

ASSESSMENT *Showcase*

Featuring **best practices in assessment** at K-State

Friday, Oct. 24 • 10 a.m.-5 p.m. • K-State Union (2nd Floor)

9:45 a.m.-12:30 p.m. **Registration** (Table outside Union Ballroom)

10 a.m.-12 p.m. **Assessment Workshop for New Faculty/Staff** (Union 207)

12-2:00 p.m. **Lunch** (Flint Hills Room/Sunflower Room, 2nd Floor, Union)
Assessment Presentation: "What Do We Know? How Do We Know it?" Brian Niehoff
Assessment Overview: Steven J. Hawks, Assistant Director of Assessment
Presentation of Assessment Awards: M. Duane Nellis, Provost & Senior Vice President,
and Briana S. Nelson Goff, Interim Director of Assessment

2:00-3:00 p.m. **Best of Assessment Showcase
Breakout Sessions 1, 2 & 3**
207: Integrating Multiple Sources of Data:
Ray Yunk, Architectural Engineering and Construction Science, College of Engineering
212: Closing the Loop Presentation:
Steve Smethers, Journalism and Mass Communications, College of Arts and Sciences
213: Innovation and Technology Presentation:
Shing Chang and Bradley Kramer, Industrial & Manufacturing Systems Engineering,
College of Engineering

3:15-4:15 p.m. **Best of Assessment Showcase
Breakout Sessions 4, 5 & 6**
207: Accredited Programs Presentation:
Barbara Anderson, Interior Design, and Bob Garcia,
Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Human Ecology
212: Diversity and Assessment Presentation:
Paul Burden, College of Education
213: Involvement of Faculty Presentation:
Anne Phillips, English, and Irma O'Dell, Leadership Studies

4:15-4:45 p.m. **Wrap-Up** (Union 207)



Sponsored by... K-STATE OFFICE OF ASSESSMENT

Assessment Showcase Presentation Summaries

2:00 – 3:00

Session 1 (Room 207):

Ray Yunk, Architectural Engineering & Construction Science

The Architectural Engineering program is accredited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET).

The ABET criteria for engineering programs requires that each program have an assessment process which documents that graduates have achieved the educational objectives and program outcomes of the engineering program. Thirteen Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) have been determined to satisfy ABET requirements and are adapted to the context of learning objectives for the program

Session 2 (Room 212):

Steve Smethers, Journalism & Mass Communications

The A.Q. Miller School of Journalism and Mass Communications is one of 112 journalism programs accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications, an organization that heavily emphasizes assessment. The Miller School faculty has adopted an assessment program that includes a list of eleven learning objectives related to practical and conceptual skills important to media-related professions. This presentation will focus on one learning objective, and how a combination of direct and indirect measures were used to improve instruction and make curriculum changes relating to one of those learning objectives.

Session 3 (Room 213):

Shing Chang & Bradley Kramer, Industrial & Manufacturing Systems Engineering

This presentation describes an effective outcomes assessment approach that does not add a lot of work to overloaded faculty and staff members. This system was developed by the industrial and manufacturing systems engineering (IMSE) faculty at Kansas State University (K-State) in a quest to improve the direct assessment of the industrial engineering (IE) program outcomes while decreasing the use of faculty time and effort to assure the quality of our programs.

There are two parts to this presentation. The first part describes a course-based assessment process and how information gleaned from the process is used to improve our program. The second part describes the automation of the process through the development of a web-based system that streamlines the collection of assessment data, facilitates the evaluation of assessment data, and automatically archives data, decisions, and responsibilities.

3:15 – 4:15

Session 4 (Room 207):

Barbara Anderson, Interior Design, and Bob Garcia, Communication Sciences and Disorders

The programs of Interior Design and Communication Sciences and Disorders from the College of Human Ecology will present an overview of student assessment. The audience will learn important factors to consider when developing an assessment program and the positive outcomes for students and faculty.

Session 5 (Room 212):

Paul Burden, College of Education

Program assessment data indicated that our teacher candidates needed stronger understanding of human diversity. As one avenue to address this, the College of Education offered a series of half-day professional development programs for all college faculty, instructors, and graduate assistants. An advisory task force was selected to make all arrangements for the professional development programs on nine dimensions of diversity: *ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area*. This session will examine program objectives, content and format, presenters, attendees, budget, and assessment of the program.

Session 6 (Room 213):

Anne Phillips, English, and Irma O'Dell, Leadership Studies

(English) This presentation will summarize the English Department's undergraduate Assessment program, with particular emphasis on the widespread and ongoing involvement of English Department faculty. Additionally, it will suggest different, concrete ways in which the process of Assessment tangibly and identifiably benefits students as well as faculty.

(Leadership Studies) What a joy it has been to work with the School of Leadership Studies faculty on this assessment adventure. There have been ups and downs but we have all grown from this experience. Our story of assessment is a process. We have worked to develop assignments and rubrics that match our student learning outcomes. We believe in this current demand to establish a culture of evidence, we cannot gather evidence for the sake of gathering evidence. We need to use this evidence to improve leadership studies courses because according to Shavelson (2007) a culture of evidence will not automatically lead to educational improvement.