Report of the FSP Council Assessment Plan

A subgroup of the FSP Council met Friday, April 18, 2014 and crafted two halves of this proposal (1) addressed the periodic assessment of all ULOs over a 4 year cycle and (2) addressed the Continuous Improvement Cycle.

Attendees: Damoni Wright, Brian Hodges, Caile Spear, Heidi Estrem, Shari Ellertson, Shauna Anderson, Melissa Keith, Vicki Stieha

Focus of this session: To address the following question:

How can we make sense of the ULOs and the criteria so that Foundational Studies’ ULO assessment can move forward in reasonable timeframe and transparent and meaningful way?

On May 6, 2014 the full FSP Council convened and reviewed the Assessment Plan. The plan (as presented below) was unanimously approved with no abstentions by the members in attendance.

Attendees: John Bieter, Becca Sibrian, Brian Hodges, Caile Spear, Damoni Wright, Daryl Macomb, Debbie Kaylor, Eric Landrum, Heidi Estrem, Sasha Wang, Shari Ellertson, Shauna Anderson, Vicki Stieha

Absent: Melissa Keith, Kristen Mitchell

AIMS: The goal of the ULO Assessment Plan is to provide course and category (e.g. DLL, DLM) level learning outcomes assessment reporting in such a way that the university can inform decisions about course alignment, content, and pedagogy with the intention of supporting stronger learning gains within the undergraduate student population

Important assumptions guiding this plan include:

- Assessment is part of teaching and learning
- Assessment that is authentic (connected to) the course is most effective
- Assessment should not be conducted for the sole purpose of satisfying external regulators. Assessment that is generative for faculty and students will satisfy external.

PROCESS:

**Assessment Plan**

Periodic Assessment of all ULOs over 4 year cycle

| Year I Assessment Group | Oral Communication (2) | DL Visual & Performing Arts (9) | DL Literature and Humanities (10) |
Year 2 Assessment Group: Diversity (6) | DL Social Science (11) | Ethics (5)

Year 3 Assessment Group: Critical Inquiry (3) | DL Mathematics (7) | DL Natural, Physical, Applied Science (8)

Year 4 Assessment Group: Writing (1) | Teamwork/Innovation (4) | Review of Assessment Process

* See "rationale for periodic review" below for explanation of the assessment cycle.

Guiding Question

The assessment questions will be: How well are students achieving the outcomes? And how do you know?

Faculty will provide: Report summarizing assessment results for the course, assignment(s) used to assess ULOs, examples of student work (along with the associated assignment), evaluation criteria.

Sampling strategy: Faculty may sample student work for ULO assessment based on the sampling strategy included in the table below. Non-academic programs may use the same sampling approach based on program/event population.

<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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 +</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course reports (program reports from non-academic units) will be sent to the FSP Council. Assessors would review the assessment results and aggregate all sections of a course to provide a course level report for departmental reporting use.

[Ideally, in departments or programs a team of individuals would have reviewed reports for potential changes and enhancements to support learning prior to sending to the FSP Council. Doing so, however, is not currently funded centrally and would need to be incorporated into department or program workload.]

Assessors would then aggregate all course/non-academic program reports for category level reports (e.g. all DLV courses would be aggregated and the data would be assessed). Category level reports would be routed to the Provost’s office (for accreditation reporting) and to the appropriate faculty senate subcommittees.

Continuous Improvement Cycle
The cycle recommendations were made to balance the assessment across the four year period. We wanted to spread the signature learning outcomes (1-6) over the 4 year period. We were mindful of the courses that were still being rolled out (in 2014-15 CIDs will be fully implemented and in 2015-16 FFs will be fully implemented). We also considered the time needed to establish the e-Portfolio on campus and to support expansion into classes beyond the first year.

The first year ULOs 2, 9, and 10 were chosen because we are already assessing Oral Communication in UF 100 and 300. The faculty teaching CID courses can be added in 2014-15. DLV is a small category and most of the courses are similar in size and structure (large lecture classes). DLL includes two disciplines that have been working on and thinking about assessment for some time (World Languages and English) and most of the courses use writing as a mode for instruction.

The second year inclusion of ULOs 5 & 6 in conjunction with ULO 11 (Social Sciences) brings together issues of culture and difference shared across all the ULOs, albeit in very different ways. ULOs 5 & 6 are assessed annually in UF 200 and 300.

The third year adds 3, 7, and 8. We have been assessing all three of these ULOs in smaller ways. ULO 3 is assessed annually in UF 100 and 300. ULOs 7 and 8 have been assessed in DL courses for STEM majors through an NSF funded research project, CALIPER.

The fourth year includes ULO 1 and 4 (Teamwork & Innovation). Again, both have been assessed elsewhere annually in UF 100, 300, and in the FYW Program. We will be adding assessment from CIDs and FF courses to those ongoing assessment efforts. The FFs will have had time to get up and running and the e-Portfolio system should be fully integrated by this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>ULOs 2, 9, 10</th>
<th>ULOs 5, 6, 11 + CID</th>
<th>ULOs 3, 7, 8 + FF</th>
<th>ULOs 1, 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DETAILS:

- Faculty may use quantitative methods and/or qualitative methods as well as sampling of student generated assessment artifacts for assessment.
- Faculty will generate assessment reports based on the student learning outcomes in their course.
- Assessment reports are shared by the faculty within a course for the purpose of informing course design decisions.
- Following the phases above, faculty committees will review assessment reports from multiple courses to determine if we are meeting our learning outcomes goals for students within that category. See phase notes for more on this process.
- The emphasis will be to provide faculty development and course development support intended to bolster continuous improvement of teaching and learning.
- Findings from course category groups will be shared with FSP and with appropriate faculty senate bodies. Summaries of findings and action plans will be shared with the Provost’s office for accreditation reporting.