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Wayne State University Context

► Large, urban, inclusive, research-intensive state university

► Licensing of Compliance Assist in 2012 accompanied by technology training

► Creation of institutional Director of Assessment position in September 2014
“A prerequisite for AfL [assessment for learning] to be successfully implemented... is the teachers’ assessment practice. ... Highly qualified and dedicated teachers who want to support their students’ learning feel that they do not know enough about AfL to successfully practice it” (Smith 2011: 55)

Learning Outcomes

Participants will:

- Define the characteristics of effective faculty development
- Identify obstacles to faculty participation in professional development
- Employ a multi-faceted approach to designing a faculty development plan for their own institutional context to integrate best practices and overcome obstacles
Brainstorming

- Think about the professional development experience from which you learned the most. What made it effective?
Compare Your Experience to the Published Findings

Characteristics of effective professional development:

- Active learning, reflection
- Content responds to normal work contexts, questions, problems
- Ongoing process
- Combination of expert input with collaborative discussion with colleagues
- Context-specific, “situated”
- Adaptive-to-specified continuum


Obstacles to Assessment for Faculty

1. Attitudes about the value of assessment vs. other work
2. Fear of punitive uses, change
3. Lack of resources
4. Lack of familiarity with social science research techniques

In order to be effective, professional development must also address these obstacles.


A multi-faceted approach addresses characteristics of effective professional development and reduces obstacles by being:

- Accessible
- Meaningful
Multi-Faceted Approach

- Multiple delivery modes and formats
- Range of content
- Accessible times and venues
- Peer-to-peer development
- Engagement strategies
Accessible: Multiple Delivery Modes and Formats

- In-person workshops
- Small group and individual consultations
- Video tutorials, written instructions, templates

http://wayne.edu/assessment/
Program assessment home

Program assessment timeline
Documenting program assessment
Program assessment learning opportunities
Progress report
Additional resources
Contact us
Accessible: Time Commitment and Scheduling

- A la carte workshop registration
  - Multiple day options
  - Short blocks of time

- By-request workshops, presentations, meetings, consultations

- Email and phone consultations

- Website for 24/7 information
Accessible: Workload

- Deliberate efforts to identify assessment practices within existing workload
- 30- or 60-minute workshop sessions per assessment task, including initial drafting or identification of information
- Time saving venues close to faculty
## Meaningful: Range of Content and Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specified</th>
<th>Adaptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to program assessment</td>
<td>Unit-specific versions of all specified workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing mission statements and learning outcomes</td>
<td>Developing rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating and interpreting curriculum maps</td>
<td>Feedback rubric as a diagnostic tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing assessments</td>
<td>Unstructured discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and interpreting results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using results for program improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate program assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a feedback rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meaningful: Range of Learning Styles

- Auditory and written content
- Linguistic and graphical representations
- Individual, paired, and group learning opportunities
- Linear and nonlinear options
Meaningful: Hands-On, Reflective

- Analysis of examples
- Elicitation or presentation of program-specific content, questions, examples
- Application of content to program-specific context through brainstorming, drafting, revision
Meaningful: Peer-to-Peer

- Committee-based feedback rubric use
- Assessment recognition luncheon
- In development:
  - 5-minute presentations at college meetings
  - Peer mentoring program
Accessible and Meaningful: Engagement Strategies

- Time, scheduling, and venue choices
- Responsive to feedback and requests
- Campus-wide communication of assessment support to match reporting timeline
- Individualized communications based on progress reports to link available workshops and other support to department or program needs
- Reinforcement of importance from administrators
Effectiveness Data

- Survey results from workshop participants
  - Annual
  - Immediate
- Change in participation rates before and after faculty development (workshops, meetings, consultations)
- Pre- and post-faculty development assessment plan quality
Participant Survey Data: Annual

- AY14-15 institutional survey; items evaluating usefulness of resources (% responding *moderately useful* or better)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Survey Data: Immediate

- Fall 2015 university workshop participants (n=14; survey sent immediately following workshop dates)
  - Scope of content: 4.1/5
  - Usefulness of workshop: 4.3/5
  - Clarity of information: 4.6/5
  - Schedule 4.7/5
Assessment Reporting Rates

- Comparison of programs participating in professional development vs. programs not participating in professional development
  - 8/31/2014 (before any professional development offered) to 9/1/2015
  - 8 reporting items to submit per academic year
Assessment Reporting by Participation in Professional Development (AY14-15)

![Graph showing assessment reporting over time for PD group and No PD group from 8/31/2014 to 9/1/2015. The graph indicates an increase in reporting for both groups, with the PD group showing a higher increase.]
Quality Review Data

Scores from a feedback rubric to evaluate the quality of assessment plans pre- and post-professional development for 11 of the 149 programs that participated in professional development

A 10% sample of the number of individuals representing those programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISSION STATEMENT</th>
<th>Reflects best practices</th>
<th>Meets standards</th>
<th>Needs development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The mission statement identifies:  
  □ The program’s (not the department’s) purpose (i.e., why the program exists and what the program does that distinguishes it from other units or programs).  
  □ All points are included and are well developed.  
  □ All or most points are included, but some need development. The statement might not be focused on learners as the primary audience.  
  □ Few or none of the points are included. or  
  □ The statement is too broad or has no focus. |
Quality of Assessment Plans with Professional Development Participation (AY14-15)
Hands-On Application

Describe your institution’s faculty development program in terms of the multi-faceted approach presented. Which considerations of the approach are currently addressed? What opportunities for revision might be suitable for your context?

**Accessible**
- Multiple delivery modes and formats
- Time commitment and scheduling
- Workload

**Meaningful**
- Specified and adaptive content and contexts
- Range of learning styles
- Hands-on, reflective
Questions or Comments?

Thank you!