



Open Pathway

Quality Initiative Institutional Report Template

The enclosed Quality Initiative report represents the work that the institution has undertaken to fulfill the Improvement Process of the Open Pathway.

Signature of Institution's President or Chancellor

Date: June 12, 2015

Clifton M. Smart III, President

Missouri State University

Springfield, Missouri

Date: June 12, 2015

Name of Institution: Missouri State University

State: MO

Contact Person for Report: Keri Franklin, Ph.D., Director of Assessment

Contact Person's email address: kfranklin@missouristate.edu

Institution ID: 1449

Overview of the Quality Initiative

In summer 2012, a university-wide committee of faculty and staff chaired by Dr. Tammy Jahnke, Dean of the College of Natural and Applied Science, selected assessment of student learning in Public Affairs as the focus of Missouri State's Quality Initiative Project (QIP). A Director of Assessment, Dr. Keri Franklin, associate professor of English, was hired to oversee institutional assessment for improvement—focusing on student learning and using evidence collected as an institution to improve student learning. A Public Affairs rubric (see *Appendix A*) was developed by committee and through use with student work that aligned institutional outcomes including general education student learning outcomes, student development and Public Affairs outcomes, student affairs outcomes, and professional education outcomes.

From fall 2012 through spring 2015, 72 faculty and staff submitted over 4,000 samples of student work collected from their courses, and 1,800 student essays were collected through the University Exit Exam. Four-day review workshops were held in May 2013, May 2014, and May 2015. A one-day review workshop was held in October 2013. Over 2,800 samples of student work were reviewed by faculty and staff during these workshops using an internally developed Public Affairs rubric, and, for some hard to measure artifacts, a collaborative assessment protocol. The workshop included norming, calibration, and testing for inter-rater reliability (90%).

Sharing ideas across disciplines helps us to identify effective teaching practices and the impact Missouri State has on student learning related to Public Affairs. What came to be our annual assessment of Public Affairs review workshop was a positive professional development experience that helped faculty and staff from across disciplines to gain an understanding of Public Affairs within their own courses, understand the history of Public Affairs as an institution, see new options for implementation into their teaching context, develop collaborative relationships across disciplines, and brainstorm new ways to integrate and deepen student learning related to Public Affairs.

Based on evidence of student learning and reviewer feedback, a Public Affairs Toolkit was developed and continues to be added as a resource for those who teach Public Affairs oriented courses such as GEP 101, Public Affairs courses in general education, and upper-level Public Affairs capstone requirements. Public Affairs assessment grants were offered to reviewers who participated in the review process and wanted to continue to develop assignments in classes or in departments to improve teaching and learning related to Public Affairs.

Collecting student work through courses led to conversations about better ways to collect information regarding student learning and public affairs. The QIP process led us to change what and how we collect student information and evidence through the University Exit Exam. Using the UEE allowed us to collect student work outside of specific courses and to focus on student learning in public affairs at the institutional rather than the course-level. Other changes include the development of public affairs assessment grants, and the QIP workshop is now the centerpiece of the university's new comprehensive public affairs assessment plan and the way the university intends to close the loop on assessment.

Scope and Impact of the Initiative

2. What Has Been Accomplished In Relation to Purposes and Goals

The original proposal described a three-part annual cycle of collecting and evaluating evidence and disseminating reports with a possible goal of developing this as a process to assess general education in the future. Missouri State has collected evidence and, by the October 2015 HLC site visit, will have coordinated four review sessions since the original proposal was written in 2012. The original purpose was to develop a comprehensive, university-wide assessment plan for student learning outcomes related to the Public Affairs mission in general education, discipline specific programs, and co-curricular activities. A result of this process would be to incorporate these processes into the institution’s broader assessment practices. Some changes were made to the initial process, and the process was responsive to the needs of faculty participating in the review.

The following table describes the goals established in the 2012 proposal alongside the accomplishments through 2015:

2012 Goals	Accomplishments in Relation to Goals
<p>to allow all members of the campus community to know about the outstanding existing evidence of Missouri State student learning related to the Public Affairs mission in the classroom and outside the classroom.</p>	<p>Participation by all colleges, school, staff, and students as part of the assessment workshop.</p> <p>As of May, 2015, 11 grants were awarded to faculty and staff members to further work begun during the review process.</p> <p>Developed a Public Affairs Toolkit on the webpage for campus-wide use.</p> <p>The University Exit Exam allows faculty, departments, and colleges to easily collect evidence of student learning related to Public Affairs for department and college internal assessment efforts.</p> <p>We hold an annual workshop that includes faculty, students, and staff from all colleges where they review students’ perspectives on Public Affairs and take that knowledge back to their colleges and departments as well as providing evidence for decision-making at the institutional level.</p>
<p>to provide a mechanism for measuring difficult-to-measure student learning outcomes, associated with Public Affairs, in the general education program.</p>	<p>A process for soliciting, collecting, coding, and reviewing student work was developed to assess student learning in general education, upper-level courses, and in graduate courses.</p> <p>A Public Affairs rubric was collaboratively developed and tested for an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability. The rubric is shared widely and available on the Assessment web page.</p>

Open Pathway: Quality Initiative Report Review Form

	<p>A collaborative protocol was used to measure difficult to measure student artifacts. The results were analyzed by course-level (100-level) and across a variety of media. The university's general education committee reviewed the report.</p> <p>We have developed a new process as of January 2015 to get a more complete picture of the Public Affairs mission at Missouri State. In addition to student coursework, we added the Public Affairs essay prompts collected during University Exit Exam to the process that provides the university a more complete picture of what students' leave with in terms of Public Affairs knowledge and experience at the conclusion of their degree program.</p>
<p>to give MSU a vehicle for collecting evidence on inclusive excellence and diversity, as it relates to learning outcomes of the Public Affairs mission.</p>	<p>Three of the nine attributes on the rubric are related to cultural competence. Prompts were developed to be administered during the University Exit Exam based on the rubric. In the first and second year, essays on cultural competence were reviewed. In the third year, 900 essays were reviewed related to student thinking on cultural competence. This complements other institutional efforts to gauge these outcomes, including the university Climate Survey, the National Survey of Student Engagement questions, and Public Affairs Scale data that can be used to triangulate and get a sense of the picture of Public Affairs on campus.</p> <p>Reports were developed to focus on cultural competence. Cultural competence reports from QIP were shared with the University's Diversity Task Force. The new University Exit Exam also led to student evidence collated by Public Affairs themes for review by faculty, staff, and students in summer 2015.</p>
<p>to provide feedback for improvement in all areas of student learning—in co-curricular and academic programs.</p>	<p>Reviewers provided feedback on improvement and some reviewers applied for an assessment grant to focus on improving teaching and learning related to Public Affairs in courses and programs.</p> <p>The process developed gave students an active role in the assessment process, as opposed to only participating as a survey respondent. To provide feedback, we created the University Exit Exam opportunity to look at student curricular and co-curricular experiences institutionally, not based solely on a class or course.</p> <p>Reports were published on the Assessment webpage. The Director of Assessment presented the dissemination and</p>

	<p>use of the feedback acquired from these efforts through Academic Leadership Council, HLC Steering Committee, Executive Enrollment Management, College Department Head Meetings, Advising Council, General Education Council, Student Affairs Council, and Student Development and Public Affairs, to name a few.</p>
<p>to give the institution the opportunity to share a united story about how Missouri State University is preparing our students, faculty and staff for our global world.</p>	<p>After many years as a Public Affairs institution, the conversation about what it means to teach Public Affairs has moved in a positive direction for those who have participated in this assessment process.</p> <p>The toolkit offers faculty the chance to share work designed specifically by faculty to incorporate the university's mission within their discipline.</p> <p>On the Public Affairs Toolkit web page, we have shared excellent examples of ways faculty have integrated Public Affairs into coursework.</p> <p>Efforts have been made by faculty and staff (First-Year, First-Year Orientation, Capstone, Retention) to review student opportunities for participation in Public Affairs integrated at each level. The goal for curricular and co-curricular areas to be intentional about Public Affairs integration and offer students opportunities to participate in Public Affairs, academically and non-academically, throughout their college experience.</p>

The Review Workshop

In summer 2013 and 2014, the paper preparation and paper flow process relied heavily on the National Writing Project (NWP) scoring model, including using their basic model of coding, paper flow, calibration, and anchor papers. Their process was adapted in our preparation of 4,000 samples of student work.

The first review workshop was organized in May 2013. The intent and emphasis of the workshop was to focus on institutional outcomes, not individual courses or departments. The question that led the group was “How do students understand ethical leadership, community engagement, and cultural competence institutionally through curricular and co-curricular experiences?”

Dr. Franklin facilitated the workshops in which four to five faculty and staff from different disciplines and colleges used anchor papers and practice papers to norm and calibrate using the Public Affairs rubric. Setting the group norms, understanding the background of the QIP, and becoming familiar with the rubric and calibration took a day and a half. The HLC Steering Committee chair and dean of College of Natural and Applied Sciences attended the workshop to discuss HLC, and the president of the university participated in part of the workshop. Over the course of the summer 2013 workshop, faculty and staff reviewed over 800 samples of student work collected from 47 faculty and staff, including 23 academic departments and 4 co-curricular units. In a short one-day workshop in October 2013, faculty and staff reviewed 200 samples of student work collected from 15 faculty and staff submission from 10 academic departments and 2 co-curricular units.

By the May 2014 session, several reviewers had participated in at least two previous review sessions. These faculty became table leaders and their guidance assisted the review workshop in moving more quickly. After scoring close to 300 student samples (and analysis was happening concurrently) collected from 32 faculty and staff including 16 academic departments and three co-curricular units, and directly from 29 students, the group realized that the results from the May 2014 workshop were consistent with the previous workshops. The review workshop focused on developing action plans and next steps. One of these next steps to “keep the fire going” was to have an opportunity to talk with the Provost and to offer opportunities for Public Affairs Assessment grants. The Provost met with the group in the fall and the Provost funded Public Affairs Assessment grants that fall and made a commitment of funding for a minimum of \$5,000 a year for three years.

Reports were developed and uploaded to the website regarding the results of the review session. Information from the review session was also disseminated through presentations to departments, Academic Leadership Council, Administrative Council, and more.

In May 2015, the student work reviewed was collected through the University’s Exit Exam. In fall 2014, Assessment Council had recommended a change to the University Exit Exam. In spring 2015, Assessment became the administrator of the University Exit Exam. Instead of 100% of graduates taking the ETS Proficiency Profile, 50% would take this test and 50% of seniors would complete two essays on Public Affairs. Because of this change, approximately 1900 students wrote Public Affairs essays in spring 2015. These were collected, sorted by public affairs theme and college, and de-identified to prepare for the review workshop in May 2015. Twenty-six faculty and staff and 11 undergraduate and graduate students reviewed the Public Affairs essays in summer 2015.

3. Impact of the Initiative: Changes, Processes, Policies, Curricula, Programs, Student Learning, and Success

Broadening Our Understanding of Public Affairs and Using What We Learn

The review workshop allowed a group of faculty and staff to see student work occurring around the mission. As a result of the review workshops, the Provost Office supported Public Affairs assessment grants in fall 2014. A total of 11 Public Affairs grants were awarded in Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 to further the development and/or integration of Public Affairs in assignments or in overall department assessment. These assignments have become part of the Public Affairs Toolkit and one of the Public Affairs Signature Work examples on the Assessment Public Affairs Toolkit web page, utilizing AACU’s idea of “Signature Work.”

The Provost Fellow for Student Success participated in three review workshops and has presented regarding new teaching ideas she has developed around public affairs. She is currently working on a Title III grant, and her experience has impacted conversations about that grant and the university’s first-year seminar course on public affairs.

Restructuring Institutional Assessment

The 2012 proposal led to a restructuring of assessment and its functions, including hiring a Director of Assessment and making changes to Assessment Council to include two representatives from each college. The goal of the director position was to oversee institutional assessment for improvement beginning with implementation of the proposed Quality Initiative Project. Dr. Franklin, an associate professor of English with a background in writing assessment and professional development, was hired in January 2013. The next steps beginning in January 2013 were to collect student work across the campus in earnest and figure out if the draft of the Public Affairs rubric would work when used alongside student work.

Development of an Institutional Rubric Aligned with the Statewide Public Affairs Mission

The Public Affairs rubric was developed by committee in 2012 and aligned with the university's general education student learning outcomes, student development and Public Affairs outcomes, student affairs outcomes, and professional education outcomes. In anticipation of the workshop in spring 2013, the rubric was piloted alongside recently submitted student work by a group of faculty and staff. In addition to university sources, AAC&U LEAP rubrics and Webb's Depth of Knowledge Levels were integrated into the rubric.

Closing the Loop on Public Affairs and Student Learning: Developing a Comprehensive Public Affairs Assessment Plan

One of the Board of Governors' Eight Board Goals for 2014-2015 was to develop a Public Affairs assessment plan. Our Quality Initiative Project is a key piece of our comprehensive and continuing plan to assess student learning in Public Affairs with future expansions currently in the planning stage. One key piece of the comprehensive plan is to continue to hold summer review sessions with faculty, staff, and students to assess student learning in the following areas:

- assess student learning for Public Affairs outcomes in general education
- Public Affairs outcomes in upper-level Public Affairs capstone courses
- a more comprehensive review of Public Affairs data collected during the University Exit Exam.

Changes in Curricula

Public Affairs Toolkit Web Page

The Public Affairs Toolkit was one direct result of the 2014 review of student work and subsequent conversations. This web page serves as a Public Affairs resource for new faculty or any faculty interested in viewing samples of Public Affairs assignments. Because of AACU's idea of "Signature Work" this page is being reconceived as a Public Affairs "Signature Work" page. The summer 2015 workshop included a morning in which invited faculty and a student who had been enrolled in the faculty member's course discussed how the faculty member developed an assignment and the student shared his or her approach to the assignment and how that changed perspective of Public Affairs.

Public Affairs Assessment Grants

Encouragement to, in the words of faculty participants, "keep the fire going" led to Public Affairs Assessment grants in fall 2014. Faculty in Communication, English, Communication Science Disorders, Music, Athletic Training, Counseling and Special Education, and Student Engagement submitted assessment grant proposals. If they received a grant, awardees were required to participate in three short meetings to develop a community of practice around questions of Public Affairs within their disciplines. The goal was also to collect student work for the summer 2015 workshop and sample assignments for the Signature Work page.

Departmental and Course Changes

Two departments, after having faculty and administrators participate in the workshop, Athletic Training and Occupational Therapy, made changes to the program. Occupational Therapy added Public Affairs as part of the entrance interview process.

Faculty from English, Communication, Physics, Communication Science Disorders, Agriculture, Athletic and Training made changes to courses based on participation in the workshop. For example, Physics faculty

adapted the Public Affairs rubric to heighten students' appreciation of the role of ethical leadership, community engagement, and cultural competence in their discipline. Athletic Training worked to intentionally and explicitly think through Public Affairs throughout their program by incorporating weekly blog posts about Public Affairs into students' weekly writing assignments on clinical experiences. Faculty in Agriculture asked students to write "Agriculture Leadership and Public Affairs" essays defining the pillars and asking students what they had learned at the end of an Agriculture first-year course. The School of Agriculture also developed a Public Affairs rubric to assess student work.

In the third year of the workshop, many of these faculty brought students enrolled in their courses to the workshop to share the impact of the newly developed assignments on students and to share how faculty's thinking developed related to the teaching of Public Affairs.

As reviewers returned to departments, word spread about the rubric and the process developed for the Quality Initiative Project. For example, the university's pre-med committee became aware of the Public Affairs rubric and saw ways in which they could use the Public Affairs rubric in the pre-med interview process. A faculty reviewer was invited to meet with the group to discuss this. This also led to an invitation to the Biomedical Sciences department meeting to discuss Public Affairs and the rubric.

Changes in the University Exit Exam to Support Assessment of Public Affairs

The University Exit Exam had included a Public Affairs Likert scale. Once the Assessment Office began overseeing administration of the Exit Exam, it led to an opportunity to incorporate Public Affairs open-ended questions for seniors to answer regarding Public Affairs experiences. Prompts were developed in 2014 based on the Public Affairs rubric and reviewed and discussed by Assessment Council. This change to the University Exit Exam allowed the university to collect student reflections on Public Affairs from 50% of the seniors each year.

In Year 3, instead of collecting student work samples from courses, student samples were collected through Blackboard as part of the University Exit Exam. Students choose from 10 prompts related to Public Affairs as part of the Exit Exam. These responses were collected, sorted by the pillar students chose to write about, and examined this student work during the May 2015 workshop. This change in the process resulted in a more streamlined collection process which helped to focus students' thinking on the institution rather than the course.

Teams reviewed student reflections by theme, and then faculty and staff met in college teams and reviewed student work to report to their college and departments.

4. Tools and Data Resulting from the Work

The Public Affairs rubric was developed and revised by committee and utilized in three summer workshops. A Public Affairs rubric was developed by committee in 2012 and revised in spring 2013. The rubric was aligned with institutional outcomes including general education student learning outcomes, student development and Public Affairs outcomes, student affairs outcomes, and professional education outcomes. The AACU rubrics also influenced the design of the rubrics as well.

The Director of Assessment, an undergraduate student who participated in the workshop, and the Associate Provost for Student Development and Public Affairs presented on the QIP process developed at Missouri State and shared what the university had learned, especially relate to the importance of student participation in the assessment process.

Open Pathway: Quality Initiative Report Review Form

Quality Initiative Project Scoring Workshop Results, 2013 & 2014 (<i>n</i> =1,060)						
	(4) Capstone	(3) Milestone	(2) Milestone	(1) Benchmark	Mean	SD
Holistic	3.0%	25.1%	39.5%	32.4%	1.99	0.89
Ethical Leadership						
Ethical Self-Awareness	3.4%	21.2%	28.6%	46.9%	1.76	0.85
Ethical Dilemmas & Recognition	8.0%	24.6%	36.7%	30.8%	2.09	0.91
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	6.5%	29.0%	29.0%	31.3%	2.08	0.92
Cultural Competence						
Cultural Self-Awareness	5.8%	28.6%	26.4%	39.2%	2.14	0.95
Cultural Attitudes	9.3%	25.3%	32.0%	33.3%	2.14	0.95
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	5.7%	29.7%	34.1%	30.6%	2.12	0.89
Community Engagement						
Civic Identity and Commitment	5.0%	23.2%	34.5%	37.3%	1.97	0.87
Analysis of Knowledge & Public Affairs	6.9%	19.2%	35.8%	38.2%	1.95	0.90
Civic Action & Reflection	4.2%	14.4%	46.3%	35.2%	1.75	0.78

A summer review session was held in 2013, 2014, and 2015. Each workshop lasted four days and, in the first two years, student work collected in courses was reviewed. In 2013 and 2014, a minimum of a day and a half was committed to calibrating and norming with anchor papers. Inter-rater reliability was 90% ($\alpha \approx .9$). A one-day review session in October 2013 had substantially less time for review training and review with a lower inter-rater reliability than the summer sessions. In the interest of improved accuracy, it has been omitted from the weighted averages shown in the table. In 2013 and 2014, in a review of 1,084 samples of student work—with each sample graded for each of the three pillars—mean scores for each attribute range from 1.75 (Civic Action & Reflection) to 2.14 (Cultural Self-Awareness and Cultural Attitudes). The three Cultural Competence items had the highest mean scores across all sessions in those years.

	Faculty/Staff Submissions	Academic Departments	Co-curricular Units	Collected Directly from Students	Total Submissions
Summer 2013	47 faculty/staff submissions	23	4	0	2,167
Fall 2013	15 faculty/staff submissions	10	2	0	553
Summer 2014	32 faculty/staff submissions	16	3	29	1,148
Summer 2015	5 faculty/staff submissions	0	0	1,871	1,876
					5,745

In the 2015 review workshop, student work was collected via the University Exit Exam on Blackboard. This process was beneficial in several ways. There were fewer problems with students inputting incorrect student ID numbers. The common prompts aligned with the rubric helped create consistency in the responses. Prompts developed aligned with the rubric and reviewed by Assessment Council before being piloted in spring 2015. Student work could also be coded by department and student responses could be sent in a timely manner directly to colleges for dissemination to departments to close the loop. Unlike previous scoring sessions, each sample of work was linked to a specific pillar and scored accordingly.

Quality Initiative Project Scoring Workshop Results, 2015 (n=1,871)						
	(4) Capstone	(3) Milestone	(2) Milestone	(1) Benchmark	Mean	SD
Ethical Leadership (n=478)						
Ethical Self-Awareness	10.6%	18.5%	32.1%	38.8%	2.01	1.00
Ethical Dilemmas and Recognition	5.1%	5.1%	25.4%	64.4%	1.51	0.82
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	18.2%	25.0%	27.1%	29.7%	2.32	1.09
Community Engagement (n=407)						
Civic Identity & Commitment	17.1%	36.6%	30.9%	15.4%	2.55	0.95
Civic Action & Reflection	8.7%	17.4%	27.8%	46.1%	1.89	0.99
Analysis of Knowledge and Public Affairs	8.6%	10.3%	29.9%	51.3%	1.71	0.95
Cultural Competence (n=906)						
Cultural Self-Awareness	23.6%	19.4%	22.2%	34.7%	2.32	1.19
Cultural Attitudes	20.2%	19.7%	33.0%	27.2%	2.33	1.08
Diversity of Communities & Cultures 1	22.0%	27.4%	30.4%	20.2%	2.51	1.05
Diversity of Communities & Cultures 2	26.9%	19.2%	26.9%	26.9%	2.46	1.15

For at least five years, the Public Affairs Scale has been collected through the University Exit Exam but not widely shared. One success of the QIP project is that this data is now used to complement the rubric-assessed review of student work. Due to the Quality Initiative Project, the student responses to the scale are used to triangulate the review of student work to provide a richer picture of Public Affairs learning as students experience it.

In spring 2015, direct measures show students scoring higher in cultural competence, and a majority of students chose to write about cultural competence than the other areas. While the direct measure—student work assessed with the rubric in the area of cultural competence had a higher overall mean, the indirect measure—the Public Affairs Scale--shows students' confidence level in cultural competence is less than the other pillars. At the same time, rubric-assessed student work in ethical leadership has the most student work at the benchmark and milestone levels, yet students showed the most confidence in ethical leadership through the Public Affairs scale.

5. Challenges and Opportunities Encountered

An initial challenge was gaining interest in an institutional assessment process. After three years, interest in the process is an opportunity. All colleges participated in the process. Faculty, staff, students, and administrators were included in the review. The next opportunity and challenge, as of May 2015, is to turn this established network of people who have an interest in assessment and Public Affairs into a sustained and focused forward-moving effort as part of the university's comprehensive assessment plan.

The new process of moving the collection of student work outside the course-level is a positive one. The process of collecting evidence at the senior-level is a major success. A next step is to find the most efficient and streamlined way to reach first-year and transfer students.

This type of institutional assessment—looking directly at student work outside of a department or college—was new to the university. Developing trust that the process was to understand student learning as opposed to evaluating courses or instructors was key. To build trust in the process, it was important that participation was voluntary and that a modest stipend supported the extra work required of assessment.

As with all assessment work, a challenge is getting the information out campus-wide in a usable and meaningful format and in the hands of decision-makers of all levels.

Commitment to and Engagement in the Quality Initiative

6. Faculty and Staff Involvement and Perceptions of Worth and Impact

A faculty and staff committed met in summer 2012 to develop the proposal. A main goal was to include as many into the work as possible. A highlight of the initiative was our inclusion in Year 2 of an undergraduate and graduate student. In Year 3, 10 students were recruited by faculty and staff and participated. Over the course of three years, 66 individual faculty, staff, student, and administrators have participated as reviewers. Each college, school, and unit has been represented.

	Students	Staff	Instructor	Senior Instructor	Assistant Professor*	Associate Professor*	Professor*
Year 1	0	3	2	1	2	6	5
Year 2	2	4	2	3	6	5	6
Year 3	11	7	0	3	6	9	2

*Includes department heads, program coordinators, and associate deans

7. Most Important Points Learned By Those Involved

In an analysis of the reflections from 2013-2015, several key ideas emerged. Faculty and staff left the workshop with a broader understanding of public affairs and ideas for ways to change teaching in a classroom or public affairs integration in a department or college. Participants valued the opportunity to make connections across disciplines and discuss student learning with colleagues. The process gave participants a broader understanding of Public Affairs and an opportunity to define it for themselves within their discipline. Last, including students in the assessment process is essential.

Of the 66 reviewers who participated, several returned to a second workshop which shows, at some level, people's perceptions of the worth of the project. By the end of each of the workshops, faculty, staff, and students were overwhelmingly positive and enthusiastic about their participation. Participants felt either a new sense of the worth of Public Affairs or a renewed sense of next steps and knowledge that others at the university felt similarly. One participant wrote: "It's exciting and reaffirming to watch [participants] go from tentative participants to active participants to engaged leaders." The workshops have turned a potentially daunting task into something participants see as "easier than [they] thought"—truly a goal for all assessment.

A senior instructor wrote the following in 2015:

Benefits for me range from social interaction with faculty from other disciplines to a deepening inquiry into the meaning of the public affairs mission itself and the strength and desire to help students internalize it, thus giving them the tools to become the more fully realized citizens we hope to see. We want them to succeed professionally, but we want them to know that acting within the framework of ethical leadership, cultural competence, and community engagement is both possible and essential to success which is an otherwise hollow term. From this assessment activity, I get encouragement, inspiration, and concrete ways to move ahead. I both expand my thinking on the Public Affairs mission and more narrowly focus my use of it in the classroom.

A department head noted the following:

Most worthwhile for me is the realization of ways in which instructors and administrators, at the department level, can learn from the student feedback. Clearly, being a Public Affairs university is gaining greater traction as all constituents appreciate how the three pillars can vastly improve themselves, their community and the world. The initiative has clearly impacted the campus as gen ed courses were revisited, SLOs were created and we engage in the assessment of those SLO's. Participating in this workshop has inspired me with new ideas regarding what I can do to influence my peers and students. Additionally, I made contacts and been given great, concrete and actionable strategies to employ.

A student noted the following:

- This project is worthwhile because it is evaluating something that our university considers to be a fundamental part of our character. The Public Affairs mission is supposed to make Missouri State stand out as distinct from the 1000s of other educational institutions in our nation. If this is the case then we should constantly be evaluating it and improving upon the foundations of our understanding of Public Affairs.
- The impact of the QIP is that more people are starting to understand what Public Affairs is all about. Faculty and staff are looking at it from a deeper level to gain understanding of each pillar. They are then looking for practical ways to translate that to students. The students involved are starting to see the value in Public Affairs and to apply it to their own personal and professional lives because of this investment.
- Most important points learned:
 - Everyone needs to understand the value of Public Affairs for them to have an interest in it
 - Public Affairs can be easily incorporated into existing curriculum

Another student shared the following:

This event has had a large impact on me in two ways. The first is an improvement of my understanding of Public Affairs. Prior to this event, I could rattle off the three pillars and tell you in what ways I embody those ideals. I can now identify ways in which I still need to grow. I have understanding, now I need action. I need to apply my knowledge to my

civic and political identity. I need to seek interactions with diverse people with the intention of learning from them. The second way is that it has allowed me to form meaningful connections with and gain wisdom from other members of the university. The collection of backgrounds, personalities and opinions in this room allows for excellent collaboration. The work we have done could not be done by one person, because it would have been one dimensional. The depth of thought needed for meaningful solutions came from three-dimensional meshing of contributions.

An assistant professor shared the following:

I've been aware of the Public Affairs mission and my program manifests the pillars fairly explicitly, but the QIP process helped focus the mission even more for me. I'm finishing my second year as faculty, so I'm still trying to integrate a lot of things. This was well-timed for me as I revise/plan classes for this fall and have conversations with our department head. Our program has components that specifically affect civic engagement and cultural competence in fairly comprehensive ways. We have been having conversations about modifying the capstone to include a career development component. The QIP process helped me suggest we use the capstone/career topic to provide a focus for ethical leadership development.

Faculty noted that it helps them in tangible ways to alter teaching in their own programs, and that it provides a platform for a broader understanding of Public Affairs at the institutional level. What they want to see is the impact they felt move beyond the workshop through the active support of upper administration, with Public Affairs becoming a more essential part of university life/function.

An associate professor wrote:

The QIP has been a great deal of benefit to me as teacher. It has given me a reason to pause and assess its value to my students, to think creatively about ways to inspire my students about the Public Affairs Mission, and to share ideas with other faculty. I have found the interactions with other faculty, students, and staff inspiring and motivating. I look forward to using my enthusiasm at the first department meeting! I look forward to further involvement. I look forward to clarifying the Public Affairs Mission and helping my students 'connect the dots.'

Resource Provision

8. Human, Financial, Physical, Resources to Support the Work

The campus community and the Office of the Provost made a commitment to this project. An internal Director of Assessment and faculty member was hired to oversee the process. A principle that guided the work was that this project was "extra." It took time and that time needed to be recognized. Financial resources were used to recognize each step of the process. Faculty and staff were given a Starbucks card for submitting student work. Graduate assistants were utilized to assist with making copies so faculty and staff would not have to. Faculty were paid a modest stipend for participating as a reviewer.

Assessment staff, including the director, graduate assistants, and assessment and learning outcomes consultants supported the process.

The Provost Office committed \$45,000 for three cycles of review workshops from 2013-2015. An additional, \$15,000 (\$5,000 per year from 2015-2017) was committed by the Provost Office for Public Affairs Assessment grants to “keep the fire alive”—a direct request of faculty and staff reviewers. Eleven grants were supported in fall 2014. Ten more grants will be available in fall 2015 and spring 2016. The Assessment budget was used to supplement the cost of the final year of the project due to increased interest (\$6,000). The Provost committed additional funds when more reviewers participated in year 1, 2, and 3 than planned.

As the process of collecting student work moved to Blackboard and the Exit Exam, Computer Services, the Blackboard team, and the Registrar’s office worked together to change the administration. Assessment Council reviewed the process and provided feedback. Deans were essential to the success of this process in terms of supporting faculty participation and disseminating reports.

Plans for the Future and Future Milestones

9. Plans for Ongoing Work Related to or as a Result Initiative

Missouri State has a strong group of advocates of public affairs at all levels—from undergraduate students to faculty to staff to administrators—because of this project. Approximately 10% of faculty submitted course work for the project, and 66 individuals participated in the workshop.

Our plan for the future must be to “keep the fire going.” The Assessment will office will continue to bring groups of people together to discuss and share ideas about students learning. Public Affairs assessment grants will continue, and we will continue to streamline the process of collecting student work, and make sure this information is shared in a timely manner on campus so those who teach can review and analyze for their own purposes as they consider their discipline and teaching. The review workshop developed through the QIP project will continue as the centerpiece of the university’s comprehensive Public Affairs assessment plan. The Annual Comprehensive Public Affairs Assessment is the most important step to close the loop on assessment.

Reflections from participants, the level of participation, and the changes that have been made at many levels provide evidence the goals of the original proposal have been met and surpassed. Participants in 2015 had several suggestions for building on the successes of the original proposal, including:

- Develop opportunities to discuss student learning in interdisciplinary groups.
- Consider conceptualizing a longitudinal research study to understand how students experience Public Affairs across a four-year degree
- Continuing to improve Blackboard’s use as a platform for the University Exit Exam.
- Provide evidence collected from the University Exit Exam in a timely manner during the semester the student work is collected. Improving the turnaround time and dissemination improves the institute, the colleges, and departments ability to use the data. Giving people evidence from the Exit Exam in as timely a manner as possible. Improving the turnaround time from data collection to evidence dissemination, and work to bring people together to talk about what the data means.
- Considering ways to use the process developed for QIP for other purposes such as assessment of general education outcomes at the institutional level.

10. Practices or Artifacts to Be Shared

We are extremely proud of the outcome of this three-year project and would be willing and, in fact, want to share what we have learned widely, including:

- the paper flow process developed during the scoring

- how to develop interdisciplinary collaboration
- reviewing student work with a rubric
- ways to enact assessment of student learning into concrete next steps (developing a toolkit, assessment grants, helping colleges and departments close the loop)
- use of direct (looking at student work) and indirect (Public Affairs scale) measures to assess student learning in Public Affairs
- inviting students to participate alongside faculty and staff in the assessment process

Appendix A: Public Affairs rubric (May, 2014)

Attribute	Extended Thinking (4)	Strategic Thinking (3)	Skill/Concept (2)	Recall (1)
Ethical Self-Awareness	Discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of core beliefs, and discussion has depth and clarity.	Discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	States both core beliefs and the origins of core beliefs.	States either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of core beliefs but not both.
Ethical Dilemmas and Recognition	Recognizes ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.	Recognizes ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.	Recognizes basic and obvious ethical issues and grasps (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.	Recognizes basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Independently applies ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately. Considers the full implications of the application. The application is accurate.	Independently applies ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question. Considers specific implications of the application. The application may not be accurate.	Applies ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example). The application may be inaccurate.	Applies ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts independently (to a new example).
Cultural Self-Awareness	Articulates insights into cultural rules and biases (e.g., seeks new perspectives; aware of how her/his personal experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description).	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g., not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer).	Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g., with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others).	Shows minimal awareness of other cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural groups(s)) (e.g., is uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others).
Cultural Attitudes	Initiates and develops interactions with culturally different others. Suspends judgment in valuing his/her interactions with culturally different others.	Begins to initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others. Begins to suspend judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.	Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, and is aware of own judgment and expresses a willingness to change.	Receptive to interacting with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in his/her interaction with culturally different others, but is unaware of own judgment.

Open Pathway: Quality Initiative Report Review Form

Attribute	Extended Thinking (4)	Strategic Thinking (3)	Skill/Concept (2)	Recall (1)
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others' engagement with diversity.	Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Expresses attitudes and beliefs as an individual, from a one-sided view. May be indifferent, resistant, or does not reflect on what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
Civic Identity and Commitment	Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action.	Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a growing sense of civic identity and commitment.	Evidence suggests involvement in civic-engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic identity.	Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not connect experiences to civic identity.
Analysis of Knowledge and Public Affairs	Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics and government.	Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline making relevant connections to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics and government.	Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to identify knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline that is relevant to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics and government.
Civic Action and Reflection	Demonstrates independent experience and <i>shows initiative in team leadership</i> of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.	Demonstrates independent experience and <i>team leadership</i> of civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of those actions.	Has clearly <i>participated</i> in civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how those actions may benefit individual(s) or communities.	Has <i>experimented</i> with some civic activities but shows little internalized understanding of their aims or effects and little commitment to future action.