

A Comprehensive Method of General Education Assessment

Dr. John A. Dembosky and Dr. Emily Wright
Methodist University



Purpose

Participants in this workshop will learn an informative and efficient way to collectively assess several general education goals.

Background

General Education Revision
(Our "Moonshot" Experience)

- As of Fall 2014, Methodist University had completed a long process of revising its general education goals (and curriculum).
- A completely new set of goals was passed by the faculty based on skills.

Methodist University General Education Goals

The Faculty of Methodist University has approved General Education goals for all students at the University. The approved goals are as follows.

The Methodist University General Education Program produces graduates who demonstrate competence in the following skills:

- ✓ Computer Usage
- ✓ Critical Thinking
- ✓ Information Literacy
- ✓ Oral Communication
- ✓ Quantitative Reasoning
- ✓ Research
- ✓ Written Communication

Students develop competence in these skills while studying the following topics:

- ✓ Fine Arts
- ✓ Global Perspective
- ✓ Humanities
- ✓ Mathematics
- ✓ Natural Sciences
- ✓ Social Sciences
- ✓ Wellness

While studying these topics, students will encounter material addressing ethical reasoning, cultural diversity, global interdependence, and environmental issues.

The Next Step

A New Assessment Strategy

New goals = New assessment

The newly created General Education Committee had to devise a way to assess all seven of the new skills.

The Next Step

What Are We Assessing?

- The faculty did not provide a concrete explanation of what each of the seven skills meant.
- First, each skill was assigned a set of competencies by the committee to define what specifically needed to be assessed.

The Next Step

The assessment of three of the skills was assigned to specific classes:

- Oral Communication → ACL 1510
- Computer Usage → CSC 1000
- Quantitative Reasoning → MAT 1050

The Next Step

Four remaining skills needed to be addressed:

- Written Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Information Literacy
- Research

First Idea

Our first idea about how to assess these four skills was to establish assessment procedures within each major.

There were several problems with this approach.

Assessment within Majors: Problems

1. Inherent contradiction of assessing general education within majors. General education goals are not major-specific; they apply equally to all students.
2. Many of our majors don't have capstone courses, making summative assessment difficult.
3. Course-based assessment is just too complicated.

Course-Based Assessment: Problems

All instructors:

- must coordinate, use the same assessment, etc.
- must report their assessment results in the same form to department chairs, who must compile the results in an intelligible way, within a certain time frame.

The Office of Institutional Research

- must compile all the results, which may come to them in different ways from different departments at different times.

Solution

A Summative Assessment

Collect papers written by graduating seniors and assess them all according to the same criteria based on the new competencies for the four skills.

Advantages

1. Most of the work is done by the Director of Writing Across the Curriculum and the Director of General Education, both of whom have release time.
2. All students are assessed according to the same criteria.
3. The assessment would be interdisciplinary.

Mechanics for a New Strategy

Once the major decision was made, the following had to be planned out:

1. How many papers could we reasonably assess per year?
2. What rubric would we use to assess the papers?
3. Who would do the assessment, and how?

How many papers?

- MU graduates about 300-350 students per year.
- We decided to assess a third of our seniors each year.
- Using statistics on the average annual number of graduates produced by each department, a rotation schedule was devised.

THREE-YEAR DEPARTMENTAL ROTATION FOR GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT

Year Four (2018-2019)	Year Five (2019-2020)	Year Six (2020-2021)
SS&HD Phys. Ed. & Health Ed. Exercise & Sport Sci. Chem. & Phys. Sci. Elementary Ed.	SS&HD Mathematics *Computer Sci. *Secondary Education	SS&HD Biology Comp. Info. Tech. Middle Grades Ed. Special Ed. *Engineering
SPA Applied Commun. Political Sci. Social Work	SPA Mass Communication *Justice Studies	SPA Applied Forensic Sci. Envir. & Occ. Mgnt.
SA&H English History Music Music Performance Music Ed. Sociology	SA&H Global Studies *Art *Art Ed. *Graphic Design	SA&H Psychology Religion Spanish Theatre Writing
RS&AE Accounting Marketing	RS&AE Business Admin. *Entrepreneurship	RS&AE Financial Econ. Management Sports Mgnt.
SIS Health Care Admin.	SIS Athletic Training	SIS Kinesiology Nursing

*Denotes changes from previous rotation

How Many Papers?

- Each year, we collect a paper from each and every senior in the majors designated for assessment that year.
- Typically, around 100 papers are collected each year.
- 98 papers (originally 84) are randomly selected for assessment. We use the remainder for norming.

What Rubric?

A search for an appropriate rubric began.

- An invaluable resource was the VALUE Rubrics available at the AAC&U website.
- We examined the VALUE rubrics on written communication, critical thinking, and information literacy. (There was no VALUE rubric on research, but all three of the rubrics selected had criteria related to research.)

What Rubric?

A Rubric of Our Own

- A total of 20 competencies defined the four general education skills that needed to be assessed.
- The 20 competencies were mapped to eight writing criteria that were used to the construct our new rubric.

General Education Assessment: Mapping of Competencies to the Assessment Rubric

Critical Thinking

<i>Competencies</i>	<i>Assessment Rubric Evaluation Number</i>
Students can clearly and comprehensively explain an issue/problem to be considered.	2. Clarity and Coherence
Students can select and use information to investigate a point of view or conclusion.	5. Information Use/Citations
Students can thoroughly analyze their own and others' assumptions.	6. Assumptions/Context
Students can position their own perspective within a larger context.	6. Assumptions/Context
Students can derive logical conclusions.	7. Conclusions

General Education Assessment: Mapping of Competencies to the Assessment Rubric

Information Literacy

<i>Competencies</i>	<i>Assessment Rubric Evaluation Number</i>
Students can identify and access relevant sources of information.	4. Research
Students can evaluate information and its sources critically.	6. Assumptions/Context
Students can acquire information effectively.	4. Research
Students can use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.	3. Support/Evidence
Students can access and use information ethically and legally.	5. Information Use/Citations

General Education Assessment: Mapping of Competencies to the Assessment Rubric

Research

<i>Competencies</i>	<i>Assessment Rubric Evaluation Number</i>
Students can formulate a focused and appropriate research question.	1. Issue Identification and Focus
Students can locate appropriate sources with which to answer a question.	4. Research
Students can synthesize information from various sources.	5. Information Use/Citations
Students can derive a logical answer to a research question.	7. Conclusions
Students can clearly convey the results of their research to an audience.	2. Clarity and Coherence

General Education Assessment: Mapping of Competencies to the Assessment Rubric

Written Communication

<i>Competencies</i>	<i>Assessment Rubric Evaluation Number</i>
Students can produce written work that focuses clearly and consistently on an appropriate issue or topic.	1. Issue Identification and Focus
Students can produce written work that is well-organized, presenting ideas and information in a clear, coherent manner.	2. Clarity and Coherence
Students can produce written work that supports assertions with relevant facts, statistics, expert opinion, thorough explanation, appropriate examples, etc.	3. Support/Evidence
Students can produce written work that conforms with the disciplinary or generic conventions relevant to the writing task.	5. Information Use/Citations
Students can produce written work that includes few errors in grammar, sentence structure, spelling, mechanics, and usage.	8. Sentence-Level Clarity

There are 20 total competencies in the four goals. The assessment rubric is designed to cover multiple competencies per evaluation number. The competencies purposefully overlap to emphasize the importance of each skill. The graph below tabulates the effective statistics of the assessment rubric evaluation numbers.

Rubric Assessment Number	1. Issue Identification and Focus	2. Clarity and Coherence	3. Support/Evidence	4. Research	5. Information Use/Citations	6. Assumptions/Context	7. Conclusions	8. Sentence-Level Clarity
Number of Times Mapped to a Competency	2	3	2	3	4	3	2	1
Percent of Competencies Covered by Rubric Assessment Number	2/20 10%	3/20 15%	2/20 10%	3/20 15%	4/20 20%	3/20 15%	2/20 10%	1/20 5%

The graph above indicates that a fairly even percentage of the competencies are addressed across the eight assessment rubric numbers. This distribution is interpreted to mean that the assessment rubric does not generally weigh one competency more heavily than any another.

Our MU Rubric

The Short Form

- A short form of our 8-criteria rubric was created by the General Education Committee with assistance from Writing Across the Curriculum.
- The short form of the rubric is used by assessors to record students' scores.

Criteria	0 - Absent	1 - Below Expectation	2 - Meets Expectation	3 - Exceeds Expectation
1. Communication The student communicates effectively in writing.				
2. Critical Thinking The student analyzes and synthesizes information to solve problems.				
3. Problem Solving The student identifies and solves problems using logical reasoning.				
4. Teamwork The student works effectively with others in a team.				
5. Self-Management The student manages time and resources effectively.				
6. Information Literacy The student locates, evaluates, and uses information effectively.				
7. Quantitative The student uses quantitative reasoning to solve problems.				
8. Civility The student demonstrates respect and ethical behavior.				

Our MU Rubric

The Long Form

- The VALUE rubrics are accompanied by detailed explanations of each rubric criterion.
- A more detailed, longer form of our rubric was created for assessors to use as a reference.

METHODIST UNIVERSITY GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT BOARD FOR CRITICAL THINKING, WRITING, INFORMATION LITERACY, AND RESEARCH LONG FORM - 2019

Paper Number: _____ Rater Initials: _____ Round: _____

Instructions: For each of the eight criteria below, circle the numeric score for the specific phrase which describes the writing within the paper.

1. Issue Identification and Focus			
0 - Absent	1 - Below Expectation	2 - Meets Expectation	3 - Exceeds Expectation
No issue is identified. No focus is announced.	Issue is not clearly identified, and/or focus is not consistently maintained.	Issue is identified, but is too broad or vague, and/or parts of the paper lose focus on the issue identified.	Issue is clearly identified. Focus on issue is maintained consistently.

2. Clarity and Coherence			
0 - Absent	1 - Below Expectation	2 - Meets Expectation	3 - Exceeds Expectation
No structure is discernible. Ideas are unrelated to each other. Many sentences are unclear.	Structure is not clear. Problems occur in several areas of coherence.	A basic structure is apparent, but some elements of coherence are problematic.	Paper is well and clearly organized, with appropriate attention to the needs of the reader, and most elements of coherence carefully observed.

Elements of coherence are as follows:
 (1) Meanings of sentences should be clear.
 (2) Ideas should be presented in a logical order.
 (3) Each paragraph should be devoted to a single function or idea.
 (4) Transitions between sentences and paragraphs help the reader follow the writer's train of thought.

3. Support Evidence			
0 - Absent	1 - Below Expectation	2 - Meets Expectation	3 - Exceeds Expectation
No relevant support is presented.	Some support for ideas is present, but is insufficient, inappropriate, and/or not clearly relevant.	Relevant, appropriate, and sufficient support for ideas is present.	Ideas are especially thoroughly supported with specific, sufficient, and relevant details.

Ideas should be supported with specific, sufficient, and relevant details in the form of facts, statistics, expert opinion, through explanation, appropriate examples, and appropriate use of sources. Note that the following criterion assesses

0 - Absent	1 - Below Expectation	2 - Meets Expectation	3 - Exceeds Expectation
No sources are used and/or all sources are inappropriate.	Sources are used, but the number of sources is insufficient and/or inappropriate.	Sufficient number of sources are used, but some are inappropriate and/or sources are appropriate, but an insufficient number are used.	Sufficient number of appropriate sources are used.

Appropriate sources are ones that are relevant to the research question, appropriately current, and authoritative.

4. Information Use/Clarity			
0 - Absent	1 - Below Expectation	2 - Meets Expectation	3 - Exceeds Expectation
Plagiarism occurs and/or citations are not used.	Information from sources is summarized inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.). Few or none of the information use strategies are used. Graphs, charts, and tables are not presented clearly.	Information from sources is summarized clearly and is organized, but full information is not fully synthesized. Uses correctly several of the information use strategies. Graphs, charts, and tables are presented clearly.	Effectively summarizes, organizes, and synthesizes information from sources. Uses correctly all of the information use strategies. Graphs, charts, and tables are presented clearly.

Use information use strategies as an interview:
 - proper citation mechanics
 - in-text citations appear when necessary
 - using information in ways that are true to original content
 - distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution
 - paraphrased material should be clearly in the writers' own words.

6. Assumptions/Context			
0 - Absent	1 - Below Expectation	2 - Meets Expectation	3 - Exceeds Expectation
Completely fails to acknowledge contexts or assumptions.	Inadequately or insufficiently identifies contexts and assumptions.	Identifies contexts as appropriate, but does not examine their relevance.	Positions own perspective within larger context. Shows awareness of assumptions upon which own and other claims are based.

Context may include:
 Cultural/Historical - group, national, ethnic, cross-cultural, or other.
 Educational/Experiential - school, training, personal experience, disciplinary/multi-disciplinary theories, critiques, developments.
 Ethical - values, impact on society, citizenry and democracy, equity, quality of life.
 Sociopolitical/Global - ability to meet long-term future needs, change and flexibility, resource allocation; global implications.
 Political/Economic - organization or governmental, trade, labor, business, power relations.
 Scientific/Technical - conceptual, science, scientific method, applied sciences, engineering, medicine.

7. Conclusions			
0 - Absent	1 - Below Expectation	2 - Meets Expectation	3 - Exceeds Expectation
Conclusion is absent or unrelated to information presented.	Conclusion is inconsistent with information presented and/or oversimplified.	Conclusion is logically tied to information. Some related outcomes are identified.	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect students' informed evaluation.

8. Sentence-Level Clarity			
0 - Absent	1 - Below Expectation	2 - Meets Expectation	3 - Exceeds Expectation
Sentence-level errors seriously interfere with comprehension.	Contains many errors in grammar, mechanics, usage, and syntax.	Contains a few errors in grammar, mechanics, usage, and syntax.	Virtually free of errors in grammar, mechanics, usage, and syntax.

- "Mechanics" refers to spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.
 - "Usage" primarily refers to word choice.
 - "Syntax" refers to word order.
 - "Grammar" refers to the deep structure of language. Most of the Dirty Dozen are some form of grammar error.
 Specifically, the Dirty Dozen include 7 sentence structure errors, 2 kinds of agreement errors, and 3 other common grammar errors.

Who and How?

Having determined which majors and how many papers we would assess per year, and having carefully created a rubric that would assess the four General Education skills and twenty competencies we wanted to assess, we then had to determine who would do the assessment, and how.

Who and How?

We wanted and needed to:

- 1.enlist assessors from all five schools.
- 2.have a total of 14 assessors.
- 3.have at least one alternate available in case someone had to drop out.

Who and How?

- We decided to enlist three assessors from each school.
- The School of Health Sciences was significantly smaller than the other schools, so we assigned two of its representatives to the assessment task and reserved one representative as an alternate.

Who and How?

The Birth of the MU General Education WAW

We created something that we call the Writing Assessment Workshop (WAW).

- This workshop takes place over 2.5 days.
- It includes 14 faculty from five schools, plus the WAC Director and the General Education Director.

Who and How?

Support for the WAW

- All participants are paid a stipend of \$500 for participating.
- The University also supports the workshop by providing a small fund for food and beverages for workshop participants.

MU GENERAL EDUCATION WRITING ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

<i>Tuesday</i>	
9:00-10:00 am	1. Introductions Directors of General Education and WAC
	2. Overview of Workshop Schedule Distribute: Assessment assignments (including majors being assessed) USB flash drives, pencils, and folders Rubrics (long and short forms) Evaluation form (for the workshop)
	3. Overview of Rubric.
10:00-12:00 noon	Group assessment of sample papers (norming)
12:00-1:00 pm	Lunch
1:00-5:00 pm	Assessment Round 1 (each assessor rates a first set of papers)
	<i>Homework:</i> Additional assessment, if necessary.
<i>Wednesday</i>	
9:00-11:00 am	Group discussions and assessment of sample papers (norming)
11:00-12:00 noon	Resolution Round 1
12:00-1:00 pm	Lunch
1:00-5:00 pm	Assessment Round 2 (each assessor rates a second set of papers)
	<i>Homework:</i> Additional assessment, if necessary.
<i>Thursday</i>	
9:00-11:00 am	Group discussion and possible additional group assessment of sample papers
11:00-12:00 noon	Resolution Round 2
12:00 noon-1:00 pm	Workshop Evaluation and Lunch

Work Assignment Chart					
General Education Writing Workshop					
May 2019					
Grader	School	Grader	Round 1	Round 2	Round 2+
Vijay Anbaram	SSH&D	1	#1-6	#41-48	#85-86
Scott Robertson	SSH&D	2	#7-12	#49-54	#87-88
Amanda Ransom	SSH&D	3	#13-18	#55-60	#89-90
Jeremy Husvit	SA&H	4	#19-24	#61-66	#91-92
Cameron Dabhorath	SA&H	5	#25-30	#67-72	#93-94
Denise Bauer	SA&H	6	#31-36	#73-78	#95-96
Annette Webster	SHS	7	#37-42	#79-84	#97-98
Dena Beece	RSB&E	8	#1-6	#49-54	#87-88
George Hendricks	SPA	9	#7-12	#55-60	#89-90
Janald 'Tom' Johnston	SHS	10	#13-18	#61-66	#91-92
Hem Bassett	RSB&E	11	#19-24	#67-72	#93-94
Steve Downs	SPA	12	#25-30	#73-78	#95-96
Randy McKittrick	RSB&E	13	#31-36	#79-84	#97-98
John Edwards	SPA	14	#37-42	#81-88	#85-86

This table is the work assignment chart for the participants. Each participant assessed 12 papers as in previous years, plus an additional two papers to cover more student work. All participants consulted with a second participant for a final assessment for each paper during resolution rounds.

Resolution Round 1		
Vijay Anbaram	SSH&D Dena Beece	RSB&E
Scott Robertson	SSH&D George Hendricks	SPA
Amanda Ransom	SSH&D Janald 'Tom' Johnston	SHS
Jeremy Husvit	SA&H Hem Bassett	RSB&E
Cameron Dabhorath	SA&H Steve Downs	SPA
Denise Bauer	SA&H Randy McKittrick	RSB&E
Annette Webster	SHS John Edwards	SPA

Resolution Round 2		
Vijay Anbaram	SSH&D John Edwards	SPA
Scott Robertson	SSH&D Dena Beece	RSB&E
Amanda Ransom	SSH&D George Hendricks	SPA
Jeremy Husvit	SA&H Janald 'Tom' Johnston	SHS
Cameron Dabhorath	SA&H Hem Bassett	RSB&E
Denise Bauer	SA&H Steve Downs	SPA
Annette Webster	SHS Randy McKittrick	RSB&E

Workshop Results

Lots of possible statistics!

Over four years, different ways of using the workshop numbers have provided insights into the level of mastery our graduates possess with regards to all four general education skills.

Workshop Results

Workshop General Summary

- After every workshop, a table is created to summarize the scores for all of the student writing samples cumulatively assessed that year.
- The summary information generally indicates student strengths and weaknesses for aspects of the writing samples.
- A benchmark of 2.0 "meets expectations" was set for all rubric items.

The table below contains the results from the 2019 writing assessment. Each of the 98 rubrics data were entered into a master spreadsheet. For each item, a choice of 4 scores (0 - Absent; 1 - Below Expectation; 2 - Meets Expectation; 3 - Exceeds Expectation) were available with no fractions allowed.

2019 Writing Assessment Workshop Rubric Score Summary

Rubric Item 1	Rubric Item 2	Rubric Item 3	Rubric Item 4	Rubric Item 5	Rubric Item 6	Rubric Item 7	Rubric Item 8
Issue	Clarity and Coherence	Support/ Evidence	Research	Information Use/ Citations	Assumptions/ Context	Conclusions	Sentence Level Clarity
Mean	1.91	1.71	1.69	1.77	1.44	1.62	1.53
StdDev	0.71	0.64	0.76	0.82	0.80	0.63	0.83

Workshop Results

School Summaries

Student summary scores for each of the five individual schools can be produced.

This table is a breakdown of data of rubric scores by school. This data is cumulative for all three years of the assessment. When interpreting this information, it should be noted that the rubric for the first year of the workshop was a bit different from the rubric in years two and three, but the differences are not differentiated in the table. The first year differences are considered to be mostly even over all five schools. The table is primarily intended to illustrate a very basic comparison among schools.

Three-Year School Summaries

Rubric Criteria										
School	Item.1	Item.2	Item.3	Item.4	Item.5	Item.6	Item.7	Item.8	Total	Average
SS&HD	2.10	1.88	1.82	2.08	1.59	1.57	1.68	1.75	14.46	1.81
SA&H	1.79	1.61	1.82	1.91	1.61	1.85	1.24	1.58	13.39	1.67
SPA	1.75	1.64	1.77	1.52	1.26	1.53	1.32	1.58	12.37	1.55
RSB&E	1.93	1.75	1.48	1.47	1.12	1.72	1.46	1.61	12.54	1.57
SHS	1.81	1.59	1.66	1.59	1.46	1.71	1.47	1.59	12.89	1.61

Workshop Results

Annual Trends

With the completion of one full cycle of assessment, trends among rubric items and, therefore, student skills can begin to be tracked.

MU General Education
Yearly Summary
 Writing Assessment Workshop

Rubric Criteria Cumulative Scores

		Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Average
Cycle 1	2016	2.11	1.88	2.05	2.06	1.71	1.90	1.65	1.74	1.89
	2017	1.96	1.78	1.51	1.44	1.15	1.85	1.53	1.61	1.60
	2018	1.66	1.52	1.45	1.5	1.18	1.33	1.21	1.54	1.42
Cycle 2	2019	1.91	1.71	1.68	1.77	1.44	1.62	1.53	1.7	1.67

Rubric Criteria Cumulative Standard Deviations

		Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Average
Cycle 1	2016	0.67	0.73	0.72	1.00	0.84	0.68	0.81	0.62	0.76
	2017	0.43	0.53	0.66	0.87	0.80	0.47	0.60	0.56	0.61
	2018	0.83	0.7	0.75	0.82	0.73	0.69	0.81	0.71	0.76
Cycle 2	2019	0.71	0.64	0.76	0.82	0.81	0.63	0.83	0.64	0.73

Workshop Results

Departmental Data Summaries

General and school data is nice, but faculty ultimately want to learn the scores from their department's own students.

Use of the Results

Each year, the workshop data is shared with

- The General Education Committee
- The deans of the five schools
- Faculty in each of the five schools

Use of the Results

The university has attempted to improve student writing in the following ways:

- Faculty are "borrowing" from the WAW rubric for their own assignments.
- The WAW rubric has been posted electronically as a "standard" for assessing writing.
- The new QEP is targeting the two lowest WAW score items for improvement.
- We are starting to collect assignment rubrics as part of the WAW.

Assessment of the New Assessment

After every workshop, participants are asked to complete a questionnaire. The results of the 2019 questionnaire reveal some important results of the Writing Assessment Workshop.

- Discussions about the experience and how to use it occur at the close of each workshop.
- Note especially Q3 and Q4.

2019 Writing Assessment Workshop Evaluation

The following is a rating of the WAW by its participants. A rating scale of "1-terrible" to "5-excellent" was used. The topic of each question is briefly described. The written comments for each question are not included herein. Blanks in the chart indicate no response by the participant.

- Q1 - workshop organization
- Q2 - accuracy you have assessed your 12 papers
- Q3 - increasing cross-campus collegiality
- Q4 - professional development aspect
- Q5 - experience as a whole

Participant	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Mean
1	5	4	5	5	5	4.8
2	5	4	4	4	5	4.4
3	4	3	5	3	4	3.8
4	5	4	5	4	5	4.6
5	5	4	5	4	4	4.4
6	5	4	5	4	5	4.6
7	5	5	5	5	5	5
8	5	5	5	5	5	5
9	5	4				4.5
10	5	4	5	5	5	4.8
11	4	4	5	5	5	4.8
12	5	4	5	4	5	4.6
13	4	3	5	3	4	4
14	5	4	5	5	5	4.8
Mean	4.93	4.00	4.92	4.31	4.77	

blanks indicate no response

Conclusions

- The Methodist University General Education Program is being efficiently assessed using a hybrid method of class-based assessments and a coordinated system of assessing student writing samples.
- Assessment data is being used and will be used even more in the future to strengthen the student skills established in the MU General Education Program.

Acknowledgments

The presenters thank:

- The General Education Committee and WAC Program
- The Methodist University administration for support
- The Methodist University faculty for participating in and making the WAW successful

Handouts and Questions

The following handouts accompany this presentation:

- The MU WAW Short Form Rubric for 2019
- The MU WAW Long Form Rubric for 2019
- The MU General Education Assessment Mapping Guidelines
