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Outcomes

• Recognize a process for creating a holistic system of faculty development, including:
  • strategies to decentralize larger presentations
  • systems for creating a community of assessment for implementation on multiple levels

• Examine key issues and insights in assessment procedures:
  • to categorize between areas of need, potential, and accomplishment
  • to generate ideas for impactful faculty development
Macro-level Assessment Practices Across an Institution

• One size does not fit all
  • Programs/Departments have varying needs and practices
  • Difficult to cover in one meeting

• Large scale meetings/workshops are best for general information
  • Items standardized across the College or University
    • regional accreditation
    • reporting practices
Micro-level Assessment Practices

- Smaller workshops
  - Ideally, offered at varying times
- 1-1 meetings or small, departmental meetings
- Models the academic system
  - Lecture - Lab - Mentored study group
Incorporating IL, NL, and WE into Programmatic Assessment

- IL - Information Literacy
- NL - Nexus Learning
  - Active and Engaged
  - Collaborative
  - Real World
  - Infused with the Liberal Arts
- WE - Writing Enriched
Incorporating IL, NL, and WE into Programmatic Assessment

• Select courses were given IL, NL, and/or WE designations

• Assessment of how these designations affected student learning was rarely done

• We asked ourselves, “What are some ways programs can assess these designations”

• Elements of Nexus Learning were tenets, not outcomes
How Can We Disseminate this Information Broadly and Effectively?

• Faculty Workshop
How Can We Disseminate this Information Broadly and Effectively?

• Faculty workshop
  • Limited the broad discussion to key general information
• Created break-out sessions
  • One for each designation IL, NL, WE
• Repeated the smaller, focused sessions over the next several weeks
• Surveyed the faculty on interest and need
How Can We Disseminate this Information Broadly and Effectively?

• Representatives from each designation were available for more individualized needs
• Assessment advocates offered further follow-up
• Multiple levels of dissemination
Rose, Bud, Thorn

Rose - What are you doing well? What is working?

Bud - What has potential?

Thorn - What needs improvement?
Rose, Bud, Thorn

- **Macro**
  - Big picture overview of needs, potential, accomplishments
  - More diverse viewpoints

- **Micro**
  - Analyze departmental systems
  - Focus on specific needs
Creative Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enablers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- trends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People (Stakeholders)
Creative Matrix

- Macro
  - Generates a greater variety of ideas
  - Allows for cross-pollination
- Micro
  - Focus on specific solutions and needs
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