

## Forestalling Arrested Development—One University's Experience Evaluating the Assessment Process

IUPUI Assessment Institute  
 Louann Cummings and Dorothy Copas  
 The University of Findlay  
 October 28, 2008

## Presentation Learning Outcomes!

- Explain why assessment needs to be evaluated
- Identify steps and procedures to implement an evaluation process
- Discuss, develop, and prepare expected outcomes, measurement tools and a rubric for evaluating assessment
- Devise a scorecard matrix
- Share experiences
- Take achieved learning outcomes to your home institutions and put them to use!

## A Fragile Balance

Disparate Stakeholders

## The Quest for the Engaged Adopter!

		Assessment Understanding	
		Low	High
Assessment Utilization	Low	Naïve Bystander	Satisfying Rebel
	High	Great Pretender	Engaged Adopter

Arrows indicate transitions: Naïve Bystander to Satisfying Rebel, Satisfying Rebel to Engaged Adopter, and Great Pretender to Engaged Adopter.

## UF Assessment Trajectory

2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Successful HLC Continuing accreditation  Establish the Systems based Assessment And Accreditation Committee	A mixed bag of results Focus on program assessment  Program assessment forms submitted	Massive assessment facilitation program launched to 11 pilot programs 	Rollout campus wide...therein lie the rub... 	

## UF Evaluation Trajectory

2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Post HLC, AA Committee	Round #1: Intra-College PA Committee Evaluation	Round #2: Single Team Evaluation	Round #3: Integrative PA Committee Evaluation	


## Two Steps Forward...One Back

- Recursive and overlapping process
- Need for objectivity and systemization
- All programs on campus are not equal
- Disruptive intelligence




## Accountability

- HLC, OBR, SPAs
- Annual report to Committee on Committees
  - Review of action
  - Goal setting
- Institutional awareness
  - Fall in-service
    - Pilot showcase
    - Assessment Geeks
    - Past-Present-Future



## PDCA



**PROGRAM ASSESSMENT**

PROGRAM/DEGREE \_\_\_\_\_ ACADEMIC YEAR \_\_\_\_\_  
 DIRECTOR/CHAIR \_\_\_\_\_ COLLEGE \_\_\_\_\_

PLAN (4-5 learning outcomes)	DO (between 3-8 evaluation instruments)	CHECK (Evaluation Criteria/Rubric/Analysis)	ACT (Documentation of changes based on data analysis)

DEAN APPROVAL \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

## Glossary of Terms

**Glossary of Terms:**

**PLAN = LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR PROGRAM** (no more than 3-5)  
*What do you expect your candidates to possess when they finish your program? In other words, to obtain a degree from the University of Florida, what knowledge, skills, and dispositions should they exhibit?*

Outcomes, goals, objectives  
 .....

**DO = EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS** (between 3-8)  
*What methods or particular instruments will you use to measure students' attainment of your specified learning outcomes? When will you implement or administer the method(s) or instrument(s)?*


Evaluation instruments, i.e., assignments the candidate must complete that reflect the program outcomes. Examples include but are not limited to: performance portfolios, state exams, case studies, exit interviews.  
 .....

**CHECK = PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION AND ANALYSIS**  
*What did you discover?*

Identification of the components of the evaluation with degrees of performance clearly defined. Examples of performance expectations include: acceptable scores on exams, portfolio rubrics, case study rubrics, exit interview checklists. Analysis includes reviewing both individual performance and summaries of performance results by program.  
 .....

**ACT = DOCUMENTATION OF CHANGES BASED ON DATA ANALYSIS**  
*How did you act upon this information? What changes were made based on the results?*


Data analysis of the components of each evaluation instrument leads to decisions regarding the strengths of the program and areas that need improvement. Examples include but are not limited to: sending faculty to training, changing course content, changing program course requirements, and adding study sessions for state tests.



## Stop! Drop! Evaluate!

How did Program XXXXX do?

- Outcomes?
- Assessment tools?
- Rubrics/data?
- Change/feedback loop?



## Round #1: Intra-College PA Committee Evaluation

- Self-evaluation of pilot programs
- Rotation of program reports
- Pros
  - Local knowledge
  - Timely feedback
  - Statistical data available
- Cons
  - Inequality in reporting performance levels
  - Frustration
  - Unreliable data
  - Lack of validity and reliability

## Round #2: Single Team Evaluation

- Team composition
- Rubric for analysis (see attachment)
- Pros
  - One set of eyes
  - Equality
  - Established criteria for reporting
  - Unified university
  - Improved reliability
- Cons
  - Not all colleges represented
  - No formal training
  - Lack of follow up/communication

Assessment Rubric Program Director Annual Report 2005-2006 Reporting Year			
Program Report Elements	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exemplary
<b>Plan:</b> Produce 4-8 meaningful, measurable learning outcomes appropriate to program standards	Completer learning outcomes are not <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meaningful and aligned with the mission statements;</li> <li>• written in terms of what completers will know and be able to do;</li> <li>• measurable; or</li> <li>• appropriate in number.</li> </ul> No attempt was made to identify and/or align with existing program standards or guidelines.	Completer learning outcomes are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meaningful and aligned with the mission statements;</li> <li>• written in terms of what completers will know and be able to do;</li> <li>• measurable;</li> <li>• appropriate in number; and</li> <li>• aligned with college outcomes if applicable.</li> </ul>	Acceptable level plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes identify knowledge, skills, and dispositions that program completers should possess upon graduation.</li> </ul>
<b>Do:</b> Identify assessment instruments to know if learning outcomes were met	Identified assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• do not relate appropriately to the outcomes;</li> <li>• do not provide data on knowledge, skills, and dispositions of completers;</li> <li>• are not measurable;</li> <li>• are not clearly defined for students and faculty;</li> <li>• there is not at least one measurable assessment instrument for each outcome;</li> <li>• assessments are not attached</li> </ul>	Identified assessments ( <i>Please attach all assessments.</i> ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relate appropriately to the outcomes;</li> <li>• provide data on knowledge, skills, and dispositions of completers;</li> <li>• are measurable;</li> <li>• are clearly defined for students and faculty; and</li> <li>• there is at least one measurable assessment instrument for each outcome.</li> </ul>	Acceptable level plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completer outcomes are representative of student development as they progress through the program.</li> <li>• The process for the assessment system is clearly defined and integrated throughout the program.</li> <li>• There is evidence of triangulation (multiple assessments of the outcomes).</li> <li>• External and internal assessments are incorporated.</li> </ul>

## Round #3: Integrative PA Committee Evaluation

- Team composition
- Logistics and training
- Evaluation matrix (see attachment)
- Glossary revision (need to respect continuity and change)
- Feedback from Program Assessment Committee to Deans/Program Directors

Program Assessment Matrix			
Program _____	Year _____		
Director _____			
<i>1. Plan: Produce 4-8 meaningful, measurable learning outcomes appropriate to program standards</i>			
Criteria—Learning outcomes are:	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exemplary
1. Meaningful and aligned with UF mission statement			
2. Aligned with college mission (college mission statement attached) and cross-discipline objectives (if relevant)			
3. Relevant, Understandable, Measurable, Behavioral, and Achievable (all 5 = acceptable/exemplary (depending on scope/depth), < 5 = needs improvement)			
4. Appropriate in number (4-8)			
5. Incorporating knowledge, skills, and dispositions students should possess upon completion			
6. Stated in understandable terms that allow reviewers from outside the discipline to make sense of learning outcomes			
7. Expressed with action verbs			
8. Listed in the proper column on PDCA form; i.e., listed under "Plan"			
Total			

## Round #3 continued...

- Pros
  - Valid data in college reports
  - Timely feedback
  - Support of VPAA
  - Time frames established for future
  - "It takes a village" process
  - Program improvement noted in annual reports
- Cons
  - Not all programs met deadline for reporting
  - Change in committee composition

## Next Steps...

- Step up report submission due date
- Blackboard community page
- Administrator
- Technology
- Embedded in culture
- Continue to refine and adapt
- Integration of general education assessment

## Thank you!

- Dr. Louann Hofheins Cummings
  - [cummings@findlay.edu](mailto:cummings@findlay.edu)
- Dorothy Copas
  - [copas@findlay.edu](mailto:copas@findlay.edu)

Come see us! Call! Email! Stay in touch!

