

Guide to Assessment

Expanded Form

The assessment criteria and the assessment of assessment process are designed to help organize and gather information about teaching/learning in order to document and guide systematic, programmatic improvement of learning.

It is expected that each program will focus and implement assessment in ways appropriate to its own distinct context, needs, and questions.

| 1 Assessment Team & System | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|----------|---|------------|--|----------|---|-----------|--|-------------|--|
| Absent | Minimal | | Emerging | | Developing | | Adequate | | Effective | | Outstanding | |
| 0 | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | |
| Purpose | | | | Purpose | | | | Purpose | | | | |
| <p>The assessment team and system focus on tracking and reporting student progress, identifying “bottleneck” courses, and grade distributions, though evidence that may provide insight for making improvements has not been presented.</p> | | | | <p>The team and system complies with needs for accreditation task; compares students’ mean performances with program goals to provide some guidance for curricular and course design.</p> | | | | <p>The team and system leverage assessment to promote a culture of evidence that uses evidence to inform decision-making, planning, and improving student learning and learning experiences. The team focuses on questions that engage and draw upon expertise of program faculty. The assessment system activities are responsive to mean performances <i>and</i> students’ individual purposes for learning. Program initiatives are systematically integrated with WSU core themes and inform curricula, instruction, professional development, and resource allocation.</p> | | | | |
| Participation | | | | Participation | | | | Participation | | | | |
| <p>Program participation includes one or two designated people who engage in the assessment design, but there is little evidence that assessment is shared across the program.</p> | | | | <p>A large percentage of program faculty and staff have met regularly to set goals and interpret evidence. Other stakeholders (alumni, employers, accreditors, cross institutional partners, students, grad students, etc) may contribute to the assessment process periodically.</p> | | | | <p>In addition to substantial faculty participation in the process, representatives of other stakeholders take part in the design and interpretation, too, e.g., employers, graduate students, students, support staff, relevant faculty from other <i>departments</i>. They meet regularly and are engaged in a series of activities (goal setting and refinement, evidence gathering, analysis, action plans,</p> | | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | and pedagogical innovation) that serve to increase community engagement, administrative support and reflection, discourse, and experimentation. |
| | Reporting and Communication | Reporting and Communication | Reporting and Communication |
| | Program reporting and communication is largely external, limited to a few faculty who may have knowledge of assessment initiatives, but syllabi, activities, and assessment practices provide little indication of stakeholder engagement. | The report is shared with faculty and staff and at least one other audience (e.g., students or alumni). Faculty are generally aware of outcomes and ongoing assessment process, though participation in program assessment—and the implementation of identified changes—may not be fully shared. | The reporting process includes circulation of plans and draft findings to multiple audiences, e.g., faculty, staff, students, alumni, employers, and other stakeholders). Feedback from stakeholders is routinely invited. Reports include clear strategies and support for change (time, funding, teaching & learning resources/centers, etc). Assessment is educative, providing innovative models of education and assessment that inform all stakeholders.). |

***Stakeholders may include:** program faculty, leadership, students, cross-disciplinary faculty, cross-institutional faculty, alumni, employers, accreditors, and advisory boards, etc.

| 2 Program Goals, Outcomes, and Measures | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--|----------|---|------------|--|----------|--|-----------|--|-------------|--|
| Absent | Minimal | | Emerging | | Developing | | Adequate | | Effective | | Outstanding | |
| 0 | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | |
| Program Goals | | | | Program Goals | | | | Program Goals | | | | |
| <p>Program goals are vague, too numerous, or unrelated to learning so that is no obvious ways to assess progress by using evidence of student learning. They may appear to privilege topic coverage. Goals may not communicate unique program strengths (curriculum, pedagogy, student learning experiences). They seem to lack alignment with institutional goals.</p> | | | | <p>Program goals are capable of being assessed and begin to communicate the strengths of the program, but it is not always fully clear how they are aligned with the mission and goals of the university or what input relevant stakeholders had in their development. It is somewhat difficult to understand how the goals are actionable — how they could contribute to the ongoing improvement of the program.</p> | | | | <p>Program Goals are capable of being assessed and target unique program strengths that align with university core themes and goals. They are overarching and describe what the students should master. They demonstrate how the program is aligned with the university’s mission and goals. Program goals reflect the input and consensus of all relevant stakeholders*. They are actionable and focused on the ongoing improvement of the student learning experience.</p> | | | | |
| Student Learning Outcomes | | | | Student Learning Outcomes | | | | Student Learning Outcomes | | | | |
| <p>Student learning outcomes are abstract, not particularly aligned with program goals and tend to conflate coverage with observable performance. Outcomes focus principally on information students have learned rather than skills and application, or approaches to learning.</p> | | | | <p>Student learning outcomes describe what students should be able to do. They are mostly aligned with program goals, but they may be somewhat abstract or unable to fully provide direct measures of the program’s effectiveness.</p> | | | | <p>Outcomes are concrete, observable, and measurable. They are focused on core learning, knowledge, skills and application that students can demonstrate as well as observable values, attitudes, and habits of mind that contribute to successful achievement. They are aligned with program goals and provide direct measures of program effectiveness.</p> | | | | |
| Collected Evidence | | | | Collected Evidence | | | | Collected Evidence | | | | |
| <p>Evidence is easily obtained and characterized exclusively by count i.e., numbers of students retained, graduated, etc., which are conflated with assumptions of quality.</p> | | | | <p>Evidence focuses on one or more dimensions of student learning outcomes. Evidence includes reasonable breadth (sample size, cohort selection, etc) and depth (purposeful alignment and scope). Has at least minimally acceptable validity and reliability (or referential adequacy); or demonstrates commitment to</p> | | | | <p>Evidence is relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable. It covers the knowledge and skills taught throughout the program’s curriculum and provide information on multiple dimensions of student performance to provide a picture of overall strengths and weaknesses. Multiple and</p> | | | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | an assessment process that builds validity and reliability. | diverse reviewers have provided feedback on student performance. Evidence is credible, with solid breadth (sample size, cohort selection, etc) and depth (purposeful alignment and scope); is valid and reliable or meet standards of rigorous qualitative assessment); and follows best practices in data collection and assessment. |
| | Measures | Measures |
| <p>Measures may not address questions identified by or that concern faculty or administration. Measures emphasize compliance, with limited attention to collecting evidence that could yield insights into student learning or development or other aspects of program impact.</p> <p>Measurement criteria are not evident.</p> <p>Most measures are indirect measures (based on perceptions) rather than direct measures of performance. Measures are loosely aligned with learning outcomes; may focus on a single measure, or on what information has been learned; may not be embedded in coursework or clearly related to teaching or learning activities.</p> | <p>Measures may address questions identified by faculty or administration. Measures attempt to collect evidence that provides insight into student learning or processes, cognitive or affective development, or other aspects of program impact.</p> <p>Measurement criteria are evident, but it is not clear how they were developed and how fully they are shared with all relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Assessment includes a base of direct measures, in addition to indirect measures. Measures are designed with some alignment. Multiple measures align with learning outcomes and focus on student performance (direct measures); make use of core course activities.</p> | <p>Measures clearly address questions the program cares about, questions that are derived from program goals and identified outcomes. They contribute formative data to guide program improvement.</p> <p>The measurement criteria have been validated by the consensus of relevant stakeholders. Criteria are openly communicated to further an ongoing process of assessment, reflection and change.</p> <p>Both direct and indirect measures have been used to assess the effectiveness of core learning activities; the degree of curricular coherence; the cognitive and affective development of students; the impact of instructional design or innovations on program climate; or other educational processes or program outcomes.</p> |

| <h1 style="margin: 0;">3</h1> <h2 style="margin: 0;">Analysis and Action Plan</h2> <p style="margin: 0;"><i>It is not necessary to fill out the "Analysis and Action Plan" section for the December 18, 2009 report.</i></p> | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---|--|---|------------|---|----------|--|-----------|--|-------------|
| Absent | Minimal | | Emerging | | Developing | | Adequate | | Effective | | Outstanding |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | | | |
| Analysis | | | Analysis | | | Analysis | | | | | |
| <p>Limited integration of measures. May not consider relevant context (student evaluations, for instance, may be averaged and ranked with little regard to class size & level, or relationship to course outcomes, instructional innovations, or program goals).</p> <p>Analysis and reflection engage a limited number of faculty, administrators or other stakeholders; have loose ties with processes and people with responsibilities and opportunities to implement change.</p> | | | <p>The analysis begins to integrate direct measures and indirect measures. It may consider findings in the light of the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (SoTL) research or program context.</p> | | | <p>The analysis integrates multiple measures, balancing direct measures of performance with indirect measures of perception, and skillfully weighing the context of the various measures in relationship to each other.</p> | | | | | |
| | | | <p>Analysis and reflection are representative of the work of more than a few teaching faculty in the program.</p> | | | <p>Analysis and reflection engage <i>all</i> faculty and as many other stakeholders as feasible. Stakeholders with the responsibility and opportunity to implement change are directly involved in the analysis and the crafting of the action plan.</p> | | | | | |
| | | | <p>The process encourages questions and may involve SoTL research.</p> | | | <p>The analysis is informed by the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (SoTL) research, current literature and the specific context of the program.</p> | | | | | |
| Action Plan: Basis | | | Action Plan: Basis | | | Action Plan: Basis | | | | | |
| <p>Relationship to evidence or the evidence itself is problematic. There is little integration of literature on teaching and learning. Previous recommendations may be selectively unheeded.</p> | | | <p>Evidence or action planned is perhaps limited, but are appropriately qualified: better evidence gathering strategies are planned or proposed, or changes are measured. Plans may include strategies to engage more reflection and analysis by faculty, staff, and students, and plans include greater engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning.</p> | | | <p>The action plan uses credible evidence, analysis, and prior lessons learned to systematically inform and reshape teaching and learning practice and to expand the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). It provides a clear rationale for how it supports important student learning objectives and institutional goals and it builds on prior assessment and innovation. The plan identifies clear and reasonable strategies, timelines, essential resources, specific roles, responsibilities, and administrative support for follow through.</p> | | | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | Action Plan: Curriculum | Action Plan: Curriculum | Action Plan: Curriculum |
| | Action plan is vague or focused on general goals like improving outcomes or retention with little attention to the processes that required for achieving those goals. | Action plan includes new ways of organizing curriculum, introducing new pedagogies, or new strategies for conceptualizing and measuring learning. | The action plan identifies new and more effective ways to align and integrate curricula, suggesting innovative pedagogies and strategies for conceptualizing and measuring learning. |
| | Action Plan: Practice | Action Plan: Practice | Action Plan: Practice |
| | Relationship to teaching practices is missing or eclipsed by focus on student performance with little attention to accounting of <i>how</i> students learn (or fail). Perhaps strategies for decreasing class size are pursued. | The action plan item may include professional development opportunities, encouragement of teaching focused grant opportunities, strategies that redistribute teaching responsibilities in ways that engage graduate students more fully, librarians or other professionals. Internships or lab sections may be identified as strategies to explore. | The action plan includes ongoing assessment of teaching innovations and associated learning strategies. It recognizes and builds on the identification of program strengths and faculty best practices. It values and supports informed innovation, and ongoing faculty development, including the allocation of time and resources. The plan actively promotes a culture of collaboration and faculty learning communities that contribute to SoTL. |
| | Follow-through | Follow-through | Follow-through |
| | Little or no evidence of follow-through. | Follow-through is evident, though not necessarily based on best practices in teaching and learning. | A clear explanation is given as to exactly what actions were taken in response to assessment results. The rationale for those actions was clearly based on best practices and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) |

| 4 | Administrative Leadership & Support | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|---|---|---|------------|---|----------|--|-----------|--|-------------|
| | Absent | Minimal | | Emerging | | Developing | | Adequate | | Effective | | Outstanding |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | | | | |
| | Participation | | | Participation | | | Participation | | | | | |
| | Leadership engagement as evidenced in communication with stakeholders is limited to generalities and usually one way. Concrete examples are limited—perhaps claims of student satisfaction, graduate rates, etc. | | | Communication with stakeholders related to assessment and teaching and learning is two-way. There is evidence that students, faculty, and external stakeholders have engaged or provided input into the assessment process. | | | Leadership participates in assessment. It recognizes its responsibility to the public by articulating meaningful goals and learning outcomes and by providing useful information about student performance and the ways in which the program strives continually improve. External stakeholders as well as internal stakeholders are regularly engaged in structured feedback. | | | | | |
| | SoTL Support | | | SoTL Support | | | SoTL Support | | | | | |
| | Leadership does not appear to actively support much in the way of SoTL activities | | | Leadership identifies and disseminates scholarship in teaching, learning and assessment; supports speakers and visiting expertise, and supports student engagement in focus groups or panel discussion on their experience with curriculum, etc. | | | Leadership promotes a culture of evidence, engages representatives from across the educational community, and encourages evidence-based innovation in the classroom and in curricula. Leaders model SoTL by engaging in the Scholarship of Leadership related to teaching, learning, and assessment. Faculty who engage in SoTL are featured in publications and presentations. | | | | | |
| | Policy | | | Policy | | | Policy | | | | | |
| | Assessment initiatives are not evident in current policy documents. There may be some acknowledgement that assessment activities are critical, there is little reflected in the program priorities (budget, activities, etc.) | | | Leadership engagement is evidenced in policy that acknowledges the contributions of faculty to research in teaching and learning and the participation in assessment initiatives. Leadership encourages examination and policy responses to nuances of assessment, for instance, student evaluations are used in ways beyond ranked averages. | | | Leaders embrace responsibility for institutionalizing change. Assessment initiatives are available in current policy documents, and policy includes participation policies like release time or other ways of valuing service or building assessment capacity. Key attributes of a culture of evidence are reflected in program priorities (budget, activities, etc.) | | | | | |

| Rating | Dimension |
|--------|--|
| | 1. Assessment Team & System |
| | 2. Program Goals, Outcomes, & Measures |
| | 3. Analysis & Action Plan |
| | 4. Administrative Leadership & Support |
| | AVERAGE RATING |

Comments

DRAFT