

Reviewing APRs: A Session for CARC Reviewers

Workshop Presented at the 2009 K-State Assessment Showcase

Briana Nelson Goff, College of Human Ecology

Anne Phillips, Department of English, College of Arts and Sciences

- 1) Lessons learned as Interim Director and the role of the CARCs; College of Human Ecology CARC—BG
- 2) Audience questions about CARC???
- 3) A&S CARC configuration and lessons learned—AP
- 4) APR review training exercise

CARC assignments, spring 2009
Arts & Sciences

<u>Member A</u>	<u>Member B</u>	<u>Member C</u>	<u>Chair (D)</u>	<u>Member E</u>	<u>Member F</u>
Biology (4)	Art*	Chemistry	Art	Am Ethnic Studies*	Biology (4)*
Geography*	Am Ethnic Studies	Int'l Studies	Biochemistry (2)*	Chemistry	Biochemistry (2)
Journalism/MC*	English*	Journalism/MC	Geology*	English	History
Mathematics	Geology	Latin Amer Studies	History*	Geography	Mathematics*
Modern Languages	Kinesiology	Kinesiology*	Int'l Studies*	Modern Languages*	Music (2)*
Sociology, Anthro, SW (3)*	Physics*	Music (2)	Latin Amer Studies*	Physics	Philosophy
Statistics	Psychology	Philosophy*	Speech/Theatre (2)*	Psychology*	Speech, Theatre (2)
		Sociology, Anthro, SW (3)	Statistics*		
Economics	Economics	Economics	Economics	Economics	Economics
Women's Studies	Women's Studies	Women's Studies	Women's Studies	Women's Studies	Women's Studies

(4/8/09)

* Responsible for writing the summary paragraph on that APR for the Arts & Sciences Assessment Report

Arts & Sciences Assessment Overview

(Presented to Department Heads, 12-4-08, updated 2-4-09)

The following must be completed by March 2, 2009:

- Annual Reports on Student Learning (for all programs, including secondary majors, minors, and certificates);
- Student learning outcomes (SLOs) for each degree program, posted on Departmental websites, easily accessible (within two clicks of the home page);
- "Alignment Matrices" for each degree program (including secondary majors, minors, etc.), also to be posted to Departmental websites;
- Summaries of the 2007-2008 APRs for each degree program, also to be posted to Departmental websites (a brief paragraph describing the program's progress in assessment of student learning during the 2007-2008 Academic Year).

Sample Characteristics of a Good Assessment Plan: <<http://www.kstate.edu/assessment/plans/basic/aslplan.pdf>>

- The plan flows from the mission statement.
- The focus is on the program rather than on individual courses.
- The number of critical learning objectives is small.
- The plan is produced by (or at least familiar to) faculty and students.
- The plan is ongoing rather than periodic.
- The plan uses multiple measures, both qualitative/quantitative and direct/indirect.
- Students understand their role in assessment (how it will be used and how it can help them).
- The results of assessment activities are used by faculty/units to improve; they are seen as a means rather than an end.

Templates (for the Annual Progress Report, as well as the Alignment Matrix):

<<http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/process/index.htm>>

Need Help? The following members of the Arts & Sciences CARC (College Assessment Review Committee) will be evaluating your APR and other materials:

Fred Burrack, Music <fburrack@ksu.edu>, 532-5764
Angela Hubler, Women's Studies, <ahubler@ksu.edu>, 532-5738
Bimal Paul, Geography, <bkp@ksu.edu>, 532-3409
Anne Phillips, English, <annek@ksu.edu>, 532-2167
Iris Totten, Geology <itotten@ksu.edu>, 532-2251
Dave Van Domelen, Physics, <dvandome@ksu.edu>, 532-1605

Or, contact Interim Director of Assessment Briana Nelson Goff, <bnelson@ksu.edu>, 532-5712; or Assistant Director Steve Hawks, <sjhawks2@ksu.edu>, 532-5712

CHE College Assessment Review Committee
Oct 2009 APR Review—UG Programs

So you know what is expected in terms of work load (Not a lot!):

I am asking that each UG Program representative of the CARC review 2 APRs, then we will compile the scores and feedback and return the information to each program for revisions to their APR (if necessary), or for planning for the coming year. One of the things I have found really helpful this year is reviewing other programs' APRs, and I think that is one of the ways we can 1) provide feedback from multiple perspectives to our colleagues in CHE, and 2) learn from each other by seeing what other programs are doing (or need to do) with their assessment efforts.

- Each Annual Progress Report (APR) draft will be individually emailed to you with a copy of the evaluation rubric – The evaluation rubric also is available on KSOL.
- Each person will have 2 APRs to review.
 - You may have either both regular programs or both accredited programs (or you may have one of each.)
 - The evaluation rubric this year is the same for both accredited and non-accredited programs
 - The Rubrics should be easy enough to follow and complete based on the report you have

Things to consider:

- Write down all comments/questions about things that are not clear or not included in the reports. There should not be a need to go back to the original Plan—all APRs should clearly indicate the SLOs, measures used, data collected and changes being made in the program based on the assessment results. If you feel it is necessary to review the original plans, let me know and I will make those available.
- Feel free to make written comments on the actual program APRs—The rubrics and APRs will be returned to the primary person in the program for revision, so please be thorough and clear in your comments.
- Please make your comments “constructive” – don’t treat this like a blind review on a manuscript where you take out your frustrations on the person on the other side ☺
- I have tried to “mix” reports, so each person will be receiving one that is more advanced in their assessment efforts and one that needs some additional feedback/assistance

Please submit your Rubric and comments on the APRs by **email** to Briana by **Tuesday Dec 15, 2009**

2009 CHE CARC Assessment Checklist

For each Annual Progress Report, you should attend to the following:

1. Is the correct APR Template used? (9/09 version):
 - a. <http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/process/index.htm>
2. Are the Department's or Program's Student Learning Outcomes posted online? If so, has the report provided the accurate web address?
3. Are the Department's or Program's Matrices posted online, and is the address provided accurate?
4. Is the Department's or Program's short summary of assessment for 2007-2008 provided online, with an accurate web address?
5. Have you completed the rubric evaluation for this report?
6. Have you provided specific, useful suggestions for the Department or Program?

Here's a sample summary paragraph:

The Department of **Economics** assessed two learning outcomes for 2006-2007: government involvement in the economy through taxes, transfer payments, provision of services, regulation, etc.; and the advantages of specialization and trade at both the personal and national levels. These outcomes were assessed by examinations in ECON 580, Senior Seminar during fall 2007. All 26 students in the seminar were assessed. Faculty used a rubric to evaluate the students' work. The results of this assessment provide a third year of the baseline assessment. The SLO committee is preparing a report on this data that will be submitted to the head for review and disseminated to instructors as well. An alignment matrix is provided; learning outcomes, Assessment alignment matrix, and the 2007-2008 Assessment summary are posted online at <http://www.k-state.edu/economics/ugrad/outcomes.pdf>

Please submit your Rubric and comments on the APRs by **email** to Briana by **Tuesday Dec 15, 2009**

Annual Progress Report
on Assessment of Student Learning for Undergraduate Programs (Rev 09/09)

Academic year: 2008-2009

Department/Program: School of Basket Weaving

Degree program(s): BS in Applied Basket Weaving

Person(s) preparing report: Dr. A. B. Cee

Date submitted: 3/2/09

In one paragraph, summarize your 2008-2009 Annual Progress Report

Provide the web link to department web site where degree program SLOs, Alignment Matrix, and 2008-2009 APR Summary are posted

1) List the complete set of Student Learning Outcomes for your Program (*all SLOs identified for your program*)
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 1: Ability to evaluate current basket weaving practices.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 2: Ability to demonstrate an understanding of contemporary research on basket weaving.

2) Identify the Student Learning Outcomes (*from the full list above*) **that were assessed for this Annual Progress Report.**

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 1: Ability to evaluate current basket weaving practices.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 2: Ability to demonstrate an understanding of contemporary research on basket weaving.

3) What assessments were used for each learning outcome? Please include results of the assessments and the sample of students from whom data were collected.

Direct:

Student Learning Outcome 1:

1. Data were gathered through specific questions on several exams in 2 classes. Also, students in XXX 600 completed an assignment designed to assess their ability to evaluate current basket weaving practices.

Student Learning Outcome 2:

- a. Data were gathered through specific questions on several exams in each class (XXX 400, 500, and 600).

Indirect:

Senior Exit Survey Questionnaire

Results:

Direct Measure:

Exams/Assignments in XXX 400, 500, 600

Total Results:

- **FALL:**
 - XXX400 – Mean score = 87.79%; Range scores = 63-100%
 - XXX500 – Mean score = 87.79%; Range score = 37-97%
 - XXX600 – Data not available.
- **SPRING:**
 - XXX400– Mean score = 84%; Range scores = 36-97%
 - XXX500 – Mean score = 90.9%; Range scores = 79.33-100%
 - XXX600– Course not offered Spring 2009

Assessment plan indicates multi-method assignments would be used for this SLO; however, only exam data were reported by the program.

Student Learning Outcome 2:

Measure: Exam questions in XXX400 (14 students), 500 (21 students), and 600 (3 students)

Total Results: Data from the exams will be used to create a baseline data for comparison over the next several years.

Indirect Measure:

Senior Exit Survey Questionnaire – Senior Survey data were not received.

4) What was learned from the assessment results? (What do they tell you about student learning? What did you learn about strengths and weaknesses of your program?)

The data indicated that students were able to grasp the concepts and to evaluate current basket weaving practices (SLO 1). In addition, data for SLO 2 indicate that students are able to demonstrate an understanding of contemporary research on basket weaving. Senior Exit Survey data indicate that students perceive they are learning what they are expected to in the classes for their major and feel prepared for advancing in the basket weaving profession when they graduate.

5) What actions and/or revisions were implemented in response to the assessment results and the effects on student learning observed on this year's SLOs.

Baseline Data – no response needed yet.

6) Describe the process by which faculty reviewed the results of this year's SLOs.

The faculty will meet to discuss the aggregate data from the students. The specific measures (the projects, papers, and examinations were previously reviewed by faculty) were each designed by faculty members responsible for the targeted courses and reviewed in assessment faculty meetings held during 2008-2009.

7) (for non-accredited programs) Briefly describe the long-range plan to assess all of the outcomes if assessing over a sequence of years.

The data we have now is baseline data and there is basis for comparison. We will continue to collect data and monitor information for future reports as suggested.