Wabash National Study 2010: College of Charleston
Institutional Change Narrative

Summary of Project Findings and Proposed Change

Based on our assessments for the Wabash Study, we conclude the following:

- Our initial view of the project was too broad in scope.
- While integrative learning is a "hot topic" in higher education today, it may have been premature to address such a complex facet of learning in the First-Year Experience when basic assessments were not in place.
- Study abroad at the College of Charleston is not currently designed as a cohesive program with shared outcomes. Therefore, assessment of study abroad at the institutional level would require building the structure necessary for evaluating both individual programs and their alignment with appropriate overarching goals. To accomplish this and implement an assessment project is not feasible in the Wabash Study timeframe.
- Our assessments in the First Year Experience let us know that our definition of integrative learning needed to be refined from the broad concept offered through AAC&U to a more practical, working definition that applied to actual student learning within the College of Charleston. The changes to this definition can be evidenced in the adapted rubric put forth in Section 5 and will likely be further refined through workshops and faculty conversations this summer.
- The analysis of student writing from First Year Experience classes revealed uneven and limited growth with regard to integrative learning. While this is consistent with research on student writing, it may also indicate the need for opportunities for faculty development, which are relatively scarce at The College of Charleston. This study indicates that opportunities to help faculty teach and examine integrative learning with more intentionality would likely lead to enhanced student learning and engagement.
- The collection of direct evidence conducted by the faculty is the first step in faculty ownership of the assessment process. The next step is having faculty demonstrate how to use the evidence to improve the program.

Path Forward:

- First Year Experience faculty indicate they plan to incorporate what they learned from this experience in their workshops for next year and that they plan to replicate the study from this year with refined prompts. New faculty development workshops are also being planned to focus specifically on writing this summer.
- The College should encourage faculty to continue the work that was conducted from last year and to consider addressing some of the stated outcomes of the First-Year Experience.
- The College and program leadership should also encourage faculty to take their discussions a step further to determine concrete steps that will lead to program improvement.
- While primary responsibility in phase I of this project rested with the Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, it seems clear that for continued success with this endeavor the faculty should continue the work, resulting discussions, and program revisions in phase II.

Timeline for Phase II

Summer 2012	• FYE Workshops to include discussions of teaching writing in the First-Year Experience (requires funding)
Fall 2012	• Assessment of student writing in FYE courses (by faculty committee) – (requires funding)
Spring 2013	• Assessment of student writing in FYE courses (by faculty committee) – (requires funding) • Final report due to Center of Inquiry

Key Contributors to Wabash Project

Section 1: Institutional Change Narrative (4.30.12)	
Key contributors to Wabash Project Provost	Penny Brunner, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness Jeri Cabot, Dean of Students George Hynd, Provost Chris Korey, FYE Director (incoming) Karin Roof, Director of Academic Assessment and Planning Chris Warnick, Assistant Professor, Department of English
Section 2: Communication Plan (submission not required)	
Academic Affairs Leadership Academic Council Faculty Senate Assessment Committee Academic Experience Directors Student Affairs Leadership Team Student Government Association FYE Peer Facilitators	Overview of study presented Wabash website created (http://wabash.cofc.edu) and linked to OIEP website (http:/oiep.cofc.edu). Focus groups held with students and faculty (used as evidence in Section 4) also served to increase awareness of the project.
Section 3: Incoming Student Qualities (8.1.11)	
Wabash Working Committee Report shared with the Provost	Penny Brunner, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness Jeri Cabot, Dean of Students Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Susan Kattwinkel, FYE Director (outgoing) Chris Korey, FYE Director (incoming) Mindy Miley, Assistant Vice President for New Student Programs Karin Roof, Director of Academic Assessment and Planning Chris Warnick, Assistant Professor, Department of English
Section 4: Good Practices and Supportive Conditions (9.30.11)	
Wabash Working Committee Report shared with the Provost	Penny Brunner, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness Jeri Cabot, Dean of Students Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Susan Kattwinkel, FYE Director (outgoing) Chris Korey, FYE Director (incoming) Mindy Miley, Assistant Vice President for New Student Programs Karin Roof, Director of Academic Assessment and Planning Chris Warnick, Assistant Professor, Department of English
Section 5: Student Growth on Proposed Outcomes (1.31.l2)	
Wabash Project Coordinators Faculty Committee Report shared with the Provost	Anthony Bishara, Assistant Professor, Psychology Penny Brunner, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness Jennifer Burgess, Visiting Instructor, English Lei Jin, Assistant Professor, International and Intercultural Studies Chris Korey, Associate Professor, Biology and FYE Director Amy Mecklenburg-Faenger, Assistant Professor, English Karin Roof, Director of Academic Assessment and Planning Lisa Ross, Professor, Psychology Trish Ward, Department Chair, English Chris Warnick, Assistant Professor, English Jen Wright, Assistant Professor, Psychology