Agenda

• Reviewing the Program Assessment Cycle
  – Moving beyond the Assessment Plan
  – Assessment Report due at Commencement, 2015
  – Overview of Report Template

• Moving from assessment data to conclusions and recommendations
  – Adequacy of sample and instrumentation (tools)
  – Preparing tables, graphs, qualitative summaries
  – Comparing evidence to expectations (for each outcome)
  – Convergence across sources and methods
  – Implications for possible changes with timelines

• Engaging colleagues
Today’s Take-Aways

- Chart listing your assessment methods and planned analyses, organized by learning outcome
- Tentative timeline for compiling and analyzing evidence, listing those responsible
- Continuing plan for involving colleagues and students
Big Picture

• Overarching goal: Learning at multiple levels
  – Promotion of faculty study, reflection, and conversation…that also includes students.
  – Meaningful program improvement.
  – Manageable integration into routine practices.
Assessment Cycle

1. Planning for assessment
2. Collect data
3. Analyze data
4. Reflect on results and propose changes
5. Make the changes
6. Refine assessment tools and procedures

"Closing the loop"
Plan Section III: Assessment Timeline

• Indicates when and how student learning will be assessed based on clear statements of learning outcomes and expectations.

• Refers to the curriculum map.

• Specifies a series of assessment cycles (3 consecutive two-year reporting periods) in which you will assess your program’s student learning outcomes and re-visit outcomes that are implicated by program changes.
## Assessment Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Years</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Course(s) and Other Program Requirements</th>
<th>Assessment Evidence (direct/indirect)</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Period 1 2013-15</td>
<td>WHICH outcome(s) will you examine in each period (by number, i.e. 1.1 etc.)?</td>
<td>WHERE will you look for evidence of student learning (i.e., what course(s)/program requirements)? Designate for each outcome.</td>
<td>WHAT student work or other evidence will you examine in order to generate conclusions and recommendations? Designate for each requirement.</td>
<td>HOW will you look at the evidence; what means will you use to quantify the evidence? Designate for each source of evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Period 2 2015-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Period 3 2017-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Section III: Assessment Timeline

- Look at yours (Plan, Columns 4 and 5)
- That’s where you will find the data sources for your Assessment Report due this May
- For your selected outcomes, how far have you gotten so far in collecting the data from your assessment tools?
- What is your timeline for completing data collection?
Assessment Report Template: Data/Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome(s) Examined</th>
<th>Data/Evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Results &amp; Reflection</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed during this reporting period? | Other than grades, what data/evidence* were used to determine that students have achieved the stated outcome(s) for the degree? Provide:  
• type of artifact*  
• sample (include the number of students sampled, which semesters, number or type of course(s)/section(s)/program requirements) | What method(s) or process(es) were used to evaluate student work? Provide:  
• evaluation tool/instrument**  
• expected level of student achievement of the outcome  
• who applied the tool***  
• who interpreted the results of the assessment process | What were the results of the analysis of the assessment data? Provide:  
• quantitative results, including a comparison of expected level of student achievement to actual level of student achievement  
• analysis of the results, including identification of patterns of weakness or strength  
• reflection and conclusions | Are there recommendations for change based on the results? If yes: Provide:  
• recommendation(s) for change(s) planned  
• timeline for program to implement the change(s)  
• timeline for program to assess the impact of the change(s) |

Plan Timeline Column 2

Plan Timeline Column 4

---

The University of Rhode Island
### Outcome(s) Examined

Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed during this reporting period?

### Data/Evidence

Other than grades, what data/evidence* were used to determine that students have achieved the stated outcome(s) for the degree? Provide:
- type of artifact*
- sample (include the number of students sampled, which semesters, number or type of course(s)/section(s)/program requirements

### Evaluation Process

What method(s) or process(es) were used to evaluate student work? Provide:
- evaluation tool/instrument**
- expected level of student achievement of the outcome
- who applied the tool***
- who interpreted the results of the assessment process

### Results & Reflection

What were the results of the analysis of the assessment data? Provide:
- quantitative results, including a comparison of expected level of student achievement to actual level of student achievement
- analysis of the results, including identification of patterns of weakness or strength
- reflection and conclusions

### Recommendations & Planning

Are there recommendations for change based on the results? If yes:
- recommendation(s) for change(s) planned
- timeline for program to implement the change(s)
- timeline for program to assess the impact of the change(s)

---

**Assessment Report Template:**

**Example from ENG - Literature & Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome(s) Examined</th>
<th>Data/Evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Results &amp; Reflection</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.4: Graduates are able to use scholarship to define key terms in the field | Direct evidence: research papers written in seminars, F11, F12; n=30 | Program-approved rubric plus holistic comments (see appendix A)  
15 faculty in the program rated 2 papers each; evidence was combined and interpreted by program director;  
Expected=80% “average” or above | 89.3% scored average or above;  
This exceeded the expected level of 80%;  
While students did well overall, more work can be done to assure conversance with key terms, particularly by increasing student engagement with existing scholarship in the field | Formal research paper will now be required in all graduate seminars (to be implemented F14, reassessed AY 14-15, 15-16); Pedagogy: we will explore use of a required annotated bibliography with the research paper; Create an archive of “model” papers (implemented F14, reassessed AY 14-15, 15-16); Assessment: revise the rubric to better reflect expected level (for F13); make rubric available to all students (F13); |
FOR EACH OUTCOME YOU HAVE CHOSEN:
Describe the Data/Evidence for the Report

• Type of artifact? For example:
  – Seminar papers, thesis proposals

• Composition of the sample? For example:
  – Selected courses including number(s), semester(s)

• For whatever you plan to use:
  – Total number of student artifacts you have collected for each analysis
# Assessment Report Template: Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome(s) Examined</th>
<th>Data/Evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Results &amp; Reflection</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed during this reporting period? | Other than grades, what data/evidence* were used to determine that students have achieved the stated outcome(s) for the degree? Provide:  
  • type of artifact*  
  • sample (include the number of students sampled, which semesters, number or type of course(s)/section(s)/program requirements | What method(s) or process(es) were used to evaluate student work? Provide:  
  • evaluation tool/instrument**  
  • expected level of student achievement of the outcome  
  • who applied the tool***  
  • who interpreted the results of the assessment process | What were the results of the analysis of the assessment data? Provide:  
  • quantitative results, including a comparison of expected level of student achievement to actual level of student achievement  
  • analysis of the results, including identification of patterns of weakness or strength  
  • reflection and conclusions | Are there recommendations for change based on the results? If yes: Provide:  
  • recommendation(s) for change(s) planned  
  • timeline for program to implement the change(s)  
  • timeline for program to assess the impact of the change(s) |

| Plan Timeline Column 2 | Plan Timeline Column 5 |
Describing the Evaluation Process

• What “tool” was used to rate or score student performance? For example:
  – Rubric applied to papers, theses, or other products
  – Practicum supervisor ratings on a set of rating scales
  – Mock licensure examination
  – Juried performance rating form
Expected Level of Student Achievement

• Before you collect and analyze your data, what are you aiming for? For example:
  – 100% of the student papers will be scored at least “competent” on the rubric
  – 70% of the students will demonstrate at least “proficiency” on the practicum rating instrument
  – 85% of thesis proposals in the sample will meet or exceed expectations
Describing the Evaluation Process

• Who contributed to evaluating individual student work? For example:
  – Course instructor(s)
  – Practicum supervisor(s)
  – Thesis Committee
  – Program Assessment Committee

• Who compiled and interpreted the assessment results? For example:
  – Program Director
  – Assessment Coordinator
  – Assessment Committee
## Assessment Report Template:
### Example from ENG - Literature & Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome(s) Examined</th>
<th>Data/Evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Results &amp; Reflection</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed during this reporting period?</td>
<td>Other than grades, what data/evidence* were used to determine that students have achieved the stated outcome(s) for the degree? Provide: • type of artifact* • sample (include the number of students sampled, which semesters, number or type of course(s)/section(s)/program requirements</td>
<td>What method(s) or process(es) were used to evaluate student work? Provide: • evaluation tool/instrument** • expected level of student achievement of the outcome • who applied the tool*** • who interpreted the results of the assessment process</td>
<td>What were the results of the analysis of the assessment data? Provide: • quantitative results, including a comparison of expected level of student achievement to actual level of student achievement • analysis of the results, including identification of patterns of weakness or strength • reflection and conclusions</td>
<td>Are there recommendations for change based on the results? If yes: Provide: • recommendation(s) for change(s) planned • timeline for program to implement the change(s) • timeline for program to assess the impact of the change(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4: Graduates are able to use scholarship to define key terms in the field</td>
<td>Direct evidence: research papers written in seminars, F11, F12; n=30</td>
<td>Program-approved rubric plus holistic comments (see appendix A)</td>
<td>89.3% scored average or above; This exceeded the expected level of 80%; While students did well overall, more work can be done to assure conversance with key terms, particularly by increasing student engagement with existing scholarship in the field</td>
<td>Formal research paper will now be required in all graduate seminars (to be implemented F14, reassessed AY 14-15, 15-16); Pedagogy: we will explore use of a required annotated bibliography with the research paper; Create an archive of “model” papers (implemented F14, reassessed AY 14-15, 15-16); Assessment: revise the rubric to better reflect expected level (for F13); make rubric available to all students (F13);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:**
- * indicates that data/evidence were used to determine that students have achieved the stated outcome(s) for the degree.
- ** indicates that an evaluation tool/instrument was used to evaluate student work.
- *** indicates that the results of the assessment process were interpreted by the program director.
### Assessment Report Template: Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome(s) Examined</th>
<th>Data/Evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Results &amp; Reflection</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed during this reporting period? | Other than grades, what data/evidence* were used to determine that students have achieved the stated outcome(s) for the degree? Provide:  
* • type of artifact*  
* • sample (include the number of students sampled, which semesters, number or type of course(s)/section(s)/program requirements | What method(s) or process(es) were used to evaluate student work? Provide:  
* • evaluation tool/instrument**  
* • expected level of student achievement of the outcome  
* • who applied the tool***  
* • who interpreted the results of the assessment process | What were the results of the analysis of the assessment data? Provide:  
* • quantitative results, including a comparison of expected level of student achievement to actual level of student achievement  
* • appropriate qualitative results  
* • analysis of the results, including identification of patterns of weakness or strength  
* • reflection and conclusions | Are there recommendations for change based on the results? If yes: Provide:  
* • recommendation(s) for change(s) planned  
* • timeline for program to implement the change(s)  
* • timeline for program to assess the impact of the change(s) |
| Plan Timeline Column 2 | Plan Timeline Column 4 | Plan Timeline Column 5 | | |
Results: Reporting Findings

• Quantitative findings for each selected outcome:
  – Aggregate across all of the student work in your sample for the outcome
  – Consider appending a table and/or graph (not raw data)
  – Simple descriptive statistics are generally sufficient

• Qualitative findings (if relevant):
  – Include in an appendix
  – Describe the themes
  – Provide illustrative quotations

• Indirect evidence (if relevant)
Presenting the Results for the Report

Let's look at the Thesis Proposal Rubric from the Assessment website

How could results for this rubric be presented?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations = 1</th>
<th>Meets expectations = 2</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations = 3</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mastery of theories and concepts in the field demonstrated in problem statement and literature review</td>
<td>□ Arguments are sometimes incorrect, incoherent, or flawed</td>
<td>□ Arguments are coherent and reasonably clear</td>
<td>□ Arguments are superior</td>
<td>□ Objectives are well defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Objectives are poorly defined</td>
<td>□ Objectives are clear</td>
<td>□ Objectives are superior</td>
<td>□ Exhibits mature, refined critical thinking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Demonstrates limited critical thinking skills</td>
<td>□ Demonstrates acceptable critical thinking skills</td>
<td>□ Exhibits mature, refined critical thinking skills</td>
<td>□ Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Reflects limited understanding of subject matter and associated literature</td>
<td>□ Reflects understanding of subject matter and literature</td>
<td>□ Reflects mastery of subject matter and associated literature.</td>
<td>□ Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Demonstrates limited understanding of theoretical concepts</td>
<td>□ Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts</td>
<td>□ Reflects mastery of subject matter and associated literature.</td>
<td>□ Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Documentation is weak</td>
<td>□ Documentation is adequate</td>
<td>□ Generates well-reasoned and well-supported hypotheses</td>
<td>□ Documentation is excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Inadequate statement of hypotheses</td>
<td>□ Generates adequate hypotheses</td>
<td>□ Generates well-reasoned and well-supported hypotheses</td>
<td>□ Generates well-reasoned and well-supported hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery of methods of inquiry</td>
<td>□ Design inappropriate to questions</td>
<td>□ Design reasonable for questions</td>
<td>□ Design, analysis plan, excellent</td>
<td>□ Lacks anticipation of regulatory compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Confused or ineffective plan for analysis</td>
<td>□ Plan for analysis reasonable, acknowledges some limitations</td>
<td>□ Plan for analysis goes beyond the obvious, acknowledges limitations and critically considers alternatives</td>
<td>□ Considers regulatory compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Lacks anticipation of regulatory compliance</td>
<td>□ Considers regulatory compliance</td>
<td>□ Demonstrates regulatory compliance</td>
<td>□ Considers regulatory compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of writing</td>
<td>□ Writing is weak</td>
<td>□ Writing is adequate</td>
<td>□ Writing is publication quality</td>
<td>□ No grammatical or spelling errors apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent</td>
<td>□ Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent</td>
<td>□ No grammatical or spelling errors apparent</td>
<td>□ Organization is excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Organization is poor</td>
<td>□ Organization is logical</td>
<td>□ Organization is excellent</td>
<td>□ Style is exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Style is not appropriate to discipline</td>
<td>□ Style is appropriate to discipline</td>
<td>□ Style is exemplary</td>
<td>□ Style is exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Originality and potential for contribution to discipline</td>
<td>□ Limited potential for discovery</td>
<td>□ Some potential for discovery</td>
<td>□ Exceptional potential for discovery</td>
<td>□ Limited extension of previous published work in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Limited extension of previous published work in the field</td>
<td>□ Builds upon previous work</td>
<td>□ Greatly extends previous work</td>
<td>□ Limited theoretical or applied significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Limited theoretical or applied significance</td>
<td>□ Reasonable theoretical or applied significance</td>
<td>□ Exceptional theoretical or applied significance</td>
<td>□ Limited publication potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Limited publication potential</td>
<td>□ Reasonable publication potential</td>
<td>□ Exceptional publication potential</td>
<td>□ Exceptional publication potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional criterion #1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presenting the Results for the Report

This rubric could be used for one or more specific outcomes you have chosen for your report.

For example:

• Outcome 2.1: Students are able to use the literature to develop appropriate questions for scholarly investigation (Criterion #1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #1</th>
<th>Does not meet</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Weighted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of theories/concepts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/8 = 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18/8 = 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of methods of inquiry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16/8 = 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14/8 = 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality and potential for contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graphing Results

Originality
Writing
Methods
Theories

- Exceeds
- Meets
- Does not meet
# Table for Comparison to Expected Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion #1</th>
<th>Mastery of theories/concepts</th>
<th>B Meets</th>
<th>A Exceeds</th>
<th>A + B</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Expectations met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/8=37.5%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #2</td>
<td>Mastery of methods of inquiry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #3</td>
<td>Quality of writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #4</td>
<td>Originality and potential for contribution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Expected levels are assessed against a 100% scale.
Graphing Results for Performance Relative to Expected Levels

- Originality
- Writing
- Methods
- Theories

- Expected Levels
- Meets or Exceeds
Summarizing the Findings

• Summarize quantitative findings:
  – Refer to table(s) in appendix (e.g. “see Table 1”)
  – For Outcome 2.1: Students did not achieve expected levels (85% meeting or exceeding expectations) for mastery of concepts to develop research questions (37.5%)
### Assessment Report Template: Example: ENG - Literature & Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome(s) Examined</th>
<th>Data/Evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Results &amp; Reflection</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed during this reporting period?</td>
<td><strong>Direct evidence:</strong> research papers written in seminars, F11, F12; n=30</td>
<td>What method(s) or process(es) were used to evaluate student work? Provide:</td>
<td>What were the results of the analysis of the assessment data? Provide:</td>
<td>Are there recommendations for change based on the results? If yes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• type of artifact*</td>
<td>• quantitative results, including a comparison of expected level of student achievement to actual level of student achievement</td>
<td>• recommendation(s) for change(s) planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• sample (include the number of students sampled, which semesters, number or type of course(s)/section(s)/program requirements)</td>
<td>• expected level of student achievement of the outcome</td>
<td>• timeline for program to implement the change(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• who applied the tool***</td>
<td>• who interpreted the results of the assessment process</td>
<td>• timeline for program to assess the impact of the change(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.4: Graduates are able to use scholarship to define key terms in the field**

|                      |               | Program-approved rubric plus holistic comments (see appendix A) | 89.3% scored average or above; This exceeded the expected level of 80%; While students did well overall, more work can be done to assure conversance with key terms, particularly by increasing student engagement with existing scholarship in the field | Formal research paper will now be required in all graduate seminars (to be implemented F14, reassessed AY 14-15, 15-16); Pedagogy: we will explore use of a required annotated bibliography with the research paper; Create an archive of "model" papers (implemented F14, reassessed AY 14-15, 15-16); Assessment: revise the rubric to better reflect expected level (for F13); make rubric available to all students (F13); |
|                      |               | 15 faculty in the program rated 2 papers each; evidence was combined and interpreted by program director; Expected=80% “average” or above | | |
Incorporating Qualitative Data and Indirect Evidence

• Faculty reviewer comments for Outcome 2.1:
  – Theme: Problems with writing literature reviews in a professional style
  – Quotation: “Many of the proposals seem to describe previous findings ad nauseam with no focus on key conclusions or attention to the flaws in studies”

• Student survey feedback for Outcome 2.1:
  – Theme: Few chances for literature review practice with feedback
  – Quotation: “We take lots of exams, but no one teaches us how to organize critiques of journal articles”
### Assessment Report Template: Reflections and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome(s) Examined</th>
<th>Data/Evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Results &amp; Reflection</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed during this reporting period?</td>
<td>Other than grades, what data/evidence* were used to determine that students have achieved the stated outcome(s) for the degree? Provide: • type of artifact* • sample (include the number of students sampled, which semesters, number or type of course(s)/section(s)/program requirements</td>
<td>What method(s) or process(es) were used to evaluate student work? Provide: • evaluation tool/instrument** • expected level of student achievement of the outcome • who applied the tool*** • who interpreted the results of the assessment process</td>
<td>What were the results of the analysis of the assessment data? Provide: • quantitative results, including a comparison of expected level of student achievement to actual level of student achievement • appropriate qualitative results • analysis of the results, including identification of patterns of weakness or strength • reflection and conclusions</td>
<td>Are there recommendations for change based on the results? If yes: Provide: • recommendation(s) for change(s) planned • timeline for program to implement the change(s) • timeline for program to assess the impact of the change(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Thesis/Dissertation Proposal Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations = 1</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mastery of theories and concepts in the field demonstrated in problem statement and literature review | - Arguments are sometimes incorrect, incoherent, or flawed  
- Objectives are poorly defined  
- Demonstrates limited critical thinking skills  
- Reflects limited understanding of subject matter and associated literature  
- Demonstrates limited understanding of theoretical concepts  
- Documentation is weak  
- Inadequate statement of hypotheses |                                                                                                           |                                                                                                          |
• Discuss convergence and divergence across sources (e.g. qualitative and quantitative):
  – Consistent with rubric findings, faculty reviewers commented on the difficulty students had with extracting pertinent information and providing a critical perspective in a literature review
  – Reviewers were consistently impressed with the sophistication of research methods but not their rationale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome(s) Examined</th>
<th>Data/Evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Results &amp; Reflection</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed during this reporting period? | Other than grades, what data/evidence* were used to determine that students have achieved the stated outcome(s) for the degree? Provide:  
• type of artifact*  
• sample (include the number of students sampled, which semesters, number or type of course(s)/section(s)/program requirements) | What method(s) or process(es) were used to evaluate student work? Provide:  
• evaluation tool/instrument**  
• expected level of student achievement of the outcome  
• who applied the tool***  
• who interpreted the results of the assessment process | What were the results of the analysis of the assessment data? Provide:  
• quantitative results, including a comparison of expected level of student achievement to actual level of student achievement  
• appropriate qualitative results  
• analysis of the results, including identification of patterns of weakness or strength  
• reflection and conclusions | Are there recommendations for change based on the results? If yes:  
Provide:  
• recommendation(s) for change(s) planned  
• timeline for program to implement the change(s)  
• timeline for program to assess the impact of the change(s) |

1.4: Graduates are able to use scholarship to define key terms in the field | Direct evidence: research papers written in seminars, F11, F12; n=30 | Program-approved rubric plus holistic comments (see appendix A)  
15 faculty in the program rated 2 papers each; evidence was combined and interpreted by program director;  
Expected=80% “average” or above | 89.3% scored average or above;  
This exceeded the expected level of 80%;  
While students did well overall, more work can be done to assure conversance with key terms, particularly by increasing student engagement with existing scholarship in the field | Formal research paper will now be required in all graduate seminars (to be implemented F14, reassessed AY 14-15, 15-16);  
Pedagogy: we will explore use of a required annotated bibliography with the research paper;  
Create an archive of “model” papers (implemented F14, reassessed AY 14-15, 15-16);  
Assessment: revise the rubric to better reflect expected level (for F13); make rubric available to all students (F13);  

---

* artifact
** evaluation tool/instrument
*** who applied the tool

---

**Example: ENG - Literature & Culture**
## Assessment Report Template: Recommendations & Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome(s) Examined</th>
<th>Data/Evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Results &amp; Reflection</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed during this reporting period? | Other than grades, what data/evidence* were used to determine that students have achieved the stated outcome(s) for the degree? Provide:  
  - type of artifact*  
  - sample (include the number of students sampled, which semesters, number or type of course(s)/section(s)/program requirements | What method(s) or process(es) were used to evaluate student work? Provide:  
  - evaluation tool/instrument**  
  - expected level of student achievement of the outcome  
  - who applied the tool***  
  - who interpreted the results of the assessment process | What were the results of the analysis of the assessment data? Provide:  
  - quantitative results, including a comparison of expected level of student achievement to actual level of student achievement  
  - appropriate qualitative results  
  - analysis of the results, including identification of patterns of weakness or strength  
  - reflection and conclusions | Are there recommendations for change based on the results? If yes:  
  Provide:  
  - recommendation(s) for change(s) planned  
  - timeline for program to implement the change(s)  
  - timeline for program to assess the impact of the change(s) |

---

*Note:* The table headers are designed to guide the completion of the template. Each column represents a specific section of the assessment process, including the examination of outcomes, the collection and analysis of data, and the formulation of recommendations for future planning.
Moving from Conclusions to Recommendations

• Do assessment methods (tools, sample) require improvements?
  – Thesis proposal rubric criterion #1 can be refined to focus more on the organization of the literature review

• What changes in pedagogy, course content, or curricular requirements may be called for?
  – More emphasis on literature review in the early seminars, using a style manual and a shared rubric at that level
  – A new section of the research methods course calling for journal article critiques and syntheses using the style manual
  – Shift the order of courses to provide more early practice with the development of research questions
Timelines for Recommendations

• When will each recommendation be implemented?
  – Change to add seminar focus on a literature review assignment with feedback will be made starting Spring 2016

• And for curriculum/pedagogy changes, when will you assess for effects of the changes?
  – We will re-assess in Spring 2016 plus 2016-17 (seminars) and 2017-18 (thesis proposals)

• You will report on the effects of these changes in future Reports (Section II)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome(s) Examined</th>
<th>Data/Evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Results &amp; Reflection</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed during this reporting period?</td>
<td>Other than grades, what data/evidence* were used to determine that students have achieved the stated outcome(s) for the degree? Provide: • type of artifact* • sample (include the number of students sampled, which semesters, number or type of course(s)/section(s)/program requirements</td>
<td>What method(s) or process(es) were used to evaluate student work? Provide: • expected level of student achievement of the outcome • who applied the tool!!! • who interpreted the results of the assessment process</td>
<td>What were the results of the analysis of the assessment data? Provide: • quantitative results, including a comparison of expected level of student achievement to actual level of student achievement • appropriate qualitative results • analysis of the results, including identification of patterns of weakness or strength • reflection and conclusions</td>
<td>Are there recommendations for change based on the results? If yes: Provide: • recommendation(s) for change(s) planned • timeline for program to implement the change(s) • timeline for program to assess the impact of the change(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4: Graduates are able to use scholarship to define key terms in the field | Direct evidence: research papers written in seminars, F11, F12; n=30 | Program-approved rubric plus holistic comments (see appendix A) 15 faculty in the program rated 2 papers each; evidence was combined and interpreted by program director; Expected=80% “average” or above | 89.3% scored average or above; This exceeded the expected level of 80%; While students did well overall, more work can be done to assure conversance with key terms, particularly by increasing student engagement with existing scholarship in the field | Formal research paper will now be required in all graduate seminars (to be implemented F14, reassessed AY 14-15, 15-16); Pedagogy: we will explore use of a required annotated bibliography with the research paper; Create an archive of “model” papers (implemented F14, reassessed AY 14-15, 15-16); Assessment: revise the rubric to better reflect expected level (for F13); make rubric available to all students (F13). We do… |
Engaging Colleagues: An Essential Part of Making Things Meaningful and Manageable

What are you already doing for this?

What seems to be working for you?
Engaging Colleagues: Maintain a Timeline

• Consider the timing for meetings with colleagues (and students) to get to the Report by May:

Where are you now?
– Designating the artifacts and designing the tool
– Choosing the sample
– Collecting the artifacts
– Applying the tool (rating instrument, rubric)
– Scoring and aggregating
– Reviewing and reflecting
– Recommending and planning
Getting There from Here

• Ongoing **individual consultation** provided

• **Website**: [www.uri.edu/assessment/g_forms](http://www.uri.edu/assessment/g_forms)
Thank You!