1. Original Goals

Continue to develop and enhance instructional development opportunities; tie instructional development to assessment findings and feedback from faculty; review and revise (if necessary) program outcomes; establish an assessment process that is sustainable; support the development of an Honors Program and of a Center for Engaged Learning and Teaching; disseminate findings at regional and national conferences.

Results:

Description Activities: Funding from the grant has supported faculty institutes, workshops and meetings, external and internal experts, and support for travel to both present at and attend professional conferences.

Instructional Development: We expanded our instructional development opportunities to embrace a richer, more flexible, and varied set of possibilities, including workshops, meetings, and institutes. Key expectations for instructional development include: engage faculty members in a commitment to their cohort and to delivering the area of the program for which they are responsible; help faculty develop familiarity with program outcomes and with designing assignments that will facilitate student development; involve as many faculty as possible in developing rubrics and in assessing program outcomes; involve faculty to serve as peer-coaches in sharing their curricular and pedagogical work with their colleagues; and encourage faculty to attend regional and national conferences and to present the work we are doing.

During the 2008-2009 we offered several workshops and meetings. In spring 2008 we held five workshops with seventy-two faculty participating. During the 2008 fall semester faculty cohorts in each of the program areas continued to participate in regular semester meetings to discuss outcomes, assignments and pedagogy. In January 2009, we formed three teams (seven members each) to review the existing outcomes for quantitative reasoning, critical thinking and writing. These outcomes were revised and rubrics were created to assess them in a pilot assessment conducted at the end of the spring semester. In May 2009, we held the Developing Learning-Assignments Matter Conference. Nine faculty presented information regarding teaching strategies for enhancing quantitative reasoning, writing and critical thinking. Twenty-eight faculty attended this conference. Finally in June, 2009, five workshops were held with 96 faculty participating.
Outcomes: Based on assessment results and feedback from faculty, we have revised the writing, critical thinking and quantitative reasoning outcomes. In the fall, our goal is to review and likely revise two more academic/intellectual skills outcomes – reading and technological fluency. We are in the process of revising the perspectives, integrative and interdisciplinary outcomes. Teams revised these outcomes in June and we will be discussing and getting input and feedback from faculty this fall. The revision process has been very exciting as it demonstrates the goal that the Integrative Studies Program be a dynamic, not static, program and the faculty’s commitment to responding to recommendations made as a result of assessment findings.

Assessment: In May 2008 and January 2009 we assessed writing, critical thinking, information literacy, and quantitative literacy using artifacts from the program’s two foundation courses (Thinking and Writing and Quantitative Literacy). In January, three teams of faculty (21 total) revised the writing, critical thinking and quantitative reasoning student learning outcomes. We have just completed a pilot assessment of writing, critical thinking and quantitative reasoning using artifacts from the perspectives and interdisciplinary courses. The findings are very interesting and will help our discussions with faculty. We have revised our assessment plan to more accurately reflect where we are in the process.

We are very pleased with the assessment process we have established and are getting good participation from both faculty and students.

Honors Program: In part due to the early success of the Integrative Studies Program, the College approved an all College Honors Program this spring. The program models and expands on the Integrative Studies Program.

CELT (Center for Engaged Learning and Teaching): The approval of this Center is another initiative that will ensure the sustainability of the Integrative Studies Program and the instructional development approach supported by the Davis Educational Foundation. CELT will have responsibility for institutionalizing instructional development for faculty and staff.

Dissemination: In 2008-2009 faculty presented at the following conferences.

November 2008 AAC&U: Engaging Science, Advancing Learning Conference
Designing Effective Science Experiences for Non-science Majors: The Importance of Faculty Development

NEEAN Fall Forum

Assessment as Faculty Development

February 2009 AAC&U: General Education Conference

Philosophic and Pragmatic Aspects of Implementing Integrative Studies and Core Programs: A Tale of Two Colleges
2. **Strengthening teaching and learning practices and controlling costs.**

   What we have learned is that faculty need to be remunerated to assess ISP outcomes. This is different than departmental program assessment and faculty need to be compensated for additional time. We are pleased, however, that the cost of conducting ISP assessment seems to be reasonable and ought to be something the institution can do, though the times are tough for adding any additional costs to any program initiative.

3. **What did we learn (challenges and unanticipated outcomes)?**

   **Challenges:**

   We continue to be challenged in helping to clarify program intent and what we are doing with assessment. We have struggled to develop our program map. We continue to be challenged by our content outcomes much more than we are our skills outcomes. An ongoing challenge is to help understand how to align assignments with the outcomes they have chosen to address.

   **Unanticipated Outcomes:**

   Faculty participation in workshops, conferences, meetings has been better and more consistent than we anticipated. Faculty being willing to serve as assessors and cohort leaders is also an unanticipated positive outcome. We are broadening our base of those who are engaged in the work.

   **What might be beneficial to other colleges:**

   Assure the program design is based on a conceptual framework.
   Assure deans play a key leadership role in holding faculty responsible and accountable for meeting program expectations.
   Be sure subcommittees are assigned various tasks.
   Invite faculty who are not members of the committee to serve on the subcommittees.
   Invite faculty who are not members of the committee to attend conferences.
   Have committee members serve as liaisons to each department.
   Have the deans serve as committee members.
   Hold regular all campus meetings to present information and receive feedback.
   Use feedback in making decisions.
   Have coordinators of institutes being offered for the first time attend an existing institute so they are familiar with the process.
Tie instructional development to the revised [new] program. Faculty support for the new Integrative Studies program was based in large part on the collaborative nature of the process, but was also grounded upon the imprimatur that Davis Foundation support provided for the TW and QL foundations courses, and the confidence that faculty development for a new IS program would have meaningful support from the Davis Foundation. Their support helped and continues to help us to make change happen at KSC. Be ready to be flexible with implementation issues – the best laid plans often need to be revised. Be sure someone is always paying attention to what needs to get done and who helps keep people and processes on track.

4. **How will we sustain and build upon the outcomes of the project?**

We will continue to develop the organizational structure and the leadership model. We have established an ISP budget and are requesting additional ongoing funding for assessment of the program. We will continue our work with CELT assuring that faculty instructional development opportunities are provided.

5. **How were funds spent?**

See addendum
### Outcomes for Keene State College Integrative Studies Program Curricular Transformation 2008-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals in Order of Importance</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Measurable Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Create rubrics for program outcomes | Interdisciplinary/Multidisciplinary and Perspectives subcommittees will work with faculty teaching courses in the Perspectives and Interdisciplinary/Multidisciplinary areas to identify criteria that will be used to assess student work. | Rubrics will be developed for the perspectives, interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary and integrative outcomes.  
This work will continue into next year. Progress has been made in revising outcomes, but the final approval has not occurred.  
In addition, we are discussing using a different method to assess perspectives and interdisciplinary outcomes and until a decision is made, rubrics cannot be created. |
| Enhance faculty instructional and student learning development | Continue to offer instructional development institutes, workshops and roundtables with a focus on helping faculty incorporate the outcomes in their ISP courses and helping them develop learning experiences that will facilitate successful understanding of the identified outcomes  
Develop the Center for Academic and Community Engagement which will offer programs that will both support faculty in their teaching and students in their learning as each relates to the program outcomes. | Faculty teaching in the program will continue to participate in instructional development institutes, workshops, roundtables and seminars.  
Achieving a critical mass.  
Faculty will work with colleagues teaching in the various program categories to discuss and improve teaching and learning as they relate to the program outcomes.  
This is being accomplished in the foundation and interdisciplinary areas. We need to accomplish it in the perspectives area.  
The Center will receive approval; the conceptual framework will be developed; we will receive approval to search for a director; the search will take place during 2007-2008; the director will assume his or her position beginning July 1, 2008.  
The Center was approved and the Director was hired in the Spring of 2009. |
| Assess all program outcomes over the three year period [see timetable] | Faculty with expertise in outcome areas will be identified to train reviewers; reviewers will assess student work and report results. | All outcomes will be assessed a minimum of once in the three year period. Reported results will be disseminated to faculty teaching in the program and adjustments to the curriculum and pedagogy will be made accordingly.  
We have not been able to accomplish this goal. We have assessed writing, critical |
thinking, information literacy, quantitative literacy and quantitative reasoning. We must still revise criteria for reading, technological fluency, creative thinking and critical dialogue; and we must revise the perspectives and interdisciplinary outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implement the College’s Honors Program</th>
<th>The Honors Program Committee will create and implement the program structure and make recommendations regarding organization.</th>
<th>A program structure will be created and implemented; the first courses will be taught; a director will be hired; a faculty cohort will be identified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate our experience with colleagues at other institutions</td>
<td>Submit proposals for presentation at AAC&amp;U, AIS and other relevant professional conferences.</td>
<td>Faculty and staff will present at a minimum of two conferences per year. We have exceeded expectations for disseminating information and are particularly pleased with the recognition as a LEAP Exemplar Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see we are accomplishing the goals set forth in our proposal. However, because progress has been slow in the perspectives area, we have not expended the funds granted in a three year period and are requesting an extension of one year to complete the work in the perspectives and interdisciplinary areas.