

CTW Assessment Report for AY 2008-09

Marti Singer, Ph.D.
Director of Academic Assessment
Georgia State University

August 10, 2009

CTW Assessment Report for 2008-09

As part of the SACS re-affirmation process in 2008, Georgia State University developed a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) focused on Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW). This initiative seeks to increase our baccalaureate students' capacity for critical thinking as evidenced through writing in their major field of study. An inventory of student learning outcomes, as they are associated with the University's General Education Outcomes, across all undergraduate degree programs at Georgia State University from AY 2005-2008 demonstrates a consistently increasing interest among faculty and academic programs for critical thinking and writing. (See Appendix A for General Education Outcomes Reported in Degree Programs from AY 2005-06, AY 2006-07, and AY 2007-08.) The CTW initiative encourages faculty to consider critical thinking as it is demonstrated through writing within each discipline. In other words, this initiative is not intended to measure writing skill, but rather to measure critical thinking within each discipline/field through the medium of writing.

The strategy for achieving the goal of enhancing critical thinking was to implement a university-wide graduation requirement such that undergraduate students pass two critical thinking through writing (CTW) courses in their major. This requirement, approved by the University Senate in April of 2007, takes effect for students entering Fall, 2009. Each degree program also designated one or more faculty members, CTW Ambassadors, to lead the initiative in their departments. Each degree program then developed CTW courses which were approved by the Undergraduate Assessment Committee.¹

Assessing CTW: Pilot Year

Each year, beginning in the summer of 2008, every major is required to report on the status of CTW in their area. During the 2008-09 academic year, all undergraduate majors were encouraged to pilot courses designated as CTW in order to provide an opportunity for revision of assignments, assessment strategies, critical thinking definitions, and faculty preparation. This year, student learning outcomes for CTW were not reported in WEAVEonline², as AY 2008-09 was designated as the year for finalizing department plans for implementation and faculty were piloting courses and assignments. Instead, Ambassadors reflected upon and reported on the

¹ Although the QEP document refers to the General Education Assessment sub-committee as the body that approves CTW Plans and assesses student learning, in the Fall Semester, 2008, the name of the General Education Assessment Committee was changed to the Undergraduate Assessment Committee (through a University Senate motion) to more accurately describe this committee's responsibilities for undergraduate assessment. In addition, the title of the Senior Faculty Associate for Assessment has changed to the Director of Academic Assessment, which more accurately defines the full-time nature and responsibilities of the position as it has developed.

² Currently and since 2005, all university academic programs report student learning outcomes in WEAVEonline, a software system developed by Virginia Commonwealth University. This system captures and saves over time all student learning assessment reports.

status of their CTW program in a Content Management System developed by the Director of CTW. These annual reports are comprised of five areas: Faculty Workshops, Assessments of Critical Thinking through Writing, Assignments, Achievements, and Action Plans for Next Year (see Appendix B for categories and questions that guided the Ambassadors' reports).

The Undergraduate Assessment Committee (UAC) met in mid-June, 2009, and provided independent written responses and recommendations based on Ambassadors' reports. The Director of Academic Assessment then reviewed both the UAC responses and the Ambassadors' reports. In consultation with the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, feedback will be provided to all Ambassadors in fall semester, 2009. Copies of their reviews and this summary report will also be given to an outside reviewer with expertise in Critical Thinking and Writing, who will consider the reports and offer suggestions for improvement. He will come to Georgia State in September to discuss his recommendations with the Ambassadors and the CTW Leadership Team.

This assessment report includes highlights of responses from UAC based on the categories in the Content Management System. These are followed by conclusions/recommendations from the Director of Academic Assessment. Appendices include qualitative summaries of the Ambassador's reports.

Results and Summary of 2009 CTW Annual Reports

Fifty-two degree programs have developed CTW plans. All but one program provided a CTW report during the summer, 2009. The Undergraduate Assessment Committee and the Director of Academic Assessment reviewed the 51 CTW reports posted in the online CTW Content Management System. At this point in the CTW process, Ambassadors reported in a reflective manner.

Piloting Courses: Of the 52 CTW programs, nearly 70% of the programs piloted at least one course. Although an impressive number of courses were piloted last year, nearly a third of the programs did not or could not pilot a course (in three cases, the courses didn't make). (See Appendix C for Pilot Status.) .

Faculty Preparation for Teaching CTW courses: The types of faculty preparation mentioned in reports across the university tended to fall into four major categories though a few of the CTW programs reported more than one type of faculty preparation or training for creating CTW assignments and teaching these courses. The four major categories include: Faculty Workshops or meetings, One-on-one training with colleagues, the Ambassador works alone as the only one teaching CTW courses, (no mention of group or faculty preparation), and no mention of faculty preparation in the report (See Appendix C for detail on Faculty Preparation).

Typical issues reported by Ambassadors regarding faculty preparation centered around assessment strategies for measuring critical thinking. The most common issues reported focus on developing and revising rubrics and assignments.

Assessment: Nearly half of the CTW Ambassadors focused on a discussion of their rubrics or assessment criteria. Only three reported the results of the CTW rubrics/assessment in terms of student learning. (See Appendix D for details by program.) Several programs made general comments about student improvement in writing or thinking, but did not provide evidence of these improvements. The Undergraduate Committee expected to see more detailed results of student learning in this section of the report, and their feedback encouraged Ambassadors include this detail in the coming year.

Assignments: Reflections on the assignments indicated that close to half of the Ambassadors felt that assignments needed revision. Many programs included CTW writing assignments requiring lengthy papers. Others built in unlimited revisions of writing. CTW faculty reported that both the length of papers and the unlimited revisions proved to be arduous for them. About one-third of the programs reported that their assignments were appropriate and no revisions are planned in the coming academic year. A few of the Ambassadors discussed, in general terms, that assignments encouraged students to think critically and that students enjoyed them (n=6). Others mentioned that working with the assignments influenced faculty to revisit and revise their definitions of critical thinking (n=6). (See Appendix E for details regarding Assignments and their effects.)

Achievements: Achievements at this early phase in the QEP were difficult for CTW faculty to define. In fact, more than a third of the Ambassadors did not report in this section at all. However, subtle indications of achievements could be found in other areas of the report and were defined by faculty in various ways. Many times their responses seem to be areas in which they are pleased with the program in their department so far, e.g. faculty preparation and assignments. Ambassadors reported that the discussions about CTW had positive effects on colleagues in terms of their renewed enthusiasm for teaching, as well. Several also mentioned, though without supporting data, that their students improved in thinking and writing as a result of attending to critical thinking and to using writing as a means of learning. (See Appendix F for details by program on Achievements)

Action Plans: Like the Achievements section of the Content Management System, Action Plans were mentioned throughout the report but not always stated in this section. The most common action planned for AY 2009-10 concerns faculty preparation and training for CTW, often reported in the Faculty Preparation section. Half of the Ambassadors mentioned that faculty preparation would be imperative as the CTW initiative unfolds this fall. Nearly as many faculty reported that revised assignments and rubrics are also part of their Action Plan for AY 2009-10. A few programs went as far as to consider revising their definitions of critical thinking or their

course offering itself. Only four programs did not mention an action for the coming year. (See Appendix G for details by program of Action Plans).

Conclusions and Recommendations:

The Undergraduate Assessment Committee, along with the Director of Academic Assessment, commends the degree programs for their hard work during this pilot year for CTW. Many of the programs reported interesting and insightful gains as they put into action the CTW concepts and the plan for their department/program. The primary successes seem to lie in the development and implementation of assignments, faculty workshops, and building of CTW rubrics that reflect each discipline. At the same time, these are the areas most often mentioned for revision and continuation as the initiative unfolds, which are certainly appropriate given the early stage of the initiative.

One concern includes preparation for departments/programs where pilots were not done. Each degree program was encouraged strongly to pilot courses during the 2008-09 academic year and supported with resources for doing so. Although piloting a course was not a requirement as such, doing so was encouraged and imperative for early successful implementation and modification of assessment strategies (e.g., rubrics), assignments, training, and other aspects of the CTW plan. It will be interesting to observe whether there are beneficial effects of piloting courses in 2008-09 as the programs unfold during 2009-2010.

Although over half of the programs report a conscious effort at faculty preparation through large group or on-on-one training, nearly a quarter of the programs do not mention faculty preparation or training for CTW during the 2009-2010 academic year. Faculty training may be critical for our efforts to make CTW a campus-wide academic initiative. CTW faculty, in particular, must be aware of not only what is expected from them, but also the underlying purposes fostered through training for enhancing students' critical thinking in their disciplines. In addition, faculty awareness provides potentially rich engagement and feedback from all faculty, not only the ones immediately involved in the CTW initiative.

Another concern has to do with relating the definition of critical thinking to the assignments and assessments (rubrics or other criteria). As the initiative develops, departments/programs will need to address the connections between their assignments, their definitions, and their assessments of student learning. CTW workshops during AY 2009-10 might focus on revisiting definitions of critical thinking and how these align with other elements of the CTW plan within each department/program.

Reporting specific student learning assessment results is required as part of the initiative. The way questions were phrased in the Content Management System may need to be revised so that Ambassadors will be more clearly guided toward the kind of reflection and assessment necessary for CTW results of their students' learning. The Undergraduate Assessment Committee, along

with the Director of Academic Assessment, acknowledge that the way the questions were asked may have implied a call for a more general discussion of assessment procedures rather than the actual results of the assessment of student learning. Therefore, the CTW Directors and Leadership Team should revisit the questions in the Content Management System and consider whether or not the student learning assessment data should be part of this annual reporting system, reported separately in the System from the Plan, or reported in WEAVEonline as a separate document, as stated in the QEP document. As the Content Management System is set up presently, only narrative information and data can be reported into the system. This reconsideration is vital for tracking success of the CTW program, as well as value –added over time for student learning.

CTW assignments must be reconsidered as well. CTW faculty who report that lengthy papers and unlimited revisions made their courses difficult are revising assignments. Lengthy paper assignments are actually counter to the intention of the CTW training where short writing assignments that focused on specific elements of critical thinking were encouraged. Revision is considered good pedagogy, and may enhance student engagement; however, time constraints and reasonable amounts of paper-load also should be considered. Perhaps successes regarding shorter assignments and student engagement could be addressed more specifically in CTW workshops during the coming year.

Finally, as a university-wide initiative, Critical Thinking through Writing is a powerful and vast endeavor. While many programs produced insightful reports that will move their departments forward, the following programs should be recognized for excellence in various aspects of this year's report. This list is not intended to be exclusive, as other programs clearly contribute to the efforts of the QEP initiative at Georgia State and to their respective departments. Rather, these Ambassadors' reports serve as samples of excellence in specific ways (listed below).

Reports Nominated for consideration for recognition, 2009:

For assessment report of rubric results of CT

- Chemistry (Doyle Barrow)
- Geosciences (Katherine Hankins)

For insightful reflections of courses, pilots, definitions of CT

- Communications – Speech (Jeffrey Bennett)
- German (Robin Huff)

For analysis of assignments, faculty training and website to come

- English (Audrey Goodman)

For analysis of progress of plan, clarity of report, and openness to change/improvement

- Criminal Justice (Brenda Blackwell)

- Nursing (Kathy Plitnick)

APPENDIX A

Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes

Associated with the University's General Education Outcomes, 2005-2008

General Education Learning Outcomes 2005-06³

	Written Com	Oral Com	Collab	Critical Thinking	Contemp Issues	Qual Skills	Tech
Core	41	39	26	49	49	16	26
Undergrad	132	106	86	196	124	84	90

General Education Learning Outcomes 2006-07

	Written Com	Oral Com	Collab	Critical Thinking	Contemp Issues	Qual Skills	Tech
Core	34	37	23	33	29	14	19
Undergrad	134	113	78	201	132	80	96

General Education Learning Outcomes 2007-08

	Written Com	Oral Com	Collab	Critical Thinking	Contemp Issues	Qual Skills	Tech
Core	18	10	5	21	16	7	7
Undergrad	160	127	85	217	148	89	105

³ Data for the Core during 2005-06 includes some information for the major in addition to the Core, as some departments at that time defined "Core" as the gateway course for the degree program. Therefore, it was not always possible to distinguish just the Core information. This problem was rectified in 2006-07.

APPENDIX B

The Undergraduate Assessment Committee considered the following questions when reviewing reports. These are listed in the online Content Management System developed by the Director of Critical thinking through Writing under *Reports*.

Workshops

How many workshops for faculty training were held this year? How many faculty attended? What were the discussions about? What issues arose? Got resolved?

Assessments

What methods of assessment did the program use? How successful was the method(s)? What effect have the assessments had on the process of the initiative for this department?

Assignments

Are any changes to the current assignments proposed? How clearly did the Ambassador assess the assignments, their successes, and their revisions?

Achievements (milestones)

Were there any achievements recorded in the report that are worthy of sharing with other members of the community—if yes, please say what they were.

Action Plans

How are the action plans related to the assessment? What did this department learn? How will it adapt, make future decisions, based on what they learned?

Overall

How well is the CTW Initiative working in this Department?

APPENDIX C: Pilot Status and Faculty Preparation
This information was taken from the 2008-2009 CTW Annual Reports

CTW Faculty Training 08-09*			
Department	Ambassador	Training Type	Future Plans
Accounting	Jennifer Joe	One-on-one	
African American Studies	Jonathan Gayles	Ambassador Only Instructor	
Anthropology	Emanuela Guano	One-on-one	
Applied Linguistics	Stephanie Lindemann	One-on-one	
Art, Education	Melanie Davenport	One-on-one	
Art, Studio	Connie Thalcken	None/No Pilot	No Plan Reported
Art History	Susan Richmond	Ambassador Only Instructor	Fall 09 Workshop
Biology	Therese Poole / Francisco Cruz	None/Piloted	Fall 09 Workshop
Birth trough Five	Gary Bingham	None/ Piloted	No Plan Reported
BIS	Charles Jarrett	None/No Pilot	No Plan Reported
Chemistry	Doyle Barrow	One-on-one	Fall 09 Workshop
Communication-Film	Greg Smith	Workshop	
Communication-Journalism	Doug Barthlow	Workshop	Fall 09 Workshop
Communication-Speech	Jeffrey Bennett	Workshop	
Communication-Theater (BIS)	Frank Miller	One-on-one	
Computer Information Systems	Geoffrey Hubona	None/ Piloted	No Plan Reported
Computer Science	Michael Weeks	Workshop	
Criminal Justice	Brenda Blackwell	Workshop	
Economics	Shelby Frost / Inas Rashad	Workshop	
Early Childhood Education	Caitlin Dooley / Teri Peitso-Holbrook	Workshop	
English	Audrey Goodman / Melissa McLeod	Workshop	
Finance	Richard Fendler	One-on-one	
Geol/Geog	Katherine Hankins	Workshop	
History	Jared Poley	Workshop	
Hospitality Administration	Debby Cannon	Ambassador Only Instructor	
International Business	David Bruce / Pedro Carillo	Workshop	
Kinesiology and Health	Jacalyn Lund	One-on-one	
Middle Childhood Education	Gladys Yarborough	None/ No Pilot	Fall 09 Workshop
MGS- Entrepreneurship	Bill Bogner	Workshops	

Department	Ambassador	Training Type	Future Plans
MGS- Operations Management	Walter Wallace	Ambassador Only Instructor	
MGS- Business Analysis	Tom Whalen	None/No Pilot	No Plan Reported
MGS- Human Resources	Kay Bunch	Ambassador Only Instructor	
Marketing	Chip Barksdale	One-on-One	
Mathematics	Yi Zhao	Workshop	
MCL -French	Eric Le-Calvez	None/No Pilots	Fall 09 Workshop
MCL - German	Robin Huff	Workshop	
MCL -Spanish	Rudyard Alcocer	Workshop	
Music	Oliver Greene	One-on-One	
Nursing	Kathy Plitnick	Workshop	
Nutrition	Barbara Hopkins	Workshop	
Philosophy	Andrew Cohen	Workshop	
Physics and Astronomy	Brian Thoms	None/No Pilots	Fall 09 Workshop
Political Science	S. Rashid Naim	Workshop	
Psychology	Chris Henrich	None/No Pilots	Fall 09 Workshop
PAUS	Shena Ashley	One-on-One	Fall 09 Workshop
Real Estate	Karen Gibler	Ambassador Only Instructor	
Religious Studies	Tim Renick	None/No Pilots	Fall 09 Workshop
Respiratory Therapy	Doug Gardenhire	One-on-One	
Risk Management	Martin Grace	One-on-One	
Social Work	Deborah Whitley	Workshop	
Sociology	Wendy Simonds	None/No Pilots	Fall 09 Workshop
Women's Studies	Julie Kubala	One-on-One	

Totals	Workshops	20
	One on One	14
	Ambassador Only	6
	None	12

Future Plans	Planned Fall 09	11
	No Future Plans	5

APPENDIX D: Assessment Types

This information was taken from the 2008-2009 CTW Annual Reports

CTW Assessment Types Overview 08-09		
Department	Ambassador	Assessment Type
Accounting	Jennifer Joe	R
African American Studies	Jonathan Gayles	UAC
Anthropology	Emanuela Guano	NP
Applied Linguistics	Stephanie Lindemann	R
Art, Education	Melanie Davenport	R
Art, Studio	Connie Thalken	NP
Art History	Susan Richmond	UAC
Biology	Therese Poole / Francisco Cruz	UAC
Birth trough Five	Gary Bingham	R
BIS	Charles Jarrett	NP
Chemistry	Doyle Barrow	RR
Communication-Film	Greg Smith	UAC
Communication-Journalism	Doug Barthlow	NP
Communication-Speech	Jeffrey Bennett	R
Communication-Theater (BIS)	Frank Miller	R
Computer Information Systems	Geoffrey Hubona	R
Computer Science	Michael Weeks	UAC
Criminal Justice	Brenda Blackwell	R
Economics	Shelby Frost / Inas Rashad	UAC
Early Childhood Education	Caitlin Dooley / Teri Peitso-Holbrook	R
English	Audrey Goodman / Melissa McLeod	R
Finance	Richard Fendler	R
Geol/Geog	Katherine Hankins	RR
History	Jared Poley	R
Hospitality Administration	Debby Cannon	R
International Business	David Bruce / Pedro Carillo	R
Kinesiology and Health	Jacalyn Lund	R
Middle Childhood Education	Gladys Yarborough	NP
MGS- Entrepreneuership	Bill Bogner	NP
MGS- Operations Management	Walter Wallace	R
MGS- Business Analysis	Tom Whalen	NP
MGS- Human Resources	Kay Bunch	R
Marketing	Chip Barksdale	R
Mathematics	Yi Zhao	RR

Department	Ambassador	Assessment Type
MCL -French	Eric Le-Calvez	NP
MCL - German	Robin Huff	R
MCL -Spanish	Rudyard Alcocer	NP
Music	Oliver Greene	UG/R
Nursing	Kathy Plitnick	R
Nutrition	Barbara Hopkins	R
Philosophy	Andrew Cohen	UG/R
Physics and Astronomy	Brian Thoms	NP
Political Science	S. Rashid Naim	NP
Psychology	Chris Henrich	NP
PAUS	Shena Ashley	NP
Real Estate	Karen Gibler	NP
Religious Studies	Tim Renick	NP
Respiratory Therapy	Doug Gardenhire	R
Risk Management	Martin Grace	UAC
Social Work	Deborah Whitley	UG/R
Sociology	Wendy Simonds	NP
Women's Studies	Julie Kubala	UAC

Totals	Rubric-Results Explained (RR)	3
	Rubric-No Explanation (R)	22
	Unknown Assessment Criteria (UAC)	8
	Used Grades combined with Rubric (UG/R)	3
	No Pilots (NP)	16

APPENDIX E: Assignments

This information was taken from the 2008-2009 CTW Annual Reports

CTW Assignments Overview 08-09		
Department	Ambassador	Assignments
Accounting	Jennifer Joe	NC
African American Studies	Jonathan Gayles	CA/AD/AES
Anthropology	Emanuela Guano	NC
Applied Linguistics	Stephanie Lindemann	RA/AD
Art, Education	Melanie Davenport	RA/AES
Art, Studio	Connie Thalken	NC
Art History	Susan Richmond	RA/AD
Biology	Therese Poole / Francisco Cruz	RA/AES
BIS	Charles Jarrett	NC/no report
Chemistry	Doyle Barrow	AD/CA
Communication-Film	Greg Smith	RA/RC
Communication-Journalism	Doug Barthlow	CA
Communication-Speech	Jeffrey Bennett	RA
Communication-Theater (BIS)	Frank Miller	RA/AES
Computer Information Systems	Geoffrey Hubona	RA
Computer Science	Michael Weeks	CA
Criminal Justice	Brenda Blackwell	RA/RC
Economics	Shelby Frost / Inas Rashad	NC
Early Childhood Education	Caitlin Dooley / Teri Peitso-Holbrook	RA/AD
Early Childhood Education B-5	Gary Bingham	RA
English	Audrey Goodman / Melissa McLeod	CA/AD/AES
Finance	Richard Fendler	RA
Geol/Geog	Katherine Hankins	CA
History	Jared Poley	NC
Hospitality Administration	Debby Cannon	RA/AES
International Business	David Bruce / Pedro Carillo	RA
Kinesiology and Health	Jacalyn Lund	CA
Middle Childhood Education	Gladys Yarborough	NC
MGS- Entrepreneurship	Bill Bogner	RA
MGS- Operations Management	Walter Wallace	RA
MGS- Business Analysis	Tom Whalen	CA
MGS- Human Resources	Kay Bunch	CA/NC
Marketing	Chip Barksdale	RA
Mathematics	Yi Zhao	CA/RA

Department	Ambassador	Assignments
MCL -French	Eric Le Calvez	NC
MCL - German	Robin Huff	RA
MCL -Spanish	Rudy Alcocer	NC
Music	Oliver Greene	RA
Nursing	Kathy Plitnick	RA
Nutrition	Barbara Hopkins	RA
Philosophy	Andrew Cohen	NC
Physics and Astronomy	Brian Thoms	CA
Political Science	S. Rashid Naim	CA
Psychology	Chris Henrich	CA
PAUS	Shena Ashley	NC
Real Estate	Karen Gibler	NC
Religious Studies	Tim Renick	CA/NC
Respiratory Therapy	Doug Gardenhire	CA
Risk Management	Martin Grace	NC/RA
Social Work	Deborah Whitley	RA
Sociology	Wendy Simonds	CA/NC
Women's Studies	Julie Kubala	RA

Totals		
	Revise Assignments (RA)	25
	Continue with Assignments as they are (CA)	16
	Assignments and Definition of CT (AD)	6
	Assignments Encourage Students (AES)	6
	Revise Course as result of Assignment(RC)	3
	No Comments on Assignments (NC)	15

APPENDIX F: Achievements

This information was taken from the 2008-2009 CTW Annual Reports

CTW Achievements Overview 08-09		
Department	Ambassador	Achievements
Accounting	Jennifer Joe	NR
African American Studies	Jonathan Gayles	SP
Anthropology	Emanuela Guano	NR
Applied Linguistics	Stephanie Lindemann	SI
Art, Education	Melanie Davenport	SP
Art, Studio	Connie Thalken	NR
Art History	Susan Richmond	SA
Biology	Therese Poole / Francisco Cruz	SI
Birth trough Five	Gary Bingham	SI / SA
BIS	Charles Jarrett	NR
Chemistry	Doyle Barrow	SI
Communication-Film	Greg Smith	NR
Communication-Journalism	Doug Barthlow	FAC
Communication-Speech	Jeffrey Bennett	SF / SP / FAC
Communication-Theater (BIS)	Frank Miller	SA
Computer Information Systems	Geoffrey Hubona	SR
Computer Science	Michael Weeks	NR
Criminal Justice	Brenda Blackwell	SP / FAC
Economics	Shelby Frost / Inas Rashad	SI
Early Childhood Education	Caitlin Dooley / Teri Peitso-Holbrook	SP
English	Audrey Goodman / Melissa McLeod	FAC
Finance	Richard Fendler	SA / SF
Geol/Geog	Katherine Hankins	SAS
History	Jared Poley	FAC
Hospitality Administration	Debby Cannon	NR
International Business	David Bruce / Pedro Carillo	SR / C
Kinesiology and Health	Jacalyn Lund	NR
Middle Childhood Education	Gladys Yarborough	NR
MGS- Entrepreneurship	Bill Bogner	NR
MGS- Operations Management	Walter Wallace	SF
MGS- Business Analysis	Tom Whalen	NR
MGS- Human Resources	Kay Bunch	SA / SI
Marketing	Chip Barksdale	SI
Mathematics	Yi Zhao	SR / R

Department	Ambassador	Achievements
MCL -French	Eric Le Calvez	NR
MCL - German	Robin Huff	SR / FAC
MCL -Spanish	Rudy Alcocer	FAC
Music	Oliver Greene	SI
Nursing	Kathy Plitnick	SP / SR
Nutrition	Barbara Hopkins	SF/ SP / SA / R
Philosophy	Andrew Cohen	SP
Physics and Astronomy	Brian Thoms	NR
Political Science	S. Rashid Naim	NR
Psychology	Chris Henrich	FAC
PAUS	Shena Ashley	NR
Real Estate	Karen Gibler	NR
Religious Studies	Tim Renick	R
Respiratory Therapy	Doug Gardenhire	SA / SI
Risk Management	Martin Grace	NR
Social Work	Deborah Whitley	FAC / SI / C / SR
Sociology	Wendy Simonds	NR
Women's Studies	Julie Kubala	R

Totals	Student Improvements (SI)	10
	Positive Affect on Faculty (FAC)	9
	Successful Pilots (SP)	8
	Successful Assignments (SA)	7
	Successful Revisions (SR)	6
	Successful Rubrics (R)	4
	Student Feedback (SF)	4
	Consultants (C)	2
	Successful Assessment (SAS)	1
	No Report (NR)	18

APPENDIX G: Action Plans

This information was taken from the 2008-2009 CTW Annual Reports

CTW Action Plan Overview 08-09		
Department	Ambassador	Action Plans
Accounting	Jennifer Joe	FT
African American Studies	Jonathan Gayles	RR
Anthropology	Emanuela Guano	NP
Applied Linguistics	Stephanie Lindemann	FT/RR/SC
Art, Education	Melanie Davenport	RR / RA
Art, Studio	Connie Thalken	NP
Art History	Susan Richmond	RR / RD
Biology	Therese Poole / Francisco Cruz	FT/ RAC / CW
Birth trough Five	Gary Bingham	RA
BIS	Charles Jarrett	NP
Chemistry	Doyle Barrow	RA
Communication-Film	Greg Smith	RR / RA
Communication-Journalism	Doug Barthlow	FT / RAC
Communication-Speech	Jeffrey Bennett	RA / FT
Communication-Theater (BIS)	Frank Miller	SC / FT / RR
Computer Information Systems	Geoffrey Hubona	RA / FT
Computer Science	Michael Weeks	NP
Criminal Justice	Brenda Blackwell	RR/ FT / CT / AC
Economics	Shelby Frost / Inas Rashad	FT
Early Childhood Education	Caitlin Dooley / Teri Peitso-Holbrook	RD / FT / CT / RAC
English	Audrey Goodman / Melissa McLeod	CW / FT / RA / RAC
Finance	Richard Fendler	RA / RR
Geol/Geog	Katherine Hankins	FT
History	Jared Poley	FT
Hospitality Administration	Debby Cannon	RA
International Business	David Bruce / Pedro Carillo	RR / FT / SC / CT / OA
Kinesiology and Health	Jacalyn Lund	FT / OA
Middle Childhood Education	Gladys Yarborough	FT
MGS- Entrepreneurship	Bill Bogner	AC / RA
MGS- Operations Management	Walter Wallace	RA / RD / RR
MGS- Business Analysis	Tom Whalen	SC
MGS- Human Resources	Kay Bunch	SC
Marketing	Chip Barksdale	RR / RA
Mathematics	Yi Zhao	RA / SC

Department	Ambassador	Action Plans
MCL -French	Eric Le Calvez	FT
MCL - German	Robin Huff	RR / RA / SC / FT
MCL -Spanish	Rudy Alcocer	RCO
Music	Oliver Greene	RA
Nursing	Kathy Plitnick	RR / RA
Nutrition	Barbara Hopkins	RR / RA / RAC / FT
Philosophy	Andrew Cohen	FT / RAC
Physics and Astronomy	Brian Thoms	FT
Political Science	S. Rashid Naim	FT
Psychology	Chris Henrich	RCO
PAUS	Shena Ashley	FT
Real Estate	Karen Gibler	FT
Religious Studies	Tim Renick	FT / RCO
Respiratory Therapy	Doug Gardenhire	RA / SC / RR
Risk Management	Martin Grace	RA
Social Work	Deborah Whitley	CT / RR / RA /
Sociology	Wendy Simonds	FT
Women's Studies	Julie Kubala	RA / RR / RAC

Totals	Faculty Training (FT)	26
	Revise Assignments (RA)	21
	Revise Rubrics (RR)	17
	Address Student Concerns (SC)	8
	Revise Assessment Criteria (RAC)	7
	Consultant Training (CT)	4
	Revise or Review Course Offerings (RCO)	3
	Revise Critical Thinking Definition (RD)	3
	Create Website (CW)	2
	Add Online Assessment (OA)	2
	Add Course (AC)	2
	No Action Plan (NP)	4