

## Changes in the Assessment Process

Several modifications were made in 2002 to the assessment process as a result of the evaluation, with some changes to be phased in over subsequent cycles.

### 2002 Changes

- Interview process – addition of an ice-breaker “tell me a story” question, “How did you choose your major?”
- Interviewers were provided with a framework within which to rate students’ goal attainment. The framework suggested what a strong answer would include.
- Expanded faculty training – with the addition of a mock interview with a “coached” student and an experienced interviewer.
- The rating scale for judging goal attainment was shortened to 5 points
- Student Self-Assessment – students made self-assessments of their level of attainment on the six Goals of General Education so that their self-assessment could be directly compared to the faculty assessments.
- Disseminate the results of the assessment process more widely by making the results available via the web.

### Recommendations for Changes from the 2002 Faculty Debriefing

- Increase the amount of payment to the student from \$25 to \$40 to entice students to participate.
- Drop the two-page essay from students on, “What three courses had the greatest impact on you?”
- Hold interviews on week 7 of the semester rather than week 8 (the week prior to Spring Break) to help avoid conflicts with due dates for mid-term exams and projects.
- Start the interviews at 6:30pm rather than 7:00pm to build in a few more minutes for faculty to complete the rating forms at the conclusion of the interviews.
- Include information on which students have participated in Study Abroad, because it is an experience that distinguishes the better performing students.

### 2003 Changes

- Student payment increased from \$25 to \$30.
- Dropped two-page essay from students on, “What three courses had the greatest impact on you?”
- Interviews held on week 7 rather than week 8 (the week prior to Spring Break).
- Results disseminated more broadly to key administrators, deans and directors, departmental chairs, and faculty participants, via email with link to website.

## Recommendations for Changes from the 2003 Faculty Debriefing

- Establish more standardization of the interview questions, with no more than two questions per goal. Rework the questions in order to clarify what constitutes a “strong” answer. Maintain the flexibility afforded by the current questions.
- Give students two ratings per goal—one rating on how well they can think through a process and answer verbally, and the second on the actual content of their answer.
- Add the ice-breaker questions, “What does being an educated person mean to you?” and, “Do you vote?” because no matter how a student answers, these questions can be followed up with questions relevant to general education.
- Consider reading the students the goal before each question, or have the list of goals available to the students during the interview.

## Additional Planned Changes

### Recommendations from the 2000 Evaluation

- Obtain written self-assessment from a larger sample of students as a way to increase sample size. Possibly include first-year students in the assessment process as a way to address the issue of the “KU difference.”
- Disseminate the goals of general education more broadly through:
  - New Student Orientations
  - *Graduate in 4* notebooks
  - Departmental websites
  - Undergraduate brochures (Geography is model)
  - Course catalog
  - PRE 101
  - New faculty orientation
  - CTE
  - PR piece in the *KU Report*