

Program Assessment of Student Learning (PASL) Summary 2010-2011

Dept: _____ Date: _____ Contact Person: _____

This reporting plan was developed by the Assessment and Teaching Enhancement Center. It has been endorsed by the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee (TLAC) and the Dean's Council.

This system addresses the accreditation mandates by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) for university and program assessment plans. More importantly, the system will allow program faculty to direct the need, type and use of their assessments and resultant data. It has been designed in recognition that programs are at various stages of development and have different needs and resources. The report is in four parts:

- 1) Learning Outcomes. *A list of program and related college learning outcomes identified by program faculty.*
- 2) Assessment Planning Chart. *A chart to depict alignment between identified learning outcomes, data obtained, and action/decisions made based on the findings.*
- 3) Evaluation Rubric for Assessment System. *A set of evaluation criteria to gauge progress in developing the assessment system.* These are related to sound assessment practices that are necessary to build and maintain an evaluation infrastructure. Criteria are set at three levels (A, B, C) to correspond to the general Levels of Implementation used by the HLC. If a program is in an earlier stage of development, as determined by faculty and the chair, then Level A criteria and reporting can be used for the first year of reporting, for example. Programs with more mature systems can decide to evaluate themselves on the criteria outlined at all levels. The idea is to progress towards full implementation over a three year period. If you feel that your program is at the early development stage, then do not address all three levels of the summary.
- 4) Summary. *A self-evaluation on the program assessment system implementation criteria (with stated rationale).* Evidence for progress can be described for each rubric criterion. A summary of overall results, future goals and necessary resources can be made.

You may propose and alternate reporting plan for your department or program as long as it addresses the essential elements of this plan (e.g., learning outcomes, assessments, data, decisions made) and the evaluation of your activities with the rubric in parts 3 and 4.

The PASL is due from programs/departments every other year. Please see the schedule on the last page of this document for the due dates, approved by Dean's Council, for your program/department. The assessment deadline schedule does not override any college or school assessment requirements or deadlines. The summary should include data and activities since your last report.

The PASL is available as a PDF download at www.emporia.edu/asem.

I will be available for consultation to help departments develop their plans.

Anthony Ambrosio, Ph.D.
Director of the Assessment and Teaching Enhancement Center
Morse Hall 23
(620) 341-5103
aambrosi@emporia.edu

Part 1: Learning Outcomes

List learning outcomes, department outcomes, etc. here.

SLIM Master of Library Science program outcomes that are related to teaching and learning are based on what students are to know and be able to do as a result of their coursework. SLIM's *MLS Handbook* and website state specifically that graduates of the SLIM Master of Library Science degree program will be able to:

1. articulate a philosophy of client-centered information services based on the epistemological and ethical foundations of the library and information professions;
2. explain and apply interdisciplinary theories and models relevant to managing library and information service agencies;
3. conduct information needs assessment and design and evaluate customized information services and products based on those needs;
4. based on a diagnosed need, retrieve, interpret, and/or repackage relevant information resources, and evaluate their use and impact;
5. lead appropriate change by using effective collaborative, communication and organizational skills;
6. teach information literacy skills in order to facilitate effective learning organizations;
7. demonstrate life-long learning skills by continually acquiring new knowledge, skills and perspectives to respond to changing conditions; and
8. communicate effectively in writing, orally, and using information technologies.

These learning outcomes are evaluated using the IDEA Diagnostic Form from the IDEA Center:

- gaining factual knowledge (2, 3, 4, 6)
- learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories (1, 2)
- learning to apply course materials (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
- developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view (1-8)
- acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team (5, 8)
- developing creative capacities (4, 5, 8)
- gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (7)
- developing skill in oral or written expression (5, 8)
- developing a clearer understanding and commitment to personal values (1, 5, 6)
- learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view (1, 2, 5, 7, 8)
- acquiring an interest in learning by asking questions and seeking answers (7)

The Capstone Course portfolio is expected to provide evidence that the student has learned MLS course content and can perform skills outlined in the MLS Program Outcomes, reflect the student's professional goals, indicate the student's talents and unique abilities with particular user needs or populations, showcase evidence of the student's technology skills, include a resume, and have a professional appearance. The introduction must link the student's professional goals to the MLS program outcomes and professional values as well as to the portfolio contents. In addition to the Capstone course, students who elect a practicum course are evaluated by the supervising instructor on their application of theory and skills learned

in the MLS program.

Part 2: Assessment Planning Charts (add or delete rows as necessary)

A. Direct Measures- Evidence, based on student performance, which demonstrates actual learning (as opposed to surveys of “perceived” learning or program effectiveness). See “Assessment type” chart at the end of this document for a list of potential assessment types and their definitions. Note how it is possible to have an objective covered by more than one assessment, or one assessment to cover more than one objective.

Learning Outcome(s) #	Assessment(s)	Type # + (see chart)	Data/Results	Action Taken/Recommendations (if necessary)

B. Indirect Measures -Reflection about the learning gained, or secondary evidence of its existence. Please refer to “assessment type” chart at the end of this document.

Learning Outcome(s) #	Assessment(s)	Type # +(see chart)	Data/Results	Action Taken/Recommendations (if necessary)

Part 3: Assessment Rubric for Departmental Evaluation

	1 Beginning	2 Developing	3 At Standard	4 Above Standard
Level A: Beginning Implementation				
Professional standards and student learning outcomes	Development of the assessment system does not reflect professional standards/outcomes nor are the standards established by faculty and/or outside consultants.	Development of the assessment system is based on professional standards/outcomes, but the faculty and the professional community were not involved.	Development of the assessment system is based on professional standards/outcomes, and the faculty AND the professional community were involved.	Development of the assessment system is based on professional standards/outcomes, and the faculty AND professional community are engaged in continuous improvement through systematic (e.g., yearly) activities.
Faculty involvement	No faculty involvement is evidenced in department assessment activities.	Faculty involvement consists of one or two individuals who work on program assessment needs and activities. Little or no communication is established with other faculty or professionals.	Faculty involvement consists of a small core within the department, but input from other faculty and professionals about assessment issues is evidenced.	Faculty involvement is widespread throughout the program or department. All faculty within the department have contributed (and continue to contribute) to the use and maintenance of an assessment plan.
Assessment alignment	No alignment between faculty identified learning outcomes and assessments is evidenced.	Alignment exists with some outcomes and assessments, but not others OR the alignment is weak/unclear.	Alignment between outcomes and assessments is complete and clear.	Alignment between outcomes and assessments complete. Courses are identified that address each outcome.
Level B: Making Progress in Implementation				
Assessment structure	The assessment plan has only one of the following attributes: 1) multiple direct and indirect assessments are used. 2) assessments are used on a regular basis (i.e., not just given once to get initial data). 3) assessments provide comprehensive information on student performance at each stage of their program.	The assessment plan has only two of the following attributes: multiple, regular and comprehensive, at each stage.	The assessment plan has all of the following attributes: multiple, regular and comprehensive, at each stage.	The assessment plan has all necessary attributes and are embedded in the program (versus “added-on”).
Data management	No data management system exists.	A data management system is in place to collect and store data but it does not have the capacity to store and analyze data from all students over time.	A data management system is in place that can store and process most student performance data over time.	A data management system is in place that can store and process all student performance data over time. Data are regularly collected and stored for all students and analyzed and reported in user-friendly formats.
Data collection points	Data are not collected across multiple points and do not predict student success.	Data are collected at multiple points but there is no rationale regarding their relationship to student success.	Data are systematically collected at multiple points and there is strong rationale (e.g., research, best practice) regarding their relationship to student success.	Data are systematically collected at multiple points and provide strong relationship between assessments and student success.

Data collection sources	Data collected from applicants, students, and faculty, but not graduates or other professionals.	Data collected from applicants, students, faculty, and graduates, but not other professionals.	Data collected from applicant, students, recent graduates, faculty, and other professionals.	Data collected from multiple information on/from applicants, students, recent graduates, faculty, and other professionals.
Program improvement	Data are only generated for external accountability reports (e.g., accreditation), are not used for program improvement, and are available only to administrators.	Some generated data are based on internal standards and used for program improvement, but are available only to administrators “as needed.”	An ongoing, systematic, objectives based process is in place for reporting and using data to make decisions and improve programs within the department.	An ongoing, systematic, objectives based process is in place for reporting and using data to make decisions and improve programs both within the department and university-wide.
Level C: Maturing Stages of Implementation				
Comprehensive and integrated measures	The assessment system consists of measures that are neither comprehensive nor integrated.	The assessment system includes multiple measures, but they are not integrated or they lack scoring/cut-off criteria.	The assessment system includes comprehensive and integrated measures with scoring/cut-off criteria.	The assessment system includes comprehensive and integrated measures with scoring/cut-off criteria that are examined for validity and utility, resulting in program modifications as necessary.
Monitoring student progress, & managing & improving operations & programs	Measures are used to monitor student progress, but are not used to manage and improve operations and programs.	Measures are used to monitor student progress and manage operations and programs, but are not used for improvement.	Measures are used to monitor student progress and manage and improve operations and programs.	Measures are used to monitor student progress and manage and improve operations and programs. Changes based on data are evident.
Assessment data usage by faculty	Assessment data are not shared with faculty.	Assessment data are shared with faculty, but with no guidance for reflection and improvement.	Assessment data are shared with faculty with guidance for reflection and improvement.	Assessment data are shared with faculty with guidance or reflection and improvement. Remediation opportunities are made available.
Assessment data shared with students	Assessment data are not shared with students.	Assessment data are shared with students, but with no guidance for reflection and improvement.	Assessment data are shared with students with guidance for reflection and improvement.	Assessment data are shared with students with guidance for reflection and improvement. Remediation opportunities are made available.
Fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessments	No steps have been taken to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessments.	Assessments have “face validity” regarding fairness, accuracy, and consistency.	Preliminary steps have been taken to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessments.	Assessments have been established as fair, accurate, and consistent through data analysis.

Part 4: Summary

Factors	Rubric Score	Evidence/Rationale to Support Your Self-Rating
Level A		
Professional standards and student learning outcomes	1 2 3 4	(Note: Please describe the activities/processes, etc. that support your self-rating...Don't restate the rubric performance criteria here).
Faculty involvement	1 2 3 4	
Assessment alignment	1 2 3 4	
Level B		
Assessment structure	1 2 3 4	
Data management	1 2 3 4	
Data collection points	1 2 3 4	
Data collection sources	1 2 3 4	
Program improvement	1 2 3 4	
Level C		
Comprehensive & integrated measures	1 2 3 4	
Monitoring student progress, & managing & improving operations & programs	1 2 3 4	
Assessment data usage by faculty	1 2 3 4	
Assessment data shared with students	1 2 3 4	
Fairness, accuracy & consistency of assessments	1 2 3 4	

A. General findings

B. Future suggestions

C. Requested Resources

+Assessment Type Legend (use numbers in “Type” column above)

Direct Measures (evidence, based on student performance, which demonstrates the learning itself)

1. Locally Developed Achievement Measures. This type of assessment generally is one that has been created by the individual faculty members, their department, the college or the university to measure specific achievement outcomes, usually identified by the dept and its faculty.
2. Internal or External Expert Evaluation. This type of assessment involves an expert using a pre-specified set of criteria to judge a student’s knowledge, and/or disposition and/or performance.
3. Nationally Standardized Achievement Tests: These are assessments produced by an outside source, administered nationally, and that usually measures broad exposure to an educational experience.
4. Portfolio Analysis. A portfolio is a collection of representative student work over a period of time. A portfolio often documents a student's best work, and may include a variety of other kinds of process information (e.g., drafts of student work, student's self assessment of their work, other students’ assessments). Portfolios may be used for evaluation of a student's abilities and improvement. The portfolio can be evaluated at the end of the student’s career by an independent jury or used formatively during a student’s educational journey towards graduation.
5. Capstone Experience. Capstone experiences integrate knowledge, concepts, and skills associated with an entire sequence of study in a program. Evaluation of students' work is used as a means of assessing student outcomes.
6. Writing Skill Assessment. Evaluation of written language.
7. Other (please list): _____
8. Other: _____

Indirect Measures (reflection about the learning or secondary evidence of its existence)

9. Persistence Studies. The number/percentage of students who, from entry into the university, graduate/complete the program within a given number of years, usually 6 to 7.
10. Student or Faculty Surveys (or Focus Groups or Advisory Committees). This type of assessment involves collecting data on one of the following: 1) perceptions of knowledge/skills/dispositions either from a student, faculty, or group, 2) opinions about experiences in a course/program or at the university, 3) opinions about the processes or functioning of a department/course/program, 4) minutes from an advisory committee.
11. Alumni Surveys (or Focus Groups or Advisory Committee). This type of assessment involves collecting data on the same topics as presented in “Student or Faculty Surveys” presented above, except the respondent is a past graduate and not a current student or faculty.
12. Exit Interviews. Individual or groups interviews of graduating students. Could be a survey format, but also can involve face-to-face interviews.
13. Placement of Graduates. Any data that surveys post-graduate professional status. Data can include graduate employment rates, salary earned, position attained, geographic locations, etc.
14. Employer Satisfaction Surveys. Employer surveys can provide information about the curriculum, programs, and students that other forms of assessment cannot produce. Through surveys, departments traditionally seek employer satisfaction levels with the abilities and skills of recent graduates. Employers also assess programmatic characteristics by addressing the success of students in a continuously evolving job market.
15. Other (please list): _____
16. Other: _____

Due Dates for PASL for Undergraduate Programs at ESU

College (Deans)	Dept	Chair	Major Title*	March 5, 2011	March 4, 2012
Business (Joseph Wen) (John Rich)	Accounting & Computer Information Systems	Alexis Down	Accounting and Info Systems	X	
	Business Administration & Education	Jack Sterrett	Business Administration		
			Business Education		
			Management		
	Marketing				
LAS (Steven Brown) (Gary Wyatt)	Art	Cynthia Patton	Art	X	
	Biology	Brent Thomas	Biology		X
	Communication & Theatre	Stephen Catt	Communication	X	
			Theatre	X	
	English, Modern Languages and Literatures	Marie Miller	English	X	
			Modern Languages and Lit	X	
	Mathematics & Computer Science	Larry Scott	Computer Science	X	
			Economics	X	
			Mathematics	X	
	Music	Allan Comstock	Music	X	
	Nursing	Judy Calhoun	Nursing		X
	Physical Science	DeWayne Backhus	Chemistry		X
			Earth Science		X
			Physics		X
			Physical Science (bio chem, mole bio)		X
	Social Sciences	Ellen Hansen	Political Sciences		X
History				X	
Social Sciences				X	
Sociology & Anthropology	Nate Terrell	Sociology and Anthropology		X	
Inter-Disciplinary	Information Resource Studies	Anne O'Neill	Information Resource Studies		X
TC (Phil Bennett) (Ken Weaver)	Elementary Teacher Education	Jean Morrow	Elementary Education	X	
	Health, Physical Education & Recreation	Kathy Ermler	Athletic Training		X
			Health Education	X	
			Health Promotion		X
			Physical Education	X	
			Recreation		X
Psychology, Art Therapy, Rehab & Mental Health Counseling	Brian Schrader	Psychology		X	
		Rehabilitation Services		X	
SLIM	Information Management	Gwen Alexander	<i>None-Support TC and Interdisciplinary (distance education)</i>		X
BIS	Bachelors of Integrated Studies		Bachelors of Integrated Studies (on-line only)		X

Due Dates for PASL for Graduate Programs at ESU

College (Deans)	Dept	Chairs	Major Title	March 5, 2011	March 4, 2012
Business (Joseph Wen) (John Rich)	Business Administration & Education	Jack Sterrett	Business Administration (accounting)	X	
			Business Education*		
LAS (Steven Brown) (Gary Wyatt)	Biology	Brent Thomas	Biology (botany, env bio, gen bio, micro, zoology)		X
	English, Modern Languages and Literatures	Marie Miller	English		X
			TESOL*	X	
	Mathematics	Larry Scott	Mathematics		X
	Music	Allan Comstock	Music (music ed & perf)	X	
	Physical Science	DeWayne Backhus	Physical Sciences*	X	
	Social Sciences/History	Ellen Hansen	Social Sciences		X
History				X	
Geospatial Analysis			X		
TC (Phil Bennett) (Ken Weaver)	Psychology, Art Therapy, Rehab & Mental Health Counseling	Brian Schrader	Art Therapy		X
			Clinical Psychology		X
			Experimental Psychology		X
			Mental Health Counseling		X
			Psychology (gen & I/O)		X
			Rehabilitation Counseling		X
			School Psychology		X
	Early Childhood/Elementary Education	Jean Morrow	Early Childhood		X
			Master Teacher* (subject matter, reading specialist)		X
	Instructional Design & Technology	Marc Childress	Instructional Design and Technology*	X	
	Health, Physical Education & Recreation	Kathy Ermler	Health, Physical Education and Recreation*	X	
	Special Education & School Counseling	Jean Morrow	Special Education (adaptive, gifted)		X
			Counselor Education (School Counseling)		X
	School Leadership, Middle & Secondary Education	Jerry Will	Curriculum and Instruction* (national board cert, curriculum leadership, effective practitioner)	X	
Ed Ad Building Level*			X		
Ed Ad District Level			X		
SLIM	Information and Management	Gwen Alexander	Library Science (law librarianship)		X
			Information Management		X
			Legal Information Management		X
			Information Management		X
			Archives		X

* Also offered on-line