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Why Faculty Development?

- Georgia Regents University is the product of a consolidation
What went wrong?

- ASU- All Deans had been trained and charged with ensuring quality SLO assessment
- GHSU- The issue had been addressed by upper level leadership and responsibility assigned
- SLO assessment was seen as “Administrate.”
Information does not flow down hill. It must be intentionally carried by a human being.

-Ray Whiting
The Core of the Problem

- There was no culture of meaningful SLO assessment on either campus
- Both campuses had engaged the wrong people at the wrong levels
- Academic program directors and faculty did not understand why they should care about SLO assessment
A New Plan: Faculty Development

• SLO assessment needed to be an institution-wide responsibility
  • Academic Affairs: Quality
  • Faculty Development: Training
  • Institutional Effectiveness: Process

• We needed to find a way to construct an institutional culture that embraced SLO assessment
A New Plan: Faculty Development

• Training needed to take place at the program and department level
• Trained college level review teams needed to be created
• Project management techniques needed to be applied to this problem:
  • Executive Sponsors
  • University-wide core team
  • Project Leader
  • Project manager
Project Structure

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

Executive Level Sponsors
- Serves as champion for the project and provides high-level direction, authority, and resources for the project. Removes roadblocks.

Project Manager
- Karen Ribble
- Provides process expertise, tracking, and reporting.

Enterprise Project Manager

Functional/Business Unit Leaders
- Provides subject matter expertise and functional ownership and accountability for project results.

Core Team – Functional Team Leaders
- Provides day-to-day leadership for the planning, implementation, and closing of the project. Resolves issues and escalates when required. Manages the individual functional teams.

Functional Teams
- Provide the subject matter expertise and day-to-day planning and implementation for the respective functional area(s). Resolves issues and escalates when required.

Core Team
- Deborah Richardson, Adam Wyatt, Mary Filpus-Luyckx,
  - Student Affairs, IT, Beth Huggins, Karen Aubrey, Paula Dohoney,
  - Melissa Furman, Cliff Gardner, Chris Terry, Barbara Russell,
  - Phil Hanes, Lori Anderson, Andria Thomas, Patricia Cameron

Executive Leadership
- Advisory
  - Deans Council, Provost Cabinet, IE Planning Committee

Supports the sponsor and project leader. Provides high-level direction, input, and possibly decision making.

Project Leadership
- Ray Whiting
  - Project Leader

Working Project Teams

Project Resources
- Critical resources or subject matter experts that can be brought in as needed.

SLO Training/Support
- Deborah Richardson

Academic Enrichment
- Adam Wyatt

Student Affairs
- TBD

General Education
- Chris Terry
Core Team

• Assistant Dean
  – Hull College of Business

• Associate Deans
  – College of Allied Health Sciences
  – Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences
  – College of Dental Medicine
  – College of Education
  – Medical College of Georgia
  – College of Nursing
  – College of Science and Mathematics

• Vice Dean
  – The Graduate School
Success Points

• High-level support, buy-in and promotion from
  – Provost
  – Vice President for Academic & Faculty Affairs
  – Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness
  – Vice President for Student Affairs
• Core Team developed a sense of ownership
• Academic departments started inviting us to come and train all their faculty
Training in Phases

• **Pilot** with “friends”

• **Phase I**
  – “Defining and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes: A Workshop for Program Directors”

• **Phase II**
  – “Assessing SLOs: From Outcomes to Action”

• **Combined Training**
  – “leftovers,” project core team and college review committee members

• **Special Sessions**
  – Business, Sociology, Nursing
Goal of Program Director Training

Assist programs with development of clearly stated learning outcomes and basics of an assessment plan to support a continuous process of quality improvement…

…and we’re here to help!

• Training session(s)
• Individual consultation
GRU program directors have a critical role to play in working with faculty to develop and assess LOs:

- Identify desired learning outcomes for academic programs
- Develop appropriate assessments to document student learning
- Review assessment data to identify areas of possible improvement for student learning
- Implement changes to improve student learning
Goal: Student Learning

- Program goals provide coherence to curriculum; not just a set of courses
- Program goals provide guidance to instructors as they design their courses; inform development of course objectives
- Program goals form foundation for more specific intended student learning outcomes
...and the resultant SLOs in turn

- form the basis of assessment (i.e., determine what we want to assess)
- provide direction for instructional activity
- inform students about intentions of the faculty
Is this a good learning outcome?
Students will explore in depth the literature on an aspect of teaching strategies.

Improved SLO:
Students will be able to complete an in-depth exploration of the literature on effective teaching strategies for active learning.
Measurable Student Learning Outcomes: More Examples

Economics
Students will write a paper that demonstrates their ability to use an appropriate analytic frame to predict the impact of policy proposals on social welfare. (analysis)

English
Students will describe and explain literary and cultural theories of English literature on a final exam. (understanding)
## Group Work:
Make these general outcomes measurable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Measurable</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Measurable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate knowledge of the history of the symphonic, string orchestra, and chamber ensemble repertoire</td>
<td>Recognize a need for lifelong learning and plan for personal and professional growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Georgia Regents University

GRU
1. Each program at a table will identify one program goal for discussion and review.

2. Group will develop a measurable SLO for each program goal.

3. Identify one direct and one indirect assessment strategy for each measurable learning outcome.
Planning for next stage of training: Using Assessment for Improvement

The program faculty will review assessment data and ask:

• Do we see evidence that learning outcomes have been achieved?
• If not, what changes might lead to improvement of student learning?
• If yes, what other learning outcome might we focus on?
PHASE II
Assessing SLOs: From Outcomes to Action

SLO-II Workshop for Program Directors
Facilitated by Deborah Richardson, Ray Whiting, and/or Adam Wyatt
Review

• Programs have developed SLOs
• *Most* have also identified methods of assessing those SLOs
• Now we think about the assessment data and how it can be used.
Purpose of Assessment

• Summative: to make decisions about whether a person or a program has succeeded
• Formative: to provide feedback; diagnostic

Learning Outcome Assessment is **Formative**
Good assessments reflect consideration of...

- Quality (i.e., reliability and validity)
- Cost
  - Time — for students, faculty, program directors
  - Money
- Faculty and student motivation to assign or complete
Kinds of Assessment

• Indirect
  • perceptions of students, employers, instructors

• Direct
  • focused exams
  • performance assessment
We encouraged course-embedded assessments

- an efficient and effective approach
- requires willingness/cooperation of instructors
  - …to do assessment of learning goals that were developed by the program faculty
- *not* asking them to modify how they teach the course
Using Assessment Data

The program faculty must meet and consider all the information gained from assessments of an SLO and:

- Determine degree to which learning outcomes have been achieved
- Identify areas that need improvement
- Identify changes that may improve student learning
- Identify a new outcome if achieve satisfactory performance for a couple of cycles
Identifying Factors that Affect Learning

- Knowing strengths and weaknesses does not necessarily tell you what you need to do to improve student learning
- Need information and hypotheses
  - review available research
  - do research yourself
  - consult with Office of Faculty Development and Teaching Excellence
Summary: What we aim to do as we engage the SLO assessment process

- examine student performance at key points
- identify something we wish students were doing better
- explore factors that influence learning
- do whatever research suggests will improve the learning
- “Look again, but don’t necessarily expect that your actions will result in desired changes” keep trying
No Frills Program Assessment
(Walvoord, 2010)

1. Learning outcomes for each degree (or track)
2. At least two measures of how well students are achieving the goals
   • one direct and one indirect
3. Forum to discuss data and identify action items
## Response of Trainees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Sessions</th>
<th># of Trainees</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Comfort contacting facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All ratings on 7-point scales.
Review Structure

• Electronic Database/System of Record
• Department
• College-level review
• Continual spot check by Academic and Faculty Affairs, Faculty Development, and Institutional Effectiveness
• Peer-to-Peer Summit
Lessons Learned

• **Flexible** in how we did the review
• Regulations of **specialized accreditors**
• Getting everyone in for **training**
• Need for wider **examples**
• Specific colleges thought they already knew
Indications of Culture Change

• Core Team
  – No buy-in at first now has buy-in

• Faculty disengaged  ▲ engaged
  – “always bad timing” to recognition of effort and timing

• Belief in separate cultures  ▲ bridges cultures of institutions

• Formalized committees (P&T)
Success

• Actual assessments will show success of training program
• Peer-to-Peer Summit
Peer-to-Peer Summit

• **Personalities** of each college came through
• Examples of **similar assessments** methods being used to **different degrees of effectiveness**
• Opportunities for **feedback** in friendly, social environment
• Clear **peer-to-peer learning**
What’s Next?

• Addition of
  – Minors without majors
  – Concentrations
  – Certificate programs
What’s Next?

- **Curriculum Mapping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PG 1</th>
<th>PG 2</th>
<th>PG 3</th>
<th>PG 4</th>
<th>PG 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLVL 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLVL 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforced</td>
<td>Reinforced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforced</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforced</td>
<td>Reinforced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLVL 3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforced</td>
<td>Reinforced</td>
<td>Reinforced</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLVL 4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mastered</td>
<td>Mastered</td>
<td>Mastered</td>
<td>Reinforced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s Next?

• Link to academic planning
  – SLOs are not explicitly linked to budget
• Link to student success studies
• Ongoing training for new chairs and program directors
Overall Strength

• Reinforcement from multiple areas
  – Academic and Faculty Affairs
  – Faculty Development
  – Institutional Effectiveness
Questions