Recommendation 4

3.3.2: The Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that it has identified goals and outcomes, and a clear plan to assess the extent to which the goals and outcomes are achieved.

Onsite Committee's Concerns

"While the Institution has identified goals and described numerous assessment tools it plans to use, it did not identify a clear plan to assess the extent to which it will monitor the achievement of the plan's goals. The Institution would benefit from developing baseline data to establish the assessment goals of the plan; more clearly define outcome measures; and determine key indicators of those outcomes that will provide measures of success (or lack of success). The committee also believes that as the Institution clarifies its ability to implement a more focused plan, it will be able to develop a more well-defined assessment plan.

The assessment plan, as described, uses a nationally normed instrument prepared by ACT will accomplish the assessment process for student learning outcomes. Education rubrics will also be imbedded in individual Tier II courses. This assessment process will be mirrored in the institution's distance education courses. Additional assessment of the four pillar components will be conducted regarding data captured in the student information system, Banner, advising software and Degree Works. Tier II course syllabi audits will be conducted, and the institution's faculty and staff will complete surveys of influence. The committee observed that many of these assessment measures rely on student and faculty self-reported satisfaction.

Finally, one of the goals of the QEP is to enhance the institutional-level data and monitoring of key metrics, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates, and to stratify these data by student demographics and other variables. The committee encourages the institution to enhance its Institutional Research efforts in these areas, and in particular, to monitor the impacts on its transfer student population, which comprise nearly a third of its undergraduate population.

The plan describes that an assessment team made up of members of the four pillar functional area will oversee the assessment. This membership will include a General Education Coordinator, the Interim Director or member of the Office of Online Academic Programs, the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Services, and the Director of University Career Center. Data will be collected by the Vice Provost for Strategic Enrollment, and the data analysis will be completed by the Office of Planning and Decision Support."

Response

This narrative sets forth the revised QEP goals and outcomes and the plan to assess the extent to which the goals and outcomes are achieved. The goals for the revised QEP are:

Institutional Goal

- Establish a redesigned university-wide general education program that incorporates emergent 21st century connected learning experiences

Student Learning Goals

- Students are integrative thinkers
- Students are digitally fluent

Since the revised QEP focuses on emergent 21st century learning experiences and not the six competencies in VCU general education as was originally proposed, the assessment plan will not utilize the nationally normed ACT instrument, the rubrics, course syllabi audit, and student/faculty self-reports described in paragraph two of the on-site team's response.

Similarly, the enhancement of institutional-level data and monitoring of key metrics, as described in paragraph three of the on-site team's response, is not a goal of this revised QEP. Therefore, this VCU response does not address the evaluation of those efforts.

As part of the QEP revision, the "assessment team" has been reconfigured as was described in VCU's Response to Recommendation 3. This reconfiguration is described in more detail in the following section on the organizational structure.

This remainder of this section is focused on the revised QEP goals and is organized as follows: a) organizational structure for evaluation and assessment, b) institutional goal assessment, c) student learning goals assessment, and d) continuous program improvement.

A. Organizational Structure

The Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs will oversee the QEP Evaluation Team, which will remain intact for the duration of the QEP. The responsibility for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the QEP is with the Evaluation Team. The QEP Evaluation Team comprises five members: Dr. Linda Birtley, Dr. Henry Clark, Dr. Kathleen Ingram, Dr. Scott Oates, and Dr. Carol Scotese. (See Attachment 1 for biographical sketches.) The work of the Evaluation Team will be coordinated by Dr. Birtley, who reports directly to the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs. The Evaluation Team will be supported by members of the Assessment Office, which is directed by Dr. Scott Oates. These two individuals, Ms. Janice Baab and Ms. Connie Peyton, possess expertise in student learning outcomes assessment and survey administration and analysis.

The QEP Evaluation Team will coordinate closely with the QEP Executive Director, the QEP Co-Directors, the Learning Innovation Center faculty, and the Tier II general education faculty to ensure that instruments for implementation monitoring are developed and deployed and to co-develop student learning outcomes assessment rubrics, learning analytics, and course evaluation questions. (These are described in detail below.) Collaboration with the Learning Innovation Center faculty and the QEP general education faculty will be necessary for preparing faculty in their assessment-related responsibilities. The Evaluation Team will prepare quarterly monitoring reports and recommendations during the first two years of implementation that will be provided to the QEP leadership (Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs, Vice Provost for Learning Innovation and Student Success / QEP Executive Director, QEP Co-Directors, General Education Task Force, and QEP Advisory Council). After the first two years, reports will be prepared annually, unless circumstances dictate otherwise.

The organizational structure for the assessment of the QEP will promote engagement by key stakeholders, a shared sense of responsibility for the assessment activities, and communication to all participants impacted by the initiative.

The next two sections explain the plan to assess the extent to which the goals and outcomes are achieved. A logic model that depicts the evaluation plan for both the institutional and student learning goals is in Attachment 2. The logic model shows the connections between the QEP resources, major activities, outputs of the activities, institutional and student learning outcomes, and the institutional and student learning goals.

B. Institutional Goal

The institutional goal is:

- Establish a redesigned university-wide general education program that incorporates emergent 21 century connected learning experiences

The key indicator of success will be an approved general education program that is fully implemented by academic year 2018-2019. A key benchmark is the submission of the proposal for the redesigned general education program in Spring 2015. A second key benchmark is the approval of the redesigned general education program in Fall 2015. The timeline in Recommendation 3, Attachment 2 identifies major activities against which the QEP Evaluation Team will monitor progress toward achievement of the institutional goal.

Another evaluation strategy is to monitor the attendance and mix of faculty participating in the redesign process. This is important because "university-wide" means participation by all the schools and colleges that offer undergraduate degrees. This is expected through representation on the General Education Task Force, participation in open faculty forums on general education, and participation in the University Seminar on General Education. "University-wide" can be ascertained, also, through the language and structure of the approved general education program, as well as by determining whether all academic schools and colleges contribute to the course offerings that comprise the new general education program. The logic model in Attachment 2 identifies the data that will be collected and used to measure university-wide participation in the QEP.

C. Student Learning Goals

The student learning goals are:

- Students are integrative thinkers
- Students are digitally fluent

Protocols for assessing student learning will be developed and piloted in year one and two. The assessment plan will be implemented fully at the beginning of the third year of our QEP. (See the timeline in Attachment 3.) The baselines for integrative thinking and digital fluency will be established in year three. By the conclusion of year five, three years of data on student learning will have been collected and analyzed.

The fully developed assessment plan will include two direct assessments and one indirect assessment:

- Direct assessment of student work products produced in our new and redesigned QEP general education courses that incorporate integrative thinking and digital fluency.
- Direct assessment through learning analytics applied to student interactions with *rampages.us*, the primary web platform for integrative thinking and digital fluency.
- Indirect assessment through student end-of-course evaluations of QEP general education courses, with indicators in the form of questions or statements targeting integrative thinking and digital fluency.

These are explained below.

Direct Assessment of Student Work Products (Embedded Assessment). The direct assessment of student work products for integrative thinking and digital fluency will be course-embedded. Embedded assessment uses student work products for assessment in contrast to "add-on assessments" such as standardized tests. An advantage of embedded assessment is highly motivated students producing authentic work. The practice of course-embedded assessment also necessitates faculty developing and nurturing shared understandings about the purpose of the curriculum and the desired outcomes for student learning.

The process, drawing on embedded assessment as described by Barbara Walvoord[1], will be a two-phase process. For phase one, in the new and redesigned general education courses, faculty will take a "snapshot" each semester of student work on *rampages.us* and assess the student work using a rubric for digital fluency and a rubric for integrative thinking. Additionally, at the end of the semester, faculty will prepare qualitative, summary observations of student strengths and weaknesses in terms of digital fluency and integrative thinking. This summary/observation activity will be semi-structured, asking faculty to focus on student learning and the expected outcomes. A summary/analysis of the assessment data yielded by the rubrics will be prepared by the Assessment Office. Snapshots of the assessed student work on *rampages.us* will be stored for phase two, which will occur during the summer of 2016.

For phase two, a team of trained, independent faculty raters will use the program rubrics to assess a random sample of student work on *rampages.us*. The purpose of phase two is to establish reliability but more so, to prepare materials for faculty development activities in using student learning findings to make improvements. Comparing and contrasting the two sets of data and findings will stimulate and enrich problem posing and problem solving about the improvement of student learning.

Implementation of Embedded Assessment. The development and administration of course-embedded assessment will be directed by QEP Co-Director Jeff South. VCU's Director of Assessment will assist the QEP Co-Director with the development and piloting stages during years one and two. The implementation activities include identifying and preparing general education faculty members who will function as "curriculum and assessment leads" for their general education colleagues. Additionally, the Learning Innovation Center faculty will develop and offer varied development opportunities to prepare the general education faculty delivering these new and redesigned courses. Topics will include designing and delivering "signature

---

[1] Walvoord, B. (2004). Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

assignments[2]" for integrative thinking and digital fluency, and using rubrics to assess snapshots of student work on *rampages.us*.

      Development of Rubrics for Embedded Assessment. Faculty under the direction of QEP Co-Director Jeff South will develop the rubrics for embedded assessment. This work will start with provisional language culled from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) VALUE Rubrics[3]. Rubrics will be completely developed during year one and piloted in year two of our QEP.

      Outcomes for Integrative Thinking. The following questions will guide the development of the embedded assessment rubric: What does integrative thinking look like? What learning will we intentionally foster and expect to see? What statements of expected learning outcomes will guide our designing of curriculum, instruction, faculty development, and serve as the focus for assessing the efficacy of our QEP? The following statements, paraphrased from the AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Integrative Learning[4], provide a strong conceptual framework for our rubrics:

- **Connections to Experience**: Students connect academic knowledge to relevant experiences. Beginning with identifying connections that are similar to their life experiences and interests, over time and experience, our students will demonstrate a "deepened understanding of fields of study" and an enlarged point of view by having practiced meaningful synthesis among experiences such as internships, capstone experiences, and travel abroad.
- **Connections to Disciplines**: Students make connections across disciplines. Early on, students will learn to demonstrate an understanding of a field of study or perspective by describing relevant examples, facts, and theories; later, students will independently make connections across disciplines, combining concepts, methods, and perspectives from more than one field of study to pose problems, perspectives, and solutions.
- **Transfer**: Students adapt and apply skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations. Initially, students will learn to apply "in a basic way" methodologies learned in one situation to a new situation. As students develop, they will, given an unfamiliar problem, adapt and apply "skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to a new situation to solve difficult problems or explore complex issues in original ways."
- **Students** practice integrated communication. A beginning student can produce a text in a form appropriate to the purpose and audience (e.g., PowerPoint; essay; poster; video; oral presentation). Later, students will independently select media, format, digital platform, language, or other visual medium that "enhances meaning" of the communication, demonstrating an understanding of the "interdependence of language and meaning, thought, and expression."

---

[2] A "signature assignment", a phrase coined by Lee Shulman, refers to an assignment that features and reinforces concepts, proficiencies, and/or skills that are core and foundational (or the signature) of a discipline or profession. Disciplines such as nursing, medicine, law, and education have begun to identify develop "signature" elements that can be incorporated into existing assignments.

[3] "The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts across the U.S. The teams examined existing rubrics and other documents for the outcome. The rubrics describe key dimensions of the outcome and descriptions of performance along a developmental arch describing progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment". Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index_p.cfm

[4] American Association of Colleges and Universities VALUE Rubric for Integrative Learning. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/ index_p.cfm

- **Students** reflect and self-assess. Beginning students can identify strengths and weaknesses in their performances; matured students can evaluate how they have changed as a learner over time and demonstrate greater ease working with complex, ill-structured and unscripted problems.

Outcomes for Digital Fluency. As a starting point in developing the rubric for the direct assessment of digital fluency, VCU will use the Boise State University definition:

> An evolving aptitude that empowers the individual to effectively and ethically interpret information, discover meaning, design content, construct knowledge, and communicate ideas in a digitally connected world. We believe this aptitude thrives when inquiry, play, and exploration are valued and encouraged as meaningful learning experiences.[5]

Outcomes and rubric selection and development will occur during year one of the implementation plan. A provisional set of behaviors, proficiencies, and aptitudes found in Kathleen Blake Yancey's work on digital literacy and portfolios [6] will inform this work.

- Composing in a variety of discourse modes (narration, analysis, compare/contrast, classification, etc.)
- Using a variety of text types (alphabetic, numeric, sound, image, and video)
- Using a variety of digital technologies/platforms/apps for representing and connecting among texts, audience, networks, and contexts
- Working inside and outside the curriculum; able to work among a variety of linguistic registers
- Collaborating and making connections with other learners

Other skills to foster toward the goal of digital fluency come from AAC&U's VALUE Rubric for Information Literacy.[7]

- Able to know when there is a need for information
- Able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share information
- Able to work in an "open" system such as the World Wide Web as well as "closed" systems such as a library database

And, as the Boise State definition alludes, digital fluency is also a set of dispositions and attitudes. Again, AAC&U provides us with provisional language with which to begin articulating the outcomes we expect to foster and observe in our students. The following, from AAC&U's VALUE Rubric for Lifelong Learning, paraphrases descriptions of students at a "capstone" level.

- Curiosity – exploring a topic in depth; rich awareness and esoteric information
- Initiative – generates and follows through; expands knowledge, skills, abilities

---

[5] http://at.boisestate.edu/home/definition-of-digital-fluency/
[6] Yancey, K.Blake. "Portfolios, Circulation, Ecology, and the Development of Literacy." Technological Ecologies & Sustainability. Computers and Composition Digital Press   2009. http://ccdigitalpress.org/tes/05_yancey.pdf
[7] http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index_p.cfm

- Independence – intellectual activity and pursuits are pursued independently, inside and outside of the curriculum
- Transfer – innovative applications of learning; connects skills, knowledge, and abilities to novel contexts
- Reflection – able to reveal significantly changed perspectives about educational and life experiences; serves as a foundation for growth and direction

Finally, it is appropriate to include here a succinct definition of the emergent learning paradigm of "connected learning," as articulated in a recent journal article defining the paradigm as well as outlining research methodologies for understanding and assessing student learning in a "connected learning" framework:

> Efforts to understand the dynamic processes of learning situated across space and time, beyond the here and now, are presently challenging traditional definitions of learning and education. How can we conceptualize learning in a way that is able to respond to and explain the increasing complexity, connectivity, and velocity of our times? We elaborate on the notion of "connected learning" as a conceptual heuristic that has recently received recognition as a potential lens and a model through which to research and promote learning as a holistic experience that stretches beyond formal and informal communities. We reflect on the methodological challenges of describing, defining, and analyzing connected learning across young peoples' everyday "learning lives" from the sociocultural and dialogic perspectives. We discuss such key notions for connected learning as understanding, tracking, and tracing learners; chronotopes; boundary crossing; intertextuality; and learning lives.

The conceptual heuristic or paradigm of connected learning, as described above, informs this entire QEP, and serves as an overarching framework that includes all of the rubrics and outcomes detailed here.[8]

Direct Assessment of Student Connectedness (Learning Analytics). Learning analytics data will be collected to assess students' interactions with the *rampages.us* platform. Our aim with this element is to track student-to-student interactions and student-to-other interactions, where "other" represents people who are not enrolled in the course. "Other" can include VCU students and faculty in other courses, non-VCU students, faculty and scholars from other institutions, community members, etc. Through the learning analytics, the network of interaction can be documented and the content or type of interactions can be analyzed, including the sophistication of usage. This analysis will indicate the degree to which our academic programming successfully supports the development of digital fluency.

Data will be collected to answer questions such as the following:

- What are the numbers, percentages, and distribution of targeted students using the *rampages.us* platform?
- Of the students using the *rampages.us* platform, what do the data tell us about how frequently users are making connections possible only in an open digital platform, and with whom?

---

[8] See Kumpulainen, K. and Sefton-Green, J. (2012). "What Is Connected Learning and How to Research It?" *International Journal of Learning and Media*, MIT Press, Spring 2012 (4:2), pp. 7-18.

- Of the students using the *rampages.us* platform, what kinds of other media (especially rich media such as images, sounds, videos, hyperlinks, etc.) and texts are they using for representing, reading, composing, and sharing?

The technology for collecting these data is under development in our Learning Innovation Center, and early versions have already been deployed in the digital engagement pilot sections of the Tier II course UNIV 200, "Inquiry and the Craft of Argument." Elements include page views, unique visitors, time spent on each page (bounce rate), average video view duration, network connectivity and density as measured by Martin Hawksey's Twtter TAGSExplorer, number of blogs, number of comments per student, number of comments on each blog post, etc. (See for example http://thoughtvectors.net/twitter-explorer, as well as the entire course site at http://thoughtvectors.net.) As with the other elements of our assessment plan, this method will undergo development and piloting during years one and two. The Evaluation Team and Assessment Office will work closely with the QEP Executive Director, the QEP Co-Directors, and the Learning Innovation Center to identify the analytics and content analysis strategies to be used.

Indirect Assessment of Student Learning (End-of-Course Evaluations). VCU will use its end-of-course evaluation system to collect student perceptions of curriculum and instruction in terms of our QEP learning goals. The recently acquired online course evaluation software (*Explorance Blue*[9]) enables the efficient customization of evaluation questions for deployment in specific courses, and aggregation and disaggregation of the data for analysis. The development and piloting of end-of-course evaluation questions will occur during years one and two of our QEP, with full deployment commencing in year three. The development of the end-of-course evaluation questions relevant to this QEP will be under the aegis of QEP Evaluation Team. The QEP Evaluation Team will analyze the results to prepare for communication to the faculty in the "closing the loop" workshops. For continuous program improvement related to student learning outcomes, faculty will incorporate the results of all these assessment activities into their teaching.

D. Continuous Program Improvement

The Evaluation Team will prepare the assessment and evaluation data for formative and summative purposes (Patton, 1997).   As noted above, there will be quarterly monitoring reports and recommendations during the first two years of implementation provided to the QEP leadership (Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs, Vice Provost for Learning Innovation and Student Success / QEP Executive Director, QEP Co-Directors, General Education Task Force, and QEP Advisory Council.) For formative purposes, the evaluation and assessment activities and reporting will serve four purposes:

1. Monitoring the implementations of the QEP, the assessment plan for student learning outcomes, the use of resources, and the timeline.
2. Comparing the actual to the planned implementation of the activities, assessments, and resources.
3. Surfacing and documenting the reasons for any divergence between the actual and the planned implementations.
4. Producing a running historical record of the implementation of VCU's quality enhancement plan.

---

[9] http://www.explorance.com/blue/course-evaluations/

The formative components will inform leadership and other stakeholders along the way so that timely decisions can be made about adjustments to the timelines, resources, and activities supporting the QEP. In comparing the actual to the planned implementation, an eye can be kept on what is working and what is not, what challenges arise and how they can be managed, what unintended consequences emerge and how they can be addressed, what strategies need to be bolstered or abandoned.   Documenting the implementation, including the decisions and adjustments made, and preparing summative findings will produce a running record that can be utilized for VCU communications and annual reporting to stakeholders and for writing its 5th year QEP Impact Report for the SACS Commission on Colleges.

Conclusion. The above narrative provides the revised QEP goals and outcomes and the plan to assess the extent to which the goals and outcomes are achieved. This evaluation plan was updated and aligned with the revised QEP described in Recommendation 3.

References

American Association of Colleges and Universities VALUE Rubric for Integrative Learning. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index_p.cfm

Kumpulainen, K. and Sefton-Green, J. (2012). "What Is Connected Learning and How to Research It?" International Journal of Learning and Media, MIT Press, Spring 2012 (4:2), pp. 7-18.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Walvoord, B. (2004). Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Yancey, K. Blake. (2009). "Portfolios, Circulation, Ecology, and the Development of Literacy." Technological Ecologies & Sustainability. Computers and Composition Digital Press 2009. http://ccdigitalpress.org/tes/05_yancey.pdf

Attachment 1

Evaluation Team Biographical Sketches

Linda Birtley, Ph.D.
Special Assistant to the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs, VCU Office of the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs

Dr. Birtley received a Ph.D. in Public Policy and Administration from Virginia Commonwealth University in 2011. She also holds an M.A. in Sociology from the University of Missouri at St. Louis, a pre-doctoral program that was funded by the National Institute of Mental Health to produce trained evaluators. Dr. Birtley served as an evaluator on government, nonprofit, and business sector client-based projects at the VCU Survey and Evaluation Laboratory for eight years before joining the Vice Provost's office to support the fifth-year SACSCOC reaffirmation. She also coordinated the activities of the institutional coordinating team for the 2014 SACSCOC compliance certification and VCU's academic program review process for the last three years. Earlier in her career, Dr. Birtley conducted evaluation studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago and the Chicago Crime Commission.

Henry Clark, Ph.D.
Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, VCU School of Education

Dr. Clark received a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology with a focus on Human Learning and Cognition from Teachers College of Columbia University in 1982. He has extensive training in research, evaluation, data analysis, and development of assessments. Before joining VCU, he was Director of Research for the School of Education at Northern Arizona University and Assistant Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies at Northern Arizona University. He has served routinely as an evaluator on grants through the U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation. At VCU, Dr. Clark oversees the Office of Assessment in the School of Education, and has had direct responsibility for selection of the school's assessment platform and development of key assessments. He has experience with multiple accrediting bodies including National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education / Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education, and SACSCOC.

Kathleen Ingram, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs, VCU College of Humanities and Sciences

Dr. Ingram received a J.D. in 1984 and a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology in 1995 from The Ohio State University. Her current responsibilities include overseeing academic program review and assessment of student learning outcomes in the College of Humanities and Sciences. Previously, she served as Interim Director of Assessment at VCU (2009-2010) during VCU's fifth-year SACSCOC reaffirmation and as Special Assistant to the Provost for University Assessment (2010-2011). As Interim Director of Training for VCU's Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Program (1999-2001; 2006), Dr. Ingram played a leadership role in two successful reaccreditation reviews of the program by the American Psychological Association. She has expertise in research methods and statistics and has taught statistics in the Department of Psychology.

Scott Oates, Ph.D.
Director of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, VCU Office of Planning and Decision Support

Dr. Oates received a Ph.D. in the cultural foundations of education at the University of Utah in 1998. Prior to joining VCU in July, 2010, he held a joint appointment at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, where he was tenured in the English department and served as the university's Director of Assessment. In addition to teaching, Dr. Oates has developed and directed a comprehensive institutional plan to assess student learning, led assessment teams for institutional and program accreditation, and delivered workshops to faculty on how to conduct the assessment of their students' learning. Currently, he oversees student learning outcomes assessment at VCU, chairs the university's Assessment Council, and co-leads a joint Lumina Foundation / Association of American Colleges & Universities funded project that compares and contrasts the commensurability of general education competencies between transfer and native students at VCU.

Carol Scotese, Ph.D.
Chair of the Department of Economics, VCU School of Business

Dr. Scotese received a Ph.D. in Economics from The Pennsylvania State University in 1991. Dr. Scotese's research uses statistical methods to evaluate the predictions of economic models. Her research has utilized time-series and cross-section econometric methodologies and she has experience using large data sets including data extracted from the decennial census. Dr. Scotese has been a member of the School of Business Ph.D. Program Committee (charged, in part, with program evaluation of the School of Business Ph.D. program), a member of the School of Business Master's Program Committee (charged, in part, with program evaluation of the School of Business specialized masters degrees), chaired the assessment committee for the M.A. in Economics since 2008, and has overseen the development of an assessment plan for the B.S. in Economics as well as the revision of the assessment plan for the M.A. in Economics last year.

Attachment 2

Institutional Goal	Establish a redesigned university-wide general education program that incorporates emergent 21st century connected learning experiences.		
Student Learning Outcomes	Students are integrative thinkers.		
	Students are digitally fluent.		
Resources[10] *What do we need to make the program succeed?*	**Major Activities** *What do we need to accomplish?*	**Outputs** *What will these activities produce that we can measure/count?*	**Outcomes** *What changes will result from these activities?*
	Curricular Innovation		
Personnel -QEP Exec Director -QEP Co-Directors -General Education Faculty -Evaluation Team -Assessment Office -General Education Task Force -Learning Innovation Center Faculty -Advisory Council -Postdoctoral Fellows -General Education Fellows -Student Intern **Software** -*rampages.us* WordPress web-authoring platform -Curriculum and catalog management -Course evaluation software **Travel** -Professional development **Other Support** -Meeting and workshop supports	Convene general education faculty task force	Proposed revisions to the general education program that incorporate integrative thinking and digital fluency	**Institutional Outcomes** Approved redesigned general education program Approved and implemented general education courses that incorporate integrative thinking and digital fluency Increased # of general education faculty incorporating digital fluency in general education courses Increased # of general education courses that incorporate integrative thinking **Student Learning Outcomes** Students demonstrate increased proficiency in integrative thinking Students demonstrate increased proficiency in digital fluency
	Execute Grand Challenges and Wicked Problems series	Number of Grand Challenges and Wicked Problems events # and mix[11] of faculty and students participating in Grand Challenges and Wicked Problems events	
	Develop and conduct University Seminar on General Education	# and mix of faculty participating in the University Seminar on General Education	
	Develop and conduct general education faculty development workshops and learning communities on integrative thinking and digital fluency	# of general education faculty development events for integrative thinking & digital fluency # and mix of general education faculty participating faculty development events on innovative curricula and digital engagement	
	Develop and launch General Education Fellows Program	# and mix of faculty applicants for General Education Fellows Program # of faculty serving as General Education Fellows # of consultations General Education Fellows provided to academic units	
	Develop and launch Postdoctoral Learning Innovation Fellowship Program	# of applicants to Postdoctoral Learning Innovation Fellowship Program and types of programs from which their degrees were earned # of Postdoctoral Learning Innovation Fellows hired # of consultations provided, presentations delivered, and/or educational materials developed by Postdoctoral Learning Innovation Fellows	
	Develop and launch Connected Learning Award	# and mix of nominees for Connected Learning Award # of Connected Learning Awards given	

---

[10] The Resources are listed one time.
[11] "Mix" refers to representation across academic schools and colleges.

Institutional Goal	Establish a redesigned university-wide general education program that incorporates emergent 21st century connected learning experiences.		
Student Learning Outcomes	**Students are integrative thinkers.**		
	Students are digitally fluent.		
Resources *What do we need to make the program succeed?*	**Major Activities** *What do we need to accomplish?*	**Outputs** *What will these activities produce that we can measure/count?*	**Outcomes** *What changes will result from these activities?*
	Pathways to Participation		
	Develop and implement plan for communication to students and faculty about integrative thinking, digital fluency, and revised general education curriculum	student orientation updates provided first-year advising updates provided Council of Deans updates provided Council of Assistant and Associate Deans updates provided University Advising Advisory Council updates provided Lead adviser communication provided	**Institutional Outcomes** Approved redesigned general education program Approved and implemented general education courses that incorporate integrative thinking and/or digital fluency Increased # of general education faculty incorporating digital fluency in general education courses Increased # of general education courses that incorporate integrative thinking **Student Learning Outcomes** Students demonstrate increased proficiency in integrative thinking Students demonstrate increased digital fluency
	Develop and launch general education faculty incentive program for new or revised course proposals that incorporate integrative thinking and digital fluency	# of course proposals and course revisions received	
	Offer approved new and revised courses that target integrative thinking and digital fluency	Of the # of proposals received and the number of course revisions received, the # of new courses approved Of the # of new courses and revisions approved, the # offered Of the new or revised courses offered, the # of students enrolled Student work products demonstrating integrative thinking and digital fluency	
	Implement curriculum and catalog management software	Curriculum and catalog management software is identified, purchased, and implemented	

16

Institutional Goal	Establish a redesigned university-wide general education program that incorporates emergent 21st century connected learning experiences.		
Student Learning Outcomes	Students are integrative thinkers.		
	Students are digitally fluent.		
Resources *What do we need to make the program succeed?*	**Major Activities** *What do we need to accomplish?*	**Outputs** *What will these activities produce that we can measure/count?*	**Outcomes** *What changes will result from these activities?*
	Digital Engagement		
	Conduct general education faculty training on *rampages.us*	# of general education faculty training events on *rampages.net*	**Institutional Outcomes** Increased # of general education faculty incorporating digital fluency in general education courses **Student Learning Outcomes** Students demonstrate increased digital fluency

Attachment 3

Assessment Action	2014 Su	2014-2015 Fall	Spr	Su	2015-2016 Fall	Spr	Su	2016-2017 Fall	Spr	Su	2017-2018 Fall	Spr	Su	2018-2019 Fall	Spr	Su
Course Embedded Assessment																
Develop guidelines for GE course proposals		▩	▩													
Complete rubrics for Integrative Thinking and Digital Fluency		▩	▩													
Develop protocols for the practice of course embedded assessment:		▩	▩													
Develop implementation and administration plan for course embedded assessment		▩	▩													
Pilot course embedded assessment in courses targeting Digital Fluency (DF) and Integrative thinking (IT)			▩		▩	▩										
Course embedded assessment in courses targeting DF and IT (Faculty Assessment)								▩	▩		▩	▩		▩	▩	
Independent, trained raters score randomized sample from fall and spring classes targeting DF and IT							▩			▩			▩			▩
Set baseline and targets for performance on rubrics										▩						
Analysis and summary of Course Embedded Assessment Data - preparation for closing the loop faculty workshop in August										▩			▩			▩
Learning Analytics																
Develop protocols for collecting and analyzing data from Rampages.us		▩	▩													
Pilot learning analytics data collection and analysis from Rampages.us					▩	▩	▩									
Learning Analytics: data collection from Rampages.us								▩	▩		▩	▩		▩	▩	
Learning Analytics data analysis; prepare findings for "closing the loop" workshops										▩			▩			▩

Assessment Action	Su 2014	2014-2015			2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018			2018-2019		
	2014	Fall	Spr	Su	Fall	Spr	Su	Fall	Spr	Su	Fall	Spr	Su	Fall	Spr	Su
End of Course Evaluations																
Develop standardized end of course evaluation questions (re: digital fluency & integrative thinking)		X														
Develop protocols for administering end of course evaluation questions and analyzing data		X														
Pilot end of course evaluation: administration and analysis					X	X										
Administer end of course evaluation questions in Forms of Inquiry and revised general education courses								X	X		X	X		X	X	
Set baseline and targets: end of course evaluation data										X						
Analyze end of course evaluation data; preparation for closing the loop faculty workshop in August										X			X			X
Closing the Loop - Continuous Improvement																
Pilot use of assessment findings to engage faculty in continuous improvement							X									
Prepare assessment findings for closing the loop/continuous improvement										X			X			X
Use assessment findings in August workshops with faculty										X	X		X	X		X
Develop and set action plans for improvement for academic year										X			X			X