1. BRIEF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF KEY ASSESSMENT/PROGRAMMATIC ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVES:

Strategic planning is conducted by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Associate Director of Faculty Development in consultation with the Center for Faculty Innovation Advisory Committee. Input into planning is derived from a variety of sources: campus-wide surveys assess faculty needs and interests; requests from faculty members, colleges, administrative units, and/or university committees for programming support; satisfaction surveys of those participating in Center for Faculty Innovation programs.

Planning for New Faculty Orientation, Faculty Academy, and workshops is shaped by self-report participant evaluations. For example, evaluations of the Fall 2011 New Faculty Orientation indicated faculty desired more unstructured time dedicated to increasing collegiality and support. Hence, the 2012-13 New Faculty Orientation included longer luncheons without planned presentations and a cocktail hour at the end of the Orientation that allowed faculty to meet informally with one another. In addition, 2011-12 evaluation comments suggested that presentation times were too long, thus they were shortened during the 2012-13 Orientation. Faculty have indicated that they would like to attend more faculty development workshops (median=5). An increased number of opportunities for faculty to share best practices and experiences during the 2012-13 year are being planned.

All programming is developed in accordance with the Center for Faculty Innovation Strategic Plan. The Center for Faculty Innovation Advisory Committee selected six strategic goals to focus on during 2011-12. These goals include to increasing pedagogical competency related to improving students’ critical thinking, strengthen mentoring of faculty, supporting the Common Curriculum revision, Mission and Ministry, and extraordinary faculty.

2. TOP STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES/GOALS (SLO) OR KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPI) ADDRESSED IN THIS ASSESSMENT PLAN (What are the top SLOs that your department is focusing on for the current year? Example: Students will be able to ... upon completion of the program.)

Top Strategic Goals for 2011-12

1. Develop workshops designed to improve the teaching of critical thinking through active learning.
2. Organize and fund training for a team of faculty leaders in designing assignments to improve students’ critical thinking. The team will train other faculty in assignment design and in workshop presentation.
3. Enhance mentoring programs across the university. Build on existing mentoring guidelines to create Mentoring Handbook; create and sustain program of Master Teaching Mentors to supplement one-on-one mentoring of new faculty in departments and colleges.
4. Create and present workshop on designing course criteria and proposals for new and revised Common Curriculum courses.
5. Collaborate with the Office of Mission and Ministry to offer programs on Ignatian pedagogy.
6. Develop a plan to offer greater university-wide support to extraordinary faculty.
3. ASSESSMENT (What measures/tools are you using to assess your top SLOs or KPIs cited above, and what are the corresponding target goals?):

Goal 1: Several workshops were held throughout 2011-12 that focused on improving students’ critical thinking. These included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, September 23</td>
<td>Teaching Critical Thinking through Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 28</td>
<td>Talking about Teaching: Teaching Critical Thinking through Writing with Dr. Mary McCay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 5</td>
<td>Creating Effective Research Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 12</td>
<td>Talking about Teaching: Creating Effective Research Assignments with Malia Willey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, October 21</td>
<td>Teaching Critical Thinking through Active Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 26</td>
<td>Talking about Teaching: Teaching Critical Thinking through Active Learning with Dr. Erin Dupuis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 16</td>
<td>Creating Critical Thinking Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 15</td>
<td>Creating Critical Thinking Assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment of workshops is done by utilizing self-report participant evaluations (see CFI Annual Report for more details). Assessment results are located on the CFI intranet.

Goal 2: In early Spring 2012, a team of 4 faculty members attended the CLA in the Classroom training session. This team returned to campus and designed a workshop to train faculty on how to develop multi-source writing assignments that enhance critical thinking. Two workshops were held in Spring 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 16</td>
<td>Creating Critical Thinking Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 15</td>
<td>Creating Critical Thinking Assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-report participant evaluations were used to assess these workshops (see CFI Annual Report for more details). Assessment results are located on the CFI intranet.

Goal 3: The “Master Teaching Mentors” program encourages early- and mid-career faculty to engage outstanding teaching faculty in one-to-one mentoring began in Spring 2012. A dinner introducing the “Master Teaching Mentors” to early- and mid-career faculty was held in the Spring 2012 semester. There is no assessment instrument for the Master Teaching Mentor program. Given that the program is still being formulated, no assessment instrument can be created yet. Once the program has developed, then an assessment tool will be devised. The Center for Faculty Innovation Advisory Committee recommended that the “Mentoring Guidelines” currently in use continue to be utilized, as opposed to a mentoring handbook. CFI, in conjunction with the Monroe Library, has several books on mentoring available to faculty mentors and faculty mentees. A list of these resources is available on the CFI webpage.

Goal 4: The Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum decided against offering workshops on designing course criteria and learning outcomes in 2011-12.

Goal 5: CFI collaborates with Mission and Ministry by publicizing all events that faculty development programs that are offered. In addition, workshops related to Ignatian pedagogy were offered by the Center.
Workshop assessments use a self-report participant evaluation (see CFI Annual Report for more details). Assessment results are located on the CFI intranet.

Goal 6. During 2011-12, the CFI Advisory Committee requested that member Robert Bell, Director of Writing Across the Curriculum, spearhead an effort to regularize the status of extraordinary faculty at Loyola. He gathered a task force of extraordinary faculty members, created a survey to determine the priorities of this group, and, in conjunction with the task force drafted a proposal to provide more job security and clearer status to extraordinary faculty members. The proposal was presented to theProvost, who referred it to the Faculty Senate. The Senate convened a subcommittee to review the proposal and recommend revisions if needed.

4. ASSESSMENT/DATA LOCATION (Where are the assessments/data located, or is the data being generated?):

The assessments are located on the CFI intranet.

5. EVALUATION METHODS (How are the assessment results evaluated, or what criteria/rubrics are you using to determine progress or success or need for improvement relevant to the SLOs and KPIs cited above?):

The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Associate Director for Faculty Development shared the results of the assessments with the Center for Faculty Innovation Advisory Committee (CFIAC). These dialogues were used to collect feedback, recommendations, and to conduct planning for 2012-2013.

6. SUMMARY OF RESULTS/OUTCOMES (What have you learned from the data, and how have these results informed your enhancement actions?):

Goal 1: Assessment of workshops using self-report participant evaluations related to developing students’ critical thinking skills through a variety of active learning techniques indicate high levels of satisfaction (median scores range from 4 to 5). Each workshop is rated based on a 1-5 scale with 1 indicating “strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “strongly agree” on 5 questions (see CFI Annual Report).

Goal 2: Each workshop is rated based on a 1-5 scale with 1 indicating “strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “strongly agree” on 5 questions (see CFI Annual Report). The median score for each question listed on the evaluation form for the Critical Thinking Assignments workshop ranged from 4-5, indicating faculty satisfaction.

Goal 3: There is no assessment instrument for the Master Teaching Mentor program. Given that the program is still being formulated, no assessment instrument can be created yet. Once the program has developed, then an assessment tool will be devised.

Goal 4: N/A

Goal 5: Evaluation results of the Ignatian pedagogy workshop indicates faculty satisfaction (median scores range from 3 to 5). Each workshop is rated based on a 1-5 scale with 1 indicating “strongly disagree” and 5 indicating “strongly agree” on 5 questions (see CFI Annual Report).

Goal 6: While no formal assessment has been conducted of the extraordinary task force’s
work, the efforts of CFIAC member Robert Bell have pushed extraordinary faculty issues to a prominent position in Faculty Senate deliberations. Success of the effort will be measured by progress made on regularizing the status of these faculty by the end of 2012-13.

7. USE OF RESULTS [Assessment use CODE: 1. Curricular Revision/Enhancement; 2. Course Revision/Enhancement; 3. Pedagogical Enhancement; 4. Program Review Process Revision; 5. Student Goals Revision & Articulation of SLOs; 6. Assessment Criteria Revision; 7. Assessment Methodology Revision; 8. Other (e.g. Website Updates, Intranet Enhancements, & Source document Uploads); A. New Protocol/Process Implementation; B. New Assessment Methodology Implementation; C. New Policy Implementation; D. Budget Adjustment; E. Faculty/Staff Development/Training; F. Student Academic Support/Services Enhancement; G. Strategic Planning Initiative/Reprioritization of Action Plan; H. Other] Please indicate all that apply:

8. Other: Website Updates

A. New Protocol/Process Implementation

D. Budget Adjustment

G. Strategic Planning Initiative/Reprioritization of Action Plan

8. RESOURCES/TIMELINE/APPROVALS (Based upon the modifications/adjustments and program/course changes included in the USE OF RESULTS section identify the timeline (implementation dates), resources, and approvals required to implement programmatic changes.):

A full-time administrative assistant is needed to support the collection, processing, and assessment of data. The 2011-2012 operating budget will be necessary to continue current levels of faculty development support in 2013-2014.