Assessment Workshop
January 25, 2017
Agenda

• Welcome & Introductions
• Principles of Effective Assessment
• Highlight Institutional Assessment Data
• Assessment Resources
• Best Practices Discussion
Nine Principles of Effective Assessment
(American Assoc. of Higher Education)

1. The assessment of student learning begins with educational values.
2. **Assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional, integrated, and revealed in performance over time.**
3. Assessment works best when the programs it seeks to improve have clear, explicitly stated purposes.
4. **Assessment requires attention to outcomes but also and equally to the experiences that lead to those outcomes.**
5. Assessment works best when it is ongoing, not episodic.
6. Assessment fosters wider improvement when representatives from across the educational community are involved.
7. **Assessment makes a difference when it begins with issues of use and illuminates questions that people really care about.**
8. Assessment is most likely to lead to improvement when it is part of a larger set of conditions that promote change.
9. Through assessment, educators meet responsibilities to students and to the public. (AAHE, 1992)
Levels of Assessment & Examples

- Course Level (e.g., ENGL 101)
  - Exam, portfolio, paper

- Program Level (e.g., BS in Chemistry)
  - Pre- & Post-Content Exams or Major Field Test
  - Capstone Project
  - Samples of student course work

- Institution Level (e.g., General Education Program)
  - National-normed assessments, i.e., CLA & HEIghten
  - Student work evaluated with VALUE rubrics
Available Institutional Assessment Data

• Data is available for these Learning Outcomes, with drill-down to the degree program level (or school):
  o Written Communication
  o Critical Thinking
  o Ethical Reasoning
  o Civic Engagement
  o Quantitative Literacy

• Next we’ll review which assessments are available and look at sample data.
• As we are reviewing this information, think about which assessment data could compliment your existing assessment plans & how you could use this information to improve teaching and learning.
Ethical Reasoning (VALUE or QEP Rubric)

- Freshman & Junior Levels
- Ethics across the Curriculum (normally Junior & Senior levels)

![Graph showing LDRS 111 Ethical Reasoning Essay 2015-2016 AYs]
## QEP/ Ethical Reasoning Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1: Ethical Concept Recognition</th>
<th>value: 1.00</th>
<th>value: 2.00</th>
<th>value: 3.00</th>
<th>value: 4.00</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student fails to recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and concepts.</td>
<td>Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and concepts and grasp (incompletely) the complexities.</td>
<td>Student can recognize most ethical issues and concepts when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context.</td>
<td>Student can recognize ethical issues and concepts when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context.</td>
<td>Student can recognize ethical issues and concepts when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 4: Application of Ethical Perspectives / Concepts</th>
<th>value: 1.00</th>
<th>value: 2.00</th>
<th>value: 3.00</th>
<th>value: 4.00</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student fails to independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to describe an ethical issue, and inaccurately differentiates whether it is a moral temptation or an ethical dilemma.</td>
<td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to describe an ethical issue, but inaccurately differentiates whether it is a moral temptation or an ethical dilemma.</td>
<td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives / concepts to describe an ethical issue, but fails to fully differentiate between a moral temptation and an ethical dilemma.</td>
<td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to describe an ethical issue, and accurately differentiate whether it is a moral temptation or an ethical dilemma.</td>
<td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to describe an ethical issue, and accurately differentiate whether it is a moral temptation or an ethical dilemma.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 5: Application of an Ethical Reasoning Process</th>
<th>value: 1.00</th>
<th>value: 2.00</th>
<th>value: 3.00</th>
<th>value: 4.00</th>
<th>Score/Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student fails to apply the ethical reasoning process to an ethical dilemma from their own experience, and is unable to accurately describe why this is an ethical dilemma and fails to evaluate the dilemma using the ethical dilemma paradigms AND decision principles to justify a resolution.</td>
<td>Student inaccurately applies the ethical reasoning process to an ethical dilemma from their own experience, describing why this is an ethical dilemma but fails to utilize ethical dilemma paradigms AND decision principles to justify a resolution.</td>
<td>Student can independently apply the ethical reasoning process to an ethical dilemma from their own experience, describing why this is an ethical dilemma and evaluating the dilemma using EITHER the ethical dilemma paradigms OR decision principles to justify a resolution.</td>
<td>Student can independently apply the ethical reasoning process to an ethical dilemma from their own experience, describing why this is an ethical dilemma and evaluating the dilemma using BOTH the ethical dilemma paradigms AND decision principles to effectively justify a resolution.</td>
<td>Student can independently apply the ethical reasoning process to an ethical dilemma from their own experience, describing why this is an ethical dilemma and evaluating the dilemma using BOTH the ethical dilemma paradigms AND decision principles to effectively justify a resolution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collegiate Learning Assessment

- Random Sample of 100 Freshmen & Seniors annually
- Sample size from each degree program varies
- Outcomes related to Critical Thinking & Written Communication
Written Communication & Critical Thinking (VALUE Rubric)

- Sophomore, Junior, and Senior Levels
- Sample size from each degree program varies

Written Communication - Sophomore English Essay 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context of and Purpose for Writing</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Development</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources and Evidence</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rubric</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical Thinking - Seniors - AY 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of issues</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of context and</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's position (perspective,</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thesis/hypothesis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and related</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-point scale

Mean / 4pt Scale

1-Benchmark 2-Milestones 3-Milestones 4-Capstone
# National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE & FSSE)

- Freshman & Senior Levels
- Data related to multiple outcomes

### Academic Challenge – Seniors & Upper-Division Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher-Order Learning</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
<th>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memorizing course material</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected your learning to societal problems or issues</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included diverse perspectives in course discussions or assignments</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- % students responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much coursework emphasized...
- % of faculty responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much coursework emphasized...
- % students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...
- % of faculty who responded "Important" or "Very Important" when asked how important it is that students ...
Citadel Experience Senior Survey

- Senior Level
- Other areas: support, encouragement for graduate study, quality of advising, research, and more
Citadel Alumni Survey

- SCCC and CGC Alumni

### Instruction in your major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cadet</th>
<th>Non-cadet Undergraduate Student</th>
<th>Graduate Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citadel Employer Survey

- SCCC and CGC

**What Citadel School/Department did your employee(s) graduate from?**

- Department of Leadership Studies: 0.6%
- School of Business: 22.3%
- School of Engineering: 22.5%
- School of Humanities and Social Sciences: 26.9%
- School of Science and Mathematics: 25.6%
- Zuber Family School of Education: 1.5%

**Writing effectively**

- No Response: 8%
- Unable to Evaluate: 14%
- Needs Improvement: 24%
- Below Average: 24%
- Average: 37%
- Above Average: 18%
- Superior: 18%
HEIghten Exams

• Targeted, 50-min. exams that measure competency in certain outcomes:
  o Critical Thinking
  o Quantitative Literacy
  o Written Communication
• Last year we partnered with instructors in Business, English, and Science and Mathematics
• Let us know if you are interested in taking part
Resources

- www.citadel.edu/assessment

- National Institute for Learning Outcome Assessment
  www.learningoutcomesassessment.org

- College Portrait/Volunteer System of Accountability
  www.voluntarysystem.org

- Assoc. of American Colleges & Universities
  www.aacu.org
  - Degree qualifications profile
  - LEAP
  - VALUE Project
Best Practices: AAC&U VALUE Rubrics

- VALUE = Valid Assessment of Undergraduate Education
- Used by more than 4,200 institutions
- Authorized by the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA)
- Currently used by the College & many departments
- Rubrics:
  - Inquiry and Analysis, Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, Written Communication, Oral Communication, Quantitative Literacy, Information Literacy, Reading, Teamwork, Problem Solving, Civic Knowledge and Engagement, Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, Ethical Reasoning, Global Learning, Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning, and Integrative Learning.
Best Practices: AAC&U VALUE Rubrics

Available at citadel.edu/assessment

Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestone 3</th>
<th>Milestone 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanations of issues</td>
<td>Issue problems to be considered critically in text</td>
<td>Issue problems to be considered critically in text</td>
<td>Issue problems to be considered critically in text</td>
<td>Issue problems to be considered critically in text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation, to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) without interpretation/evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of context and assumptions</td>
<td>Thoroughly systematically and consistently analyze causes and effects; assumptions and verify the relevance of cause and effect.</td>
<td>Identify and analyze assumptions and effects; assumptions verified and effect relevant.</td>
<td>Question; some assumptions; identify several relevant causes and effects.</td>
<td>Shown no awareness of context; some assumptions; identify several relevant causes and effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s position (perspective, thesis/baseline)</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/baseline), taking into account the complexity of an issue.</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/baseline), taking into account the complexity of an issue.</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/baseline) acknowledges different sides of an issue.</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/baseline), taking into account the complexity of an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and linked outcomes (implications and consequences)</td>
<td>Conclusions and linked outcomes (implications and consequences) are logical and substantiated; conclusions substantiated by specific position (perspective, thesis/baseline).</td>
<td>Conclusions are logical and substantiated; linked outcomes (implications and consequences) are identified.</td>
<td>Conclusions are logically linked to information or arguments.</td>
<td>Conclusions are logically linked to information or arguments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, methods, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Examinations are conducted using a score in any work sample or selection of work that does not exceed benchmark (4) and final performance.
Resources: ePortfolios

- TaskStream software is available for custom, degree-specific ePortfolios
- Can be course-based, assignment-based, or outcome-based
- Simplifies evaluation of student work and feedback to students
- Simplifies collection of assessment data
- Can be used for both cadet and masters programs
Best Practices Discussion

Instructions

• For this portion of the workshop, please select a scribe and record the ideas your table comes up with.

• Be prepared to briefly report on one or two of your tables’ responses to each question.
Best Practices Discussion

• Which effective assessment practices have you used at the course or degree program level?
• What best practices or resources promulgated by academic or professional organizations in your discipline have helped (or could) with assessment at the course or program level?
Reminders

• January — All degree program and department assessment plans should be entered in TaskStream AMS – data collection should be ongoing

• Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, April 3- 20

• End of June — 16-17 Assessment Reports Due
Reminders

• A copy of this PPT will be available at www.citadel.edu/assessment

• For assistance with your degree program assessment plan, including discussion of outcomes and specific data you could leverage, contact Todd Shealy or Tara Hornor.

• Thank you for your participation today!