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1. Establish target student learning outcomes
   – Institutional
   – Program-level

2. Identify authentic summative assessments

3. Determine enabling knowledge and skills

4. Logically order the delivery of enabling knowledge and skills

5. Identify key formative assessments to effectively monitor students’ progress at designated checkpoints (a.k.a. milestones or transition points)
Establishing Institutional Learning Outcomes

- Institutional Mission, Vision, & Values
- General Education
- Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
  - Criterion 3.A.2: The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
  - Criterion 3.B.1: The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
  - Criterion 3.b.2: The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
  - Criterion 3.b.3: Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
- AAC&U LEAP Initiative and VALUE Rubrics – we’ll look at these later in the presentation

Establishing Program Learning Outcomes & Critical Indicators for Skills

- Faculty
  - Professional expertise
  - Best practices research
  - Networking/collaboration
- Stakeholders
- Professional associations/professional journals
- Applicable federal & state guidelines
- Accreditation agencies
- Aspirational peer institutions
- Critical indicators: using a job task analysis approach
Connecting the Dots: A Program-level Curriculum & Assessment (C&A) Map

• Documents where target learning outcomes/ competencies are taught and where key formative and summative assessments are administered
• Can be used to help balance faculty workload across a program (regarding key assessments)
• Helps ensure comprehensive coverage of all target learning outcomes in the program curriculum
• Serves as a foundation for syllabi of required courses
• Provides a framework for faculty discussions on assessing students’ progress and mastery (to ensure comprehensive formative and summative assessment and appropriate use of assessment data)
• Documents continuity of institutional learning outcomes beyond general education

Curriculum & Assessment Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Course 4</th>
<th>Course 5</th>
<th>Course 6</th>
<th>Etc.</th>
<th>Exam</th>
<th>Capstone Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>F2</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F1, F2, etc. are reflected in syllabi as critical assessments of applicable competencies
X = Basic elements taught in curriculum    R = Reinforced in curriculum
Program Assessment Requirements: What is the “Right” Number of Key Assessments?

Programs should identify a **manageable** number of robust and well articulated key formative and summative assessments that collectively provide mid-program evidence of students’ progress at designated checkpoints (a.k.a., milestones or transition points) as well as convincing end-of-program evidence of students’ mastery of all applicable student learning outcomes.

How Do Key Program Assessments Differ from Course Assessments for Grading?

- The purpose of key formative and summative program assessments is to monitor and verify students’ acquisition and mastery of program-level target learning outcomes.
- Typical “traditional” grading strategies are usually designed to calculate course grades.
  - May not provide evidence of student performance related to all target learning outcomes
  - Often result in rubrics with multiple levels of mastery in key assessment rubrics, which can result in a variety of major assessment problems
- Let’s look in more detail at how these two categories of assessment differ
“Traditional” Course-Centric Assessment

- Primary purpose is to calculate a course grade based on a course grading formula, which is usually included in the course syllabus.
- May or may not assign different weighting factors to different assessments.
- Usually aligned with established course objectives (explicitly or implicitly).
- Differentiation of “formative” and “summative” assessments is from a course-based perspective.
- Use of well-designed rubrics to assess student performance is rare.
- This is the appropriate domain for “academic freedom” in assessment.

Program-level Assessment

- A critical dimension of assessment!
- Purposeful assessment of program-level target learning outcomes should be an integral element of program design and development.
- Faculty need to embrace both course- and program-level perspectives of curriculum and assessment.
- Faculty “own” program-level assessment just as they “own” course-level assessment, but “academic freedom” at the program-level is a joint/collaborative domain.
- Stakeholders should play an active role in helping to establish program-level target learning outcomes.
- Technology support is essential to effective program-level assessment.
Key/Signature Assessments: Some Important Considerations

- What criteria should be assessed, and how are those criteria determined?
- Linear vs. non-linear approach?
- Self-selected or directed artifacts?
- Do key assessments provide comprehensive formative and summative assessment of all key competencies?
- Are key assignments well-articulated with key assessment instruments?
- How many levels of performance should be included?
- Should grading be holistic or analytic?

Why Use Rubrics...and When?

- Minimize subjectivity in assessing student performance
  - Help ensure that you are focusing assessment on critical indicators for target learning outcomes (construct and content validity)
  - Help improve accuracy and consistency in assessment (reliability)
- Make learning goals transparent; provide a learning scaffold for students—well-designed rubrics enhance teaching and learning!
- Maximize the impact of your most knowledgeable faculty and stakeholders
- Produce actionable data at the student and program level
- With technology support, provide effective and efficient collection and management of key assessment data
Attributes of an Effective Rubric

- The rubric and the assessed activity or artifact are well-articulated
- The rubric has construct validity (you are assessing the “right stuff”) and content validity (rubric criteria represent all critical indicators for the competency(ies) being assessed)
- Each criterion assesses an individual construct (there are no double- or multiple-barreled criteria)
- Performance descriptors:
  - Provide concrete, qualitative distinctions between performance levels (there are no overlaps between performance levels)
  - Collectively address all possible performance levels (there are no gaps between performance levels)

“Meta-rubric” to Evaluate Rubric Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubric Alignment to Assignment.</td>
<td>The rubric includes multiple criteria that are not explicitly or implicitly reflected in the assignment directions for the learning activity to be assessed.</td>
<td>The rubric includes one criterion that is not explicitly or implicitly reflected in the assignment directions for the learning activity to be assessed.</td>
<td>The rubric criteria accurately match the performance criteria reflected in the assignment directions for the learning activity to be assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness of Criteria</td>
<td>Multiple critical indicators for the competency being assessed are not reflected in the rubric.</td>
<td>One critical indicator for the competency being assessed is not reflected in the rubric.</td>
<td>All critical indicators for the competency being assessed are reflected in the rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity of Criteria</td>
<td>Multiple criteria contain multiple, independent constructs (similar to “double-barreled survey question”).</td>
<td>One criterion contains multiple, independent constructs. All other criteria each consist of a single construct.</td>
<td>Each criterion consists of a single construct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Performance Descriptors (A)</td>
<td>Performance descriptors are not distinct (i.e., mutually exclusive) AND collectively do not include all possible learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Performance descriptors are not distinct (i.e., mutually exclusive) OR collectively do not include all possible learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Performance descriptors are distinct (mutually exclusive) AND collectively include all possible learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Performance Descriptors (B)</td>
<td>Distinctions between performance levels are purely quantitative with no qualitative component.</td>
<td>Distinctions between performance levels are qualitative but not concrete.</td>
<td>Performance levels are clearly, qualitatively differentiated and provide student with a concrete description of desired performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Common 5-Level Rubric Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Poor (0 points) 0-59%</th>
<th>Marginal (1 point) 60-69%</th>
<th>Meets Expectations (2 points) 70-79%</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations (3 points) 80-89%</th>
<th>Exemplary (4 points) 90-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Common 4-Level Rubric Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (0 pts)</th>
<th>Developing (1 pt)</th>
<th>Proficient (2 Pts)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3 pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Better 4-Level Rubric Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (0 pts)</th>
<th>Developing 1 (1 pt)</th>
<th>Developing 2 (2 Pts)</th>
<th>Mastery (3 pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #1 [Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #2 [Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #3 [Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #4 [Standard(s)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Association of American Colleges & Universities
Liberal Education & America’s Promise (LEAP)

• “Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) is a national advocacy, campus action, and research initiative that champions the importance of a twenty-first century liberal education—for individual student success and for a nation dependent on economic creativity and democratic vitality.” (An Introduction to LEAP, AAC&U, available online at: https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/IntroToLEAP2015.pdf)

• Key elements of the LEAP initiative:
  • Essential Learning Outcomes
  • High-Impact Educational Practices
  • Authentic Assessments
LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes

- 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

- Intellectual and Practical Skills, including:
  - Inquiry and analysis
  - Critical and creative thinking
  - Written and oral communication
  - Quantitative literacy
  - Information literacy
  - Teamwork and problem solving

- Personal and Social Responsibility, including:
  - Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global
  - Intercultural knowledge and competence
  - Ethical reasoning and action
  - Foundations and skills for lifelong learning

- Integrative and Applied Learning, including:
  - Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

AAC&U VALUE Rubrics
(Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education)

1. Civic Engagement
2. Creative Thinking
3. Critical Thinking
4. Ethical Reasoning
5. Global Learning
6. Information Literacy
7. Inquiry and Analysis
8. Integrative Learning
9. Intercultural Knowledge and Competence
10. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
11. Oral Communication
12. Problem Solving
13. Quantitative Literacy
14. Reading
15. Teamwork
16. Written Communication
The LEAP Challenge: Signature Assignment

- Grounded in Essential Learning Outcomes
- Rich in Inquiry-based and Integrative Learning
- At progressively more challenging levels
- Evaluated consistently through milestone and capstone assessments
- For all students
Teacher Education Rubric
Template Based on Bloom’s Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Remembering, Understanding</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Analyzing, Evaluating, Creating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Might That Look When Applied to Teacher Education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Remembering, Understanding</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Analyzing, Evaluating, Creating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration of content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
<td>Informed practice</td>
<td>Reflective and impactful practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Rubric Problems

- Including more performance levels than are needed to accomplish the desired assessment task (e.g., multiple levels of “mastery”)
- Using highly subjective or inconsequential terms to distinguish between performance levels
- Using double- or multiple-barreled criteria or performance descriptors
- Failing to include all possible performance outcomes
- Using overlapping performance descriptors
- Attempting to use a single rubric to demonstrate level of proficiency and generate a “traditional” course assignment grade
- Failing to include performance descriptors or including descriptors that are simply surrogates for performance level labels

An Example of Qualitative Differentiation of Performance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Applicable P-12 Standards</td>
<td>Lesson plan does not demonstrate alignment of applicable P-12 standards to lesson objectives.</td>
<td>Lesson plan reflects partial alignment of applicable P-12 standards to lesson objectives (e.g. some objectives have no P-12 alignment and/or some P-12 standards listed are not related to lesson objectives).</td>
<td>Lesson plan reflects comprehensive alignment of all applicable P-12 standards to lesson objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Peter Ewell

President Emeritus, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) and Senior Scholar for the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)

Dr. Ewell has written numerous publications about the quality of evidence used to demonstrate student learning for the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA), and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). In his article, “Principles for Measures Used in the CAEP Accreditation Process,” he suggests that all of the following qualities of evidence should be present:

1. Validity and Reliability
2. Relevance
3. Verifiability
4. Representativeness
5. Cumulativeness
6. Fairness
7. Stakeholder Interest
8. Benchmarks
9. Vulnerability to Manipulation
10. Actionability

Article available at: http://caepnet.org/standards/commission-on-standards

Implications for the Continuous Quality Improvement Cycle

Change → Plan

Evaluate & Integrate

Measure

Analyze
Summary/Reflection

- Differentiate between course-centric assessment and program-level assessment
- Establish program-level target learning outcomes for all programs
- Programs should also incorporate and build upon institutional learning outcomes
- Identify critical indicators for target learning outcomes
- Develop well-designed rubrics for key formative and summative performance assessments
- Ensure that program assessment systems are comprehensive and well articulated
- Make your assessment system transparent

LIVETEXT™ Visitor Pass

- Go to www.livetext.com
- Click on “Visitor Pass”
- Enter “FD58026C” in the Pass Code field and click on Visitor Pass Entry
- Click on “UNO November 2016”
- You will have access to
  - My PowerPoint presentations from all sessions today
  - Resources for institutional effectiveness (continuous quality improvement) assessment and for designing high quality rubrics, including my “meta-rubric”
  - Links to AAC&U LEAP Initiative information and VALUE Rubrics
  - Link to National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)
  - Article: “Principles for Measures Used in the CAEP Accreditation Process” (Peter Ewell, May 29, 2013)
- For those of you in educator preparation:
  - CAEP Accreditation Handbook v3 March 2016
  - CAEP Evidence Guide January 2015
  - CAEP Instrument Rubric June 2016
  - InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers (2013)
  - Links to the latest versions of CAEP standards for initial and advanced programs
  - Link to CAEP’s Accreditation Resources web page
Questions/Comments?