Presented: March 31, 2015 & April 1, 2015
Goals for the Session

- Present reporting requirements for WEI activity
- Describe alignment across WEI and campus assessment processes
- Review key elements in each section of the Report
- Questions/Feedback
WEI Phase One – Two

- Identify Outcome(s)
- Assess Prior Student Work Using new Rubric
- Map Outcome to Curriculum
- Plan the Intervention
The Cycle of Assessment

1. Identify Outcomes
2. Map Outcome to Curriculum
3. Assess the Outcome
4. Interpret Results
5. Plan Improvements
6. Implement Changes
7. Reassess
Elon Student Learning Assessment Documents

- Plan for Student Learning Assessment (PSLA)
- Annual Report of Assessment Progress (ARAP)
Your Assignment…
Updating your program's Plan for Student Learning Assessment (PSLA) serves as evidence of a department’s WEI activities.

This slide lists the key components of a department assessment plan.

**What you must do:** Departments are asked to update their Goals/Outcomes and Course Map to meet WEI reporting requirements.

**What we’d like you to do:** Update assessment schedule to incorporate assessment of the writing outcome into department continuing assessment plans and activities.
Definitions (source: Elon College Guide for Creating a Plan for Student Learning Assessment)

Goal: Goals are broad statement of what you want majors to leave knowing and be able to do. Goals tend to be broadly stated and not obviously measureable

Outcome: Outcomes are specific statements of what knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors you want students to be able to demonstrate upon completion of your program. Well written outcomes communicate some information about measurability.

There are many resources for writing learning outcomes. Programs with professional accreditation should consider the standards for accreditation (which can vary widely).

Comment: There is wide variation across campus with respect to goal and outcome structure. If your writing outcomes does not align (e.g. format) with the outcomes of your programs, that’s a good opportunity to discuss with Paula or Kim. While it is not required that outcomes align, doing so is indicative of a comprehensive and coherent approach to assessing the learning outcomes of a program.

What you must do: Incorporate your writing outcomes into your program Plan for Student Learning Assessment.
**What we’d like you to do:**
Please bold the writing related outcomes in your Plan for Student Learning Assessment to make it easy for reviewers to identify them in the document.
The course map represents the relationship between the experiences (the curriculum) and your intended student learning outcomes. It can be used descriptively – to visually represent these relationships, or analytically – to identify the extent to which your curriculum emphasizes an outcome, identify gaps in covering the outcomes and to help determine when and how the outcomes is assessed. Many (but not all) programs at Elon assess outcomes within a course (course-embedded assessment). The course map should indicate in which courses the outcomes are assessed. If your program assesses an outcome outside a course, then this is an opportunity to discuss with Paula or Kim about how to represent that in the course map.

There is variation in the nature of codes used in course maps on campus. Similar to that of outcomes, writing is more clearly integrated into your programs if your map for writing aligns with other outcomes of the program (i.e., use the same notation).

**What you must do:**

- Add the writing outcome(s) and coding to indicate the relationship between development of the outcome and course experiences to the map.
- Make clear to the reviewer when the outcome is assessed.
What we want you to do:
Add a line to the title section of the document to indicate when it was revised. This will make it easier to confirm that interested parties have the most recent version.
One of the goals of the WEI is to have writing development and assessment of student writing integrated into every academic program offered at Elon. One of the ways this is demonstrated is that a program’s assessment plan includes assessment of writing on a continuing basis.

**What you need to do:**
Nothing

**What we’d like you to do:**
Update your assessment schedule to indicate when writing will be assessed in your program

If you decide to do this, Kim has the following recommendations:

- In the guidelines for creating a Plan for Student Learning Assessment there is a reference to a “complete assessment cycle” – a multi-year timeframe in which all outcomes are assessed at least once. The current Plans for Student Learning Assessment were typically written for a specific time frame (for most it is 2011-2016). It can be useful to think about your assessment schedule not in terms of specific years but in terms of a complete assessment cycle – and update the cycle accordingly when you make changes to curriculum and/or outcomes and goals.
- External reviewers want to see (e.g., SACS-COC ) would like to see evidence that
the assessment of an outcome is systematic and ongoing. One way to demonstrate that is to develop a schedule that indicates two assessment points for each outcome. That way you can make changes based on the assessment in time 1 and assess the impact of the change at assessment in time 2.

• Kim is available to discuss strategies for updating assessment schedules.
Current Annual Report of Assessment Progress (ARAP)

- Sent to deans and department chairs in May each year
- Degree – Majors Represented
- Update on Prior Year Results
- Current Year Assessment Activity
- Program Director’s Statement
- Plan for Next Year Assessment
The main document for the WEI ARAP should be 2-4 pages at most.
Include additional details as supplements to the main documents.
If you have questions regarding assessment reporting from your assessment schedule, contact your appropriate dean.

The subsequent slides describe each section of the report in detail.

Template contents:

NOTE: Complete only if your department worked on Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the WEI during 2014-2015. Contact Paula Rosinski or Kim Fath with questions.

Department/Program:
Majors Represented:
Department Chair/Director:

Writing Related Learning Goal/Outcomes:

Assessment Strategy
Summary of Results
Interpretation of Results

Intervention Plan/Plan for Improvement

Classification of Changes: Check all that apply
☐ Co-curricular Change
☐ Course Revision
☐ Pedagogy
☐ Assessment Method
☐ Criteria
☐ Process Revision
☐ Budget
☐ Faculty Development/Training
☐ Other: Specify

Plan for Reassessment of Intervention/Outcome

Appendices: Attach assignment/tasks used for assessment and scoring tool (Rubric) to this report
Assignment
Rubric
Optional Supplemental documents

NOTE: Complete only if your department worked on Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the WEI during 2014-2015. Contact Paula Rosinski or Kim Fath with questions.

- Department/Program:
- Majors Represented:
- Department Chair/Director:
- Writing Related Learning Goal/Outcomes:

We need to account for every degree offered at the university. Listing each program by major and degree makes it possible support our claim that we do this.
This section should answer the questions listed in the slide. We are looking for concise descriptions.

**Assignment/Task** – Because departments are able to determine which assignments are used to assess and outcome in a given year, it is important that you describe the assignment. This makes it possible to use the ARAP as an historical document within a department and makes it possible for a reviewer to verify that the assignment is a reasonable means of assessing your outcome.

- The easiest way to do this is by including the actual assignment in the appendix.  
  Sample language: “We assessed seniors in the major using their capstone assignment enrolled in our senior seminar. The assignment distributed to students is included in the appendices.”

**Scoring Tool** – Paula has indicated that all departments will be using rubrics to score. Include in the appendix

Sample language: “The department developed a rubric for use to assess student writing on this assignment. The rubric is included in the appendices.”

**Who does the scoring?** Departments vary in their scoring practices. State here who did the scoring (the rater) for the assignment. This may be the instructor of record for the course or a group of faculty. If your program uses multiple raters, identify the
number of raters per student assignment.

**Sample language:** “A team of faculty score each capstone assignment. During the current year each assignment was scored by three (3) faculty.”

**(Optional but recommended) Describe the criteria for success** Assessment experts recommend establishing minimum performance standards for your outcomes. This criteria helps you determine if your program is achieving the desired level of student performance. These are defined at both the student and program level. Not all programs use criteria but it can be helpful for determining if results require action on the part of the department. There are several ways to define your success criteria. The following offers one suggestion.

**Example:** “A student has achieved the desired level of performance on writing if the mean score on all dimensions of the rubric is 3.5 out of a maximum of 4 points. The program has achieved the desired level of performance for writing if 90% of students achieve the minimum 3.5 average on the rubric.”

**Where do you keep a record of scores?** Assessment scoring/ratings for an outcome should be stored somewhere for later access. Elon does not have a central location in which to do this so this report should indicate where the score sheets or spreadsheets of scores are located.

**Where do you keep samples of student work?** Good assessment practice encourage maintenance of student writing samples. This makes is possible to re-evaluate work when you want to test a new rubric or assess the sample for a different outcome.
Number of students represented in the analyses: Report how many students’ work was assessed in this report.

What years are represented: Most departments assess only their current students. However, departments with a small number of majors may wish to collect writing samples from multiple years and assess and reporting.

Sample language: We assessed student writing from 2012-2015. This represented 42 students graduating during that time.
How do I report results?

- Whatever makes the most sense to your faculty

BUT

- Good assessment is diagnostic so need to look at dimensions of the outcome

- You'll want to compare this group of students to another group of students

- Tables

- Frequencies vs. Means
## Frequency Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Awesome</th>
<th>Criteria for Success</th>
<th>Achieved/Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- May exclude columns for “criteria for success” and “achieved/not achieved”
- Table represents the numbers of students scoring at each performance level.
Notes:
• Alternate strategy for reporting rubric results.
• Requires that a number be assigned to each performance level.
Describe who discussed results:

List the faculty who participated in the discussion of results. This demonstrates that use of assessment is a shared responsibility of department faculty.
Provide a concise summary of the intervention plan /plan for changes.

Classify the type of activities represented in the intervention plan. The next slide provides examples of types of changes within each classification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Curricular Change</td>
<td>• Curricular change to degree program (added a course or other requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changed sequence or courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Course Revision</td>
<td>• Revising existing course or courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Added assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modified assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modified course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changed textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pedagogy</td>
<td>• Revised method of delivering course material (less lecture, more student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Assessment method</td>
<td>• Changed assessment tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changed data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Criteria</td>
<td>• Increased or modified criteria for success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Process revision</td>
<td>• Changed entrance requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hired new faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changed environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Budget</td>
<td>• Requested additional fiscal resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Development/training</td>
<td>• Provided faculty or TA development or training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Other</td>
<td>• Please specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan for Reassessment of Intervention/Outcome

Departments may assess the success of the intervention in the first year of implementation or elect to wait for a later time based on time for the intervention to “work” or based on their planned assessment schedule. The assessment cycle, in a previous slide, requires that one reassess the outcome to determine whether or not the assessment was successful. This reminds us to do that reassessment and provides evidence to reviewers that a department completes the cycle of assessment for the WEI outcome.

Include supporting documents as appendices.
Questions?

Paula Rosinski, WEI - prosinski@elon.edu
Kim Fath, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment – kfath@elon.edu