Purpose of assessment: To provide <u>useful feedback</u> to <u>benchmark</u> and <u>improve</u>

Assessment Plan							
Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Methods/Instruments	Quality	Who will be assessed?	Logistics	Schedule	Criteria (optional)	
1 For instructions and tips, move your mouse to the column headings (near the black triangles)							
2							
3							

Program: Name of degree or major program (e.g., B.A. in Assessment Studies)

Assessment Plan: How can we determine the degree to which students attain each SLO? How can we ensure we obtain useful information?

Student Learning Outcomes: The knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values you intend students to attain as a result of your program.

Assessment Methods: A brief description of the methods and/or instruments that will be used to assess student performance for each SLO.

Quality: A brief description of how faculty in the program ensure some level of quality (consistency) for each assessment method.

Who will be assessed: Will this assessment be administered to all students in a class? all majors? a sample of majors in selected years?

Logistics: A brief explanation of how the assessment will be administered and how results will be analyzed and used. Who is responsible?

Schedule: When will this assessment be administered?

Criteria: If possible, provide a brief description of the criteria you will use to determine if students successfully attained the SLO.

Expectations:

Assessment Plans: All programs are expected to document assessment models that are feasible and will yield useful information. In addition to assessing the mastery of students nearing the end of the program, programs should also assess growth in student performance throughout the program.

Methods/Instruments:

Quantity: Assess each SLO using as many instruments as you need to confidently make inferences about student achievement. **At a minimum, programs are expected to assess each outcome using results from at least two instruments.**
Most SLOs are statements of what we expect for students who complete our programs. Therefore, SLOs should be assessed near the end of the program. Because it's important to continually monitor student progress, programs are encouraged to assess student learning outcomes multiple times throughout a student's career.

Types: Programs should remain flexible and choose the types of assessments that will yield the most useful information. Guidelines:
1. Assessment instruments with <u>documented evidence of quality</u> are preferred to instruments with little/no available evidence of quality
2. <u>Externally-benchmarked assessments</u> should be used whenever possible to allow for external comparisons
3. <u>Each SLO should be assessed by at least one direct assessment</u>. This information may be supplemented by indirect measures.
<u>Direct</u>: Actual student products, performances, or behaviors that can be directly observed and evaluated
<u>Indirect</u>: Perceptions, opinions, or attitudes of students (or others) that indicate, rather than provide evidence of, student achievement
Indirect measures do provide useful information regarding student perceptions, satisfaction, and engagement.
Course grades typically represent many factors outside any one particular SLO. Because of this, grades or GPAs are usually not recommended as measures of student performance on program-level SLOs. Programs may use course grades if they can document evidence that course grades do represent student performance on any particular SLO (and do not include many other irrelevant factors). This could be the case if a course uses standards based assessment and grading.

Quality: Programs are expected to work to document and evaluate the quality of the instruments they use to assess each SLO.
How can you ensure consistency and quality in your chosen assessments?
1. Consult with other faculty within the program to ensure assessments align with the intended outcomes
2. Develop (or locate) a common rubric to ensure consistency in assessment across courses or instructors
3. When feasible, programs should use multiple faculty to evaluate (at least a sample of) student performance
4. When possible, programs should use an externally-benchmarked instrument

Who will be assessed: Will this assessment be administered to all students in a class? all majors? a sample of majors in selected years?

Schedule: Programs are expected to assess at least one SLO every year. All SLOs are expected to be assessed twice every 5 years.

Types of Direct Measures:

Direct Method	Description / Example	Benefits	Drawbacks
Licensure or Certification Exam		Allows for external benchmarking. Quality is documented by publisher. Scoring is handled externally	Test may not perfectly align with program SLOs; information from the test may not be specific enough to be useful
Standardized test	Nationally-normed, externally-developed tests. Examples: Major Field Tests, Peregrine, Collegiate Learning Assessment, ACT CAAP, ETS Proficiency Profile, GRE subject tests	Allows for external benchmarking. Quality is documented by publisher. Scoring is handled externally	Test content may not align with program outcomes; students may not take the test seriously; tests can be expensive; administration may require time outside of class
Local program exam	Locally-developed exam administered to students outside of class. Example: Program writing exam	Exam can be designed to align perfectly with program SLOs	Students may not take the test seriously if it does not contribute to a course grade
Embedded exam or questions	Tests embedded within classes. Examples: Student pass rates on common MATH 171 final exam; Five questions on a Psychology exam scored by multiple faculty members	Embedded assessment systems take advantage of our day-to-day work; students typically motivated by course grade	Requires time to collaborate in developing and scoring exams; requires trust in sharing assessment results
Embedded signature assignment	Faculty determine the one assignment in a particular class (or assignments with common key features across multiple classes) that best assesses the SLO. This assignment is designated the "signature assignment." Faculty collect and maintain results from this signature assignment each year. Example: Oral presentation in an engineering class.	Embedded assessment systems take advantage of our day-to-day work; students typically motivated by course grade; once established, signature assignments can be administered every semester with very little extra work	Requires time to collaborate in developing and scoring signature assignments; requires trust in sharing assessment results; student performance may be based on a single assignment (how can we ensure the assignment is high-quality?)
Embedded key assignment	Faculty decide to use a single assignment within a course to assess a SLO, but that assignment may vary from year-to-year or instructor-to-instructor. At the end of the semester, faculty synthesize results from these assignments.	Embedded assessment systems take advantage of our day-to-day work; students typically motivated by course grade	Student performance may be based on a single assignment that may vary in quality over time or from instructor-to-instructor; can results be compared over time or across classes?
Embedded standardized assignment	Students across multiple sections of a class (or multiple classes) are given the exact same assignment under the same conditions. Example: Students in sociology classes are asked to analyze and evaluate a case study. Faculty grade the assignments using a common rubric. Scores may count towards students' grades.	Embedded assessment systems take advantage of our day-to-day work; students typically motivated by course grade	Requires time to collaborate in developing and scoring standardized assignments; requires trust in sharing assessment results; student performance may be based on a single assignment (how can we ensure the assignment is high-quality?)
Embedded preponderance of evidence	Faculty consider all the work students do in a particular class and, at the end of the semester, rate student performance on the SLO based on all this evidence. Faculty maintain a list of the evidence they used to rate student performance. Example: At the end of the semester, an instructor found 4 students exceeded, 11 students met, and 5 students failed to meet expectations on the program SLO.	Embedded assessment systems take advantage of our day-to-day work; students typically motivated by course grade; student performance is assessed from multiple pieces of information	How can we ensure the ratings are measures of the SLO and not extraneous factors?

Direct Method	Description / Example	Benefits	Drawbacks
Grades (standards-based)	Grades can be used if they allow for "pure" measures of SLOs. If a course is designed to address a single SLO and grades are not based on extraneous factors (such as participation, attendance, or compliance), then grades may provide useful assessment data. Standards-based grading is one such system that ensures course grades only measure student performance on outcomes.	Students are motivated to perform their best on the outcomes; students are typically given multiple opportunities to demonstrate their achievement using multiple modes of assessment	Requires a change in classroom grading systems; students and faculty may be uncomfortable with standards-based grading
Portfolios	A collection of student work throughout the program, including written assignments, personal reflections, and self-assessments. Developmental portfolios typically include work completed early, middle, and late in the students' academic career so growth can be noted. Showcase portfolios include students' best work and aim to show the students' highest achievement level.	Provides a comprehensive view of individual student development over time; students feel more responsible for their learning and assessment; students can use portfolio when applying for employment or graduate school; online portfolios can simplify assessment process	Time consuming for both students and faculty; accommodations may be needed for transfer students or students who declare major late
Pre/Post tests	When used for program assessment, students take the pre-test as part of a required, introductory course. They take the post-test during their senior year, often in a required course or capstone course.	Provides a measure of student development over time	It's difficult to design pre- and post-tests that are comparable (or equate them to become comparable); pre-testing takes time
Employer or internship evaluations	Evaluation or rating of student performance in a work, internship, or service-learning experience by a qualified professional	Students may value evaluations by professionals outside SAU; faculty can learn what is expected by professionals outside SAU	Professionals may not take evaluation seriously; standards/criteria may vary widely from evaluator-to-evaluator
Capstone	Students produce a piece of work or several pieces that showcase their cumulative experiences in a program. The work(s) are evaluated by a pair of faculty members, a faculty team, or a team comprised of faculty and community members.	Students have the opportunity to integrate their learning; capstone tasks may be more authentic than other forms of assessment	Creating the capstone task (project) may be difficult; rubrics may be difficult to develop
Performance Tasks or Simulations	Instructors rate student performance on a task or simulation (can include evaluation of student discussion/participation using an observation checklist)	Performance tasks or simulations may be more authentic than other forms of assessment; can assess SLOs that otherwise cannot be assessed by tests or written papers	Students may believe evaluations are subjective; rubrics may be difficult to develop
Student publications or conference presentations	Students present their research to an audience outside their program. Faculty and/or external reviewers evaluate student performance	Students are given the opportunity to receive feedback from an external audience	Scheduling and evaluating presentations may be difficult

Indirect Method	Description / Example	Benefits	Drawbacks
Student surveys	Students self-report via a questionnaire (online, telephone, or paper) about their ability, attitudes, and/or satisfaction. Example: students answer questions about their information literacy competence via an online questionnaire.	Surveys can be administered to large groups at low cost; analysis of responses is typically straightforward; externally-developed surveys are available	Difficult to get good response rates; perceptions do not necessarily agree with reality; designing high-quality surveys is difficult
End of course evaluations	Students report their perceptions about the quality of a course, its instructor, and the classroom environment	Part of regular work-load	Does the data align with program SLOs?
Alumni surveys	Alumni report their perceptions via a questionnaire (online, telephone, or paper). Example: alumni answer questions during a telephone survey about the importance of particular program learning outcomes and whether they are pertinent to their current career or personal life.	Easy to administer to large groups at low-cost	Low response rates are typical; alumni are difficult to locate
Employer surveys	Potential employers complete a survey in which they indicate the job skills they perceive are important for college graduates. Note: if the survey asks employers to directly evaluate the skills, knowledge, and values of new employees who graduated from SAU, the survey can be considered a direct method of evaluating students.	Easy to administer to large groups at low-cost	Low response rates are typical; alumni are difficult to locate; privacy issues are difficult to overcome
Interviews	Face-to-face, one-to-one discussions or question/answer session. E.g., A trained peer interviews seniors in a program to find out what courses and assignments they valued the most (and why).	Can provide in-depth information; anecdotes can be persuasive	Interviewing, transcribing, and analyzing results can be time consuming
Post graduation placement	The percent of students who found employment in a field related to the major/program within one year.	Employment and graduate study information may provide a direct measure of program SLOs	Difficult to locate alumni

Indirect Method	Description / Example	Benefits	Drawbacks
Focus groups	Face-to-face, one-to-many discussions or question/answer session. E.g., A graduate student lead a focus group of 4-5 undergraduate students who were enrolled in Foundations Symbolic Reasoning courses (e.g., Math 100). The graduate student asked the undergraduates to discuss their experiences in the course, including difficulties and successes.	Can provide in-depth information; anecdotes can be persuasive; the group dynamic may provide unique information	Interviewing, transcribing, and analyzing results can be time consuming
Course grades	Grade point averages or grades of students in a program.	Data are easy to collect	Nearly impossible to reach conclusions about the levels of student learning.
List of courses taken; skills developed	Students are asked to describe or list what they have learned. The descriptions are evaluated by faculty in the program and compared to the intended student learning outcomes. Example: After completing a service-learning project, students describe the most important things they learned through their participation in the project. Faculty evaluate how well the service-learning project contributed to the program outcomes.	Data are easy to collect; allows programs to see student perceptions	Retrospective self-reports may not be accurate; measures inputs, not outputs
Graduation/Retention rates	Percent of students who continue in or finish the program	Data are easy to collect	Graduation and retention are low-level outcomes
Time spent on program activities	Students' self reports on time spent on: co-curricular activities, homework, classroom active learning activities verses classroom lectures	Data are easy to collect; allows program to measure participation in activities	Participation does not necessarily mean students attained any particular SLO

<u>Portfolio considerations:</u>

Showcase: Emphasizes the products of learning – Students select and submit their best work.

Developmental: Emphasizes the process of learning – Students select and submit work that shows evidence of growth over time.

Reflective Essay: Included in either portfolio, students write reflective essays explaining the work and reflecting on how the collection demonstrates their accomplishments. They may also explain why particular examples were selected and describe changes in their knowledge/ability/ attitude as a result of the program.

.

Scoring: Multiple faculty members, using a common rubric, score all (or a sample of) student portfolios.

Steps:

1. Determine the purpose of the portfolio and identify the SLOs to be addressed by the portfolio.
2. Identify key course assignments or co-curricular activities, including internships, that will align with the purpose of the portfolio.
3. Determine what (and how much) students will include in their portfolios. Do you want a showcase or developmental portfolio?
4. Locate/develop a rubric to evaluate the portfolio against its stated purpose and program SLOs. Share rubric with students.
5. Create instructions that will inform students how to select work for the portfolio, format it, reflect, and submit.
6. Decide when faculty will evaluate the portfolios and how results will be shared and used for improvement.

<u>Data collection considerations:</u> What type of data do you want to collect from your assessment activities? How do you want to use the data?

Student-level: Assessment results are collected and maintained for each student in the program.

      Example: Joe Smith met expectations on SLO #1 in CLASS 101. He scored 4/5 on SLO #2 rubric in CLASS 202.

      Advantages: Results can be analyzed in a variety of ways (individual growth, subgroup comparisons, based on course sequence)

      Drawbacks: It may be difficult to maintain assessment results for individual students

Course-level: Assessment results are collected and maintained at a class or section level. Results cannot be traced back to individual students.

      Example: Spring 2013, CLASS 101-A – 4 failed to meet, 7 approached, 9 met, and 3 exceeded expectations on SLO #3.

      Advantages: Data collection is simplified; easy to synthesize results to the program level

      Drawbacks: Limits the types of analyses that can be conducted

Cohort-level: Assessment results are collected and maintained for a cohort of students. Results may or may not be tied to individual students.

      Example: Our 2015 graduating class – 4 failed to meet, 7 approached, 29 met, and 8 exceeded expectations on SLO #3 (in a particular class, semester, or year)

      Advantages: Results are easy to collect, synthesize, and maintain; results can be tied to curricular (or student) changes over time

      Drawbacks: Programs must have at least a pseudo-cohort model

Program-level: Assessment results (from all or samples of students) are collected and maintained at a program-level.

      Example: In 2013-14, our program had 10% of students fail to meet, 20% approach, 60% meet, 10% exceed expectations.

      Advantages: Provides a single set of results to maintain; does not require all students to be assessed on each outcome

      Drawbacks: Sampling student work can be tricky; scoring is typically done outside the classroom

Rubrics: Communicate (to students, faculty in the program, and the community) shared expectations for student performance

Levels of Performance

	Below Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Components of the SLO — Component A	These boxes would describe			
Component B	observable student behaviors			
Component C	associated with each level of performance			

	Below Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Duration	Fell asleep within 10 minutes	Stayed awake for 10-29 minutes	Stayed awake for entire workshop	Was so excited, didn't even sleep that night
Eyes	Eyes were closed longer than would be expected for a blink	Eyes were open, but eyelids were droopy	Appeared to be looking at handout or other participants most of the time	Except for blinking, maintained eye contact at all times
Engagement	Did not appear to pay attention; completed other work during workshop	Appeared to pay attention to most, but not all, of the workshop	Appeared to pay attention to the entire workshop	Asked questions for clarification or provided input

Sources of Rubrics:
Rubric Library (Waypoint Outcomes): http://rubriclibrary.com
AAC&U VALUE Rubrics: http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index_p.cfm?CFID=36761167&CFTOKEN=78093204
Quality Rubrics: http://qualityrubrics.pbworks.com/w/page/992395/Home

.