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Session Objectives

This presentation will discuss the collaborative role of the School of Nursing (SON) during the adoption of an institution-wide assessment process through the following objectives:

- Describe the history and challenges of an institution-wide focus on assessment.
- Overview the strategies implemented at the institutional level to initiate a culture change among faculty.
- Explore how the SON collaborated with interdiscipliary departments to model assessment of student learning at the programmatic level to measure program effectiveness.
- Discuss the results of faculty engagement at the departmental level.

History of Assessment at Georgia Southern University

- 1990’s – program and institution had system
- 2000’s – Administrative changes; less emphasis on academic assessment; Each college had own system; Those with external accreditors had process, others did not.
- 2005 – SACS reaffirmation visit identified AA as weakness.
- 2009 – recharged focus on AA at institutional level with adoption of WEAVEOnline
- 2010 – Office of Institutional Effectiveness Created
- 2011 – Put on monitoring report by SACS; Dropped WEAVEOnline; New institutional process established
- 2013 – Successful outcome in 2013

Challenges:

- Assessment was decentralized and inconsistent
- Some academic programs were not engaged in assessment activities
- Other academic programs did not distinguish between course grades and assessment processes
- Assessment initially became an exercise in report writing
- Success was measured by “turning the box green” upon uploading reports
- No consistent process of assessment across the institution
- No consistent reporting format required at the institutional level
- Faculty inexperienced in engaging in a structured assessment process
- It is still:
  - Often undertaken to satisfy accreditation demands
  - Externally mandated by the administration
  - Confused with evaluation
  - Not well understood as a vehicle for improving/maximizing what we do

What we did institution-wide:

- Implementation:
  - Singular Assessment model adopted
  - Reporting format adopted for use across institution adapted from James Madison University
  - Mission/Purpose statement
  - Outcomes/Objectives
  - Measures
    - Types of measures and the relationship between measures and outcomes
    - Data collection and integrity
  - Targets
  - Findings
  - Presentation of results
  - Interpretation of results
  - Action Plans
Assessment Model Adopted:

[Diagram showing academic assessment process]

Series of workshops and retreats offered to educate faculty
- 3 day retreat for all faculty to learn about cycle
- Supported by stipends
- Report writing retreats with available support
- Participatory
- Supported by stipends
- 77% representation in 2013; 87% representation in 2014
- Nursing heavily involved in modeling activities...

Exemplars from Nursing’s Assessment Process

Characteristics of Targets:
- Acceptable target level:
  - What is the minimum level of achievement that you expect of students on any given measure to be successful?
  - How did faculty decide on this level?
  - How many students do you expect to meet the minimum?
- Desired target level:
  - Higher level of achievement that you strive to see in your students.
  - How did faculty arrive at this desired target?
  - How many students do you think is reasonable to meet this level?
  - What is that decision based on?

Example of Targets in SON:
- Acceptable level:
  - 90% of graduating seniors will reach “competent” levels on all rubric elements related to student learning outcomes on their senior capstone project.
- Desired level:
  - In addition, 50% of the students will reach “outstanding” on three of the five rubric elements. These targets are based upon an analysis of students’ baseline results conducted by program faculty at last year’s annual planning retreat.

Exemplars from Nursing’s Assessment Process

Portfolio Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior Level Average</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Average</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exemplars from Nursing’s Assessment Process

Portfolios Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Ratings</th>
<th>Faculty Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Incorrect Report of Portfolio Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Ratings</th>
<th>Faculty Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior Level Average</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level Average</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exemplars from Nursing’s Assessment Process

* Correct Report of Portfolio Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Self-Evaluation Mean</th>
<th>Faculty Evaluation Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institution-wide Results:

- All programs use consistent assessment process and format for reporting
- Regained compliance with accrediting body standards
- Increased faculty involvement in the assessment process
- Greater emphasis on student learning / awareness of evaluating student learning instead of faculty teaching
- Disciplines can talk with each other in common language
- Fosters interprofessional collaboration in designing teaching/learning endeavors

Recommendations:

- Ongoing faculty development
- Faculty turnover
- Varied competency levels
- Sustaining a culture that values academic assessment
- Form an outcomes committee in each college
- Promoting continued faculty involvement
- Resist reverting back to the monitoring program effectiveness as an administrative concern