Organizing Assignment-Design Work On Your Campus

A Tool Kit of Resources and Materials
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NILOA Mission

The National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment’s (NILOA) primary objective is to discover and disseminate ways that academic programs and institutions can productively use assessment data internally to inform and strengthen undergraduate education, and externally to communicate with policy makers, families and other stakeholders.

Please cite as:
In 2013, as part of our role in documenting campus experience with the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP), the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) began working with faculty to create an online “Assignment Library” of faculty-designed and peer-reviewed assignments linked to DQP proficiencies.

Our goal in this work has been to promote an embedded approach to assessment—through the assignments that faculty require of their students—that is integral to the teaching and learning process and therefore more likely to lead to improvement than “add-on,” compliance-driven approaches. Thoughtfully designed assignments can support learning-centered curricular and pedagogical reform and create clearer, more powerful pathways for students. And for faculty, working together on the design of assignments has turned out to be a powerful professional development experience.

Through the Assignment Library Initiative, NILOA has organized and sponsored a series of assignment-design “charrettes” (a term borrowed from architecture education denoting a collaborative design process) for faculty from around the country who have applied to participate.

But what has become increasingly clear is that campuses (and sometimes systems and states, and even disciplinary societies) are interested in organizing their own such events. That is the purpose of this toolkit: to provide tools, materials, and resources that can be borrowed and adapted to local circumstances. We hope you find them useful...and we invite your feedback (niloa@education.illinois.edu) on how to add to and improve them.

To download the items collected here, please complete this brief log-in so we can learn about patterns of use and how to improve this collection.

**Background**

*Catalyzing assignment design activity on your campus: Lessons from NILOA’s assignment library initiative*. This 2015 NILOA report makes the case for the value of a focus on assignment design, and highlights features of powerful assignments. It describes the NILOA “charrette” model as well as adaptations and examples from campuses. In addition, *Designing Effective Classroom Assignments: Intellectual Work Worth Sharing*, further explores the assignment design process for campuses.
Organizing around Shared Learning Outcomes

A critical principle behind NILOA’s work on assignment design is the idea that powerful assignments advance (and assess) the learning outcomes the institution cares about. This means organizing work on assignments around shared frameworks for learning. These may be institutional or program outcomes developed by your campus and/or proficiency frameworks developed beyond the campus, including the following:

1. The Degree Qualifications Profile:

2. The Association of American Colleges and Universities’ Essential Learning Outcomes is another possible framework—one that overlaps in many ways with the DQP.


The NILOA Charrette Model and Materials

- Assignment design charrette invitation, to participants
- Agenda (with annotations) to adapt
- NILOA process, step by step, to guide the work of participants
- NILOA charrette feedback form
- PowerPoint presentation designed to parallel the agenda

Guidelines for Charrette Facilitators

- Guidelines for assignment-design charrette facilitators
- Questions for reflection and conversation

The Quality Question

The NILOA Assignment Library Initiative did not begin with a sharp delineation of the features of effective or powerful assignments; we chose to turn to the field to answer that question in more organic ways.
You may be interested in the list of features identified by the first charrette group, and What Makes an Assignment Effective? Tentative Set of Features for Discussion, a set of principles adapted from a NILOA/AACU webinar.

Campuses may want to take up this question locally, or even build it into the charrette process as an opening or closing point of discussion.

Central to the quality question is the relationship between the design (and use) of an assignment and the quality of students’ response. Here are reports from two research projects that speak to this issue—and reinforce the importance of effective design in facilitating the success of all students:


Transparency in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (TILT Higher Ed).

The Disciplines

- American Historical Association
  - AHA assignment charrette suggestions to AHA facilitators
  - AHA suggestions for charrette staff, facilitators, and recorders Questions
  - AHA assignment charrette feedback form

- National Communication Association
  - Forthcoming

Models and Materials from Campuses and Related Initiatives

Transparent Assignment Design, UNLV.

The Transparency in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (TILT Higher Ed) project is housed at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Its goal is to help faculty to implement a transparent teaching framework that promotes college students' success equitably. Assignment design plays a key role in the project.

For an overview of the TILT Higher Ed project, its methods, findings and publications, see: http://www.unlv.edu/provost/teachingandlearning
For research results and faculty reflections from the Transparency and Problem-Centered Learning Project, in partnership with the Association of American Colleges and Universities, see: http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/2016/winter-spring

Materials to support the development of transparent assignments:
- Transparent Assignment Templates: for faculty, for students
- Examples of less transparent and more transparent assignments
  - Example A
  - Example B
  - Example C
  - Example D
- Transparent Tuesdays invitation (revise your assignments with colleagues online)
- DRAFT Checklist for Transparent Assignment Design (send your suggestions)

Washington State University

As part of an effort to advance and assess institutional learning outcomes, and to embed assessment in existing classroom work, WSU organized a two-day workshop focused on the design of assignments for senior-level, integrative learning in capstone courses. Faculty from 4 campuses, 9 colleges, and 22 departments participated; together, these 30 instructors brought assignments from a wide range of disciplines, including capstones in the major and in general education. Each instructor shared an assignment, participated in a charrette, and committed to revising the assignment based on feedback from colleagues.

Participants reported they traded ideas about teaching (96%) and came away with concrete ideas about how to strengthen their assignment and make those changes later (100%). Nearly all faculty said they revised their assignment based on capstone principles (96%) or integrative learning design (89%), for example, by being more explicit about the assignment’s purpose, task and evaluation, or by improving the connection and extension of prior learning. Faculty expect the workshop and charrette experience to impact their teaching in other courses as well, including how they design assignments and how they grade student work.

WSU’s Sample Materials
- Details for faculty participants (workshop description, preparation and expectations)
- Faculty Pre-Workshop Survey Questions
- Faculty Post-Survey: Capstone Assignment ReDesign
Presentations and Webinars

Also helpful as an overview of the assignment-design initiative are two webinars:

December 17, 2014: Pat Hutchings & Natasha Jankowski, NILOA

- Assignment Design (recording)
- PowerPoint slides (pdf)

December 17, 2015: Pat Hutchings, NILOA, and Susan Albertine, AAC&U

- Catalyzing Collaborative Work on Assignment Design (Webinar Recording)
- Catalyzing Collaborative Work on Assignment Design Slides (pdf)

AAC&U and NILOA workshop on Transparent Assignment Design

October 10, 2016: Pat Hutchings, NILOA, Susan Albertine, AAC&U, and Mary Ann Winkelmes, UNLV

- Transparency And Equity Workshop (Webinar Recording)

See also the list of features outlined in this NILOA presentation, Paralleling the Agenda: Assignment Design Charrette.

Finally, here are the presentation materials to serve as a guide for unfacilitated assignment design charrettes:

- Unfacilitated Assignment Design (Webinar Recording)
- Unfacilitated Assignment Design Slides (pdf)
Guidelines for Assignment-Design Charrette Facilitators

The charrettes sponsored by NILOA have employed trained facilitators, and this document draws on their experience. But for campus events with large numbers of participants, it may not be feasible to have facilitators (i.e., group members whose primary responsibility is to manage the discussion and the timing of the process). If your event will not have designated facilitators, please see the Guide on unfacilitated charrettes.

1. Recognize that participants are likely to be nervous about sharing assignments, which have traditionally been fairly private work. It may be helpful to begin by acknowledging this outright, using the occasion to set a tone of constructive review and sharing ("we’re all in this together"), a focus on improvement, and an understanding that every assignment is a work in progress, which requires adjustments and modifications over time.

2. Following on this first point, work with the group to establish some “rules of engagement.” These might include turn taking, the importance of active listening, a focus on being helpful rather than critical, and mutual respect.

3. Manage the time. NILOA’s charrette model allows 25 minutes per assignment, which includes a brief introductory context-setting by the assignment author, and 5 minutes for written feedback at the end, with discussion in between. You may want to revise this timing to suit the context, but whatever timing is agreed upon, the facilitator’s first and sometimes hardest job is to monitor the time and make sure that everyone in the group can contribute—and benefit.

4. Prepare for the session by reading all the assignments carefully and come with some questions and issues that seem important to raise if they do not emerge naturally within the discussion. It may be helpful to look at NILOA’s list of questions for reflection and conversation: http://www.assignmentlibrary.org/uploaded/files/Questions_to_Ask_About_an_Assignment.pdf. This document could also be shared with participants as a way to get started.

5. At the end of each round, ask everyone in the group to write feedback to the person whose assignment has been discussed. NILOA’s feedback form is very simple—just 4 open-ended questions—but you could modify the form to focus it more on local goals. For instance, if your charrette focused on assignments designed to stimulate and assess integrative learning, one of the questions might ask about the assignment’s strengths vis-à-vis that outcome.
Additionally, facilitators at NILOA charrettes have found it useful to hand out the feedback forms at the beginning of the discussion so participants can make notes on them all along the way rather than waiting for the final 5 minutes.

6. At the end of the charrette, after everyone’s assignment has been discussed, the facilitator can invite participants to reflect on the process: what have they learned, what themes seemed to emerge, how did it feel, what next steps (personally or for the program or institution) would be useful? This is also a chance to invite insights about the characteristics of powerful assignments.
Assignment Design: Questions for Reflection and Conversation

As part of our role in documenting campus experience with the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP), the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment has begun to assemble an “assignment library,” a collection of high-quality assignments designed and used by faculty to assess DQP proficiencies which serve as examples to incite faculty to craft their own assignments. Toward this end, we have convened groups of faculty and invited them to share their assignments with one another and work together to refine and improve them. The questions that follow are intended to capture the kinds of issues raised by these faculty members as they talked with one another. We put them forward here in the hopes that they will be useful to others—either as prompts for individual faculty reflection or as “conversation starters” for colleagues working together on their own campuses to improve their assignments.

The list is meant to be suggestive, not comprehensive; it is a work in progress that will be refined and expanded based on suggestions from individuals and groups engaged in work on assignments.

For other resources related to assignment design, see http://www.assignmentlibrary.org/resources

Purpose and Alignment

What is the main purpose of the assignment?

How well does it provide a means for students to exhibit or demonstrate the proficiency you want them to have mastered?

How is the assignment related to course goals? Could that connection be made stronger or more explicit?

The Degree Qualifications Profile specifies five broad areas of proficiency: specialized knowledge; broad, integrative knowledge; civic and global learning; applied and collaborative learning; and intellectual skills. To learn more visit: http://degreeprofile.org
How is the assignment related to larger program goals (e.g., outcomes of the major, general education goals, or institution-level learning outcomes)? Could that connection be made stronger or more explicit?

Do students understand these connections? Would it be useful to help them do so? What would that look like?

**Clarity and Communication**

Is the assignment and its purpose clear to students? (See assignment template, Ewell, 2013).

Does the assignment as written provide sufficient information for students to be able to generate a successful (and scorable) response?

How might students misunderstand the assignment or understand it differently than it is intended?

**Value for Learning**

What do students learn—or what do you hope they will learn—in responding to the assignment?

Does the assignment push students to a next level of understanding or skill development? If not, could it do so?

Is there an opportunity to open up the assignment to other media and genres of performance? Rather than a traditional research paper intended for the instructor, might it, for instance, be a news article intended for a relevant community of readers? Could it be a group project? A PowerPoint presentation?

**Scaffolding**

Does the course provide sufficient practice, information, and sequenced activities on the assignment’s topic to allow students to be successful?

Does the assignment help to prepare students for subsequent related assignments, in this course and/or beyond?
What kinds of feedback on this assignment are most useful to students? How are opportunities for feedback and revision (or multiple drafts) built into the assignment?

**Motivation and Engagement**

Is the assignment pitched at the right level of expectation given students’ preparation and experience?

Is the assignment likely to motivate students to do their best work? Does it present an “intriguing problem” (Bean, 2011, p. 98)?

How might the assignment be made more engaging for students?

Is the assignment sufficiently challenging? Is it too hard?

**Assessment Rubrics and Criteria**

What does a “good” student response to the assignment entail or look like?

Do you employ a rubric or explicit set of criteria for evaluating student work on the assignment? Are the criteria for assessing student performance on the assignment clearly aligned with the purpose and goals of the assignment?

Are the criteria for assessing student performance on the assignment sufficiently clear to students?

**Ongoing Development and Improvement**

Are there aspects of the assignment that you’d like to reconsider or redesign?

What information would be helpful to you in redesigning and strengthening the assignment?

NILOA’s Assignment Library was created in response to requests from faculty and campuses seeking examples, models, and templates for assessing DQP proficiencies. Assessment that relies on assignments given by faculty as part of students’ regular coursework can help make assessment a more integral part of teaching and learning and therefore more useful for improvement. To access the Assignment Library (and submit a contribution), see assignmentlibrary.org
Sample Annotated Agenda for an Assignment Design Event

Preliminary notes and suggestions:
This agenda assumes a half-day event—which is probably enough since most participants find the experience quite intense—but it could certainly be extended. A nice touch, and enticement to participate, is to begin with breakfast or lunch.

Participants should bring copies of a draft assignment with them. And it’s even better if they can submit those assignments in advance so they can be distributed and read by others in the group before the actual event. As noted in the “invitation to participate” document in this toolkit, assignments (as given to students) should be accompanied by a reflective memo that explains the context in which the assignment is used, and a rubric or criteria for evaluating student work.

How should groups be organized? Most faculty appear to be more comfortable sharing their pedagogical work with others who are not in their immediate department. Multi-disciplinary groups have the advantage, as well, of raising questions about more cross-cutting outcomes. On the other hand, some assignments focus on knowledge and abilities that are particular to the field and where at least some knowledge of the field is required in order to respond in a meaningful way. With this in mind, a middle ground is to create groups by families or field: for instance arts and humanities together, social sciences, and so forth. As noted in the next paragraph, another option is to invite faculty to participate in teams.

Who should participate? Faculty members, of course, including adjuncts. But think about including others who interact with students and shape the educational experience: librarians, student life professionals, advisors. They may not have assignments to contribute but they can bring important insights. Additionally, think about inviting participants to attend and work together as teams with assignments that are, or could be, connected to one another in ways that create clearer, stronger pathways for students. For instance, a faculty member teaching a lower level course in the major might attend with one who teaches the capstone; their focus would be on linking those assignments in some way.

See accompanying PP slides, which you are free to adapt.

Welcome and Introductions [10 minutes]
Depending on the size of the group, introductions could be at tables instead of around the full group. Keep in mind that there will be some nervousness about sharing work that is often seen as private; this is a chance to create a welcoming, improvement-oriented tone. See Guidelines for Facilitators elsewhere in this toolkit.
Context and Rationale [10 minutes]
It’s important to begin with a clear sense of purpose: why focus on assignments? What are the goals for the day? What do you hope that people will take away from the occasion? See accompanying PowerPoint slides. Emphasize the value of the experience to faculty and to students.

This could also be a time to mention and briefly describe the NILOA Assignment Library, to give participants a sense that they are part of something bigger. There are several slides focused on the NILOA initiative.

Charrette Discussions [timing depends on the size of the groups]
In this segment, you’ll work in small groups, with colleagues, to discuss your assignments. The goal here is to share what you’re working on with others who will ask good questions, offer suggestions, prompt consequential reflection and also learn from what you’re doing. Each group will have a facilitator.

Participants should be sitting in small groups with a facilitator (see Guidelines for Facilitators). NILOA has found that groups of 4-5 (not counting the facilitator) work well to give voice to diverse perspective. But depending on available time, groups can be smaller than this. Before beginning, distribute the assignments, if they have not been sent around in advance, so everyone has a copy of the assignment(s) under discussion. Also distribute the feedback sheet (see sample elsewhere in this toolkit).

The NILOA process is as follows for each participant in the group:

- Assignment author sets up the discussion, briefly reviewing the focus and purpose of the assignment, and indicating what kind of feedback would be most useful—5 minutes
- Q&A, feedback, discussion—15 minutes
- Written feedback—5 minutes
- Brief break before the next person

We have found that it’s useful to include this set of bullets in the agenda; it is also on the PP slides and on a handout that can be provided to participants to guide them through the entire process.

Reflections [15 minutes]
This can be done within the charrette groups or (better probably) as a group of the whole. What have people learned? What themes have emerged? What was it like to participate in this work? How might others be involved? Are there aspects of the process that would be helpful with other groups on campus?

Adjourn
Dear all,

I hope you are well as the holiday breaks begin. Thank you for agreeing to help staff the AHA's Assignment Charrette for this year's Undergraduate Teaching Workshop in Atlanta.

A few things. First, please read Pat Hutchings, Natasha A. Jankowski, & Peter T. Ewell, “Catalyzing Assignment Design Activity on Your Campus: Lessons from NILOA's Assignment Library Initiative. You are all already familiar with the AHA's Tuning project; this article will fill you in on another important context for our assignment charrette, which we have adapted for historians from a process that the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) has been implementing with interdisciplinary groups of faculty around the country. This reading will give you a sense of other work that is being done in the area of faculty work on assignments, and spells out some of the goals that we can hope to achieve with our workshop participants in a few weeks.

Second, I will be writing again in the next day to share the full set of assignment materials from all of the workshop participants. At that time, I will also let you know which pairs of facilitator and recorder will be working with which groups of 4-5 faculty presenters. Please plan to read the assignments and other documents from your group of presenters very carefully and take notes. In addition, I encourage you to read through as many of the other assignments as you can, with the understanding that you will not go into as much depth with them.

Third, please read the attached set of suggested questions for facilitators to ask during an assignment charrette. Note that because this document was produced specifically for the NILOA charrettes based on the Degree Qualifications Profile, the introductory remarks are not perfectly aligned with our own, specific goals for a charrette of assignments used in introductory history courses. Nevertheless, I think that this is a very useful list. I will adapt a version of it to hand out to facilitators and staff at the workshop (and email to you before that).

Finally, we would like to schedule a conference call to help orient you all to your tasks. I will be sending out a Doodle scheduling poll for this by tomorrow; please reply as soon as possible. I expect that we might need to hold two such calls, because people's holiday schedules will be tricky. If we succeed in getting you all on a call, I might still have an optional in-person meeting in Atlanta on Thursday, January 7 for any last-minute questions or issues, but you don't need to plan your meeting schedule around it. I just want you all to feel confident that you know what you are supposed to do, and that we are all on the same page.

I'll be in touch again very soon. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks again for your help,
Julia

Julia Brookins
Special Projects Coordinator
American Historical Association
Our goals for this workshop are to practice collaborative methods for refining great assignments, and to generate specific ideas for further faculty work on history teaching, especially in relation to student learning through assignments at the introductory collegiate level.

The presenters have all written 1-page memos about their assignments and will have five minutes to concisely summarize and provide additional context to frame discussion of their work with colleagues. By the end of the 5-minute introductory statement, each Charrette member should have a clear understanding of the following:

1. Course location within the curriculum
2. Student demographics (level, major/non-major), etc.
3. Student motivation for taking the course
4. Ways assignment fits into course content
5. Proficiencies being assessed
6. Experience with assignment
7. Particular challenges faced by students
8. Questions for colleagues

Suggestions for facilitators:

After the oral introduction, make sure the presenter has addressed the 8 points above in at least cursory form. Be prepared with a few questions or probes to use should conversation be slow to start. Be willing and ready to restate or summarize major points to help the presenter stay relaxed and keep the conversation in constructive territory. Keep the conversation moving when it drifts or seems overly redundant.

You and every other presenter should fill out a feedback form at the end of each presentation. The recorder/secretary may fill one out, but does not need to—it might be more productive to spend this time going over notes. Make sure that each presenter collects all of the feedback forms at the end of his or her allotted time.
Suggestions for facilitator questions to have ready if needed:

- What are specific qualities and characteristics that highlight the strengths or weaknesses of this assignment?
- What does this assignment look like from the student perspective?
- Do students have a clear understanding of what is expected and how they will be graded?
- How appropriate is this assignment based on the level of students in the class?
- How is this assignment part of a growth process for students?
- What are students expected to learn by doing the task? (Not just: What are they demonstrating by completing the assignment?)
- This assignment is worth X% of the grade. What else do students do in the course that will increase the likelihood that they will be successful?
- What opportunities do students have for practice, feedback, and refinement?
- Is this a ‘high stakes’ assignment? Are there examples for partial credit? Does the student’s experience in the discipline make a difference?
- What would a response from a more advanced student completing this assignment look like?
- If the class has students at various levels and interests (beginning, mid-level and seniors/majors/non-majors) are all held to the same standard?
- What would a capstone paper look like, and how are these different from responses to a research paper or primary-source analysis in an introductory class?
- Is the language clear? Is the format easy to understand? Are there components that are either missing or extraneous, given what the instructor wants students to do?

Suggestions for recorders:

Keep time for the group. Oral intro by presenter - 5 minutes; Discussion -15 minutes; writing feedback – 5 minutes. (Jane Doe, John Doe, and Joe Doe only have 4 presenters, so you can take extra 3-4 minutes in discussion and 1 minute on the written feedback in those groups.)

Please take written notes on the discussion (do not make an audio or video recording). Pay attention not only to the concerns that arise in multiple discussions, but also to the broader themes and ideas that seem to be emerging across the group. Some keywords that I thought I saw while reading the assignments included: imagination, narrative, past/present, meta-cognition, empathy, scaffolding analytical writing, identifying significant questions and generating research strategies, conflicting sources, and civic contexts for history education.

The facilitator and every other presenter should fill out a feedback form at the end of each section. As the recorder, you may but do not need to fill out a feedback form—it might be more productive to spend this time adding to going over your notes.
After the small group discussions, you will have 25 minutes to confer with other recorders and distill the lessons from each of the separate group discussions into a single presentation of 15 minutes. You may choose how to divide up the task of presenting your findings to the whole group, but please provide the audience with a synthesis, not a series of separate summaries. In addition to these summary lessons, you might want to share a handful of open questions or next steps for history instructors that emerge from your meeting. Your presentation should help us come away with an agenda for further action on history teaching and learning, especially at the introductory level in relation to assignments.

After your presentation, we should have some time for questions and a general discussion among all charrette attendees.

**Some questions for recorders to consider during and after the workshop:**

- What are the key teaching issues/challenges that faculty and students are facing in their courses?
- What are common observations about the role of assignments in history learning? What are some characteristics and qualities of good assignments? To what extent are these informed by history as a specific discipline?
- To what extent are desired learning outcomes in intro courses shared across disciplines?
- What work can instructors do to improve their assignments? What kinds of feedback did they ask for? How might a college/university or the AHA help to support work on assignments?
What Makes an Assignment Effective?

There is no formula for what makes an assignment effective. They vary in all kinds of ways depending on the course context, student preparation, and the outcomes the assignment is designed to foster and elicit. For instance, a writing assignment for first-year students’ needs more explicit directions and scaffolding than one at the senior level. That said, effective assignments are often characterized by at least some of the following features. You will think of others as well.

1. **Intentional**: An effective assignment has a clear sense of purpose. It is aligned with course, program and institutional goals for student learning.
2. **Clear to students**: Assignments and their purposes should be clear to students, who will benefit from understanding why they are being asked to undertake the task at hand and how that task (assignment) fits into a larger trajectory of their learning.
3. **Explicit about evaluation**: Additionally students should understand how their work will be evaluated. This might mean providing students with an evaluative rubric as part of the assignment, but other forms and formats for communicating expectations can be effective as well, including a statement of criteria for evaluation or examples of effective performance.
4. **Engaging**: Effective assignments present what composition scholar John Bean (2011) calls a “Task as Intriguing Problem” (TIP). That is, they engage and motivate students.
5. **Responsive to different ways of knowing and different assets that students bring to their work**: This might be accomplished by offering options in terms of format (student might write a paper, develop a website, or create and present a poster) or by drawing on student experiences in ways that reflect equity-mindedness and cultural awareness.
6. **Formative**: Effective assignments are designed and used in ways that provide students with useful feedback for improvement. This might mean working through multiple drafts, with feedback along the way. It might mean opportunities to self-assess and reflect on the process, with students asking “How might I have done better on this assignment?” Or, “How can I build on what I’ve done here?”
7. **Linked to and aligned with other assignments**: An effective assignment is not an island. It is connected to other assignments the student encounters in the same course but also to assignments in courses that precede and follow. When assignments are linked to one another in ways that are made explicit to students, they create more coherent, connected pathways for learning.
8. **What would you add to this list?**

Adapted from December 17, 2015 Faculty Collaboratives webinar
Pat Hutchings, NILOA, and Susan Albertine, AAC&U
Features of Excellent Assignments Identified by NILOA Charrette Participants:

**Form:**
- Simple and easily understood
- Focused, with minimum distractions from the main task
- Contains appropriate information needed to frame a good response
- Does not address too many DQP proficiencies
- Appropriate balance between DQP and course/discipline outcomes

**Content:**
- Engages student interest and supports learning
- Helps student see underlying structure of the problem
- Reflects the actual learning experiences that students have had
- Provides opportunities for small successes within the main task (e.g. for partial credit)
- Provides opportunities for correction after feedback
- Is unbiased with respect to student backgrounds and circumstances
- Allows originality in response

**Level of Challenge:**
- Is the assignment appropriately located on a developmental continuum
- Contains scaffolding appropriate to the level of challenge—more for beginning students, less for those at more advanced levels
- Might be a series of related assignments with ascending levels of challenge as the student progresses through them
- Can determine what level of performance signifies mastery of the proficiency
Assignment Design Charrette Invitation to Participants

Dear Colleague,

You are invited to be part of an interactive assignment-design charrette on [DATE, TIME, sponsored by...etc].

Assignments are powerful teaching tools, and their design is one of the most consequential intellectual tasks that faculty undertake in their work as educators. Yet that work is often private and unavailable for collegial exchange and knowledge building. The charrette—a term borrowed from architecture education, denoting a collaborative design process—will be an opportunity to talk with other faculty [and librarians, and student affairs staff, etc.] interested in trading ideas about the design and use of the various tasks, projects, papers, and performances we set for our students.

The charrette aims to 1) stimulate ideas about how to strengthen the assignment you bring to the session, 2) think together about how assignments can be intentionally linked to important course, program, and institutional learning outcomes in ways that create more coherent pathways for students, and 3) open up a productive “trading zone” for discussion about teaching and learning [and assessment].

Please come to the workshop [or: submit in advance so the assignments can be distributed and read before the charrette] with an assignment you would like to share. This might be a draft assignment you are working on and would like to share with colleagues, one that has worked well but may be in need of a “refresh,” or one that has not worked as you hoped.

To facilitate informed and constructive discussion, we ask that you also prepare a reflective memo to accompany the assignment, indicating:

1) The purpose of the assignment: What outcomes is it intended to foster and elicit?
2) The context in which it is used—in what course or courses, with what students, at what point in the curriculum?
3) Your experience of the assignment at this point? How have students responded? What do they do well? What do they find especially challenging?
4) Questions you have about the assignment: What kinds of feedback on the assignment are you hoping for from colleagues attending the charrette?
5) How do you assess student work in response to the assignment? Please include a rubric or evaluation criteria.
The charrette is modeled on a process developed by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) as part of its Assignment Library Initiative. The Library (see www.assignmentlibrary.org) is an online, searchable collection of assignments from faculty in a wide range of fields and institutional types, keyed to proficiencies identified in the Degree Qualifications Profile [or: keyed out outcomes in five broad areas of learning].

We look forward to seeing you, etc etc.

[If there is a stipend attached to this work, it might also be mentioned. Note whether there is an expectation/requirement that the assignment be revised and resubmitted or shared in some further way--including in an institutional repository, submitted to NILOA, shared at a campus conference....]
Assignment-Design Charrette Process:

In groups of 5, each person/team will have an opportunity to share their assignment and receive suggestions and feedback from the group. In order for everyone to have an opportunity to give and receive feedback, we will use a timed carousel process. There will be five rounds. You will be a “presenter” for one round and a “participant” for the other four rounds.

Each round is 25 minutes.

Introduce assignment (5 min):
Presenters will introduce the assignment and provide background information such as: in what course the assignment is used, at what point in the course, pertinent information about the students in the course (majors vs. non-majors), what they find most challenging about the assignment, how it builds on earlier work and/or prepares students for more advanced work in later courses (or success beyond graduation), your experience with the assignment to date, how you hope to strengthen it, and what kinds of feedback and suggestions you would like from others.

Listeners: jot down thoughts and questions but please do not interrupt the presenter, let them have their full five minutes.

Discussion (15 min):
Listeners will respond to what they have heard, taking turns asking questions, sharing thoughts, feedback, etc. The purpose of the discussion is to help your colleague strengthen their assignment so please be constructive and collegial. Also, please mind the time and allow each participant the opportunity to contribute to the discussion. Discussion should address the four questions on the feedback sheet.

Presenters: listen carefully and respond to the inquiries. Think about alignment, but also think creatively about possible solutions.

Feedback (5 min):
Everyone: Based on the discussion, use the feedback form to give the presenter written feedback and suggestions. The presenter can use this time to write down notes about the assignment, based on what they just heard, along with outlining next steps for revision or additional feedback.
Assignment-Design Charrette Feedback Sheet:

Assignment

Comments From

1. What outcomes do you think students will be able to demonstrate with this assignment?

2. What are the main strengths of this assignment for assessing the identified outcomes?

3. Thinking about the assignment from the point of view of students, what questions or suggestions do you have?

4. Other suggestions and possibilities – especially in response to the author’s questions about improving the assignment?
Assignment: _________________________________________________________________

Comments From (name): ____________________________________________________

What outcomes do you think students will be able to demonstrate with this assignment?

What are the main strengths of this assignment for assessing the identified outcomes?

Thinking about the assignment from the point of view of students, what questions or suggestions do you have?

Other suggestions and possibilities - especially in response to the author's questions about improving the assignment?

Recommendation for specific change(s) to the assignment:

What questions do you still have about the assignment?
Designing Senior-level Culminating Assignments that Help Students Integrate their Learning

Workshops with Dr. Pat Hutchings
Washington State University, May 25-26, 2016

Details for Faculty Participants

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

- **Day 1**: Wed, May 25th (9:30am - 3pm, with lunch provided, CUE 518)
- **Day 2**: Thursday, May 26th (9:30am - 3:30pm, with lunch provided, CUE 518)
- **Follow up**: assignment revision due by August 31

This two-part interactive workshop will focus on one of the most important challenges in undergraduate education today: providing students with opportunities to connect and integrate the various elements of their learning. This means making connections across courses, within the major and/or between general education and the major, connecting academic coursework and work, citizenship, and personal life. Such connections do not happen automatically; they require intentionally designed experiences—including assignments—that help students integrate their learning.

The workshop is especially intended for faculty who have taught a capstone course—or similar culminating experience course for seniors to integrate learning—and are interested in refining the assignment.

**Workshop goals**

- Share a capstone assignment you are working on with others who will ask good questions
- Stimulate ideas about how to strengthen your assignment
- Make revisions to your assignment

WORKSHOP DETAILED DESCRIPTION

**Workshop Day 1**: One of the most powerful contexts for integrative learning is the senior capstone. This first session will be an occasion to explore the varieties of capstone experiences at WSU and beyond: What are the different models, and what are their distinctive benefits, especially for integrative kinds of work? Within capstones, what kinds of assignments—papers, projects, community engagement experiences, and the like—both foster and provide evidence of students' ability to make connections? Day 1 will help set the stage for work on your own assignment the next day.
Workshop Day 2: Developing powerful assignments is one of the most consequential intellectual tasks that faculty undertake in their work as educators. Yet that work is often private and unavailable for collegial exchange and knowledge building. This session, modeled on the NILOA Assignment Library Initiative, will be an opportunity to talk with other faculty who teach in capstone contexts about the design of an assignment you’re working on. The session aims to 1) stimulate ideas about how to strengthen the assignment you bring to the session, 2) think together about how assignments might be linked to one another in ways that create more integrated, coherent pathways for students, and 3) open up a productive space for discussion about teaching and learning. Day 2 will set the stage for you to revise your assignment as a follow-up to the workshop.

Follow-up: Revise your Assignment: Revise your assignment by August 31 and complete a survey about the revision process. Optional: Faculty will be invited to participate in a follow-up activity in August or fall semester.

PREPARING FOR THE WORKSHOP

Assignment: Please come to the workshop ready to discuss an assignment designed to foster and assess integrative learning in a capstone course for an undergraduate degree or UCORE, and your related rubric or evaluation criteria. This might be a draft assignment you are working on and would like to share with colleagues, one that has worked well but may be in need of a “refresh,” or one that has not worked as you hoped. If your course involves a sequence of scaffolded assignments, bring the culminating assignment or the one you have questions about.

Reflective Memo: To facilitate informed and constructive discussion, prepare a short reflective memo (approximately one page) to accompany the assignment, and a rubric or set of criteria you use to evaluate the students’ work. The reflective memo should address the following questions:

1) What is the purpose of the assignment? What outcomes is it intended to foster and elicit?
2) In what context is it used?
3) What does integrative learning look like in your capstone course and assignment?
4) How would you evaluate the quality and character of students’ work in response to the assignment? What do they do well? What is challenging?
5) What questions do you have about the assignment-- or what would you like feedback about?
6) Anything else that your colleagues need to know to be helpful

By 5/18/16: Please send your one-page reflective memo, assignment, and rubric to ATL by 5/18/16, so ATL can make copies for the small group discussions. Contact ATL if you have questions.
Pre-workshop survey: Please complete the pre-workshop survey by 5/18/16, coming in Qualtrics.

FACULTY SUMMER STIPEND AND TRAVEL FUNDS
- Participating faculty can receive a $500 summer stipend and a letter of recognition. Expectations include participation in the workshop both days, assignment revision by August 30th and completion of a brief survey.
- Matching funds are also available for travel reimbursement for faculty participants from other WSU campuses.

Expectations for Faculty:

In advance
1. Review your assignment prompt, syllabus, and your program’s curriculum map, if available; provide your assignment prompt and rubric/evaluation criteria for the workshop.
2. Write a one page reflective piece about the course/assignment that will be shared with other faculty along with your assignment prompt (see Reflective Memo questions on page 2).
3. Do a short pre-survey (survey will be sent to you in advance of workshop).

Two workshop days
1. Participate in workshop both days.
2. Provide your assignment prompt, rubric/evaluation criteria, and reflective memo for peer discussion.
3. Review your colleagues’ assignments after day 1 and come prepared to discuss on day. You can expect to review assignments from about 5 colleagues.
4. Leave the day 2 workshop with notes about possible adjustments to your assignment.
5. Provide a one page “intent” summary of what you plan to change in your assignment.

Follow up
1. Revise assignment and submit to ATL by August 31
2. Do a post survey about revision process by August 31
Faculty Pre-Workshop Survey Questions

[Below is a copy of the questions from the Pre-Workshop Survey for Participants in the Capstone Assignment ReDesign Workshop. Please note that the survey was conducted online using Qualtrics; therefore, while questions may appear differently in the online format, and include skipping, the wording and order of questions are as follows.]

We are looking forward to your participation in the upcoming capstone assignment design workshop with Dr. Pat Hutchings. Please complete the following survey to help us plan the workshop for the WSU community.

Thank you,
Kimberly Green, Director, Office of Assessment of Teaching and Learning

General Questions

Q1. What has motivated you to attend this workshop and redesign your capstone assignment? (select all that apply)
   - Opportunity to meet colleagues interested in talking about learning and teaching
   - My chair/college or someone else urged me
   - I have specific questions about my capstone
   - I will be teaching this capstone for the first time
   - Summer stipend
   - Other (please specify) ____________________

Q2. Please indicate how important these aspects were to your motivation:

Q3. Comments:

The following questions are related to the assignment that you will be sharing and revising.

Q4. Please list the capstone or senior culminating experience course where this assignment is used (e.g., HIST 497).

________________________
Q5. How would you best characterize the capstone or culminating senior assignment that you will be redesigning? (select all that apply)
- Thesis
- Research project
- Artistic creation or performance
- Prototype development
- Real or simulated professional task
- Internship
- Presentation
- Portfolio
- Exam-licensure test
- Other (please specify) ________________

Q6. Which of the following principles that connect to capstone design are highlighted in your assignment and course? (select all that apply)
- Integration and extension of prior learning
- Authentic and contextualized experiences
- Challenging and complex scenarios
- Student independence and agency
- A concern with critical inquiry and creativity
- Active dissemination and celebration
- Other (please specify) ________________

Q7. Who takes your capstone course?
- Primarily majors in the discipline
- Mix of majors and non-majors
- Primarily non-majors
- Other (please specify) ________________

Q8. Is your course designated as a UCORE [general education] capstone [CAPS]?
- Yes
- No
- Other (please specify) ________________
Q9. About how many times have you taught this course or a similar version of this assignment as a culminating assignment for seniors?
   ☐ I have not taught this course/assignment
   ☐ Once
   ☐ Twice
   ☐ More than two times

Q10. Comments:

Q11. When do you expect to teach this course again? (select all that apply)
   ☐ Fall 2016
   ☐ Spring 2017
   ☐ Other (please specify) ____________

Q12. What would you like to gain or take away from this workshop?

Q13. Do you have any questions or comments for Dr. Hutchings?

_The following questions are related to other capstone or senior culminating experience courses that you may teach._

Q14. Please list any other capstone or senior culminating experience courses that you teach (e.g., HIST 497).
   
   Course 1 ______________
   
   Course 2 ______________

_[Q15-18 are displayed as applicable if Q14 is answered]_

Q15. Who takes your capstone course [Course 1 Name]?
   ☐ Primarily majors in the discipline
   ☐ Mix of majors and non-majors
   ☐ Primarily non-majors
   ☐ Other (please specify) ______________

Q16. Is [Course 1 Name] designated as a UCORE capstone?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ Other (please specify) ______________
Q17. Who takes your capstone course [Course 2 Name]?
   ☐ Primarily majors in the discipline
   ☐ Mix of majors and non-majors
   ☐ Primarily non-majors
   ☐ Other (please specify) ____________________

Q18. Is [Course 2 Name] designated as a UCORE capstone?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ Other (please specify) ____________________

The following questions concern workshop logistics.

Q19. We will be providing lunch/refreshments during the workshop. Do you have any dietary restrictions? If yes, please briefly describe.
   ☐ No
   ☐ Yes ____________________

Q20. Do you have any other comments, questions, or information you’d like to provide?
Faculty Post-Survey: Capstone Assignment ReDesign

[Below is a copy of the questions from WSU’s Post-Survey for Participants. Please note that the survey was conducted online using Qualtrics; therefore, while questions may appear differently in the online format and include some skipping/branching, the wording and order of questions are as follows.]

Thank you for your participation in the 2016 summer redesign project for a Capstone or Senior Culminating Assignment. We would like participant feedback about the project as a whole, including the value of the two-day workshop with Dr. Hutchings, to assess the effectiveness of our efforts to support faculty and capstones at WSU, identify potential follow up, and inform future offerings.

Please complete this survey by August 31. Contact ATL at 335-1355 or atl@wsu.edu if you have questions or any difficulties completing this survey. Thank you in advance for your feedback and your commitment to effective undergraduate curriculum and student learning.

Kimberly Green, Director, Office of Assessment of Teaching and Learning, Washington State University, 2016

Section 1. Questions about the Two-day Workshop

Q1. Please rate the following aspects of the workshop in terms of how useful they were to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat useful</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>Cannot rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat Hutchings’ presentation</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion at my table during</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer feedback on my assignment during</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charrette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of other assignments during</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charrette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up resources provided/linked</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Comments:
Q3. Please rate the workshop’s effectiveness in increasing your understanding of the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat effective</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Cannot rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstones</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment design</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. Comments:

Q5. Based on your experience, to what extent were the following workshop and charrette goals met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Cannot rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was able to share assignments with colleagues working in similar (culminating/capstone) contexts</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to get concrete ideas about how to strengthen assignments and make those changes later</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to surface emergent connections among assignments that can contribute to more coherent, integrative experiences for students</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to trade ideas about teaching</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to feel part of a larger conversation at WSU about capstones, integrative learning, and assignment design</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to feel part of a larger conversation by becoming aware of NILOA’s Assignment Library Initiative work on other campuses and through disciplinary associations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Comments:
Q7. After the two-day workshop, how prepared to revise your assignment did you feel?
- Well prepared
- Prepared
- Somewhat prepared
- Not prepared

Q8. Comments:

Q9. What **three words** would you use to describe your experience in the charrette process (small group discussion about assignments)?

Q10. Please rate your satisfaction with the logistical aspects of the workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Cannot rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue (CUE 518, Pullman)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch and refreshments</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two day schedule</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates (end of May, prior to Memorial Day)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel funds (for urban campuses)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty stipends</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. Comments:

Q12. Please rate the overall usefulness of your workshop experience.
- Very useful
- Useful
- Somewhat useful
- Not useful
- Cannot rate

Q13. Would you recommend a similar workshop to your colleagues?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q14. Comments:
Section 2. Questions about Your Assignment Redesign

Q15. What aspects of effective integrative learning design did you decide you wanted to improve in your assignment? (Select all that apply)

- More explicit about purpose, task, and evaluation ("transparency")
- More engaging to students (task as intriguing problem)
- Respecting and reflecting different ways of knowing and levels of preparation
- Allowing more useful, formative feedback
- Linked to and aligned with prior and subsequent assignments
- Other: ____________________
- None of the above

Q16. What aspects of the following capstone principles did you decide you wanted to improve in your assignment? (Select all that apply)

- Integration and extension of prior learning
- Authentic and contextualized experiences
- Challenging and complex scenarios
- Student independence and agency
- A concern with critical inquiry and celebration
- Active dissemination and celebration
- Other: ____________________
- None of the above

Q17. Specifically, what changes did you make to your capstone assignment? (Select all that apply)

- Making the purposes and instructions for the assignment more transparent
- Explicitly communicating capstone expectations to students (why this is "not just another assignment")
- Explicitly designing in more integrative learning, to help students synthesize various aspects of the curriculum, adding intentional occasions or activities for integrative learning
- Encourage critical, complex, sophisticated inquiry or analysis
- Adding reflection
- Scaffolding or chunking pieces of a larger project in small segments
- Revising the timeline and identifying specific milestones
- Refining the rubric to provide clearer criteria and/or feedback
- Revised group work component
- Peer feedback
- Other: ____________________

Q18. Please comment on the key changes that you made:
Q19. After the workshop, did you do further research or reading on your own related to
the workshop topics (assignment design, capstones, integrative learning, etc.)?
 Yes
 No

[Q20 is displayed if Q19 is answered “Yes”]

Q20. Please briefly describe what topics you researched and why, and what sorts of
resources you used.

Q21. After the workshop, did you use any follow up resources provided by ATL (books,
slides, pdfs, links)?
 Yes
 No

[Q22 is displayed if Q21 is answered “Yes”]

Q22. Please briefly mention any resources you found particularly useful.

Q23. Over the summer, did you share your revised assignment with others, such as
members of your charrette?

Q24. What were the biggest challenges in the revision process?

Q25. What aspect of the workshop experience was most helpful in supporting your
revision work?

Q26. Knowing that you have not had the opportunity to try your revised assignment
with students, how satisfied are you with the assignment you revised now compared to
previously?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous to workshop and revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After workshop and revision</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q27. Did participation in this experience (two-day workshop and following assignment revision) change any of the following aspects of your approach to teaching? (Select all that apply)

- How you will design assignments
- How you will teach students
- How you will grade student work for the capstone class or other classes
- Your views of capstones
- Your views of integrative learning
- Other: ________________

Q28. To what extent did this experience increase your ability to revise other assignments in the future?

- I feel much more able to revise other assignments
- I feel more able to revise other assignments
- I feel somewhat more able to revise other assignments
- I do not feel more able to revise other assignments

Section 3. Questions about Follow-up Activities

Q29. Would you be interested in a one hour lunch gathering to share the redesign with your charrette group in the fall semester?

Q30. Are you willing to contribute your revised assignment to a WSU capstone bank?

- Yes
- Maybe
- No

Q31. Comments:

Q32. Have you or are you planning to submit your revised assignment to the NILOA Assignment Library?

- I have submitted my assignment
- I plan to submit my assignment
- I do not plan to submit my assignment
- Not sure

Q33. Comments:
Q34. Would you be willing to share your experience with assignment redesign with other faculty, such as participating on a faculty panel, contributing to a news article, or other?
   - Yes
   - Maybe
   - No

Q35. Comments:

Q36. Would you be interested in joining regular follow-up discussions with a group of faculty about assignment design and teaching?
   - Yes
   - Maybe
   - No

Q37. Comments:

Q38 is displayed if Q36 is not answered “No”

Q38. How often would you be willing to meet?
   - Once per semester
   - Twice per semester
   - Once per month
   - Twice per month
   - Other: ________________

Q39. Do you have suggestions for other ways to continue sharing and discussing assignments with WSU faculty?

Q40. Are you interested in potentially offering charrettes in your department/major?

Q41. Would you be interested in resources and/or professional development for using or refining rubrics?
   - Yes
   - No

Q42-45 are displayed if Q41 is answered “Yes”
Q42. I would like to find out more about how to use rubrics to:
   ☐ Communicate expectations to students
   ☐ Provide useful feedback to students for improvement (formative)
   ☐ Provide final evaluation of student performance for course/instructor
   ☐ Gather learning outcomes assessment data for the major/curriculum
   ☐ Gather learning outcomes assessment data for UCORE, Big 7 Learning Goals
   ☐ Other: ____________________

Q43. Comments:

Q44. Please indicate your level of interest in the following resources/professional development for using or refining rubrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Very interested</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat interested</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop on rubrics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of sample rubrics used for capstones</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU faculty panel on rubrics used for capstones</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal discussion group on rubrics used for capstones</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q45. Comments:

Q46. Do you have any other suggestions for follow-up activities?

Q47. If you have remaining questions about assignment design generally, or your assignment revision in particular, what are they?

Submit.
Thank you for your feedback and your participation in WSU’s capstone assignment redesign project.
**Presentations and Webinars**

Also helpful as an overview of the assignment-design initiative are two webinars:

December 17, 2014: Pat Hutchings & Natasha Jankowski, NILOA

- [Assignment Design](#) (recording)
- [PowerPoint slides](#) (pdf)

December 17, 2015: Pat Hutchings, NILOA, and Susan Albertine, AAC&U

- [Catalyzing Collaborative Work on Assignment Design](#) (Webinar Recording)
- [Catalyzing Collaborative Work on Assignment Design Slides](#) (pdf)

AAC&U and NILOA workshop on Transparent Assignment Design

October 10, 2016: Pat Hutchings, NILOA, Susan Albertine, AAC&U, and Mary Ann Winkelmes, UNLV

- [Transparency And Equity Workshop](#) (Webinar Recording)

See also the list of features outlined in this NILOA [presentation](#), *Paralleling the Agenda: Assignment Design Charrette*.

Finally, here are the presentation materials to serve as a guide for unfacilitated assignment design charrettes:

- [Unfacilitated Assignment Design](#) (Webinar Recording)
- [Unfacilitated Assignment Design Slides](#) (pdf)
For more information, please contact:

National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
360 Education Building
Champaign, IL 61820

learningoutcomesassessment.org
niloa@education.illinois.edu
Phone: 217.244.2155

About NILOA

The National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) was established in December 2008.

NILOA is co-located at the University of Illinois and Indiana University.

The NILOA website contains free assessment resources and can be found at http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org

The NILOA research team has scanned institutional websites, surveyed chief academic officers, and commissioned a series of occasional papers.

One of the co-principal NILOA investigators, George Kuh, founded the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE).

The other co-principal investigator for NILOA, Stanley Ikenberry, was president of the University of Illinois from 1979 to 1995 and of the American Council of Education from 1996 to 2001.