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Six-step assessment process

1. What do we want our students to learn and/or our units to accomplish?
2. How are we documenting the assessment AND improvement activities/results?
3. How are we doing? How do we know?
4. What evidence do we need to know to determine whether we are successful?
5. How do we use data to confirm/improve our practices?
6. What changes are we making? Are the changes working?
## Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value-added</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>“Add-on”/External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Summative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choosing the right methods

- Valid
- Reliable
- Actionable
- Sustainable
- Start simple
- Prioritize embedded measures
- Use multiple methods
- Meaningful and engaging to stakeholders

Focus on “what we want to measure,” not “what existing measure we have”
Choosing the right sample

- Relevant
- Representative
- Reasonably sized

Determined by outcome, program circumstances
Direct assessment: Examples

- Exam/Quiz: Embedded or external
- Course assignment: In class or take home
- Paper/Presentation
- Project/Portfolio
- Recital/Exhibition
- Peer evaluation
## Embedded or External?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Embedded** | • Align directly with local curriculum/outcomes  
• Provide specific, actionable results  
• Meaningful to students/faculty  
• Embedded - No extra requirement/cost | • Time to develop and coordinate  
• Less rigorous process makes validity and reliability difficult to establish  
• Often isolated results; no comparison groups |
| **External** | • Have sound psychometric properties  
• Provide comparison groups  
• Provide test administration and/or scoring | • Do not align with local curriculum  
• Do not provide specific, actionable results  
• Not meaningful and/or burdensome to students/faculty  
• Costly |
Indirect assessment: Examples

• Self-reflection essay
• Survey**: Homegrown or published
• Interview: Individual or group
• Focus group: Structured or unstructured

Focus on “what we want to measure,” not “what existing measure we have”

**Surveys are not always indirect assessment
## Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>The whine have multiple purposes/targets; There is full audience participation; The pitch oscillated through entire frequency range...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>The whine has a clear target; Many people participated in the whine; Pitch of whine is very high like fingernails on a chalkboard...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>The whine has no clear target; Nobody noticed the whine; The pitch is very low...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Holistic

### Analytic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The purpose of the whine is to get a group response...</td>
<td>There is full audience participation...</td>
<td>The whine was seemingly endless, carrying on for days...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is a clear target of the whine...</td>
<td>Everybody in the area noticed your whine...</td>
<td>Whine is audible over classroom noise...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The whine is not directed at a target.</td>
<td>Nobody noticed; nobody cared.</td>
<td>The whine is little more than a whimper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Details for Score 2-4 omitted*
Is rubric the answer?

• **Effective scoring tool:**
  • Assess complex performance/products effectively
  • Capture multiple criteria/characteristics
  • Clarify expectations for faculty/students
  • Facilitate criterion-referenced grading
  • Facilitate the establishment of “criteria of success”

• **Potentially time-consuming:**
  • Development
  • Calibration
Remember...

• Triangulation

• Criteria of success
Ideas for COTA

- **Dance SLO:**
  Students demonstrate critical thinking in the communication about works in the arts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students attend live performance(s) in the discipline and write a critical assessment. Faculty use a holistic rubric to score the paper.</td>
<td>Student exit interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of success</td>
<td>80% of students receive satisfactory or above on the paper.</td>
<td>90% of interview participated report that they are able to critically examine and communicate art works/performances in their discipline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Ideas for COTA

- **Visual Arts SLO:**
  Students will be able to apply theories of culture, ethnicity and gender to interpret historical and contemporary art.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final exam essay question in ART 201A/B -- asking students to explain the influence of feminism culture on characteristics of painting of a particular period.</td>
<td>Graduate survey -- items asking students’ self-perceived ability to apply theories of culture to interpret art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of success</td>
<td>75% of students receive 80% or higher credit on the essay question.</td>
<td>The average rating of survey respondents is 3.0 or higher on a 4-point scale (3 = “confident”; 4 = “very confident”) that they are able to apply theories of culture to interpret art.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ideas for COTA

- **Theatre Arts SLO:**
  Students are able to collaborate successfully with other students and artists in the creation and execution of work for the theatre in a variety of capacities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and 2 peers rate each student’s performance in 498A/B group project using a holistic rubric (4-point); The average of faculty and peer ratings is calculated as the final score for the student.</td>
<td>Student self-reflection presentation on the group project in 498A/B, reviewed by a panel of faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of success</td>
<td>75% of students receive an average score of 3.0 or higher.</td>
<td>90% of students are judged by the faculty as “able to collaborate successfully.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>