Assessment is the process of gathering and discussing information from multiple and diverse sources in order to develop a deep understanding of what students know, understand, and can do with their knowledge as a result of their educational experiences; the process culminates when assessment results are used to improve student learning.
The main goal of LAT is to

1) bring awareness to the campus community relative to the growing importance of assessing student learning in academia,

2) help as possible in enhancing assessment activities, and

3) Improve student learning.
WHAT LAT DOES PROVIDE

- Facilitate faculty/department projects.
- Facilitate workshops and presentations.
- Inform others about ongoing activities relative to learning outcomes assessment. (IRAP website, college/department consultation, … etc.)
- Provide constructive feedback. (Assessment Review, Summer ‘10, ‘11)
Motivation

- Determine the level of activities on campus relative to student learning outcomes assessment.
- Provide programs/departments with suggestions for changes and additional activities that may help us all become more engaged and aware of expectations.
Posted SOAPs on the IRAP website.

Reported activities in the college’s annual report.
SOAP REVIEW

- SOAP Elements  (see template on IRAP)
- Current
- Assessability
- Curriculum Map*
- Assessment Methods (Variety including alumni survey)
- Alignment of methods with outcomes*
- Defined Standards
- Closing the Loop*

* Most often missing and/or scored low
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## SOAP Review Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Elements</strong></td>
<td>missing ≥3 elements</td>
<td>Missing 2 elements</td>
<td>Missing one element</td>
<td>all required elements are included</td>
<td>all required elements are included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td>Out of date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to date with current timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessability of Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Most outcomes do not include measureable verbs</td>
<td>Some outcomes do not include measureable verbs or are unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All outcomes are clear and assessable with measureable verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum Map</strong></td>
<td>no curriculum map</td>
<td>Curriculum map included but no levels of emphasis for each outcome indicated for each course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum map with levels of emphasis for each outcome indicated for each course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variety of Methods</strong></td>
<td>Only one method</td>
<td>A mixture of direct and indirect methods used with strong emphasis on indirect methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>A mixture of direct and indirect methods used</td>
<td>A mixture of direct and indirect methods used with strong emphasis on direct methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment of Instruments/Methods with Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Methods not provided</td>
<td>Methods provided are unlikely to measure stated outcomes</td>
<td>Methods are unclear whether they align with outcomes</td>
<td>methods seem appropriate for almost all of the learning outcomes</td>
<td>Methods align well with stated outcomes and will provide quality data on achievement of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defined Standards</strong></td>
<td>no standard methods such as a rubric for evaluating student work are used</td>
<td>Rubrics or standards for evaluating work are mentioned (but not included) but no benchmarks for student achievement are established</td>
<td>Rubrics or standards for evaluating work are mentioned (but not included) along with benchmarks for student achievement</td>
<td>Rubrics or standards for evaluating work are included along with benchmarks for student achievement</td>
<td>Rubrics or standards for evaluating work are included along with benchmarks for student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process for Closing Loop</strong></td>
<td>no process included</td>
<td>some process for closing the loop is described, but not clear if faculty reflection or change will result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a clear process for closing the loop which is likely to result in meaningful reflection and change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall SOAP Rating</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOAP is posted, but is outdated/not current</td>
<td>SOAP is current, but does not contain all required elements</td>
<td>SOAP is current and contains all required elements</td>
<td>SOAP is current, contains all required elements and is of high quality with established benchmarks for student performance on outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW

• Alignment with SOAP (Assessed learning outcomes and instruments used)
• Findings from data
• Changes made

* Low score
## Annual Report Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment with SOAP (#1 and #2)</strong></td>
<td>Activities are not consistent with the SOAP and don't make sense</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities are not exactly aligned with the SOAP but seem reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities align with methods and timeline given in SOAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discovery from data (#3)</strong></td>
<td>No clear evidence that data was compiled</td>
<td>No evidence that data was carefully analyzed and conclusions not clearly based on evidence</td>
<td>Clear evidence that data was analyzed, but conclusions not based on evidence</td>
<td>Some conclusions are drawn based on evidence</td>
<td>Report shows careful consideration of data and insight into strengths and weakness of student performance are identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes Made (#4)</strong></td>
<td>No response to conclusions that seem to require action</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible action items were considered for conclusions presented</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate action was taken based on the conclusions made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Annual Report Summary Rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Engagement in Assessment Activity Rating</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No assessment activity reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment activity reported, but no changes or planned changes made as a result of data or reported changes were unrelated to assessment findings.</td>
<td>Assessment activity reported along with relevant changes* made or planned based on student performance as related to established benchmarks.</td>
<td>Assessment activity reported along with relevant changes* made or planned based on student performance as related to established benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little assessment activity reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment activity reported along with relevant changes* made or planned based on student performance as related to established benchmarks.</td>
<td>Assessment activity reported along with relevant changes* made or planned based on student performance as related to established benchmarks.</td>
<td>Assessment activity reported along with relevant changes* made or planned based on student performance as related to established benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* note - relevant changes include a decision not to change anything if the data support this conclusion.
• Developed rubrics for SOAP and Annual Report Review.
• Held a norming session for several programs.
• About 60 undergraduate programs were reviewed independently by two LAT members. (SOAPs and Annual reports)
• The two reviewers discussed their ratings and reached consensus.
• The LAT group discussed each program review to ensure uniformity and to provide summary comments for constructive feedback to programs.
**FINDINGS**

**Summer ‘10**
- Twelve programs didn’t have a published SOAP on IRAP website.
- Overall campus SOAP rating was 1.6/4.0.
- Overall campus assessment activities rating was 1.7/4.0.

**Summer ‘11**
- Three programs don’t have a published SOAP on IRAP website. (2 of the 3 were received after the review)
- Overall campus SOAP rating is 2.2/4.0.
- Overall campus assessment activities rating is 2.3/4.0.
• The campus is moving in the right direction.
• What is an acceptable target?
ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

- 18 programs scored higher than 2.0 in both overall scores this year. (It was only 6 programs last year.)
- Some programs substituted GE assessment for assessment based on the SOAP.
- Many programs report vague generalities without supporting evidence.
EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

- Nursing
- Communicative Disorders & Deaf Studies
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

• We are on the right track.
• Update the SOAP to rectify shortcomings.
• Keep your eye on the SOAP and implement it according to the time-line.
• Use results for decision making
• Annual reports need to be more complete and in line with the published SOAP.
THANK YOU