

Assessment Methodology

1. Develop reasonable (measureable) student learning outcomes be they to address General Education (GE) concerns or to address Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) at the program/major level.
2. Develop reasonable (measureable) student learning outcomes at the course level that address GE and/or ALCs.
3. Develop assessments (tests, papers, group projects) and embedded assessments (select questions on tests, sections of papers, activities within group projects) that address GE and/or ALC learning outcomes.
4. Develop a scoring key or a scoring rubric that not only attaches points/grades to individual assignments but that also demonstrates the opportunities/paths for student learning.
5. Collect, compile and analyze student work—in addition to keeping a detailed, itemized and well-documented grade book, conduct “item analysis” on test items to gauge individual/group performance and collect graded copies of the best/worst student papers and/or group projects.
6. Evaluate your course with the goal of improving student learning by considering changing textbooks, changing assignments, or perhaps even changing student learning outcomes.
7. As faculty colleagues evaluate student learning outcomes for individual courses as well as for the GE and the ALCs.
8. Implement improvements to GE and the ALCs based on assessment results.

Contact information: Dr. J. E. Gonzalez, jegon@spadmin.usf.edu; 727.873-4716
The university assessment portal: www.stpt.usf.edu/ir

Assessment Plan 2008

There are three concurrent assessment activities going on during AY 2008-09. The first is the Assessment Backfill Project, the second is the Institutional Assessment Project, and the third is the MAPP Project. A fourth project that will also be ongoing in the background is an Evaluation of ALC Assessments.

Assessment Backfill

- Goal 1 Collect evidence of previous assessment
- Goal 2 Document to SACS multiple assessment points

Institutional Assessment Project

- Goal 1 Use Assessment Backfill results for decision-making and ongoing development of assessment activity
- Goal 2 Showcase decision-making in continuous improvement resulting from these assessment activities
- Goal 3 Develop the university's ongoing assessment plan

Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP)

- Goal 1 Administer the MAPP to small cohorts of freshmen and rising/graduating seniors
- Goal 2 Use normative data to validate campus-based assessment and identify the appropriate use of comparative data

Evaluate/Update/Use Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs)

- Goal 1 Evaluate assessment practices in the ALCs and update with best practices in assessment
- Goal 2 Use results for continuous improvement in programs

The Assessment—Improvement Cycle Beyond SACS

Three Levels of Assessment Activity

Institutional Goals

Institutional mission-based goals need to be developed

General Education and Academic Learning Compact Goals

GE goals have been developed for the 1st pass through
 GE assessment findings will be used to evaluate GE goals
 ALCs have to be evaluated for best practice in assessment
 ALC assessment findings will be used to evaluate ALCs

Student Learning Outcomes—Course-level

At the course-level, faculty need to:

1. Develop student learning outcomes (SLOs)
2. Develop assessments that address SLOs
3. Develop a student performance rubric
4. Collect, compile, and analyze assessment data
5. Save detailed, itemized and well-documented grade books, “item analysis” results, and copies of the best & worst in student products
6. Evaluate your course for improvement

Improvement Cycle

Use assessment at the course-level to improve student learning.
 Use GE- and ALC-level assessment to improve GE and ALCs.
 Use institutional-level to improve the institution.

The GE Committee bears responsibility for assessment in GE;
 program assessment in the form of ALCs falls to the Colleges;
 and overall assessment efforts will be coordinated by the
 Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC).

Rubrics

Mary Allen notes that rubrics: “...are explicit schemes for classifying products or behaviors into categories that are steps along a continuum.” She notes that these steps generally range from “unacceptable” to “exemplary” and that rubrics: “...can be used to classify virtually any product or behavior...”

Mary Allen notes that there are two major types of rubrics: holistic and analytical. Holistic rubrics: “...describe how one global, holistic judgment is made” while analytical rubrics: “...involve making a series of judgments, each assessing a characteristic of the product being evaluated.”

Example of a Holistic Rubric

Level	Description
Inadequate	Insert description of inadequate work
Developing	Insert description of developing work
Acceptable	Insert description of acceptable work
Sophisticated	Insert description of sophisticated work

Example of an Analytical Rubric

Product	Level of Performance		
	Low	Good	Exceptional
A	Insert description for each level of work for Product A		
B	Insert description for each level of work for Product B		
C	Insert description for each level of work for Product C		

The ideal rubric includes a scoring system...

Example of an Analytical Rubric that Includes a Scoring System

	Level of Performance			Score
	Low	Good	Exceptional	
A	Description (0-2)	Description (3-5)	Description (6-8)	(0-18)
B	Description (0-2)	Description (3-5)	Description (6-8)	(0-18)
C	Description (0-2)	Description (3-5)	Description (6-8)	(0-18)
Total Score	(0-6)	(9-15)	(18-24)	(0-54)

Based on the work of Mary Allen (2004). Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education. Ankor: MA. (pp. 138-141).

The university assessment portal: www.stpt.usf.edu/ir

Contact information: Dr. J. E. Gonzalez, jegon@spadmin.usf.edu; 727.873-4716