared to those of 2015 and indicated that, on average, students recorded a 0.3 improvement in critical interpretation and written communication. GERC: Preliminary results from a recent pilot of the new Critical Thinking Rubric showed growth between first year English students and junior-level WOI students and singled out evaluation and explanation as two dimensions that students struggled with most. GERC: According to results from the NSSE, seniors at UW-Whitewater report an overall higher degree of engagement in critical thinking in their courses than first-year students; both groups of students generally perceive their UWW experience as positively contributing to their development of critical thinking skills. However, UW-W first-year students tend to	L&S, p. 20. L&S, p. 20. GERC p. 10 GERC p. 11

	report less engagement with higher order thinking in their courses than students at peer institutions. A&R: 10 (63%) assessed the critical and/or creative thinking ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong; Weaknesses were identified in using evidence, drawing conclusions, insufficient justification COEPS: Preliminary results from the alumni survey (n= 210) during the 2015-16 academic year found, 68% of COEPS alumni believe their education contributed "quite a bit," or "very much" to their skills associated with the Critical Thinking ELO. CoBE: AOL scores in FNBSLW 344 receiving "very good" and "good" classifications using 2 traits to measure critical thinking in 2015 are;86% and 94%. Assessment: Voluntary System of Accountability analyses of CAAP scores for critical thinking showed a gain from freshman to senior year at UWW of 0.10 standard deviations, categorized as a gain that is "the same as what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities."	A&R p. 4 COEPS p. 9 CoBE, Appendix: AOL Forms and Results: BBA AOL Assessment, pg. 4
Creative thinking	Tracked in multiple departments in multiple ways. Unfortunately, the results of this tracking are not currently available. A & C: Art & Design students who wish to earn a BFA degree must pass several reviews of their work (mandated by NASAD). Students are assessed on Design/Composition, Ideas and Personal Expression, and Technical Facility. Students receive a rubric, as well as a written critique. This review is Pass/Fail. Results for FA 2013-SP 2016 **BFA Entry Review**: 2013-2014: 12 participants 68% pass 2014-2015 11 participants 94% pass 2015-2016 8 participants 63% pass Results for FA 2013-SP 2016 **BFA Junior Review**: 2013-2014: 12 participants 85.5% pass 2014-2015 18 participants 72% pass 2015-2016 16 participants 63% pass A&R: 10 (63%) assessed the critical and/or creative thinking ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong; Weaknesses were identified in using evidence, drawing conclusions, insufficient justification. COEPS: Preliminary results from the alumni survey (n= 210) during the 2015-16 academic year found, 54% of COEPS alumni believe their education contributed "quite a bit," or	L&S, p. 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21 & 22. A & C Appendix A, p. 1 A&R p. 4 COEPS p. 9

	"very much" to their skills associated with the Creative Thinking ELO.	
Problem solving	Tracked in multiple departments in multiple ways. Unfortunately, the results of this tracking are not currently available.	L&S, p. 8 and 9.
	A&R: 5 (31%) assessed the teamwork & problem solving ELO. Overall performance was strong; 1 program noted student difficulties in identifying problem.	A&R p. 4
	COEPS: Preliminary results from the alumni survey (n= 210) during the 2015-16 academic year found, 63% of COEPS alumni believe their education contributed "quite a bit," or "very much" to their skills associated with the Problem Solving ELO.	COEPS p. 9
	CoBE: 2 traits are used to measure problem solving in FNBSLW344 in Fall 2016. 59% and 74% students were rated as "very good" and "good".	CoBE, Appendix Forms: BBA AOL
Written communication	Senior exit survey administered in Spring 2015 indicated that 88% and 81% of English major respondents asserted their skills at using textual evidence to develop thesis-driven interpretations and extended arguments, respectively.	L&S, p. 20.
	The History Department examined longitudinal results that contrasted writing improvements across the HIST 200-499 sequence with those of the HIST 200-399-499 sequence. Results of this comparison revealed that students performed substantially better when including 399 in their course work as average improvements increased from 9% to of 26%.	L&S, p. 21.
	A&C, Communication: Advertising emphasis assessed their written communication SLO, using the Magazine Advertisement assignment from JOURNALISM 320 (Copywriting and Layout). Students were assessed using a 3-point rubric. Results/Averages (FA 2014-# of students and further data not provided): • Message: 2 • Strategy: 1.85 • Persuasion: 2.2 • Language: 1.825 • Design: 1.825 • Combined: 1.94	A&C, p. 12
	GERC: • Over a two-year period from 2013-2015, the First Year English program assessed student writing from ENGLISH 102, ENGLISH 101, and ENGLISH 090 using the signature assignments for each course. A	GERC p. 12

	majority of ENGLISH 102 research papers fell into the *developing* category (compared to *accomplished* or *competent*). Analysis of ENGLISH 101 papers noted students were generally competent in structure but struggled with underdeveloped analyses and with synthesis itself. Early-semester and late-semester ENGLISH 090 papers revealed considerable growth on each of the five dimensions on the scoring rubric. Both ENGLISH 101 raters and ENGLISH 090 raters found students often struggled with reading comprehension. These assessments resulted in recommendations for changes in pedagogy and assignments (including scaffolding), as well as refinements in assessment process.	GERC p. 13
	• On the NSSE survey, UW-W students perceive themselves as improving in their written and oral communication skills as they move through college	
	• Results from NSSE surveys indicate that UW-W first-year students generally report similar levels of engagement in writing activities when compared to peers at other institutions. However, seniors fall short in some key areas. And students at all levels report significantly less disciplinary writing and less experience with best practices in writing instruction.	GERC p. 14
	A&R: 10 (63%) assessed the written & oral communication ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong. One program identified weaknesses in using proper terms, report structure; 1 in analysis, interpretation, thesis/focus.	A&R p. 4
	CoBE: HR MGMT 478 CAAP project average 3.90 which is higher than campus average.	CoBE, Appendix BBA
	MASS: 11% increase in literacy scores on Reading for Success pre/post tests before to after student participation in Summer Academic Camps in Summer 2016	MAAS, pg. 5
	MASS: 22% increase in average Verbal GRE scores, pre/post tests before to after student participation in McNair Program, Summer 2016 cohort	MASS, pg 6
	Enrollment & Retention: First year students who took the New Student Seminar Satisfaction Survey reported that NSS allowed them to "use written communication to articulate my ideas and viewpoints" (average scores of 3.83 and 3.97 out of 5 in 2014 and 2015, respectively).	Enrollment & Retention, pg. 3
	Assessment: Voluntary System of Accountability analyses of CAAP scores for writing showed a gain from freshman to senior year at UWW of -0.93 standard deviations, categorized as a gain that is "the same as what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities."	Assessment, pg. 4, 10
Oral communication	A&R: 10 (63%) assessed the written & oral communication ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong. One	A&R p. 4

	program identified weaknesses in using proper terms, report structure; 1 in analysis, interpretation, thesis/focus.	
	Enrollment & Retention: First year students who took the New Student Seminar Satisfaction Survey reported that NSS allowed them to "use verbal communication to articulate ideas and viewpoints" (average scores of 3.94 and 4.03 out of 5 in 2014 and 2015, respectively).	Enrollment & Retention, pg. 3
Quantitative literacy	In an effort to improve the quantitative literacy of Psychology majors, more advanced statistics course – Psych 416 Advanced and Multivariate Statistics – was offered for the first time in fall 2014. Assessment results will be forthcoming.	L&S, p. 21
	A & C, Communication: Advertising emphasis assessed quantitative literacy in JOURNALISM 322 (Media Buying and Planning). Test questions included problems using math formulas for determining reach, frequency, GRPs, CPM, CPP, and Projected Audience Number. Results (SP 2013-FA 2014-4 semesters, 133 students): • Reach: 82.27% • Frequency: 84.57% • GRPs: 80.35% • CPM: 76.02% • CPP: 75.67% • Proj Aud #: 62.2 One result of this assessment was the creation of a tutorial (on D2L) to review math skills, including small exercises to give practice in using formulas.	A&C, p. 12
	GERC: • Results from the MATH 141 signature assignment indicate that even at the conclusion of the course, many students are still struggling to apply algebraic skills to solve real world problems. • An assessment of GENED 130 students' skills in reading and interpreting graphs indicated that students struggled to explain the significance of quantitative data or use the data to make an argument. • NSSE data reveals that substantial numbers of UW-W students may have limited engagement with quantitative reasoning tasks across the curriculum and many students are ambivalent about their overall proficiency in this area.	GERC p. 17 GERC p. 19
	A&R: 2 (13%) assessed this ELO. Overall performance was strong. One program identified weaknesses in conclusion, interpretation, & communication	A&R p. 4
	CoBE: 2 traits are analyzed in AOL tests to measure quantitative literacy in Econ 202. 66% and 62% were considered "very good" and "good".	CoBE, Appendix: BBA AOL Forms

	MASS: 12% and 16% increase in Math scores on CAP II and CAP III pre/post tests, before to after student participation in Summer Academic Camps in Summer 2016	MASS, pg 5
	MASS: 9.75% increase in average Quantitative GRE scores, pre/post tests before to after student participation in McNair Program, Summer 2016 cohort	MASS, pg. 6
Information literacy	Three sets of online information literacy tutorial modules collect assessment data:	
	1. English 102 (basic skills) – Data suggests information literacy instruction improves students' information literacy skills (average scores improved 12.3% from pre- to post- across all items and modules taken by students in four English 102 sections during Spring 2015), but additional attention is needed in some areas, *e.g.*, plagiarism, search tips, and annotated bibliographies.	AL, p. 4 and Appendix A
	2. Research Apprentice training (advanced skills) – In Fall 2014, 50 or more of 65 students achieved 100% on graded activities in two modules (module 1: stating research questions, identifying keywords, understanding peer review; module 2: using Endnote and identifying appropriate subject databases). However, responses on the third module's activities were variable, with only 33 students achieving 100% accuracy in identifying correct citations and only 26 students more than 70% correct when constructing APA style citations.	AL, Appendix B
	3. BEINDP 101 for new business students (freshmen and sophomores) – In Fall 2015, average quiz scores of 123 students in 3 sections ranged from 46.22%-78.55% on assessments in seven modules, with lowest average scores in "Finding Company Profiles" (46.22%) "APA Citations" (56.25%) and "Finding Information on Non-Profit Organizations" (59.36%). The highest average quiz score was in "Searching for Articles" (78.55%).	AL, Appendix C
	Longitudinal assessment data collected in Spring 2014 and 2015: English 102 students tested pre- and post- library instruction: 105 students completed both. Reassessing those students in upper level courses has not yet begun. The Spring 2015 was modified to add two items related to ethical use of information. Post-library instruction responses on these items showed that only 10% of 107 students incorrectly identified writing "a condensed form of an author's thesis" as ethical use of others' work, but 27% incorrectly identified a proper citation to avoid plagiarizing an excerpted text.	AL, Appendix D
	The COMDIS ongoing investigation using scaffolded assignments (semester 1 assignment: annotated bibliography, semester 2 assignment: literature review) and continuously modified instructional techniques resulted in significantly higher scores from 2012 to 2013 on annotations and citations, based on the Library Research Matters rubric and CSD Writing Matters rubric, as well as improvements in overall understanding of empirical research in the field. However, it is not clearly demonstrated that student relate author information to source selection.	AL, p. 3, and Appendix E

	GERC: • An assessment of the information literacy skills of ENGLISH 102 students administered by Andersen Library before and after the completion of online tutorials showed overall gains in most areas, but also indicated that students need more instruction and practice in some basic skills. • Bibliographies of students in ENGLISH 102 were given an average rating of 2.86/4.00 on a pilot testing of the Library's Research Matters Rubric as compared to 3.24/4.00 for research papers from 300-level classes and 3.18/4.00 for 400-level research papers.	GERC p. 16
	A&R: 3 (19%) assessed this ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong.	A&R p. 4
	CoBE: 2 traits are tested to measure information literacy in ITSCM 306. 77% and 95% student scores were considered "good" and "very good" in 2016 AOL.	CoBE, Appendix BBA AOL forms
Teamwork	A&R: 5 (31%) assessed the teamwork & problem solving ELO. Overall performance was strong; 1 program noted student difficulties in identifying problem.	A&R p. 4
Personal and Social Responsibility *Anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges*		
Civic knowledge & engagement (local & global)	Assessment of student papers collected from four Film Studies courses using a Film Studies rubric contrasted 2014 results with those from 2015. They indicated an average improvement of 0.5 in civic critical interpretation and communication.	L&S, p. 21
	A&R: 1 (6%) assessed this ELO. Program reported that performance level was "okay."	A&R p. 4
	COEPS: Preliminary results from the alumni survey (n= 210) during the 2015-16 academic year found, 42% of COEPS alumni believe their education contributed "quite a bit," or "very much" to their skills associated with the Civic Engagement ELO.	COEPS p. 9
	Enrollment & Retention: First year students who took the New Student Seminar Satisfaction Survey reported that NSS helped them "understand the importance of participating in the University community" (average scores of 3.94 and 4.02 out of 5 in 2014 and 2015, respectively).	Enrollment & Retention, pg. 2
	Assessment: Across 2 years, items pertaining to knowledge of the role of governments at local and global levels were the	Assessment, pg.7, 8

	lowest rated ELO-related items on the Senior Outcomes Assessment Survey (SOAS) (3.75 and 3.59 out of 5).	
Intercultural knowledge & competence	A senior exit survey administered in Spring 2015 to English Education majors showed that the mean score for analyzing literary trends representing diverse and global traditions, culture, and histories was 4.00, while results from the same survey for English Literature majors were slightly higher, at 4.33.	L&S, p. 21
	GERC: In a 2014 survey of GENED 130 students, large majorities reported improving their understanding of diversity issues and had improved their ability to articulate diverse perspectives.	GERC p.22
	GERC: NSSE survey results indicate that many UW-W students report infrequent engagement with diverse perspectives in the classroom and just over half feel that their university experience is helping them become a more informed and active citizen.	GERC p. 22
	A&R: 5 (31%) assessed this ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong. All were self-report measures.	A&R p. 4
	COEPS: Preliminary results from the alumni survey (n= 210) during the 2015-16 academic year found, 46% of COEPS alumni believe their education contributed "quite a bit," or "very much" to their skills associated with the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence ELO.	COEPS p. 9
	CoBE: 2 traits are measured to assess this in Marketing 311 and 82% scored as "VG" and "G".	CoBE, Appendix BBA AOL
Ethical reasoning & action	GERC: Library assessments of ENGLISH 102 students show progress in their understanding about the ethical use of information sources.	GERC p. 21
	Results from the NSSE survey appear to show a decline since 2011 in the percentage of first-year students and seniors who report that their experience at UW-W has positively contributed to the development of a personal value system.	
	A&R: 5 (31%) assessed this ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong.	A&R p. 4
	COEPS: Preliminary results from the alumni survey (n= 210) during the 2015-16 academic year found, 56% of COEPS alumni believe their education contributed "quite a bit," or "very much" to their skills associated with the Ethical Reasoning ELO.	COEPS p. 9
	CoBE: 2 traits are assessed to measure ethical reasoning and action in Management 301 and 95% and 92% scores were "very good" and "good". 2 traits are assessed in Acct. 249 and VG and G were 81% in both.	CoBE

Foundations & skills for lifelong learning	GERC: • On recent iterations of the NSSE survey, 70-75% of first-year students and seniors reported that they are developing the ability to learn effectively on their own due to their experience at UW-W. • In a recent survey of 634 UW-W students from all four colleges and class levels, close to 50% agreed or strongly agreed that "General Education provides skills and knowledge that will be helpful to me after graduation." On the other hand, just 28% agreed or strongly agreed that "My coursework in General Education helps me succeed in my major."	GERC p. 23
	A&R: 6 (38%) assessed this ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong. One program noted problems with following directions.	A&R p. 4
	COEPS: Preliminary results from the alumni survey (n= 210) during the 2015-16 academic year found, 69% of COEPS alumni believe their education contributed "quite a bit," or "very much" to their skills associated with the Life-long learning ELO.	COEPS p. 9

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

Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies	Students enrolled in the capstone seminar (Political Science 489) were assessed across all multiple criteria using the Writing Matters and the Critical Thinking rubrics. Students scored lower on synthesis (a higher ordered critical thinking skill) than they did in the areas of analysis, evaluation and explanation.	L&S, p. 22 and Appendix 4.
	A&C, Communication: Public Relations emphasis assesses Freshman students in COMM 202 and again in the capstone (COMM 402) in their senior year. In 2014, more than 200 students completed the assessment. Results showed that students in COMM 402 answered 60% of the items correctly, while students in COMM 202 answered 37% correctly. Further analysis of the data showed some similar weaknesses in several areas, resulting in revisions in the capstone course.	A & C Appendix A, p. 3
	A&C, Beginning in FA 2014 the Music Department began tracking the results of all semester performance juries of music majors, based on rubrics devised by each performance area (instrumental, vocal, and keyboard). Several more cycles are needed to amass meaningful data.	A & C pp. 14-15
	A&C, Senior-level BFA Theatre/Dance Senior Capstone project (a major role in a play, serving as house- or stage manager for a production, or designing scenery, lighting design, costumes, make-up, or sound design for a production). Students are assessed on a 3-point scale (3 is highest).	A & C p. 14

	Results for BFA Senior Capstone review, FA 2012-SP 2014: 2012-2013: 16 participants Average = 2.87 2013-2014 13 participants Average = 2.88	
	A&C, Music Education Students participate in an assessment to measure student preparedness for the new edTPA process. The study tracked Music Education majors in FA2014 and SP 2015 on three tasks (Planning, Teaching, and Assessing Instruction): Mean Scores (3 pt scale), FA 2014 & SP 2015: Task 1: Planning —FA 2014: 2.1; SP 2015: 2.5 Task 2: Teaching—FA 2014: 2.2; SP 2015: 2.3 Task 3: Assessment—FA 2014: 2.0; SP 2015: 2.4	A&C Appendix A p. 9
	A&R: 7 (44%) assessed this ELO. Overall performance was moderate to strong. Two programs noted problems understanding connections and bias.	A&R p. 4
	COEPS: all teacher candidates completed the edTPA capstone assessment during the 2015-16 academic year. The average score and pass rates were above the state and national average.	COEPS p. 82
	COEPS: Preliminary results from the alumni survey (n= 210) during the 2015-16 academic year found, 63% of COEPS alumni believe their education contributed "quite a bit," or "very much" to their skills associated with the Integrative Learning ELO.	COEPS p. 9