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Institutional Context

“We will be a national leader in the assessment of learning outcomes and the use of innovative teaching strategies.”

from *Capture your Horizon: Strategic Plan Extension 2017-2022* (p. 11)
By the end of today’s session, participants will have:

• an introduction to the Institutional Assessment’s Educational Programs Discussion Worksheet
• an opportunity to receive IA support with crafting assessment report components.
Educational Programs Assessment Worksheets

Overview
This set of worksheets was created to provide a resource that educational programs could use when discussing assessment in their programs. While programs are not required to use this tool, IPAR recommends it as a useful way to structure assessment-related discussions and working sessions to support assessment reporting.

When conducting working session(s) to discuss assessment results, please have available:
• summarized data on student performance and
• copies of ECU IPAR's Assessment Report Guidelines (http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/Assessment-Resources.cfm).

Worksheets
This workbook includes worksheets that align with our Nuventive Improve Reporting Areas:
• Actions Taken Worksheet
• Results Worksheet
• Analysis of Results Worksheet
• Actions Planned Worksheet.

An additional worksheet is available to support evaluation of your assessment process:
• Evaluating the Assessment Process Worksheet.
Actions Taken

Actions Taken are a summary of the curricular and pedagogical actions faculty took to improve student learning that are related to the outcome.

1. Was the last action plan implemented?
2. What curricular/pedagogical changes were made?
3. Was the curriculum delivered differently?
Results

Results are a summary of the data collected from the Means of Assessment (MoA) and should be stated in terms of the Criterion for Success.

1. What results were generated from the Means of Assessment (MoA)?
2. Were multiple MoAs used?
3. Was the Criterion for Success met?
Analysis of Results

The Analysis of Results should include two parts:

a) a summary of the relationship between Actions Taken by faculty to improve student learning and the Results, and

b) faculty’s interpretation of the Results with the identification of an area for improvement or reinforcement.

Part A – relationship between Actions Taken and Results

1. How do findings on this outcome compare to past results on the outcome?

2. In faculty's professional judgment, does it appear that the Actions Taken (based on last year’s action plan) had an impact on your Results?
Analysis of Results (continued)

Part B – faculty interpretation and area of improvement

1. What do the assessment results say about how well all students, or subgroups of students, achieve the intended program SLO?
2. On what criteria or sub-skills do students seem to be doing particularly well or seem to be struggling?
3. What about the results is surprising?
4. Based on the interpretation of the results, what are the area(s) of particular concern where you would like to see student performance improved or reinforced?
5. Were there other variables that could have impacted the Results? If so, what were they?
6. What types of circumstances remained constant or changed so that faculty could see the impact of the Actions Taken (i.e., delivery method, instructor, class schedule, etc.)?
Actions Planned

Actions Planned summarize the curricular or pedagogical steps faculty will take to improve or reinforce student learning for the area identified in the analysis.

1. Based on the area of improvement identified in the analysis, where in the program could you take curricular or pedagogical actions to contribute to the learning outcome?
2. What other actions could be implemented to impact the outcome outside of the course where it is assessed (i.e., series of courses, out of class experiences, internship, clinical rotation)?
3. Who else needs to know about these findings and next steps?
4. Who is responsible for making sure that the actions planned are implemented?
   **Note:** For Nuventive Improve, don’t enter a person’s name; instead, enter the person’s title / role (course instructor, program director, department chair, etc.).
5. What steps will you take in the coming year to capitalize on the positives and to make improvements?
6. If you will need any resources or supports to facilitate these steps, what might they be?
Evaluating the Process

1. Are you gathering assessment data from courses with a different delivery methods (DE versus face to face)? Are you only collecting data from the same sections/professors each time?

2. Do classroom experiences align with or support the intended program outcomes and the assessment so that students are prepared to succeed?

3. What were students’ reactions to the assessment process?

4. Do instructors understand how to submit results to the unit assessment coordinator in the appropriate format?

5. What did you find especially effective in the assessment process?

6. What did you particularly dislike about the process?

7. What would you change about the process? Why?
To Make the Process Work

• Involve appropriate faculty.
• Schedule meeting(s) after results are available.
  • If using Fall Semester data, consider meeting in the Fall or early Spring Semester.
• Use the worksheets to draft your responses to enter into Nuventive Improve.
• Make sure to enter it by the deadline May 15th / June 15th.
Detailed Assessment Reporting Guidelines & Examples for Educational Programs, are available on ECU's IPAR Website:

http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/ipar/Assessment-Resources.cfm

**Report Example: Multiple Means of Assessment**

Outcomes: Students will recognize, apply, and explain the use of rhetorical techniques in a wide range of texts.

CPS: 80% of students score satisfactorily or better on the portfolio rubric. On the exit survey, 80% of students agree or strongly agree that the program coursework has improved their ability to recognize, apply, and explain the use of rhetorical devices in a wide range of texts.

1. **Actions Taken**: In the discipline-specific area meetings faculty shared innovative teaching practices from Writing Intensive classes, successful and unsuccessful model essays, and types of reflective writing in which students identify rhetorical techniques. This resulted in a bank of materials that was shared on the departmental’s Sharepoint for faculty to use particularly in their Writing Intensive classes for majors. All instructors incorporated at least one strategy from the bank into their class.

2. **Results**: Out of 34 portfolios, 88% scored satisfactory or higher. Our CS (80%) was met. 100% of students who responded (N=7) to the survey indicated that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement that their coursework has improved their ability to apply and explain the use and effects of various rhetorical techniques in a wide range of texts. Our CS (80%) was met.

3. **Analysis of Results**: Results from the two means of assessment suggest that all seniors responding to the survey feel confident about using rhetorical techniques, while 88% of student portfolios (30 out of 34) indicate the same. The results were similar to last year where 89% of the portfolios met the criterion. The actions implemented during the year helped to maintain student learning for this outcome. Of the student portfolios that were rated “unsatisfactory” in the current year, they all failed to explain the use and effects of form, style, structure, and themes of rhetorical techniques. Faculty acknowledged there was a significant decrease in the survey response rate from last year to this year. The limited results suggest that student perceptions and performance on this outcome are closely matched.

**Actions Taken**

- Actions developed collaboratively and implemented in multiple classes
- Actions targeted at area for improvement

**Actions Planned**

- This additional action provides better data but does not directly improve student learning
- Comparison to last year’s results and judgment on whether actions had an impact

**Supporting Documentation (optional)**

Attach documents to support any component if appropriate (e.g., meeting minutes, reports, data tables, etc.).

Undergraduate and graduate programs report on a minimum of 3 outcomes as defined in the 5-year cycle section of the workbook.

Certifications and Stand-alone minors report on a minimum 2 outcomes.