Thank you in advance for taking the time to answer these questions. You willingness to participate in this assessment activity and feedback is greatly appreciated. The purpose of these questions is to provide an opportunity for the group to summarize their findings and make recommendations for future assessment activities.

1. What do you believe that the writing samples were able to demonstrate about students' ability to write multi-page essays or reports?

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• The ability to write a variety of formats and types • Appropriate logical order and cohesiveness • Adequate sentence structure, grammar and vocab	• Thesis construction • Writing in Technical fields was weak

Recommendations for further actions:
• Sharing of writing rubrics and assignment templates between disciplines. • Professional development time for faculty to work on the assessment of writing.

2. What do you believe the writing samples were able to demonstrate about students' content knowledge and ability to apply that knowledge in a multi-page essay or report?

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Reference to previous classes and theories	• Lack of citations and evidence

Recommendations for further actions: • We combined Content Knowledge with the Writing Rubric. See recommendations for above question.

3. What do you believe that the writing samples were able to demonstrate about students' critical thinking ability?

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
• Papers incorporate adequate knowledge and comprehension of content • Strong application—taking what they learned and applying it to specific situations (especially in the technical fields)	• Poor synthesis • Poor analysis (regurgitation of text rather than analysis) • Poor evaluation • Too many quotes—lack of paraphrasing and explanation

Recommendations for further actions: • Some of the assignments do not ask for analysis, synthesis and evaluation—this could be fixed with ***inter-disciplinary***, ***faculty-generated*** common assignments and rubrics that clearly require higher level critical thinking skills for selected courses.

4. What worked well in this assessment activity?
    - We spent time simplifying the rubric to align with GE outcomes one and two.
    - We calibrated the rubric by reading two sample papers and comparing our scores.
    - We made the decision to divide the rubric by outcome to allow for maximum flexibility for future assessment.
    - We created a cross-discipline team and read papers from different disciplines.
    - We established a process to work in pairs and assign scores as pairs, which validated our calibration.

5. What did not work well in this assessment activity?

- The initial instructions were not clearly defined (First instructors thought they were only submitting Capstone papers, then it changed to 200 level courses. There was a question as to whether or not the papers should be exemplary or random.)
- Not all disciplines were represented (in paper or in person).
- Initial rubric contained inconsistent wording between categories making it difficult to understand and apply.

6. What suggestions for future assessment activities would you provide based on this experience?
    - All papers should have course name and short assignment synopsis on top for ease of scoring.
    - Establish a systematic process by which there is a cross section of disciplines represented in papers and scorers.
    - Make process electronic. Upload all essays to a Blackboard page which scorers have access to (using PDF to ensure all formats are accessible) and provide iPads to scorers for process. This will improve efficiency and collaboration amongst scorers.
    - More time and resources need to be provided to faculty to conduct this assessment. We read 30 papers out of 147, or approximately 20 percent, given the time allowed. The first day was spent setting the foundation by creating and calibrating the rubric as well as establishing the assessment process.

7. What do you think is the most valuable information about students that you learned from this assessment activity?
    - The 200-level courses clearly demonstrate adequate writing skills.
    - There is more work to be done on the fundamentals of writing.
    - Writing needs to be an emphasis in every discipline.
    - There needs to be more emphasis on assessments that measure higher order critical thinking skills.

8. Other recommendations:

- Create a faculty-developed rubric for each of the remaining GE outcomes.
- Use the assessment process established by this team as a starting point for future GE assessment teams to promote efficiency.
- Share the findings of this group (assessment process and rubrics) with the faculty to align assignment and assessment at the course level.

- Share assessment data associated with specific courses with Program Coordinators in order to provide useful data about GE outcomes for their program reviews.

Submitted by Jayne Barnes, Sally Bashalany, Mark Dodge, Robyn Griswold David Hubbs, and Jennifer Tripp

June 4 and 6, 2014

CATEGORY	4 Proficient	3 Competent	2 Developing	1 Does not Meet Standard	N/A N/R	Points
Knowledge and Comprehension	Issue/problem to be considered critically is thoroughly stated and described using relevant information.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is appropriately stated and described using relevant information.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is adequately stated and described using relevant information.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is weakly stated and described or missing.		
Application and Analysis	Knowledge from the discipline is thoroughly applied to an actual situation in a clear and thoughtful way. Strong, clear evidence of analysis of own and other viewpoints can be easily found.	Knowledge from the discipline is appropriately applied to an actual situation in a clear and thoughtful way. Clear evidence of analysis of own and other viewpoints can be easily found.	Knowledge from the discipline is adequately applied to an actual situation in a clear and thoughtful way. Some evidence of analysis of own and other viewpoints can be found.	Knowledge from the discipline is weakly applied or missing. Evidence of analysis of own and other viewpoints is unclear or missing.		
Synthesis and Evaluation	Strong evidence of important ideas from the discipline is thoroughly compiled into a new whole. Conclusions and related outcomes are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation.	Evidence of important ideas from the discipline is appropriately compiled into a new whole. Conclusions and related outcomes are mostly logical and reflect student's informed evaluation.	Evidence of important ideas from the discipline is adequately compiled into a new whole. Conclusions and related outcomes are somewhat logical and minimally reflect student's informed evaluation.	Evidence of important ideas from the discipline is weak or missing. Conclusions and related outcomes are weak or missing.		

Written Communication Rubric

CATEGORY	4 Proficient	3 Appropriate	2 Developing	1 Does not Meet Standard	N/A N/R	Points
Thesis/Purpose	Thorough thesis that is clear, well-developed or implied.	Thesis is appropriate and relevant to the topic.	Thesis is adequate.	Weak or missing thesis statement.		
Organization	Essay is thoroughly developed with strong transitions between paragraphs and contains a logical order.	Appropriate logical order that supports thesis with transitions between paragraphs.	Adequate order with basic transitions between and within paragraphs.	Weak development with minimal or no transitions between paragraphs.		
Grammar/Usage/Mechanics	Thorough command of spelling, punctuation, grammar, and word choice.	Appropriate command of spelling, punctuation, grammar, and word choice.	Adequate command of spelling, punctuation, grammar, and word choice.	Weak command of spelling, punctuation, grammar, and word choice.		
Content Development and Documentation	Thorough understanding of the content is displayed throughout the essay with strong details that advance the thesis. Skillful use of documentation as required by discipline.	Appropriate understanding of the content is displayed throughout the essay with details that advance the thesis. Competent use of documentation as required by discipline.	Adequate understanding of the content is displayed throughout the essay with some details that advance the thesis. Minimal use of documentation as required by discipline.	Weak understanding of the content is displayed throughout the essay with few to no details to advance the thesis. Lack of documentation as required by discipline.		