Wake Forest University

A Case Study on the
Institutional Dynamics and Climate for
Student Assessment and Academic Innovation

Conducted by:
Marvin W. Peterson, *Research Director*
Thomas E. Perorazio, *Coordinator*
Sylvia Hurtado, Associate Professor
Mary Ziskin

Research Program on Institutional Support for Student Assessment
National Center for Postsecondary Improvement
University of Michigan
610 E. University, Suite 2339
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

June 25, 2001

Ross Griffith, Director
Office of Institutional Research
Post Office Box 7373 Reynolda Station
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, NC 27109-7373

Dear Ross,

We have finished our case study and summary profile of the survey data for Wake Forest University. We wish to thank you for your patience while we drafted our analysis, collected and analyzed the survey data, and summarized the survey findings. As promised we have included with this letter a copy of the final case study, as well as three appendices: 1) a summary profile of the Institutional Climate for Student Assessment (ICSA) survey, 2) a summary profile of the Faculty Survey on Teaching, Learning and Assessment (FSTLA) survey, and 3) a summary profile of the Student Experiences with Teaching Learning and Assessment (SETLA) survey.

The case study provides you with an analysis of the findings from our campus visit and interviews, an analysis of documents and other information collected during the study, and recent feedback from your office regarding our initial findings. The appendices provide descriptive profiles of three separate surveys sent to administrators, faculty, and students on campus. Each appendix has a brief cover memo that describes the response rate and summarizes key findings. The first appendix, the ICSA, provides a summary of the survey completed by all institutional administrators involved in academic assessment and faculty from all Arts and Science departments with the exception of the four focus departments: math, English, psychology, and chemistry. The second appendix, the FSTLA, provides a summary of the faculty survey completed by all (or a representative sample depending on each institutional sample) of the faculty in the four focus departments. The third appendix, the SETLA, provides a summary of the student survey completed by a representative sample of 400 students enrolled within the Arts and Science division.

We hope that you and your staff will be able to make good use of this information in future planning and evaluation of your student assessment efforts and further innovation in your teaching and learning practices.

We are most grateful to you and other members of your faculty and administration for your cooperation in our study. The research team's experience at Wake Forest University was a very positive one. They report that faculty and administrators share a genuine concern for their students and for the campus community as a whole. We commend you for your efforts and

for your commitment to the improvement of undergraduate assessment, teaching, and learning.

Thank you again for your active interest in our investigation and your cooperation and goodwill that helped make our study a success. Should you have any questions about the case study or the work of NCPI, please do not hesitate to call the NCPI office at (734) 647-7768.

Sincerely,

Marvin W. Peterson	Sylvia Hurtado	Eric L. Dey
Professor	Associate Professor	Associate Professor
University of Michigan	University of Michigan	University of Michigan

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

A. Brief Institutional Description

Wake Forest University (WFU) is a private, four-year, residential, liberal arts institution that also has graduate and professional schools. The tradition of liberal learning remains strong and is central to the mission of the undergraduate and graduate programs. The university takes pride in its ability to offer the resources and training of larger universities in the setting of a small, more intimate environment. Located in Winston-Salem, NC, the institution was established in 1834 at Wake Forest, NC and is one of the oldest institutions of higher learning in the state. WFU was founded in cooperation with the N.C. Baptist State Convention and its ties to the Baptist heritage remain a significant influence on the ethos of the institution.

WFU last received accreditation from the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in 1997. It participated in SACS' "Alternate Model for Institutional Self-Study and Reaffirmation of Accreditation," a program in which accepted institutions provided documented evidence of compliance. Planning initiatives were also reviewed by consultants as part of the SACS visiting committee. This most recent accreditation has raised awareness among faculty and departments regarding the importance of outcomes assessment and demonstrated results. This awareness has transcended into the academic planning and improvement initiatives.

An important development that must be known to fully understand WFU is its recent strategic plan. Adopted in 1995 and known as the Plan for the Class of 2000 (PTC 2000), the plan (among many other things) provides each incoming student with an IBM ThinkPad and color printer. The laptops are upgraded after two years and become the student's property upon graduation. Faculty, who also receive laptops, are encouraged to use technology in their classrooms, and the students are becoming more accomplished in their use of technology. The result has been the integration of computer and information technology into the entire teaching and learning enterprise. This embrace of technology has not gone unnoticed; WFU was ranked as the "most-wired" liberal arts college in the U.S. by Yahoo! Internet Life Magazine for its innovation and support services.

During the 1999-2000 year, WFU enrolled 6,147 students, with 3,850 of them being undergraduates, 2,164 in the graduate and professional schools, and 133 in Allied Health. WFU is also very selective. The average SAT is 1300, and more than 2/3 of its incoming freshmen having graduated in the top 10% of their high school classes, while less than 12% of the freshman cohort are outside their high school's top 20%. Twenty eight percent of these students came from within the state of North Carolina, while 72% were out-of-state. Also, 70% of the students receive some form of financial aid. Minority enrollment for the fall of 1999 was about 12%, with African-Americans comprising a little more than 8% of the student body, Asian students comprising 2%, and other ethnic groups and non-resident aliens comprising less than 1 % each. In 1999-2000, WFU had 348 full-time undergraduate faculty and a student-faculty ratio of 10.5:1.

B. The Undergraduate Schools

Originally consisting of only Wake Forest College, WFU is now comprised of seven parts. The two undergraduate components are Wake Forest College and the Calloway School of

Business and Accountancy. Wake Forest College is the undergraduate college of arts and sciences and is the academic unit to which all students are initially admitted. WFC has the largest enrollment of all the colleges and is the center of the institution's academic life. It offers courses in over 40 fields of study leading to the baccalaureate degree, as well as minors and opportunities for study in many other areas. The Calloway School awards baccalaureate degrees in accountancy, business, analytical finance, information systems, and mathematical business.

The undergraduate colleges are governed by the Board of Trustees, the WFU administration, and their respective faculties. The deans of the individual schools report to the Senior Vice-President- the chief academic officer of the institution- and are responsible for the academic planning and administration of their schools.

C. Other Schools

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences offers advanced work and confers the masters of Arts, the M.A in education and liberal studies, an M. S. in arts and sciences, and the Ph.D. in biology, chemistry, physics, and 11 biomedical sciences.

There are also four professional schools. The School of Law confers the juris doctor and masters in American law degrees and the Babcock School of Management offers the M.B.A; the two also offer a joint program. The Divinity School, just established in 1999, offers the master of divinity degree. And the Wake Forest School of Medicine offers the doctor of medicine degree and allied health programs. It is located about four miles away from the other colleges and schools on the Bowman Gray Campus, near the downtown area. All other parts of the campus are collected together in northwest Winston-Salem on the Reynolda Campus, covering approximately 340 acres. Finally, it should also be noted that WFU also offers instruction abroad for its students at houses it owns in Venice, London, and Vienna.

II. INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO STUDENT ASSESSMENT

A. History of the Emergence of Assessment at WFU

From 1988-2000, there have been three major institutional developments that were fundamental to the emergence of the current pattern of student assessment activity. The most important is a regular and ongoing process of strategic planning that has addressed several major institutional needs over this time span. The second major development is the university's active engagement with the SACS accreditation criteria, particularly their focus on improving institutional effectiveness. Finally, the third development fostering student assessment is the emergence of departmentally based planning and assessment activity, especially the internal process for evaluating academic programs.

Strategic Planning

The introduction and development of strategic planning has been a key focus of the current president, who was hired to conduct long range planning as part of his overall responsibilities. There have been three waves of institutional planning during the administration of the current president, and a fourth is currently underway.

The initial planning effort (1988-1992) focused on space needs. The President and the VP for Finance and Administration initially developed a process to build WFU as part of its

transition from a college to a university. They felt a new physical configuration was needed to help the university fulfill its mission. During a second major wave of planning, it was decided that the law school and the professional schools had to be strengthened to make them of the same quality as the undergraduate departments. The other outcomes of the academic plan did not greatly change the curriculum, although women's studies and international education were added. Otherwise, it did not greatly alter the academic arena.

However, the campus approach to planning was changed. The President and the VP established a pattern for making planning a regular tool to help identify problems and opportunities. This planning wave produced three ongoing, institution-wide planning processes. The first is an academic planning procedure in which departments submit annual reports to the Provost. The Program Planning Committee also examines these when it is reconstituted every 3-4 years for 18 months to make recommendations on major academic initiatives. The second planning process was a master physical/campus plan (headed by the VP for Finance & Administration) which is now regularly reviewed by the Capital Planning committee. Finally, this planning wave produced an institutional financial plan (also headed by the VP for Finance & Administration). The Budget Planning Committee makes ten-year financial projections based on external economic factors.

The third major wave of strategic planning by the President and VP produced significant change in the academic enterprise. This effort (1992-1994) was headed by the Provost and was undertaken by the Program Planning Committee. Data on students was collected regarding their satisfaction with academic programs and experiences and faculty needs were ascertained through surveys and many open hearings. A new initiative that outlined academic goals and recommendations for the next decade emerged from this planning process. This initiative was the Plan for the Class of 2000 (PTC 2000). During the spring of 1995, there were extensive campus wide discussions regarding the plan before it was approved in April 1995 by the faculty and the Board of Trustees. The PTC 2000 had three major components: 1) improvement of the first-year experience, 2) use of information technology for learning (all incoming freshmen were given laptops), and 3) the overall improvement of the intellectual climate on campus. Other recommendations included the addition of 40 faculty to lower the student-faculty ratio from 13/1 to 11/1, study abroad scholarships and fellowships for students collaborating with faculty on research projects. PTC 2000 is also important for the development of student assessment because it gave rise to the Evaluation Committee, which uses assessment data to evaluate the effectiveness and success of the plan (see Sec. III C).

A new wave of strategic planning is currently underway (headed by the Senior VP, acting as Interim Provost) and will focus specifically on the intellectual climate issue, including student and faculty life and relationships and residential living and learning. The Division of Student Life is heavily involved in this effort because it has been collecting data on students and their experiences for several years. Discussions with campus leaders revealed that this issue is of primary concern and there is some sense that the time has come for action and the implementation of some of the ideas already proposed.

Accreditation

The second major development important to the emergence of assessment at WFU is the work the institution has done to satisfy the SACS criteria for institutional effectiveness. In 1992-93, WFU moved into preparation for reaccredidation and in November of 1994 submitted a proposal to be considered under the pilot "Alternative Model" program. Under this process, the

institution submitted documents and engaged in its own self-study of the qualitative and subjective areas of institutional improvement from 1995-1997. Still, they had to satisfy all of SACS *Criteria for Accreditation*. The Provost charged part of the Steering Committee with looking at accreditation while another focused on the strategic component of their academic planning process. The accreditation visit occurred in March of 1997. Following the visit, WFU was given 17 recommendations for compliance-- the most important of which was to focus on institutional effectiveness, an area not sufficiently addressed in the original report.

Following the SACS accreditation review, the executive officers, the faculty, and the campus gave greater priority to assessment. There had not been much formalized student assessment in place before the accreditation process. Departments were asked to formally demonstrate institutional effectiveness in their annual reports using assessment data. Department chairs had to report what they were doing regarding outcomes and had to specify their mission, purpose, goals, assessment processes, etc.

One significant change ensued. SACS had noticed that some of the 1995-96 reports had been weak and did not cover assessment at all. Following these efforts, the 1996-1997 annual reports showed a marked improvement regarding assessment activity within departments. Other changes include an initiative by the division of Student Life to gather more data on students and all aspects of their WFU experiences, a centrally coordinated system for collecting data institution wide, and the use of more assessment data by departments to evaluate their activities and programs.

Departmental Planning and Assessment

The third development in the history of assessment at WFU was the emergence of a campus wide system for ongoing planning and improvement centered in the departments. This was a by-product of the strategic planning efforts and attention to the accreditation review process. There exists now an integrated planning process for institutional effectiveness that is departmentally based, but also connected to the planning efforts of the academic and administrative divisions and the entire institution. This first began around 1990 with the advent of annual reports (see Sec. II B) and Academic Program Review, which is completed every seven years (see Sec. II B). Each of these processes feed data collected by the department from student assessment back into the evaluation and decision making procedures. This allows for the incorporation of assessment data into the planning cycle of the departments and those at higher levels of the institution. On the whole, the planning mechanism is quite decentralized because of an administrative philosophy that those most knowledgeable of and closest to the ongoing processes of the department should also be responsible for reviewing them and implementing changes.

It will become clear that strategic planning and an integrated planning process based at the departmental level and focused on institutional effectiveness combine to reveal that WFU has a extensive process for academic planning and institutional improvement that values assessment information regarding performance. It is a complex framework in which most of the information is gathered locally and combined with institutional data by higher levels of administration to produce a coordinated planning cycle. Its emphasis is whether WFU and its units are achieving academic and strategic priorities rather than on comparisons with peer institutions or "benchmarking."

B. Areas of Assessment

WFU has a management approach driven by a focus on planning, a concern for examining data, including student assessment in various areas, and a philosophy focused on the improvement of WFU. Three main approaches to assessment comprise the major student assessment activity on campus. These are: 1) Institution-wide assessment, including data collection and surveys administered by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), 2) the Departmental and Program Review processes, and 3) Student Life, which collects data on student experiences and perceptions. Other groups, including the Executive Council, Program Planning, the Evaluation Committee, and academic administrators also contribute, but are most often users, not producers, of student assessment data.

Institution wide assessment

Institution wide assessment is primarily centered in the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). This office works with the Associate Provost, the Evaluation Committee, and other interested parties. They have developed a plan for regularly collecting and analyzing student assessment data.

To support the institution's planning and evaluation efforts, OIR collects quantitative data through several institution-wide surveys that are administered periodically. WFU participates in the annual CIRPS Freshmen Survey, which is administered during the orientation program by the University Counseling Center, although OIR analyzes the data. From 1996-1998, OIR administered the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) to first-year, sophomore, and junior students. Beginning in 2000, the CSEQ will be administered every other year. Seniors have been surveyed annually from 1993-1998 using the HEDS Senior Survey. It will now also be given every other year, starting in 2000. HEDS surveys were also administered to alumni in 1994 and 1998, and will now be given at five year intervals, with the next survey scheduled in 2003. There is also an in-house survey to assess student's experiences with computers for educational purposes.

Quantitative data is also collected on faculty in three ways. WFU participated in the HERI Faculty Survey in 1998 and is scheduled to do so again in 2001 and 2004, pending approval by the Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Committee has also developed an internal survey of faculty that it administered in 1994, 1998, and 2000 to assess the strategic plan. The Department of Communication also administers a faculty survey on computer usage.

WFU has not been as successful in collecting qualitative data. Beginning with the class of 2000, incoming freshmen were asked to write essays on their expectations from college. The intent was to follow up with them during the spring of their senior year, but that follow up was only done on a voluntary basis. As might be expected, very few seniors returned to write their second essays for comparison. The institution has plans to increase the response rate of 2001 seniors in an effort to strengthen the qualitative study of its students. The next focus for assessment will be on life outside the classroom and the academic/intellectual atmosphere on campus.

Peer Comparisons

Wake Forest conducts a significant amount of assessment on peer institutions. One of the goals of the Plan for the Class of 2000 was to raise Reynolda campus faculty salaries to the mean at each rank of nine “Cross Admit” institutions. A considerable amount of in depth analysis of

salaries at these peer institutions took place in 1999-2000 resulting in the "Salary Opportunity Plan" which provided an additional $3,000,000 into the salary pool for 2000-2002. Another goal of the Plan for the Class of 2000 was to reduce the student faculty ratio from 13/1 to 11/1 to reach the mean of student faculty ratios at the private Cross Admit institutions. Research on these nine institutions takes place continually in a number of other areas as well.

Wake Forest belongs to the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Consortium consisting of 137 private institutions nationally. HEDS provides to OIR reports with data on peer institutions in a number of areas including enrollment, admissions, faculty salaries, endowment, financial aid, retention and graduation rates and tuition. Wake Forest has recently used the comparative information on endowment and financial aid to set goals for the upcoming $300 million campaign.

Additionally, HEDS designs and makes available senior and alumni/ae surveys and subsequently provides in reports both unmasked and masked survey results on Wake Forest and chosen peer institutions. Earlier, the survey results from peer institutions were used in the goal setting process of the Plan for the Class of 2000. The Evaluation Committee continues to analyze the peer institution results as the committee assesses the outcomes of the Plan for the Class of 2000.

Departmentally Based Assessment

Departmentally based academic planning developed around 1990. The planning unit at WFU is the academic department and assessment of plans and major initiatives are reviewed in the administrative hierarchy to refine their implementation. Procedures for program review were adopted in 1995 that allow for the incorporation of results from assessment tools and other feedback into this departmental planning cycle.

Program Review

Planning for the Program Review process itself was begun in 1992 under the Provost who tapped the Dean of the Graduate School to head the Program Review Task Force. The Task Force facilitated a process that gave faculty and students the opportunity to provide input. The Task Force decided that, rather than distinguish between undergraduate and graduate programs, the departments would be reviewed as a whole and by undergraduate and graduate programs every seven years.

The program review process is now coordinated by the Director of OIR and has specific guidelines and criteria. One review cycle takes about 13 months. First, the Director of OIR and the Deans of WF College and the Graduate School meet with the chairs from the department to be reviewed in early May. Then the chair and the department are given about five months to conduct a self-study, during which time they also identify external reviewers who will visit the campus later. In mid-November, the self-study report is submitted to an Internal Review Committee of elected faculty (chair is chosen by the Deans), and by January 1st, the self-study report is submitted for review by the Provost, Deans, and the external reviewers. In mid-February, the external reviewers visit the campus for two days, and then submit their findings back to the Internal Review Committee by mid-March. This committee submits its final report to the Deans and Provost by May 1st. The department works with the Deans and Provost to develop its Memorandum of Understanding by the end of May. The Memo details a timetable for the implementation of any recommendations emerging from the review. A follow-up study is conducted one year after the completion of the Memo of Understanding to ensure that data gathered from the assessment process and the recommendations were appropriately acted upon.

While examining all levels of departmental activity, a considerable amount of attention is given to student assessment data in the process. Departments draw on data from the OIR for their self-studies (mostly student experience, satisfaction, and alumni surveys). These include the CSEQ, the HEDS Senior and Alumni surveys, exit interviews of leaving students, as well as current student body characteristics, (GPAs, diversity, etc.). This use of student assessment data is not centrally mandated. Faculty talk about the kinds of trends they see in GRE scores, admission to graduate/professional schools, licensure exams. The reason it continues is the departments feel peer pressure to keep their own standards up.

Examination of student and department outcomes varies by department. Some will rate performances by faculty. Some departments will have capstones in which a project, paper, or recital is reviewed by a full committee. Or a department might look at the performance of its alumni in a graduate program. For some departments, the link of program review to IR gives them some connection to student life, because otherwise they might have little contact with that part of the student experience. Some of the smaller departments feel there needs to be an examination of the qualitative/quantitative issue, because they cannot maintain the data they need. A few chairs have mentioned that they are starting to create databases they need to do their own, others are working with OIR to have them maintain the data.

Annual Reports

A system of annual reports is an integral part of WFU's plan for institutional effectiveness. At the end of each academic year, each administrative unit and committee, as well as every department and school, must submit a report to the dean or direct supervisor. The report must summarize major activities during the year, including the progress made on objectives from prior years. For this it must specify the data and criteria used to demonstrate the achievement of previous objectives. It must also set forth objectives for the next year and the next five years. Departments are given the authority to design their own approach to the annual report but must include a summary of the reports of individual faculty in their unit. Chairs submit reports to the Dean of the College and Den of the Graduate School (as appropriate), Provost and Vice President for Finance and Administration while the academic deans submit reports to the Provost and Vice President for Finance and Administration.

Student Life

Since its formation in 1989, the Division of Student Life has utilized annual reports, surveys, and other evaluative measures to undertake planning for the following year. Each office submits reports at the end of each year, including goals and objectives for the upcoming year. Most of their work with student assessment touches on students' experiences and perceptions regarding campus life. There is also a considerable emphasis on examining each service unit's performance using assessment data on student satisfaction. This data draws on the OIR institution-wide surveys but also involves extensive data collection efforts spearheaded by Student Life. There are times when they will share data with academic departments, but for the most part, academic units focus on data about teaching.

In 1992, the Provost reached out to open conversations between the academic and student life areas of the student experience. The Student Life Committee worked on ways to improve the intellectual climate on campus during the strategic planning of 1995. In 1997, a group

funded by the Lilly Endowment submitted 14 recommendations to improve the intellectual and cultural climate on campus. At this point, the assessment within Student Life is coalescing around the improvement of the intellectual climate on campus. This area will part of the major focus during the upcoming strategic planning effort (chaired by the Interim Provost) which will focus on improving the academic climate on campus.

The collection of CSEQ data grew out of a consultative relationship with George Kuh to help define the issues surrounding academic life on campus. His report led to much discussion on campus of a list of priorities that are targeted at improving the experience for first year students. Use of the CSEQ has helped debunk some of the myths students and faculty have about students' time. The student myth is that they have to spend too much time doing work for courses (students call the school "Work Forest"), but the survey revealed that students spend less time on classes, homework, and attending intellectual events than even the faculty thought. There is also a faculty myth that students spend too much time on student activities, but survey results showed that not to be the case. Given this information, one of the issues to be studied in the planning for the intellectual climate is to determine exactly what students are doing with their time.

There is the perception that the academic administration pays too little attention to student life. The division does many studies on a variety of topics like alcohol, student behaviors, eating disorders, community service programs, honor integrity, and others. It is hoped that more of this information will be used in the next planning phase dealing with relationships between students and faculty. Student Life is also assisting in the longitudinal study on the use of computers; it is examining its social impacts as a part of the evaluation of PTC 2000.

Summary

The three major developments to emerge from the institutional planning over the past 12 years, strategic planning, departmentally based academic planning and review, and assessment activities at several levels, all reflect a data oriented approach to academic management. There is a flow of assessment information upwards to those responsible for undertaking planning initiatives. The Executive Council regularly reviews the data on institution wide assessment reports. The Provost and the Dean of WF College regularly examine data in departmental reviews and in academic planning and evaluation committees. Student Life is data driven regarding its programs and how they affect students' experiences. The emphasis is whether WFU and its units (academic and student life) are achieving strategic priorities, while peer comparisons or benchmarking, also play a role in that evaluation.

C. Student Assessment Activity and Types of Data, Instruments, & Collection

The student assessment data collected at the institutional level is primarily quantitative and comes through the form of questionnaires and surveys administered to students, alumni, and faculty (see Sec. II B). Overall, the information gathered is focused on objective outcomes, rather than cognitive or affective outcomes. Most of the surveys used by OIR are available nationally, except for the in-house faculty surveys that were developed by the Evaluation Committee for the assessment of PTC 2000 and the Department of Communication.

The CSEQ collects information on how students use their time. Administration of this survey resulted of a planning and consultation relationship with George Kuh in 1995-96 regarding the academic climate on campus. Analysis of data collected from the CIRP Freshmen

Survey has allowed WFU to learn about the changing demographics of new students over time. The HEDS Senior Survey lets WFU assess graduating seniors' overall experiences, while the HEDS Alumni Survey lets them determine the effects of those experiences five years out. There is also an in-house survey developed to measure students' expectations and comfort with using computers for educational purposes. Results from the computer surveys help determine what kind of computer training is needed.

First year students are also surveyed about their experiences with the new First Year Seminar (FYS) courses--part of PTC 2000. Students are asked to rate the program on its rigor, how it compares with other courses, and if they feel it helped them develop the intellectual skills outlined in the goals for the seminars, such as reading, writing, technical expertise, and critical analysis.

The data on undergraduate faculty is collected through the HERI Faculty Survey, and two in-house surveys. The WFU Faculty Survey was developed to help the Evaluation Committee assess the effectiveness of the strategic plan (PTC 2000), while the computer survey was administered to determine faculty members' comfort and ability to use computers for teaching.

As part of their program review and annual reporting processes, departments target their majors and their alumni regarding their satisfaction with their programs. The focus is on improvement to make the programs useful and worthwhile. Common procedures include exit interviews for students who dropout or transfer, contact with alumni to ask how their education is serving them, and surveys of graduating seniors about their preparation and opinions of their classes.

There is a cultural disposition towards independence and autonomy for the departments because they are best qualified to make decisions regarding goals and how to measure them. Some departments work with Student Life and the data they collect, but that is more informal and grows out of a relationship over time. Most departments are likely to focus on teaching and the effective delivery of material. Some departments collect unique forms of data, such as the degree progress of majors or students' intentions with regards to graduate school or specific jobs. However, there does not seem to be any systematic method for gathering information about graduates from employers directly. Some departments feel that it would be difficult to get consistent and useable data from such a diverse array of employers.

There is little collection of qualitative data institution wide, although OIR does some. The HEDS Senior Survey allows for open-ended comments, and these comments are read with an item analysis conducted by OIR as part of the overall analysis of the survey results. Other qualitative data is collected in the context of academic program reviews and reports, but is unsystematic. There is a need for pre- and post qualitative data on students (written essays) on students' experiences. Also, OIR doesn't get detailed statistics on how departments assess learning, although grade inflation studies are periodically conducted by OIR and disseminated to the Deans. They do get info from Student Affairs on satisfaction with services, but departments assess students in coursework. There is also no systematic data on whether students are changing in preferred ways. WFU doesn't do any longitudinal studies in this area, but anecdotal data is received when students are asked to reflect back on their experiences.

D. Reports

At the institutional level, OIR publishes a 50-page *Fact Book* each year that summarizes data on students, faculty, staff, as well as university facilities and finances. It is distributed to the Trustees, Board of Visitors, Alumni Council, and internally to Executive Council for their use in

planning and evaluation. Regarding students, the *Fact Book* contains information on admission and enrollments, retention rates, characteristics of the entering such as test scores, and information on current students as geographic distribution and their affiliation with Greek organizations. The *Fact Book* also contains information about graduating students such as degrees and majors, placement rates and areas, entry into graduate and professional schools, and graduates with distinction. All in all, this publication compiles approximately 60 statistical studies relevant to the WFU community.

The Director of OIR makes periodic reports to the Executive Council (President, Provost, VPs and Deans) and the Reynolda Cabinet (President and VPs). These bodies occasionally ask for summaries of statistical studies, but there is no formal, regular reporting to them. The Evaluation Committee (EC) also gets reports on the data centrally collected by OIR. Smaller work groups within the EC take relevant information to the appropriate department chairs, but then it becomes the chairs' responsibility to use the information. The work groups also make a full report back to the EC once a year.

Program reviews and departmental annual reports go to the immediate supervisors--deans and department chairs. The findings from these reports stay within the departments or school; they are not generally shared with anyone who is not directly or indirectly connected with that school or department. Many administrative and service units also file annual reports indicating student and customer satisfaction with their services/performance, and department heads outline areas for improvement. The Board of Trustees receives regular reports from the President and the Executive Council about planning efforts and the status of specific initiatives.

III. INSTITUTION-WIDE SUPPORT PATTERNS

A. Mission / Purpose

There is no specific mention in the Mission and Purpose Statement of the assessment of student learning or the evaluation of academic programs and services for institutional improvement. However, several academic leaders consider assessment part of the purpose of the institution. There is the sense that assessment facilitates planning as a management tool to address the institution's problems and help individuals work towards effectiveness. Assessment was done informally prior to the most recent strategic planning initiative and has become driven internally by the faculty so that the institution can demonstrate to outside stakeholders and observers that it is maintaining its quality.

B. Institution-wide Events/ Activities Related to Assessment

It seems that many of the events that facilitated the initial push towards greater assessment can be traced back to the efforts of the Provost beginning around 1992. Some ideas continue while others have faded away. For example, the provost encouraged the formation of one faculty group interested in issues of teaching effectiveness in the early 1990s. This was a group of 10-12 who met regularly over dinner for several years. Their findings and recommendations fed into the program planning process that produced FYS and PTC 2000. In the early 90s, the Provost also organized Assessment Seminars for several years. This usually involved bringing in speakers to discuss various topics like teaching effectiveness or improving learning. This series of events provided a stimulus for the planning for the PTC 2000.

These types of events still occur, although less frequently. Administrative of academic departments occasionally convene "best practices conferences" when they perceive a special need for some external group or person to provide consultation or advice on a topic. The past several years have seen conferences on admissions, the first-year orientation process, and the status of women on campus. Regular events are also scheduled. Each year, department chairs hold a planning retreat to discuss topics like the program review process, assessment instruments, and the success of prior year initiatives. Planning retreats are also held twice annually by the President, Provost, VP for Health Affairs, and the Director of Athletics to review the implementation and evaluation of various programs.

In 1995-96, WFU entered into a consultative relationship with Dr. George Kuh from the University of Indiana, who helped faculty, students, and administrators discuss the larger issues surrounding the academic life on campus. In January of 1996, a group of students, faculty, and staff attended a weekend retreat that produced a list of priorities and recommendations for improving the intellectual climate on campus. Dr. Kuh's final report, issued later in 1996, provided campus planners with much material for debate, and the conversation continued through a series of articles in the campus newspaper.

Finally, the embrace of technology has created a need for increased training on the equipment (see Sec. V B). The Information Systems Office (ISO) trains faculty on standard software on the machine, and people from the Computer Enhanced Learning Initiative (CELI) train them on specialized software for courses. Also, the library does training on a new program that provided course information. And there are events to share methods for using computers. Students trained by ISO to help faculty use technology in the classes hold an annual conference to present their ideas and projects to the campus.

C. Planning and Coordination of Student Assessment

WFU has no single office or task force that directs or plans student assessment and no central plan or policy regarding it. Coordination is achieved both formally and informally by a variety of people and groups who either direct some area of student assessment, support it, or regularly rely on such information.

Formal

The primary formal coordination at the institutional level comes from the Director of OIR and the various roles performed by that office. First, there is a regular schedule and set of data collections from OIR (see Sec. II B & C). These have been selected/designed by the Director of OIR with the advice and support of the Associate Provost. OIR performs the function of student data collector and provider to the campus community through the annual publication of the *Fact Book* and other reporting duties, as well as providing individual departments specific data upon request. The OIR director also coordinates the departmental program review process, and there is some consistency across departments in the types of data collected and reviewed.

Formalized assessment also occurs across the institution as the implementation of PTC 2000 is evaluated by a committee of faculty and administrators. The Evaluation Committee (EC), initially begun by the former provost, was charged with evaluating the effectiveness of the Plan for the Class of 2000 but has also evolved into an overall assessment committee in an advisory capacity. The OIR director now chairs the Evaluation Committee and helps coordinate the student assessment process for the committee. At first it considered the areas to assess, the

means for evaluating, and used existing institutional surveys. It has now moved towards more nationally-administered surveys and has sanctioned all of the surveys OIR uses to do institution wide assessment (see Sec II B &C). Later, it formed subcommittees to look at various issues because it was decided that they needed a mechanism to feed the information collected back to the university community. The members of the EC also serve as liaisons to various committees and offices throughout the university, so they transmit results. Those working groups are: 1) Intellectual Climate, 2) Career Planning, 3) Faculty/Student Academic Relations, and 4) Information Technology.

Evaluation Committee areas of concern include reviewing the criteria by which programs are judged and what types of supplemental questions should be added to survey instruments. The EC receives and reviews the results and analysis from student, alumni/ae and faculty surveys as well as the *Fact Book*. All in all, there are 27 key measures of quality on which the EC monitors progress, including the quality of students upon entrance and exit, the quality of their experiences, retention and graduation rates, and the effects of study abroad. Members of the committee feel they have helped departments embrace the SACS requirements for assessment and effectiveness.

Another major coordinated effort to gather assessment data occurs with the First Year Seminar (FYS) program and the FYS Committee. The FYS Committee surveys students about their experiences and satisfaction with their FYS courses. The ratings are anonymous for each course, professor, and student. Then all surveys are combined and the entire FYS program is evaluated at once. The committee has the responsibility to say if they are pleased with the outcomes of the student evaluations and if any changes need to be made to the criteria for course approval. The committee would also propose any new evaluations.

Informal

The expectation is that the academic leadership, including the President and all VPs and Deans, will engage in strategic planning periodically and the academic program review will occur at regular intervals, thereby allowing for the assessment and evaluation of units and for the appropriate changes to be made. Informally, there is interaction among and use of assessment information by various groups such as the Executive Council, the Reynolda Cabinet, the Program Planning Committee and other all-university planning groups, and the departments when designing their program review. Other groups like the Evaluation Committee and Division of Student Life lead to the continual suggestion for new data needs, analyses, and reports.

D. Support for Student Assessment

Strong institutional support for assessment on campus is embedded in the academic leadership. Executive responsibility and support is different for different data streams, however, primary support is widespread. The President and the VP of Finance & Administration provide support by using assessment information in their strategic planning decisions. Assessment results have been instrumental in helping focus the planning initiatives on critical institutional needs and have helped in the evaluation of academic decisions. Information regularly flows to these administrators through their involvement with the Executive Council and the Reynolda Cabinet, the two highest level committees to make planning and management decisions.

Administrative support for academic planning & program review is given by the Provost, the Dean of WFC, the Senior VP, and the VP for Student Life who all use assessment

information routinely. The planning/implementation/evaluation cycle used by academic and administrative departments requires a regular flow of assessment information regarding programs and services. This process requires the collection of information by department chairs and unit leaders, who then forward the results upward to decision-makers. Although the types of information and decision criteria differ amongst units, there is a common need for data in all phases of the planning cycle. The OIR director works and shares campus-wide information with those individuals who collect and compile assessment information. For example, the VP for Student Life and his staff works with advice from OIR.

One group that would like to become more involved and provide more support for assessment is the faculty senate. Currently there are no by-laws of other university policies that give this body the authority to make decisions regarding the program review process or assessment. The senate is trying to become more involved in the long range planning process. However, it is important to note that there was a great deal of faculty input and support for both the program review process and for PTC 2000.

E. Evaluation of Student Assessment Process

There is no formal, administrative effort to evaluate the assessment efforts in a holistic manner. However, continuous use of data in the planning/implementation/evaluation cycle leads to continuous revision in what is collected, the studies done, and reports prepared in all three streams-- the institution-wide, departmental-level, and student life assessment processes.

There are some important evaluative steps that occur among several units. For example, OIR conducts an annual survey of WFU department chairs and deans regarding the effectiveness of the *Fact Book* to determine if its content and format are useful to users. This has resulted in some changes, including the incorporation of some additional statistical studies. Also, the Evaluation Committee for PTC 2000 reviews the surveys and data collected for the process of evaluating the strategic plan. One of the early changes resulting from this process was the adoption of the CSEQ survey and the development of the in-house faculty survey.

PTC 2000 is being evaluated throughout its implementation by the EC, so there is no group that will take a retrospective look at the plan down the road. The assessment techniques used to evaluate it are continually reviewed as part of the strategic planning process, although there is no single group charged with evaluating instruments or techniques.

IV. EXTERNAL INFLUENCES

A. State Level

WFU is a private institution free from state oversight and its ultimate governing authority rests with the privately appointed Board of Trustees. The institution remains proud of its Baptist heritage that encourages freedom from outside interference. As such, there is no discernable link between state assessment policies and practices at WFU.

B. Accreditation

It became clear from participant interviews that the most powerful external influence on the creation and maintenance of the assessment initiatives at WFU was the accreditation criteria

of SACS. The lasting effect of SACS is most evident in the continued attention given to the institutional effectiveness criteria. The evaluation and approval process in the 1990s seemed to have solidified the belief amongst the administration and faculty that assessment has to be taken seriously to earn reaccredidation (see Sec. II A). And the institution believes too strongly in its academic reputation to do anything that would risk an unfavorable report.

Members of the faculty have indicated that going through the accreditation process and following the institutional effectiveness guidelines have been the most helpful to the departmental planning and assessment efforts. All the administrators and faculty members we interviewed referenced the effectiveness criteria and the importance of assessment to the accreditation process.

Still, this new process for management is not accepted without criticism. Some felt that WFU has a love-hate relationship with SACS. Certainly, the two organizations share goals of self-evaluation and self-improvement, but some feel the SACS guidelines and criteria are too standardized. WFU is less interested in specifically targeting student learning outcomes because they feel the students they attract are so strong. The university and departmental administration are more interested in the unique needs and situations of the individual academic units.

C. Other

There are only a few other discernible external influences on the adoption and continuance of assessment. One was that as part of the implementation of PTC 2000, tuition was raised $3000 in order to finance the laptop initiative. This action moved WFU from being one of the least expensive schools in its market to having prices comparable to many of the private schools with which it competed for students. WFU officials felt pressure to justify the raise and demonstrate the quality of the school to external stakeholders. The Evaluation Committee, charged with assessing PTC 2000, was partly born from this kind of thinking.

The consultation with George Kuh in the mid-1990s was also an important influence because it helped the Program Planning Committee focus on specific academic needs regarding faculty-student interaction. The ideas and recommendations from that relationship continue to inform the next round of planning on the intellectual climate.

V. ACADEMIC MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES

A. Allocation of Resources

The only office on campus that has funds budgeted specifically for student assessment initiatives is OIR. It is funded to perform the institution wide data collection and analysis. As the central office that provides data and reports to other units around campus, WFU has invested most of its resources for assessment in this one unit.

Although it is an academic management priority to provide departments with funds sufficient to meet planning goals, there is nothing specifically targeted for assessment. Deans and provosts know assessment is important for SACS and evaluation of the strategic plan at this time, so they make some internal funds available for it. However, quality performance in student assessment work is occasionally granted to units that produce special reports.

B. Student Information Systems

The Information Systems Office (ISO) handles programming for student records and provides tech support for online registration. It also offers training to students and faculty on software. ISO is developing the Wake Information Network (WIN), a network for students and alumni to get information. ISO plans to eventually have WIN be a single portal for all information from marketing and admissions to registration to providing alumni services for life.

It supports offices on campus that perform assessment by providing tech support, creating surveys, posting them on the web, and tabulating results. The funds for this do not come out of ISO's budget. Every department has an Academic Computing Specialist (ACES); someone that works for Deans to facilitate surveys of students as well as providing other technical support services to faculty. This person is the first contact. Faculty and offices develop survey and get approval and mailing lists out of their own budgets, but ISO posts it at no charge; it is not a fee-for-service operation.

ISO also makes available an online course evaluation template so that faculty can design their own forms. The department makes up the general format and faculty can add questions before the finished forms are uploaded to WIN. Students can pull up evaluations for courses they registered for and the results and analysis are sent back to the department head. Students do not see these results; it is a closed system. This is the major assessment tool. Chairs make decisions about how that information is shared with faculty, but the automation makes tabulation and maintenance easier and chairs know how many have been completed. The Dean has encouraged all departments to go to online evaluations, but it is not yet required.

Assessment by ISO itself comes in the form of feedback it collects on how information technology serves students. Every year, 12-20 focus groups are conducted in the dorms and print surveys are distributed. ISO also collects their own data regarding their services. It doesn't really assess learning, but it gives them an idea of how their services are aiding students and faculty with academic work. The senior surveys (HEDS) provide ISO with student perceptions of its services relative to others. They watched that data carefully the first two years, but they perceive the results as focused on faculty/teaching related issues and not on technology related issues, per se. Regarding future assessment needs, ISO has no plans to assess the effect on graduates of having lived in this technological environment, although they said they would be interested in getting data that shows whether specific computer treatments produce certain academic effects.

ISO has provided assistance from 1995 to the present on the longitudinal survey that is evaluating the effect of computing as part of PTC 2000. The Provost and VP for Finance and Administration recognized the need for survey and assessment tool and originally approached the Communication Department about it. The survey is sent to all students at the beginning of the year and is focused on comfort with technology, whether they learn more with it, how its helps communication, and their expectations for dealing with technology. Findings show that some students deal with computerization better than others. ISO recognizes that juniors and seniors have less tech shock, but some training and support is provided to help all students adjust more easily. They work with the student body to find a way to have them deliver technology and teach each other. All of this helps ISO understand what needs of students are and how the computing services are being delivered.

C. Access to Student Assessment Data

Student assessment data is retained within the unit that collected it. Since OIR collects most of its own data and provides analysis and reports for other offices, it is the central clearinghouse for information. First and foremost, it produces the *Fact Book*, but extensive student assessment data reports and special studies are widely shared. What is made available is primarily done so at the administrative level. This is in the form of reports to the Executive Council and Reynolda Cabinet, the chairs of academic departments, and the directors of administrative offices. OIR also share data and performs analysis for the Program Planning and Evaluation Committees, the Division of Student Life, and to the Program Review Committee. Student survey results (HEDS Senior and CSEQ) are released to the student newspaper for publication, while the faculty and alumni survey results, as well as the *Fact Book*, are posted on the OIR web site.

Data generated by the university's assessment efforts is not housed at the Information Systems Office (ISO). Survey results are retained in the office that administers the survey. ISO does manage the registrar's data and other offices' requests for information regarding students for their own surveys. It has helped to automate the foreign language placement testing and makes those results available to department chairs via a closed network on WIN. As a general rule, ISO does not provide information back to the university community; usually data is returned to the faculty, deans, or the office that conducted an individual survey. Departments make their own packets of information available to the Board of Visitors and other groups.

D. Student Related Policies

Some students are involved in assessment efforts at different levels across campus. There are a few students that work with the Director of OIR in the collection and analysis of data. Also, a group of students attended the planning retreat for faculty and administrators with George Kuh that produced recommendations for the academic climate on campus.

Data collection on students themselves occurs at several points of their academic careers: at entry with the CIRP Survey, along the way with the CSEQ, and as seniors and alumni with the HEDS Senior and Alumni Surveys (see Sec. II B&C).

E. Professional Development Opportunities Related to Assessment (for faculty, staff)

We learned that teams from WFU attended AAHE Assessment Conferences in the early 1990s, as well as workshops sponsored by ACT & ETS about assessment. There were also campus-wide events during this time as the institution prepared for accreditation and went through strategic planning (see Sec. III B). This type of activity seems to have decreased after the provost who spearheaded the initial assessment efforts took another position within the institution. It was unclear whether similar activities will begin again once a new provost is found. There is also some internal training and development efforts regarding the technology and how to incorporate it into teaching (See Sec VI).

F. Faculty Evaluation and Rewards

Recommendations for tenure are made in WF College by department chairs and in the professional schools by the deans, all in consultation with tenured faculty. Faculty involvement with assessment-related activity is not necessarily evaluated for promotion and tenure; evaluations of teaching are the primary data involving students that is used. Faculty members are encouraged to participate in assessment activities and in various academic governance processes by the leadership. And some interview participants indicated that there have been a few times when a faculty member was singled out for doing a good job.

A discernible theme was that there is a desire to maintain decentralization. Participants indicated that faculty would probably resist any top-down push to require more assessment efforts of them. The provost had given some mandates, like for student evaluation of teaching, but did grant some leeway to departments. It is also important to note that the Teaching and Learning Center does not evaluate faculty members teaching or involvement in assessment activity; it is a service unit for the improvement of teaching.

G. Academic Planning and Review

As has been noted, assessment activity and information is interwoven into the planning and evaluation efforts of the administration and departmental decision-makers. Since the primary planning unit at WFU is the academic department, even when the Program Planning or Evaluation Committees consider student assessment data, the primary focus is mostly department-specific.

VI. INNOVATIVE TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

A. Campus-wide Initiatives

Teaching and Learning Center

The idea for a campus unit to assist faculty with the assessment and teaching issues was born of the discussions taking place in the early and mid- 1990s. The original idea came from the Provost but there was also faculty interest expressed through a faculty committee on teaching and learning issues. idea for a teaching and learning center for faculty was approved in 1997.

The Teaching and Learning Center is a service unit for faculty. Its mission includes making it possible for faculty to share innovative teaching practices with others, find support for their own new ideas, and seek out mentors and colleagues to help with any difficulties in teaching. It fosters cross-disciplinary dialogues among faculty through brown bag discussions and workshops on pedagogy and also houses resources that faculty members can use. The Center has also been closely involved in the First Year Seminars (FYS) through the development of a manual to help faculty and departments design and revise seminar courses.

The faculty elects a committee on teaching and learning (which meets twice a semester) who then appoint a director. The director is given a reduced teaching load during the year in which they serve. Some faculty would prefer that the Center be staffed with “trained people” as opposed to faculty who temporarily take on the directorship in exchange for course release.

However, the general perspective of the faculty is that the Center has turned out well. Teaching was already part of the culture, but having the Center is a symbol to new faculty members about the importance of learning new techniques, training with the technology, and getting students working on things outside of class.

CELI

The Computer Learning Initiative (CELI) was a faculty-based initiative (1997-1999) charged with developing effective uses of computers in instruction. The faculty member directing the program was given a reduced teaching load. The mission of CELI was the following:

- To preserve Wake Forest's tradition of personal and individual instruction, enhanced by the resources of computer technology;
- To help Wake Forest take a leadership role in integrating computer-technology into a liberal arts education true to the ideals of "pro humanitate" and intellectual integrity;
- To foster an environment of collaborative and life-long learning by facilitating intellectual exchange within the extended Wake Forest community; and
- To identify, develop, and disseminate computer applications that contribute to learning and scholarship across the wide array of disciplines at Wake Forest University.

ICCEL

Another organization on campus that provides faculty with new ideas related to teaching is the International Center for Computer Enhanced Learning (ICCEL). Interestingly enough, this Center is led by the former WFU provost who was so instrumental in the development of the assessment initiatives currently in use.

However, ICCEL is not simply a resource for WFU faculty, although they are certainly beneficiaries of its activities. The Center is a consortium of officials from WFU and other institutions that holds conferences, conducts interactive sessions, and offers consultation to all types of teachers interested in using technology to increase learning. ICCEL's services are offered to higher education institutions, K-12 teachers, corporate trainers, and community groups. It collects and shares best practices from those taking on the challenges of using new methods to enhance learning outcomes.

To date, the information has assisted faculty and administrators from over 400 colleges and universities through its workshops and sessions. ICCEL also makes its findings available through publication of white papers and articles.

Technical Support for Teaching

The Information Systems Office (ISO) provides a standard software package with a testing module in it for quizzes and tests, and faculty work with Academic Computing Specialists (ACS) to develop new instruments or techniques. If a faculty member wanted something for a specialized application, an ACS would help them do it in their department. ISO meets with ACS once a month to get feedback on processes. Also, ISO puts specially trained students (STARS program) to work with faculty to design IT applications for their classes. Approximately 25-40 students participate every year, and they do a presentation at the end of the year on their work for each other and for the campus. That has made a big difference in instruction methods.

Also, technology is infused into everything students do and to that end, ISO and the tech support they provide is an extension of the academic mission. They provide students with a skill and a capacity through the experiences provided in and out of class that they would not do otherwise and that they don't get from any one course.

B. Assessment in Four Focal Departments

Math

Teaching/Learning Practice and Culture

The Math department at WFU is starting to embrace the technology present on campus and is also active in assessment of its teaching and its students. It also appears there is change afoot in teaching methods. In conversations with faculty, we heard about interactive class sessions that were in contrast to preliminary descriptions of departmental practice as almost exclusively lecture-based.

While characterizing the department as generally "open to innovation," math faculty added that the department does not necessarily follow national trends in teaching. Instead the faculty feel they must decide what is right for WFU Math. "We don't want to do things that don't have benefits," one participant explained, pointing immediately to the benefits of computing in the classroom as an example. Symbolic calculation software, such as the MAPLE package installed on all WFU students' laptops, allows faculty and students to tackle problems that are "computationally intense" and therefore not practical for traditional presentation on a chalkboard.

Interviews revealed a conceptual emphasis in teaching calculus shared by the department faculty. One participant reported a somewhat unified sense that the conceptual/ theoretical aspect of calculus has "*got* to be there," in the courses, "otherwise the students don't know what they're doing; they don't know why they're doing it; they don't know what that answer means." However, a faculty member's ability to present anything other than a trivial problem is greatly enhanced by having MAPLE available in class. The availability of the technology reinforces the teaching of the concept. Without it, an instructor could present the theory, but would not have the ability to back it up with a thorough, complex computational demonstration.

The use of technology in WFU math courses is not limited to the computational software alone. Several math department faculty use course web pages, for example, to distribute, discuss and receive assignments.

Assessment Practice

Based on faculty interviews, it appears the Math department performs assessment in several areas. Activities include exit interviews of majors in Bachelor's and Master's programs (conducted through advisors), and feedback regarding classes functioning as "service courses." The department maintains contact with several departments who include math courses among their program pre-requisites. There is also a senior survey, distributed to graduating math majors concerning their future plans, and a survey of graduates five years out collects information about current professional placement and activities, satisfaction, etc. The Department Chair also compiles an "assessment report" annually and distributes it to the faculty.

Academic Management

Math last went through program review 3 - 4 years ago. Faculty members we interviewed indicated that the annual assessment they do aids them in preparing for it. However, there does not appear to be definitive push for learning *outcomes* assessment through the program review process. It seemed that what was in place approximated whatever might be asked for in the context of assessing student learning.

There were several significant changes as a result of the last program review including recommendations that Computer Science be made a separate department, that Master's degree requirements be adjusted, and that the curriculum should include more applied math courses. Also, the department restructured their calculus sequence. Otherwise, there was not much feedback on undergraduate programs or on student assessment. Reviewers and students were "generally complimentary" and alumni provided anecdotal feedback by expressing the value of a math major.

Assessment in the department appears to be driven by the fact that the faculty have developed the program review process and have agreed to do this-- albeit at the behest of a (SACS) requirement for departments to have an assessment process in place. However, plans are controlled at the department level, so there is little administrative pressure for an across the board, uniform kind of assessment practice.

Psychology

Teaching/Learning Practice and Culture

Interview participants noted that the psychology department is characterized by a culture in support of teaching. For example, all new hires are exposed to the idea, from the interview forward, that teaching is very important at WFU. There is also a concern with faculty development. For example, new faculty members are assigned teaching "mentors" for each class they teach. Services available for other faculty include informal classroom observation upon request and departmental teaching seminar. These are informal, discipline- and faculty-driven sessions in which faculty talk among themselves.

Of course, there are a number of changes underway. Two new initiatives are the introduction of greater opportunities for experiential learning in classrooms, and the involvement of undergraduates in research. Technology was an issue of concern because of the changes that it was bringing to classroom presentation; some expressed a need to temper that trend. Finally, faculty mentioned that the department is struggling to keep class sizes down. As such, physical plant solutions were seen as important.

Assessment Practice

The department conceptualizes "assessment" primarily as assessment of teaching. Faculty characterize the internal approach to teaching/learning and assessment as "reasonable" because it seems to operate in formal and informal ways.

The department doesn't focus as much on student learning outcomes specifically as they do of the assessment of teaching activity, admittedly because "it is harder to do." But the faculty do look at two "bracket" courses at the 300-level. These courses involve students in group

projects and real-world research problems. The department can look at results from those two courses to see how they are preparing students. Also, the chair conducts "faculty development" interviews that reveal relationships between courses. This translates into an informal assessment of student learning, e.g. whether students seem less prepared on an issue in advanced courses; or if students need the ability to write a results section by 300-level courses. In particular, 300-level courses reveal a lot about how students are learning material in the lower division courses.

For 20 years, the Psychology Department required senior majors to take a national standardized test. However, students would show up and not take it seriously or not put forth the effort. Faculty members saw it as testing for testing sake, so they simply stopped giving it. Now they conduct student evaluations of teaching and encourage new faculty to elicit midterm evaluations from students as well. The department also surveys students after graduation. Faculty describe the survey constructs as, "How are you doing?" and "What did we miss?" types of questions. The surveys have been distributed approximately every seven years in the past. That cycle might well be accelerated in the future to distribute the survey every 5 years.

Academic Management

In general the department administration espouses a formative attitude toward the improvement of teaching, and faculty note that the absence of threat or pressure from central administration also allows the department to maintain a formative approach to faculty development. Rewards for teaching include a pervasive culture in support of teaching within the department (so that one reward is fitting in). There is also the university-wide teaching award and the fact that teaching activity is factored into merit raises.

Participants did not provide much information on how assessment information or results are used within the department, or what specific changes were traceable to assessment activity.

English

Teaching/Learning Practice and Culture

The WFU English department has a culture that places a high value on teaching however it is measured. One of our participants noted “that [the value of teaching improvement] comes from us; it’s nothing that’s been imposed on us.” While central administration also expresses a priority on teaching, faculty perceived the departmental culture in support of teaching improvement as independent of any centralized agenda.

Faculty we spoke with characterized the WFU English department in a nurturing context, especially with regard to faculty development and teaching and learning issues. Participants described informal mentoring relationships among the faculty, and a general attitude supportive of faculty learning while teaching. To a certain extent, participants drew an overt distinction between this supportive departmental environment and the more general (and ostensibly less supportive) tone set university-wide.

Teaching and learning activities currently pursued by the English faculty include: undergraduate involvement in faculty research (conferences, papers, journal production), field experiences in journalism courses (at county jail and city planning office), collaborative writing, the incorporation of technology into the classroom, and team teaching within the department.

Assessment Practice

Student input and student work are most often used in the assessment of teaching. The department contacts alumni English majors for individual faculty reviews and recruits current students to meet regarding faculty members' tenure or promotion. Regarding students, the faculty hope to see midterm evaluations put in place in the near future; they distributed a survey to undergraduate students and was pleased with the results. Also, recently, the department has instituted placement exams for some entering students. Finally, the department uses first-year students' writing samples as a part of their evaluation of composition courses and of untenured faculty's teaching performance.

Departmental assessments of teaching center primarily on student evaluations, but also include peer review of teaching. This was historically done by the director of the department's lower division, but will now be performed by a lower division committee that is developing an observation sheet that aims to be constructive and separate out skills vs. personality issues.

Assessment of student learning is carried out mostly by individual faculty. Some WFU English faculty use portfolios and journaling strategies for classroom assessment. Honors Program students take oral exams in addition to writing and presenting a capstone-experience papers. The department doesn't require any specific activity in the assessment of student learning, however. While committees examine syllabi and exams, portfolios and other results are not included in these reviews.

First-year seminars in the English department and throughout the college are assessed by the dean's office, which focuses primarily on student evaluations of the courses and the instructors. The results of these reviews are returned to the departments.

Academic Management

Participants report that some faculty perceive a level of strain between departments and the administration in terms of a good work environment. An implication is that there is a lack of respect towards faculty on the part of the administration. Some participants perceive two levels of activity driving teaching/ learning improvement and assessment at WFU: the first is something coming from above, which is seen as less important than the second aspect, the culture within the department that emphasizes teaching.

Chemistry

Teaching/Learning Practice and Culture

As we heard confirmed at several points throughout our visit, chemistry faculty participants in our study described department-wide culture that values teaching.

Assessment Practice/ Assessment of Teaching

The WFU program review process figures prominently in the chemistry department's assessment strategies. Individual assessment practices in place include an online student survey of satisfaction ratings and attitudes and interviews with majors to elicit students' concerns about credits, classroom assignments, etc. They also use the American Chemical Society's standardized exams in various content areas and beginning next year, will offer "pre-assessments" (i.e.

placement exams). Individual instructors respond to deficiencies revealed by assessment data. The department has been mostly satisfied with the results.

When assessing faculty members, the department looks mostly for glaring problems with student evaluations and for patterns independent of grade distribution. They also tabulate scores for junior faculty to see if they are within the normal range. Results are reported to the dean and the dean meets with the provost. Otherwise, faculty point to additional opportunities for faculty to show that they are trying to innovate in the classroom, e.g. volunteering to teach a first-year seminar, incorporating technology into teaching. Also, there is no classroom observation by the chair.

Academic Management

One faculty member characterized the May, 1999 program review report as "a friendly review, but honest." The results suggested that the department's curriculum needed to be updated. Accordingly, the chemistry faculty redesigned the first three years of its major requirements. Courses are now self contained, more sequential, and exhibit less overlap. In the near future, they hope to finish the third-year revision, expand the biochemistry curriculum, and hire an additional biochemistry faculty member. Regarding SACS, the faculty we spoke with made no mention of specific action as a result of the accreditation review.

VII. USES AND IMPACTS OF STUDENT ASSESSMENT

A. Uses in Academic Decisions

Assessment results have not been used to modify the academic institution mission in any way, but have been extensively used in strategic planning and evaluation, academic planning, departmental reviews, and in the refinement of instructional techniques and curricular patterns. The various types of assessment data (and subsequent reports) are involved at the institutional and departmental levels of planning and implementation, and by Student Life.

The institutional and Student Life planning efforts converged around the first year experience of students during the work of the Program Planning Committee and the development of PTC 2000. Among other things, the results of this were the First Year Seminars and the decision to reduce the undergraduate student/faculty ratio, as well as increased opportunities for students to work with faculty individually. These data streams are also being used in the next planning wave. Having now obtained more data about student time outside of class through the CSEQ and a series of other assessment measures, the administration can make better-informed decisions about the intellectual climate on campus and relations between students and faculty members.

There have also been widespread impacts at the departmental level. At this time, WFU has nearly completed a full round of departmental program reviews (the entire process was expected to take about seven years). At the end of the cycle there will be an evaluation of the entire program review process. Still, WFU has found the process useful thus far. The Health & Exercise program added three faculty members and made changes to its curricula. The Department of Anthropology underwent major changes, including the suspension of graduate admissions, an administrative restructuring, training for faculty on teaching effectiveness, and changes to the curriculum. Also, the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science was

split into separate departments. WFU believes this process demonstrates its linkage of assessment data, program review, and evaluation.

Assessment information has had little direct impact on administrative decisions to allocate resources specifically to student assessment activities, and there is no evidence to suggest there has been any effect on faculty rewards and evaluation for tenure and promotion. There is also an increasing understanding that WFU is not yet able to assess or demonstrate how students are changing in regarding institutional goals like values, perceptions about service, and citizenship. Also, there is little or no effort to objectively measure specific learning outcomes of courses or programs. Most of what is known is based on anecdotal information, such as the stories students relate about their experiences. Some involved in assessment would like to see faculty adopt more systematic measures of these things, rather than using their subjective impressions when making decisions.

B. Internal Institutional Impacts

Effects on educational discussions have occurred through the academic planning processes. Regarding curricular patterns, the recent Curriculum Review Committee considered student assessment reports from OIR and Student Life in its discussions. And the laptop computer initiative has been the focus of a major longitudinal study by the Department of Communication. This has provided insight into the types of training required, the effects computers have had on communications across campus, and how their use has impacted teaching practice.

Other significant impacts that affected the curriculum were the FYS program and the decision after the second planning wave in the mid-1990s to internationalize the curriculum. Campus-wide discussions on instructional patters are ongoing through such mechanisms as the Teaching and Learning Center, ICCEL, and the natural emphasis on teaching evident within the departments. Since these initiatives have been successful, as have other programs like STARS that also help faculty with teaching, it is possible to conclude that there is greater faculty interest in learning new teaching methods and engaging with the technology. Several departments also indicated that assessment and program review helped them modify or refocus their curriculum and develop new ways of teaching.

Assessment has also facilitated changes in administrative and service areas of the university. Offices like the Registrar and Career Services in the Business School, and services for students like orientation and academic advising have all made changes in their practices because of findings from student and alumni satisfaction surveys. The data on students has also let faculty see the difference between Greeks and non-Greeks on academic achievement as part of the intellectual climate study. Also, people in Information Systems know much more about students' comfort level with technology and if their training has been effective.

C. External Impacts

It is difficult to allocate credit for any external trends or changes specifically to student assessment efforts. This is, in part, because it is difficult to separate the institutional improvements due to strategic and departmental planning from those resulting from assessment of performance. The two processes are closely intertwined. So although the institution has seen positive trends in the areas of number of Rhodes Scholars, graduate school admissions,

employment and placement, and student/alumni satisfaction with WFU, these gains cannot be linked solely to the student assessment initiatives.

VIII. ASSESSMENT CLIMATE AND CULTURE

Student assessment at WFU is embedded in the institution's larger academic management processes. It is extensive and widely used but is not a separate driving force. It is not done as an end in itself, but as a means to helping the institution become more effective and achieve its long-range goals. Because assessment has been incorporated into the academic planning, implementation, and evaluation processes of the administration and the departments, there exists an academic management culture that stresses use of a rational planning and review mode that is driven by data analysis. There is a stress on the uniqueness of WFU and the need to structure academic planning and review around meeting goals and priorities rather than engaging in extensive peer comparison and benchmarking. Also, major academic decisions are made based on evaluation studies and assessment data, including some student assessment data.

Improvement in the campus climate regarding assessment is evident in the governance of the institution. Gaining administrative consensus early in the development process was key because leadership then showed the departments that it was possible to make things happen. And through that, proponents were able to convince the trustees. Now that time has passed since implementation, there is a consensus that the recommendations and the promise of the administration have been met.

Despite the lack of any comprehensive master plan and the mostly decentralized implementation of assessment across campus, there are many ways in which assessment information comes together to produce institutional improvement. Continued emphasis by the academic leadership sends the message that this is an important part of everyone's work. The "teeth" of the assessment effort to enforce recommendations and make specific changes exist because the deans are committed and collectively, the university has a desire to make the effort succeed. Also, information sharing across campus can put pressure on units to change since no one wants to be seen as under-performing. The Provost and Senior VP show results to units that are found to be lackluster. Recent improvements in advising are an example, as are recent changes in the admissions process.

Without any one person or group directing the entire effort, the process is kept in motion by several forces, including the ongoing need to evaluate PTC 2000 and the feeling that the quality of the institution must be demonstrated. There is a sense that WFU must justify its tuition hike and the national publicity its strategic plan has generated. Also, the institution has gained notoriety from its national rankings in *U.S. News & World Report* and *Yahoo! Internet Life*. And faculty are continually engaged in the planning and assessment efforts by the changes it makes in teaching. There is a sense within departments that whatever makes the classroom better is worth engaging in. Lastly, having recently completed a self-study, SACS is still fresh on people's minds. Departments are aware of institutional effectiveness and are developing their own internal methods for meeting its criteria.

In summary, assessment is now part of what WFU does in its drive towards increased institutional effectiveness. Planning and evaluation are integral components of its management philosophy, and assessment is an essential tool for helping the university achieve its strategic objectives. And there is a collective effort to meet this responsibility.

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY AND PROFILE OF

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO

"INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE FOR STUDENT ASSESSMENT"

for

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY

SUMMARY

This memo summarizes some general insights from the following frequency distribution profile of Faculty and Administrative responses to the "Institutional Climate for Student Assessment" questionnaire distributed as part of our case study of student assessment at Wake Forest University. The survey was designed to obtain the respondents' perceptions of the institution's patterns of undergraduate student assessment in the *College of Arts and Science.*

The instrument was distributed to a random sample of faculty in the *College of Arts and Science,* and to all academic and student affairs administrators involved with student assessment. Faculty in the departments of Chemistry, English, Mathematics, and Psychology who received a special questionnaire are summarized in Appendix II. The sample included 182 faculty and administrators. Fifty-three usable responses were received. Although the percent return is small (29%), a comparison of respondents by rank and by faculty or administrative role suggests it is representative of the original sample.

The following comments are organized by sections of the questionnaire but readers are encouraged to review the item-by-item results for the actual frequency distribution on each item.

I. Institutional Academic Culture

Respondents to the survey reported the following dominant patterns on each of four culture dimensions. Twenty-seven percent believe the purpose of undergraduate education is to enhance the thinking capabilities of students. Students must learn to reason critically and to communicate their thoughts. Twenty-six percent believe that the purpose of undergraduate education is to provide students with knowledge and skills that enable them to earn a living and contribute productively to society. Forty percent reported that decision-making at the institution is autocratic. Forty-one percent believe that WFU leads educational change in undergraduate education. Forty-four percent of respondents reported that the teaching and learning process (learning goals, teaching techniques, and course content) is determined by individual departments while forty-three percent reported that the process is determined by individual faculty. Lastly, over the past five years, respondents reported that the quality of undergraduate education and the institution's ability to meet the needs of entering students has improved somewhat.

II. Institutional Approach to Student Assessment

The survey indicated that the content areas with the greatest emphasis on assessment were cognitive development and student satisfaction. Both of these areas were rated to have a moderate emphasis. The data also indicate that the most commonly used assessment technique is the use of focus groups and surveys and student-performance methods.

III. Institutional Support for Student Assessment

Institutional mission priorities rated highest by the respondents were teaching undergraduates and excellence in undergraduate education. The survey also indicated that the most important

purpose for assessment is to prepare for accreditation and to improve the institution's external image. The primary influences on assessment seem to be from individual departments and faculty and to a lesser extent, senior level administrators. Planning for student assessment and the Institution-wide activities in promoting student assessment were all ranked unimportant or unknown. The Institutional Research office and the faculty ranked highest in supporting student assessment.

IV. External Influences on Student Assessment

Respondents reported that external influences on student assessment come primarily from regional accreditation and professional accreditation and review.

V. Assessment Policies and Practices

A computerized student information system and access to student assessment data for advisors and academic units ranked the highest for policies surrounding student assessment information. For student policies, individual feedback provided to students regarding their own student performance results was ranked the highest. For professional development, faculty workshops and internal or external consultants for faculty ranked highest in policies encouraging student assessment. Encouraging faculty to assess student learning in their classes and evidence of student performance considered in faculty evaluation ranked highest among evaluation and rewards policies. Lastly, academic department or program planning/review ranked somewhat important to academic management of student assessment.

VI. Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment

The survey indicated that faculty and administrators use information on student assessment to make changes to academic support services and academic programs or majors. Respondents also reported that there were positive impacts of student assessment on institutional evaluation from regional accreditation and institutional reputation.

VII. Attitudes Toward, Involvement In, and Satisfaction with Student Assessment

There is a strong indication that the respondents feel that effectiveness of teaching is enhanced when faculty are free to implement their own approaches to student assessment. There is also evidence that the faculty and administrators do not have a common understanding of the meaning of the term student assessment. Respondents reported that they are satisfied with administrative leadership support for student assessment and the impact student assessment has had on WFU. Personal involvement in activities related to student assessment that ranked highest were revision of course or instructional methods based on student assessment and the use of student assessment in instruction.

Profile of Responses

INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE FOR STUDENT ASSESSMENT

Wake Forest University Case Study

A Faculty and Administrative Survey for the Research Program on Institutional Support for Student Assessment

The "Institutional Climate for Student Assessment" (ICSA) survey has been developed by the research program on Institutional Support for Student Assessment for the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement* (NCPI). The primary purpose of the ICSA is to examine how your institution supports student assessment at the institutional level. We are interested in your perception of how your institution approaches student assessment, how it provides organizational and administrative support for it, the types of policies and practices used to promote it, and the uses and impacts of that student assessment information. We are interested in your perception of these topics even though you may not be directly involved with them.

In this study, we are interested in assessment of undergraduate students **at the institutional level**, rather than at the classroom or department level, unless specifically stated otherwise. Student assessment is defined as those activities, other than traditional end-of-course grading, focused on measuring undergraduate student performance. Student performance includes students' academic, personal, and social development; attitudes; behavior; and perceptions related to their role as students.

The ICSA is designed for faculty and for academic, student affairs, institutional researchers, and student assessment administrators. This survey is part of an intensive case study that examines your institution's approach to and strategy for supporting student assessment. The case study report describing your institution's student assessment strategy will include a profile of responses to this survey. This information should be helpful both in better understanding and in enhancing support for student assessment at your institution. Any questions concerning the survey can be addressed to:

Marvin W. Peterson, Project Director
National Center for Postsecondary Improvement,
Program on Institutional Support for Student Assessment
University of Michigan
School of Education
610 E. University, Room 2339
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259
Phone: 734-647-2464 / Fax: 734-936-2741
Email: ncpi.proj52@umich.edu

*NCPI is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement under OERI grant number R309A600012

A. Purpose of Undergraduate Education
(Distribute 100 points)

My institution believes that the purpose of undergraduate education is:

1. 20%__ to make the world a better place for all of us. Students must be taught to make the most of their roles in society and to strive to improve it.

2. 26%__ to provide students with knowledge and skills that enable them to earn a living and contribute productively to society.

3. 25%__ to emphasize the great learning and discoveries of the human mind. Students should be able to demonstrate both breadth of knowledge and depth in their major fields.

4. 17%__ to help students clarify their beliefs and values and thus achieve commitment and dedication to guide their lives. The development of personal values is an educational outcome as important as acquisition of subject knowledge.

5. 27%__ to enhance the thinking capability of students. Students must learn to reason critically and to communicate their thoughts.

Total = 100 points

B. Governance of Undergraduate Education
(Distribute 100 points)

Academic decision making **at my institution** can best be described as:

1. 22%__ collegial: There are widespread opportunities to participate meaningfully in decision making.

2. 21%__ formal/rational: Decision making is formally structured. Problems are analyzed. Decisions are made in a logical and reasoned manner.

3. 29%__ autonomous: Academic and professional units function with a good deal of freedom in a decentralized or loosely coordinated environment.

4. 40%__ autocratic: Decisions are made by higher level administrators with little or no consultation with faculty or lower level academic units.

5. 22%__ political: Different people or groups move in and out of the decision making process, wielding varying amounts of power at different times.

Total = 100 points

C. Educational Change Orientation
(Distribute 100 points)

In addressing educational change in undergraduate education, **my institution**:

1.41%___ leads. It looks ahead and anticipates educational trends. It sets the goals and the pace and other institutions follow.

2. 32%_ adapts. It is constantly looking outward, monitoring the trends in undergraduate education and changing accordingly.

3. 31%__ responds. It observes what is happening in other institutions. As other institutions change, my institution follows by adopting their patterns and initiatives.

4. 24%__ resists. It usually rejects or ignores changes in undergraduate education taking place at other institutions.

Total = 100 points

D. Responsibility for the Undergraduate Teaching and Learning Process
(Distribute 100 points)

The **undergraduate** teaching and learning process (curricular requirements, learning goals, teaching techniques, course content, etc.) **at my institution** is mainly determined by:

1. 43%__ individual faculty.
2. 44%__ individual departments, schools, or colleges.
3. 18%__ an institution-wide academic governing body (e.g. faculty senate).
4. 13%___ academic administrators.
5. 2%___ institutional or system governing board.

Total = 100 points

E. Perceptions of Undergraduate Educational Quality

Please rate **your institution's** change in performance on the following indicators of undergraduate education over the past 5 years. (Circle **one** for each)

Perceptions	Improvement over the Past 5 Years (Very much improved – 5; Somewhat improved – 4; About the same – 3; Somewhat worse – 2; Very much worse – 1)
1. The quality of undergraduate education	3.54
2. The ability of this institution to meet the educational needs of entering undergraduate students	3.62
3. The preparedness of undergraduate students for collegiate-level work	3.02
4. The effort undergraduate students devote to their studies	2.68
5. The academic performance of undergraduate students	3.04

II. INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO STUDENT ASSESSMENT

Sections II - VI specifically address **your institution's** approaches to, support for, influences on, practices regarding, and uses and impacts of student assessment.

A. Content of Student Assessment

Please rate the emphasis placed by **your institution** on the following content areas of student assessment.
(Circle **one** for each)

Content Area	Emphasis (Very Strong – 5; Strong – 4; Moderate – 3; Little – 2; None or Unknown – 1)
1. Basic college-readiness skills	2.98
2. Cognitive development (higher-order skills, general education competencies, competence in major field of study)	3.65
3. Affective development (values, attitudes, personal growth, etc.)	2.78
4. Social development (political, social or community involvement)	2.98
5. Vocational or professional skills or competence	2.71
6. Student academic plans, intentions, and progress	3.10
7. Student satisfaction and involvement with the institution	3.18

B. Methods of Student Assessment

In its student assessment efforts, to what extent does **your institution** emphasize the following methods of collecting student assessment data? (Circle **one** for each)

Method	Emphasis (Very Strong – 5; Strong – 4; Moderate – 3; Little – 2; None or Unknown – 1)
1. Institutional or state developed instruments or tests	2.04
2. Commercial instruments or tests	1.90
3. Student-performance methods (observations of student performance or demonstrations, portfolios, capstone courses)	2.47
4. Student or alumni interviews, focus groups, and surveys	2.80
5. External examination of students (licensure exams, external reviewers)	2.31
6. Employer interviews, focus groups and surveys	2.19
7. Transcript analysis	2.13
8. Other: please specify: _____	1.64

III. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR STUDENT ASSESSMENT

The questions in this section address **institution-wide** evidence of support for student assessment.

A. Institutional Mission Priorities

To what extent are the following components priorities in **your institution's** mission? (Circle **one** for each)

Mission Component	Priority
1. Excellence in undergraduate education	4.57
2. Teaching undergraduates	4.53
3. Research	3.60
4. Service to the external community	2.83
5. Service to institution (serving on committees, etc.)	3.29
6. Assessment of undergraduate student learning	2.81
7. Identifying clear educational outcomes expected of students	2.57
8. Interdisciplinary teaching or research	3.00
9. Alternative delivery systems (distance learning, experiential learning, learning communities)	2.00
10. Innovative instructional methods (peer teaching, cooperative learning, collaborative learning)	2.87
11. Student diversity	2.68

Priority: Very High – 5; High – 4; Moderate – 3; Low – 2; Very Low or Unknown – 1

B. Purpose of Conducting Student Assessment

How important to **your institution** is each of the following purposes for pursuing undergraduate student assessment? (Circle **one** for each)

Purpose	Importance
1. Preparing institutional self-study for accreditation	3.84
2. Meeting state reporting requirements	2.22
3. Guiding internal resource allocation decisions	2.91
4. Guiding undergraduate academic program improvement	3.63
5. Improving the achievement of undergraduate students	3.38
6. Improving faculty instructional performance	3.16
7. Improving our institution's external image and reputation	4.37

Importance: Very important – 5; Important – 4; Somewhat important – 3; Not important – 2; Very unimportant – 1

C. Influences on Student Assessment

How important are the following influences on student assessment **at your institution**? (Circle **one** for each)

Influences	**Importance**
1. An institution-wide formal plan that all academic administrators and faculty are required to follow	2.10
2. An institution-wide informal policy that all academic administrators and faculty are encouraged to follow	2.31
3. Senior level administrators (e.g. Vice President of Academic Affairs, Deans, etc).	2.85
4. Individual departments who assess their own students.	3.76
5. Individual faculty members who champion assessment	3.02
6. Vocal detractors of student assessment	1.70

Importance: Very important – 5; Important – 4; Somewhat important – 3; Not important – 2; Very unimportant – 1

D. Institution-Wide Activities

How important is each of the following administrative or governance activities in promoting undergraduate student assessment **at your institution**? (Circle **one** for each)

Activities	**Importance**
1. Annual presidential or other institution-wide initiative, forums or seminars on student assessment	1.85
2. Board of trustees committee that addresses student assessment	1.40
3. Faculty governance committee that addresses student assessment issues	1.96
4. Student representation on student assessment committees	1.71
5. Planning for student assessment	1.90
6. Institution-wide steering committee or task force on student assessment	1.84

Importance: Very important – 5; Important – 4; Somewhat important – 3; Not important – 2; Very unimportant or unknown – 1

E. Support for Student Assessment

How supportive are the following groups or individuals of undergraduate student assessment activities in **your institution**? (Circle **one** for each)

Supportiveness
Very supportive – 5
Somewhat supportive – 4
Neutral – 3
Somewhat unsupportive – 2
Very unsupportive or unknown -1

Groups	
1. Board of trustees	1.76
2. Chief executive officer	1.92
3. Chief academic officer	2.51
4. Chief student affairs officer	2.00
5. Academic administrators	2.90
6. Student affairs administrators	2.02
7. Faculty governance body	2.63
8. Faculty	3.14
9. Student government	1.92
10. Students	1.79
11. Institutional research, academic review, and student assessment office	3.00

IV. EXTERNAL INFLUENCES ON STUDENT ASSESSMENT

How influential have the following external factors been on **your institution's** level of involvement in undergraduate student assessment? (Circle **one** for each)

Influence
Very influential – 5
Influential – 4
Somewhat influential – 3
Hardly influential – 2
Not influential or unknown – 1

External Factor	
1. State requirements for or review of my institution's student assessment efforts	1.81
2. Regional (institutional) accreditation requirements or review	3.40
3. Professional (program/field) accreditation requirements or review	2.96
4. Professional associations promoting student assessment (institutional, disciplinary, or administrative)	2.31
5. Private foundations or corporate groups	2.00

V. ASSESSMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Institutions have adopted a variety of intentional policies and practices designed to support student assessment. From your perspective, how important does **your institution** consider the following policies and/or practices in encouraging student assessment activities? (Circle **one** for each)

Importance of Practice to Your Institution
Very important – 5
Important – 4
Somewhat important – 3
Not important – 2
Very unimportant or unknown – 1

Policy or Practice	
A. Student Assessment Information	
1. Dissemination of student assessment reports and studies	2.48
2. Access to student assessment data on individual students for advisors and academic units	2.70
3. Computerized student information system	2.98
B. Student Policies	
1. Requiring student participation in student assessment activities	2.16
2. Incentives encouraging students to participate in student assessment activities	1.98
3. Individual feedback provided to students regarding their own student performance results	2.64
4. Student assessment activities scheduled in the academic calendar	1.82
C. Professional Development	
1. Faculty workshops on student assessment	2.14
2. Support for faculty to attend professional conferences on student assessment	1.94
3. Internal or external consultant services for faculty on the use of student assessment in course design or instruction	2.08
4. Assistance for faculty (paid leaves, stipends, mini grants or course reduction) to improve their use of student assessment	1.88
5. Student assessment workshops for deans, department chairs, and other academic administrators	1.86
6. Student assessment workshops for student affairs staff and administrators	1.52

Assessment Policies and Practices (continued)

Importance of Practice to Your Institution
Very important – 5
Important – 4
Somewhat important – 3
Not very important – 2
Not important or unknown – 1

D. Evaluation and Rewards

1.	Evidence of student performance (not just student teaching evaluation) considered in faculty evaluation for promotion or tenure	2.71
2.	Evidence of student performance considered in faculty evaluation for annual salary or merit increases	2.51
3.	Faculty scholarship on or participation in student assessment activities considered in promotion or tenure reviews	1.88
4.	Faculty scholarship on or participation in student assessment activities considered in salary reviews or merit increases	1.98
5.	Public recognition or awards for faculty for innovative or effective use of student assessment	1.90
6.	Experience or skill in student assessment considered in faculty hiring process	1.82
7.	Encouraging faculty to assess student learning in their classes	2.63
8.	Rewards or incentives for academic and student affairs administrators who promote use of student assessment in their unit	1.50
9.	Incentives for academic units to use student assessment information in their evaluation and improvement efforts	1.90

E. Academic Management

1.	Annual budget allocation to academic units to support student assessment	1.67
2.	Academic department or program planning/review using student assessment data	2.63
3.	General education or core curriculum review using student assessment data	2.31
4.	Course review and development using student assessment data	2.24
5.	Review and planning for student academic support services based on student assessment data	2.00
6.	Evaluation of the student assessment process	1.76

VI. USES AND IMPACTS OF STUDENT ASSESSMENT

A. Uses of Student Assessment Data

To what extent does **your institution** use undergraduate student assessment information in making decisions or changes in the following areas?
(Circle **one** for each)

Use of Student Assessment Data
Very high – 5
High – 4
Moderate – 3
Low – 2
None or Unknown – 1

Decisions and Changes		
1.	Undergraduate academic mission or goals	2.16
2.	Academic programs or majors	2.61
3.	General education curriculum	2.27
4.	Student out-of-class learning experiences (e.g. internships, service learning)	2.40
5.	Distance learning initiatives	1.33
6.	Student academic support services (e.g. advising, tutoring)	2.58
7.	Student affairs activities or organization	1.89
8.	Pattern of resource allocation to academic units	1.90
9.	Student assessment plans, policies, or processes	1.90
10.	Faculty promotion and tenure policies	2.22
11.	Faculty salary increases or rewards (release time, travel funds, etc.)	2.08
12.	Reports for external agents	2.52

B. Impacts of Student Assessment

What impact has student assessment information had on the following indicators of **your institution's** performance?
(Circle **one** for each)

Impact of Student Assessment
Very positive – 5
Somewhat positive – 4
None or unknown – 3
Somewhat negative – 2
Very negative – 1

Indicators		
1.	Campus discussions of undergraduate education	2.96
2.	Faculty satisfaction	2.84
3.	Faculty interest in teaching	2.94
4.	Changes in instructional or teaching methods used	3.17
5.	Student satisfaction	2.94
6.	Student retention or graduation rates	2.96
7.	Student grade performance	2.88
8.	Student achievement on external exams (professional licensure, GRE)	2.83
9.	Student applications or acceptance rates	2.98
10.	Allocation or share of state funding	2.28
11.	Institutional evaluation from regional accreditation agency	3.25
12.	Private fund raising results	2.94
13.	Success on grant applications	2.75
14.	Institutional reputation or image	3.31

VII. ATTITUDES TOWARD, INVOLVEMENT IN, AND SATISFACTION WITH STUDENT ASSESSMENT

The following questions focus on your **personal** attitudes toward, satisfaction with, and involvement in student assessment **at your institution**.

A. Attitudes

Please describe how you feel about the following statements regarding student assessment **at your institution**. (Circle **one** for each)

	Your Attitudes about the Following
	Agree strongly – 4 / Agree somewhat – 3 / Disagree somewhat – 2 / Disagree strongly – 1
Attitudes	
1. Mandated student assessment limits the academic freedom of faculty.	2.14
2. Results of student evaluations of teaching influence how faculty assess students.	2.49
3. Faculty are free to implement their own approaches to student assessment.	3.02
4. Faculty have a common understanding of the meaning of the term *student assessment*.	1.73
5. Administrators have a common understanding of the meaning of the term *student assessment*.	1.78
6. Student assessment limits the amount of time faculty have for other academic activities.	2.72
7. Student assessment is more effective when determined by the faculty member rather than by the institution.	2.88
8. Student assessment has improved the quality of education at this institution.	2.37
9. Students today are learning more due to an institutional focus on the assessment of student learning.	1.84
10. Student assessment techniques accurately measure students learning.	1.96
11. The effectiveness of teaching is enhanced when faculty regularly engage in student assessment.	2.75
12. Faculty use more student assessment techniques than they did five years ago.	2.48
13. Faculty use student assessment information to modify how or what they teach.	2.59
14. Faculty frequently communicate with colleagues on how to improve their students assessment practices.	2.00
15. Faculty enjoy participating in student assessment activities.	1.76
16. Faculty and administrators agree on the value of assessing student learning.	1.84
17. Faculty update their in-class assessment techniques on a regular basis.	2.00
18. Assessing students has resulted in the development of learning experiences that better meet diverse learning styles.	2.35
19. Faculty are reluctant to engage in student assessment for fear that student assessment results will be used in evaluations.	2.57
20. State or federally mandated assessment requirements improve the quality of undergraduate education	1.46

B. Satisfaction

Please rate your **personal** satisfaction with the following statements about student assessment **at your institution**. (Circle **one** for each)

	Your Satisfaction
	Very satisfied – 5 / Satisfied – 4 / Neutral or unknown – 3 / Not satisfied – 2 / Very dissatisfied – 1
Statements	
1. Institution's approach to student assessment (content and methods)	2.78
2. Institution-wide plan or policy on student assessment	2.74
3. Opportunities to participate in policy making about student assessment	2.80
4. Administrative leadership support for student assessment	2.82
5. Faculty leadership support for student assessment	2.90
6. Student support for student assessment	2.61
7. Professional development for student assessment	2.72
8. Evaluation and rewards based on student assessment data or involvement	2.73
9. Use of student assessment data in making academic decisions	2.78
10. Impact student assessment has had on your institution	2.82

C. Involvement

Please rate your **personal** involvement in the following activities related to student assessment **at your institution**. (Circle **one** for each)

	Your Involvement
	Very highly involved – 5 / Highly involved – 4 / Involved – 3 / Moderately involved – 2 / Not involved – 1
Activities	
1. Participation in institutional workshops or seminars to learn about student assessment	1.94
2. Creating new assessment techniques	2.26
3. Participation in program review, curricular evaluation, or planning activities using student assessment results	2.80
4. Service on school-wide or institution-wide committee or task force on student assessment	1.88
5. Setting assessment policy for institution	1.45
6. Publishing articles, reports, or other writings on student assessment	1.34
7. Attendance at state, regional, or national workshops or conferences on student assessment	1.60
8. Presentation at state, regional or national workshops or conferences on student assessment	1.28
9. Advising students using their individual student assessment results	2.62
10. Interpreting the results of studies of student assessment at my institution	1.78

The following 5 involvement questions are for faculty members. **Administrators, please skip to Section VIII: Personal Data**.

Involvement
Very highly involved – 5
Highly involved – 4
Involved – 3
Moderately involved – 2
Not involved – 1

Activities (cont.)	
11. Use of student assessment in my instruction	3.15
12. Use of active assessment techniques (student portfolios, performances, observations) in my classroom.	2.96
13. Revision of my course or instructional methods based on student assessment results	3.26
14. Evaluating the success of my classroom assessment activities	2.93
15. Participation in departmental activities related to student assessment	2.37

VIII. PERSONAL DATA

1. Sex 67%_ Male _33%_ Female

2. Race / Ethnicity
   _0%__ American Indian or Alaskan Native
   _0%__ Asian
   _0%__ African American/Black
   _2%__ Hispanic/Latino
   _0%__ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   _98%_ White
   __0%_ Other

3. Primary Appointment
   __92% Faculty
   ___8% Administrator

4. Academic Field (Faculty appointment only)
   _20%_ Natural Sciences
   _41%_ Arts & Humanities
   _35%_ Social Sciences
   _4%__ Professional/Occupational

5. Rank (Faculty appointment only):
   _0%__ Lecturer or instructor
   _16%_ Assistant Professor
   _35%_ Associate Professor
   _47%_ Professor
   __2%_ Other, please specify: _____
   __0%_ No ranks at this institution

6. Tenure Status (Faculty Appointment only)
   _82%_ Tenured
   _14%_ Tenure track, not tenured
   __4%_ No tenure for my position

7. Administrative Appointment
   _30%_ Academic affairs administrator
   _60% Department or division chair
   _ 0% Student affairs administrator
   _10%_ Institutional research, academic evaluation, or student assessment officer

8. For how many years have you worked
   a. at this institution _22.3 years
   b. in higher education _16.2 years

9. Highest Degree
   _92%_ Doctorate of Philosophy
   _2%__ Professional Doctorate (J.D., M.D.)
   __4%_ Master's
   __0%_ Certificate beyond Bachelor's
   __0%_ Bachelor's
   __0%_ Associate's Degree
   __2%_ Other, please specify:_____

10. Faculty Appointment
    _94%_ Full time faculty
    _2%__ Part-time faculty
    _2%__ None

D. Your Feedback

Please use this space to elaborate on any of your responses and/or to provide additional information on your institution's approach to, support for, and practices regarding assessment of undergraduate students.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences and perspectives with us. Please review the questionnaire to be sure you have not skipped any questions you can answer. We look forward to receiving your responses via the enclosed envelope.

APPENDIX II

SUMMARY AND PROFILE OF

FACULTY RESPONSES TO

"FACULTY SURVEY ON TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT"

for

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY

SUMMARY

This report summarizes some general insights from the following frequency distribution profile of faculty responses to the "Faculty Survey on Teaching, Learning and Assessment" questionnaire distributed as part of our case study of student assessment at Wake Forest University. The survey was designed to obtain respondents' perceptions of the institution's patterns of undergraduate student assessment in departments focusing on the arts and sciences. The instrument was distributed to 61 faculty members in the departments of Chemistry, English, Mathematics and Psychology at the College of Arts and Sciences. A total of 31 usable responses were received for a return rate of 51%. The following comments are organized by sections of questionnaire but readers are encouraged to review the item-by-item results for the actual frequency distribution of each item.

I. Background

All of the faculty had full time appointments, and the majority of faculty had a continuous appointment (81.3%). Most faculty held an assistantship as a graduate student, and have revised their courses based on student assessment information. Faculty indicated that their teaching load consisted of courses in lower-division undergraduate courses, and upper-division undergraduate courses. Very few taught general education requirement courses and graduate student classes, and none of the respondents taught remedial and developmental classes. Faculty occasionally participate in evaluating capstone experiences such as exams, portfolios, theses or performances.

II. Institutional Perspective

Most faculty felt the various initiatives on campus generally emerge from a "bottom up" perspective originating from faculty; especially in the areas of assessment techniques and planning for improving student learning. Faculty were most satisfied with their job security, freedom to do outside consulting, department support for promotion and tenure, and quality of students that they teach. Faculty noted strong involvement in the academic planning for undergraduate education, as well as undergraduate curriculum development. The least involvement was noted in student recruitment policies and decisions.

Faculty agree strongly that their students are capable of learning the basic concepts. Most respondents found that the most highly rewarded faculty are those oriented primarily toward research. In the last five years, most changes at the institution were the ability of the institution to meet the educational needs of entering undergraduate students and the quality of undergraduate education. Faculty recognized that the institution is trying to increase its national ranking, and that there is a concerted institutional effort to increase grant-funded research. Faculty are satisfied with technology for teaching, and computer, colleagues in the department and library holdings in the University.

III. Assessment

Personal views on assessment were strongest around the notions that student assessment is more effective when determined by the faculty member rather than by the institution, the effectiveness of teaching is enhanced when faculty regularly assess students, and faculty have a professional obligation to regularly assess what students are learning. Many faculty believe that students have little to say about assessment techniques, and that most faculty do a good job of assessing what students are learning in the classroom. Many faculty agree somewhat that their department is recognized by faculty on other campuses for its approach to teaching, learning and assessment. However they also noted that their departments generally do not coordinate their student assessment activities with campus administration. In the last 15 to 20 years, faculty feel the greatest changes in aspects of academic work have occurred in the kinds of work performed by scholars, and the uniformity of research methods. On a discipline level, many respondents agreed somewhat that recent departures from traditional research are fundamentally important to the discipline.

IV. Teaching and Learning

The top activities faculty are frequently engaged in include: stopping lectures to make sure students understand the material, meeting with students outside of formally scheduled times, providing feedback more than three times each term to all students, and receiving high teaching evaluations from students. Faculty believe that students expect availability during office hours and clearly articulated expectations for coursework. Faculty frequently engage in coordinating the improvement of student writing skills across all disciplines and including multicultural issues/readings in the general education curriculum. Faculty have some concern that new practices in teaching seem too time consuming, but feel little concern that there is pressure from peers to resist new practices.

Faculty feel their students have demonstrated the most growth in their competitiveness on the job market and critical thinking ability. Faculty believe students spend a mean of 1.29 hours preparing for each class session, and a mean of 5.62 hours in preparation the day before an exam. Faculty themselves spend 11 to 15 hours in a typical week teaching. Faculty frequently ask students directly whether they understand course material, and work to get students to ask questions during class. In undergraduate courses, faculty most of the time to all of the time explicitly state to students their goals for student learning. Faculty learn about new teaching, learning or assessment techniques through conversations with faculty colleagues. In the last three years, faculty annually discuss teaching with colleagues.

V. Demographics

Most faculty respondents started at Wake Forest University as Assistant Professors, and are currently between the Associate Professor and Professor rank. Interests lie in both teaching and research, but lean more towards research. Very few hold positions at two or more institutions. Most respondents are U. S. citizens and most obtained their highest degree in the U. S. Ninety-four percent of respondents identify their racial/ethnic background as White, and 6.3% of them Hispanic. More males than females responded and 93.8% of respondents are married with a mean of 1.50 children.

Profile of Responses

FACULTY SURVEY ON TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT

Wake Forest University Case Study

A Faculty Survey for the Research Program on
Academic Programs and Students

The "Faculty Survey on Teaching, Learning and Assessment" (FSTLA) survey has been developed by the research program on Academic Programs and Students for the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement* (NCPI). The primary purpose of the FSTLA is to examine how your institution supports teaching, learning, and assessment in the classroom. We are interested in your perception of how your institution approaches teaching, learning and assessment, how it provides support for it, the types of policies and practices used to promote it, and the uses and impacts of that information. We are interested in your perception of these topics whether or not you are directly involved with them.

Student assessment refers to various ways of evaluating students' learning. Instructors, departments schools, states and employers assess students in many ways. Please refer to this definition of assessment when completing the survey.

This survey is part of an intensive case study that examines your institution's approach to and strategy for supporting teaching, learning and assessment. The case study report describing your institution's teaching, learning and assessment strategy will include a profile of responses to this survey. This information should be helpful both in better understanding and in enhancing support for teaching, learning and assessment at your institution. Any questions concerning the survey can be addressed to:

Eric L. Dey, Project Director
Sylvia Hurtado, Project Director
National Center for Postsecondary Improvement,
Project on Institutional Support for Student Assessment
University of Michigan
School of Education
610 E. University, Room 2339
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259
Phone: 734-647-1653 / Fax: 734-936-2741
Email: ncpi.proj53@umich.edu

*NCPI is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement under grant number R309A600012
The University of Michigan is a non-discriminating employer.

Faculty Survey on Teaching, Learning and Assessment
Research Program on Academic Programs: Faculty and Students
National Center for Postsecondary Improvement

Wake Forest University

Mean and Percentage Scores
April, 2001Section I - Background

1. In the space below, indicate:
Your college/school affiliation (e.g., College of Engineering, School of Business).
Arts and Sciences: 100.0%
Not in A & S: 0.0%

The department in which you hold your primary appointment (e.g., Sociology, Music Education).

English 18.8%
Chemistry 18.8%
Mathematics . 18.8%
Physics 0.0%
Psychology ... 37.5%
Computer Sci..6.3

2. What percentage of time is your current appointment at this institution?
Mean: 100%

3. The length of my contract is: (Circle one.)

One term contract 0.0%
Nine to twelve months contract 12.5%
Multiyear contract 6.3%
Continuous appointment 81.3%

4. Have you had any of the following experiences? (Circle one for each.)

	MEAN
Held a teaching assistantship as a graduate student?	2.00
Held a research assistantship as a graduate student?	1.63
Co-authored papers or participated in intensive projects with other students as a graduate student?	1.69
Been a department chairperson?	1.31
Held a major faculty-wide office, such as a deanship?	1.00
Served on a committee charged with implementing assessment of student learning?	1.25
Received at least one firm job offer from somewhere else in the past two years?	1.13
Supervised student teaching assistants?	1.62
Received an outstanding teaching award?	1.31
Supervised student research assistants?	1.69
Taken a sabbatical?	1.69
Received a research award?	1.63
Been a staff member or fellow of a campus teaching and learning center?	1.13
Held a joint appointment across departments?	1.38
Served on an institutional program review board?	1.50

Revised my courses based on student assessment information? 1.94

5. What is the approximate size of the largest class you taught last year? (Number of students)

MEAN 26-50

6. What is the approximate size of the smallest class you taught last year? (Number of students)

MEAN Less than 10

7. What proportion of your teaching load is comprised of the following types of courses in a typical academic year? (Circle one for each.) All – 4 Most – 3 Some – 2 None – 1

	MEAN
Remedial and developmental classes	1.00
Courses that meet general education requirements	1.73
Lower-division undergraduate classes	2.07
Upper-division undergraduate classes	2.13
Graduate student classes	1.87

8. **How frequently do you participate in the following activities?** (Circle one for each.) Frequently – 3 Occasionally – 2 Never – 1

	MEAN
Conduct research on teaching and learning	1.38
Evaluate the effectiveness of new teaching and learning practices for my department	1.31
Help determine the performance standard for students graduating from my department	1.62
Evaluate faculty in their use of new teaching and learning practices	1.44
Assist faculty peers in their use of new teaching and learning practices	1.62
Evaluate students on capstone experiences such as exams, portfolios, theses, or performances	2.25
Test students entering my department	1.38
Make recommendations to administrative offices about new teaching and learning practices	1.38
Assess students for course placement purposes	1.44

Section II - Institutional perspective

9. How do you perceive your current campus approach on a scale ranging from "top down" (initiatives emerging from central campus administrators) to "bottom up" (initiatives emerging from faculty)? (Circle one for each.)
(Bottom up=1 Top down=5)

	MEAN
Assessment activity	2.67
New teaching/learning initiatives	2.60
Assessment techniques	2.20
Plan for improving student learning	2.33

10. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following aspects of your job at this institution? (Circle one for each.)
Very satisfied – 4 Somewhat satisfied – 3 Somewhat dissatisfied – 2 Very dissatisfied – 1

	MEAN
Your workload	2.93
Your job security	3.73
Opportunity for advancement	3.36
Department support for promotion and tenure	3.47
Quality of students you teach	3.47
Collegiality in your department	3.33
Relationships with administrators	2.73
Support for teaching and learning	3.13
Freedom to do outside consulting	3.46
Support for assessment activities	3.43
Your salary/benefits	3.07

11. What is the level of faculty involvement in your institution on the following? (Circle one for each.)
Very strong involvement – 5 Strong involvement – 4 Moderate involvement – 3 Little involvement – 2 No involvement – 1

	MEAN
Academic planning for undergraduate education	4.33
Resource allocation	2.53
Student recruitment policies and decisions	2.40
Undergraduate curriculum development	4.00
Use of educational technology	3.80
Faculty development activities	3.14
Teaching/learning workshops for undergraduate education	2.93
Faculty promotion and evaluation	3.87
Student academic support services	3.00
Student assessment policies and procedures	3.47
Interdisciplinary teaching initiatives	3.27
Innovations in undergraduate education	3.53

12. How centralized are each of the following activities at your institution? (Circle one for each.)
Institution – 5 College or school – 4 Department – 3 Voluntarily by ad-hoc faculty groups – 2 No coordination – 1

	MEAN
Criteria for student grading	2.14
Criteria for assessment of student learning	1.93
Development of new classroom assessment strategies	2.07
Goals for student learning	2.33
Curricular requirements	3.50
Development of teaching techniques	2.40
Decisions regarding course content	2.33
Use of student assessment data	2.36
Determination of coursework requirements	2.20
Development of final exams	1.87
Student evaluations of teaching	2.87
Faculty peer evaluations of teaching	2.13

13. Please indicate your level of agreement on statements about students in your courses. (Circle <u>one</u> for each.)
Agree strongly– 4 Agree somewhat – 3 Disagree somewhat – 2 Disagree strongly – 1

Most students . . .	MEAN
Are capable of learning the basic concepts	4.00
Understand material better when they also hear course concepts explained by peers.....	2.60
Learn best when they are given a test on course content.....	3.00
Have a better grasp of course concepts when they discuss concepts with peers	3.20
Do not question the readings or textbook.....	2.67
Often make connections across concepts I had not anticipated	2.20
Learn best through repetition of material in lectures, texts, and exams.....	2.73
Like to think about questions for which no single authoritative solution exists.....	1.87
Understand the complexity of a topic better after exchanging ideas with peers.....	2.87
Will never master the concepts if they do not grasp them right away.....	1.33
Want more feedback than grades or exam scores provide.....	2.60
Learn more when I keep questions and discussions to a minimum	1.53
Get credit for effort demonstrated on exams and assignments.....	2.60
Are less prepared for college level work than they were five years ago.....	2.00
Can communicate what they learn through methods outside of formal tests or assessment	2.73
Do not have the ability to ask good questions	1.73

14. Please indicate your level of agreement on statements about rewards at your institution. (Circle one for each.)
Agree strongly– 4 Agree somewhat – 3 Disagree somewhat – 2 Disagree strongly – 1

	MEAN
The tenure/promotion system is flexible in terms of weight given to teaching, research, and service	2.53
Merit/salary increases are adequate here	2.53
Faculty evaluation for promotion considers evidence of student performance in their classes (not just student teaching evaluations)	2.13
Scholarship on teaching is considered in promotion, tenure, and salary reviews	2.73
The most highly rewarded faculty are those oriented primarily toward research	3.20
Faculty evaluation for annual salary and merit increases incorporates evidence of student performance	2.00
One can be promoted and tenured primarily on the basis of teaching	1.53
Faculty receive public recognition and rewards for innovative or effective use of student assessment	2.07
Teaching excellence is very difficult to systematically evaluate for salary and promotion	2.67
Faculty scholarship on or innovative uses of student assessment is considered in promotion, tenure, or salary reviews	1.87
Collaborative work is too difficult to evaluate for the promotion and tenure of faculty	2.07

15. In the last five years, how have each of these changed at your institution? (Circle one for each.)
Very much improved – 5 Somewhat improved – 4 About the same – 3 Somewhat worse – 2 Very much worse – 1

	MEAN
The quality of undergraduate students who choose to pursue majors in your field	3.27
The ability of this institution to meet the educational needs of entering undergraduate students	3.60
The quality of learning that students in my program achieve	3.53
The quality of undergraduate education	3.60
The preparedness of undergraduate students for courses in your department	3.07
The effort undergraduate students devote to their studies in your department	2.73
The quality of education that a bachelor's degree represents	3.13
Undergraduate students' development of necessary competencies in your field	3.13
Knowledge about how to better prepare undergraduates	3.47

16. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your institution. (Circle one for each.)

Agree strongly – 4 Agree somewhat– 3 Disagree somewhat– 2 Disagree strongly – 1

	MEAN
Administrators work collaboratively with faculty.....	2.20
My institution is trying to increase its research reputation at the expense of teaching	2.13
Female faculty are treated fairly here.....	2.93
Grade inflation is prevalent	3.20
Administrators are collegial.....	2.80
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minority groups are treated fairly here	3.07
There has been pressure to increase faculty workload here	2.60
My institution is trying to increase its national ranking	3.80
Coordination of assessment activities among faculty and administrators has improved.....	2.33
The administration is often autocratic.....	3.00
There is a concerted institutional effort to increase grant-funded research.....	3.40
There are clear policies that support collaborative work here.....	2.53
My institution is striving for a national reputation for high quality teaching	3.53

17. At this institution, how would you evaluate the facilities, resources, or personnel supporting your work? (Circle one for each.) Excellent – 5 Good – 4 Fair – 3 Poor – 2 Not available – 1

	MEAN
Colleagues in the department	4.53
Resources for student assessment activity.....	3.29
Funds to develop teaching/learning initiatives.....	3.80
Release time for course development or faculty development.....	2.67
Funding opportunities for research	3.73
Department funds for teaching.....	3.13
Institutional funds for teaching.....	3.53
Faculty development workshops.....	3.07
Classrooms	4.20
Technology for teaching.....	5.00
Assistance with teaching skill development	3.53
Laboratories.....	4.31
Research equipment and instruments.....	4.36
Computer facilities.....	4.93
Library holdings.....	4.40
Secretarial support	3.87
Travel funds.....	3.20
Funds and administrator support for collaborative work	3.33

Support to implement changes in teaching 3.07

Section III - Assessment

18. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following views about assessment. (Circle <u>one</u> for each.)
Agree strongly – 4 Agree somewhat– 3 Disagree somewhat– 2 Disagree strongly – 1

	MEAN
Mandated student assessment limits the academic freedom of faculty.	2.44
The results of student evaluations of my teaching influence my approach to assessing student work	2.19
State or federally mandated assessment requirements improve the quality of undergraduate education	1.62
Student assessment reduces the quality of education	2.06
I am completely free to implement my own approach to assessment.	3.06
Student assessment limits the amount of time I have to devote to other academic activities.	2.44
Student assessment is more effective when determined by the faculty member rather than by the institution.....	2.94
Student assessment has improved the quality of education at this institution.....	2.33
Students today are learning more due to an institutional focus on the assessment of student learning	1.87
From an educational standpoint, it is necessary for us to monitor what students learn	2.93
The effectiveness of teaching is enhanced when faculty regularly assess students	2.94
Student assessment techniques accurately measure student learning	2.44
Regular assessment of students accurately captures what they are learning in my classroom	2.56
I use more student assessment techniques than I did five years ago.....	2.38
Monitoring student assessment is a distraction and competes with essential academic work	2.25
Faculty have a professional obligation to regularly assess what students are learning	2.94
What I learn by assessing student learning has immediate relevance to what takes place in the classroom	2.75
Frequent communication with colleagues improves my student assessment practices.....	2.88
An effective teacher is one who regularly assesses what students are learning.....	2.75

Faculty are reluctant to engage in student assessment for fear that student assessment results will be used in evaluations.....	2.38

19. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about student assessment at this institution. (Circle <u>one</u> for each.) Agree strongly – 4 Agree somewhat– 3 Disagree somewhat– 2 Disagree strongly – 1

	MEAN
Students have little say about assessment techniques used here	2.75
Student grades reflect the standards of this institution	2.75
Most faculty do a good job of assessing what students are learning in the classroom.....	2.69
Grading practices are increasingly influenced by results from new forms of student assessment.....	2.13
Most faculty regularly assess what their students are learning in the classroom.....	3.13
This institution does very little to use student assessment in shaping academic planning and policy-making	2.50
Faculty should spend more time assessing student learning.....	2.06
Student grades provide the best measure of what students learn	2.56
Assessment instruments provide a better gauge of student learning than course grades	2.13

Section IV - Department and discipline

20. Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements about your department? (Circle <u>one</u> for each.) Agree strongly – 4 Agree somewhat– 3 Disagree somewhat– 2 Disagree strongly – 1

My department . . .	MEAN
Has standard criteria for student performance	2.13
Coordinates its student assessment activity with campus administrators	1.87
Has an atmosphere conducive to faculty cooperation and interaction.....	3.06
Is recognized by faculty on other campuses for its approach to teaching, learning and assessment	3.19
Has an effective plan for monitoring student outcomes	2.56
Demonstrates a great deal of consensus on its approach to student learning.....	2.62
Collects information about employer needs for specific skills and knowledge among our graduates	2.13
Is perceived as a campus leader on issues of student assessment	2.13
Has influence on assessment techniques I use	2.87
Allows student input on academic program	2.94

issues.....	
Encourages faculty to work with other campus units to improve student learning.....	2.50

21. In your opinion, how much have the following aspects of academic work <u>in your discipline</u> changed in the past 15 to 20 years? (Circle <u>one</u> for each.)
Greatly changed – 4 Somewhat changed – 3 Slightly changed – 2 Not at all changed – 1

	MEAN
Basic concepts	2.73
The nature of inquiry	2.73
Conceptions about teaching	2.73
Kinds of work performed by scholars	3.00
Uniformity of research methods	3.00
Conceptions of knowledge	2.40
Differentiation from other disciplines	2.67

22. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following views about scholarship <u>in your discipline</u>? (Circle <u>one</u> for each.)
Agree strongly – 4 Agree somewhat– 3 Disagree somewhat– 2 Disagree strongly – 1

	MEAN
A single paradigm informs most current inquiry	1.87
Today's complex research problems require the multiple perspectives that collaborative scholarship can provide.....	2.63
Relativism in recent scholarship sacrifices rigor.....	2.47
Traditional scholarship as it was practiced in general 20 years ago is no longer relevant.....	2.13
Expanding and improving a central set of facts is the main focus of scholarship.....	2.25
In general, students now emerge with an inferior command of essential facts.....	2.19
Recent important advances in my field are the result of collaboration.....	2.56
Recent departures from traditional research are fundamentally important to the discipline	2.75
An increase in interdisciplinary scholarship would revitalize current work.....	2.50
Employer and professional association requirements influence what is taught.....	2.31
Scholarship operates more or less on the assumption that knowledge is absolute regardless of context	2.06
Integrating the methods, style, and approaches of colleagues is a major obstacle to collaboration.....	2.69

Section V - Teaching and learning

23. How frequently have you engaged in each of the following activities? (Circle <u>one</u> for each.)
Frequently – 3 Occasionally – 2 Never – 1

	MEAN
Team taught a course.	1.69
Stopped lectures to make sure students understood the material	2.94
Collaborated with colleagues from outside your discipline on teaching issues	2.06
Provided feedback to students immediately after each assessment	2.63
Drew on theories and scholarship from other disciplines to enhance your own work	2.31
Met with students outside of formally scheduled times	2.88
Participated in intensive writing or research projects with other faculty	2.25
Provided feedback more than three times each term to all students	2.81
Collaborated with colleagues from the same field of study	2.63
Spent a good amount of class time addressing student questions	2.69
Included reading on theories and scholarship from other fields in your teaching	2.13
Received high teaching evaluations from students	2.81
Utilized short class activities to assess whether students have grasped concepts	2.25
Consulted literature on teaching and learning to inform your teaching	1.94
Limited all student feedback to final course grades	1.31
Offered a course listed in more than one department	1.38
Received above average merit increases	2.67
Participated in interdisciplinary course development or projects	1.88

23. Please indicate your agreement about what students expect of you. (Circle <u>one</u> for each.)
Agree strongly – 4 Agree somewhat– 3 Disagree somewhat– 2 Disagree strongly – 1

A challenging learning experience	3.25
Clearly articulated expectations for coursework	3.88
High grades	2.94
Opportunities to pursue subject matter further	2.50
Frequent summaries of key concepts	3.00
Extensive one-on-one interaction	2.94
Extensive use of audio/visual aids	2.44
An entertaining lecture style	3.37
Outlines and other printed course aids	2.94
Opportunities to redo assignments to improve grades	2.44
Multiple out-of-classroom gatherings	1.75
Availability during office hours	3.69

25. How important are each of these activities at your institution? (Circle one for each.)
Essential – 4 Very important – 3 Somewhat important – 2 Not important – 1

teaching and learning.....	
Using student peer groups to reinforce course learning.....	1.80
Coordinating the improvement of student writing skills across all disciplines.....	2.80
Encouraging faculty to do research on how students learn in their classes.....	1.60
Assisting cohorts of students in taking a series of linked introductory courses/sections.....	1.64
Changing the way students learn mathematics.....	1.64
Encouraging more faculty involvement in discussions about teaching improvement.....	2.33
Changing the way students learn science.....	1.71
Using standard measures of student learning in all departments.....	1.27
Including multicultural issues/readings in the general education curriculum.....	2.80
Providing students with experiential learning opportunities to supplement course content.....	2.27
Encouraging faculty to use student performance information to reflect on their own teaching.....	2.20
Creating small communities where students' academic and social environments are seamless.....	2.27
Complementing student evaluations with other faculty teaching performance information.....	1.73
Using student assessment data to meet external agency requirements.....	2.07

	MEAN
Using student assessment data to improve	2.07

26. Regarding new teaching and learning practices, to what extent do you feel that each of the following is a concern of faculty in your department? (Circle one for each.)
Major concern – 3 Minor concern – 2 Not a concern – 1

Faculty think . . .	MEAN
New practices seem too time-consuming.....	2.53
New practices seem ill-founded or ill-researched.....	2.13
They do not feel they can perform this practice well.....	2.13
There is pressure from peers to resist new practices.....	1.47
They feel the new practice is less effective than traditional teaching techniques.....	2.27
They feel that following teaching trends or fads is dangerous.....	2.20
They feel that such practices make them give up too much classroom control.....	1.93
New practices are too time-consuming for students.....	1.87
New practices are typically dictated by the needs of administrators.....	2.13

27. Please rate the growth undergraduate students demonstrate in your department from college entry to graduation. (Circle one for each.)
Greatly increase – 5 Increase somewhat – 4 Stay about the same – 3 Decrease somewhat – 2 Greatly decrease – 1

	MEAN
Critical thinking ability	4.29
Knowledge of other cultures	3.57
Leadership ability	3.79
Mathematical ability	4.08
Oral communication skills	3.93
Written communication skills	4.21
Ability to work cooperatively with others to accomplish goals	3.93
Understanding others' points of view	3.71
General self-confidence	4.07
Competitiveness on the job market	4.64
General academic ability	4.07
Problem solving ability	4.14
Ability to interact in multicultural environments	3.36
Acceptance of people with different beliefs	3.36
Understanding their own strengths, weaknesses and learning processes	3.62

28. What is the average time that your students spend preparing for each session of a class? MEAN 1.29 hours

29. What is the average amount of time that your students spend in preparation the day before an exam in one of your classes? (Write N/A if not applicable.) MEAN 5.62 hours

30. In a typical week during the past term, how many hours did you spend pursuing the following activities? (Circle one for each.)
16 or more hours – 5; 11 to 15 hours – 4; 5 to 10 hours – 3; 2 to 4 hours – 2; 1 hour or less – 1

	MEAN
Teaching (including class time, grading, lab, preparing for class)	4.33
Research (activities leading to a product)	3.00
Scholarship/professional growth (expanding your knowledge of the field)	2.87
Institutional service (committees, administrative duties)	2.73
External service (including professional organizations and civic projects)	1.60
Professional consulting for pay	1.20
Undergraduate education committees (including thesis and examinations)	1.53
Graduate education committees (including thesis and examinations)	1.73
Undergraduate student advising	1.80
Graduate student advising	1.47

31. How frequently do you do each of the following? (Circle one for each.)
Frequently– 3 Occasionally – 2 Not at all– 1

	MEAN
Encourage students to collaborate on course work through study groups or internet discussions	2.25
Ask students directly whether they understand course material	2.88
Encourage students to act as "peer mentors" to others in review or discussion sections	2.00
Create regular assignments that have many different correct answers or approaches	2.00
Make an effort to mentor graduate students and junior faculty in their own teaching	1.88
Talk with colleagues regularly about ways in which we can improve our teaching	2.00
Have a network of colleagues with whom I discuss teaching issues	1.81
Depend on the same teaching routines year after year	2.19
Design classes to be highly interactive	2.31
Listen to students' concerns, and take them into account in my teaching	2.62
Work to get students to ask questions during class	2.88
Expect students to guide the discussion and activities for a majority of class time	1.62
Introduce new or experimental teaching strategies in class	1.94

32. In how many of your undergraduate courses do you do each of the following? (Circle one for each)
All – 4 Most – 3 Some – 2 None – 1

	MEAN
Grade on a curve	2.00
Collect and evaluate portfolios of student work	1.73
Use short in-class writing exercises (e.g. one minute papers) to quickly assess student understanding of course material	1.75
Use a department-wide examination	1.27
Use a standardized test	1.25
Use an electronic assessment method	1.44
Use computer-based practice exercises	1.81
Provide a course web page	2.44
Lecture extensively	3.13
Use small group work/group projects	2.31
Have another faculty member review my teaching for feedback	1.06
Use service learning experiences	1.31
Require multiple drafts of student written work for progressive feedback	1.88
Explicitly state to students your goals for student learning	3.44
Require student in-class presentations	2.31

Use student performance information to evaluate my own teaching	2.88
Try new teaching practices	2.44

33. How do you learn to use new teaching, learning or assessment techniques? (Circle one for each.)
Almost always – 4 Frequently – 3 Occasionally – 2 Never – 1

	MEAN
Disciplinary conferences	1.81
Faculty development workshops	2.00
Presentations by faculty in your department	1.75
Discussion in faculty meetings	2.00
A designated master teacher in your department	1.00
Publications in my discipline	2.06
General higher education publications	1.81
Your graduate students	1.56
Your undergraduate students	1.75
Conversations with faculty colleagues	2.25

34. In the past *three* years, how many times have you performed each of these activities? (Circle one for each.)
More than once a year – 4 Annually – 3 Every two or three years – 2 Never – 1

	MEAN
Attended a faculty development workshop presented by your institution's teaching and learning center	2.25
Presented a faculty development workshop	1.25
Attended a faculty development workshop sponsored by your department	1.88
Attended a teaching workshop sponsored by your disciplinary association	1.50
Presented a teaching workshop sponsored by your disciplinary association	1.31
Participated in informal teaching development activities with colleagues	2.63
Discussed teaching with colleagues	3.50

Section VI - Demographics

35. Indicate your first position at this institution and your present academic rank. (Circle one for each column.)

	First Position	Present Rank		First Position	Present Rank
Professor	8	8	Instructor	4	4
Associate Professor	7	7	Lecturer	3	3
Assistant Professor	6	6	Visiting	2	2
Research Scientist	5	5	Other	1	1

First Position Mean: 6.29
Present Rank Mean: 7.20

36. What is your tenure status? (Circle one.)

Currently hold tenure at this institution.....4
Currently on tenure-track at this institution...3
Not on tenure-track at this institution 2
Tenure is not available at this institution.....1

MEAN 3.75

37. Regarding your own preferences, do your *interests* lie primarily in teaching or in research? (Circle one.)

Primarily in research.....1
In both, but leaning toward research.....2
In both, but leaning toward teaching.....3
Primarily in teaching.....4

MEAN 2.38

38. When were you first hired at this institution? (Circle one.)

1965 or before 8	1981 to 1985..... 4	MEAN 3.44
1966 to 1970..... 7	1986 to 1990..... 3	
1971 to 1975..... 6	1991 to 1995..... 2	
1976 to 1980..... 5	1996 or after 1	

39. How many years you have been employed as a professional in higher education?
MEAN 18.13

40. Do you currently hold positions at two or more institutions? (Circle one.)

Yes.....2 No...1

MEAN 1.06

41. Are you a US citizen or permanent resident?
(Circle one.)

Yes.....2 No...1

MEAN 1.87

42. Did you obtain your highest degree in the U.S.? (Circle one.)

Yes.....2 No...1

MEAN 1.87

43. How do you identify your racial/ethnic background? (Circle **all** that apply.)

		Response Percentage
African American or Black	1.	0.00
Asian or Asian American.....	2.	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	3.	6.3
Native American.....	4.	0.00
White or Anglo.....	5.	93.8
Other	6.	0.00

44. What is your sex/gender? (Circle one.)

Male.....1 Female.....2

MEAN 1.44

45. What is your current marital status? (Circle one.)

	Response Percentage
Single, never married	6.3
Married	93.8
Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship	0.0
Separated	0.0
Divorced	0.0
Widowed	0.0

46. How many children do you have? Mean 1.50

47. What is the highest degree you have received?

	Response Percentage
Master's	0.0
Doctorate	100.0
Medical	0.0

APPENDIX III

SUMMARY AND PROFILE OF
STUDENT RESPONSES TO
"STUDENT EXPERIENCES WITH TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT"
for
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY

SUMMARY

This report summarizes some general insights from the following frequency distribution profile of undergraduate student responses to the "Undergraduate Student Survey: Experiences with Teaching Learning and Assessment" questionnaire distributed as part of our case study of student assessment at Wake Forest University. The survey was designed to obtain respondents' perceptions of the institution's patterns of undergraduate student assessment in departments focusing on the arts and sciences.

The instrument was distributed to a random sample of 400 undergraduate students at the College of Arts and Sciences, based on information provided by the Registrar. A total of 83 usable responses were received for a return rate of 21%. The following comments are organized by sections of questionnaire but readers are encouraged to review the item-by-item results for the actual frequency distribution of each item.

I. Background

Of the 83 respondents, 97.6% were pursuing a Bachelor's degree. Respondents were sophomores (44.6%) and juniors (55.4%). All of the students were attending Wake Forest University full time. The top two sources of financial support reported were full parental support (44.5%) and institutional scholarship (33.8%).

Pre-college variables reveal that 51.8% of the students were in the top 5% of their high school graduation class, and 26.5% were in the top 10% of their class. Average high school grades were estimated to be in the A-minus to A or A-plus range. Students reported that their parents/guardians generally have an education level of a Bachelor's degree. In high school, most students used a family owned computer, and used a computer to write a paper. Many of them took high school Honors courses in addition to Advance Placement courses. Very few students wrote a term paper that was at least 20 pages, but many participated in group projects in the classroom. The racial composition of the students' neighborhoods was mostly white or all or nearly white. Campus friends of those interviewed as well as friends in general were also mostly white, or all or nearly white. The high school composition ranged from half white and half people of color to mostly white.

II. General College and Classroom Experiences

Respondents indicated a mean GPA between the B to B-plus range. Students reported high mean scores for providing written feedback to faculty members about his/her teaching when asked about their participation in various activities during college. During their years at Wake Forest University, mean scores revealed students have used Internet in course-related activities several times to regularly, and students heard the instructor lecture for a full class session several times to regularly. A very small number of students had participated as an assistant on a faculty research project.

Students indicated that most of their time each week was spent attending class lectures/seminars, preparing for class/homework, and informally socializing with other

students. While in class, students encountered extensive lecture more than other pedagogical methods, but at the same time found their instructors gave explicit expression of goals for student learning. Many students had at least one faculty member who had a strong impact on their learning.

Many students believed faculty had high expectations of them, and at the same time felt challenged by course material, and felt as if they put forth their best effort in class. Since entering the institution, students felt their understanding of their own strengths, weaknesses and learning processes, critical thinking ability and written communication skills had increased somewhat. Students were most satisfied with their quality of instruction, opportunities to discuss coursework and/or assignments outside of class with professors and their courses in major field. Students also reported that faculty occasionally to frequently stop to see if students understand the material, work to get students to ask questions during class, and listen to students' concerns, and take them into account in their teaching. In math and science classes, students heard the instructor lecture for a full class session almost regularly.

III. Attitudes about Teaching and Learning

When questioned about their own preferences, the highest means were recorded for the following responses: "I am most satisfied when instructors give a clear summary of specific material covered on an upcoming exam", and "I try to understand course material by making connections between the readings and the concepts from the lectures". Response means also indicated that students agreed they are able to learn basic concepts in their classes, and thought it was a good idea to help each other, but wanted more feedback than grades or scores can provide, and believed they can communicate what they learn through methods outside of formal tests. Students expect their instructors to be available during office hours, and that instructors describe clearly all their expectations for coursework and give frequent summaries of key concepts, while delivering an entertaining lecture style.

IV. Attitudes about Assessment

Instructors, departments, schools, states, and employers assess students in many ways. When the respondents were prompted for levels of importance regarding success within one's major, mean results showed that professional exams were viewed as the most important, with departmentally-reviewed projects or performances being seen as the next most important. Students agreed somewhat that the main purpose of assessment was to help give students feedback on their progress. Students also believed somewhat that essay-type exams allow them to convey what they learned.

V. Demographics

More females responded than males (mean 1.75). All respondents were single, and 89.2% were Caucasians. The mean student age was 20 years old, with 100% identifying as U.S. citizens or permanent residents, and 25.3% as in-state residents. The typical family size during their final

year of high school was slightly over 4 people, with estimated familial income in the $75,000 to $99,999 range. Eighty-eight percent of the students plan to earn a master degree or higher.

Profile of Responses

STUDENT EXPERIENCES WITH TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT

Wake Forest University Case Study

A Student Survey for the Research Program on
Academic Programs and Students

The "Student Experience with Teaching, Learning and Assessment" (SETLA) survey has been developed by the research program on Academic Programs and Students for the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement* (NCPI). The primary purpose of the SETLA is to examine how your institution supports teaching, learning, and assessment in the classroom. We are interested in your perception of how your institution approaches teaching, learning and assessment, how it provides support for it, the types of policies and practices used to promote it, and the uses and impacts of that information. We are interested in your perception of these topics whether or not you are directly involved with them.

Student assessment refers to various ways of evaluating students' learning. Instructors, departments schools, states and employers assess students in many ways. Please refer to this definition of assessment when completing the survey.

This survey is part of an intensive case study that examines your institution's approach to and strategy for supporting teaching, learning and assessment. The case study report describing your institution's teaching, learning and assessment strategy will include a profile of responses to this survey. This information should be helpful both in better understanding and in enhancing support for teaching, learning and assessment at your institution. Any questions concerning the survey can be addressed to:

Eric L. Dey, Project Director
Sylvia Hurtado, Project Director
National Center for Postsecondary Improvement,
Project on Institutional Support for Student Assessment
University of Michigan
School of Education
610 E. University, Room 2339
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

*NCPI is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement under grant number R309A600012

Phone: 734-647-1653 / Fax: 734-936-2741
Email: ncpi.proj53@umich.edu

Undergraduate Student Survey: Experiences with Teaching, Learning and Assessment

Research Program on Academic Programs: Faculty and Students

National Center for Postsecondary Improvement

Wake Forest University

Summary of Responses (Mean scores or percentage)
April, 2001

Section I: Background and Pre-College Experiences

1. Please indicate the program you are following at this institution. (Circle one.)

1. Bachelor's degree	97.6%	4. Certification only	0.0%
2. Associate's degree	0.0%	5. Other	1.2%
3. Non-Degree	0.0%		

2. What is your intended major (e.g. Psychology). Indicate "undecided" if you are not yet sure.

Major	%	Major	%
Arts	2.4	Mathematics	1.2
English	6.0	Elementary Ed	2.4
History	1.2	Oth Education	1.2
Language-Lit	2.4	Chemistry	2.4
Philosophy	1.2	Other Tech	1.2
Gen. Biology	9.6	Economics	3.6
Anthropology	2.4	Political Sci	1.2
Theater/Drama	1.2	Psychology	15.7
Kinesiology	7.2	Sociology	1.2
Finance	4.8	Communications	9.6
Theology/Religion	1.2	Undecided	8.4
		Business Admin	12.0

3. What is your current student classification? (Circle one.)

1. First-year student	0.0%	4. Senior	0.0%
2. Sophomore	44.6%	5. Not applicable	0.0%
3. Junior	55.4%		

MEAN 2.55

4. Please indicate how many years have you been enrolled at this institution?

0	0.0%
1	9.6%
2	47.0%
3	43.4%
4:	0.0%
5:	0.0%
6:	0.0%

MEAN 2.34

5. Did you transfer into this institution from another college? (Circle one.)

1. No 96.4% 2. Yes 3.6%

MEAN 1.04

6. Please indicate your enrollment status? (Circle one.)

1. Part-time 0.0 2. Full-time 100.0%

MEAN 2.00

7. What is your current financial support during college? (Circle two primary sources only.)

1. Federal grant (Pell grant)	2.4%	7. Work-study job	4.8%
2. State grant/fellowship	7.2%	8. Job/employment	2.4%
3. Federal loan/GSL	27.7%	9. Partial parental support	21.7%
4. Private loan	2.4%	10. Full parental support	44.5%
5. Private scholarship	4.8%	11. Personal savings	3.6 %
6. Institutional scholarship	33.8%	12. Other	2.4%

MEAN #1: 6.39 MEAN #2: 7.92

8. Where did you rank in your high school graduating class?
(Circle one.)

6. Top 5%	51.8%	3. Top 50%	2.4%
5. Top 10%	26.5%	2. Below 50%	0.0 %
4. Top 25%	12.0%	1. Not Applicable	6.0 %

9. What were your scores on the SAT and/or ACT?

SAT	VERBAL	MEAN 659.25
	MATH	MEAN 662.4
ACT	Composite	MEAN 29.75

Never took SAT/ACT (1 response)

10. Please indicate how often you engaged in the following activities during high school?
(Circle one number for each item.)
Frequently – 3 Occasionally - 2 Never – 1

	Mean Score
Used a high school computer	2.07
Used a family-owned computer	2.71
Used a computer to write a paper	2.89
Studied with other students	2.16
Wrote a term paper that was at least 10 pages	1.90
Received extra help in English/composition	1.52
Had a teacher take a personal interest in you	2.49
Took Advance Placement (AP) courses	2.70
Took SAT/ACT prep courses	1.82
Took college (dual-enrolled) courses	1.28
Took high school Honors courses	2.80
Took state proficiency exam or standardized test prior to college (not including ACT/SAT)	1.99
Obtained feedback from teacher about your academic work (other than course grades).	2.61
Wrote a term paper that was at least 20 pages	1.31
Studied with someone from a racial/ethnic group different from your own	2.08
Worked for pay	2.19
Volunteered for community service	2.47
Held a leadership position in a student group	2.43
Gave an oral presentation in class	2.53
Participated in group projects in the classroom	2.60
Read a newspaper daily	1.91

11. Indicate which number best describes your average high school grades. (Circle one.)

9. A or A+	5. B-	1. D or below
8. A-	4. C+	
7. B+	3. C	MEAN 8.27
6. B	2. C-	

12. How would you describe the racial composition of the following? (Circle one number for each item.)
All or nearly all White - 5
Mostly White - 4
Half White and Half People of Color - 3
Mostly People of Color - 2
All or nearly all People of Color - 1

	MEAN
The neighborhood where you grew up	4.31
The high school you attended	3.76
Your friends on this campus	4.16
Your friends in general	4.12

13. What is the highest level of education completed by each of your parents/guardians? (Circle one number in each column.)

	Mother or Female Guardian	Father or Male Guardian
Not applicable or don't know	0	0
Elementary school	1	1
Some high school	2	2
High school graduate or G.E.D.	3	3
Vocational school	4	4
Some community college or college	5	5
Associate's degree	6	6
Bachelor's degree	7	7
Master's degree	8	8
Ph.D. or professional degree (e.g. law, medicine)	9	9
MEANS	6.73	7.38

Section II: General College and Classroom Experiences

14. Please indicate which number best describes your average college grades. (Circle one.)

9. A or A+	5. B-	1. D or below
8. A-	4. C+	N/A. No college G.P.A.
7. B+	3. C	
6. B	2. C-	MEAN 6.55

15. How often have you engaged in the following activities during college? (Circle one number for each item.)
Frequently – 3 Occasionally – 2 Never – 1

	MEAN
Received academic advising from a faculty member	2.19
Received academic advising from a staff member or administrator	1.73
Received personal feedback about your work from faculty before the mid-term	2.07
Provided written feedback to a faculty member about his/her teaching (including evaluations)	2.54
Used/purchased class notes from a professional service	1.04
Contested a grade	1.45
Assembled a portfolio of your college work for review by faculty	1.07
Asked a peer to explain a course concept to you	2.35

16. Please indicate how often you experienced the following during college. (Circle one number for each item.)
Regularly – 4 Several times – 3 Once or twice – 2 Never – 1

	MEAN
Used a computer in class	3.24
Used the Internet in course-related work	3.78
Used a computer during lab sessions	3.16
Referred to a course web page	3.59
Made an oral presentation	3.08
Participated in a formally assigned work group	3.11
Participated in a informal work group	2.73
Heard the instructor lecture for a full class session	3.73
Asked a question in class	3.22
Participated as an assistant on a faculty research project	1.30
Received a grade based on group work	2.69

17. Estimate the average time you spend each week (in a typical term) doing the following.
(Circle one number for each item.)
26 hours or more – 7; 16 to 25 hours – 6; 11 to 15 hours – 5; 6 to 10 hours – 4; 1 to 5 hours – 3; Less than 1 hour – 2; None – 1

	MEAN
Preparing for class/homework	5.22
Engaging in group work in class	2.39
Engaging in group work outside of class	2.37
Interacting informally with faculty outside of class	2.04
Course-related internet discussion	1.66
Attending class lectures/seminars	4.90
Attending lab (science, language, etc.)	2.45
Commuting to campus	1.27
Working for pay	3.04
Using E-mail	3.43
Surfing the web	3.28
Attending tutoring or supplemental instruction sessions	1.82
Discussing course-related topics with other students outside of class	2.71
Participating in sports/fitness activities	3.31
Participating in student organizations	2.96
Volunteering for the community	2.19
Attending to home responsibilities	2.04
Informally socializing with other students	4.89
Preparing for exams	4.01
Amount of time spent in preparation the day before an exam	3.48

18. In how many of your courses do you encounter each of the following? (Circle one number for each item.)
All courses – 4 Most courses – 3 Some courses – 2 No courses - 1

	MEAN
Grading on a curve	1.96
Use of short, ungraded in-class writing exercises (e.g. one-minute papers) to quickly assess your understanding of course material	1.45
Department-wide examinations.	1.87
Standardized tests	1.36
Computer-based practice exercises	1.93
Course web pages	2.67
Extensive lecture	2.99
Small group work/ group projects	2.30
Service learning experiences	1.45
Multiple drafts of written work for progressive feedback	1.86
Instructors' explicit expression of goals for student learning	2.69
Formal in-class presentations	2.46
Activities that require interaction with peers from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds	1.83

19. How many college courses have you completed in each of the following subject areas? (e.g. 4 courses)

	MEAN
English / Writing	2.52
Psychology	1.34
Mathematics	1.16
Chemistry	0.96
Basic skills, remedial or developmental courses in writing	0.41
Basic skills, remedial or developmental courses in math	0.23
Courses in English as a second language	0.20
Courses which do not carry credit toward any degree	1.51

20. Have you ever done the following during college? (Circle yes or no for each.)
No=1; Yes=2

	MEAN
Received college credit for exams or courses taken before graduating high school	1.73
Received advice about courses to take, based on your performance on a placement exam	1.82
Taken remedial/developmental courses to help you develop basic skills needed for introductory courses	1.07
Changed your major because of academic difficulty	1.19
Been placed on academic probation	1.01
Received a failing final grade in a course	1.06
Had at least one faculty member have a strong impact on your learning	1.77
Taken or expect to complete a culminating project to meet graduation or certification requirements	1.34
Contested course placement recommendations	1.11
Taken or expect to complete an exam to meet graduation or certification requirements	1.26

21. How often have you experienced each of the following during college? (Circle one number for each.)
Frequently – 4 Sometimes – 3 Rarely – 2 Never – 1

	MEAN
Felt stimulated and excited about your studies	3.22
Participated in class discussion	3.27
Felt like you were becoming a professional in your field	2.58
Felt certain about your career goals	2.66
Fell asleep in class	1.75
Felt challenged to think more broadly about an issue	3.24
Put forth your best effort in a course	3.63
Felt like your mind was on automatic pilot in class	2.61
Used the library to find books and articles on course topics	3.13
Felt challenged by course material	3.66
Reviewed notes that you took in class	3.65
Felt instructors were both challenging and supportive of you	3.49
Believed faculty had high expectations of you	3.78
Felt like instructors were giving the same lectures they gave ten years ago	2.39
Studied with students from a racial/ethnic background different from your own	2.47

22. How much have you changed in the following ways since entering this institution? (Circle one number for each item.)

Greatly increased – 5 Increased somewhat – 4 Stayed about the same – 3 Decreased somewhat – 2 Greatly decreased – 1

	MEAN
Critical thinking ability	4.23
Knowledge of other cultures	3.70
Leadership ability	3.73
Mathematical ability	3.22
Oral presentation skills	3.89
Written communication skills	4.12
Ability to work cooperatively with others to accomplish goals	3.69
Understanding others' points of view	4.04
General self-confidence	3.98
Competitiveness on the job-market	3.93
General academic ability	4.05
Problem solving ability	3.94
Ability to interact in multicultural environments	3.36
Acceptance of people with different beliefs	3.76
Understanding your own strengths, weaknesses and learning processes	4.20

23. Indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with the following aspects of your undergraduate education.
(Circle one number for each item.)
Very Satisfied – 5 Satisfied – 4 Neutral – 3 Dissatisfied – 2 Can't rate / no experience – 1

	MEAN
Science and mathematics courses	3.30
Humanities courses	3.51
Social science courses	3.89
Courses in major field	4.16
General education requirements	3.53
Relevance of coursework in your major to everyday life	3.77
Relevance of coursework outside your major to everyday life	3.46
Quality of instruction	4.27
Opportunity for interdisciplinary courses	3.27
Opportunity to discuss coursework and/or assignments outside of class with professors	4.02
Academic tutoring or assistance you received on campus	2.96
Academic advising	3.27
Formal opportunities to take stock of your academic progress and/or achievement	3.01
Contact with faculty and administrators	3.81
Overall relationships with faculty and administrators	3.86
Opportunity to learn about racially/ethnically diverse populations in the U.S.	2.80
Tests that assess what you have learned in class	3.54

24. How frequently do your instructors do the following?
(Circle one number for each item.) Frequently – 3 Occasionally – 2 Not at all – 1

	MEAN
Encourage students to collaborate on course work through study groups	2.20
Encourage students to collaborate on course work through internet discussions	1.61
Ask you directly whether you understand course material	2.29
Encourage students to act as "peer mentors" to others in review or discussion sections	1.59
Create assignments that have many different correct answers or approaches	2.10
Seem to depend on the same teaching routines year after year	2.01
Design classes to be highly interactive	2.33
Listen to students' concerns, and take them into account in their teaching	2.45
Work to get students to ask questions during class	2.67
Expect students to guide the discussion and activities for a majority of class time	2.01
Introduce new or experimental teaching strategies in class	1.82
Spend a substantial amount of class time addressing student questions	2.06
Include reading on theories and scholarship from other fields in your courses	1.81
Incorporate short class activities or exercises into class sessions	1.99
Stop lectures to see if students understand the material	2.41

25. How often have you experienced each of the following in math and science courses you have taken? (Circle one for each.)

If you have **never** taken a math or science course during college, mark **N/A** here and proceed to question 26:

Regularly – 4 Several times – 3 Once or twice – 2 Never – 1

	MEAN
Made an oral presentation	1.39
Submitted a term paper or other extensive written assignment	1.83
Used a graphing calculator	3.03
Participated in a formally-assigned work group	2.42
Participated in a informal work group	2.47
Heard the instructor lecture for a full class session	3.86
Asked a question in class	2.66
Encountered exam questions applying course material to an unfamiliar context or format	2.68
Received a grade based on group work	1.93
Took a class in which the primary class meetings included fewer than 35 students	2.83
Received feedback on homework from a teaching assistant	2.26
Received feedback on homework directly from faculty	2.67
Discussed your understanding of course material with the instructor	2.53
Felt encouraged to take advanced courses in science or math	1.95
Felt you could apply course concepts in real-world situations	2.45

26. In the past year, how often have you experienced each of the following in your courses?
(Circle one number for each item.) Regularly – 4 Several times – 3 Once or twice – 2 Never – 1

	MEAN
Took a test before a course began and then a similar exam subsequent to completing the course	1.27
Received advice based on your performance on exams, homework, etc	2.51
Felt encouraged to ask questions in class	3.30
Discussed your goals for learning with an instructor, either in or outside of class	2.51
Received feedback more than three times in a term	2.63
Rated an instructor highly on teaching evaluations	3.28
Received feedback only in the form of a final course grade	1.85
Met with faculty outside of formally scheduled times	2.38
Felt inhibited from participating in class discussion	1.95
Received oral feedback	2.69

Section III: Attitudes About Teaching /Learning

27. For each item, indicate how well it describes you.

(Circle one number for each item.) Very much like me – 4 Like me – 3 A little bit like me – 2 Not at all like me – 1

	MEAN
I prefer lecture-based classes over classes that require students to work things out on our own.	2.22
I learn more working in group-project settings than on my own	1.96
I find lecture-only classes boring and would rather be doing something active in class	2.62
I think repetitive exercises are the most reliable way to learn course material	2.19
I try to relate ideas presented in one class to material from other courses whenever possible	2.96
I think group projects are a waste of my time	1.73
When reading for a class, I try to relate the material to what I already know	3.01
I can learn important things with other students.	2.88
I try to understand course material by making connections between the readings and the concepts from the lectures	3.27
When studying for a course I try to determine which concepts I don't understand well	3.22
I try to share my ideas and materials with other students when I think it will help them	2.75
I often go beyond required reading to learn more about a topic	1.89
I often discuss theories and ideas with students outside of class	2.48
I think it is a good idea for students to help each other learn	3.10
I am most satisfied when instructors give a clear summary of specific material covered on an upcoming exam	3.70
I expect instructors to provide a guide detailing how to succeed in their courses	2.88

28. How much do you agree with the following statements about your learning experience?
(Circle <u>one</u> number for each item.) Agree strongly – 4 Agree somewhat – 3 Disagree somewhat – 2 Disagree strongly – 1

	MEAN
I understand material better when I also hear course concepts explained by peers	3.04
I often make connections across concepts that the instructor had not anticipated	2.66
I have a better grasp of course concepts when I discuss concepts with peers	3.11
I learn best through repetition of material in lectures, texts, and exams.	2.94
I understand the complexity of a topic better after exchanging ideas with peers	3.02
If I do not grasp a concept right away, I will probably never master it	1.59
I want more feedback than grades or scores provide	3.33
I learn more when the instructor keeps questions and discussions to a minimum	1.54
I can communicate what I learn through methods outside of formal tests	3.26
I am capable of learning basic concepts taught in my courses	3.72
I often feel underprepared for college-level work	1.68
I have difficulty asking good questions	2.04
It is a good idea for students to help each other learn	3.24
In-class presentations reinforce important skills	2.91
Written assignments help me make sure I understand the course material	3.05

29. How much do you agree with these statements about what you expect from your instructors at this institution.
(Circle <u>one</u> number for each item.) Agree strongly – 4 Agree somewhat – 3 Disagree somewhat – 2 Disagree strongly - 1

I expect…	MEAN
A challenging learning experience	3.73
Instructors to describe clearly all their expectations for coursework	3.68
High grades	3.05
Opportunities to pursue subject matter further	3.25
Frequent summaries of key concepts	3.38
Extensive one-on-one interaction	2.91
Extensive use of audio/visual aids	2.89
An entertaining lecture style	3.33
Outlines and other printed course aids	3.22
Opportunities to redo assignments to improve grades	2.58
A clear indication of what material will appear on course exams	3.53
To be evaluated based on my direct recall of material presented in class	2.56
Instructors to be available during office hours	3.89
Frequent and extensive feedback on my work	3.14
Assignments that require me to spend several hours in preparation for each class session	2.41
Support for exploring topics further on my own	2.99
Opportunities to synthesize what I am learning across different courses	3.19

30. For each item, indicate how well it describes you.
(Circle one number for each item.) Very much like me – 4 Like me – 3 A little bit like me – 2 Not at all like me – 1

When I analyze an argument in class or in reading, I often find that it is based on hidden assumptions.....	2.21
I believe that news stories generally represent unbiased, objective reporting of events.....	1.54
I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.....	3.06
If I am sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.....	1.79
I sometimes find it difficult to see things from "the other person's" point of view.....	1.68
I try to relate course content to current events.....	2.71
I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision	3.04
I really enjoy analyzing the causes of other people's behavior.....	3.21
I think a lot about the relationship between what I learn in my courses and what I notice happening in the world.....	3.00
I don't enjoy getting into discussions about the causes for other people's behavior	1.35
I prefer simple rather than complex explanations for people's behavior.	1.85
I tend to take people's behavior at face value and not worry about the inner causes for their behavior.....	1.40
When I analyze a person's behavior I often find the causes form a chain that goes back in time.....	2.68
I think a lot about the influence that society has on other people	3.09
I think a lot about the influence that society has on my behavior and personality.....	3.05
I tend to notice the relationships between current events and what I learn in class	2.70

Section IV: Attitudes About Assessment

Assessment refers to various ways of evaluating students' learning. Instructors, departments, schools, states, and employers assess students in many ways. Please refer to this definition of assessment when completing the remainder of the survey.

31. When it comes to succeeding in your intended major, how important is your performance on each of the following types of assessment? (Circle one number for each item.)
Not applicable - n/a Extremely important – 4 Somewhat important – 3 Not very important – 2 Not important at all – 1

	MEAN
Exams determining course placement	2.97
Departmentally reviewed projects or performances	3.13
Departmental exams	3.07
State exams or requirements	2.60
Professional exams (e.g. teaching certification, CPA)	3.23

32. Please indicate your level of agreement on the following

statements about student assessment at this institution.
(Circle one number for each item.) Agree strongly – 4 Agree somewhat – 3 Disagree somewhat – 2 Disagree strongly – 1

	MEAN
In general, the tests in my courses accurately measure what I have learned..	2.91
The main purpose of assessment is to help instructors improve their teaching	2.44
Student grades reflect the standards of this institution	2.85
Most faculty do a good job of assessing what students are learning in the classroom	2.91
The main purpose of assessment is to help give students feedback on their progress	3.10
I usually have ample opportunity to express what I have learned on course exams	2.72
Most faculty regularly assess what their students are learning in the classroom	2.83
Faculty should spend more time assessing student learning	2.68
Student grades provide the best measure of what students learn	1.83
Multiple-choice or fill-in-the-blank type exams allow me to convey what I learned	2.30
The main purpose of assessment is to help the institution improve	2.57
Students here are assessed more than is really necessary	2.10
I hardly ever get a chance to show what I have learned in a class at all	1.96
Departmental tests reflect what I learned in class	2.31
My performance on placement exams usually reflects my skill-level accurately.	2.52
Essay-type exams allow me to convey what I learned	3.33

Section VI: Demographics

33. What is your gender? (Circle one.)

1. Male 2. Female

MEAN 1.75

34. What is your marital status? (Circle one.)

1. Single	100.0%	5. Widowed	0.0%
2. Married	0.0%	6. Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship	0.0%
3. Divorced	0.0%		
4. Separated	0.0%		

35. For how many children do you have primary caregiver responsibilities? MEAN 0.00

36. What is your age? MEAN 20

37. What is your racial/ethnic background?

(Circle **all** that apply.)	MEAN	%
African American or Black	0.00	7.2
Asian or Asian American	0.00	0.0
Hispanic or Latino	0.00	1.2
Native American (indicate tribe:_____)	0.00	1.2
White	0.89	89.2
Other:_____	0.00	0.0

38. Are you a U.S. citizen or permanent resident?
(Circle one.)

1. No 2. Yes

MEAN 2.0

39. How many family members (including yourself) lived with you in your final year of high school?

MEAN 3.83

40. What is your best estimate of your family's annual income in the year you entered this college?

MEAN $75,000 to $99,999

41. Did you leave a full-time job to attend college?
(Circle one.)

1. No 2. Yes

MEAN 1.01

42. Are you legally considered a resident of the state in which you attend college? (Circle one.)

1. No, out-of-state resident..... 74.7%
2. Yes, recently became state resident 2.4%
3. Yes, always been a state resident. 22.9%

MEAN 1.48

43. What is the highest degree that you ever plan to earn? (Circle one.)

1. No degree	0.0%
2. Associate's degree	0.0%
3. Bachelor's degree	10.8%
4. Master's degree	44.6%
5. Ph.D. or professional degree (law, medicine)	43.4%

MEAN 4.33