

## INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT PLAN - DEPARTMENT / UNIT

Unit: **Centers for Teaching and Learning & Teaching and Learning with Technology**

College/Division: **Provost's Office**

Date: **October 3, 2005**

**Mission Statement:** (purpose and functional responsibilities of the department)

The mission of the Center for Teaching and Learning is to support and promote advances in student learning through improvements in teaching.

The mission of the Teaching and Learning with Technology Center is to work with faculty and staff to improve teaching and learning using technology.

### **Intended Outcome # 1:**

#### **Facilitate departments' work in promoting and documenting student learning.**

Effectiveness Indicators: (What factors/variables/elements will you be measuring to gauge your success at reaching your intended outcome?)

Indicators will be evidence of departmental assessment plans and reports for all degree programs.

Success Criteria: (For each indicator described above, what minimum score, value or result will signal success? What score, value or result will signal a need for improvement? What score, value or result will signal a need for immediate intervention?)

a. The first success criterion will be for 100% of departments to submit assessment reports on student learning by August 1, 2005.

**Report:**

**Because departments were not required to submit reports to the Provost's Office until September 19, 2005, the criterion date specified above was changed from August 1 to October 1, 2005. As of October 1, 2005, of the 42 of 46 departmental (91%) and 2 of the 4 college-wide programs (50%) had submitted annual Learning Outcomes Assessment (LOA) reports. All reports from AYSPS and the colleges of A&S, HHS, and Law have been received. One department (Educational Policy Studies) and three departments from the Robinson College of Business have not been submitted (School of Accountancy, International Business, Managerial Sciences [except the MS program which has been received], and Marketing) along with the core BBA and PhD Programs.**

**The effectiveness indicator has not been met as of 10/01/05.**

b. The second criterion will be for 80% of departments to score at least 2.5 on the three major items of the Rubric for Departmental Learning Outcome Assessment Plans and Reports at

<http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/outcomes/Rubric.htm>.

**Report:**

**LOAs are currently being assessed and the score on the rubric will be reported by October 31.**

Department/Unit: Centers for Teaching and Learning and Teaching and Learning with Technology\_\_\_\_\_

**Data Collection and Analysis Procedures:** (How, when, and by whom will data be collected? How will it be analyzed? What will be the product of the analysis?)

Reports on student learning will be submitted by department chairs to the Provost as part of the departmental annual report. The reports will then be analyzed by the Director of the CTL for adherence to the outcomes rubric.

**Utilization of Results:** (How will results of the analysis be used in planning, decision making, and continuous improvement? What type of actions will be taken based on the analysis results?)

Assessment reports will be reviewed by the CTL, and those not meeting the rubric standards will be targeted for follow-up. Follow-up might include revising assessment plans (including learning outcomes), identifying or developing alternative assessment tools, planning curricular revisions or changes in student management procedures (e.g., advisement, selection, etc.).

**Report:**

**Future Unit Reports will align due dates for reporting and analyzing LOAs according to the dates required by the University's administration, i.e., the report on compliance in submitting reports as set by the Provost's Office and the analyse of the quality of the reports one moth after they are due.**

**As of 10/01/05, the Director of the CTL has met with 5 department chairs or assessment coordinators to provide feedback as to the 2005 LOA reports. This process will continue as the LOA reports are evaluated. The suggested changes to date have been(1) increased participation and coordination of faculty who teach required courses, especially courses which are capstone or culminating requirements; (2) shifting from "proving students have mastered requirements to assessing for improvement, and (3) greater continuity in following assessment plans.**

## **Intended Outcome # 2: Enhance faculty members' abilities for designing learning experiences and facilitating and assessing student learning.**

**Effectiveness Indicators:** (What factors/variables/elements will you be measuring to gauge your success at reaching your intended outcome?)

Learning gains in instruction, evidenced by, for example,

a. Faculty members learning to:

(1) develop assessable learning outcomes

(2) design learning experiences

(3) assess learning outcomes

b. Faculty members learning to analyze learning outcomes for identifying opportunities for improving instruction or eliciting improved student affective reaction to learning experiences

**Success Criteria:** (For each indicator described above, what minimum score, value or result will signal success? What score, value or result will signal a need for improvement? What score, value or result will signal a need for immediate intervention?)

That faculty members participating in CTL/TLTC-affiliated programs demonstrate progress on effectiveness indicators (a) and (b) above.

**Report: This indicator has been partially met. While we believe that faculty who participated in the training improved in their ability to develop assessable learning outcomes and to design appropriate learning experiences as evidenced by their work in the workshops, we do not have direct evidence from their courses as to how these experiences improved student learning.**

**Data Collection and Analysis Procedures:** (How, when, and by whom will data be collected? How will it be analyzed? What will be the product of the analysis?)

Learning outcomes, designs for learning experiences, assessments of learning outcomes, and analyses of learning outcomes prepared by faculty members will be analyzed for evidence of effectiveness. These will be collected by faculty in CTL/TLTC affiliated programs and review by CTL/TLTC Directors.

**Proactive Efforts: The CTL conducted two workshops for faculty (each repeated twice) which emphasized strategies for specifying assessable learning outcomes, designing appropriate learning experiences and assessing evidence of student learning. Faculty were asked to design outcomes and assessment strategies as part out the workshops. Of particular interest were the workshops for minority faculty which were perceived by the participants as being quite helpful.**

**Direct consultation on teaching and learning was provided to 9 faculty members during 2004-2005 (2 AYSPS, 6 CAS, 1 COE, and 1 HHS). In three cases, faculty members sought assistance in order to raise Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEIs) for promotion/tenure considerations, five cases involved general concerns over low SEIs and approaching pre-tenure reviews, and two cases were for personal improvement. In only one case was there actual follow up regarding evidence of student learning.**

Department/Unit: Centers for Teaching and Learning and Teaching and Learning with Technology\_\_\_\_\_

Utilization of Results: (How will results of the analysis be used in planning, decision making, and continuous improvement? What type of actions will be taken based on the analysis results?)

Results will be used to modify programs for faculty members.

**Outcome 2 will continue to be an emphasis for the CTL/TLTC for 2005-2006. A greater attempt will be made to document the impact on faculty teaching and student learning.**

### **Intended Outcome # 3: Enhance Teaching Assistants' abilities in facilitating and assessing student learning.**

**Effectiveness Indicators:** (What factors/variables/elements will you be measuring to gauge your success at reaching your intended outcome?)

Learning gains in instruction, evidenced by, for example,

a. GTAs learning to develop:

(1) assessable learning outcomes

(2) assessments of learning outcomes

b. GTAs learning to analyze learning outcomes for identifying opportunities for improving instruction or eliciting improved student affective reaction to learning experiences

**Success Criteria:** (For each indicator described above, what minimum score, value or result will signal success? What score, value or result will signal a need for improvement? What score, value or result will signal a need for immediate intervention?)

All GTAs in CTL/TLTC-affiliated programs will demonstrate (a) and (b) above.

**The CTL worked with 15 doctoral students in 2004-2005 (8 from Economics and 7 from PAUS). Drs. Frost and Mansfield from Economics and Dr. Lewis from PAUS were supporting faculty. All students completed assignments of planning assessable learning outcomes and designing tests and assignments which would assess the outcomes. Unlike previous classes, these students were not teaching and no direct evidence is available to determine the extent to which they apply these skills in actual classes. The criterion was met based on students' completion of requirements in the pedagogy seminar.**

**Data Collection and Analysis Procedures:** (How, when, and by whom will data be collected? How will it be analyzed? What will be the product of the analysis?)

Learning outcomes, assessments of learning outcomes, and analyses of learning outcomes prepared by GTAs will be analyzed for evidence of effectiveness.

**Utilization of Results:** (How will results of the analysis be used in planning, decision making, and continuous improvement? What type of actions will be taken based on the analysis results?)

Results will be used to modify GTA preparation programs and guidance for faculty responsible for the programs. **The use of assignments which require planning learning outcomes which are assessable and designing tests and requirements to assess the outcomes will continue.**

**In 2005-2006 TAs will be offered the opportunity to apply for the designation of Excellence in Teaching in Higher Education. The documentation for assessable learning outcomes will be part of the criteria for this honor.**

**Intended Outcome # 4:**

**Facilitate faculty use of technology to promote student learning.**

**Effectiveness Indicators:** (What factors/variables/elements will you be measuring to gauge your success at reaching your intended outcome?)

Learning gains enabled by technology use in instruction, evidenced by, for example, faculty members integrating technology in:

- (1) developing assessable learning outcomes
- (2) designing learning experiences
- (3) assessing learning outcomes
- (4) analyzing learning outcomes

**Success Criteria:** (For each indicator described above, what minimum score, value or result will signal success? What score, value or result will signal a need for improvement? What score, value or result will signal a need for immediate intervention?)

That faculty members participating in CTL/TLTC-affiliated programs incorporating technology demonstrate progress on the Effective Indicators above.

**Data Collection and Analysis Procedures:** (How, when, and by whom will data be collected? How will it be analyzed? What will be the product of the analysis?)

Learning outcomes, designs for learning experiences, assessments of learning outcomes, and analyses of learning outcomes prepared by faculty members will be analyzed for evidence of effectiveness.

**Utilization of Results:** (How will results of the analysis be used in planning, decision making, and continuous improvement? What type of actions will be taken based on the analysis results?)

Results will be used to modify programs for faculty members.

**Intended Outcome # 5:  
Facilitate faculty research on increasing student learning (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning—SoTL).**

Effectiveness Indicators: (What factors/variables/elements will you be measuring to gauge your success at reaching your intended outcome?)

Evidence of effectiveness will be the body of works (articles, papers, and presentations) by GSU faculty members in the scholarship of teaching and learning and award nominations in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Success Criteria: (For each indicator described above, what minimum score, value or result will signal success? What score, value or result will signal a need for improvement? What score, value or result will signal a need for immediate intervention?)

The target criterion is an annual increase in the number of works in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

**These data provide a baseline for assessing future years' SoTL productivity.**

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures: (How, when, and by whom will data be collected? How will it be analyzed? What will be the product of the analysis?)

The number of scholarly works on student learning will be gathered from the departmental Annual Reports submitted to the Provost each year, with 2004 serving as the baseline.

**Report:**

**This report analyzes evidence of faculty SoTL work in an alternative form. Rather than report the number of SoTL publications across the university, we are reporting evidence of faculty production for which the Centers have had direct involvement through mentoring, editing, and consulting. During 2004-2005, GSU faculty who were assisted by the CTL/TLTC had three publications about the impact of teaching on student learning that were accepted for publication. A fourth article has been revised and resubmitted. Each of these articles would be considered research.**

**In addition, the Director of the CTL, with input from colleagues in the Research University Consortium for the Advancement of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (RUCASTL) group—a Carnegie Academy Leadership Cluster-drafted a position paper on the role of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in a research university (see attached).**

Department/Unit: Centers for Teaching and Learning and Teaching and Learning with Technology\_\_\_\_\_

**Utilization of Results:** (How will results of the analysis be used in planning, decision making, and continuous improvement? What type of actions will be taken based on the analysis results?)

Results will be reviewed to see if faculty members that have participated in SoTL activities have reported work on SoTL projects. Also, patterns of participation will be examined by college and discipline to determine the possible impact of policies for promotion and tenure and annual review on SoTL productivity.

**The Centers will continue to encourage and support faculty to conduct SoTL work through it's college-level faculty interest groups (currently in RCB and COE) and participation in the national RUCASTL initiative.**