CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Annual Student Learning Outcome Assessment Reports

Assessing the Assessment

Tom Henderson and Bret Smith   1/4/2016

I. BACKGROUND

A. INITIAL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME (SLO) ASSESSMENT AT CWU

1. RUBRIC

In 2007 CWU implemented an annual assessment template for all degree projects and a rubric to provide feedback to each degree program. The current Student Learning Outcome Report template is in Appendix 1, page 7. The current Feedback Rubric is in Appendix 2, page 9.

All Student Learning Outcomes, Annual Assessment Reports, and Feedback Reports are posted online.

Initially the targets for each of the five elements of the rubric were as follows.

Table 1 – Initial Target Ratings for Rubric Elements

RUBRIC ELEMENT	TARGET	SCALE
1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?	2.0	Five point scale with a minimum of 0 and a maximum rating of 4
2. How were they assessed? a. What methods were used? b. Who was assessed? c. When was it assessed?	2.0	Five point scale with a minimum of 0 and a maximum rating of 4
3. What was learned (assessment results)?	2.0	Five point scale with a minimum of 0 and a maximum rating of 4
4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information (feedback/program improvement)?	2.0	Three point scale with a minimum of 0 and a maximum rating of 2
5. How did the department or program make use of the feedback from last year's assessment? Were the changes effective?	2.0	Three point scale with a minimum of 0 and a maximum rating of 2

2. CHANGES TO RUBRIC TARGETS

Over the years, CWU average ratings have been slowly improving. The target (or goal) for the first three rubric elements were increased from 2 out of 4 to 3 out of 4 for the 2013-2014 Annual Student Learning Outcome Assessment Reports.

The average CWU rubric ratings over time have increased, see Table 2.:

Table 2 – Average CWU Rubric Ratings Over Time

	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback/ Program Improv.	Previous Year Use
2014/15	3.0	2.9	3.7	1.8	1.7
2013/14	2.9	3.0	3.8	1.8	1.8
2012/13	3.1	2.9	3.7	1.8	1.6
2011/12	2.7	2.9	3.6	1.7	1.6
2010/11	2.5	2.7	3.2	1.7	1.6
2009/10	2.6	2.6	3.0	1.4	1.7
2008/09	2.8	2.4	3.1	1.1	1.5
2007/08	2.6	2.3	3.0	1.1	1.5
CURRENT TARGET	**3 / 4**	**3 / 4**	**3 / 4**	**2 / 2**	**2 / 2**

B. CHANGES TO HOW STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES WERE LINKED TO GOALS

CWU revised the 2014/2015 Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report template. Originally, each degree program was asked to link their Student Learning Outcomes to department goals, college goals, and CWU mission and goals. The 2014/2015 report template was updated to ask degree programs to link their Student Learning Outcomes to specific outcomes in CWU's Strategic Plan.

C. GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT – 2011 and 2012

In 2011 CWU had a university-wide General Education goal of "Writing Across the Curriculum." In 2012 CWU had a general education goal of "Reading." Departments had the option of submitting one general education assessment report in lieu of separate Student Learning Outcome reports for each degree program in a department.

D. CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING "2-in-1" and "3-in-1" REPORTS

The former Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) at CWU was a department of the College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS). The CTL helped write required reports to the Washington State Professional Education Standards Board. One of the CTL reports included which student learning outcomes were assessed and the results of that assessment. CWU accepted these "2-in-1" reports in lieu of Program Student Learning Outcome assessment reports for several years. Some programs outside of CEPS might have used these reports, e.g., the B.M. in Music Education or the B.S. in Biology Teaching.

CTL "2-in-1" and "3-in-1" reports are noted in the summary tables of 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Student Learning Outcome reports.

The CTL reports did not ask degree programs to assess how they used prior year's results so those ratings have an NA.

II. WHAT WAS LEARNED?

Many departments have used the annual summative reports to spot needed improvements and make changes. This is reflected in the institution-wide average ratings over the years:

The rubric that CWU uses to assess each Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report rates degree program reports on:

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information (feedback/program improvement)?
5. How did the department or program make use of the feedback from last year's assessment? Were the changes effective?

Both element 4 (Planned Improvements) and element 5 (Use of Prior Year Assessment) have been steadily improving over the eight years of the assessments.

See Table 2 on page 3.

III. HOW CAN THE PROCESS IMPROVE?

Several improvements can be made to this process.

1. **Feedback should be provided to degree programs much more quickly**

   The rating process is fairly time consuming. While ratings were posted on CWU's web page some of them were posted weeks after a department or program submitted their annual report. Feedback should be provided more quickly, for example, a phone call to the person who created the report or a meeting with a College's department chairs.

2. **The process should be easier and less time consuming for departments and programs**

   Some degree programs submit over-detailed reports. Maybe an online form would work to prompt authors for just the data that is requested.

3. **Reports could be submitted once every two years instead of annually**

   It would speed up the rating process and be less of a time burden to degree programs if they were asked to submit one report every other year instead of annually.

4. **Faculty from various departments could be used as raters for other colleges**

   Faculty could be used as raters for degree programs outside of their college. It would take time to norm the various raters but they could see how other degree programs assess and improve their student learning outcomes.

APPENDICES

CWU | Central Washington University

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Degree Program Report
http://www.cwu.edu/associate-provost/assessment-planning-forms

College: Department:

Program: Degree:

Prepared by: Academic Year of Report: 2014/2015

1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?

In answering this question, please identify:

- the specific student learning outcomes that were assessed
- reasons for assessing the outcomes, with the outcomes written in clear, measurable terms
- which CWU Strategic Plan Outcome do the student learning outcomes relate to? See: http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/strategic-plan. For example:

  - o Outcome 1.1.1: **Students** will achieve programmatic learning outcomes.
  - o Outcome 1.1.3: **Students** and faculty will be increasingly engaged in the learning process in and outside the classroom.
  - o Outcome 3.1.1: Sustain participation by faculty, **students**, and staff in quality research, scholarship, and creative expression.

2. How were the student learning outcomes assessed?

A) What methods were used?

Concisely describe each specific method used in assessing student learning outcomes. For each assessment method specify:

- If that assessment method was direct (e.g. exams) or indirect (e.g. focus groups)
- If the assessment method assessed performance, knowledge, and/or attitudes
- The specific standard of mastery (criterion) against which you will compare your results. For example, "at least 85% of students pass the senior exit exam"

B) Who was assessed?

- The population assessed
- The number of students assessed (e.g., 53)
- Survey or questionnaire response rate (if appropriate)

C) When was it assessed?

- When did the assessment take place (was it at the end of the degree, as students entered the program or during a specific term?)

3. What was learned?

- Were the standards of mastery met?
- Report results in specific qualitative or quantitative terms, with the results linked to the student learning outcomes you assessed, and compared to the standard of mastery (criterion) you noted above
- Include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

- Note specific changes to your program as they affect student learning, and as they are related to results from the assessment process
- If no changes are planned, please describe why no changes are needed
- In addition, how has/will the department report the results and changes to internal and/or external constituents (e.g., advisory groups, newsletters, forums, etc.)

5. What did the department or program do in response to previous years' assessment results, and what was the effect of those changes?

- Describe any changes that have been made to improve student learning based on previous assessment results
- Were those changes effective?
- Discuss any changes to your assessment plan or assessment methods

6. Questions or suggestions? Contact Tom Henderson (henderst@cwu.edu) or Bret Smith (bpsmith@cwu.edu)

1.   **What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?**

Guidelines for Assessing a Program's Reporting of Student Learning Outcomes **(Target = 3)**		
Program Score	Value	Demonstrated Characteristics
	4	Student Learning Outcomes are written in clear, measurable terms and include performance, knowledge, *and* attitudes. All learning outcomes are linked to specific CWU Strategic Plan outcomes.
	3	**Student Learning Outcomes are written in clear, measurable terms and include performance, knowledge, and/or attitudes. Some learning outcomes are linked to CWU Strategic Plan outcomes.**
	2	Student Learning Outcomes are written in clear, measurable terms and include performance, knowledge, and/or attitudes. Learning Outcomes may be linked to outcomes in CWU's Strategic Plan.
	1	Some Student Learning Outcomes may be written as general, broad, or abstract statements. Learning Outcomes include performance, knowledge, or attitudes. Learning Outcomes may be linked to Strategic Plan outcomes.
	0	Student Learning Outcomes are not identified.

Comments:

2.   How were they assessed?

       d.   What methods were used?
       e.   Who was assessed?
       f.   When was it assessed?

Guidelines for Assessing a Program's Reporting of Assessment Methods **(Target = 3)**		
Program Score	Value	Demonstrated Characteristics
	4	A variety of methods, both direct and indirect are used for assessing each Student Learning Outcome. Reporting of assessment methods includes population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Each method has a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed
	3	**Some Student Learning Outcomes may be assessed using a single method, which may be either direct or indirect. All assessment methods are described in terms of population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Each method has a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed.**
	2	Some Student Learning Outcomes may be assessed using a single method, which may be either direct or indirect. All assessment methods are described in terms of population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Some methods may have a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed.
	1	Each Student Learning Outcome is assessed using a single method, which may be either direct or indirect. Some assessment methods may be described in terms of population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Some methods may have a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed.
	0	Assessment methods are nonexistent, not reported, or include grades, student/faculty ratios, program evaluations, or other "non-measures" of actual student performance or satisfaction.

Comments:

3.   What was learned (assessment results)?

Guidelines for Assessing a Program's Reporting of Assessment Results **(Target = 3)**		
Program Score	Value	Demonstrated Characteristics
	4	Results are presented in specific quantitative and/or qualitative terms. Results are explicitly linked to Student Learning Outcomes and compared to the established standard of mastery. Reporting of results includes interpretation and conclusions about the results.
	3	**Results are presented in specific quantitative and/or qualitative terms and are explicitly linked to Student Learning Outcomes and compared to the established standard of mastery.**
	2	Results are presented in specific quantitative and/or qualitative terms, although they may not all be explicitly linked to Student Learning Outcomes and compared to the established standard of mastery.
	1	Results are presented in general statements.
	0	Results are not reported.

Comments:

4.   What will the department or program do as a result of that information (feedback/program improvement)?

Guidelines for Assessing a Program's Reporting of Planned Program Improvements **(Target = 2)**		
Program Score	Value	Demonstrated Characteristics
	2	**Program improvement is related to pedagogical or curricular decisions described in specific terms congruent with assessment results. The department reports the results and changes to internal and/or external constituents.**
	1	Program improvement is related to pedagogical or curricular decisions described only in global or ambiguous terms, or plans for improvement do not match assessment results. The department may report the results and changes to internal or external constituents.
	NA	Program improvement is not indicated by assessment results.
	0	Program improvement is not addressed.

Comments:

5. **How did the department or program make use of the feedback from last year's assessment? Were the changes effective?**

Guidelines for Assessing a Program's Reporting of Previous Feedback **(Target = 2)**		
Program Score	Value	Demonstrated Characteristics
	2	**Discussion of feedback indicates that assessment results and feedback from previous assessment reports are being used for long-term curricular and/or pedagogical decisions. Is there evidence that the changes are working?**
	1	Discussion of feedback indicates that assessment results and feedback from previous assessment reports are acknowledged.
	NA	This is a first year report.
	0	There is no discussion of assessment results or feedback from previous assessment reports.

Comments: