Faculty Senate Archives

Volume XXX

Annual Reports of
Faculty Senate Standing Committees

Accepted at the Meeting of May 8, 2017

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

2016 - 2017 Committee Annual Reports

Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee 2016-2017 Annual Report

Members: Ray Hull (Health Professions), Chris Brooks (LAS Humanities), Carolyn Shaw (LAS Social Sciences), Terrence Decker (Business), Abu Asaduzzaman (Engineering), Paul Rillema (LAS Nat Sciences), Samuel Willis (University Libraries), Kirsten Johnson (Fine Arts), Janice Ewing (Education), Bayram Yildirim   President (Chair, President, Engineering), Peer Moore-Jansen (Past President, LAS Social Sciences), Carolyn Shaw (President-Elect, LAS Social Sciences)
The committee met approximately nine times during Spring 2017 semester. The charge of the committee was to provide feedback to Faculty Senate and President's Budget Advisory Committee on initiatives that could shape the 6% cut planned for 2018 and 2019 fiscal years. Several members of the committee attended President's Budget Advisory Efficiency, Priority and Revenue Sub-Committee open meetings, and reported back to Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee. The summary of discussions at this committee were presented at President's Budget Advisory Committee meetings and Faculty Senate meetings. In addition, major recommendations were shared with President Bardo.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee 2016-2017 Annual Report

Members: Bayram Yildirim (President, Engineering), Carolyn Shaw (President Elect, LAS Social Sciences), Peer Moore-Jansen (Past President, LAS Social Sciences), Jeff Pulaski (Vice President, Fine Arts), Janice Ewing (Secretary, Education), Masud Chand (Business) and Victoria Mosack (Health Professions), George Dehner (LAS Humanities); Ex-Officio: Tony Vizzini (Provost and Senior Vice President)
The committee meets first and third Mondays of each month, 3:30pm-5:00pm, 16 times during 2016-17 academic year. In addition, the committee met for a retreat on 8/17/201712pm-5pm to discuss priorities of Faculty Senate for the 2016-17 academic year. During the bi-weekly meetings, the executive committee set the agendas of 16 Faculty Senate meetings and two General Faculty meetings. The agendas can be found at http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=facultysenate&p=/a1617/.

Court of Academic Appeals Annual Report for 2016 - 2017

Faculty Members: Kirsten S. Johnson, College of Fine Arts Dan Close, College of LAS Ray Hull, College of Health Professions

Student Members: Motahareh (Sara) Bahrami Zanjani, Graduate Representative Hannah Fernandes, SGA Undergraduate Representative

Faculty Alternates: Jeff Hayton, College of LAS Rajiv Bagai, College of Engineering Frank Rokosz, College of Education

Alternate Students Members: Demetrius Sterling, SGA Undergraduate Representative Anna Turosak, Graduate Representative

Meeting Schedules and Committee Activities: The Court meets whenever an appeal case is presented to be heard by Linnea Glenmaye, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 semesters had little activity.

There was one case presented to the committee in late October that the Chair had a confusion on the student's email. I thought I read it correctly from the appeal form, but I was wrong. The email never bounced back as an undeliverable address, so the chair thought the email was reaching the student. The first email notification went out on 10/28/2016, and the last on 11/29/2016. By this time, I was unable to handle convening the court, as I was having double knee-replacement surgery on Dec. 12, 2016. Rajiv Bagai, previous chair of this committee, graciously accepted the responsibility of handling this grievance.

We are going to meet Friday, April 28th to hear an appeal. In the meantime, I have been in contact with Dr. Glenmaye off and on answering questions which arise.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kirsten S. Johnson Associate Professor of Graphic Design School of Art, Design + Creative Industries April 18, 2017

Faculty Affairs Committee   2016- 17

End of the academic year Report

Submitted by Dr. Pina Mozzani, Chair

Fall 2016:

Committee Members: Dr. Pina Mozzani, Carol Bett, Syed Taher, Soon Chun Lee, Atul Rai, Lorraine Madway, Deepak Gupta, Fred Besthorn, Ariel Loftus

Attendance: Because we have an itinerant committee whose members travel frequently and far, attendance at the meetings has been inconsistent. Most of the members are there when not called away for pressing reasons.

September:
Pina Mozzani was appointed to chair the committee.
A Thursday 12:30 time was selected by the committee members.
The committee met weekly

Meeting: The committee met weekly from October 13th throughout the fall because of the charges made to us by the senate. The Faculty Affairs Committee was charged with three tasks during 2016-17 academic year.
1. The first charge required development of a feedback survey for the Provost evaluation -- a priority charge. This project was turned into the Senate between the Fall and Spring semesters.
2. Study the UNISCOPE Model
3. Begin the process to align the Faculty Activity Report with the UNISCOPE model, adopted by the senate, to the faculty activity report. The charge was to provide a draft by Spring Break, 2017.

Task #1:
Our Process:
1. Interviewed Dr. Vizzini to ask if there was specific information that would be important to him before crafting questions.
2. Interviewed an instructor at the Kansas Leadership Center.
3. Interviewed a former WSU Dean
4. Interviewed a former WSU Vice President for Academic Affairs to discover past processes, and to search out questions that would be helpful to WSU and to the Provost
5. Met weekly to work on the project.
6. Researched and read articles the 360 evaluative process
7. Researched and compared similar processes at the following institutions:

University of Kansas
Southeastern Louisiana Stat University
Georgia State University
Western Illinois University
West Liberty University

Spring 2017:

Task #2:

While working on the Faculty Activity Form we were charged with the following charge to take precedence over task #2.

Task #3:

Study pros and cons of Department Head vs. Department Chair, and provide a recommendation to the senate for further discussion. It would be great to have some recommendation by mid-march if possible.

While not possible to complete this task by mid-March, the committee will turn in our work by Friday. April 21. We will be completing the final edit of our document, Thursday, April 20,

2017, at which time will return to the alignment of the Faculty Activity Report Form with the Uniscope Model.

Task #4:
While working on Charges 2 and 3, our committee was charged with another task:

"The LAS T/P committee would like to request that the Faculty Affairs committee review Policy 4.16 – the T/P calendar - and consider whether the mid December deadline for anything further to added to the secondary dossier is reasonable.   The question was raised that if a candidate was given some major award or something that ought to be considered, shouldn't that be added to the file at any point (recognizing that it may be after deliberations have begun)."

This was sent to the senate this last week.

Charge #1 – Completed Fall of 2016. The Senate needs to consider creating a more complete evaluation of the Provost and VP for Academic Affairs. This should be an ongoing process of development.

Charge #2 – Postponed until April due to two more pressing charges, recently assigned.
  It will probably not be complete by the end of this semester.
Charge #3 – Complete and slated to be turned in on April 21 after a final edit.
Charge #4 – Complete – turned in this week.

Pina Mozzani

Faculty Support Committee
Annual Report Academic Year 2016-2017

1. Current Members:
• Rick LeCompte, Chair (Business)
• Rocio DelAguila, (LAS)
• Jeremy Patterson, (Education)
• Betty Campbell-Smith, (Health Professions)
• Gerald Scholl, (Fine Arts)
• Kyoung Lee (LAS)
• Paul Rillema (LAS)
• Meghann Kuhlmann, (Library)
• Gamal Weheba (Engineering)
• Karen Davis, (Research) serves the committee in a non-voting capacity to provide administrative support.

2. Meeting Schedule: The committee meets four to five times during the academic year depending on application due dates and committee availability.

3. Committee Activities: The committee oversees a fiscal year budget of approximately $120,000 to be used to fund three internal grant programs the University Research/Creative Award (URCA), the Multi-disciplinary Research Projects Award (MURPA), and the Research/Creative Award (ARC). During FY17, the committee recommended funding 26 of these awards for a total of $113,989. The committee also reviews applications made to the Flossie E. West Foundation. And, the committee is responsible for selecting award winners from nominations submitted for the following Excellence Awards: Excellence for Creative Activity Award, Excellence Award for Community Research, Excellence in Research Award, Faculty Risk Taker, Young Faculty Risk Taker, and the Young Faculty Scholar. The committee was notified that the Flossie E. West award was moved to Kansas State University, and the remaining balance of $499.59 was awarded. All recommendations for funding are made to the Vice President of Research and Technology Transfer. Committee members are also charged with reviewing applications for sabbatical leave and making recommendations to the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Overall in FY17, 36 grant applications, 28 nominations for faculty awards and 10 applications for sabbatical leave were reviewed and voted on by the committee.

4. Pending Issues: All awards for Fiscal Year 2017 have been made. The committee will meet again one more time before the end of the academic year to review and make recommendations to the Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer for the first round of FY18 URCA proposals. No additional items are pending.

5. Recommendations: None

Library Committee

First Meeting - Wednesday, September 21, 2016

Present: Chase Billingham, Kathy Downes, Robert Feleppa, Keith Gray, David Hunsicker, Cathy Moore-Jansen, Tiruvadi Ravigururajan, Carolyn Shaw, Elaine Steinke, Semih Tartaroglu

Absent: Donna Sayman, Huzefa Kagdi

1. University Libraries Updates – Dean Kathy Downes
a. Dean Downes reported that University Libraries is currently searching for two positions, the Coordinator of Library Instructional Services and the Dean of University Libraries.
i. Interviews are being conducted now for the coordinator position with an anticipated start date late this semester.
ii. Provost Vizzini has delayed the Dean's search for budgetary reasons. The priority review date is October 3 with an anticipated start date of August 6, 2017.
b. Dean Downes reviewed selected information from recent presentations she gave to the Foundation and the Strategic Planning Review for FY2016. Highlighted information includes:

Second Meeting - October 26, 2016
Invited: Chase Billingham, Kathy Downes, Robert Feleppa, Keith Gray, David Hunsicker, Cathy Moore-Jansen, Tiruvadi Ravigururajan, Elaine Steinke, Semih Tartaroglu, Huzefa Kagdi, Carleigh Camacho.
1.) Update on Dean's search: Dean Kathy Downes
2.) General update on activities: Dean Kathy Downes
3.) Questions & Answers
Third Meeting April 27, 2017

Robert Feleppa	Accepted
Donna Sayman	Accepted
David Hunsicker	Declined
Chase Billingham	Declined
Semih Tartaroglu	No response
Elaine Steinke	Accepted
Huzefa Kagdi	Accepted
Keith Gray	No response
Carleigh Camacho	Accepted
Michelle Adler	Accepted
Kelly St. Pierre	Declined

1. Update on Dean's search: Dean Kathy Downes
2. General update on activities: Dean Kathy Downes
3.) Need for a Committee chair for 2017-2018

Rules

Annual Report for 2016-17

Committee members: Carolyn Shaw- Chair; Masud Chand, Mary Walker, Hyuck Kwon, Chris Brooks, Hussein Hamdeh, Danny Bergman, Julie Bees, Kathy Strattman, Jeff Pulaski

Committee meeting dates: Friday mornings, once a month on average.

Committee activities:

• Filled existing vacancies for 2016-17 standing senate committees
• Reviewed representation options for teaching faculty and proposed expansion of Senate membership.
• Reviewed policies related to the grievance pool.
• Reviewed proposed revisions to Policy Manual on Chapters 4 and 5 regarding faculty. This work will continue into 2017-18.
• Filled vacancies for expiring terms on standing senate committees (2017-18)

For Senate Action:
• Nothing pending

University Admissions and Exceptions Committee (UAEC) 2016-2017 Annual Report

Members: Amy Chesser (Health Professions); Katherine Cramer (Education); Rachel Crane (Chair; University Libraries); Deepak Gupta (Engineering); Kirsten Johnson (Fine Arts); John Perry (Business); Brigitte Roussel (LAS Humanities); Mark Walsh (LAS Math/Natural Sciences); (LAS Social Sciences)

We hope to fill the vacancy for a representative from the LAS Social Sciences. The student representative is Jason McCarty.
The committee meets approximately 14 times per year, including summer months. Meetings were held on the following dates: August 10, August 11, September 15, October 20, November 17, and December 15 of 2016 – January 11, January 12, February 16, March 16, of 2017. Upcoming meetings are scheduled for April 20, May 11, June 15 and July 20. A new chair will be elected at the April meeting.
In the last academic year, in addition to the continual review of student petitions, the committee reviewed pre-approval criteria for each college. Petitions meeting stipulated criteria are automatically pre-approved and in most cases, then provided with designated restrictions. Petitions granted pre-approval status are those having commonly recurring circumstances that would be routinely approved. Pre-Approved cases appear on the agenda but are not heard by the committee. The committee determined that no changes were deemed necessary.
Meeting agendas are comprise of petitions ruled on by the college-level admissions and exceptions advisory committees, including rulings on readmissions, late adds, late drops, withdrawal requests and other exceptions to established rules. As cases of exceptions for admission to the University are now considered solely through the Office of Admissions, we would like the Senate to consider a revision to the committee's charge, particularly item number 2: "Consider applications for admission of students who do not meet

University standards for admissions, and exceptions to existing rules for students requesting them." The committee would then like to complete the revision of its respective handbook to reflect these changes. The committee expects to continue to review policies and procedures regarding exceptions to existing University rules.

Respectfully Submitted,
Rachel Crane, Chair
April 14, 2017

WSU Faculty Senate
Undergraduate Research Committee: 2016-2017 Final Report

1. Undergraduate Research Committee: 2016-2017 Membership

Name College Term ends
Anthony May Business 2017
William Flynn Fine Arts 2017
Trisha Self Health Professions 2017
Susan Sterrett LAS - Humanities 2017
Dinorah Azpura LAS - Social Sciences 2018
John Hammond - chair LAS – Natural and Applied Sciences 2018
Aaron Bowen University Libraries 2018
Shuang Gu Engineering 2019
Janice Ewing Education 2019
Kimberly Engber Dean, Honors College N/A
Sandra Carlo Student Member N/A

2. Undergraduate Research Committee: 2016-2017 Charge

The 2016-2017 charge of the Undergraduate Research (UR) Committee was to organize, administer, and review the 17th Annual Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity Forum (URCAF) that took place on Tuesday, April 4, 2017, at the Rhatigan Student Center. The UR Committee was assisted greatly in its URCAF charge by Sheri Light, Conference Coordinator, Office for Workforce, Professional and Community Education. Her contribution was essential to the overall success of this year's URCAF.

3. WSU Student Participation in the 2017 URCAF

The UR Committee focused its attention during the early Spring 2017 academic semester on URCAF submission recruitment across the University's Colleges. We had a total of 37 undergraduate students presenting this year. The College- and category-specific submissions are presented in the following table:

WSU Senate division	Oral Presentations			Poster Sessions		
	NS & Ea	SS & Hb	CA & Pc	NS & Ea	SS & Hb	APd
College of Business	0	0	0	0	0	0
College of Education	0	1	0	0	3	1
College of Engineering	4	0	0	7	0	0
College of Fine Arts	0	0	0	0	0	0
College of Health Professions	0	0	0	2	0	1
Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	2	6	1	7	2	0
Total Across Colleges	6	7	1	16	5	2

aNS & E=Natural Sciences and Engineering. bSS & H=Social Sciences and Humanities.   cCA & P=Creative Activity and Performances. dApplied Learning

4. 2017 URCAF Highlights

a. Multiple observers (judges and non-judging faculty and staff) positively commented about the overall level of quality in this year's presentations. Whereas the winners in the six URCAF competition categories demonstrated exemplary work, all of the undergraduate students displayed impressive expertise in their respective research areas, and professionalism in their presentations. (A list of the 2017 URCAF winners can be found at http://www.wichita.edu/urcaf.)

b. The committee received especially positive feedback from several observers for hosting the event at the Rhatigan Student Center rather than the venue used in prior years (Eugene Hughes Metropolitan Complex). The committee is hopeful that the new venue will lead to increased numbers of presenters and observers in future years.

c. Undergraduate presenters were provided specific feedback from a minimum of three judges in the month following their presentations.

5. Recommendations for the 2018 URCAF

a. Increase the number of undergraduate student presenters across WSU, particularly in the Fine Arts and Health Professions colleges. Action Plan: The UR Committee, working in conjunction with the Honors College, will begin the recruitment of undergraduate student researchers early in the Fall 2017 semester.

b. Increase the number of presenters in the Applied Learning category. Action Plan: The UR Committee, working in conjunction with the Honors College, will begin the recruitment of undergraduate student researchers early in the Fall 2017 semester.

c. Reduce the UR Committee's annual requirement to self-fund the URCAF. Action Plan: The UR Committee will express to the Faculty Senate the importance of a dedicated University-level budget line to support the annual URCAF, particularly given the importance of undergraduate research at WSU.

University Tenure and Promotion Committee   2016-17

Report on Review of Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and Other Issues

The University Tenure and Promotion Committee met on February 23, 2017 to review college tenure and promotion guidelines and to discuss issues that arose during tenure and promotion deliberations. Members present were Ed Baker, Timothy Craft, Rachel Crane, Doug Parham, Jean Patterson, Carolyn Shaw, and Charles Yang. The committee reviewed and discussed documents from the College of Education and the status of the College of Engineering policies.

College of Education:
The committee reviewed the College of Education's tenure and promotion policy, which has been significantly revised to align with the UniScope model. The committee did not have any major recommendations.

College of Engineering:
The College of Engineering has drafted a new policy, but the faculty has not yet voted on it.

An Engineering faculty member did independently raise a concern regarding the summary statements written by committee chairs, per WSU policy "When the committee's discussion of a candidate is complete, the committee chair will summarize in writing the committee's evaluation of the candidate" from http://webs.wichita.edu/inaudit/ch4_18.htm. The concern related to the committee chair downplaying opposing views in the summary statement they write.

The University T & P committee felt this issue should be addressed internally at the college and department levels. The Committee did, however, agree that the normative practice is to ensure the department committee reach consensus on the letter. There was also agreement that if the vote is not unanimous, it would be helpful to have a brief explanation (without going into too much detail or weighing a minority vote too heavily).

Other issues:
1) The new Positive Risk Taking section of the FAR. The Committee discussed this new addition to the FAR, which was added late in the evaluation year, did not come from any faculty committee but from Academic Affairs, and with no guidance for how to fill it out or what to include. The Committee had the following recommendations:
1. Clarify the confusion over the addition of this section to the FAR.
2. The language of positive risk taking does not acknowledge that taking risk often leads to failure before success. It would be helpful to ensure faculty understands that failure in risk taking attempts are acceptable.
3. Involve faculty in further development and/or changes to the FAR.

2) The Committee discussed at length the current policy on separate votes for Tenure and Promotion. This issue frequently comes up, as there is often at least one case in which the vote for Tenure and the vote for Promotion are split. It has been the practice in recent years to view these as a single process as directed by the Provost. That is, if a faculty member is tenurable, then she or he is promotable. This year, the committee was asked to vote only on Tenure in two cases where the faculty had appealed a negative vote and were instructed not to vote on Promotion, which the Committee felt put us in an awkward position. Therefore, the Committee made the following suggestion:
1. Faculty Senate discuss the T & P policy of separate votes for Tenure and Promotion. as well as whether the allowed one appeal is to both Tenure and Promotion votes or only one of these two. Why have a policy if the Provost supersedes the policy? Is there a benefit to the candidate to have those votes separate? Is there an argument for keeping those votes separate?

Wichita State University | 1845 Fairmount St. Wichita, Kansas 67260 | (316) 978-3456

Select Language ▼

The General Education Committee Review of Student Learning Outcomes, AY 2016-2017

Process:
- In the fall semester, the General Education Committee gathers and assesses the data that has accumulated since the last review (i.e., learning outcomes, changes) and writes a report to the Faculty Senate.
- In the spring semester, the report with any recommendations for change is presented to the senate so that the senate has the time for thorough consideration prior to taking the recommendations to the general faculty later in the semester.
- Any changes approved by the faculty (e.g., to the general education program) will be instituted in the following version of the undergraduate catalog

Activities:
- Activities for AY, the Committee:
  - Reviewed the outcomes of the new first-year seminar (FYS) courses offered fall 2016 and considered approval to advance fall 2016 first-year seminar outcomes to the Senate and request a second year of pilot courses to be offered/developed for fall 2017/spring 2018.
    - The outcomes/request were reviewed/approved on February 13, 2017; forwarded to the Faculty Senate (page 2). Library report reviewed April 24, 2017.
    - Faculty Senate approved proposal on February 27, 2017.
  - Evaluated writing rubric assessment of the first-year seminar courses (page 25).
  - Reviewed student learning performance dashboard data for overall student learning outcomes (page 26).
- Summary of information/data reviewed:
  - FYS data
    - Need another year of data before making a requirement for all entering freshmen.
  - Writing rubric assessment project
    - Sample size: 122
    - Results: Pre and Post test scores on the composite Writing Rubric and each of the individual sub scores showed statistically higher post-test scores relative to pre-test values but the magnitude of differences between pre and post scores were very small.
  - Student Learning Performance dashboard for overall student learning outcomes.
    - In terms of direct measurements for student learning, students were performing "near" expectations on the CLA (n= 100 seniors) and "at" expectations on the English 101 writing performance (n=815) and public speaking (n=459) assessment. Likewise, indirect measures indicate continued success in student perception in their critical thinking abilities, oral/written competency, and teamwork competency. Students continue to perceive their chosen degree will be useful to them in their career and 79.8% of them are employed within 6 months of graduation.
    - NSSE outcomes were higher than previous years, but not statistically different.

Recommendations for next academic year:
- Evaluate student performance in (SP 17) first-year seminar courses for Faculty Senate reconsideration (FL 17).
- No other changes to the general education program are recommended.

4.24.17

First Year Seminars (FYS) Update

Background
The proposal to create a required FYS for all incoming freshmen at WSU, originated in the General Education committee in 2014-15, based on the premise that such an offering would promote retention and student success. The idea was a modification to the WSU 101 courses which had not been as well received as had been hoped. The new proposal was to offer courses with specific disciplinary (or interdisciplinary) content combined with student success content. The proposal was presented to the Faculty Senate in November 2015, and was accepted as a *pilot project* in December 2015, to be implemented in the Fall of 2016.

Faculty were recruited and curricula were approved by the Gen Ed committee in Spring 2016, and 11 courses were offered this past Fall.   Although the Senate only approved courses for the Fall semester, several instructors were asked to offer their courses a second time in the Spring 2017 semester in order to gather more data to present to the Faculty Senate for a final decision regarding FYS in the Fall 2017. In the meantime, the Senate would like a preliminary report on the Fall 2016 courses.

Assessments
A qualtrics survey was created and administered voluntarily by most of the FYS faculty (results are attached). Faculty also submitted two writing samples from their classes to be evaluated by an external (contracted) reviewer based on the AACU Writing rubric (results also attached). The survey questions were designed to capture some of the outcomes specified in the original proposal, specifically:
> "Upon completion of a first-year seminar, a student will have been exposed to the following learning outcomes, varying by discipline:
> • Acquired knowledge in the arts, humanities, and/or natural and social science
> • Effectively write and speak
> • Developed fundamentals of information literacy and library research
> • Developed an appreciation for diversity"

The survey had quantitative measures as well as open ended questions, which provided some insights into student perspectives on their FYS experiences.

There were three questions that mirrored questions asked in surveys administered in 2013, 2014 and 2015 for the WSU 101 courses. These results are provided as a comparison.

Results
The survey results seem largely positive. Some of the measures, as well as the written comments, reveal very diverse experiences for students in different classes, so the aggregate data captures the middle ground. There does not appear to be any alarming or particularly disappointing outcomes.

<u>Reflections</u>
Framework / Goals
Some instructors felt that the framework for the FYS was so loose that it was hard to decide what elements of the course design were essential and which were optional. The freedom was nice in a way, but frustrating in others. We could invite outside speakers to the class to address budgeting, info literacy, schedule building, etc, or not. We could incorporate service learning, or not. We could include the common read, or not. We could require extracurricular activities for community building, or not. Given this openness, it would have been helpful to have more concrete goals for the FYS program as a whole.

Although there were learning outcomes in the proposal, it did not actually contain specific goals for what the FYS were designed to accomplish. Faculty tend to build writing, speaking, problem solving, critical thinking skills, etc. in all of our classes, so how is FYS supposed to be unique? It seems like the pieces that need to be more explicit are the community building piece and student success piece. Community can be built through a variety of different approaches that fit different faculty members' styles, but if community building is a specific desired outcome, that should be stated upfront so faculty can design courses with this goal in mind. Some of this is articulated in the "Rationale" of the original proposal, but it is not explicit.

Developing Some Tips / Strategic Considerations
While it is important for faculty to have the freedom to develop their FYS courses, those who taught an FYS this past semester wanted to share some of their own tips with those developing new courses (some of these are found below). Many of us found these courses were more challenging that we expected in a variety of ways, including the diverse interests of the class (made up of non majors with only rudimentary knowledge of topics), the effort to build in peer-peer and faculty-peer relationships, and an entire class that is on the campus for the first time (learning basic appropriate behaviors in college courses).

Student Success Coaches
The freshmen seemed to have a positive perspective on their interactions with their student success coaches, but some faculty felt that perhaps these students created a barrier to the freshmen connecting with and coming to faculty for assistance. It is hard to tell if this is always a trade off, or where the value comes down in terms of connecting with senior peers or with faculty members to provide mentoring, or whether this task can be shared effectively.

Looking Forward

The FYS pilot project is an initiative of the Gen Ed committee and has been given Senate support. If the committee believes this FYS project is worth pursuing, the following steps make sense:

- **February 2017: <u>Report Fall 2016 results to the Senate and request a second year of pilot courses to be developed</u>**. This will allow faculty to modify/improve their courses, and allow additional faculty to experiment with developing FYS courses. This will include a call for and review of new curricular proposals in Spring 2017 to be taught in the 2017-18 academic year (presumably in preparation for meeting the demands for a *required* FYS in AY 2018-19).

- **<u>Fall 2017:</u> <u>Present full data from 2016-17 to Senate and make recommendation regarding whether FYS should become a permanent part of the curriculum or not starting in 2018-19</u>**. (Approval in the Fall 2017 would allow all departments that want to offer FYS courses to be able to complete Fall 2018 schedule building by the Jan/Feb 2018 deadline.)

- **Spring 2017:** Provide more clearly stated goals for the FYS so those developing new courses can have more guidance as they consider their course designs. Suggestion:

  Goal for FYS: Promote student success academically, professionally, and socially.
  1. Build students' academic skills and confidence using disciplinary or inter-disciplinary content. [Outcomes focused on writing, speaking, critical thinking, problem solving, information literacy]
  2. Connect students to resources on campus to advance their professional/life goals [Content can include: financial literacy, advising/schedule building, career services, learning styles]
  3. Connect students to groups/events/others on campus [Content can include extracurricular activities (group or indiv), peer-peer in-class activities, service learning, etc.]

Tips / Strategic Considerations
[Some of these are obviously good practices for all classes, but the impact is high when carrying out these strategies for a class full of first semester freshman.]

- *Explain the learning value of each activity*. Take a few minutes to regularly communicate to the class *why* the course includes the modules that it does: student success components, extracurricular components, service learning, etc.   It can be obvious to us (who designed the course) why these elements are included and how they advance the FYS goals, but it may be less obvious to the students. A few quick sentences when introducing a class visitor from OSMM or the Career Center regarding the goal of helping students succeed outside the classroom and beyond college is likely all that is needed.

- *Explain concepts and norms that we might assume that they already know*. Its ok for those who know to get a reminder, but it might be the first time a student hears about key concepts or norms as a college student. [Ex: if you skip class, your professor is likely to assume it is a deliberate choice, not that you were sick. Communicate with your professor.]

- *Work collaboratively with the student Success Coaches*. They are in the course to build connections with the students. They can help serve as a liaison between the faculty member and students. They provide insights for faculty into what students might be struggling with or thinking about with regard to the content and structure of the course. They can serve as an additional voice to drive home the key points the faculty member wants to convey (additional 'words of wisdom', and from a peer sometimes have more impact). Keep the success coach in the loop and find ways they can enhance the students' experiences in the course.

- *Carefully consider the level of knowledge the students might bring to the class.* If your course is designed to appeal broadly, you may not have any majors in the course, and in fact might be teaching to students from multiple colleges. This requires a different approach than courses that are designed to draw in students from more specific majors.

- *Have them create some evaluation materials like a quiz and use it*. It may help them read the materials in a different way.

- *Do several activities so the students team up or mingle*. Building community contributes to the goal of retaining these students at WSU.

- *Work on peer-review activities*. This can provide opportunities for mentoring and well as learning from each other.

- *Encourage discussion outside the class* (Blackboard forum, Facebook group, etc.)

- *Encourage them to get out of their comfort zone as a learning tool* and give them support in doing this. This might take many forms (role playing, giving a speech, interviewing someone on/off campus, discussing controvertial topics, attending talks or performances, etc.).

- *Take them to places like the library or a talk.*

- *Invite a guest to talk about x topic.*

- *Have some kind of personal meeting(s) with them.* They have met with advisors, but likely have not had any personal meetings with a faculty member on campus. Help them recognize that faculty members are people who want to see them succeed.

- *Send reminders a couple days before each deadline*, and encourage them to learn how to keep calendars and take responsibility for their assignments because not all faculty will provide reminders.

- *Put everything on Blackboard* for easy and timely location. Explain the format you want for each assignment and put it on Blackboard.

- *Give them all the good feedback you can.* You are helping them transition effectively to the college environment and they need to know what they expectations are and how they can improve their work.

- *Submit mid semester evaluations and use SEAS* (Student Early Alert System). They need to be told explicitly if they are performing well or if adjustments are needed to achieve the grade they want in the class.

SKILLS BUILDING

My First Year Seminar Course help me:

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	SD/Disagree	Agree/SA	N =
Develop my information literacy skills (library / research)	7.50%	7.50%	18.33%	45.00%	21.67%	**15%**	**66%**	120
Develop my writing skills	8.33%	8.33%	21.67%	40.00%	21.67%	**16%**	**61%**	120
Develop my public speaking skills	6.61%	9.09%	23.97%	39.67%	20.66%	**15%**	**60%**	121
Develop my notetaking skills	16.67%	24.17%	31.67%	18.33%	9.17%	**40%**	**27%**	120
Develop my time management skills	11.86%	12.71%	24.58%	33.90%	16.95%	**24%**	**50%**	118
Develop a greater respect for global diversity	7.50%	5.83%	13.33%	25.00%	48.33%	**13%**	**73%**	120

STUDENT SUCCESS CONTENT

I found it helpful to include lessons about:

Question	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	SD/Disagree	Agree/SA	N =
Learning styles (visual, audio, kinetic, etc)	6.14%	7.89%	21.05%	26.32%	38.60%	**14%**	**64%**	114
Schedule planning	5.98%	4.27%	17.95%	37.61%	34.19%	**10%**	**71%**	117
Career development	6.19%	10.62%	28.32%	29.20%	25.66%	**16%**	**54%**	113
Financial literacy (budgeting)	7.07%	11.11%	30.30%	24.24%	27.27%	**18%**	**51%**	99

COMMUNITY BUILDING

By being enrolled in this class:

Question	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	**SD/Disagree**	**Agree/SA**	N =
I feel more connected with my freshmen peers.	4.96%	10.74%	16.53%	38.02%	29.75%	**15%**	**67%**	121
I feel more connected with the faculty on campus.	4.92%	9.02%	27.05%	36.07%	22.95%	**13%**	**59%**	122
I am more aware of different engagement opportunities on campus.	5.04%	3.36%	15.13%	35.29%	41.18%	**8%**	**76%**	119

STUDENT SUCCESS COACH

The Student Success Coach in our class:

Question	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	**SD/Disagree**	**Agree/SA**	N =
Helped me connect with others on campus	7.63%	5.08%	21.19%	27.12%	38.98%	**12%**	**66%**	118
Helped me find support resources on campus	5.08%	4.24%	15.25%	30.51%	44.92%	**9%**	**75%**	118
Helped me understand the course content	5.93%	10.17%	18.64%	27.97%	37.29%	**16%**	**65%**	118

SERVICE LEARNING

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	**SD/Disagree**	**Agree/SA**	N =
My service learning experience complemented the course content	5.00%	5.00%	20.00%	35.00%	35.00%	**10%**	**70%**	40
My service learning experience added value to the course	10.00%	2.50%	12.50%	47.50%	27.50%	**12%**	**75%**	40

OVERALL SATISFACTION

How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the course?

0= unsatisfied; 10 = very satisfied	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation
Individual course scores for 9 courses:	5	10	7.78	1.55
	0	10	6.71	3.06
	1	9	5.6	3.38
	2	10	6.73	2.47
	1	10	7.8	2.52
	0	9	4.76	3.15
	3	10	8.79	1.86
	4	10	8.33	2.13
	0	9	2.67	2.75
AVERAGE			**6.57**	

Would you recommend a first-year seminar to other first year students?

Answer Fall 2013	%	N =
yes	59%	97
no	41%	69
Total	100%	166

Answer Fall 2015	%	N =
yes	85%	63
no	15%	11
Total	100%	74

Answer Fall 2014	%	N =
yes	79%	77
no	21%	21
Total	100%	98

Answer Fall 2016	%	N =
yes	73.28%	85
no	26.72%	31
Total	100%	116

Overall, do you think this course contributed to your *personal success* at WSU? If yes, how? [2016]

Answer	%	N =
Yes	60.53%	69
No	39.47%	45
Total	100%	114

How would you rate how this course helped in your *personal* success? [2013, 2014, 2015]
2013: 3.24 out of 5.
2014: 4.06 out of 5.
2015: 3.92 out of 5.

Overall, do you think this course contributed to your *academic success* at WSU? If yes, how? [2016]

Answer	%	N =
Yes	54.46%	61
No	45.54%	51

How would you rate how this course helped in your academic success? [2013, 2014, 2015]

2013: 3.16 out of 5.

2014: 3.91 out of 5.

2015: 3.86 out of 5.

Comments about Skill Building:

Dr. ___ did a really good job at making sure he had projects that encompassed all of these, throughout the semester I had to present, sing, write a paper, make a presentation, and really took my own grade in my own hands
Using FYS to develop "respect for diversity" is gives a lot of reason for students to not like it. Mandating a way of thinking isn't freedom and is not what a campus should be setting as a goal for a freshman seminar. Dr. Wine did a very good job of respecting opinions though.
I was pushed out of my comfort zone in a beneficial way.
It has got way better.
very useful
the professors were really good at helping develop these skills but keeping it in a casual form
Team work and group projects was a big role in this class.
I don't feel as though I developed any new skills or strengthened any skills I already possessed.
None
Definitely helps with diversity
The papers required for class allowed me to strengthen my writing skills, but we did not take many notes.
The professor was fantastic at providing feedback on our essays. However, notetaking and traditional public speaking did not really apply to the subject matter of the course.
Many of the class activities were focused on developing respect for national/global diversity.
good
We were put on the spot for talking alot, and were judged harshly on writing
My teacher expected all of her students to have English and Public Speaking background before coming to her class. She was very unorganized and never had a complete syllabus. The content of the class was good and when it came to writing papers and making presentation she was never clear on what we need to do. We never used the book and got the book half way through the semester. I learned nothing that i didn't already know.

While i had high hopes for this class i was strongly dissapointed in the disorganization that my teacher held. Even the final week of the class she was telling few people about the remain assignments that needed to be completed before the course ended, but never made sure to tell everyone. I felt that it was always a guessing game of what was due the next class time. The syllabus never matched the plans of the class and it felt very scattered. While she graded hard on papers she didnt really give much feedback as to what could be improved for future writing, or work on some general concepts she saw people struggling with. We never covered notetaking skills or time management during the time in the course.

I did not see much skill building but rather learning about skill building rather than actually building.

We were encouraged to use APA instead of MLA, but they didn't really teach us how. It was sort of addressed, but not really. And the class had a schedule, but they didn't really help me in my own time management skills--I was left floundering. And they didn't really address national/global diversity

Comments about STUDENT SUCCESS CONTENT:

I mean, kind of unnecessary.

Lots of guest speakers that helped with nothing.

The only thing what we learned was about financial literacy. This is because she had a guest speaker come in and talk about it. Then we just wrote a thank you note and that was it. No more further discussions.

While we spent a lot of time talking about learning styles, we hardly covered any of the other topics listed above, excepting having a speaker come in to give a brief 30 minute talk.

Learning styles was interesting to learn about at the beginning. It was also nice to have them go over different engineering majors/careers, and it helped me narrow down the engineering majors I might decide on.

What suggestions do you have for greater community building opportunities for a first-year seminar in the future?

I felt really left out in the freshman seminar class because i was one of the only girls who didn't rush for greek life, but the relationship I built with the facility I had to talk to will benefit me more in the long run
Seminars should be able to meet up with other groups more often.
More in class group activities.
Better quality with homework.
I think the professor did a good job of of getting us to work together to build a stronger sense of community.
More organized
Do a community service event as a whole class.
It would be interesting to do more hands-on activities in the community.
Help more with scholarship applications
It might be more helpful to do a community project as a group, to get some of our hours done and to bond better with our peers.
go to more events as a class
I have heard of some colleges having class bonding activities for their freshman seminars/orientation classes. These activities include service projects or even camping trips. I think it would have been fun to do something like that with the class in order to connect with each other better.
Stop having them
Have the class participate at an event that offers community building opportunities.
Maybe make them optional. I had many other classes that I needed to take to fulfill course credit. Although this course was interesting, it didn't really create any skill development.
She never let us know about anything going on around campus. She did for the first few weeks of the semester then that came to an endd end.
Make sure the goals for the class are laid out properly.

have time to get to know people in the class because maybe someone in the class doesn't know anyone on campus and has to do the required material alone.

You could have different first-year seminar classes meet with each other and have them share what they have learned/are learning.

Do not allow intro to Tech and Innovation as a seminar.

Well it would have been helpful to actually form an engineering team with like-minded freshmen, not lazy, 21+-year-olds who skip classes and meetings. Maybe if we worked on small projects withint the same class, instead of across classes, then I would have felt deeper connections, because then we mix/mingle with our peers who we see every other day of the week, and are exposed to more people than just our single team.

Build more cool stuff, cross course sections less

Comments on the Student Success Coach:

I loved Samantha so much. She really took her time to prepare things that we need and if she didn't think we needed to know it we kind of blew past it and it was very helpful my first semester here

Very nice and helpful, definitely helped me in many situations on campus I probably would have been lost in alone.

I loved my student success coach!

He was very nice, he helped me find additional tools on the mywsu homepage.

My success coach left half way through the semester so they were really kind of pointless in the grand scheme of things.

She has definitely helped me find my way around campus as well as understanding the course

He was great!

He was very nice and I enjoyed him a lot. The course itself wasn't very structured so he couldn't help us with it because the course was just all over the place.

He was flexible when it came to meeting times.

he was very knowledgeable and helpful.

I did not interact with my Student Success coach a lot, simply because I did not have many questions. She was always willing to help when I did.

She met with us periodically to check in with us and offer to help us if we needed it.

she's cool

Very stuck up. didnt really care for them

We didn't really discuss the course content much, but I also didn't really need that, at least what he could tell me.

They were able to accommodate my schedule when we needed to meet which was incredibly helpful.

How did this course contribute to your *personal success* at WSU?

I got to know a lot of my class mates really well & my teacher helped me get out of my comfort zone
I think it contributed to my personal success at WSU by giving me an opportunity to explore an area that I never would have expected to.
I know more of the school, the class had a more open feel than some of my other classes and I feel like I've made good connections to other students and faculty and I now have an appreciation for the fine arts at Wichita State
The course exposed me to opportunities on campus and music appreciation.
Made me think in different, more challenging ways than before.
It helped me build relationships with other people on campus. Having friends from Wichita State is crucial for morale.
It helped me get a real grasp of life on campus, and of the workings of a university and how i can work with it
I loved having this seminar. I felt like it was an extended orientation. It's nice to still feel like I have help right here on campus even though my parents live four hours away. I loved having the resources I needed and knowing I could ask my professor or success coach about anything I was having trouble with.
I will need to know this material being a teacher
GET OUT OF MY COMFORT ZONE
Helped me build relationships with other freshman students and made me feel more comfortable at WSU
Connected me to fellow freshmen
Public speaking
It helped me to become aware of the different fine arts events that are held around campus, and to appreciate music to a greater degree.
The teachers gave us tips about confidence and other skills for the future.
Since I was required to be in band I got to meet new people.
Having a small class of other freshman that I was able to get to know and go through the same experiences with over the course of a semester has been very valuable.
The teachers gave us tips about confidence and other skills for the future.

Since I was required to be in band I got to meet new people.
Having a small class of other freshman that I was able to get to know and go through the same experiences with over the course of a semester has been very valuable.
It gave me good resources.
It helped me improve skills that will be necessary later in my college career
If I had not taken this course, I may not have voted. I definitely would not have learned so much about the candidates.
I learned many things about campus life, as well as how to communicate with others on campus who share differing opinions than my own.
Welcoming atmosphere with a broad range of topics was positive for me.
College skills and education on the election
We were taught where to find resources, how to plan effectively, and more.
I learned how to write better.
This class was a good transition class into college. It focused more on how to succeed rather than content based. Knowledge gained from this class will help me in the future.
I got to know my peers better.
I feel as if my FYS class led me to be more confident academically.
Helped me to gain more information about how our Government works.
Really helped me get the hang of college as a first year student.
because it makes you get out and do things on campus
I feel more knowledeable in this topic
Many of the activities we did were very thought provoking, and helped me formulate opinions on important matters in society.
It helped me time manage down to the minute. It helped me better understand diversity and what it actually means. It made me more reflective of my own life and gain insight to who I am.
I learned so much about the different cultures here at WSU and developed my writing and speaking skills.
I learned more about other cultures.
Learning diversity of the campus

Allowed me to not be shy around peers like I used to be. I still am a little shy though. I need to better myself with public speaking as well.

Helped me find resources on campus to help with my success

I helped me understand the diversity on campus and to get to know people!

showed me opportunites

By getting to known the facility on campus

Helped me learn about others and how people look at me.

It helped me to understand race and diversity more.

I feel like I was with other people who were like me and we all connected as we learned about a serious topic that could help us in the future.

Helped me view race and ethnicity in a whole new light even as a minority.

Dr. Rife contributed and helped me see the world in a different way.

It taught us that everybody has something to prove and not give up

help me learn about different cultures

It helped me get involved

Broadened my horizons and made me more open minded. Allowed me to see things in a different light.

I met more people who are also freshman and helped me manage my time better by the actitives provided.

forced me to be more out there and do things on campus.

It forced me to get involved on campus and do community service to fulfill the service learning requirement

I was able to meet new people in a fun environment and also had the chance to volunteer.

scholarship from it

It helped me understand what kind of engineering that I wanted to go into.

minimally, but I guess I know more about business. Unfortunately, I wanted to know more about engineering

I became a finalist in the Koch Innovations challenge because of this course

It allowed me to learn how to invent things hands on but to not shoot for the stars when it probably won't count for anything

How did this course contribute to your *Academic success* at WSU?

It helped contribute to my academic success by giving me an opportunity to explore topics that I don't fully understand or have an interest in to help me know why I have to do topics I don't like in my 4 years
I was able to plan my year, study skills and work with the help of this class.
I had access to programs that provide academic support.
Made me think different. Had new light on subjects.
Our success coach gave us so many resources that I am 100% sure I will use in the future that will contribute to a great academic career.
I will need to know this being a teacher
LEARNING TO SET GOALS AND GET HOMEWORK IN ON TIME
It was an easy learning environment that provided a great transition into college
Helped make connections
It helped to fulfill a necessary requirement, and made me a more rounded individual.
It was mandatory.
They also gave us some tips about singing in the beginning of the semester.
Perhaps the most important thing I learned was how to effectively use the resources available in the library.
They also gave us some tips about singing in the beginning of the semester.
Perhaps the most important thing I learned was how to effectively use the resources available in the library.
The professors were very helpful.
The course taught me a lot ranging from talking to people to my writing skills as well as simply just taking in information from my teachers.
This course helped me open up to the topic in relating to the subject in a way.
It required me to plan for the next four years of classes.
It helped me to learn how important it is to study and pay attention, while at the same time not allowing me to slack off and get an easy A. i appreciate that in a class.
Welcoming atmosphere with a broad range of topics was positive for me.

Time management
We were required to plan for the next four or so years, so I think this helped us think about how we would become successful at that.
Dr. ____ helped my writing by giving me good feedback.
Yes, I was very interested in course material.
It helped me to write more papers for practice.
I learned new concepts and learned valuable tips
The professor gave us life advice, like how to properly contact our professors and what to do if we fall behind in a class, etc.
There were several texts that we read and analyzed. I believe that this class helped to learn how to truly analyze a new piece of literature.
It helped my writing and speaking skills.
I was able to understand different cultures, and wsu is quite diverse, so I now have an understanding of different people.
I have horrible public speaking skills, and this class helped me develop those skills for the future.
By getting all the foundation learned my freshman year. So I can continue to grow here at WSU.
It helped me to balance my time
I think yes because I am now a more educated individual.
It helped me get out of my comfort zone.
it wasn't as difficult as I thought it would be there is a lot cramed into a semester but its worth it.
helps you stay focus
He was supportive in everything we did
Helped my GPA
Not a difficult class but was helpful in developing my writing skills
Helped transition into college
Made me realize grades are important if I want to succeed
it will help my grades stay strong

Having a success coach was good, just knowing that I had someone that was a student that i could go to helped me.

My study habits have improved, as well as my time management skills.

It helped me by awarding me with a scholarship. Also it helped me better understand engineering.

I learned about a lot of things that I had been putting off because I can't always afford cool and one-time building projects on my own.

Again, don't spend too much time on things that won't matter in the end

Report on the University Libraries Involvement
In the 2016-2017 First Year Seminar Pilot Program

In preparation for the Fall 2016 First Year Seminar (FYS) pilot program
- University Libraries (library) instruction librarians, faculty who also serve as liaison/subject librarians, created eight online interactive tutorials to support the achievement of the General Education Outcome "5. Develop fundamentals of information literacy and library research."
    - The learning objectives for the tutorials cover introducing the students to
        - The library (tour) and its services
        - Material types
        - Finding materials
        - Advanced search strategies
        - Defining a topic/research question
        - Evaluating sources
        - Understanding plagiarism
        - Citations styles

- The library assigned a liaison librarian to each of the eleven FYS courses in Fall 2016.
    - The liaison librarians created research guides for each of the FYS courses.
    - The liaison librarians contacted all the professors teaching in the FYS pilot program, explained and offered their services, and collaborated to the extent desired by each professor.
        - Most professors "embedded" the liaison librarians in their Blackboard shells – that is, they created a content area that contained at least the name and contact information for the liaison librarian and possibly links to the library website page which provided access to the eight online interactive tutorials and a research guide for the specific FYS course.

During the Fall 2016 semester
- All but one of the professors had the liaison librarians give at least one class session on an information literacy and library research topic.
- Some professors required their students to work through at least some of the eight online interactive tutorials, but only a few professors required their students to take the quizzes at the end of whatever tutorials they worked through.
    - The library considered the quizzes assessments.
        - The average percentage of correct answers on the eight quizzes ranged from 58% (on the Material Types quiz) to 96.5% (on the Understanding Plagiarism quiz).

In January 2017 the library surveyed the professors who taught the Fall 2016 FYS courses to get feedback from them, and 12 of the 15 professors responded. Some of the most important findings are the following:
- Only 4 professors (33% of the respondents) required students to work through any of the online interactive tutorials and take the associated quizzes.
    - In a comments section one professor explained that s/he had already finalized her/his syllabus when s/he found out about the tutorials and went on to say that s/he offered extra credit for taking the quizzes.

Important findings from January 2016 survey of FYS professors (con't):

- Of the 11 professors who answered the question "The amount of information in the interactive tutorials for the First Year Seminar courses (http://libresources.wichita.edu/fys) is appropriate for freshmen in a 3-credit hour course of this type,"
  - 9% strongly agreed
  - 73% agreed
  - 18% disagreed.
- In a comments section three professors indicated that they were disappointed in their students' citations.
- Twelve professors answered the question "The content of the embedded librarian's face-to-face library instruction session(s) and the interactive tutorials had an impact on students' performance in this course."
  - 33% said it was a strongly positive impact.
  - 42% said it was a positive impact.
  - 8% said it was a negative impact.
  - 17% said they had no basis for judging.
- All twelve professors responded positively to the statement "including information literacy and library research instruction in the First Year Seminar courses benefits students."
  - 58% strongly agreed with this statement.
  - 42% agreed with it.
- For a complete report on this survey, please contact Kathy Delker, Coordinator of Library Instructional Services, kathy.delker@wichita.edu.

In Spring 2017
- The library again assigned liaison librarians to all four of the FYS courses. The liaison librarians worked with same professors with whom they had worked in Fall 2016.
- The liaison librarians interacted with the professors and students in the same manner as they had during Fall 2016 in terms collaboration and library instruction during class sessions.
- The library does not yet have responses to the quizzes at the end of each tutorial for Spring 2017.
- Besides the quizzes students took at the end of each tutorial they worked through, just a week or two before the end of the semester the liaison librarians will be administering an online post-test consisting of one question from each quiz. At the time this report was written the post-test had not been given to students.

During Summer 2017 the instruction/liaison librarians will
- Reduce a little the content of the set of online interactive tutorials for the 2017-2018 second year of the FYS pilot program. Some feedback from faculty on the Jan. 2017 survey and the opinions of some of the librarians led to the conclusion that the original content of the tutorials was too much for some incoming freshmen.
- Update existing research guides as needed and create a research guide for the two new FYS courses: Law and Politics and Solutions by Design: Introduction to Design Theory.

In Fall 2017 the library plans to administer both a pre- and post-test to gauge better how much the tutorials and the in-class library instruction sessions added to the FYS students' understanding of information literacy concepts and application of library research skills.

General Education Writing Rubric Assessment, Fall 2016

Summary: Pre and Post test scores on the composite Writing Rubric and each of the individual sub scores showed statistically higher post-test scores relative to pre-test values but the magnitude of differences between pre and post scores were very small.

Scoring (4=high)	Mean Writing Rubric Score*		Context of & Purpose for Writing		Content Development		Genre & Disciplinary Conventions		Control of Syntax & Mechanics	
	Pre test	Post Test	Pre test	Post Test	Pre test	Post Test	Pre test	Post Test	Pre test	Post Test
mean	2.76a	**3.11b**	3.03a	**3.22b**	2.70a	**2.88b**	2.68a	**2.93b**	2.31a	**2.87b**
std dev	.70a	.66b	.78a	.67b	.70a	.70b	.82a	.80b	.78a	.74b

effect size for composition and individual scores is not meaningfully significant (<.02).

Student counts by score level:

Score levels	122	100%	122	100%	122	100%	122	100%	122	100%	122	100%	122	100%	122	100%	122	100%	122	100%
4	17	13.9%a	32	**26.2%b**	38	31.1%a	42	34.4%a	14	11.5%a	21	17.2%a	23	18.9%a	32	26.2%a	8	6.6%a	21	**17.2%b**
3	61	50.0%a	74	60.7%a	51	41.8%a	67	**54.9%b**	60	49.2%a	67	54.9%a	41	33.6%a	53	43.4%a	38	31.1%a	69	**56.6%b**
2	42	34.4%a	14	**11.5%b**	32	26.2%a	11	**9.0%b**	45	36.9%a	32	26.2%a	54	44.3%a	34	**27.9%b**	60	49.2%a	27	**22.1%b**
1	2	1.6%a	2	1.6%a	1	.8%a	2	1.6%a	3	2.5%a	2	1.6%a	4	3.3%a	3	2.5%a	16	13.1%a	5	**4.1%b**

* Values in the same row & sub table not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 level , **bold font** shown for display purposes to highlight difference.
Sample: 122 enrolled thru end-of-term students. Excludes WSUF102B, WSUF102A and WSUN102A as score outliers being 2.5 or greater standard deviations from the mean.

End-of-term Grade Distributions by Course

end of term course grade	All	WSUA 102A	WSUA 102B	WSUA 102C	WSUA 102D	WSUA 102E	WSUD 102A	WSUD 102B	WSUE 102A
total	122	5	16	12	19	23	9	19	19
A	67	4	5	4	11	10	7	12	14
B	37	1	6	2	7	12	0	4	5
C	12	0	4	3	1	1	1	2	0
D	4	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0
F	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
A	54.9%	80.0%	31.3%	33.3%	57.9%	43.5%	77.8%	63.2%	73.7%
B	30.3%	20.0%	37.5%	16.7%	36.8%	52.2%	0.0%	21.1%	26.3%
C	9.8%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	5.3%	4.3%	11.1%	10.5%	0.0%
D	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	5.3%	0.0%
F	1.6%	0.0%	6.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Business Intelligence and Predictive Modeling (BIPM)

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Stoplights: actual to target
🔴 greater than -/+ 5%
🟡 within -/+ 5%
🟢 met or exceeded

Wichita State University Foresight 2020* *Student Learning Performance*

Foresight 2020 Strategic Goals:

	yearly measure	base year 2010	2013	2014	2015	2016	Target 2016	Goal Status	Goal 2020	desired goal direction
II. Improve Economic Alignment (continued from Foresight 2020 Dashboard).										
II.3 WSU Graduates are Scholars by demonstrating:										
Critical thinking and problem solving										
Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) score[1] for Seniors as percent of expected score	AY	103%	99.6%	101%	99.8%	99.4%	101.2%	🟡	104%	↗
Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) score[1] for Seniors	AY	1,296	1,174	1,151	1,147	1,117				
(expected score)		1,258	1,179	1,143	1,149	1,124				
Student's perception academic challenge from NSSE2 for Freshmen (goal to exceed peers, scale 0-60)	AY	n/a	32.1	n/a	34.7	n/a	36.8	🔴	40.0	↗
Student's perception of level academic challenge from NSSE for Seniors (goal to exceed peers, scale 0-60)	AY	n/a	35.9	n/a	36.9	n/a	38.4	🔴	40.0	↗
Undergraduate perception of critical thinking competency exit survey3 (scale 1 to 5-- percent 4 or higher shown)	AY	n/a	92.8%	90.9%	91.8%	91.5%	87.7%	🟢	86.0%	↗
Undergraduate's perception of numerical literacy competency exit survey (scale 1 to 5-- percent 4 or higher shown)	AY	n/a	77.0%	75.2%	76.3%	75.7%	78.9%	🟡	82.0%	↗
Effective communication										
Student presentation frequency (NSSE) Freshmen (scale 1 never to 4 very often)	AY	n/a	2.1	n/a	2.1	n/a	2.2	🔴	2.3	↗
Student presentation frequency (NSSE) Seniors (scale 1 never to 4 very often)	AY	n/a	2.5	n/a	2.5	n/a	2.7	🔴	2.8	↗
English 101 Post-test scores from the English pre- and post-test writing performance assessment	Fall	3.45	3.27	3.35	3.43	3.38	3.78	🔴	4.0	↗
Communications 111 public speaking performance assessment (scale 1 to 3 high)	Fall	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.68	2.66	2.26	🟢	2.7	↗
Undergraduate's perception oral/written competency exit survey (scale 1 to 5-- pct 4 or higher shown)	AY	n/a	90.0%	88.7%	89.3%	88.1%	89.1%	🟡	90.0%	↗
Preparation for lifelong learning										
Percent enrolled in 4 yr school within 1 yr of WSU graduation (Nat. Clearinghouse data)	AY	29.3%	26.7%	28.2%	28.0%	tbd	27.9%	🟢	28%	↗
Percent enrolled in 4 yr school within 1 yr of WSU graduation to have earned a master degree within 2 yrs	AY	22.2%	35.9%	tbd	tbd	tbd	29.9%	🟢	35.0%	
Undergraduate's perception of library literacy competency from exit survey (scale 1 to 5-- pct 4 or higher shown)	AY	n/a	69.2%	68.3%	68.1%	68.1%	69.6%	🟡	72.0%	↗
Preparation for career in their chosen field										
Percent of undergraduates perceiving chosen degree useful to very useful in career exit survey (scale 1 to 5)	AY	n/a	91.8%	87.2%	87.8%	87.5%	89.0%	🟡	90.0%	↗
Percent undergraduates employed within 6 months of graduation -- alumni survey	AY	tbd	82.1%	81.2%	83.9%	79.8%	86.0%	🔴	90.0%	↗
II.4 WSU Graduates are Leaders by demonstrating:										
Global mindedness and forward thinking										
Percent Freshmen participated at least one High Impact Practice (NSSE, goal to exceed peers, scale 0-100)	AY	n/a	0.4	n/a	36.1%	n/a	38.8%	🟡	40.0%	↗
Percent Seniors participated one or more High Impact Practice (NSSE, goal to exceed peers, scale 0-100)	AY	n/a	0.5	n/a	51.1%	n/a	56.0%	🟡	60.0%	↗
Percent of undergraduate students participating in study abroad from exit survey	AY	tbd	7.1%	8.1%	8.5%	9.3%	11.6%	🟡	15.0%	↗
Undergraduate's perception diversity/globalization competency ext srvy (scale 1 to 5-- pct 4 or higher shown)	AY	n/a	80.8%	78.8%	79.0%	79.7%	80.4%	🟡	90.0%	↗
Collaboration and service orientation										
Undergraduate average weekly hours in community service reported by students from exit survey	AY	n/a	5.7	5.1	5.1	4.5	8.3	🔴	10	↗
Percent undergraduates participate in volunteer service exit survey (scale 1 to 5-- pct 4 or higher shown)	AY	n/a	28.9%	29.3%	29.8%	31.3%	31.0%	🟢	35.0%	↗
Undergraduates and Graduates in internships and/or co-op positions through Cooperative Education	AY	993	1,138	1,094	1,032	964	1,534	🔴	1,690	↗
Undergraduate's perception team work competency from exit survey (scale 1 to 5-- pct 4 or higher shown)	AY	n/a	88.8%	89.5%	88.7%	88.9%	89.5%	🟡	90.0%	↗

[1] Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) total score for critical thinking, analytical reasoning, problem solving and written communication. Information for Academic year 2010 data are from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences only; [2] NSSE National Survey of Student Engagement; NSSE data collected in odd years post 2009; NSSE changed survey in 2013, no longer using benchmarks [3] Exit Survey is required of all undergraduate and graduate students upon degree completion.

Business Intelligence and Predictive Modeling (BIPM)

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY