

Assessment Institute October 22-24, 2017

Indicators of “Good Practice” in Program Assessment: Faculty Collaborating for Quality Outcomes and Tools, Meaningful Evidence, Improvement and Transparency

The Indicators are available at www.cuw.edu/IndicatorsGoodPractice

Elizabeth Evans
Concordia University Wisconsin

Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching
Elizabeth.evans@cuw.edu 262 243 4283

What we hope to do today:

1. How do these indicators speak to you? Review one section and suggest clarifications.
2. In one or more sections, identify areas of congruency or lack thereof at your own institution.
3. Suggest additions or subtractions to facilitate applications to multiple contexts.

Questions for Reflection:

4. What is missing from these indicators that cannot be reduced to one sentence?
5. How might these be used in faculty development at your institution?

Part I Introduction

Who is here? What is your role? Level of responsibility? Level of experience? Type of institution?

Part II Overview of Sections of the Indicators document

Which section(s) of the indicators do you want to focus on? Individually? Groups? Pick two/three.
Any arguments with the descriptions?

- a. Collaborative Faculty Work
- b. Quality of Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes
- c. Curriculum Mapping
- d. Effective Measurement Tools and Procedures
- e. Meaningful Evidence and Conclusions
- f. Changes/Improvements Recommended
- g. Impact of Previous Implementation
- h. How do we use the information to advance
 - teaching, courses, curricula
 - student learning
 - the assessment process
 - strategic planning, budgets
 - transparency with stakeholders

Part III How is this used at presenter’s institution?

- a. Developed by the presenter and the Assessment Committee
- b. Framework for dialogue about “assessment showcase” presentations by departments
- c. Taught in a faculty development session with Peer Reviewers in August
- d. Used in the Peer Review of Assessment Roundtable annual review of reports
- e. Coordinators use as self-reflection in their departments after Peer Review Roundtable
- f. Coordinators submit self-evaluation and comments after roundtable

Part IV Working Individually or in Groups

In your chosen section:

What are your suggestions/ clarifications/additions/subtractions?

How could this be adapted for different regional accreditors or different institutional contexts?

How is your institution doing compared to these indicators?

How would you use this at your institution?

PART IV Large Group Conversation on Part III and Questions for Reflection

- a. What is missing from these indicators that cannot be reduced to one sentence?
- b. How might these be used in faculty development at your institution?

**Indicators of Good Practice in Academic Program-level Assessment of Student Learning
At Concordia University Wisconsin - Mequon and Ann Arbor**

Are these elements of good practice demonstrated in the annual program/major assessment process/report?

Y	N	Collaborative Work:	Notes
		Is the program assessment process collaborative so that many faculty participate in the processes (such as developing SLOs, collecting data, mapping, developing conclusions, and implementing improvements)?	
		Does the process invite the creation of shared responsibility within/across departmental faculty?	
Y	N	Quality of the Program-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):	
		Do the student learning outcomes (SLOs) address student learning (rather than program operational goals)?	
		Do SLOs describe levels of knowledge, skills or attitudes students should have acquired by program completion/exit?	
		Do SLOs reach higher levels of student learning on Bloom's or a similar taxonomy?	
		Are the SLOs described at a level and in a manner that is measurable?	
		Do the SLOs relate to performance standards or benchmarks (including external) in this discipline/program area?	
		Is the level of student achievement desired described for each SLO?	
		Is there at least one program-level SLO related to mission-specific university outcomes?	
		Is the cycle/schedule describing when each program SLO is assessed included?	
Y	N	Curriculum Mapping:	
		Has the department engaged in curriculum mapping of major or program courses/learning processes to the program-level SLOs?	
		Does the curriculum map supplied identify courses where content/course level outcomes are related to each program SLO? Exemplary versions of maps identify detailed information such as where learning related to the SLO is introduced (I), developed (D), and assessed (A)?	
		Has a map of the program SLOs to university-level SLOs been created and used?	
		If applicable, are the program SLOs also mapped to the gen ed/core curriculum?	
Y	N	Measurement Tools and Procedures:	
		Are measurement tool(s) described for each program SLO reported on this year?	
		Does the tool accurately measure the nature and level of learning described in each SLO?	
		Are tools primarily <i>direct measures</i> (that actually measure student learning)?	
		If a tool measures more than one SLO, is the report/department clear about which aspect of that tool accurately measures a particular SLO? (i.e. one row in a rubric rather than grades on an assignment)	
		Is information provided about when and how each tool is used to collect data?	
		Do indirect measures (such as student perceptions about learning) support but not replace the use of direct measures?	

Y	N	Evidence/ Results:	
		Are reported results aggregated across groups of students rather than reported for individual students?	
		Are data/results provided for each program SLO being assessed this year?	
		Does evidence/results arise from data acquired through the identified tools?	
		Is the evidence analyzed and described according to each program SLO (rather than aggregated across multiple SLOs) so changes may be recommended to improve student learning for individual SLOs where performance is too low?	
Y	N	Conclusions:	
		Do the conclusions/evaluations relate to evidence collected on student learning (results) for each SLO?	
		Do the results/conclusions provide sufficient information to identify where changes can be made?	
		Do the conclusions compare evidence/results (actual achievement) to the level of achievement desired (desired achievement) for each program SLO?	
		Are conclusions meaningful?	
Y	N	Changes/ Improvements Recommended:	
		Are proposed changes based on conclusions?	
		Are proposed changes specific and identify how and when they will be implemented?	
		Do proposed changes address weak areas in student performance?	
Y	N	Impact of Previous Recommendations:	
		Were previously recommended changes implemented and tracked?	
		Has the program been able to link recommendations implemented to changed results?	
Y	N	Uses of the Information:	
		Does the program/school or college/university use assessment processes and/or results to further develop the curriculum, standards, or teaching?	
		Does the program/school or college/university use assessment processes and/or results to improve departmental policies/procedures/processes?	
		Does the program/school or college/university use assessment processes and/or results to improve the assessment process itself?	
		Does the program/school or college/university use assessment processes and/or results to improve student achievement/student learning?	
		Does the program/school or college/university use assessment information to identify priorities or initiatives in their strategic plan or budgets?	
		Does the program/school or college/university use the information to communicate student success to the public and other stakeholders?	