

**General Education Committee  
Annual Assessment Reporting Form**

**MM/DD/YY of Completion:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Person Preparing Form:** Tyler Seacrest (name); \_\_\_\_\_ (signature)

**1) Attachments:** Individual 2016-2017 Reports from the following General Education Categories are found below (abbreviations in parentheses):

- a. Assessment Report for General Education Category: Behavioral and Social Sciences (B&SS)
- b. Assessment Report for General Education Category: History
- c. Assessment Report for General Education Category: Humanities: Literary and Artistic Studies (L&AS)
- d. Assessment Report for General Education Category: Mathematics (Math)
- e. Assessment Report for General Education Category: Natural Sciences (Science)
- f. Assessment Report for General Education Category: Written and Oral Communication (Writing)

The report from Humanities: Expressive Arts (EA) is still pending.

**2) Names of Faculty Actively Participating in Annual Assessment:**

Committee members and meeting leaders: Bethany Blankenship, Heather Haas, Bill Janus, Steve Mock, Wendy Ridenour, Tyler Seacrest, Laura Straus, Judy Ulrich.

**3) LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes Assessed:**

Written Communication, Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, Inquiry and Analysis, Quantitative Literacy, Problem Solving, Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, Engagement with Big Questions about Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World,

**4) Means of Assessment:**

Most faculty reported data from assignments, exams, item analyses from exams and/or assignments, or final grades in their classes which assess LEAP Essential Learning outcomes through an online survey tool. For example, if a final exam measured a student's quantitative literacy, this score was reported. 28 Faculty reported data using this tool. Two faculty went farther and used pre-test / post-test assessment. Other faculty collected data on their own and shared it during assessment meetings.

## **5) Brief Commentary:**

Several weaknesses in our current assessment structure were identified:

1. Some faculty, and especially new and adjunct faculty, are unaware of the LEAP outcomes, requirements for syllabi, and expectations concerning assessment. Some faculty aren't even on the all-faculty mailing list, which makes communication that much harder. (B&SS)
2. Satisfactory progress in a single class is not the same as satisfactory achievement over the course of the whole program. The course-by-course assessment may be inadequate to measure the success of General Education as a whole.
3. "Gen Ed courses require a consistent, coherent system of measuring outcomes, capable of generating actionable data" (History). We don't have such a system. We also need to decide how consistent we should be between General Education category areas.
4. It's not clear what the online survey tool referred to as a "reasonable goal score" (Science)

Even so, our assessment data does show that faculty are generally satisfied with the progress students are making in their courses with respect to the ELOs. L&AS used the data to note that scores generally go down as the semester progresses, and Math used the data to note that the honors General Education class that was taught received a very high score. Furthermore, our assessment meetings generated productive discussions of many ways to improve the General Education program.

Additionally, we have been concerned to learn recently of multiple incidences of General Education classes being taught without the knowledge or approval of the General Education committee. These situations are described more fully in Appendix A, which is a letter that we sent to Faculty Senate and administration. Making sure faculty have full knowledge and control over the General Education program is critical for accomplishing our goals of attainment of the LEAP learning outcomes.

## **6) Area/s for Targeted Improvement and Plan/s to Implement and Assess Targeted Improvements:**

Here are possible avenues of improvement in General Education delivery and assessment:

- Make sure every faculty member is on the all-faculty mailing list, and use email and the fall conference to educate faculty members about ELOs and assessment. We can assess this by looking at course syllabi and verifying that LEAP ELO information is consistently presented.
- Grade all group activities using the LEAP Team Work rubric.
- Track ELO achievement block-by-block throughout the semester to look for any trends that emerge, and decide how this might affect scheduling in the future.
- "Tailor the electronic assessment survey to each GenEd area to help ensure consistent selection of ELOs" (Science); also, further clarification on what is meant in the electronic reporting tool.
- Incorporate block 7 and 8 data, which are currently unavailable due to when the assessment reports are written.

- Have students create portfolios that document their achievement and improvement across the General Education curriculum.

Below I have also summarized some of the other plans for improvement within each category. See the individual category report for more details.

Writing: Uncover problems with placement in WRIT 101 with a common writing prompt the first day that is graded using a common rubric. Add learning center tutors to peer editing sessions for additional support. Potentially adopt a software program called “The Write Class” for improved placement in writing.

Math: Offer fewer sections of “Introduction to Number Theory” and replace them with courses that more closely match the interests of our students. Offer more General Education honors courses to improve student’s academic self-efficacy. Offer a more appealing probability class for those who do not need it as a prerequisite for statistics. Link more classes – especially M095 to M121. Evaluate our service classes.

L&AS: Use shared rubrics, and create a space on the General Education Moodle page to facilitate this.

Science: Added effort in addressing ELOs to bring achievement levels up 5%-10%.

History: Use Common assessment rubrics to provide a consistent point of comparison across all history classes.

B&SS: Due to the diversity in disciplines and mode of instruction, no category-wide changes are planned but individual instructors are improving instruction and assessment.

## **7) Financial or Other Resources Necessary to Facilitate Planned Improvements:**

In regards to the letter in Appendix A, we need faculty, staff and administration to bring to our attention, in a timely manner, any significant changes that affect the General Education program. An example of a significant change would be a new General Education course being offered, even if it is experimental course.

We would also appreciate guidance and/or release time to develop solutions to help make our assessment more successful and to implement changes the come from assessment discussions.

## **Appendix A: Letter to Faculty Senate regarding unapproved General Education classes**

April 3, 2017

To: Faculty Senate

From: General Education Committee

Re: Items of concern

Cc: Chancellor Weatherby, Provost Hedeem, Registrar Walters

During this academic year, two items have indirectly come to the attention of the General Education Committee whereby two separate courses were approved for General Education credit without ever having been seen by the committee, let alone approved. While we do not know all the details of either situation, it does trouble us that this has occurred. In reality, it's the lack of knowledge of the details which is our greatest concern. In addressing these two issues, the General Education Committee is concerned about *process*, not *content*. We are not at this point questioning the academic integrity of the courses or instructors or even if they do or do not belong within the General Education Curriculum. We simply have no information regarding these courses, their content, a curriculum proposal, or their validity as Gen Ed classes.

This past Fall, a B100 rubric course was offered for General Education credit. There were actually two courses listed, B100 291 A: Animal Science and Physiology, and B100 291 B Animal Science and Reproduction. Not only were these classes not evaluated, let alone approved, by the General Education Committee, the Biology Department was completely unaware that they were being offered under one of "their" rubrics. What makes the situation even more puzzling is that the schedule also indicated that the two courses would count for Gen Ed credit for "Business and Equine Science majors only". To our knowledge, there has never been a course listed in this manner at Montanan Western. It is also our understanding that the Faculty Senate was not aware of these two courses.

A second case involves HTH 110 Personal Health and Wellness. This class is now listed as one of the General Education class choices under the area of Behavioral and Social Sciences. This is not listed as a one-time experimental class but is in the current catalog when it was not in the 2015-16 catalog. No curriculum proposal for this class came through the Gen Ed Committee. What's more, the committee member from HPSS, the department that includes Behavioral and Social Sciences, was not aware of the class or its inclusion in the Gen Ed curriculum.

The General Education Committee is requesting an explanation from Faculty Senate (or others) as to how these two situations occurred, and some assurances that in the future the General Education Committee will not be bypassed.



# Assessment Report for General Education Categories

---

**General Education Category:** Social & Behavioral Sciences

**Time & date of meeting:** online communications

**Participation in Electronic Communications Regarding the End of the Year Assessment:** Christopher Brown, Aaron Cashmore, Sean Eudaily, Jim Falvey, Michael Francisconi, Heather Haas, Janelle Handlos, Mark Krank

**This Report Also Incorporates Survey Response Information Submitted by:** Michael Francisconi, Heather Haas, Janelle Handlos, Mark Krank, Katherine Mallon, Amanda Richmond

**What are the primary LEAP essential learning outcomes (ELOs) that define courses that belong to your general education category?**

\*Engagement with Big Questions about Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World

\*Critical Thinking

\*Inquiry and Analysis

\*Intercultural Knowledge and Competence

**To what degree were these ELOs attained by your program area?**

The degree to which these ELOs were attained appeared to vary considerably not only across students but also across courses. Most instructors expressed satisfaction with the degree to which students had made progress on the emphasized outcomes, although several instructors also noted that progress in a single course is not the same as satisfactory competence. This parallels a point raised in the Behavioral and Social Sciences area discussion last year in emphasizing that achievement of these broad intellectual outcomes probably develops as students progress through their college careers and, as such, course-by-course assessment of the attainment of these outcomes may not really provide a complete picture of students' achievements.

**Are there any secondary LEAP ELOs you found that were addressed in a significant number of the courses from your general education category?**

\*Written Communication

\*Ethical Reasoning

**To what degree were these ELOs attained by your program area?**

Most instructors appeared to be generally satisfied with the degree to which students had made progress on the emphasized outcomes, although many of the qualifications raised in the comments about the primary ELOs also apply here.

**What other data did you discuss and what conclusions did you reach regarding that data?**

We did not emphasize other data, but a number of faculty did describe the methods by which they were assessing the achievement of the outcomes in their courses. The most common method

appeared to be assessment of ELOs as a part of the normal grading of course assignments and/or exams. Other faculty reported using post-test or pre-test/post-test assessments including, in one case, a critical thinking test pulled from the research literature (i.e., the CCTT-Z). Another used a brief student survey of perceptions of LEAP emphasis during the course. Perhaps the most common response, however – especially from adjunct and online faculty - was confusion about how this assessment was supposed to proceed and a desire for more information about assessment options.

**Based on data that you analyzed and the conclusion you drew from this analysis, list all items that were chosen for action by your program area:**

Given the diversity of the faculty in this content area (across disciplines and mode of instruction), it is unlikely that we will be working as a program area to take any particular action beyond attempting to spread the word to new, online, and adjunct faculty within our individual areas about the existence of these Gen Ed assessment expectations.

Individual faculty will also be working to improve their own instruction and assessment. For example, one instructor reported adapting class discussions to help students focus on key themes including the importance of critical thinking and social awareness; another raised the possibility of finding ways to encourage the more senior students in classes to mentor younger students; and a third reported revising reading assignments, homework assignments, and the final exam to focus more explicitly on the LEAP outcomes most relevant to the course.

**Describe any follow-up on plans and actions from the previous assessment cycle in your program area.**

Several course instructors are now reporting using pre-post assessments, which was an option raised in previous assessment discussions.

**Provide any recommendations for items that require resources outside the control of your general education program area or require action on behalf of another general education action area (or academic unit).**

\*Probably the most important issue that emerged from the online communications regarding ELO assessment in the Behavioral and Social Sciences Gen Ed area is the need to improve communication about the process. This is particularly true for online and adjunct faculty, but even full-time and on-campus professors expressed some confusion regarding the expectations. Faculty expressed a need in particular for *ongoing* communication, which might be helpful in any case but which is particularly important for adjunct and online faculty who may not be included in beginning-of-the-year training sessions or announcements.

\*One key realization that arose from this exercise is the need to ensure that all faculty teaching Gen Ed courses are included on the UMW Faculty email list. At least four instructors in the Behavioral and Social Sciences area do not appear to be included on the list and two long-time instructors were only added to the list in the fall. When instructors are not included on the UMW Faculty list, they do not receive the communications from the Gen Ed committee about important Gen Ed directives and issues or even links to the online surveys.

\*As noted in last year's report, greater administrative support of assessment efforts is needed. At the very least, efforts must be made to include all Gen Ed instructors on the UMW email list as soon as possible so they receive the information they need in time to be able to complete these assessments.

\*Our electronic discussion also raised several questions about how outcomes should be chosen and assessed (and, perhaps, how they should be communicated) when there are multiple instructors for the same course. At present, different sections of a course sometimes emphasize different outcomes and they often use different assessments. This is not a pedagogical problem per se and at least some of us would be resistant to imposition of mandated outcomes or assessments, but the extent to which parallelism across sections is desired or expected is unclear.

\*A few of our instructors and program areas face particular challenges either because the programs as a whole are in flux or because of staffing changes. Such situations further add to the complexity of trying to plan for quality assessments of student outcomes. New instructors must not only be given more information about the ELO assessment expectations, but they must also be given that information in time for them to plan appropriate assessments.

\*One instructor noted that more intensive and earlier efforts to improve students' quantitative literacy and ability to work in teams might be helpful in preparing students to make progress with respect to other LEAP outcomes. Interestingly, the psychology department this year began offering a course in Group Dynamics specifically intended to teach students how groups work and how to improve the work of groups. That course is offered as a Gen Ed course and is intended specifically for students who will not be pursuing majors or minors in psychology and who have no other background in the field.

**General Education Category:** History

**Time & date of meeting:** 3:30pm, April 17, 2017

**Attendance:** John Hajduk, Bill Janus, Aaron Weinacht, Erin Zavitz

**What are the primary LEAP essential learning outcomes (ELOs) that define courses that belong to your general education category?**

For the last two academic years, History, has been a stand-alone Category in Western's General Education program. Based on a review of History Category LEAP essential learning outcomes, we have found that the following two outcomes were the primary ELO's for the History Category:

1. Inquiry and Analysis
2. Intercultural Knowledge and Competence

The following two outcomes were secondary ELO's for the History Category:

1. Critical Thinking

There were no Tertiary ELO's for the History Category:

1. Written Communication

**To what degree were these ELOs attained by your program area?**

Based on reported Gen Ed Assessment Survey Data, we found the following success rates for primary ELOs (percentage of students achieving satisfactory scores):

John Hajduk: 83%

Bill Janus: 71%

Aaron Weinacht: 75%

Erin Zavitz: 77%

Totals: 76.5%

Based on reported Gen Ed Assessment Survey Data, we found the following success rates for secondary ELOs (percentage of students achieving satisfactory scores):

John Hajduk: 81%

Bill Janus: 75%

Aaron Weinacht:

Erin Zavitz: 76%

Totals: 77%

Based on reported Gen Ed Assessment Survey Data, we found the following success rates for

tertiary ELOs (percentage of students achieving satisfactory scores):

John Hajduk: 81%

Bill Janus:

Aaron Weinacht:

Erin Zavitz: 73%

Totals: 77%

Notes:

1. These figures do not include data from Block 8, during which two additional Gen Ed History classes were offered.

2. The range of students (year, age, experience, etc.) within Gen-Ed classes further complicates the accurate assessment of learning outcomes.

### **What other data did you discuss and what conclusions did you reach regarding that data?**

Our group discussed a number of additional issues that relate to the understanding and capture of relevant assessment data within Gen-Ed courses:

1. We discussed how the specific ELO's are broken down into component parts related to historical practice (research, primary source analysis, citation style, etc.) and how to balance those in computing success rates in meeting the outcomes.

2. We still feel (as reported last year) that the purpose and structure of our General Education program is somewhat in flux, making it difficult to standardize our systems of assessment. Gen- Ed courses require a consistent, coherent system of measuring outcomes, capable of generating actionable data.

3. Given that many of our students enter college level history classes with limited experience in the discipline (which is not uniformly required throughout high school curricula), and that there are no remedial programs like those in Math and Writing, it is unlikely that we will ever achieve 100% success rates in meeting ELO's.

### **Based on data that you analyzed and conclusion you drew from this analysis, list all items that were chosen for action by your program area:**

1. We will work next year on improving the precision with which we define our ELOs in the Gen Ed syllabi. We will also discuss and possibly develop a standard assignment that can be integrated into all our Gen Ed courses to provide a reliable point of comparison in evaluating the respective outcomes.

2. We are developing a common assessment rubric which will be used for one assignment, in each History General Education class. We anticipate that data collected from these assignments will provide a point of comparison (in ELOs) across these classes. This data should provide a consistent and coherent system of measuring outcomes, capable of generating actionable data.

**Describe any follow-up on plans and actions from the previous assessment cycle in your program area.**

None.

**Provide any recommendations for items that require resources outside the control of your general education program area or require action on behalf of another general education action area (or academic unit).**

None

# Assessment Report for General Education Categories

---

General Education Category: Literary and Artistic Studies  
Time & date of meeting: March 30, 2017  
Attendance: Bethany Blankenship, Shane Borrowman, Ashley Carlson, Judy Ulrich, Delena Norris-Tull

**What are the primary LEAP essential learning outcomes (ELOs) that define courses that belong to your general education category?**

Written communication  
Critical Thinking

**To what degree were these ELOs attained by your program area?**

Written communication—85%\*  
Critical Thinking—85%\*

**Are there any secondary LEAP ELOs you found that were addressed in a significant number of the courses from your general education category?**

None

**To what degree were these ELOs attained by your program area?**

None

**What other data did you discuss and what conclusions did you reach regarding that data?**

We discussed how we graded successful achievement of an ELO. Do we use final grades themselves, one particular assignment, or a specialized rubric? Delena noted that she had embedded Complete College America's rubric for the Critical Thinking ELO and assessed students' work according to that rubric.

\*This percentage represents the average number of students perceived by the instructors to have achieved this ELO as reported on the Gen Ed survey.

We discussed how the data showed student achievement of ELOs trended downward as the semester continued.

We discussed the ability of the Moodle gradebook to give us the data we need to assess our student ELO achievement.

**Based on data that you analyzed and conclusion you drew from this analysis, list all items that were chosen for action by your program area:**

We need to tell faculty who teach in this area only to assess their classes for Gen Ed in two areas: Written Communication and Critical Thinking. This decision to focus on these ELOs was made last year but not communicated.

We should track ELO numbers throughout the semester to see if student achievement does trend downward throughout the semester and/or academic year. We should also look at how the number of Gen Ed classes offered per block may affect this number. This may affect future scheduling.

We need to educate incoming faculty on what the ELOs are before the beginning of each academic year.

**Describe any follow-up on plans and actions from the previous assessment cycle in your program area.**

Last year we agreed to share rubrics, and this year, we actually created a Moodle space in the Assessment and Accreditation space for the Literary and Artistic Studies group to upload rubrics they use to assess ELOs (Check under the heading "General Education Courses and General Education Program Assessment").

We recommend that all Gen Ed classes using graded group activities to use the LEAP Team Work rubric.

**Provide any recommendations for items that require resources outside the control of your general education program area or require action on behalf of another general education action area (or academic unit).**

Moodle limits our ability to gather data on our students' work as it is assessed using the ELO rubrics. We need the most updated version of Moodle we can buy. The "Faculty Resources" page on Moodle needs to be cleaned up.

# Assessment Report for General Education Categories

---

General Education Category: **Mathematics**

Time & date of meeting: **3:30, March 29, 2017**

Attendance: **Eric Wright, Liz Vandree, Debbie Seacrest, Tyler Seacrest, Eric Dyreson**

What are the primary LEAP essential learning outcomes (ELOs) that define courses that belong to your general education category?

**Quantitative literacy is our sole primary ELO.**

To what degree were these ELOs attained by your program area?

**On average, we exceeded a reasonable level of attainment (as determined by the instructors themselves) by about 4%. This shows that on average, students were achieving the goals that the instructors of the course had for them.**

Are there any secondary LEAP ELOs you found that were addressed in a significant number of the courses from your general education category?

**Problem Solving, Inquiry and Analysis, Critical Thinking, were also covered.**

To what degree were these ELOs attained by your program area?

**Each of these exceeded reasonable levels of attainment by the following percentages: Problem Solving 8%, Inquiry and Analysis 12%, Critical Thinking 5%.**

What other data did you discuss and what conclusions did you reach regarding that data?

**We also discussed our personal experiences teaching the courses, course schedules, requirements regarding serving other degree programs, course demand and attrition rate.**

Based on data that you analyzed and conclusion you drew from this analysis, list all items that were chosen for action by your program area:

**We decided to try to continue to pursue honors courses. Not only did the honors course score well in our assessment, but we talk about how taking honors courses may lead the students to having a higher sense of self-efficacy and therefore higher achievement.**

**We agreed to offer only one M119 per year, as proof-based courses may not be a great fit for our students' interests in mathematics. The requirement that we offer at least one is due to the math-focus option in the elementary education degree.**

**Our probability class serves as a pre-requisite for statistics, but many also take it as a terminal general education course, but it may not be able to serve both groups at a high level at the same time. We talked about splitting the course in two and serving both demographics separately. While the scheduling may not work out, we may try this idea out by using M127: Topics in Mathematics to teach a terminal probability-based general education class.**

**We also considered linking M095 and M121: College Algebra, as having recent algebra knowledge is critical to M121, but may not be possible for scheduling purposes.**

Describe any follow-up on plans and actions from the previous assessment cycle in your program area.

**We continue to want to gain a better understanding of how the assessment process can best work, what we mean by each ELO, and to discuss specific examples from our classes, but we would appreciate further guidance from either the general education committee or assessment committee before committing too many resources to these goals.**

Provide any recommendations for items that require resources outside the control of your general education program area or require action on behalf of another general education action area (or academic unit).

**Mathematics general education classes are commonly used as service classes to other degrees. However, we wonder if in all cases that mathematics being taught in one of these required classes is ultimately useful for those students. We would ask other departments on campus consider the math courses they require and let us know what student learning outcomes from those courses are used and needed. For example, above we discussed lowering the number of sections we offer of M119: Number Theory. Could other mathematics**

**classes fulfill the requirement for this class in the math-focused option of the Elementary Education degree?**

**General Education Committee  
Annual Assessment Reporting Form**

**(Upload to Moodle by End of Block 7 of each year)**

**MM/DD/YY of Completion:** 03/30/2017

**Person Preparing Form:** Steve Mock (name); \_\_\_\_\_ (signature)

**1) Attachments:** Table of results for Natural Sciences Gen Ed courses. Results were generated by self-reporting of professors within Natural Sciences (Env. Science and Biology) utilizing a survey monkey available to faculty on campus.

**2) Names of Faculty Actively Participating in Annual Assessment:**

Wendy Ridenour, Mike Morrow, Craig Zaspel, Karl Ulrich, Jack Kirkley, Rob Thomas, Laura Young, Steve Mock

**3) LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes Assessed:**

Inquiry and Analysis, Critical Thinking, Problem Solving

**4) Means of Assessment:**

Project reports, exam questions/problems, oral presentations, lab reports

**5) Brief Commentary:**

The survey monkey that was used was different in format than in past years so the numbers gathered were also a bit different. Each faculty member determined how best to assess each of the 3 selected ELOs within the context of their courses. Each faculty member also determined what level of performance was necessary in order to establish that a student had achieved the outcome, and from that, determined what percentage of students achieved the desired learning outcomes in each course. These results were then submitted via the survey tool.

However, a change for this year was that the survey also asked for a desirable “achievement goal” for each ELO within in each class. Each faculty member selected their own answers or stated percentage goal for each class. This was done while submitting the results on the survey and before the group discussed the idea of “desirable goals”.

During our 2 hour evening meeting, this notion of desirable goals resulted in a lively discussion. There were a lot of comments, ideas, and suggestions as to what might constitute an ideal level of class performance, a lower level that would leave us quite pleased, and a lower still acceptable level of class performance. We came to some level of consensus that ideally, we'd like to see 100% of our students achieve each of the goals. (That's sort of why most of us chose teaching for our careers....) However, we all agreed that this ideal is virtually never met and likely not achievable, especially within the context of near open-enrollment for Montana Western. Further, we generally agreed that if 80-85% of our students in a particular class achieved the learning outcomes, we would be quite pleased with that. Last, we concluded that a 70% level of achievement is acceptable.

We also reviewed the specific results of the survey numbers that we had. Generally speaking, most of our classes had 70-80% of the students achieving the learning outcomes. One thing that is not clear to us is does the 70% mean that 70% achieve all 3 outcomes with 30% not achieving any, or is there a bit more of an assortment. Gathering and evaluating that data would require a bit more time and effort but might lead to some interesting results and discussions.

#### **6) Area/s for Targeted Improvement:**

We may try to each bring our class achievement levels up 5-10%.

One thing that is not clear to us is does the 70% mean that 70% achieve all 3 outcomes with 30% not achieving any, or is there a bit more of an assortment. Gathering and evaluating that data would require a bit more time and effort but might lead to some interesting results and discussions.

#### **7) Plan/s to Implement and Assess Targeted Improvements:**

Added effort in addressing the ELOs in each class.

#### **8) Financial or Other Resources Necessary to Facilitate Planned Improvements:**

No significant resources are necessary but we would like to see that whoever creates and maintains the assessment surveys tailor the surveys to each Gen Ed area (i.e., Natural Sciences) to help ensure consistent selection of ELOs.

# Assessment Report for General Education Categories

---

General Education Category: Writing and Oral Communication  
Time & date of meeting: Conducted via email  
Attendance: Bethany Blankenship, Shane Borrowman, Ashley Carlson, Alan Weltzien, Francis Davis, Sally Cobau, Jed Berry

**What are the primary LEAP essential learning outcomes (ELOs) that define courses that belong to your general education category?**

Written communication

**To what degree were these ELOs attained by your program area?**

Written communication—85%\*

**Are there any secondary LEAP ELOs you found that were addressed in a significant number of the courses from your general education category?**

Critical thinking  
Information literacy  
Inquiry and analysis

**To what degree were these ELOs attained by your program area?**

Critical thinking—83%\*  
Information literacy—82%\*  
Inquiry and analysis—84%\*

**What other data did you discuss and what conclusions did you reach regarding that data?**

None.

\*This percentage represents the average number of students perceived by the instructors to have achieved this ELO as reported on the Gen Ed survey.

**Based on data that you analyzed and conclusion you drew from this analysis, list all items that were chosen for action by your program area:**

There were five different ELO areas faculty chose to evaluate. In the future, WRIT 101 would be better served if we focused on only two or three ELOs, especially ones that can be observed and assessed in each major writing assignment (e.g. written communication, critical thinking, inquiry and analysis).

Goal scores for the Written Communication ELO were consistently either met or exceeded by actual scores. Actual scores didn't always exceed goal scores for secondary and tertiary ELOs. By assessing fewer ELO areas, we will be able to focus our attention on necessary elements of the class.

**Describe any follow-up on plans and actions from the previous assessment cycle in your program area.**

In our last assessment, we described a plan for students on the first day of WRIT 101 and Stretch to write to a common prompt. The writing was to be evaluated upon a shared rubric as a way of uncovering problems of placement. This was not accomplished this year, but it is set to start in fall 2017.

In response to increasing our actual scores in Written Communication, we added Learning Center tutors to peer editing sessions in each Stretch English class this academic year. This addition gives basic writers an added layer of support, particularly in the areas of grammar and style.

**Provide any recommendations for items that require resources outside the control of your general education program area or require action on behalf of another general education action area (or academic unit).**

Boise State University has developed a placement software program called The Write Class that could be tailored to our needs at UMW (see quote attached). This software would allow students themselves to use multiple measures on-line to discover what class they should be placed into. With The Write Class, students would be placed where they are likely to succeed.



**BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**  
*Office of Technology Transfer*

Bethany Blankenship  
Department of English  
University of Montana Western  
710 S. Atlantic St.  
Box 34  
Dillon, MT 59725

January 20, 2016

Dear Bethany:

We appreciate the opportunity to work with you and your colleagues to realize your vision for The Write Class at University of Montana Western. As you know, we have implemented customized versions of The Write Class at Boise State University, College of Western Idaho (a community college), and at University of Idaho (a public land-grant university). As such, your project fits our abilities and interests well, and we hope to continue working with you in the near future. Based on our discussion, we propose a customized version of The Write Class (TWC) that includes the following components.

### **Pre-Implementation Services**

Once provided with materials, we will customize the look and content of TWC for your institution. As requested, we will design the content around your course offerings.

We will remove the multilingual student pathway and customize the algorithm to generate course placements appropriate for your first-year writing sequence.

Then, we will run test scenarios, provide reports on these scenarios, and beta test the site for functionality. Any necessary adjustments will be made prior to the site launch.

Pre-implementation support also includes consultation on data management and documentation for staff and faculty (for example, FAQ sheets, pamphlets, advising information, and troubleshooting guides as appropriate).

### **Live Site Development**

This application will be hosted by a subcontractor. This subcontractor has FERPA securities and is PCI and HIPPA compliant. Your site will be available through a Web browser at a specialized Web domain. Once at that site, users would be prompted to log in with their name and a specific unique code (such as e-mail address or university ID). We will also provide a separate control panel for administrators.

An administrator panel that is accessed by separate log-in will be created. It will include a dropdown list of students who have completed the assessment. By selecting a student, an administrator will be able to review the student's assessment and see the system's placement for that student. Administrators are also able to export the entire completed assessment database as a Microsoft Excel file.

Based on the request to integrate TWC, this application development will include a script that exports TWC data nightly as a .csv file and transfers it (via SFTP) to the University of Montana Western data warehouse. University of Montana Western will need to develop an import script that will import student data (names, email addresses, student IDs) from a .csv file that is transferred to TWC nightly.

### Post Implementation Support

TWC comes with content specialist support that includes content consultation and revisions at no charge for the first three months post-build. Additional supporting documentation will be provided as requested and when possible. Technical support via email for local site administrators (Monday-Friday, 9:00a.m.-5:00p.m. Mountain Time) is included.

### 2015-2016: Site Construction and Implementation

Based on these specifications, we have provided a breakdown of the estimated costs below.

	Minimum	Maximum
Pre-Implementation Services	\$1,919	\$3,837
Live Site Build	\$3,838	\$3,838
Post Implementation Support	\$683	\$1,366
Annual SSL Certificate	\$155	\$155
First-Year Licensing Fee	\$5,000	\$5,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,595</b>	<b>\$14,196</b>

### 2016-beyond: Continued TWC Use

This proposal addresses the initial site build and support for full implementation of The Write Class at University of Montana Western. Each subsequent year will involve a relicensing agreement.

We do hope to be able to work with you on this project. As you read through this proposal, please let us know if you have any questions or if you would like the proposal revised in any way. Of course, if you are ready to move forward and would like a contract for this work, please do not hesitate in letting us know that as well.

Sincerely,



Heidi Estrem



Dawn Shepherd



Samantha Sturman