

Assessment Plan Reporting Template (APRT)
Longwood University
MEASURING WRITTEN COMMUNICATION COMPETENCY
(2008-09)

PART A: PLAN

1.0 Definition of Terms

1.1: Identify the core area to be assessed. How is it defined? How does it relate to the institution's mission and goals?

Longwood University is dedicated to the development of well-informed citizen leaders who are prepared to make significant contributions to the good of society.
(http://www.longwood.edu/president/direction/mission_vision.htm)

To fulfill this commitment, it is imperative for us that our graduates are well versed in all areas of the liberal arts and sciences, and that the university engages in an ongoing, integrated, and research-based process to assess student learning in “college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them.” (See *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*, COC SACS, 2008 interim ed., p.15)

One of the core areas assessed is Written Communication Competency (WCC). Competent writing should provide evidence of suitable content, effective organization and reasoning, appropriate rhetoric, and compliance with standard conventions of writing and documentation. Longwood University's written communication goals are guided by a rhetorical approach to both academic and public writing as presented in its General Education Goals 2 and 14; both courses engage students in information literacy as well as writing processes as students work toward Longwood University's mission of “the development of citizen leaders who are prepared to make positive contributions to the common good of society” (see Longwood web site above).

Longwood's first-year composition course that fulfills Goal 2 (English 150/ Writing & Research) prepares students to “write and speak logically, clearly, precisely, and [. . .] through accurate reading and listening, to acquire, organize, present, and document information and ideas” (<http://www.longwood.edu/gened/goal2.html>); our “bookend” course at the upper division that fulfills Goal 14 (English 400/ Active Citizenship: An Advanced Writing Seminar) prepares students “to synthesize and critically analyze through written discourse and a common educational experience information pertaining to issues of citizen leadership” (<http://www.longwood.edu/gened/goal14.html>).

1.2: Identify the criterion or criteria that indicate competency in the core area. This could be a cutoff score, performance benchmark, or rubric that will be used to mark a competent student performance.

Longwood students will demonstrate written communication competency (WCC) by developing

1. Rhetorical knowledge, which consists especially of
 - The ability to "focus on a purpose."
 - The ability to "respond to the needs" of an audience.
 - The ability to "use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation."
2. Knowledge of textual and document conventions, which consist especially of
 - The ability to use "genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics."
 - The ability to "practice appropriate means of documenting" work and to "control such surface features [of writing] as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling."

These goals—along with the outcomes of “critical thinking, reading, and writing” and “processes”—are expressed in the Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Statement for First Year Composition adopted by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA) in April 2000. These outcomes reflect general areas of WCC and are further detailed by Longwood University’s outcomes for its two General Education writing courses, English 150/Writing and Research and English 400/Active Citizenship: An Advanced Writing Seminar.

More precisely, student writing is “competent” if documents scored by a panel of readers rate at Level 3 or higher. A document scored at Level 3 on our 5-point rubric

- ~ Identifies and summarizes the topic/problem, and most of the relevant questions and issues meeting requirements of the assignment.
- ~ Organizes paragraphs coherently to support the main argument with appropriate use of transitions, explanations, and examples that communicate the questions and issues.
- ~ Uses language, explanations, examples, and concepts in several instances that are generally appropriate to the rhetorical situation.
- ~ Includes only a few errors in correct grammar, spelling, or documentation.

1.3: Describe the learning objectives for the defined core area.

The defined core area is comprised of two courses in composition, English 150/Writing & Research and English 400/Active Citizenship: An Advanced Writing Seminar. The learning objectives for each of these two courses are provided below:

English 150

English 150 (General Education Goal 2, *Longwood Undergraduate Catalog 2007-08*, p. 25) has as its outcomes that students will

- Understand and adapt to rhetorical and contextual differences in tasks involving writing, reading, speaking, and listening;
- Engage in academic inquiry using and evaluating a variety of sources, incorporating and documenting source material appropriately, and avoiding plagiarism;
- Develop flexible processes for engaging in academic writing;

- Develop knowledge of conventions for different kinds of texts and demonstrate substantial control of the conventions of Edited American English; and
- Reflect on and make judgments about their own texts and writing processes.

English 400

English 400/ Active Citizenship: An Advanced Writing Seminar (General Education Goal 14, *Longwood Undergraduate Catalog 2007-08*, p. 30) has as its outcomes that students will

- Engage in the process of citizen leadership by investigating multiple perspectives on an important public issue;
- Understand the nature of public discourse/debate as determined by purpose, audience, and context;
- Choose appropriate formats in writing for a variety of purposes;
- Analyze the effectiveness of their own texts and processes for specific rhetorical situations; and
- Understand how the knowledge, skills, and values learned in general education are interwoven and interrelated, and how they can contribute to the process of citizen leadership.

These outcomes may be summarized and in some cases conflated into categories that reflect students' ability to

1. Identify and summarize the topic/problem and relevant questions and issues that inform the assignment;
2. Organize ideas into paragraphs that cohere and support the main argument through appropriate transitions, explanations, and engaging examples;
3. Develop ideas with rhetorically appropriate examples and explanations; and
4. Demonstrate proficiency in conventional use of grammar, spelling, and documentation.

These four outcomes which both courses hold in common are most systematically expressed in the rubric that we will use for our assessment, which is discussed in section 2.1 and is included as an appendix to this document.

2.0 Methodology

- 2.1 Describe the value added analytic approach being used, with reference to the *Guidelines* (p. 8, ff.)
- 2.2 Explain how educational experiences at the institution produce student learning and reasons for choosing the analytical approach in 2.1.

In response to a recent call for value-added assessment, Longwood proposes to use cross-sectional design and multiple direct and indirect measures to assess the “value-added” to our students’ learning by their college experience, particularly in the WCC area.

The direct measure is an internally designed scoring rubric (see Appendix I), and the indirect measure includes three student engagement scales that are created by using National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data (see Appendix II). Beginning with the Fall 2009 semester, we will employ both direct and indirect value-added measures.

- **Direct Measure:** In 2002, we contracted with Dr. Joyce Neff, professor of professional writing in the Department of English at Old Dominion University, to guide Longwood faculty in developing and applying a scoring guide in assessing student writing. In 2005, we again worked with Dr. Neff to revise the scoring guide for training faculty in assessing WCC. Since then, we have periodically conducted review and revision of the rubric to enhance its validity and reliability in measuring student competency in writing. The rubric we propose here represents the latest result of this continuing effort.

With SCHEV approval, we will use course-embedded data collection to facilitate this assessment. Specifically, students will compose a formal writing assignment that involves the use of sources, evidence, and documentation for a course (either English 150 or English 400). The completed document will be graded by the classroom instructor and scored separately by faculty raters using the rubric provided in Appendix I and the assessment methods proposed in section 2.3.

- **Indirect Measure:** The indirect measure will be used to assess the level of student engagement via the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The details of the methodologies for each of these measures are given below.

At the end of every third school year since 2000, Longwood randomly selects a group of freshman and senior students to take the NSSE to measure student engagement. The mean values for these two groups on these selected items are analyzed and compared (see Appendix II). We will continue to use the NSSE—particularly those items that are included in NSSE questions 1, 2, 3, 11, and 13—as indicators of three variables: “level of student engagement in writing and reading,” “level of student engagement in analytic activities,” and “self-reported learning outcomes.”

Specifically, the proposed analysis procedure on NSSE data includes:

- Using NSSE items to construct three scales to measure “level of student engagement in writing and reading” (NSSE items Q3-a, b, c, d, and e), “level of student engagement in analytic activities” (NSSE items Q1-d and i, Q2-b, c, d, and e), and “self-reported learning outcomes” (NSSE items Q11-a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i, j, k, l, m, n, o, and p, and Q13). (see Appendix II)
- Testing internal reliability of the scales by using Cronbach’s Alpha statistics;
- Calculating mean scores on two scales for the freshman and senior students who participate in NSSE;
- Using a two-sample, t-test procedure to analyze the difference in group mean values on the scales to demonstrate the added value.

Our sample will be taken from English 150 and English 400 because these are general education writing courses required, respectively, of Longwood freshmen and seniors as a whole (for

exceptions, see section 2.4). English 150 prepares first-year students to be college writers; English 400 prepares seniors to write in the public sphere after graduation. These courses seemed singularly appropriate to sample for the purposes of course-embedded assessment of written communication at Longwood. English 400 is also a signature course for Longwood, combining our general education focus on written communication with our institutional focus on preparing citizen leaders.

2.3 Elaborate upon the expected reliability and validity of the analytical approach mentioned in 2.1.

In order to assure the reliability and validity of the approach, we plan

- 1) In Fall 2008, to train all faculty members who are assigned to teach English 150 and English 400 to familiarize them with the recently revised rubric as a way to confirm the reliability and validity of that instrument.
- 2) In Spring 2009, to run a full scale pilot test of our assessment. We will randomly select for evaluation a number of students equivalent to 15% of the total enrollment for the academic year of freshmen in English 150 and seniors in English 400. For each selected student, a particular assignment that involves the use of sources, evidence and documentation will be gathered, and then scored and evaluated by a group of faculty scorers.

Prior to evaluating the sample, these faculty scorers will participate in a norming session in order to ensure that they are interpreting and applying the rubric in a consistent manner. This norming session will mimic the norming methods used both by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) for scoring advanced placement (AP) exams in composition and by Dr. Joyce Neff in her 2002 and 2005 workshops for Longwood faculty. The Director of Composition/Composition Committee will secure papers from among the courses being assessed as “anchor”—or representative—of the available scores on the rubric and use those papers to guide the faculty training session. Faculty will meet in small groups led by an experienced scorer to review additional sample papers, scoring those papers against the rubric, and discussing the scores until trainers see a reasonable level of consistency among faculty scorers.

For the purposes of this assessment, faculty will rate each of the four individual outcomes that are considered in the rubric (these outcomes are listed at the end of section 1.3). Each outcome will receive a score on the rubric’s 5 point scale, and the paper will receive a holistic overall score. Each paper from the sample will be rated by two faculty scorers; the average between their scores will determine the paper’s rating in each category. If there is a difference of 2 points or more on our 5 point scale between these two scores, a third rater will score the paper. The two closer faculty ratings would then be averaged to determine the paper’s score.

- 3) In Fall 2009, to evaluate the results of our pilot study and (if necessary) to refine our rubric and data collection procedures to adjust for any problems uncovered by our

pilot study. Should any alterations be necessary, the Director of Composition will revise the rubric in conjunction with the Composition Committee and the data collection procedures in conjunction with the Office of Assessment. The Director of Composition will also work to familiarize the faculty with any changes to the rubric and will further train them on its use.

- 4) In Spring 2010, to fully implement our WCC assessment plan by performing a pre-assessment of randomly selected freshman and a post-assessment of randomly selected seniors. Provided that the pilot test does not reveal any methodological or logistic problems in our assessment method, this assessment will be carried out according to the methodology described above (see section 2.3.2).

If the quality of the revised rubric is confirmed, we plan to assess WCC in this fashion every other year or corresponding to the University's assessment schedule. The exact timing of our future assessments (i.e., whether they will take place fall semester or spring semester) will be determined by the Director of Composition and the Director of Assessment after both have reviewed the results of the first testing cycle.

2.4 Explain generally the student population from which samples, cohorts, or groups will be drawn. This section should include specific mention of factors relevant to assessment, such as student population size, completion rates, number of transfers that are relevant to assessment.

At Longwood, all students, save for those who fall under the exceptions detailed below, must take English 150 and English 400. Therefore, the target population for proposed WCC assessment consists of all first year students in English 150 and all senior students in English 400. The assessment data will be collected from a course-embedded assignment for both English 150 and English 400. Department guidelines stipulate the cases in which students may be exempt from English 150.

Exemption from English 150

According to the by-laws for the Department of English and Modern Languages, students may be exempted from English 150 in either of the following two ways:

1. Students who receive a score of 60 or above on the CLEP Test of English Composition (either version) or a score of 69 or above on the CLEP Test of Freshman Composition will receive credit for English 150 upon writing an essay judged by at least two Department evaluators to be proficient by the standards applied to the final examination in English 150.
2. Students who receive a score of 3 or higher on the Advanced Placement Test in English Language and Composition will receive credit for English 150.

Students will receive credit for English 150 by receiving a score of 60 or above on the CLEP Test of Analyzing and Interpreting Literature and by writing an essay, using secondary sources, judged by at least two Department evaluators to be proficient by standards applied to the research paper in English 150. Students may also receive credit for English 150 by receiving a score of 3 or higher on the Advanced Placement Test of

English Literature and Composition.

Students who have completed the IB Diploma will receive 3 hours credit for English 150 with a score of 5, 6, or 7 on the IB Higher-Level English A1 exam. Students who have not completed the Diploma, but who have earned a 5, 6, or 7 on the Higher-Level English A1 exam, will be considered for 3 hours of credit, subject to successful performance on the relevant final exams.

In addition to these test-based exemptions, students who transfer in credit for an equivalent course may have their English 150 requirement waived.

Exemption from English 400

All students earning an undergraduate degree from Longwood University must complete English 400/Active Citizenship: An Advanced Writing Seminar, part of the General Education program. Generally, this course is taken in the senior year since its goal is to prepare students to apply their writing to issues of public significance beyond the University. In order to assure upper-division status, students must have earned 75 credit hours before taking English 400.

Specifically, every other year (or as determined by the university's assessment schedule), a number of students equivalent to 15% of the year's total enrollment of freshmen in English 150 and seniors in English 400 will be selected by the staff of the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research (OAIR) for WCC assessment. The selection will exclude sophomores in English 150 as well as juniors and transfer students in English 400, as these groups could skew our attempt to determine value added. Once all of the written assignments (with all ID information except student number removed) are collected from the sample, a group of faculty members will rate them. After the assessment is complete, the Director of Composition and the Composition Committee will work with the research staff from OAIR to conduct further analysis on the results.

2.5 Explain the technique used for data collection with reference to the *Guidelines* (p. 11, ff.), including such factors as whether the data will be collected in the classroom (course embedded) or outside the classroom (single setting).

Typically, the Department of English and Modern Languages enrolls approximately 870 students in 45 sections of **English 150** and 800 students in 40 sections of **English 400** each year. For example, during the 2007-2008 academic year,

Course	Fall 2007		Spring 2008	
	Sections	Students	Sections	Students
English 150	24	528	17	374
English 400	18	378	20	420

Sections of English 150 are capped at 22 students per section; sections of English 400 are generally capped at 21, although dependent upon classroom space available, some sections are capped at 18 students.

In addition to the composition courses housed in the Department of English and Modern Languages, “all students will earn a grade of C- or better in at least two writing-intensive courses beyond courses required for General Education” (see *Longwood Undergraduate Catalog 2007-08*, p. 20).

2.6 Describe and explain measurement strategies to be applied during the pre-assessment with reference to the *Guidelines* (p. 13, ff.).

We will use the “Constructed Response Format” defined by SCHEV’s *Guidelines* (p.14) to assess WCC. That means that the selected students will complete an assignment that is embedded in the English 150/Writing and Research and that is guided by a rubric made explicit as part of the drafting and revising process for that assignment. To most effectively determine value added, we will assess English 150 papers written at or before the middle of the semester. We will directly measure competency by rating the paper both holistically and in terms of individual outcomes, using our modified scoring rubric (see Appendix 1). Such a method means that raters use a common scoring guide listing several categories both in order to rate those categories on a 5-point scale (Level 1-Level 5) and to derive an overall or holistic score for the paper.

2.7 Describe and explain measurement strategies to be applied during the post assessment with reference to the *Guidelines* (p. 13, ff.).

Applying the same strategy mentioned in section 2.6, during the post assessment, students will complete an assignment that is embedded in the English 400/Active Citizenship: An Advanced Writing Seminar course and that is guided by a rubric made explicit as part of the drafting and revising process for that assignment. To most effectively determine value added, we will assess English 400 papers written at or after the middle of the semester. Since the assignment selected from both courses (English 150 and English 400) must involve the use of formal evidence, sources, and documentation (see section 2.3), the outcomes for each cohort should be comparable. We will directly measure competency by rating the paper both holistically and in terms of individual outcomes, using our modified scoring rubric (see Appendix 1). Such a method means that raters use a common scoring guide listing several categories both in order to rate those categories on a 5-point scale (Level 1-Level 5) and to derive an overall or holistic score for the paper.

2.8 Explain the nature of value added given 2.7 and 2.8.

We anticipate that the majority of those students in their first year at Longwood and enrolled in English 150 will score at Level 3 or below, and that majority of those students in their final year at Longwood and enrolled in English 400 will score at Level 4 or above. The difference in mean scores for these two groups, if proved to be statistically significant, will be used as evidence of “value added” in WCC.

2.9 Estimate the academic year and team that pre and post assessments will be completed for this core area

For the current cycle, we estimate that the completion of pre- and post-assessments will take a total of two years. The first year (2008-2009) will serve as a pilot study year. During this time, the Director of Composition will (a) work with the Composition Committee on refining the rubric, (b) work to familiarize the faculty with the rubric and train them on its use, and (c) experimentally evaluate the validity of the rubric by using it in a full scale pilot study of selected assignment papers from English 150 and English 400 classes. The goal of the pilot will be to determine the extent to which the rubric measures the value-added in student learning in the area of WCC. Once the validity of the rubric has been confirmed by our pilot study, we will be ready for full-implementation, which will be carried out during the second year (2009-2010). For more a more detailed account of our implementation plan, please see section 2.3.

3.0 Process evaluation

3.1 Describe and explain how the results will be reported to institutional units, students, and external constituents.

Once the test/survey data are made available by the contractual agencies, the staff of Office of Assessment and Institutional Research at Longwood will conduct preliminary analysis, report and disseminate the findings, and coordinate further discussion among the faculty members who participated in drafting this WCC plan, the members of the General Education Committee, and chief academic officers. The discussion will focus on:

- Summarizing the findings;
- Identifying the area(s) in need of improvement;
- Developing strategies for improvement; and
- Developing strategies for assessing improvement.

3.2 Describe how the results have been and will be used to improve educational experiences and advance the mission of the college or university.

Using both direct and indirect value-added measures, the findings of the data analyses will be used to support university-wide decision making on program/service improvement. The data will be reported to the president's Advisory Committee on Assessment and to the faculty senate, from which it will be disseminated to the Longwood faculty as a whole. The Director of Composition will also review the assessment results and share them with the Composition Committee and the faculty of the Department of English and Modern Languages, for use in making future improvements to English 150 and English 400. The true power of the data collected from the WCC assessment process is in informing the teaching and learning activities on the campus. As such, the data from the on-going assessments will continue to be used to inform work in individual courses and within the majors. The new value-added results will provide important insights into two major areas of responsibility for the faculty on the Longwood campus: the students enrolled in our General Education courses and the graduates who will encounter the challenges of applying what they have learned to real world problem-solving.

3.3 Estimate the costs of the proposed assessment. Provide a narrative of the calculation as well as pertinent statistics.

The estimated direct costs: \$26,000 (WEAVEonline program, stipends, etc.)

The estimated indirect costs: \$ 90,000 (.3 assessment staff and .5 FTE faculty salary and benefits)

The total costs for implementing the WCC assessment: \$116,000

For a more detailed account of the estimated costs and how they have been derived, please see Appendix III.

PART B: STATUS REPORT

4.0 Data Presentation (leave blank until data is due)

Please leave this section blank for now – results of initial assessment due January 15, 2009.

- 4.1 Explain any challenges to data collection, and how they were addressed.
- 4.2 Describe the value-added (or competency) information/data that was collected. This information should include, but is not limited to, quantitative or qualitative summaries of the differences between pre and post assessments or any performance data
- 4.3 Describe any additional evidence of value added (or competency); this might include faculty testimony, student retention, or post graduation evidence.

Appendix I: Written Communication Competency Rubric

Level 5	The document ~ Identifies and summarizes the topic/problem with remarkable clarity and addresses relevant questions and issues for all aspects of the assignment. ~ Organizes paragraphs coherently to support the main argument with consistent and skillful use of appropriate transitions, well-developed explanations, and examples that engage the reader. ~ Demonstrates precision and control over language, explanations, examples, and concepts that are appropriate to the rhetorical situation. ~ Uses correct grammar, spelling, and proper documentation.
Level 4	The document ~ Identifies and summarizes the topic/problem and the relevant questions and issues for most aspects of the assignment. ~ Organizes paragraphs coherently to support the main argument with consistent use of appropriate transitions, explanations, and examples that engage the reader. ~ Demonstrates language, explanations, examples, and concepts that are appropriate to the rhetorical situation and reflect moderate control.

	~ Uses correct grammar, spelling, and proper documentation.
Level 3	<p>The document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Identifies and summarizes the topic/problem, and most of the relevant questions and issues meeting requirements of the assignment. ~ Organizes paragraphs coherently to support the main argument with appropriate use of transitions, explanations, and examples that communicate the questions and issues. ~ Uses language, explanations, examples, and concepts in several instances that are generally appropriate to the rhetorical situation. ~ Includes only a few errors in correct grammar, spelling, or documentation.
Level 2	<p>The document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Partially summarizes the topic/problem, questions and issues but fails to meet important requirements of the assignment. ~ Does not organize paragraphs consistently to support the main argument, and does not use transitions, explanations, and examples in several parts of the paper. ~ Demonstrates language, explanations, examples, and concepts in several instances inappropriate to the rhetorical situation. ~ Uses incorrect grammar, spelling, or documentation that distracts the reader.
Level 1	<p>The document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Does not clearly state the topic/problem or address the relevant questions and issues articulated by the assignment. ~ Does not organize paragraphs or provide transitions, explanations, and examples, thus challenging readers to follow the main argument. ~ Demonstrates little control over language, explanations, examples, and concepts inappropriate to the rhetorical situation. ~ Uses incorrect grammar and spelling that interferes with the reading. There is a serious lack of proper documentation.

Appendix II: National Survey of Student Engagement

Every third year, Longwood selects a representative sample of freshman and senior students to participate in NSSE. A two-group comparison, then, will be conducted to determine if any value has been added to the student learning experience while they enroll in Longwood at these two points in time.

For the purpose of indirectly measuring WCC, three scales to be created are “level of student engagement in writing and reading,” “level of student engagement in analytic activities,” and “self-reported learning outcomes.” Specifically,

1. Measured on a 5-point scale, the indicators for “level of student engagement in writing and reading” include:
 - Q3-a. Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings (1=none, and 5 = more than 20)
 - Q3-b. Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment (1=none, and 5 = more than 20)
 - Q3-c. Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more (1=none, and 5 = more than 20)
 - Q3-d. Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages (1=none, and 5 = more than 20)
 - Q3-e. Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages (1=none, and 5 = more than 20)

2. Measured on a 4-point scale, the indicators for “level of student engagement in analytic activities” include:
 - Q1-d. Work on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources (4=very often, and 1= never)
 - Q1-i. Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions (4=very often, and 1= never)
 - Q2-b. Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components (4=very much, and 1=very little)
 - Q2-c. Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships (4=very much, and 1=very little)
 - Q2-d. Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions (4=very much, and 1=very little)
 - Q2-e. Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations (4=very much, and 1=very little).

3. Measured on a 4-point scale (4=very much, and 1=very little), the indicators for “self-reported learning outcomes” include:

- Q11-a. Acquiring a broad general education
- Q11-b. Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills
- Q11-c. Writing clearly and effectively
- Q11-d. Speaking clearly and effectively
- Q11-e. Thinking critically and analytically
- Q11-f. Analyzing quantitative problems
- Q11-g. Using computing and information technology
- Q11-h. Working effectively with others
- Q11-i. Voting in local, state, or national elections
- Q11-j. Learning effectively on your own
- Q11-k. Understanding yourself
- Q11-l. Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds
- Q11-m. Solving complex real-world problems
- Q11-n. Developing a personal code of values and ethics
- Q11-o. Contributing to the welfare of your community
- Q11-p. Developing a deepened sense of spirituality
- Q13 Overall rating of the entire educational experience at this institution.

Appendix III: Estimated Costs for Value-Added Assessment

The additional costs involved in conducting the value-added assessment are estimated as the following:

1. Purchasing software
 - **\$16,000** for the WEAVEonline program (2007)
 - **\$5,000/per year** maintenance fee for WEAVEonline (2008 and after)
2. Operational costs
 - **\$103,000/per year** (salary and full benefits) for a designated assessment staff

Annually, Longwood conducts assessment on student learning, programs, and services. The components of the assessment include, but are not limited to, the tests for six competency areas, the Major Field Tests for graduating seniors, the Praxis I & II for teacher education programs, surveys such as CSI, CIRP, NSSE, FSSE, and many other internally as well as externally developed surveys that specifically target the quality of support services. Decentralized operation without proper coordination has been proved to be inefficient in terms of controlling the total costs, reducing the “over-surveyed” burden on students/faculty/staff, sharing the information for “closing the loop,” and using the data to support the executive administration’s decision making.

To make the assessment more effective, this position is needed to coordinate all the assessment activities that are currently taking place on the campus and operated by various divisions and/or units. The major responsibilities for the manager include: (1) scheduling and preparing for campus-wide assessment activities, (2) maintaining the assessment data collection and report database, and (3) disseminating the results of the assessment to corresponding constituents for the purpose of demonstration of the program as well as the institution’s accountability.

- **\$6,000/per year** for the items, such as incentives/rewards, to be given to the selected students for participating in the assessment activities.
- **\$15,000/per year** as stipend for additional work by regular faculty/staff members for performing the following functions:
 - a. Administering tests, grading tests, collecting data, conducting analysis, and writing the report;
 - b. Developing the test instruments and rubric for WCC area
 - c. Training faculty members for conducting and reporting value-added assessment in six required competency areas; and
 - d. Training department chairs/program directors for using WEAVEonline to report the value-added assessment results.