

IU South Bend ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE -Annual Report

Presented to the Academic Senate September, 2009

The IU South Bend Assessment Committee, in existence since 1995, is responsible for promoting, supporting and monitoring departmental assessment programs. The primary activity of the Assessment Committee is the Third Year Assessment Review. These are conducted each spring on a rotating calendar so that each academic program's assessment processes and data are evaluated every third year. The Assessment Committee also requests annual updates from each department, provides grants on a competitive basis, and maintains a website and resource center. The Assessment Committee is currently a joint committee of the Academic Senate and Academic Affairs. Five members are appointed by the Academic Senate and four members by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. From the membership, the Committee selects a Chair who is appointed by the Vice-Chancellor.

Third Year Reviews: For the past several years the assessment committee has used a rubric to assist in the evaluation of third year reports from academic programs. It has been an effective tool for standardizing and summarizing evaluations. However, committee members have been concerned that the rubric did not have adequate detail or flexibility. They spent considerable time completely revising it, and piloted a new rubric during the 2008/09 third year reviews. A copy is included.

Early in the spring semester, the assessment committee hosted a tea for liaisons from departments that would be submitting a third year review. At the tea, liaisons met members of the assessment committee who could assist them, reviewed the report forms and rubric, and had a chance to ask questions. Everyone enjoyed the event, and those who were new to the third year review process found the introduction particularly useful. The committee would like to thank academic affairs for sponsoring the event.

Thirteen academic programs presented Third Year Reviews in the spring of 2009. The rubric scores are attached. For the reports, and more detailed evaluation information please visit the assessment website: <http://www.iusb.edu/~sbassess/third%20year%20home%202009.shtml>

Assessment Grants: The Assessment Committee awarded a total of \$4880 for five assessment grants during 2008/09.

- Student Services was awarded a grant to develop a website to document assessment processes and communicate progress to stakeholders
- The School of Education was awarded a grant for a faculty member to attend the NCATE/CEC workshop, and to conduct a focus group for education stakeholders.
- The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences received a grant to evaluate advising for probationary and undecided students.
- Counseling and Human Services will evaluate the effectiveness of two core courses being offered online.

- Another grant, awarded to the Criminal Justice department, is for a pilot of the Major Field Test in Criminal Justice for graduating students. If the pilot testing shows the value of the test, it will become the primary assessment tool for the department.

The assessment committee also sponsored seven faculty members at the Assessment Institute in Indianapolis. This conference always showcases the best of assessment scholarship and practice from around the world.

E-portfolio Workshop: The Assessment Committee hosted a workshop on Friday April 10 2009, led by Susan Kahn and Lynn Ward. Susan and Lynn have led the successful e-portfolio initiative at IUPUI. They shared many ways that e-portfolios can be used for assessment of student learning and demonstrated the e-portfolio component of OnCourse. Several of the participants expressed interest in starting e-portfolios for their programs.

Looking Ahead: The assessment committee is looking forward to a full year in 2009/10. Inspired by the potential of e-portfolios demonstrated at the workshop, they are in the process of creating an assessment committee e-portfolio site in OnCourse. This will serve as a demonstration of the technology for academic programs, as well as a tool for organizing and evaluating assessment reports.

The assessment committee will also continue to support efforts to implement an effective assessment strategy for the general education program on the campus.

Assessment Evaluation Rubric Results 2008/09

	Learning Outcomes	Tools and Processes	Benchmarks/ Performance Targets	Results and Analysis	Actions
Computer Science	7	10	6	10	9
Informatics	7	10	6	10	9
Applied Math and Computer Science - Graduate	3	3	2	2	2
Mathematics – Undergraduate	8	7	4	6	8
Economics	10	11	9	10	9
Philosophy	7	7	3	7	6
Political Science	11	10	6	7	10
Visual Arts	9	6	9	7	9
Music	10	7	6	5	7
Radiography	12	11	12	12	12
Nursing Undergraduate	9	9	11	8	8
Nursing - Graduate	9	7	11	3	6
Dental Education	11	10	7	10	10

Rubric key: 10-12 – Exceeds Requirements; 7-9- Meets Requirements; 4-6 – Partially Meets Requirements; 1-3 Does not Meet Requirements

	Exceeds Requirements 10 - 12	Meets Requirements 7-9	Partially Meets Requirements 4-6	Does Not Meet Requirements 1-3	Score
<p>Learning Outcomes When students successfully complete the program, what should they know? What should they be able to do? What should they value?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All outcomes clearly stated; o Compatible with IU South Bend campus goals and mission statements; o Measurable; o An appropriate range of measures; o Cover key/focused components of learning; o Reflect multiple levels of learning, primarily higher levels of learning (e.g. Bloom's Taxonomy: synthesis, application, analysis.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Most are clearly stated; o Most are compatible with IU South Bend campus goals and mission statements o Most are measurable; o An adequate range of measures; o Most cover key/focused components of learning; o Reflect multiple levels of learning, including higher levels of learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Some are clearly stated; o Some are compatible with IU South Bend campus goals and mission statements o Some are measurable; o Too many or too few in number o Most cover key/focused components of learning; o Some reflect multiple levels of learning, and some may reflect higher levels of learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Not clearly stated; o Not compatible with IU South Bend campus goals and mission statements o Inappropriate number to reflect required student learning o Not measurable; o Do not cover key/focused components of learning; o Generally reflect basic knowledge. 	
<p>Tools and Processes Direct Measures – directly evaluate student work. Examples of direct measure include exams, papers, projects, and computer programs, interactions with a client or musical performances. Indirect Measures – indirectly evaluate student learning and include asking students and alumni how will they thought they learned, tracking their graduate school or job placement rates, and so on.¹</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Appropriate number of observations; o All measure mastery of student learning using multiple methods; o Include a wide range of student work samples; o Tells you what needs to change and where in the curriculum it must be changed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Adequate number of observations; o Measure student learning; o Include student work samples; o Measures how closely target is achieved and guides curriculum changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Some observations; o Some measure student learning; o Includes some student work samples; o Measures how closely target is achieved but may not suggest specific actions for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Few or no observations; o No appropriate methods to measure desired student learning; o No student work samples; o Does not measure target achievement, does not make necessary curricular changes clear. 	
<p>Benchmarks/Performance Targets Level of performance students should achieve for selected measures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Well defined and appropriate levels of student learning are identified; o Measures how closely target is achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Defined and adequate levels of student learning are identified; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Loosely defined or insufficient levels of student learning are identified; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No benchmarks or targets for student learning are identified; 	
<p>Results and Analysis Information is gathered, summarized and provided to faculty for review, discussion and analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Clearly developed and well-conceived analysis; o Clear findings are reported on all methods o Faculty and other relevant stakeholders review and discuss all data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Analyses are provided; o Findings are reported on all methods; o Faculty review and discuss all data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Analyses are provided; o Findings are reported on most methods; o Limited review and discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No analysis; o Insufficient findings or number of methods used; o Limited or no review and discussion. 	
<p>Actions How do faculty use assessment information to modify and improve their program?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A thorough plan is developed with broad-based faculty participation to improve curriculum, assessment planning, and/or student learning outcomes; o Actions provide thorough evidence that findings have influenced curricular and co-curricular decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A plan to improve is developed with faculty participation; o Actions provide evidence that findings have influenced curricular and co-curricular decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A plan is with partial faculty participation is developed; o Unclear connections between findings and curricular and co-curricular decision making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No plan has been developed; o No evidence-based decision making is discernible. 	

1. Walvoord, Barbara (2004). Assessment Clear and Simple. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.