Why are we conducting regular assessment of the University Learning Outcomes in disciplinary lens classes?

University Learning Outcomes are the “glue” that holds academic and social learning together in the undergraduate curriculum. Assessment at the course level focuses our attention on the outcomes and lets us answer the essential ULO questions:

To what extent are our students learning the skills, knowledge, and habits of mind that make up our outcomes?”

What do we do to support that learning – and what might we do to continually work to improve learning?

What supports do we need to enhance learning?
Overview: ULO Assessment Plan

A faculty-driven continuous improvement cycle is at the heart of the University Learning Outcome (ULO) Assessment Plan. In this cyclical assessment model, the initial collection and evaluation of evidence is just the first phase of a more comprehensive, four-year process. The four-phase assessment cycle begins with evidence collection but also includes making plans for change, supporting faculty and staff development, and reviewing progress.

During the four-year cycle pictured above, two to three of the eleven University Learning Outcomes (ULO) will be in phase one each year, and all eleven ULOs will be assessed in the course of a full four-year assessment cycle.
ULO Assessment Reporting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule of University Learning Outcomes and Courses Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual &amp; Performing Arts (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature &amp; Humanities (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 100, DLV, DLL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014-15  Phase 1
2015-16  Phase 2  Phase 1
2016-17  Phase 3  Phase 2  Phase 1
2017-18  Phase 4  Phase 3  Phase 2  Phase 1
2018-19  Phase 1  Phase 4  Phase 3  Phase 2
2019-20  Phase 2  Phase 1  Phase 4  Phase 3
2020-21  Phase 3  Phase 2  Phase 1  Phase 4

Communication in the Disciplines and Finishing Foundations courses will report ULO assessment as part of their regular program assessment process.
How to approach **Phase I ULO assessment:**

**Faculty are encouraged to use student work that originates in the course** (tests, papers, speeches, posters, quizzes, projects, e-portfolios, etc.)

**Faculty may choose whether to average grades or use a sampling approach** (Averaging grades might work best with multiple choice assessment approaches, while sampling works better with papers, projects, speeches, etc.)

**ULO assessment is not evaluation of individual faculty or students.** Reports focus on how courses support institution-wide goals for undergraduate student learning.

**Aggregated data will be shared back with faculty for Phase 2 “sense making” and focusing attention on areas for student learning improvement.**
Submitting Assessment Reports

1. Choosing data and sharing it with Foundational Studies for Reporting
Decision Tree to help you choose data for assessment reporting

What data should I use?

What evidence do my students already produce?

Graded tests

- Do some test questions assess specific ULOs?
  - Yes
    - You could average results and convert to ULO scores.
      - See pg. 8 for more detail on using tests.
  - No
    - Review questions and align them to ULO criteria.
      - See pg. 9 for more detail on sampling strategies.

Essays and projects

- Do they provide evidence of ULO proficiency?
  - Yes
    - You could score a small sample of papers.
      - See pg. 10 for example use of ungraded work.
  - No
    - Consider altering prompt or assignment to align to ULO criteria.
      - See CTL assessment resources for classroom assessment

Ungraded classwork

- Does it capture evidence of ULO proficiency?
  - Yes
    - You could review and rate the work based on the ULO rubric.
      - See pg. 11 for using e-portfolios for assessment
  - No
    - See CTL assessment resources for classroom assessment

E-portfolios

- Do they capture evidence of ULO proficiency?
  - Yes
    - You could use the ULO rubric in Digication.
  - No
    - Consider adding an e-portfolio requirement to your class

You could use the ULO rubric in Digication.
See pg. 11 for using e-portfolios for assessment
Example: Using scores on tests, quizzes, or other multiple choice items for assessment.

This page provides an example used by several DLM faculty who track scores on math problems that have been mapped to the ULO criteria. It works well in large classes with multiple choice assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem #</th>
<th>ULO</th>
<th>1 7.1</th>
<th>2 7.3/7.4</th>
<th>3 7.3/7.2</th>
<th>4 7.3/7.4</th>
<th>5 7.5/7.1</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student #</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Averages for all students are combined and an estimate for the proficiency level is determined for the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg scores for each ULO</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>ULO Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Using speeches, projects, essays, or similar by assessing a sample and not the full class set.

Sampling strategy: Faculty may assess student work for ULO assessment based on the sampling strategy included in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class size</th>
<th>Number of random samples drawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>10% (5-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101+</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some classes use “non graded work” for formative assessment during the semester. This work can inform assessment as well.

Case A: Professor used “minute papers” 4 times during the semester.
1. Each time she assessed students’ ability to communicate mathematical ideas.
2. She divides the stack into Exemplary (4), Good (3), Developing (2), and Unsatisfactory (1) and finds the average for the class each time.
3. She averages the score over the 4 times that she uses this method.
4. The combined average score for the class is a “3” -- which is entered for the “non-graded work” assessment.

Case B: Professor used a combination of graded and non-graded work using the approaches described in this document.
1. He reports these scores for graded work AND non graded work on the form for the criteria covered by each.
**Example: Using e-portfolios for assessment.**

1. **Add an Assignment**
   
   Digication e-Portfolios can be used to collect and assess evidence without the need to fill out a separate Qualtrics survey.

2. **Have students submit their portfolios**

3. **Use university rubrics to assess & report within Digication.**

For help setting up an e-portfolio assignment that includes a ULO assessment rubric, contact the IDEA Shop at 208-426-3214 or Foundational Studies at 208-426-4057.
Submitting Assessment Reports

1. Choosing data and sharing it with Foundational Studies for Reporting
2. Submitting data through the survey link you will receive by email at the end of the semester.
The following survey is designed to collect assessment reports from faculty teaching Disciplinary Lens courses that are part of the Foundational Studies Program. We will be focusing on the PROFICIENCY scores (1-4) that faculty provide and combining them with other Disciplinary Lens courses in your DL category.

Descriptions of the proficiency levels for your DL category are available on the rubrics for the DL categories. Please navigate to: http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/university-learning-outcomes/. It is recommended that you open the rubric for your DL category to have available in another window while you complete this survey.

IF YOU ENCOUNTER DIFFICULTY WITH THIS SURVEY PLEASE CONTACT FOUNDAATIONAL STUDIES.

SELECT YOUR COURSE PREFIX and NUMBER from the box below

Please complete one survey per course that you are teaching. Multiple sections of the same course can be combined on one report.

ENGL 202

Please indicate how many class sections are included in this report:

1
If you are using an e-portfolio for assessment in your class, and you complete this section, the survey will send you to the questions on page 17.
I conducted assessment using Digication e-Portfolios and have completed ULO Rubrics in that site.

- Yes
- No
Screen shot of the Assessment Reporting Survey you’ll receive

You do not need to complete every criteria (column headings contain criteria). Please leave cell blank if you do not have data for a criteria. You may submit data for graded and/or ungraded evidence of learning. Please include data that have been aggregated for the class (not individual student scores) with the average scores for the evidence.

Please see the Disciplinary Lens course rubric for Social Sciences (ULO 11) for proficiency scoring details: 4 = Exemplary; 3 = Good; 2 = Developing; 1 = Unsatisfactory
(Note: Please allow pop-up windows to see rubric)

See http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/assess for more details on reporting assessment data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.1 Understanding of individuals as members of a particular culture and/or community</th>
<th>11.2 Understanding of historical and/or cultural forces</th>
<th>11.3 Reasoning, inquiry, problem solving</th>
<th>11.4 Responsibility, personal reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If using graded assessment - enter the class average (grades as a percentage of 100) for criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of mean scores to proficiency level (score 1-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If using non-graded assessment interpret students' proficiency here (score 1-4) Note: formative assessment might include minute papers, ungraded concept maps, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This instructor used a combination of “graded” and non graded work. Some criteria are left blank.
A brief explanation of the data collected for assessment is requested in the report.

In the space below, please provide a summary of the assignments (tests, quizzes, projects, etc.) collected during this semester that you are basing this report upon.

What conclusions have you drawn from your assessment data about the students’ learning?

Describe the ways in which the conclusions that you have drawn in above have implications for future course planning or instructional methods.
Please keep in mind

• You may report on any combination of data.
• We are *not* interested in course section identification and assessment is never used for faculty evaluation.
• Data coming from graded or ungraded class work is equally as acceptable.
• Faculty determine the performance in their course relative to proficiency level.
• “Excellent (4)” is expected to be the level attained by graduating students; a score of 2 or 3 may be very reasonable for many DL courses.
Resources

• Foundational Studies Program (Vicki Stieha vickistieha@boisestate.edu or 426-4057)
• Institutional Research (Sarah Toevs stoevs@boisestate.edu)
• Center for Teaching and Learning (426-4610)
• CTL resources on assessment: http://ctl.boisestate.edu/resources/links/a-z/#assessment
• Ideas for assessment (FSP page): http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/category/ideas-for-assessment/