

Assessment Update. January/February 2012. 24 (1): 1-16.

To view this newsletter online go to: wileyonlinelibrary.com

- Fulcher, Keston H. et al. "Expectations for Assessment Reports: A Descriptive Analysis."

The descriptive analysis explores how institutions operationally define "good" assessment via meta-assessment rubrics (MARs). The current (adopted Spring 2012) and former scoring rubrics for programmatic assessment appear at the end of this PDF.

- Banta, Trudy W. "A Surprising Reaction."

The editor responds to questions about the Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP). The DQP is a concept, not an assessment tool, available free of charge to institutions who should expand the DP by adding institution-specific outcomes to avoid homogenization. The emphasis in the DQP is on the cumulative integration of knowledge.

- Daffron, Eric and Sandra J. Jordan. "Getting SMART with Assessment: ACTION Steps to Institutional Effectiveness."

To help communicate the process of assessment of student learning, the authors document their SMART process:

- Sharpen learning goals into outcomes and set achievement targets;
- Map outcomes across the curriculum;
- Assess the outcomes;
- Review the results;
- Transfer the information into action.

Other institutional assessment can be made memorable through ACTION:

- Align goals with strategic directions;
- Create objectives and action steps;
- Tie action steps to targets;
- Identify measures;
- Observe actual results of assessment activities;
- Notify the planning committee of results.

- Houlette, Forrest. "Borrowing Techniques from Computational Linguistics to Process Qualitative Data."

The author borrows a computational linguistic technique to teach human coders the process to analyze qualitative data (student survey responses to the "runaround" they experience. 1) Named Entity Recognition (named entities cannot be subdivided without changing them fundamentally; i.e., names and instruments); 2) Event Segmentation (events are blocks of text that describe a coherent sequence of activities; i.e., unfulfilled promises or employees solving problems); 3) Themes (topics that are repeated often enough to achieve significance). Applying deep case hypotheses to build links among items, the assessment led to action plants to address the emergent issues.

- Crawford, C.B. and Larry Gould. "Department Chair Perspective on Learning Outcomes Assessment at Kansas's Public Universities."

Administrators studied the perception of assessment among department chairs. Their findings revolved around assessment plan implementation, faculty motivation towards assessment, student learning outcome establishment, the need for and culture of assessment, assessment resources, sharing of results with students, and variation in methods used for assessment.

- Pike, Gary R. "*Assessment Measures: Criteria for Evaluating Campus Surveys.*"

The author defines the uses to be made of student college experience surveys (from CIRP and NSSE) and cautions that along with examining packaged benchmark data, that institutions should examine all individual survey items.

This rubric was adopted by the Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee during the 2011-12 school year and was implemented beginning in Fall 2012. Program coordinators were sent this revised rubric along with their 2011-12 assessment data in Fall 2012.

	Goals	Outcomes	Measures and Tools	Data and Success Criteria	Location of Raw Data	Continuous Improvement	Feedback Loop; Collection and Use of Assessment Data
4 Exemplary	All goals are clearly defined using best practice language. All goals identify what students of the program will know, value, and be able to do upon graduation with no gaps remaining in student learning. The most recent set of goals appear accurately and completely on the program's designated web space and most recent Bulletin (2012) and correspond to the most recent set of goals found in their program assessment plan grid. All program goals are mapped to required and elective courses both within and without the major; all data is current^.	All outcomes are clearly defined using best practice language. All outcomes indicate what students should be able to demonstrate, represent, or produce upon graduation. All outcomes are mapped to their relevant goal. All outcomes are measurable as written. No gaps in the scope of student learning remain. All outcomes are mapped to required and elective courses both within and without the major; all data is current^.	All measures are clearly defined and relevant to their outcome. Measures are clearly linked via assessment plan grid to a proper tool. All current rubrics or tools are on file at OIRA to give clarity to the assessment plan and for transparency*. There is at least 1 direct measure per outcome and the majority of measures per outcome are direct. The majority of measures have intrinsic motivation for students (i.e., tied to grades). All outcomes have multiple measures at different times in the student career.	Success criteria are provided, clearly stated, relevant and accurate for all measures. Success criteria is clearly linked via assessment plan grid to a proper tool. Data is submitted within the proper time frame. All data the program uses for assessment is submitted with any exceptions due only to lack of course offering or student population, which are noted in the report.**	N/A	100% of previous-year OIRA feedback is responded to. All best practice suggestions are implemented OR the program has successfully reasoned why the changes should not occur or have not occurred.	Improvements implemented the previous year in assessment and/or curriculum are discussed and their impact is noted. Programmatic data results are summarized and discussed. Results are used and interpreted by faculty, focusing on topics and questions that best fit their program needs. Improvement initiatives are identified and result-driven changes are noted. Most or all faculty are consulted with adjuncts either consulted or informed of program-wide changes and initiatives. Suggests a "culture of evidence".
Notes:	^ failure to submit current and/or updated curriculum maps may result in significant losses in program rubric scores	^ failure to submit current and/or updated curriculum maps may result in significant losses in program rubric scores	* some national proficiency or licensure exams may not be housed at OIRA but items used and exam type should be made clear	** if course-related data, the course is not offered in the assessment cycle; or no majors in related course			

Assessment Cycle Score Range

Annual 0-15

Biennial 16-18

Triennial 19-25

	Goals	Outcomes	Measures and Tools	Data and Success Criteria	Location of Raw Data	Continuous Improvement	Feedback Loop; Collection and Use of Assessment Data
3 Established	All goals are clearly defined using best practice language. While goals identify what students of the program will know, value, and be able to do upon graduation, gaps remain though are addressed in the most recent program assessment report. The most recent set of goals appear accurately and completely on the program's designated web space and most recent Bulletin (2012) and correspond to the most recent set of goals found in their program assessment plan grid. All program goals are mapped to required and elective courses within the major; all data is current^.	All outcomes are clearly defined using best practice language. All outcomes indicate what students should be able to demonstrate, represent, or produce upon graduation. All outcomes are mapped to their relevant goal. All outcomes are measureable as written. Some gaps in the scope of student learning remain, though they are addressed in the most recent program assessment report. All outcomes are mapped to required and elective courses within the major; all data is current^.	All measures are clearly defined and relevant to their outcome. Measures are clearly linked via assessment plan grid to a proper tool. Some current rubrics or tools are on file at OIRA to give clarity to the assessment plan and for transparency*. There is at least 1 direct measure per outcome and the majority of measures per outcome are direct. Some outcomes have multiple measures at different times in the student career. Any deficiencies in any item listed here is addressed in the most recent program assessment report.	Success criteria are provided, clearly stated, relevant and accurate for all measures. Success criteria is clearly linked via assessment plan grid to a proper tool. Data is submitted within the proper time frame. Some data the program uses for assessment is missing; however, because of existence of multiple direct measures for that/those outcome(s), evidence still remains.	N/A	75-99% of previous-year OIRA feedback is responded to. All best practice suggestions are implemented OR the program has successfully reasoned why the changes should not occur or have not occurred.	Improvements implemented the previous year in assessment and/or curriculum are discussed, but their impact is unclear. Programmatic data results are summarized and discussed. Results are used and interpreted by faculty, focusing on topics and questions that best fit their program needs. Improvement initiatives are identified and result-driven changes are noted. Most or all faculty are consulted with adjuncts either consulted or informed of program-wide changes and initiatives.
Notes:	^ failure to submit current and/or updated curriculum maps may result in significant losses in program rubric scores	^ failure to submit current and/or updated curriculum maps may result in significant losses in program rubric scores	* some national proficiency or licensure exams may not be housed at OIRA but items used and exam type should be made clear	** if course-related data, the course is not offered in the assessment cycle; or no majors in related course			

	Goals	Outcomes	Measures and Tools	Data and Success Criteria	Location of Raw Data	Continuous Improvement	Feedback Loop; Collection and Use of Assessment Data
2 Developing	Some goals are not defined using best practice language. While goals identify what students of the program will know, value, and be able to do upon graduation, gaps remain and are not addressed in the program assessment report. The most recent set of goals either do not appear accurately or completely on the program's designated web space and most recent Bulletin (2012) or discrepancies with those found in their program assessment plan grid remain. All program goals are mapped to required courses within the major; all data is current^.	Some outcomes are not defined using best practice language. Some outcomes do not indicate what students should be able to demonstrate, represent, or produce upon graduation. Some outcomes are not mapped to their relevant goal. Some outcomes are not measurable as written. Some gaps in the scope of student learning remain, and are not addressed in the most recent program assessment report. All outcomes are mapped to required courses within the major; all data is current^.	Some measures are not clearly defined and relevant to their outcome. Measures are clearly linked via assessment plan grid to a proper tool. Some current rubrics or tools are not on file at OIRA to give clarity to the assessment plan and for transparency*. There is at least 1 direct measure per outcome. Some outcomes do not have multiple measures at different times in the student career. Any deficiencies in any item listed here is not addressed in the most recent program assessment report.	Success criteria are provided, clearly stated, relevant and accurate for some measures. Success criteria is not clearly linked via assessment plan grid to a proper tool. Data is submitted within the proper time frame. Some data the program uses for assessment is missing; however, because of existence of multiple direct measures for that/those outcome(s), evidence still remains.	N/A	50-74% of previous-year OIRA feedback is responded to. Some best practice suggestions are implemented. The program has not successfully reasoned why best practice changes should not occur or have not occurred.	Improvements implemented the previous year in assessment and/or curriculum are discussed, but their impact is unclear. Programmatic data results are summarized and discussed. Results are used and interpreted by faculty, but actions taken do not reflect changes best suited based on the data. Improvement initiatives are either not identified or result-driven changes are not noted. Most or all faculty are consulted, but adjuncts and/or those not in attendance are neither consulted or informed of program-wide changes and initiatives.
Notes:	^ failure to submit current and/or updated curriculum maps may result in significant losses in program rubric scores	^ failure to submit current and/or updated curriculum maps may result in significant losses in program rubric scores	* some national proficiency or licensure exams may not be housed at OIRA but items used and exam type should be made clear	** if course-related data, the course is not offered in the assessment cycle; or no majors in related course			

	Goals	Outcomes	Measures and Tools	Data and Success Criteria	Location of Raw Data	Continuous Improvement	Feedback Loop; Collection and Use of Assessment Data
1 Undeveloped	At least 2 exist: 1) Some goals are not defined using best practice language. 2) While goals identify what students of the program will know, value, and be able to do upon graduation, gaps remain and are not addressed in the program assessment report. Or 3) The most recent set of goals either do not appear accurately or completely on the program's designated web space and most recent Bulletin (2012) or discrepancies with those found in their program assessment plan grid remain. Some program goals are mapped to required courses within the major^.	At least 2 exist: 1) Some outcomes are not defined using best practice language. 2) Some outcomes do not indicate what students should be able to demonstrate, represent, or produce upon graduation. 3) Some outcomes are not mapped to their relevant goal. 4) Some outcomes are not measureable as written. Or 5) Some gaps in the scope of student learning remain, and are not addressed in the most recent program assessment report. Some outcomes are mapped to required courses within the major^.	At least 2 exist: 1) Some measures are not clearly defined and relevant to their outcome. 2) Some measures are not clearly linked via assessment plan grid to a proper tool. 3) Some current rubrics or tools are not on file at OIRA to give clarity to the assessment plan and for transparency*. 4) There is not at least 1 direct measure per outcome. 5) Some outcomes do not have multiple measures at different times in the student career. 6) Any deficiencies in any item listed here is not addressed in the most recent program assessment report.	Success criteria are provided, clearly stated, relevant and accurate for some measures. Success criteria is not clearly linked via assessment plan grid to a proper tool. Data is not submitted within the proper time frame. Some data the program uses for assessment is missing.	The Location of Raw Data is clearly stated and securely stored (this is an Exemplary score, however for ease of rubric calculation, it is placed in this row due to 0 to 1 scale)	Less than 50% of previous-year OIRA feedback is responded to. Some best practice suggestions are implemented. The program has not successfully reasoned why best practice changes should not occur or have not occurred.	Improvements implemented the previous year in assessment and/or curriculum may not be discussed. Programmatic data results may not be summarized and discussed. Results are not clearly used and interpreted by faculty. Improvement initiatives are either not identified or result-driven changes are not noted. Most or all faculty are consulted, but adjuncts and/or those not in attendance are neither consulted or informed of program-wide changes and initiatives.
Notes:	^ failure to submit current and/or updated curriculum maps may result in significant losses in program rubric scores	^ failure to submit current and/or updated curriculum maps may result in significant losses in program rubric scores	* some national proficiency or licensure exams may not be housed at OIRA but items used and exam type should be made clear	** if course-related data, the course is not offered in the assessment cycle; or no majors in related course			

	Goals	Outcomes	Measures and Tools	Data and Success Criteria	Location of Raw Data	Continuous Improvement	Feedback Loop; Collection and Use of Assessment Data
0 Deficient	No Program goals OR All 3 exist: 1) Some goals are not defined using best practice language. 2) While goals identify what students of the program will know, value, and be able to do upon graduation, gaps remain and are not addressed in the program assessment report. And 3) The most recent set of goals either do not appear accurately or completely on the program's designated web space and most recent Bulletin (2012) or discrepancies with those found in their program assessment plan grid remain. Program goals are not mapped to courses [^] .	No Outcomes OR At least 3 exist: 1) Some outcomes are not defined using best practice language. 2) Some outcomes do not indicate what students should be able to demonstrate, represent, or produce upon graduation. 3) Some outcomes are not mapped to their relevant goal. 4) Some outcomes are not measureable as written. Or 5) Some gaps in the scope of student learning remain, and are not addressed in the most recent program assessment report. Outcomes are not mapped to courses [^] .	No Measures OR at least 3 exist: 1) Some measures are not clearly defined and relevant to their outcome. 2) Some measures are not clearly linked via assessment plan grid to a proper tool. 3) Some current rubrics or tools are not on file at OIRA to give clarity to the assessment plan and for transparency*. 4) There is not at least 1 direct measure per outcome. 5) Some outcomes do not have multiple measures at different times in the student career. 6) Any deficiencies in any item listed here is not addressed in the most recent program assessment report.	No Data, OR No Success Criteria OR at least 2 exist: 1) Success criteria are provided, clearly stated, relevant and accurate for some measures. 2) Success criteria is not clearly linked via assessment plan grid to a proper tool. 3) Data is not submitted within the proper time frame. 4) Some data the program uses for assessment is missing.	Insufficient information on location of data is provided	Less than 50% of previous-year OIRA feedback is responded to. No best practice suggestions are implemented. The program has not successfully reasoned why the best practice changes should not occur or have not occurred.	Little evidence of a feedback loop exists. Improvements implemented the previous year in assessment and/or curriculum may not be discussed, and their impact is unclear. Programmatic data results may not be summarized and discussed. Results are not clearly used and interpreted by faculty. Improvement initiatives are either not identified or result-driven changes are not noted. Most or all faculty are not consulted regardless if informed of program-wide changes and initiatives.
Notes:	[^] failure to submit current and/or updated curriculum maps may result in significant losses in program rubric scores	[^] failure to submit current and/or updated curriculum maps may result in significant losses in program rubric scores	* some national proficiency or licensure exams may not be housed at OIRA but items used and exam type should be made clear	** if course-related data, the course is not offered in the assessment cycle; or no majors in related course			

This tool was used to score programmatic assessment prior to Fall 2012. 'Location of raw data' was scored 0 or 4 (changed in Fall 2012 to 0 or 1); 'Feedback Loop' was split into 2 categories in Fall 2012 to better measure which programs were using best practice feedback.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT EVALUATION RUBRIC

Revised 1/20/2010

	Goals	Outcomes / Objectives	How Measured & Measurement Tools	Success Criteria	Location of Raw Data	Feedback Loop; Collection and Use of Assessment Data
0--No Information	No student learning goals documented	No Outcomes documented	No measures, methods, or tools documented	No Success Criteria provided	Insufficient information on location of data is provided	No data has been collected or used; No evidence of a feedback loop
1--Underdeveloped	At least some goals are defined but goals are either not clearly defined or not relevant to knowledge, skills, and attitudes expected of program graduates	At least some outcomes are defined but they are either not clearly defined, not relevant to their goal, or not measurable	At least some measures are defined but they are either not clearly defined, not relevant to their outcome, or not measurable	Success Criteria are provided for all defined measures, but they are either not clearly defined or not relevant for the measure.	N/A	Evidence of the beginnings of a feedback loop is provided, but some components are not in place, or the focus is not on student learning.
2--Developing	At least some goals are clearly defined and relevant to knowledge, skills, and attitudes expected of program graduates. Gaps in goals, clarity, and/or relevance remain; and filling these gaps is not addressed in the improvement plan.	At least some outcomes are clearly defined, relevant to their goal, and measurable. Gaps such as goals without at least 1 outcome, outcome not relevant to its goal, and/or lack of clarity remain; and filling these gaps is not addressed in the improvement plan.	At least some measures are clearly defined, relevant to their outcome, and measurable. Gaps such as outcomes without at least 1 measure, measures not relevant to their outcomes, and/or lack of clarity remain; and filling these gaps is not addressed in the improvement plan.	Success Criteria are provided, clearly stated, and relevant for all defined measures.	N/A	Some data are collected, analyzed, discussed and reviewed by all faculty. Few if any student learning improvements are identified or implemented. All components of the feedback loop are in place and developing.
3--Established	Most to all goals are clearly defined and relevant to knowledge, skills, and attitudes expected of program graduates. Any remaining gaps in goals, clarity, and/or relevance are addressed in the improvement plan	Most to all outcomes are clearly defined, relevant to their goal, and measurable. Any remaining gaps such as goals without at least 1 outcome, outcome not relevant to its goal, & lack of clarity are addressed in the improvement plan.	Most to all measures are clearly defined, relevant to their outcome, and measurable. At least some measures are direct measures. Any remaining gaps such as outcomes without at least 1 measure, measures not relevant to their outcomes, and/or lack of clarity are addressed in the improvement plan. Data are being collected.	Success Criteria are provided, clearly stated, and relevant for all defined measures. Data are being collected and compared to the success criteria.	N/A	Student learning data are collected, analyzed, discussed and reviewed by all faculty, used to identify student learning improvements, and identified student learning improvements are implemented. The feedback loop is focused on student learning and has been effectively used to identify and implement student learning improvements for more than 1 year.
4-Exemplary	All goals are clearly defined and relevant to knowledge, skills, and attitudes expected of program graduates. The scope of student learning expected for graduates of the program is covered. No gaps remain.	All outcomes are clearly defined, relevant to their goal, and measurable. No gaps remain. Some goals have multiple outcomes.	All measures are clearly defined and relevant to their outcome. No gaps remain. Direct measures predominate and some outcomes have multiple measures. Data are being collected for all measures.	Success Criteria are provided, clearly stated, and relevant for all measures. Data are being collected and compared to the success criteria for all measures.	The Location of Raw Data is clearly stated and securely stored.	For all measures: Student learning data are collected, analyzed, discussed and reviewed by all faculty, used to identify student learning improvements, and identified student learning improvements are implemented. The feedback loop is focused on student learning and has been effectively used to identify and implement student learning improvements for more than 3 year. A "culture of evidence" has developed within the program.

Notes:

- o Each column is dependent on all preceding columns. Therefore a program cannot score a specific value (e.g., 3) for one column (component) unless it has scored that value or higher for all preceding columns.
- o Valid and well defined measures must identify what is being measured, where (e.g., the course) it is measured, how (test, portfolio, paper, etc.) it is measured, and the measurement tool (e.g., scannable form).
- o Unless the frequency of measurement is explicitly stated, annual is assumed.