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Office for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning

Highlights

- The Office for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning was reconfigured to include Faculty Development and we hired two new faculty developers.

- The Davis Educational Foundation funded our three year $299,000 grant to support the implementation of the new general education program through faculty development, piloting of our assessment plan, supporting the development of affordable course materials, and developing a peer led team learning project to support faculty teaching large classes.

- We developed a scaffolded approach to faculty development involving individual consultations, one time workshops, multi-session programs, semester-long programs, and communities of practice.
  - 60 faculty received individual consultations
  - Over 200 faculty from over 50 departments attended one-time workshops
  - Over 70 faculty attended multi-session programs
  - 24 attended semester-long programs.

- ATL with Faculty Development (FD) and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment and Accreditation (SLOAA) provided extensive support for the implementation of the new General Education program including providing workshops, facilitating open meetings, consulting on templates, providing surveys, and developing a plan to pilot the assessment rubrics and technologies.

- We launched three fully online programs: RN to BS, Master of Science in Dietetics, Master of Science in Cybersecurity. In the first 5 sessions of the RN to BS degree program (fall 1 to summer 1)
  - 227 students completed their first class (NUR 247)
  - Of those 97% are still active
  - The average GPA is 3.42
  - 7 nursing courses, 1 pharmacy course, and 14 courses from 12 departments are being offered to meet the new general education requirements. Each of the faculty developing the courses received training, instructional design support, and a Quality Matters review

- The 2014-15 academic year marked the conclusion of the two-year pilot of the cohort-based assessment reporting system. That data was analyzed in 2015-16.
  - 82% of undergraduate programs reported on new outcomes assessment work. 87% met or exceeded expectations.
  - 91% of undergraduate programs reported on following up on prior recommendations for change. 62% met or exceeded expectations.
  - 70% of graduate programs reported on new outcomes assessment work. 83% met or exceeded expectations.
  - 100% of graduate programs reported on following up on prior recommendations for change. 100% met or exceeded expectations.

- URI applied for and was accepted into the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement

- With help from the Office of Online Education, Sakai was moved to an external host

- SLOAA administered the NSSE in Spring 2016. URI’s response rate of 32.1% was the best average response rate for institutions of over 10,000 and far above the average response rate of 21%.
Office for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning

Introduction

In the beginning of FY 2016, the Office of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment officially became the Office for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (ATL) with the addition of responsibilities for faculty development. The new office now consists of three divisions: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment and Accreditation (SLOAA), Online Education (OLE), and Faculty Development (FD). To implement this change, we hired two Assistant Directors for Faculty Development who began work in the summer 2015. Additionally, the Office of Student Learning, Outcomes, Assessment, and Accreditation hired a new part time assessment coordinator, Kristen Johnson, faculty in Political Science to replace John Stevenson. This position is funded by the Graduate School.

This Annual Report provides a picture of the work of the ATL Office. The work of each division is discussed separately, however, one of the advantages of the ATL office is the ability to collaborate across the divisions. Two of those projects are discussed below.

ATL Projects

New Faculty Teaching and Learning Workshop

In fall 2015, ATL implemented a new design for the New Faculty Teaching and Learning Workshop. Forty-seven faculty attended this one-day workshop targeted at faculty in their first three years at URI. The workshop included both a large classroom experience including homework, and a selection of small workshops. We were also able to offer a separate set of workshops for teaching assistants which was designed by the Graduate Assistant in the OLE; 97 TA’s attended. Both faculty and TA’s came together for lunch and a panel discussion with students. We are currently in the process of planning the workshops for fall 2016 for faculty. The Graduate School and Departments have assumed responsibility for training TA’s.

Davis Grant

In May 2016, ATL was awarded a three year $299,240 grant from the Davis Educational Foundation. The grant will support four of ATL’s initiatives involving all 3 divisions:

High Impact Teaching

The grant provides support for faculty professional development through High Impact Teaching Seminars focused on three general education outcomes: effective writing, information literacy, and quantitative literacy. The grant will fund the expert facilitators in these topics who will lead the seminars as well as providing professional development funds for the faculty participants. Faculty who participate will be expected to explore and adapt research-based best practices in these topics in their classes. These course transformations may be extended into a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning research project.

General Education Assessment

We will recruit 240 faculty over two years to participate in a pilot of our general education assessment plan. Faculty will receive professional development funds to design appropriate assignments. They will also collect, score, and submit student work along with those assignments as well as providing feedback on the assessment rubrics. An additional 40 faculty will be recruited to test possible software solutions for general education assessment as it is implemented across the University.
**Peer Led Team Learning**
In order to better support students in large classes, ATL is working with the Academic Enhancement Center (AEC) to pilot a Peer-Led Team Learning project which uses undergraduate students as leaders of small student groups as they work together in to solve carefully designed problems. Staff from the AEC will receive training, and faculty who participate will be supported in developing appropriate projects for the peer leaders and supervising their work.

**Affordable Course Materials**
The grant also provides funding to support a total of 19 faculty to research and adapt affordable course materials into at least one class with the goal of reducing the cost to students by at least 50%. These faculty will also be expected to report on their work to the department and act as a resource for their departmental colleagues.

Planning for these activities is underway and will be implemented beginning summer 2016.

**Staffing (2015-16):**

**Office for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning**
- Diane J. Goldsmith – Director
- Mike Motta (PT) – Associate Director of Information and Technology Services
- Lisa Heidenthal – Administrative Assistant

**Faculty Development**
- Eric Kaldor – Assistant Director
- Joshua Caulkins – Assistant Director

**Online Education**
- Kathleen M. Torrens (PT) – Assistant Director
- Joannah Portman-Daley – Assistant Director
- Justine Egan – Graduate Assistant

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment and Accreditation**
- Elaine Finan – Assistant Director
- Kristin Johnson (PT) – Graduate Assessment
- Michele Martel – Graduate Assistant (AY)
Faculty Development

Strategy

Programming for faculty development is designed as a funnel with opportunities for hundreds of faculty members to participate in single event programs, followed by programs designed to serve dozens of faculty over multiple sessions and which narrows again to semester-long programs that serve up to 20-30 faculty. The layers of programs are meant to encourage faculty members to increasingly dedicate more time to exploring and reflecting on evidence-based strategies for teaching and learning. As they become involved in more intensive programs, we expect them to become campus leaders and mentors to other faculty.

Programs

Single Event Programs

ATL Conversation Series

ATL Conversations are designed to ignite interest and discussion among faculty and staff from across campus about teaching and learning. Each conversation combines brief presentations with active discussion and exploration of a topic. Faculty and staff participate in-person or remotely. Attendees receive an official letter summarizing the ATL events they have participated in during the Academic Year. The Office for Faculty Development organized ATL Conversations around 18 topics during the 2015-2016 Academic Year. Topics included teaching with technology, techniques for engaging students, strategies to develop students’ metacognition and self-regulation, and how to support students in the autism spectrum. Fifteen URI faculty, four URI professional staff, and four external experts led conversations in addition to ATL staff. A full description of each conversation is included in Appendix A.

Over the course of the academic year, there were a total of 213 attendees, with 124 unique participants (26 attended two conversations and 21 attended three or more). Participants represented 49 academic departments and 7 university offices. Conversations had an average attendance of 11 with 33 participants attending the two sessions on “Large Classes.”

Sixty-two percent of ATL Conversation participants (77 out of 124) responded to our prompt “As a result of attending an ATL conversation…” in our End-of-Semester Faculty Survey. Of these respondents, 55% reported that they learned about a strategy or technique they want to try. Forty-two percent indicated that they tried a new technique in their classroom and 30% plan to make changes to their teaching. Forty-seven percent stated that they discussed something they learned at a conversation with a colleague, and 27% recommended the series to a colleague.

These results suggest that the ATL Conversations are serving their primary goal to spark faculty interest around ways to improve teaching and enhance student learning. The office continues to work to identify scheduling factors that can broaden and deepen participation. Time of day, location, and time of the semester have proven to be critical factors affecting participation.

The End-of-Semester Faculty Survey also asked respondents “How would you most like to participate in faculty development opportunities (Check all that apply)?” 261 faculty responded including 91 per-course instructors. Sixty-six percent of respondents wanted to have faculty development opportunities on the Kingston Campus, 33% were interested in opportunities to participate remotely, and 16% expressed
interest in events on the Providence Campus. Importantly, 51% expressed interest in online materials that could be used independently.

**STEM Diversity Institute**
The STEM Diversity Institute was initiated in September 2015 for STEM faculty as a means of increasing a sense of urgency and awareness of inclusive pedagogy in STEM courses at URI. Thirty faculty attended the 3-hour workshop. Planning for September 2016 is ongoing with the addition of a student component: faculty and students will interact over lunch with an emphasis on dialogue around issues of inclusivity and understanding the student experience.

**The RITL Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (SoTL) Summer Institute**
Ten URI faculty were selected as SoTL Scholars to participate in the first event organized by the Rhode Island Teaching & Learning Network (RITL Network). They participated in a day-long workshop on “Moving Your SoTL Project Forward” with Professor Michele DiPietro, CELT Director at Kennesaw State University. Fifty faculty from 5 Rhode Island colleges and universities attended in total.

**Harnessing Cognitive Science to Improve Your Teaching (Summer Program)**
Eric Kaldor led a workshop on supporting student learning with four teaching strategies that build on insights from cognitive science. Participants developed an action plan for adopting new ideas into their teaching. Coffee and pastry were generously provided by Dean Karim Boughida and the University Libraries.

**Understand the IRB for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning: Students as Human Subjects**
Mary Riedford and Ted Myatt from the Office of Research Integrity led a workshop for 20 faculty members on how to navigate the IRB Approval Process for SoTL research projects. This workshop was requested by faculty attending the SoTL Summer Institute.

**Multi-Session Programs**

**ATL Book Clubs**
ATL offered three book clubs over the course of the academic year: one aimed at new faculty and two focusing on texts related to inclusive pedagogy. The “New Faculty Book Club” read *Advice for New Faculty* by Robert Boice. The group was facilitated by Eric Kaldor & Joshua Caulkins and included two groups of new faculty (hired within the past three years) with a total of 15 participants. The groups discussed approaches to teaching, writing, and service with an emphasis on sharing ideas, concerns, and strategies towards successful academic lives. The “Diversity and Inclusion Book Clubs” read two different books: *Whistling Vivaldi: How Stereotypes Affect Us and What We Can Do* by Claude Steele in Fall 2015, and *Blind Spot: Hidden Biases of Good People* by Mahzarin Banaji and Anthony Greenwald in Spring 2016. Two groups each semester were facilitated by Bryan Dewsbury and David Hayes with 13 total participants in the fall and 14 total participants in the spring.

**Active Learning Classroom Certification**
The Active Learning Classroom (ALC) in the Robert L. Carothers Library & Learning Common was inaugurated in Fall 2015 and the first courses using the room began in Spring 2016. The ALC offers faculty and students a learning environment designed for hands-on learning and collaboration. Faculty must complete three workshops and teach a mini-lesson to become certified to use the room.

The workshops introduce faculty to the features of the room, the implications for teaching, practices for maximizing learning in small groups, and training in the use of the many technologies available in the room. A panel of instructors who have experience teaching in the room share lessons learned. In addition, participants have dedicated time to practice with colleagues and support staff. Sixteen faculty were
trained in January 2016 and another twelve were trained in May 2016 for a total of 28 faculty trained to use the room. Fourteen courses ran in the ALC in the Spring 2016 semester and fifteen courses will run in the Fall 2016.

Data collected from students enrolled in the ALC indicate that they find the room highly conducive to collaboration and group work, which is the primary intent of the room’s structure. Growing demand for the room from faculty seeking spaces like these indicates a need for more classrooms like the ALC. While students and faculty rate the technology highly, the space to move around the room and the round tables were the most important features in the room cited by both.

**Semester-long Programs**

**High Impact Teaching Seminars**
The High Impact Teaching (HIT) seminars consist of a series of seven sessions focused on evidence-based teaching practices. The end-goal of the HIT seminars is for participating faculty to develop focused projects aimed at incorporating evidence-based practices in one or more of their courses.

At the end of the seminar series, each faculty member submits an action plan for making a change to one of their courses and for assessing its impact. The action plan focuses on one or two very specific research questions that can be addressed in one semester. Faculty receive $1000 in professional development funds to support their action plan, which can be used to cover costs for attending conferences, purchasing materials, licenses or technology, or paying students to serve as research assistants. Faculty who teach large courses are given priority for places in the HIT Seminar.

Two seminars were run in Spring 2016 and one during June of 2016 with a total of 24 participants representing 17 Academic Departments across 6 Colleges and the Graduate School of Oceanography. During the 2015-16 academic year, these 24 faculty taught 88 sections with a total of 1993 students. For a list of the faculty participants see Appendix B.

**Permanent Communities of Practice**

**URI Teaching Peers**
Once faculty successfully complete the HIT Seminar, they become URI Teaching Peers, a network of faculty that actively engaged in teaching as a reflective practice. As of the end of June 2016, there are now 24 URI Teaching Peers. The Teaching Peers will be promoted as a key resource for other faculty interested in evidence-based approaches to teaching and learning. A webpage highlighting the URI Teaching Peers and their interests is being developed for release in Fall 2016.

**Consultation**

The FD office provided 95 hours of consultation with 60 faculty members in 2015-2016. The vast majority of these sessions were conducted privately with a single faculty member. The office emphasizes that all consultations are confidential unless a faculty member asks the office to share specific information with a colleague, administrator or department chair.

**IDEA Consultations**
The IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction System is a sophisticated tool that can provide faculty with valuable information and suggestions to enhance student learning. These single session consultations help faculty interpret their results and learn to use the diagnostic feedback to develop strategies for improving
their teaching. Eric Kaldor attended the IDEA Conference February 1-2, 2016 to learn how to explain and better advise faculty and administrators on how to use the IDEA results appropriately and effectively.

Mid-Semester Feedback
Starting in Spring 2016, the office offered a new facilitated process for students to provide mid-semester feedback. Our feedback process asks students to focus on three questions:

- What is really working for you that helps you learn in this course?
- What improvements could be made in the course?
- What can students do to improve the course?

Students answer these questions individually, work in small groups to come to consensus around their top three answers for each, and then rate their individual answer to suggestions from all groups in the course. For courses with more than 100 students, we have developed a process that takes less class time and replaces the 40-50 minute classroom session with two fifteen minute sessions. We then discuss these results with the faculty. In Spring 2016, four mid-semester feedback sessions were conducted as proof of concept.

Course Design Consultations
The office emphasizes the importance of designing significant learning experiences and using backward design principles focus on primary student learning outcomes. Most Course Design Consultations in 2015-2016 were focused on submissions for the new General Education Program. To avoid overstretching our resources, we encourage faculty to participate in the High Impact Teaching Seminar prior to working with the office on course design.

Curriculum Consultations
The office facilitates departmental conversations for academic programs around a range of topics including strategic analysis of curricula, curriculum mapping exercises, and assignment design and coordination. In 2015-2016, the office facilitated conversations for three academic departments: University Libraries Instructional Services, Computer Science & Statistics, and Sociology and Anthropology. In addition, 6 Academic Programs joined the Collaborations in Assessment Program offered by SLOAA that includes curriculum consultations.

Consultation on College & University Initiatives
The office consulted with the College of Engineering on Active Learning Classrooms for the new Engineering Complex and with the College of Business Administration on developing and assessing intercultural competence for Business students and faculty.

The office provided extensive consulting in support of the General Education Implementation Steering Team including the development of Assessment Planning Templates for each outcome in the new General Education Program and consultation on the development of the rubric for the Integrate and Apply Outcome. We facilitated of six workshops on how to use the assessment planning templates for the course submission process and several open forums. We also conducted surveys of faculty with SLOAA on 1) integrative learning and 2) general education assessment.
Online Education

Online Programs

The Office of Online Education supported the launch of URI’s first fully online programs in fall 2016. Two of these are master’s degrees, Cyber Security and Dietetics, and one is a transfer bachelor’s program for licensed RNs to finish their BS degrees.

ONLINE RN TO BS DEGREE

Program Launch
The first students were admitted in the summer of 2015 and the first courses were offered in fall of 2015. The program has had 5 starts this year. The program admitted 277 students from Fall 1-Summer 1; 257 (93%) enrolled in the first nursing course. As of June 1, 220 were still active (86% of those who enrolled in NUR 247 and 97% of those who completed their first course). (Appendix C). Diane continues to work with other colleges and departments to find courses to meet the new general education requirements. Currently there are 15 courses from 12 departments (including Nursing) which have been approved or are on track for approval. (Appendix D)

Academic Partnerships and Internal Coordination
The Office of Online Education provides much of the coordination between our partner Academic Partnerships (AP) and URI as well as the work necessary to coordinate the work of the large number of URI departments involved with this program. This work is done primarily by Mike Motta who is attached to ATL for this purpose and Diane. While much of the preliminary technical and administrative work was completed prior to the launch of the program in the fall of 2015, there was, and continues to be an enormous amount of work as we entered the implementation stage. This year’s work has revolved around improving services, communication, and the technology necessary to facilitate the program. This includes bi-weekly phone meetings with AP, regular internal discussions with IT, Admissions, Enrollment Services, the budget office and nursing, as well as ongoing strategy sessions over specific issues.

Remote Proctor
The Office of Online Education worked with the bookstore to contract with a company to provide remote proctoring for fully online courses. Students pay for the service by buying a token through the bookstore. Faculty register their tests with the company. At the time of the test, students must turn on their webcam, show an official ID, and be videotaped taking the test under the conditions determined by their faculty, i.e. use of calculators, websites, textbooks, etc. While one faculty used this for her course in the RN to BS program, we expect others to do so after learning about her experience at our RN to BS faculty workshop.

Instructional Connections
The Office of Online Education worked with the College of Nursing to complete an RFP process for a company to provide academic coaches for the RN to BS program. Any course with more than 30 students registered provides coaches to assist the instructors. The coaches must have at least a Master’s degree and are recruited and trained by the company. Faculty may recommend graduate students or per course faculty to the company. The coaches are selected by and work under the direction of the faculty.
providing services similar to those provided by TA’s: grading, responding to emails, and facilitating group discussions. As course sizes are growing in the program, more faculty are using coaches.

**Instructional Design**

Joannah Portman-Daley provided instructional design assistance for both nursing and general education faculty in developing and moving their courses online. She had over 50 individual meetings with faculty in Nursing, Chemistry, Communications, Film, Gender and Women’s Studies, History, Pharmacy, Spanish, and Textile, Marketing and Design. This work also included meeting regularly with AP and coordinating on course reviews. All courses are developed using a single template and go through a Quality Matters review conducted by AP.

**Faculty Development Workshop**

In late May, Kathleen Torrens and Joannah Portman-Daley designed and led a workshop for faculty currently teaching and those preparing to teach in the RN to BS program. The workshop was attended by over 20 faculty. Much of the content was informed by a survey of students currently in the program.

**Master of Science in Dietetics**

This program runs on the same accelerated calendar as the RN to BS degree and therefore we have worked collaboratively on technical, regulatory, and internal policy issues. Online Education also provided training and some Quality Matters reviews for the program.

**URI Online Courses**

The Office of Online Education continues to work to improve the quality of online teaching, online course design, and student learning within classes.

**Accessibility**

Joannah Portman-Daley designed, created, and managed a captioning pilot in order to promote accessibility in online courses. In just one semester, using a student worker, we were able to caption 22 videos for faculty to use in their online courses.

**Training**

OLE offers three scaffolded training sessions for faculty who want to teach online. This includes a self-paced introduction to Sakai, a facilitated fully online three-week class on online pedagogy, and a self-paced course covering online course design. In 2015-2016, 36 faculty members completed the Basic Sakai Competency course, 32 completed Online Pedagogy 1, and 5 completed Online Pedagogy 2. Appendix E provides information on the numbers of faculty members who have enrolled and/or completed our trainings from July 1, 2015 - July 1, 2016. Data on all faculty who have completed the training is available on our website: [http://web.uri.edu/online/qualifiedonlinefaculty/](http://web.uri.edu/online/qualifiedonlinefaculty/)

OLE staff, including our Graduate Assistant Justine Egan, undertook an evaluation of our online training using data from our evaluation survey completed after faculty finish the course, a retrospective survey, and interviews done with selected faculty. The results of this research should lead to revisions in our training protocols and a possible publication.

**Instructional Design**

Joannah Portman-Daley continues to work with faculty across the University on the design of their courses. In particular, she met with faculty from GSLIS, Music, NFS, the Providence Campus, and Writing and Rhetoric.
Summer Online Courses
Kathleen Torrens, in partnership with Dean Libutti and John Olerio of the Provost’s Office, designed and facilitated an Online Teaching Fellows (OLTF) Program for faculty who wanted to offer their summer course online. The training was completed by 13 faculty from across the campus. Participants engaged in an online course on online pedagogy and course design and then redesigned an existing course to be offered in a summer session in 2016. Each completed course underwent an internal Quality Matters review.

Quality Matters Reviews
OLE has supported the training of 4 faculty (with another 2 doing training now) by Quality Matters to do peer reviews using their rubric. In addition to the 13 OLTF faculty, 7 others have had their courses reviewed by our QM-qualified peer reviewers. All courses designed for the online RN to BS degree program undergo a Quality Matters review through Academic Partnerships.

Regulatory Work
In the spring of 2016, URI applied for and was officially accepted into the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA). This allows URI to follow one set of rules regarding enrolling online students in our courses and programs for SARA states. Before SARA, we needed to check the regulations regarding physical presence for all 50 states to ensure we met each state’s requirements and/or apply for permission to offer our courses in the state. There are currently 40 states plus DC in SARA. Unfortunately, some of the last holdouts are our neighbors: MA, CT, NY, NJ, PA. While we have sought and obtained permission from most of these states, we are hopeful that they will join SARA soon so that we do not need to reapply individually to them. Some of these have passed legislation and seem to be moving forward.

Sakai

External Hosting of Sakai
Diane Goldsmith, as chair of the Joint Committee on Online and Distance Learning, worked with the committee, Mike Motta, and additional staff from ITS to complete an RFP process which resulted in moving SAKAI to an external host, Longsight, in January 2016. Since the transition, there have been no unplanned outages or major issues. At our request, Longsight performs planned maintenance at 5am on Sundays when needed. Planning to upgrade to Sakai 10 in August is underway under the leadership of Media and Technology Services. The fact that URI is now running courses in two academic calendars which do not overlap means that there are very small windows when no classes are in session in which to do major upgrades.

Training
OLE continues to work closely with the staff in Media and Technical Services to coordinate training, messaging to faculty, timing of upgrades, and other issues related to SAKAI and its technical support.
Student Learning, Outcomes Assessment and Accreditation

SLOAA serves the University of Rhode Island faculty and staff community by promoting student success and achievement through outcomes assessment and continuous program improvement strategies. SLOAA provides support to programs as they design, implement, and report on their assessment plans and activities. SLOAA facilitates a peer review process of program assessment reports. In addition, the office conducts the tri-annual NSSE survey, and works with departments outside of Academic Affairs on assessment issues.

Institution-wide Academic Program Assessment Reporting

The end of the 2014-2015 academic year marked the conclusion of the pilot of a cohort-based assessment reporting system for all undergraduate and graduate academic programs yielding a volume of direct evidence about the success of the institutional-wide assessment program. These data profile the institution’s progress toward its goal for program compliance with campus and NEASC accreditation assessment requirements, the degree to which the institution’s programs are using “best practices” in their assessment work, as well as whether programs are using evidence from learning outcomes assessment to inform changes to their programs or assessment practice. Data management, input and analysis of the multiple variables included in program reports is conducted at two critical points: report submission and feedback submission. Overview results and highlights of the recent institution-wide summary report are provided (Appendix F). LOOC uses the peer review results to publicly acknowledge excellence in reporting at the Faculty Senate and in letters of recognition from the Provost and Graduate School to Undergraduate and Graduate programs (Appendix G, list of programs recognized 2014, 15). Annual summaries of program assessment reporting activity are available on the SLOAA website (see Institutional Assessment Reporting Summary). Eighty-eight percent of all programs are in compliance with the NEASC requirement to post learning outcomes on program websites.

Program Assessment Support and Initiatives

SLOAA is committed to strategies for improving the assessment climate and ensuring compliance with reporting expectations. We also assist programs in not only reporting student performance on outcomes but on the effectiveness of a programs using the results for program improvement.

Assessment Support

Overall Faculty Outreach

Elaine Finan and Kristin Johnson met with 18 programs, held 53 face-to-face consultations reaching more than 80 graduate and undergraduate faculty. The majority of meetings were with individual faculty, but several were departmental or small groups including the Arts and Sciences Ad Hoc Assessment Committee and the Engineering department chairs. Email consultations exceed face-to-face consultations for assessment planning, methods and reminders. The lack of an assessment management system negatively impacts the workload of staff and faculty in all phases of the assessment reporting cycle.
New Program Development

As required for new program approval, SLOAA supported the development of assessment plans for two new programs in 2015-2016, with a total of 12 face-to-face meetings: Criminology and Criminal Justice (approved 2016) and Converging Media (still pending). Beginning in fall 2016, the Assessment Plan feedback process will utilize the Learning Outcomes Oversight Committee (LOOC) as a liaison between SLOAA and proposing programs, introducing a rubric scoring tool to systematize the feedback and response method whereby SLOAA provides support and LOOC provides final oversight. The rubric will be adapted from the one used for Graduate Assessment.

Grant Support

SLOAA provide assessment planning for a number of grants including two NSF grants of which one was funded and both of the Provost’s Innovation Grant initiatives, of which one was funded.

Assessment Initiatives

General Education Program Assessment Planning

SLOAA supported the General Education Implementation Steering Committee by participating in multiple summer forums and three fall workshops on assessment planning, including support for the application of the assessment planning template. SLOAA collaborated on the development of the Phase I Assessment Plan for the new General Education Program in conjunction with several committees and offices: GEIST, GEC, SAGE, ATL/FD, IR, ITS. The plan identifies a timeline (12 outcomes/2 years), method (sample of 20 faculty/10 students each) and the technology for pilot-testing rubric language, sampling method, and data gathering.

Assessment Climate Survey (Fall 2015)

A survey of department Chairs and graduate program directors was conducted during the fall 2015 providing indirect measures of the campus assessment climate, assessment use, and the institution’s capacity for doing and valuing outcomes assessment. This was the third administration of the Chairs Survey, developed and disseminated by John Stevenson with SLOAA support. Executive summary results (Appendix H) and overall results and trends for 2009, 2012, 2015 were shared with Chairs, Deans, the Associate Provost and Provost, and in a presentation to LOOC. Among the recommendations made was the increased integration of learning outcomes assessment process into Academic Program Review (APR) process which resulted in a change in APR documentation language approved by the Faculty Senate in May, 2016.

Curriculum Design and Assessment

In conjunction with ATL Faculty Developers, the Collaborations in Assessment Program (CAP) initiative supported faculty representatives from six undergraduate programs to attend the Lilly Conference in June 2016, and begin an individualized and coordinated effort of embedding faculty development and assessment into course and program curriculum (re)design. Faculty will work with teams from their programs on a single change initiative for one to two years and utilize the results for program-level assessment reporting.

College-Level Assessment Support

SLOAA collaborated on the development of two models for assessment planning and reporting: an undergraduate assessment planning model was designed for the College of Arts & Sciences which provided examples of embedding assessment planning into the curriculum and a graduate assessment reporting template was developed through collaborative efforts with an Engineering faculty member to support assessment reporting by the College of Engineering graduate programs.
Survey development
SLOAA participated in an advisory group to develop the Survey of Recent Graduates (SORG) which was first piloted in fall 2015. Six months after graduation, alumni were asked questions regarding their post graduate experiences and perceived learning gains within their major. Consultations followed with two undergraduate programs who used the results within their program. The advisory group continues to work on improving response rates and gathering additional data on graduating students including using reader cards at graduation.

Assessment Process Evaluation
Since the change to a cohort-based reporting cycle (2012) and the implementation of faculty peer review of biennial reporting (2014/15), SLOAA remains committed to an iterative cycle of review of the reporting and feedback process to learn how to improve a program’s ability to do and use assessment work.

Report Review
Program reports are reviewed by trained faculty working in teams as peer reviewers. SLOAA routinely gathers feedback from peer reviewers on the process and documentation they use for peer review, in addition to feedback from academic programs on the usefulness of the reviewer feedback. Following each round of reporting changes are made to the reviewer process, training curriculum, peer review feedback rubric, and the NEASC reporting form (E1A) yielding improved results in all areas. Improvement in both the quality of the report being submitted and the quality and utility of feedback from reviewers is critical to reducing oversight of this process by SLOAA.

Graduate Program Assessment
Personnel changes within SLOAA in 2015-2016 included the replacement of John Stevenson with Kristin Johnson (faculty, Political Science), as the Coordinator of graduate program assessment, with continued funding for two years (2015-2017) by the Graduate School. The Graduate School discontinued their partial support of the SLOAA graduate assistant after four years. To support the transition in personnel, Kristin provided each graduate program with an individualized summary of their assessment history to enhance compliance and ease the reporting burden. This was an extensive effort which has had multiple benefits: the summary information was incorporated into report reviewer materials for graduate programs to streamline reviewer work, the summaries are helpful for tracking when graduate program assessment plans expire, and this process will be used in undergraduate reminders beginning fall 2016 creating a more targeted and systematic tracking of assessment expectations and oversight.

Biennial Assessment Reporting for Accredited Programs
Following several discussions with NEASC about the reasonableness of an additional assessment reporting burden placed on accredited programs, these programs are no longer expected to report on learning outcomes assessment using the detailed NEASC assessment reporting template, but rather will use summary documents to satisfy reporting requirements. Accredited programs remain obligated to the URI biennial reporting process, but now complete two summary documents to provide the institution and NEASC with information on key issues and concerns noted by accreditors, as well as highlights of learning outcomes assessment. Programs must continue to post learning outcomes on their website and submit an updated curriculum map. This change was implemented for the reporting Cohort I, 2016 reports, and requires a change in the review process. A new rubric was developed, adapted from the Graduate Program Assessment Plan to track compliance with the requirements and is being piloted in summer 2016.

The cumulative effect of outreach, including consultations, workshops, and online resources should continue to increase compliance with reporting. More importantly, the quality of the assessment work, the
value and meaning of the assessment process, the use of results within programs, and the capacity for continued growth should continue to improve.

**National Benchmarking for Student Engagement Outcomes**

In 2013 URI moved from an every two to every three-year administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). This allows us to collect longitudinal data on students who take NSSE as a freshmen and senior. The spring 2016 administration yielded a 32.1% response rate, the best average response within the NSSE database of institutions with 10,000+ students, and far above the national average for our institution size (21%). Two additional modules were added: Gender and Sexuality and Advising (the latter was also administered in 2013. The 2016 results are expected in August 2016 with data analysis to be facilitated by IR and SLOAA staff. We are planning forums for targeted populations of faculty and staff to broadly disseminate results. Recommendations for the 2019 administration include budget changes, delegating responsibilities to a task force of campus leadership, including student affairs departments and student affairs college personnel and consideration of additional student support for the public relations campaign.

**Additional Outreach**

**Assessment Support**

SLOAA provided additional support for the assessment efforts of non-academic departments. We are participating in processes to support an assessment program in Student Affairs and have been invited to consult with the Academic Enhancement Center to coordinate assessment planning.

**Grant Funding Initiatives**

SLOAA applied for an IDEA Impact Grant to support a "preparing future faculty” program (modeled after Claremont Graduate University) for Teaching Assistants to create a “best practices” training program with program-level assessment embedded within the curriculum. The longer-term goal would focus on developing a certificate or other type of recognition graduate students could showcase in support of their teaching proficiency to future employers. While the grant was not funded, we may apply for next year.
ATL Goals for 2016-17

1. **Support the implementation of the New General Education Program through:**
   - Facilitating the implementation of Phase I outcomes assessment including training faculty, collecting and analyzing data, testing possible software solutions.
   - Providing faculty development in effective writing (one of the 12 outcomes) through our High Impact Teaching Seminars.
   - Working collaboratively with the Director of the General Education Institute to support additional training and assessment initiatives

2. **Double the number of faculty who participate in all Faculty Development and Assessment training activities through:**
   - Increasing the number of attendees in the ATL conversations, High Impact Teaching Seminars, STEM diversity Institute, ATL book clubs, active learning certification, mid-term evaluations, and consultations.
   - Developing a robust teaching peers program to use the skills of faculty who have completed the HIT Seminars.
   - Developing workshops for faculty on Assessment Issues such as Bloom’s taxonomy, curriculum mapping, developing strong course and program learning outcomes, and embedding learning outcomes assessment into external funding applications.
   - Supporting four academic programs to create course-based assessment initiatives which scale-up to program-level assessment opportunities (1 and 2 year plans) through the Collaborations in Assessment Program.

3. **Support student learning through:**
   - Increasing the number of faculty who adopt high impact teaching practices in their classes
   - Developing a peer-led team learning project for large classes
   - Developing an affordable course materials project to decrease the cost of attending URI.
   - Supporting URI’s colleges in using their programmatic assessment results to improve student learning outcomes.

4. **Continue to increase the number and quality of online courses and programs through:**
   - Working with the College of Nursing and Academic Partnership to grow enrollments in the RN to BS degree program and ensure that the program is of the highest quality.
   - Doubling the number of courses which have gone through a Quality Matters Peer Review.
   - Increasing the number of faculty who are qualified to teach online by 25%

5. **Streamline office processes and information through:**
   - Revising the websites for ATL and all divisions to provide better information in an easier to navigate format.
   - Implementing data base software designed to support event management and some assessment activities.
Appendices
Appendix A: ATL Conversation Series 2015-2016

What is Integrative Learning? How Can We Help Students Learn to Do It?
October 8, 2015
Eric Kaldor (ATL)
Participant #: 22

What do we mean by integrative learning? What are some teaching approaches that help students develop this ability? Join this conversation to learn about different approaches to integrative learning, to raise questions, and to share your experience and expertise.

HOT Questions, Deep Learning
October 14, 2015
Joshua Caulkins (ATL)
Participant #: 11

Well-designed questions can make a big difference in student learning. Faculty use questions in many different ways: to start classroom discussions, as multiple choice items, or summative essay exam questions. Simple changes to the structure of questions can promote Higher-Order Thinking (HOT). With the addition of careful scaffolding, instructors can help students begin to tackle more challenging questions.

Engage Students with Interactive Apps
October 22, 2015
Joanna Norris (Biological Sciences), Roy Bergstrom (Instructional Technology & Media Services), Stephen Norris (Graduate Student in Computer Engineering), Matthew Bessette (Computer Science Student), Jeremy Vessella (Computer Science Student)
Participant #: 10

With interactive apps, URI students are testing their knowledge, running simulations, and gathering data from beyond campus. In this conversation, we'll explore a simulation game developed for Cell Biology and the platform for interactive apps supported by URI's expert team in Instructional Technology and Media Services. Significant time will be devoted to discussion of how this technology could be implemented in your courses.

Large Classes: Can We Make a Difference in the Culture of Learning at URI? – 2 Sessions
October 28 & 29, 2015
Eric Kaldor (ATL), Joshua Caulkins (ATL), Elaine Finan (ATL)
Participant #: 33

Many faculty members have spoken to us with concerns about large classes. This conversation is organized around the question: How can we redesign the student experience in large classes to enhance
learning and student motivation? ATL staff will present data on the distribution of large courses at URI and evidence of their impact on student learning from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The main goal of this session is to have a lively conversation around faculty concerns, suggestions, and interest going forward.

**Feedback that Matters: How to Respond Effectively to Student Writing**
November 5, 2015
Nedra Reynolds (Writing & Rhetoric)
Participant #: 9

Feedback on student writing is an important tool to help students improve as writers. How can faculty provide feedback that is effective and at the same time not be overwhelmed by the workload? Nedra Reynolds (Writing & Rhetoric) will address common myths about writing feedback and discuss the difference between feedback and grading. We will examine how to use feedback to improve students’ writing process and motivate revision with a mix of directive and facilitative commentary.

**Top Hat overview and discussion – 2 Sessions**
November 18 & 19, 2015
David Liptrot (Top Hat)
Participant #: 7

In our recent survey of faculty who teach large classes, 35% of respondents wanted a university-wide solution to student response systems. One key question is whether cell phones and other devices students possess offer an alternative to stand-alone clickers. Top Hat is one of several apps for phones, tablets, and other devices that can be used as a student response system. Lara Bean from Top Hat will offer two sessions for faculty to ask questions and explain their own needs and desires for interactive technology in the classroom.

**Getting Students to Engage with the Literature: Information Literacy for Your Majors**
December 3, 2015
Shabnam Lateef (Kinesiology), Christine Zozula (Sociology & Anthropology)
Participant #: 11

Do your students struggle to recognize academic research as an ongoing intellectual conversation? Do your students struggle to see scholarship as more than a collection of isolated facts? Shabnam Lateef (Kinesiology) and Christine Zozula (Sociology/Anthropology) will lead a conversation discussing problems they identified in their students ability to engage the research literature and will discuss some small changes to assignments they have developed to help students learn how to engage with academic research more deeply.

**Get Off Campus! Designing Experiential Learning into Your Courses**
December 9, 2015
Well-designed experiential learning experiences have been shown to have significant and lasting impacts on students. Bringing experiential learning into your course or program can seem daunting, but the Center for Career and Experiential Learning has important resources to support you through this process. Blaire Gagnon (Textiles, Fashion Merchandising and Design) will describe an annual 2-day visit to NYC where her students network with employers and alumni, while Adam Roth (Harrington School) will present some exciting examples of project-based learning on campus and off. Then experiential education coordinators Tammy Leso and Diana Marshall will describe the logistical support they offer for a range of projects. Time will be reserved for brainstorming and discussing ideas on how to incorporate experiential learning into your own courses.

---

**End-of-Semester Wrap Up**
December 16, 2015
Eric Kaldor (ATL), Diane Goldsmith (ATL), Elaine Finan (ATL)
Participant #: 5

A end-of-semester session for new faculty to discuss their experiences teaching and working at URI.

---

**Exam wrappers: Create Self-regulated Learners**
February 5, 2016
Bryan Dewsberry (Biological Sciences)
Participant #: 18

Exam wrappers are activities students do immediately before and after an exam. Wrappers contain prompts asking students how they learn, how they study and why they make mistakes. These activities help students create enduring improvements to their learning and study practice. Bryan Dewsbury is using exam wrappers to help students deal with stress associated with taking exams in his large introductory biology courses. This is particularly relevant due to the causal relationship between exam stress and stereotype threat.

---

**In-Class Simulations to Develop Higher Order Thinking**
February 11, 2016
Marc Hutchison (Political Science)
Participant #: 5

Simulations are one example of active learning strategies that improve students' critical thinking skills. Marc Hutchison will present several short in-class simulations that use classroom response systems (i.e. clickers) to generate higher order thinking and engagement. These simulations help students walk through the logic of counterintuitive concepts as well as overcome biases that can skew their conclusions using more traditional approaches to the material.
Covering Less Content for Deeper Learning
February 19, 2016
Serena Moseman-Valtierra (Biological Sciences)
Participant #: 11

Scaffolding multiple teaching strategies together is a powerful means to encourage more students to engage in deep learning rather than surface learning. Serena Moseman-Valtierra will describe how she accounts for students’ prior knowledge, establishes clear expectations of what students will be able to do with their new knowledge, and designs activities that allow students to practice with real-world problem sets. These strategies are enhanced by using small groups in her large lecture classes.

Submit A Course For The Integrative Learning Outcome
February 26, 2016
Kelly Orr (Pharmacy), Silvia Dorado-Banacloche (Business Administration), Susan Hannel (Textiles, Fashion Merchandising & Design)
Participant #: 16

Members of the General Education Committee's Integrative Learning Panel will discuss how to submit courses for the integrative learning outcome. The panel will discuss the wide range of student work that is appropriate for this learning outcome. Participants will share their own ideas for course submissions and receive guidance on how to streamline their submissions.

Two-stage Exams
March 4, 2016
Kim Fournier (Kinesiology)
Participant #: 12

Collaborative testing has been employed to help improve student performance on exams and reduce test anxiety. By design, the group portion of the two-stage exam facilitates high levels of student engagement and interaction. Kim Fournier will describe why she used two-stage exams in her Human Anatomy course and the key features of collaborative testing that yield improved student success.

Working with Students with Disabilities
March 10, 2016
Pamela Rohland (Disability Services for Students)
Participant #: 11

Pamela Rohland will present a series of scenarios that faculty have faced when encountering students with disabilities. These cases often involve important legal, pedagogical, and ethical decisions that may have significant ramifications for faculty and students. She will use a case studies approach to develop
and assess options for different situations. Through these case studies, we can identify important issues but also create a supportive relationship with students with disabilities rather than a bureaucratic one.

---

Tests that Reflect How We Learn  
April 1, 2016  
David Hayes (Academic Enhancement Center)  
Participant #: 6

David Hayes will discuss how students study for tests and the study strategies that produce deep learning and long-term retention. Some test designs reinforce the value of effective study habits while others reward cramming and other inefficient strategies. A lively discussion will consider testing across different disciplines.

---

Understanding Autism Spectrum Disorders  
April 7, 2016  
Paul LaCava (Rhode Island College), Deb Arenberg (Sherlock Center)  
Participant #: 10

This workshop will provide a brief overview of Autism Spectrum Disorders and how the defining characteristics of ASDs can impact college students. The Functional Perspective on Behavior will also be shared and participants will learn how all behavior, both problem and prosocial, has a communicative function. Participants will gain an understanding of the conditions that promote and maintain both prosocial and problem behavior. In addition, they will be able to recognize the impact of the classroom environment on student’s social and academic behavior.

---

Strategies to Support Students with ASD in the Classroom  
April 15, 2016  
Adam Moore (Education), Susan Constable (Rhode Island Technical Assistance Project)  
Participant #: 14

Participants will be provided with information on what types of academic and behavioral challenges are often seen in students with Autism Spectrum Disorders. In addition, they will learn practical, easy-to-implement strategies that can be used to respond to and support students (both academically and behaviorally) with Autism Spectrum Disorders in the classroom.
Appendix B: High Impact Teaching Seminar Participants, 2015-2016

**Spring 2016 Cohort**
Jessica Adams, Biological Sciences
Christy Ashley, College of Business Administration
Laura Barnes, Mathematics
Wendy Boivin, Human Development & Family Studies
Michelle Caetano, Pharmacy Practice
George Dombi, Chemistry
Ginette Ferszt, College of Nursing
Jay Fogleman, School of Education
Steve Irvine, Biological Sciences
Katherine Petersson, Fisheries, Animal & Veterinary Science
Becky Sartini, Fisheries, Animal & Veterinary Science
Daniel Sheinin, College of Business Administration
Thomas Sproul, Environmental & Natural Resource Economics
Penny Steen, Kinesiology
Barbara Van Sciver, Biological Sciences
Christie Ward-Ritacco, Kinesiology

**Summer 2016 Cohort**
Beth Laliberte, Geosciences
Katrin Jomaa, Political Science
Marcella Thompson, College of Nursing
Niall Howlett, Cell and Molecular Biology
Cheryl Foster, Philosophy/Honors
Jaime Palter, Graduate School of Oceanography
Bethany Milner, Communicative Disorders
Nicole Asal, Pharmacy Practice
### Appendix C: Online RN to BS Data – Fall 1, 2015-Summer 1, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FALL1 2015</th>
<th>FALL2 2015</th>
<th>SP1 2016</th>
<th>SP2 2106</th>
<th>SU1 2016</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted - New</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmitted***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed NUR 247</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Active</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% currently active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/completed NUR 247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># accepted From CCRI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># accepted Partner Hospitals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Offered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Class Size</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest Class</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Enrollment at Drop Date</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Enrollment at End</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Drop to End</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average #classes/term</strong></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GPA</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D: RN to BS General Education Courses With Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Approved Online</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Grand Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 100 Communication Fundamentals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B2 approved</td>
<td>Only partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA 220 Statistics In Modern Society</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B3 submitted</td>
<td>A1 approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLM 100 Film Media</td>
<td>X (temporary course)</td>
<td>Note Flm 101 – A4</td>
<td>Note flm 101 – C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWS 220 Women and the Natural Sciences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A1 approved</td>
<td>B4 submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCM 101 Introduction to Communication and Media</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B4 approved</td>
<td>C2 Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR 150 Human Sexuality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A2 submitted</td>
<td>C3 submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR 301 Nursing Informatics</td>
<td>At CON</td>
<td>B4??</td>
<td>C1??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR 444 Community/Public Health Nursing Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C1 not submitted</td>
<td>D integrative not submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFS 207 General Nutrition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B3 approved</td>
<td>A1 approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA 101 Beginning Spanish 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A3 Approved</td>
<td>C2 Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS 146 Women in the US 1890-Present</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B4 approved</td>
<td>C1 approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS 346 Immigration, Ethnicity, and Race in America</td>
<td>Will submit to A&amp;S – for spring 1, 17</td>
<td>B1 approved</td>
<td>C3 approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMD 126 Introduction to Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A4 approved</td>
<td>B2 approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDF318G Health and Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B4 approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF 212G Public Health Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 approved</td>
<td>C1 submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix E: Training for Online Faculty by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/College</th>
<th>Sakai</th>
<th>Online Pedagogy Part 1</th>
<th>Online Pedagogy Part 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science and Statistics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film/Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Library and Information Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing &amp; Rhetoric</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Arts &amp; Sciences Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Business Administration Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries, Animal, and Veterinary Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Environmental Life Sciences</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Nursing Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development and Family Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and Food Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>College of Health Sciences</em> Total</em>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants affiliated with the new College of Health Sciences are counted as being within that college.

#### Undergraduate Assessment Reporting Results
65 Programs Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Assessment Reporting Compliance with reporting requirement</th>
<th>Report: Section I (new outcomes assessment work)</th>
<th>Report: Section II (follow-up on prior recommendations for change; using evidence to make change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution wide</td>
<td>53/65 (82%)</td>
<td>21/23 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>22/30 (79%)</td>
<td>13/14 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELS</td>
<td>13/14 (93%)</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>8/8 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>6/9 (67%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Assessment Reporting Performance</th>
<th>Report: Section I (met or exceeded expectations)</th>
<th>Report: Section II (met or exceeded expectations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution wide</td>
<td>44/53 (83%)</td>
<td>13/21 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>18/22 (82%)</td>
<td>9/13 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELS</td>
<td>10/13 (77%)</td>
<td>2/5 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>7/8 (88%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Graduate Assessment Reporting Results
### 56 Programs Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Assessment Reporting Compliance with reporting requirement</th>
<th>Report: Section I (new outcomes assessment work)</th>
<th>Report: Section II (follow-up on prior recommendations for change; using evidence to make change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution wide</td>
<td>39/53 (70%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>10/14 (71%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2/4 (50%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCE: Schmidt Labor Research Center</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELS</td>
<td>5/6 (83%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1/6 (17%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>14/15 (93%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanography</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Graduate School</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Assessment Reporting Performance</th>
<th>Report: Section I (met or exceeded expectations)</th>
<th>Report: Section II (met or exceeded expectations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution wide</td>
<td>34/39 (87%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>9/10 (90%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCE: Schmidt Labor Research Center</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELS</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>11/14 (79%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanography</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Graduate School</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/0 (first report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institution-wide Assessment Reporting Compliance

Percent of programs who submitted the report sections due

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Section I Compliance</th>
<th>Section II Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>23/25 (92%)</td>
<td>53/65 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>39/53 (74%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institution-wide Assessment Report Performance

Percentage of reporting programs who met or exceeded expectations on the feedback rubric: received a score of well developed or advanced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Section I Performance</th>
<th>Section II Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>15/23 (65%)</td>
<td>44/53 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>34/39 (87%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Appendix G: Example of Recognition for Excellence in Program Assessment Reporting

## Recognized Undergraduate Programs May 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty Member Submitting Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Kristine Bovy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences: Harrington School</td>
<td>Sandra Ketrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Jennifer Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Damon Rarick; Norbert Hedderich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development and Family Studies</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Karen McCurdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>Human Science and Services</td>
<td>Bryan Blissmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Barbara Costello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Rhetoric</td>
<td>Writing and Rhetoric</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Nedra Reynolds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Recognized Graduate Degree Programs May 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty Member Submitting Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education (PhD joint w/RIC)</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Human Science and Services URI/RIC</td>
<td>Julie Coiro (Co-Director) Minsuk Shim; Janet Johnson (RIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Human Science and Services</td>
<td>Peter Adamy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Reading Specialist</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Human Science and Services</td>
<td>Terry Deeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and Dietetics</td>
<td>Nutrition and Food Sciences</td>
<td>CELS</td>
<td>Ingrid Lofgren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Kristin Johnson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Executive Summary of the Assessment Climate Survey Report May 2016

- The purpose of the survey is to look at progress in the University’s implementation of program-level student learning outcomes assessment, and give guidance for future policies. Chairs’ perceptions were chosen as a particularly useful indicator. Content is organized into six major domains: (1) chairs’ personal attitudes toward assessment; (2) institution-wide faculty norms regarding the value of assessment; (3) leadership commitment; (4) infrastructure support for assessment; (5) department-level implementation; and (6) university-wide implementation. A final item addresses chairs’ perception of how far URI has come in the development of a useful, sustainable assessment system.

- The survey was administered as an online survey to all URI department chairs (and the directors of department-equivalent academic programs) in Fall 2009, Fall 2012, and again in Fall 2015. Currently it consists of 51 5-point rating items and one open-ended question. The response rate in 2015 was 57%, similar to the past administrations.

- There is evidence of forward progress in chairs’ views: the value of assessment for their own departments remains high; infrastructure support for assessment is going steadily up; university-wide faculty norms have risen significantly. Significant item-level changes are consistent with those trends.

- There is reason to continue to focus on enhancing forward movement: Leadership Commitment remains the lowest domain score and has continued a downward trend from past administrations. Significant item-level changes (in deans’ support, administrative tracking, and lack of negative consequences for non-compliance) exemplify that negative trend.

- Chairs’ modal view of URI’s current stage in the establishment of program-level assessment is “External Demand”, with administrative leaders requiring faculty compliance to meet that demand. Perception of Leadership Commitment is the strongest statistical predictor of chairs’ view of where URI is developmentally.

- Consistent with national findings, we conclude that although infrastructure support for assessment enables assessment (and we are moving in the right direction for that), leadership commitment to motivate assessment as an internally useful process is the key to a sustained quality-improvement system.

- The need for clear and emphatic demonstrations of the importance and internal utility of assessment from the Provost’s level, and clear recognition of the usefulness of the process by college deans, backed by essential resources, is evident. Attention to how assessment is used for faculty reflection and degree program improvement, recognition of models for good work, relevance in the Academic Program Review process, and clear messages about the consequences for non-compliance will all help to show leadership commitment.