Simple Annual Assessment Flowchart

Amy Liu, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA)
Professor of Sociology

Chia-Jung Chung, Ph.D.
Assessment Consultant, OAPA
Associate Professor of Education

Judith Kusnick, Ph.D.
Assessment Consultant, OAPA
Professor of Geology

Elizabeth Strasser, Ph.D.
Assessment Consultant, OAPA
Professor of Anthropology

Presentation at the University Chairs Meeting
California State University, Sacramento
October 1, 2015

I: The Annual Assessment Flow Chart

Q1. Program Learning Outcomes	**Q2.** Standards of Performance/ Expectations	**Q3.** Methods/ Measures (Assignments) and Surveys	**Q4.** Data/Findings/ Conclusions	**Q5.** Using Assessment Data/ Closing the Loop

Examples:

Chemistry, BS/BA

(Example of Content Knowledge with a Simple PLO)

PLO 1: Students will quantitatively determine the composition of chemical unknowns through the use of classical and modern analytical techniques and instrumentation.	Target performance for this assessment was that 50% of students would demonstrate "mastery" (i.e., reported values within 0.5% of the true value) and 75% of students would demonstrate "proficiency" (i.e., reported values within 1.0% of the true value).	Students were provided with nine chemical samples and quantitatively analyzed each unknown to determine their respective weight percent of chloride in a solid.	Findings were 44% mastery and 56% proficiency.	To close the loop, faculty has implemented additional opportunities for practice and achievement in analytical techniques and methodology in two core courses.

Educational Technology (iMet), MA

(Example of a multi-dimension PLO with Complicated Skills)

PLO 6: Critical Thinking Skills **6.1** Explanation of issues **6.2** Evidence **6.3** Influence of context and assumptions **6.4** Student's position **6.5** Conclusions and related outcomes (See Appendix III)	Seventy percent (70 %) of our students will score 3.0 or above in all five dimensions using the VALUE rubric by the time they graduate from the four semester program.	Culminating Experience Projects: Master's Thesis	Students *meet* the standards 6.1 (92%), 6.4 (77%) and 6.5 (69%). Students *do not* meet the standards 6.2 (61%) and 6.3 (61%). **Students meet some of our Critical Thinking standards.** The areas needing improvement: 1). 6.2: Evidence (61%) 2). 6.3: Influence of context and assumptions (61%).	In order to help students in our program successfully become critical thinking researchers, we will design more classroom activities and assignments related to: 1). Re-examination of evidence (6.2) and context and assumptions (6.3) in the research 2). Require students to apply these skills as they compose comprehensive responses for all their assignments.

II. Value Rubric for Critical Thinking Skill

Criterion	Capstone 4	Milestone 3	Milestone 2	Benchmark 1
6.1: Explanation of issues	Issue or problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue or problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue or problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue or problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
6.2: Evidence (Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion**)**	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation or evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation or evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation or evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation or evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
6.3: Influence of context and assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions).
6.4: Student's position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis or hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position.	Specific position (perspective, thesis or hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis or hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis or hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes (Implications and consequences**)**	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect students' informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

Q2: Standards of Performance/Expectations: Seventy percent (70%) of our students will score 3.0 or above in all five dimensions using the VALUE rubric by the time they graduate from the four semester program.

III. Data Collection Sheet

Criterion	**Capstone 4**	**Milestone 3**	**Milestone 2**	**Benchmark 1**
6.1: Explanation of issues	4	3	2	1
6.2: Evidence (Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion)	4	3	2	1
6.3: Influence of context and assumptions	4	3	2	1
6.4: Student's position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis)	4	3	2	1
6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes (Implications and consequences)	4	3	2	1

IV. Results

Different Levels[2] / Five Criteria (Areas)[2]	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Total (N=9)
3.1 Context of and Purpose for Writing	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	0%	(100%, N=9)
3.2 Content Development	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	0%	(100%, N=9)
3.3 Genre and Disciplinary Conventions.	11.1%	44.4%	44.4%	0%	(100%, N=9)
3.4 Sources and Evidence	11.1%	44.4%	44.4%	0%	(100%, N=9)
3.5 Control of Syntax and Mechanics	0%	66.7%	33.3%	0%	(100%, N=9)

V. Important Considerations for Programs Review & Assessment

In the future, please keep the following questions in mind when the unit (program, department, or the college) reflects on assessing student learning outcomes and improving the programs:

1) What are your program learning outcomes (PLOs): **what should your students know, value, and be able to do (at the time of graduation)?** Are the PLOs aligned closely with the missions of the university and the department/college? Are these PLOs (together with their standards of performance and achievement targets) able to demonstrate the **meaning, quality, integrity and uniqueness** of your degree program?

2) Is each program learning outcome aligned closely with the curriculum, the key assignment, pedagogy, grading, the co-curriculum, or relevant student support services?

3) What are **rubrics** used in assessing a particular program learning outcome? What are the explicit **criteria** or **standards of performance** for each outcome? What are the **achievement targets** for each outcome? Have the programs achieved the learning outcomes: **the standards** and/or **the achievement targets**? Is each outcome assessable?

4) **Is an assessment plan for each unit (program, department, or college) in place?** Have curriculum maps been developed? Does the plan clarify when, how, and how often each outcome will be assessed and used? Will all outcomes be assessed over a reasonable period of time such as within a six-year program review cycle? Is the plan sustainable in terms of human, fiscal, and other resources? Is the assessment plan revised as needed?

5) **What are the data, findings, and analyses for EACH program learning outcome? What is the quality of the data: how reliable and valid is the data?** Other than GPA, what data/evidences are used to determine whether your graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree (BA/BS or MA/MS)? If two or more pieces of assessment data are used for each outcome, is the data consistent or contradictory?

6) **Who is going to use the data**? Are the data, findings, or analyses clearly presented so that they are easy to understand and/or use? Is the data used only for the course or for the program where the data is collected, or do you want the data to be used broadly for the curriculum, budgeting, or strategic planning at the department, the college, or the university?

7) Has the program conducted **follow-up assessment** to evaluate the effectiveness of program changes made based on assessment data? **If yes, how effective are those changes to improve student learning and success?** If no, what is your plan to assess the effectiveness of those changes?

8) **Are students aware of these learning outcomes?** Do they often use them to assess the learning outcomes themselves? Where are the program learning outcomes published for view, e.g., across programs, with students, in the course syllabus, the department websites or catalogs? Are they widely shared?

VI. Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals for
The 21st Century & AAC&U's 16 VALUE Rubrics
http://www.csus.edu/wascaccreditation/Documents/Endnotes/E044.pdf

1. **Competence in the Disciplines**: The ability to demonstrate the competencies and values listed below in *at least one major field of study* and to demonstrate informed understandings of other fields, drawing on the knowledge and skills of disciplines outside the major.

2. **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World** through study in the *sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts.* Focused by engagement with big questions, contemporary and enduring.

3. **Intellectual and Practical Skills, including:** *inquiry and analysis, critical, philosophical, and creative thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative literacy, information literacy, teamwork and problem solving,* practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance.
    - 3.1 Critical thinking (WSCUC core competency)
    - 3.2 Information literacy (WSCUC core competency)
    - 3.3 Written communication (WSCUC core competency)
    - 3.4 Oral communication (WSCUC core competency)
    - 3.5 Quantitative literacy (WSCUC core competency)
    - 3.6 Inquiry and analysis (Sixth VALUE rubric)
    - 3.7 Creative thinking (Seventh VALUE rubric)
    - 3.8 Reading (Eighth VALUE rubric)
    - 3.9 Teamwork (Ninth VALUE rubric)
    - 3.10 Problem solving (Tenth VALUE rubric)

4. **Personal and Social Responsibility (Values), including:** *civic knowledge and engagement—local and global, intercultural knowledge and competence*, ethical reasoning and action, foundations and skills for lifelong learning* anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges.
    - 4.1 Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global (Eleventh VALUE rubric)
    - 4.2 Intercultural knowledge and competence (Twelfth VALUE rubric)
    - 4.3 Ethical reasoning (Thirteenth VALUE rubric)
    - 4.4 Foundations and skills for lifelong learning (Fourteenth VALUE rubric)
    - 4.5 Global Learning (Fifteenth VALUE rubric)

5. **Integrative Learning **, including:** *synthesis and advanced accomplishment* across general and specialized studies.
    a. Integrative and applied learning (Sixteen VALUE rubric)

All of the above are demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities (values) to new settings and complex problems.

**Understanding of and respect for those who are different from oneself and the ability to work collaboratively with those who come from diverse cultural backgrounds.*

*** Interdisciplinary learning, learning communities, capstone or senior studies in the General Education program and/or in the major connecting learning goals with the content and practices of the educational programs including GE, departmental majors, the co-curriculum and assessments.*