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Overview

- Warm Up – What constitutes exemplary assessment practice?
- General Strategy for Evaluating Assessment Reports
- Review Rubric
- Let’s Review!
Warm Up

- What Differentiates Good and Bad Assessment Processes?
Steps for Effective Meta-Assessment

- 1. Define good assessment practice
- 2. Choose/develop a rubric
- 3. Provide training
  - Develop range finders
  - Tips for writing comments?
- 4. Decide to whom the feedback will be shared
Review Rubric

- Goals - Relate to university’s guiding documents
- Program Outcomes (Program Eval)
State Learning Outcomes

- Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are what students should know, think, or do as a result of your program.
- Foundation for program assessment
Good SLO Practices

- Build student-centered outcomes
- Use clear verbs (avoid \textit{understand} and \textit{know})
- Clarify skill/knowledge/attitudinal area
- Specify what type/level of student
Example 1: Articulating Outcomes

**Poor**
Faculty will teach writing skills.

**Better**
Students graduating from the BA program in 80s pop culture will write a cogent argument about how a political event in the 80s shaped pop culture. These papers should (a) contain a coherent argument, (b) use references appropriately, (c) be well organized, and (d) consist of sentence-level mechanics that enhance the readability of the paper.
Example 2: Stating Outcomes

Poor
The students will understand basic components of 80s pop culture.

Better
Students graduating from the BA program in 80s pop culture will identify (a) relevant musicians, (b) TV shows and movies, (c) fads, and (d) technology of the period.
Measures

- Select instruments and data collection strategies to gather evidence about student achievement of SLOs.
- “You can’t fix by analysis what you bungle by design.”

Good Measure Practices

- Match instrument to SLO
- Choose direct and/or indirect measures
- Establish criteria for success
- Select data collection method
- Collect additional reliability and validity information (Advanced)
## Methodology Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Type of Measure</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Test</td>
<td>1 (identification) &amp; 2 (methods)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Census of students on assessment day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Rubric</td>
<td>3 (writing)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Representative Sampling/Course Embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication Rubric</td>
<td>4 (oral communication)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Representative Sampling/Course embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Survey</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Census of students on assessment day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Targets

- Is it specific?
- Is a logical rationale give for the target?
Findings

What did you find, and what does it mean relative to your SLOs?
O How did results compare to your criteria for success?
O Did your analysis reveal any obvious strengths or gaps?
O Are the findings unique this year or are they part of a trend?
O How trustworthy are your results?
Good Practices in Analyzing and Interpreting Results

- Organize results and map back to SLOs
- Use appropriate analyses
- Interpretation must flow logically, linking findings back to objectives and other parts of the process
# Example of Results from Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale or Subscale</th>
<th>Corresponding Objective(s)</th>
<th>2008 Results Mean</th>
<th>2009 Results Mean</th>
<th>*2010 Results Mean (sd)</th>
<th>Desired Result 2010</th>
<th>**2010 Different from 2009?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Rubric (n = 25): 1 = Beginning; 2 = Developing; 3 = Competent; 4 = Advanced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1 (.53)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9 (.62)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage &amp; Mechanics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2 (.58)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0 (.49)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6 (.75)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation of Results

Regarding weaknesses, it appears that students’ scores, on average, are rated below competent in using references in their papers (a component of the third objective). This interpretation is reinforced given that the relatively low scores have been observed over two cohorts. According to the faculty who rated the papers, errors in citations were fairly common. Specifically, students failed to use the correct punctuation within citations, and the citations within text often seemed forced.
Using Results for Improvement

Program improvement based on evidence is the main purpose of assessment.
Good Practices for Using Results

- Take curricular or pedagogical actions based on results and interpretation
- Make actions specific
- Follow up to determine if previous actions (interventions) were successful.
Use of Results Example

Instructors of the two classes where writing is heavily emphasized – PCUL401 (80s Politics and Culture) and PCUL404 (The 80s and Today) – will

- Share the results of the past writing assessment with students, emphasizing that using references is a concern.
- Provide poor and good examples of incorporating references into papers. Note: Dr. C. Lauper has agreed to pull together these examples for the other faculty.
- Evaluate references explicitly (using that component of the writing rubric) on papers in their classes.
Let’s Review Some from TNCC
Computer-Aided Drafting..., P1
Computer Arts P3
Liberal Arts, P2
Nursing P6
Science, P₁