

Documenting and Advancing Graduate Learning at KU: A Resource Guide for Departments and Programs

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Overview | 1 |
| Developing Goals and Criteria | 5 |
| Program Goals | 6 |
| Unit Consensus | 8 |
| Developing Evaluation Frameworks | 10 |
| Collecting Student Work | 13 |
| Mapping Program Goals in the Curriculum | 14 |
| Gathering Evidence | 16 |
| Evaluating Progress | 19 |
| Reviewing Evidence | 20 |
| Determining Next Steps..... | 25 |
| Improving Student Learning..... | 26 |
| Improving the Assessment Process | 28 |
| Reporting to Groups Outside the Department..... | 30 |
| RESOURCES | 35 |
| A: Making Assessment Worthwhile | 36 |
| B: Developing Frameworks | 37 |
| C: Sample Department Plan | 42 |
| D: Sample Student Permission Form..... | 49 |
| E: Suggested Readings..... | 50 |

A publication of the Center for Teaching Excellence
Editor: Judy Eddy
University of Kansas
Budig Hall
1455 Jayhawk Blvd. #135
Lawrence, KS 66045-7573
Phone 785.864.4199 • cte@ku.edu • www.cte.ku.edu

OVERVIEW

Faculty members in many KU departments and programs are asking “What do we want students to learn in our courses?” and “How can we tell if our majors are prepared to succeed in our field?” This guide was developed with the help of departments who participated in a pilot program that addressed those questions, and the guide outlines steps the departments found useful. The process described here captures students’ progress in an entire program, not an evaluation of an individual course or an individual instructor. By completing this process, departments can identify areas where they are achieving learning goals and discover areas that would benefit from development.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Developing goals and criteria

In a conversation with the whole faculty, the department/unit discusses what they want to know about the intellectual skills, knowledge and understanding of students as they progress through the program. The department identifies key goals that a successful student would demonstrate. A small committee articulates sub-components of each goal. The committee then describes what beginning, intermediate and advanced understanding might look like for each component.

With the support of the chair, the committee presents its list of goals and a framework for evaluation to the whole department for commentary and refinement. Once feedback is incorporated, the initial round of evaluation is based on these shared goals.

After the department reaches consensus on goals and criteria for evaluation, the committee and the chair ask colleagues to identify which of these goals are covered in their courses or at critical points in a program. The committee uses this information to construct a map showing which courses provide instruction on the primary program goals. The committee and the chair can use the map to ask faculty colleagues to identify assignments in their courses that give students the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and understanding.

Collecting student work

Once the department has a map, the unit collects examples of student work to build an archive for each course goal. The archive should include work from multiple courses and instructors. Samples should be selected from assignments that give students a chance to show high-level achievement.

The feedback from this evaluation will be based on an entire program, not just any individual course, so it is important that each sample of student work reflect a range of courses that would contribute to the student’s achievement of that goal.

WHAT WE’VE LEARNED

The School of Pharmacy has participated in the Documenting Learner Success pilot program for several years. This project has provided a forum for us to exchange ideas about assessing student performance in realistic patient care situations. It has helped us continue to expand our assessment activities and step beyond traditional fill-in-the-blank, short answer and multiple-choice exams with ones that simulate real clinical settings and require students to assimilate skills from many different domains to develop and implement care plans.

—Ron Ragan

Evaluating progress

At this point, the committee brings a prospective framework for evaluation to colleagues for approval. When they review the framework, department members should focus on whether the framework, overall, captures student development from beginning to advanced understanding.

A larger group of department members constitute a reading committee (which could include graduate students, as explained on the following page) to identify patterns of student performance in the unit archive. Using the identified criteria, readers describe how student work is distributed across the framework of learning goals and components of achievement levels. This description is not based on grades from individual courses, but on an independent reading of demonstrated skill in the quality of the student work found in assignments from a range of courses.

After evaluating student work, the reading committee prepares a summary document and presents it to the department. The department receives an overall picture of strengths and weaknesses in the range of understanding and knowledge among students at a particular point in the program.

Determining next steps

Using the summary of how many students are at each level of development on each goal, the department as a whole reflects upon what this evidence tells them about how well students are meeting learning goals, and the department identifies changes they might implement to better accomplish their own programmatic objectives.

OPTIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS/UNITS

A few years ago, the Provost's Office asked the Center for Teaching Excellence to develop a pilot program and serve as a consultant to various units on campus as they identified ways to document learning in their programs. CTE's role was to offer resources and feedback, organize meetings with unit representatives, and provide examples of assessment processes. Based on the success of this pilot project, a menu of options were designed to assist units as they document and develop program learning, listed below:

- Independent unit measurement: Unit works independently to define, track and report outcomes.
- Online resources and guidelines: Unit chooses from several examples and guidelines on the CTE website to identify how they will define, track, and report outcomes.
- Workshop/collaborative support: Unit sends representatives to collaborative workshops facilitated by CTE (workshop schedule available at www.cte.ku.edu/schedule). As a supplement to online resources, the workshops will provide dedicated opportunities to share and discuss goals, methods and progress for defining, tracking and reporting outcomes.
- Individual unit consultation: Unit works one-on-one with CTE Faculty Fellow or staff to discuss goals, methods and progress for defining, tracking and reporting outcomes. This option can be used in addition to the collaborative workshops and/or online resources available on the CTE website.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Before a department begins this program, the chair and other department leaders need to be committed to the process. Leadership buy-in would be demonstrated by periodic inclusion of this project on faculty meeting agendas and in the service structure of the department. When chairs set a reasonable timeline for the activities, with target dates, the process is most likely to continue.

This process is continuous and iterative. Frequently observing and discussing the quality of students' work is part of a successful instructional program. The key to sustaining the process is gathering a small but random and representative sample of work all the time, asking only central questions on a subset of goals in a subset of years. Over time the pattern of evidence of learning will make sense, so it is better to be selective and steady than to do too much in a given year.

In the following pages, the process is sketched in optimal order of occurrence, but departments are encouraged to modify the steps based on their needs and purposes. Information that should be included in reports is noted in the Process Notes column; supplemental information and examples are provided for each step, as well. For assistance with any part of the process, contact the Center for Teaching Excellence at 864-4199 or cte@ku.edu.

Developing Goals and Criteria

Program Goals

PROCESS NOTES

REPORT:

What are the department's key program goals?

What might beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of understanding of each goal look like?

Going Deeper:

Why is it necessary for students to achieve the key goals?

What background knowledge and experiences do students bring to the program?

NOTA BENE: PROGRAM GOALS

Faculty members in the School of Music's composition program have identified 12 main program goals. Identifying these goals and describing each one has laid the groundwork for developing frameworks to evaluate students' achievements in the program.

In a conversation involving the whole faculty, the department/unit should discuss what they want to know about the intellectual skills, knowledge, and understanding of students as they progress through the program. In many units this has already been accomplished through interaction with accrediting bodies and professional organizations, making the first step straightforward. The department's conversation should include recognizing that there will be variation in the success that students demonstrate.

In the early stages of this process, the department should identify and select a handful of key program goals, or central features, that a successful student would show in your department. In every discipline, there are a few intellectual goals that most professionals see as essential. The process should focus initially on that limited subset, rather than the full domain from the outset.

A small committee (generally two to four people) should be appointed to articulate sub-components of each goal, including knowledge, skills, and broad understanding. The committee would begin to describe what beginning, intermediate, and advanced understanding might look like for each component. This framework provides a road map for the process, so it should be constructed with some care.

EXAMPLE 1: PROGRAM GOALS—SCHOOL OF MUSIC MASTER OF MUSIC IN COMPOSITION

Key goals and descriptors

Knowledge of repertoire and literature:

Knowledge and understanding of literature, schools and trends. Able to critically assess extant works and composers.

Engraving standards:

Proficient with engraving and demonstrates knowledge of accepted practice. Professional-level layout and presentation.

Orchestration:

Distinctive and creative approach to the use of instruments alone and in ensembles. Coloristically sophisticated. Musical ideas are thoughtfully and excellently balanced.

Counterpoint: Insightful control of multiple lines. Discusses contrapuntal problems with insight and sophistication.

Form and structure: Excellent and imaginative treatment of form, and sophisticated understanding of musical syntax in the context of time. Can expound with authority on use of form.

Creativity: Music demonstrates significant creative gift in the service of inspired musical utterance.

Harmonic language: Music demonstrates sophisticated and insightful use of harmonic language appropriate to the individual work.

Creation of a body of work: A full program of convincingly constructed music, marked by creative insight, careful craftwork and unfettered originality.

Oral communication: Converses well, with accuracy and sophistication. Demonstrates insight drawing together elements of his/her knowledge. Offers and defends opinions.

Written communication: Prepares meaningful and insightful program notes elucidating his/her work.

Vision: Communicates a clear vision of his/her anticipated artistic path. Can explain and elaborate in a sophisticated way on issues of philosophy, inspiration, beauty, truth and musical life.

Concert production: Demonstrates initiative, organization and creativity in producing a concert of well-rehearsed music.

Unit Consensus

PROCESS NOTES

REPORT:

Does the department, in general, agree that the initial goals are a good place to start?

Does the department, in general, believe that the framework captures students' development from beginning to advanced understanding?

NOTA BENE: UNIT CONSENSUS

The School of Music's Vocal Performance graduate program goals and levels of understanding are clearly tied to students' preparation for careers on the operatic or concert stage. The program also fits well into the wider mission of higher education, focusing on expertise in languages, research in a variety of musical styles and periods, awareness of historical and cultural contexts, literary criticism and text analysis, and in depth score study. Faculty members in the program have agreed that resulting performances should reflect that broad mission.

The next step is for the committee to condense the list to three to five key program goals and create an evaluation framework that describes beginning, intermediate and advanced understanding of each goal. With the support of the chair, the committee will present its list of goals and a framework for evaluation to the whole department for commentary and refinement.

Once feedback is incorporated, the initial round of evaluation will be based on these shared goals. Both the goals and the framework of evaluation can be revised or expanded, based on the evidence generated by their initial use.

EXAMPLE 1: LEVELS OF UNDERSTANDING—SCHOOL OF MUSIC MASTER'S AND DMA IN VOCAL PERFORMANCE

Criteria for evaluation of candidates completing graduate programs in voice performance (a numerical scale follows for each area to be evaluated):

Note: It should be borne in mind that the graduate programs in voice performance at the University of Kansas are intended to prepare the individual for some type of professional career as a singer.

Vocal quality:

- 4 – The singer has an exceptionally beautiful tone quality and is capable of singing evenly and well throughout the voice range, with exceptional legato and intonation.
- 3 – The singer has a lovely voice and sings with very good legato and intonation.
- 2 – The singer has a pleasing instrument and uses it moderately well.
- 1 – The singer is deficient in the basic requirements for singing professionally, with regard to tone quality, intonation and legato.

Languages:

- 4 – The singer demonstrates exceptional fluency, diction and comprehension in the standard languages of English, French, German and Italian, along with a special sense of expressiveness and phrasing.
- 3 – The singer demonstrates very good fluency, diction and comprehension in the standard languages of English, French, German and Italian.
- 2 – The singer demonstrates adequate mastery in the standard languages of English, French, German and Italian.
- 1 – The singer's language abilities are significantly below the standard in the industry.

Musicianship:

- 4 – The singer is able to accurately prepare and execute the musical demands of repertoire at the highest level of difficulty. This would include complex contemporary scores that present significant harmonic and rhythmic challenges. The singer is, moreover, able to bring a highly developed sense of style to the performance of vocal repertoire of differing genres and historical periods.
- 3 – The singer is able to accurately prepare and execute the musical demands of repertoire at a high level of difficulty. The singer's performance also demonstrates an awareness of appropriate style as it relates to different genres and historical periods of vocal repertoire.
- 2 – The singer demonstrates reasonably adequate preparation of vocal repertoire and performs with a modest sense of style in repertoire of various genres and historical periods.
- 1 – The singer's musical preparation is inadequate.

Expressiveness:

- 4 – The singer possesses an intuitive and very personal relationship with the text of a song, which he/she is able to translate into an exceptionally affecting, emotionally satisfying performance.
- 3 – The singer has an above average sensibility of the text of the song and a similar ability to express that sensibility in a performance.
- 2 – The singer has some understanding of and some ability to expressively perform song literature.
- 1 – The singer has little to communicate expressively.

Predicted success based on an averaged score:

- 3.5 – 4 The singer is well-fitted for the pursuit of a career as a professional singer, and possesses the necessary tools to be successful in the profession.
- 3 – 3.5 The singer shows promise of further development and maturation as an artist.
- 2.5 – 3 The singer can sing competently at an amateur level.

Singers scoring below a 3 are unlikely to possess enough natural ability to overcome their deficiencies.

Developing Evaluation Frameworks

PROCESS NOTES

REPORT:

Submit a framework that identifies goals and levels of achievement (beginning, intermediate, advanced) for each goal. The report should include the date the department reviewed, revised (if necessary) and approved the final framework.

NOTA BENE: FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT

On the following page, an excerpt of the fourth draft of the Master of Music in Composition evaluation framework is provided. For more information about developing frameworks, see the Resources section of this booklet.

A successful academic program guides students' intellectual growth from the perspective and knowledge of a beginner to a more advanced and nuanced level of understanding. Faculty need to articulate their perception of these levels of development so that readers of student work can identify how far students have come along that path toward intellectual maturity and sophistication. Some development is well captured by description of a amount or range. For example, breadth of knowledge of the findings of a particular field of study lends itself to descriptions based on more or less. Other forms of development will be represented by qualitative shifts in sophistication, in treatment of observations or evidence, or in layers of capacity for conceptual analysis.

Establishing these frameworks is important. Skill can be learned by reading examples from a familiar field or by reading books on framework design and using them as guides.

After developing a draft, the committee brings the prospective framework for evaluation to faculty colleagues for discussion and approval. When they review the framework, department members should focus on whether the framework, overall, captures student development from beginning to advanced understanding.

Revising framework language can be incorporated so that assigning levels of understanding is as straightforward as possible. Additional refinements in the framework language are typically part of the first wave of reading student work, but the systems of judgment quickly become stable and reliable indicators of intellectual development.

FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT

Developing frameworks can be a difficult step. Departments that have been most successful with this task have approached it this way:

- Start by focusing on program goals. Oftentimes goals will help you make explicit the knowledge, skills and understanding you want students to develop in your program.
- Keep it simple, at least at the beginning. For each goal, list basic characteristics that novices, intermediate and advanced students might demonstrate for each goal.
- Sample some student work to see if those products reflect key points in the framework.
- Give the framework a test run. Ask a small group of readers to use the framework to evaluate samples of student work.
- Using feedback from the trial run, revise the framework. Be willing to make more minor revisions when necessary.

| Framework for the Master of Music in Composition (Fourth Draft) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | M.M. Recital | M.M. Thesis | M.M. Oral Exam |
| Knowledge of Repertoire and Literature | | | <p>3. Insightful verbal commentary on contemporary music. A commanding understanding of contemporary schools and trends. Able to offer convincing critical assessments of extant works and composers.</p> <p>2. Demonstrates knowledge of literature, schools and trends. Able to offer critical assessment of extant works and composers.</p> <p>1. Incomplete knowledge of literature, trends, major composers. Superficial evaluation of extant works.</p> <p>0. Poor knowledge of the literature. Unable to evaluate extant music critically.</p> |
| Orchestration | <p>3. Recital demonstrates unique and creative approach to the use of instruments alone and in ensembles. Coloristically sophisticated. All musical ideas are thoughtfully and masterfully balanced.</p> <p>2. Demonstrates competent orchestration. Many interesting colors. Adequate and clear balance between instruments.</p> <p>1. Recital reveals hurried, sloppy or uneven balance in orchestration. Few coloristic successes. Musical ideas are occasionally confused or obscured.</p> <p>0. Recital demonstrates poor understanding of orchestration practice. Colors are dull. Ideas often muddled or obscured.</p> | <p>3. Document demonstrates unique and creative approach to the use of instruments alone and in ensembles. Coloristically sophisticated. All musical ideas are thoughtfully and insightfully balanced.</p> <p>2. Document demonstrates competent orchestration. Many interesting colors. Adequate, clear balance between instruments.</p> <p>1. Hurried, sloppy or uneven effectiveness in orchestration. Few coloristic successes. Musical ideas occasionally muddled or obscured.</p> <p>0. Document demonstrates poor understanding of orchestration. Colors are dull. Ideas often confused or obscured.</p> | <p>3. Candidate verbally communicates sophisticated understanding of orchestration practice. Reads and interprets scores accurately and insightfully at sight.</p> <p>2. Candidate verbally communicates understanding of orchestration practice. Reads and interprets scores accurately at sight.</p> <p>1. Verbally communicates adequate but incomplete understanding of orchestration. Reads scores accurately at sight, but has difficulty interpreting compositional intent from the orchestration.</p> <p>0. Inadequate understanding of orchestration. Reads scores poorly, with little interpretive insight.</p> |

Collecting Student Work

Mapping Program Goals in the Curriculum

PROCESS NOTES

Getting Started:

What materials (assignments, exams, portfolios, studio work) link to program goals? Consider key points in undergraduate or graduate programs (capstone courses, comprehensive exams).

How do students demonstrate beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of understanding in the materials with respect to each key program goal?

REPORT:

Using this information, map how the curriculum or program meets key goals.

After the department reaches consensus on goals and criteria for evaluation, the committee and the chair ask colleagues to identify in writing which key goals are covered in their courses or at critical points in a program. For each covered component, the faculty member would describe briefly how students have an opportunity to demonstrate beginning, intermediate, or accomplished levels of achievement.

The committee uses this information to construct a map showing which courses provide instruction on the primary program goals. The map can be presented to the department for discussion, including suggestions for reducing redundant teaching or bolstering instruction for goals that seem underserved. This conversation may be helpful in identifying and filling in pieces missing from the instructional plan.

The committee and the chair can use the map to ask faculty colleagues to identify assignments in their courses that give students the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and understanding. The map, showing the location of goals within courses, can also locate goal-relevant assignments within courses.

EXAMPLE 1: MAPPING GOALS IN THE CURRICULUM—INTER-CAMPUS PROGRAM IN COMMUNICATIVE DISORDERS

The KU Intercampus Program in Communicative Disorders combines the faculty, research and clinical facilities of two departments: Speech-Language-Hearing: Sciences and Disorders, located on the Lawrence campus, and Hearing and Speech, located at the KU Medical Center in Kansas City. All graduate degrees are conferred through the joint Intercampus Program and include the Master of Arts in Speech-Language Pathology, the Doctor of Philosophy in Speech-Language Pathology and in Audiology, and the Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.).

Graduate students typically complete nine courses the first year and three clinical practica at in-house clinics. During the second year, students complete three additional courses, two required seminars, one to two full-time clinical placements off-site in the community, and one research experience. One of the challenges of this type of program is aligning training goals across classroom and clinical experiences so that students can apply knowledge gained in one domain to the other.

To see how program goals, courses and clinical experiences matched up, faculty members from the department developed the following grid, which links goals and knowledge areas with specific courses.

| Program Goals | Knowledge Areas (adapted from ASHA) | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|--|--|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Articulation/ Phonology | Fluency | Phonation/ Resonance | Receptive/ Expressive Language | Hearing | Swallowing | Cognition | Social | Modalities |
| 1. Understand basic concepts, terminology, and theory | 465/466* 565/566 816 665* 764D 764E 820* 822 828 864* 864 880A* | 764R* 824* 864* 864 | 764D 764I* 822 826* 828 864* 864 | 466* 565/566* 816* 764C 764E 764M 840* 842* 844* 846* 848 854* 864* 864 | 663* 668 669 698 SPED745 | 764D 832* 840 864* 864 | 764D 764E 764N 844 850* 854* 864* 864 | 565/566 816 764A* 764C 764N 840 842 848 850 864* 864 | 565/566 816 764C 764E 764L* 764M 764P I 822 840 846 848 852* 864* 864 |
| 2. Develop an assessment plan | 665 820* 822 828 864* 864 880A | 764R* 824* 864* 864 | 764I* 822 826* 828 864* 864 | 764M 840* 842* 844* 846* 848 854* 864* 864 | N/A | 832* 864* 864 | 842 844 850* 854* 864* 864 | 764A* 764C 764N 840 842 848 850 864* 864 | 764L* 764M 764P I 822 846 848 852* 864* 864 |
| 3. Analyze and integrate assessment findings | 465/466 565/566 816 665 820* 822 828 864* 864 880A | 764R* 824* 864* 864 | 764I* 822 826* 828 864* 864 | 565/566 816 764M 840* 842* 844* 846* 848 854* 864* | 668* 669* 698 764H* SPED745 | 832* 864* 864 | 844 850* 854* 864* 864 | 764A* 764C 764N 840 842 848 850 864* 864 | 764L* 764M 764P I 822 840 846 848 852* 864* 864 |
| 4. Determine presence of disorder and related factors | 665 820* 822 828 864* 864 880A | 764R* 824* 864* 864 | 764I* 822 826* 828 864* 864 | 764M 840* 842* 844* 846* 854* 864* 864 | 668* 669* 764H* | 832* 864* 864 | 844 850* 854* 864* 864 | 764A* 764C 840 842 848 850 864* 864 | 764L* 764M 764P I 822 840 846 848 852* 864* 864 |
| 5. Develop a treatment plan based on available evidence | 665 820* 822 828 864* 864 880A* | 764R* 824* 864* 864 | 764I* 822 826* 828 864* 864 | 764C 764M 840* 842* 844* 846* 848 854* 864* 864 | 668* 698* 764H* SPED745 * | 832* 864* 864 | 844 850* 854* 864* 864 | 764A* 764C 764N 840 842 848 850 864* 864 | 764C 764L* 764M 764P I 822 840 846 848 852* 864* 864 |

Gathering Evidence

PROCESS NOTES

REPORT:

Using your curriculum map, collect examples of student work to build an archive for each program goal. Be sure to include samples that show high levels of student achievement.

NOTA BENE: MATERIALS ARCHIVE

On the following page, you'll see an excerpt from the School of Journalism and Mass Communication's faculty survey, which was used to identify assignments within courses that could be used to build a materials archive.

Once the department has a map of the goals and the places in the curriculum where they might be demonstrated, the unit can collect examples of assignments and student work to build an archive for each of the course goals. This archive needs to be representative, with a minimum of approximately 20 examples, selected randomly. The archive should include work from multiple courses and multiple instructors. The samples should be selected from assignments that give students an opportunity to show high-level achievement. One possible finding is that some courses may not provide students an opportunity to demonstrate the highest levels of unit goals.

The feedback from this evaluation will be based on an entire program, not just any individual course, so it is important that each sample of student work reflect a range of courses that would contribute to the student's achievement of that goal. It is important to treat each sample of student work with respect, including determining how it will be read and by whom.

EXAMPLE 1: FACULTY SURVEY TO MAP GOALS IN THE CURRICULUM—SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION

KU Faculty Survey—Assessment of Student Learning

Standard #2 of ACEJMC's accreditation policies evaluates each journalism department or school to determine that "the unit provides a curriculum and instruction that enable students to learn the knowledge, competencies, and values the (Accrediting) Council defines for preparing the students to work in a diverse global and domestic society." Listed below are the ACEJMC's 11 professional values and competencies. For each course that you teach, please explain how you are working to incorporate assessment of competencies/values relevant to that course. Also, please specify any additional measures that you might effectively (in terms of results and time management) incorporate.

Course number: JOUR 676—Strategic Campaigns

Instructor:

| ACEJMC value or competency | Does course address this standard? | If so, do you assess relevant student learning? | How do you assess relevant student learning? | What additional assessments, if any, might you effectively use? |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| Demonstrate an understanding of the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____ No <input type="checkbox"/> _____ | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____ No <input type="checkbox"/> _____ | Tests, case study analysis, evaluation of the various elements of a strategic communications plan developed by students working in groups for real clients. The client, outside faculty and practitioners are given an opportunity to critique each other's work. | Benchmark testing for knowledge at the beginning of the semester. A formal portfolio review by professionals in the field. A comprehensive final exam—which is not given because of the time commitment to the group project. |
| Understand concepts and apply theories in the use and presentation of images and information. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____ No <input type="checkbox"/> _____ | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____ No <input type="checkbox"/> _____ | Student plans books and client presentations. The client, outside faculty and practitioners are given an opportunity to critique each group's work. | Benchmark testing for knowledge at the beginning of the semester. A formal portfolio review by professionals in the field. A comprehensive final exam—which is not given because of the time commitment to the group project. |
| Demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles and work ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity. | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____ No <input type="checkbox"/> _____ | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____ No <input type="checkbox"/> _____ | Tests, case study analysis, evaluation of the various elements of a strategic communications plan developed by students working in groups for real clients. Students are also required to complete Human Subjects Protection training prior to the conduct of primary research. The client, outside faculty and practitioners are given an opportunity to critique each group's work. | Benchmark testing for knowledge at the beginning of the semester. A formal portfolio review by professionals in the field. A comprehensive final exam—which is not given because of the time commitment to the group project. |

Evaluating Progress

Reviewing Evidence

PROCESS NOTES

REPORT:

For the department, reviewers summarize students' overall performance, noting that particular courses and instructors who contributed to the archive should not be identified.

A larger group of department members, possibly including graduate students, constitute a review committee to identify patterns of student performance in the unit archive. Using the identified criteria in a systematic way, the reviewers describe how the department's student work is distributed across the framework of learning goals and components of achievement levels. Questions are basic and straightforward, such as what percentage of students meet each level of a particular intellectual goal? This description is not based on grades from individual courses, but on an independent reading of the level of demonstrated skill in the quality of the student work found in assignments from a range of courses.

After evaluating the student work, the review committee prepares a summary document and presents it to the department for consideration. The description of department performance should not identify the particular courses or instructors who contributed to the archive. Rather, the department receives an overall picture of strengths and weaknesses in the range of understanding and knowledge among students at a particular point in the educational program.

EXAMPLE 1: FRAMEWORK APPLICATION—DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Examples of frameworks from the Department of Psychology are provided on the following pages. The first is being used by the department for the written portion of their oral comprehensive examinations. The second is being used for oral examinations of dissertations. The third is being used for oral defenses.

The frameworks shown here reflect the work the department has done over the last few years to make explicit the standards their faculty members have for evaluating graduate work. This work was prompted in part by Barbara E. Lovitts' article, "How to Grade a Dissertation," in the November-December 2005 issue of *Academe*.

| Oral Comprehensive Examination: Written document (dissertation proposal, written preliminary examinations, etc.) | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | OUTSTANDING | VERY GOOD | ACCEPTABLE | UNSATISFACTORY |
| Mastery of Field | <input type="checkbox"/> Interdisciplinary synthesis of relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate mastery of the relevant literature and critical insight | <input type="checkbox"/> Shows mastery of relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Critical synthesis of relevant literature | <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate literature review but review is uncritical <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited understanding of the field | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarizes or misreads or misuses sources |
| Mastery of Research Methods | <input type="checkbox"/> Develops new techniques, tools, methods, or analyses <input type="checkbox"/> Methodologically sophisticated | <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates technical competence with regards to design and methods | <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates technical competence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates ability to do research <input type="checkbox"/> Uses standard methods and analyses | <input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate or incorrect design or methods |
| Presentation/ Communication Skills | <input type="checkbox"/> Well written and organized <input type="checkbox"/> Compelling and coherent argument | <input type="checkbox"/> Well written and organized | <input type="checkbox"/> Writing is pedestrian and plodding <input type="checkbox"/> Writing lacks originality or creativity | <input type="checkbox"/> Poorly written <input type="checkbox"/> Spelling and grammatical errors <input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized |
| Analysis and Interpretation | <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mature, independent thinking <input type="checkbox"/> Argument is focused and logical | <input type="checkbox"/> Coherent, logical argument <input type="checkbox"/> Imaginative or insightful argument | <input type="checkbox"/> Sustained argument but lacks synthesis and innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Argument lacks imagination or insight <input type="checkbox"/> Argument is narrow in scope | <input type="checkbox"/> Weak, inconsistent or invalid theoretical argument <input type="checkbox"/> Wrong, inappropriate, incoherent, confused, uninformative analyses |
| Significance and Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Original and significant | <input type="checkbox"/> Some original ideas, insights, and observations <input type="checkbox"/> Programmatic extension of prior research | <input type="checkbox"/> Question or problem is highly derivative of prior work | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited or no impact |

| Final Oral Examination: The Dissertation | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | OUTSTANDING | VERY GOOD | ACCEPTABLE | UNSATISFACTORY |
| Mastery of Field | <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of the relevant literature and critical insight <input type="checkbox"/> Develops new techniques, tools, methods or analyses <input type="checkbox"/> Methodologically sophisticated | <input type="checkbox"/> Shows mastery of relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Critical synthesis of relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates technical competence with regards to design and methods <input type="checkbox"/> Well-executed research including data collection and analyses | <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate literature review but review is uncritical <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited understanding of the field <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates technical competence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates ability to do research <input type="checkbox"/> Uses standard methods and analyses | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarizes or misreads or misuses sources <input type="checkbox"/> Missing relevant sources <input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate or incorrect design or methods <input type="checkbox"/> Wrong, inappropriate, incoherent, confused, uninformative analyses <input type="checkbox"/> Data are flawed, falsified, misinterpreted, irrelevant or confusing |
| Mastery of Research Methods | <input type="checkbox"/> Well written and organized | <input type="checkbox"/> Well written and organized | <input type="checkbox"/> Writing is pedestrian and plodding <input type="checkbox"/> Writing lacks originality or creativity | <input type="checkbox"/> Poorly written <input type="checkbox"/> Spelling and grammatical errors <input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized |
| Presentation/Communication Skills | <input type="checkbox"/> Well written and organized | <input type="checkbox"/> Well written and organized | <input type="checkbox"/> Writing is pedestrian and plodding <input type="checkbox"/> Writing lacks originality or creativity | <input type="checkbox"/> Poorly written <input type="checkbox"/> Spelling and grammatical errors <input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized |
| Analysis and Interpretation | <input type="checkbox"/> Compelling and coherent argument <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mature, independent thinking <input type="checkbox"/> Argument is focused, logical | <input type="checkbox"/> Coherent, logical argument <input type="checkbox"/> Imaginative or insightful argument | <input type="checkbox"/> Sustained argument but lacks synthesis and innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Argument lacks imagination or insight <input type="checkbox"/> Argument is narrow in scope | <input type="checkbox"/> Weak, inconsistent or invalid theoretical argument <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions are unsupported, exaggerated or invalid |
| Significance and Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Original and significant <input type="checkbox"/> Interdisciplinary <input type="checkbox"/> Will make an important contribution to the field <input type="checkbox"/> Will advance the field <input type="checkbox"/> Of interest to the broader scientific community <input type="checkbox"/> Pushes new boundaries, opens up new lines of inquiry <input type="checkbox"/> Publishable in top-tier journal | <input type="checkbox"/> Some original ideas, insights and observations <input type="checkbox"/> Programmatic extension of prior research <input type="checkbox"/> Makes important contribution to the field <input type="checkbox"/> Publishable in refereed journal | <input type="checkbox"/> Question or problem is highly derivative of prior work <input type="checkbox"/> Results are predictable <input type="checkbox"/> Will make a small contribution to the field <input type="checkbox"/> Publishable, but in a lesser journal | <input type="checkbox"/> Trivial, weak, unoriginal <input type="checkbox"/> Results are obvious, unexplained or misinterpreted <input type="checkbox"/> Will not make a contribution to the field <input type="checkbox"/> Not publishable |

| Final Oral Examination: The Oral Defense | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | OUTSTANDING | VERY GOOD | ACCEPTABLE | UNSATISFACTORY |
| Mastery of Field | <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates thorough mastery of the relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates ability to critique and synthesize the relevant literature | <input type="checkbox"/> Shows familiarity with the relevant literature | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited mastery of the relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Narrow understanding of the field <input type="checkbox"/> Knows the literature, but unable to critique or synthesize it | <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates weak or incomplete mastery of the relevant literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates failure to understand key theoretical arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Reveals lack of adequate preparation |
| Mastery of Research Methods | <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates thorough understanding of relevant research designs, data analytic methods and quantitative methods | <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of relevant research designs, data analytic methods and quantitative methods | <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates technical competence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates ability to conduct research <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates basic competencies for research design, data analytic methods and quantitative methods | <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited understanding of key methodological issues <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited understanding of key quantitative analyses |
| Presentation/Communication Skills | <input type="checkbox"/> Clear, concise and logical <input type="checkbox"/> Confident, mature, articulate <input type="checkbox"/> Can rebut criticisms | <input type="checkbox"/> Communicates effectively <input type="checkbox"/> Can respond to criticisms, but counter-arguments are incomplete or unconvincing | <input type="checkbox"/> Weak or incomplete response to criticisms <input type="checkbox"/> Defense is nervous or hesitant | <input type="checkbox"/> Defense is confused or unresponsive <input type="checkbox"/> Cannot respond to criticisms <input type="checkbox"/> The presentation is sloppy, disorganized or incomplete |
| Analysis and Interpretation | <input type="checkbox"/> Insightful and original <input type="checkbox"/> Develops a thorough, logical argument | <input type="checkbox"/> Develops a logical argument | <input type="checkbox"/> Misses connections and implications | <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are illogical <input type="checkbox"/> Reveals lack of critical insight <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are not supported with relevant citations and data |
| Significance and Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Proposes novel research questions <input type="checkbox"/> Proposes programmatic line of research <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate will make significant contributions to the field | <input type="checkbox"/> Proposes important research questions <input type="checkbox"/> Proposes productive line of research <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate will make important contributions to the field | <input type="checkbox"/> Solid effort <input type="checkbox"/> Competent <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate will make modest contributions to the field | <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate will not contribute to field |

Determining Next Steps

Improving Student Learning

PROCESS NOTES

REPORT:

Department submits a report of summary data and reflections.

Using the summary of how many students are at each level of development on each goal, the department as a whole should reflect upon what this evidence tells them about how well students are meeting the program's intellectual goals. Some of the questions a department might ask would include the following:

- Are there too many low performances or not enough high performances? In what areas are students showing strengths? In what areas are there weaknesses?
- Should we change the types of learning tasks that students are asked to complete? Do they need different or more opportunities to practice or demonstrate their level of development?
- Do we need to give students more opportunities to do high-quality work?
- Do we need to revise any of the course structures? Do we need different courses or a different mix of courses?
- If all or a significant majority of the students are excelling at a particular skill, how can we raise the bar and ask more of our students?
- Do we need additional resources or support to make the changes we have identified? Where can we find these resources?
- Who will initiate the changes? Who will implement the changes? What is our timeline?

In this way, the department can periodically examine how well its collective teaching is meeting objectives and identify changes the department might implement to better accomplish its own programmatic goals.

EXAMPLE 1: REVIEW AND REFLECTION—DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING

On the following page, an excerpt of reflections by the Intercampus Program in Communicative Disorders is provided. These reflections are part of the program's e-portfolio on the CTE website. The full portfolio is available at www.cte.ku.edu/gallery/units/splh/index.shtml

CLOSING THE LOOP: IDENTIFYING PROGRAM GOALS, ASSESSING LEARNING OUTCOMES AND RE-EXAMINING PRACTICES

Our department embarked on a process of documenting student learning in 2003 that involved discussion and input from the entire faculty involved in the master's speech-language pathology program. The overarching goal of this program revision was to clearly identify program goals and establish a means of evaluating whether students are meeting these goals, with the ultimate intent of providing feedback to individual students as they progress through the program and to the program to identify areas that need revision. Clearly this has been an iterative process, spanning five years and continuing into the future. We began with a global set of program goals that provided alignment of goals across experiences (i.e., courses and clinical practica) and allowed us to evaluate the breadth and depth of our course offerings. We made an initial attempt to assess learning across experiences through our formative exam and to provide feedback and program revision to individual students through the formulation of action plans. We summarized performance on the formative exam across students and reflected on these data as a group. This reflection yielded a new set of objectives:

1. We needed to create more specific program goals that identified levels of performance from novice to advanced to better track student learning across the course of the program; and
2. Our formative assessment needed to be better integrated with our overall program.

As a result, we developed two program rubrics that incorporate more specific goals and identify four levels of performance for each goal. These rubrics currently are being adapted by individual instructors and supervisors for specific courses and practica. We currently are piloting a more integrated formative assessment through the use of student portfolios. In the future, our goals are to have:

- A common language for evaluating students (i.e., adapted program rubrics for each experience),
- A means for summarizing performance across experiences within individual students (i.e., individual portfolios) to identify strengths and weaknesses across content areas to improve each student's learning during his or her program, and
- A means for summarizing performance across students (i.e., aggregating information across portfolios) to identify areas for program revision.

National pressure is mounting for universities to document learning outcomes for all students. In many professional degree programs, this pressure already has been translated into policy through revision to accreditation standards. While we may balk at this potential external mandate, our experience is that there are benefits to creating transparency between program learning goals and course/clinic-specific learning goals. Chief among these is alignment of goals across experiences so that both faculty and students can keep their eyes on the prize. Moreover, clearly identified goals lend themselves to program-wide assessment. The benefit of program-wide assessment is that areas of strength and weakness across students can be identified so that informed program revision can be undertaken. Documenting student learning outcomes forces us to close the loop and take action if those learning outcomes are not as expected. Ultimately, this cyclical practice of identifying learning goals, assessing learning outcome, and re-examining program practices will lead to a stronger program for all students.

Improving the Assessment Process

PROCESS NOTES

For assistance with evaluating your assessment process, contact Ying Xiong
e-mail: yxiong@ku.edu
phone: 864.4112

Another type of improvement a department can make is quite often the assessment process itself. A review of the process can engage faculty members in a conversation about critical issues surrounding learning and teaching and lead to actions that improve student learning. Questions about each step of the assessment process for a department to reflect on would include:

Development of program goals

- Are there too many low-level learning goals or not enough high-level learning goals?
- Did the goals capture the most essential learning skills for our graduates to advance in their academic or professional career?

Evidence gathering process

- Did you choose appropriate courses to identify student learning evidence?
- Are the measured goals taught at the selected courses?
- Do those students involved in the assessment process represent your majors?
- Are the course assignments used appropriate for the measured goals? Are they too difficult or too easy?
- Do we offer enough learning opportunities for our students to practice and demonstrate the learning goals?

Evidence reviewing process

- Are the evaluation criteria appropriate for different levels of student performance?
- Did reviewers agree upon the descriptions of the criteria?

Feedback structure and mechanism

- Who are your target audiences? For what areas can they make decisions? (See Table 1 for examples of areas of responsibility and corresponding target audiences)
- What are the feedback mechanisms you have to feed assessment results back to your audiences?

Reviewing the usefulness of the assessment data

- Does the data help address important questions?
- Does the data generate actionable items?
- Do we need to gather additional information?

TABLE I. AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TARGET AUDIENCES

| Areas of responsibility | Target audience |
|---|--|
| Curriculum: overall course content and sequence | Department curriculum committee |
| Specific course content | Course instructors |
| Pedagogy | Course instructors |
| Testing, exams, and projects | Course instructors |
| Access to learning resources | Support units (libraries, IT department, advising, tutoring) |
| Out-of-class learning activities | Clubs, student organizations, student affairs |
| Physical facilities | Facility management |
| Course staffing (faculty or GTA) | Hiring committee, GTA training team, Course Coordinator |
| Course scheduling | Program coordinator, registrar |

Reporting to Groups Outside the Department

PROCESS NOTES

All agencies ask for:

- program goals
- assessment methods/ measures
- assessment results
- discussion and use of the results

The primary purpose of program assessment is the improvement of student learning. However, most of the time, departments also need to document their assessment process in reports to groups outside of the department. Although those internal or external agencies might have specific reporting requirements on departmental assessment, they all ask for information regarding program goals, assessment methods/ measures, assessment results, and discussion and use of the results.

Using one report that can be easily adapted to meet the requirements of different reporting groups saves faculty members a lot of time and effort. On the following pages is an example of a report that can be used for program review, program assessment, regional institutional accreditation, or professional accreditation (if applicable).

For help designing a multi-use assessment report, contact Ying Xiong, CTE Documenting Learning Specialist, at yxiong@ku.edu.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN AND REPORT*

M.S. in Electrical Engineering

Statement of Outcomes for Majors (What should students know? What should they be able to do? How should students do so?)

Majors in Electrical Engineering M.S. programs will be able to

1. Conduct original research that extends knowledge in electrical engineering.
2. Demonstrate in-depth disciplinary knowledge and capacity to function on multidisciplinary teams.
3. Communicate professionally and with the public about electrical engineering and its research.
4. Demonstrate commitment to professional and ethical responsibility.

Measures and Use of Information

| Assessment Methods | Measures and Use of Information | | | | Discussion & Use of Results |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|
| | Outcome 1 | Outcome 2 | Outcome 3 | Outcome 4 | |
| Capstone project completed by each student. Instructors complete a rubric and report, which is submitted to the Graduate Director who presents a summary to the graduate faculty. | X | X | | | Graduate Director presents a summary to the graduate faculty, which meets annually to review the data and make recommendations for change. |
| Annual student self-assessments of their progress and achievement, reviewed by advisors by using a rubric. | X | X | X | X | Advisors meet annually to review student self-assessment reports and provide evaluation results and feedback to students in writing. Results are aggregated to report common problems to Graduate Director. |
| Graduate exit interview | X | X | X | X | Graduate faculty review the interview results at the faculty meeting annually to discuss issues that have been revealed by the interview. |
| Industrial Advisory Board focus groups | X | X | X | X | Feedback from IAB members is reviewed and discussed at the faculty meeting annually to inform actions. |

| |
|--|
| <p>Focus of the Year 2012–13 (Which Learning Outcome to Focus on This Year?): Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 3, and 4</p> |
| <p>Recommendations for Improving Assessment Processes: Tracking of alumni has been very challenging. Social media (like LinkedIn and Facebook) have been suggested to be used by advisors to keep a close connection with their advisees in order to collect graduates' post-graduation information.</p> |
| <p>For ABET Accreditation: Action Based on Assessment Results Our assessment data and feedback from Industrial Advisory Board members revealed that students' communication skills and programming skills (in particular C++) are important for electrical engineering majors. To better facilitate students' improvement in those skills, ESE524 (Advanced Computer Techniques for Electronic Design) became required by the program starting from Fall 2013. Another course ESE500 (Technical Writing and Communication) was changed from 1 credit to 3 credits to provide more intensive training for students to practice and improve their communication skills. This course has added requirements of oral presentation and proposal writing to reflect the workload required by 3 credits.</p> |
| <p>For Program Review and Program Assessment: Use of Assessment Results for Budgeting and Planning (current findings, actions, and budget/resource requests): Current Findings: Analysis of student capstone work and graduate exit interviews reveals that many students are weak in communication skills. Particularly, students are less confident in presenting a scientific research topic to a general audience and they have little experience in presenting in a formal setting like local, regional or national conference.</p> <p>Action Plan: The department has charged the curriculum committee to redesign the upper-division writing/communication course ESE500. Actions taken include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the Registrar to change the course credits from 1 credit to 3 credits • Consult with the Writing Center and the Center of Science Communication to design new learning activities and assignments for this course. <p>Meanwhile, a graduate symposium was proposed to be held annually in May to allow graduate students to present on their research studies.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer stipend for ESE500 instructors to complete the course redesign. • Invite facilitators from the Center of Science Communication to provide additional workshops for all graduate students. • Funding to organize the Graduate Symposium and print students' posters. |
| <p>Sample Evidence (Please attach sample student works and assessment instruments.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student capstone project papers • Summary of common problems reflected by student annual self-assessment reports along with the report template • Graduate exit interview protocol and IAB focus group protocol and summaries of results. |

*This report is adapted from Barbara Walvoord's example in *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education*

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN AND REPORT*

Ph.D. in Sociology

Learning Outcomes for Majors (What should students know? What should they be able to do? How should students do so?)

When students complete the Ph.D., they should be able to:

1. Conduct original, publishable research in the field.
2. Demonstrate a broad knowledge of theory and research across several sub-disciplines in the field.
3. Demonstrate in-depth knowledge of one area of expertise.
4. Follow ethical guidelines for work in the field.
5. Write and speak effectively to professional and lay audiences about issues in the field.
6. For those entering teaching: grade and comment effectively on undergraduate student work; lead discussion and recitation effectively for undergraduates, demonstrate familiarity with the literature on learning and pedagogy; write a thoughtful teaching philosophy; and plan an effective undergraduate course in the field.

Measures and Use of Information

| Assessment Methods | Outcomes Addressed | Data Collection | Discussion & Use of Results |
|--|---------------------------|--|---|
| Each January the Graduate Committee uses a dissertation rubric to review all theses and dissertations produced during the previous year for originality and cogency of the theoretical and empirical work, and clarity of the presentation. The committee produces a report of overall strengths and weaknesses, as well as recommendations for the program. | 1, 2, 3, 4 | Schedule/Cycle: Annually in January People responsible: Graduate Committee Faculty Members | The report is presented annually to the graduate faculty for discussion and action as appropriate. Summaries are presented for review and recommendations every 7-8 years as part of academic review. |
| | 1, 2, 3, 5 | Schedule/Cycle: Annually in March People Responsible: Program coordinator | Graduate faculty members review the data at the faculty meeting twice a year to discuss issues revealed and additional support and resources needed. |
| For those entering teaching: Each faculty member with an assigned TA writes an annual report that evaluated the quality of work the TA has done. The instructor of the one-credit graduate teaching course analyzes strengths and weaknesses of students' written teaching philosophy statements and their course plans. | 5 | Schedule/Cycle: Twice a year towards the end of semesters. People Responsible: Faculty mentors and instructor of the 1-credit teaching course. | Reports by faculty with TA's and by the teaching course instructor are presented annually to the Graduate Director, who summarizes them in a report to the Graduate Committee. |

| |
|---|
| <p>Focus of the Year 2012–13 (Which Learning Outcome to Focus on This Year?): Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Outcome 6 will be assessed in 2013-14.</p> |
| <p>Recommendations for Improving Assessment Processes: Faculty have requested more guidance in writing their reviews of TA work, and the Graduate Director has asked for more unanimity in those reports, to facilitate the work of analyzing them. A sub-committee has been formed to draft guidelines for students' work in grad-</p> |
| <p>For HLC Accreditation: Action Based on Assessment Results In 2010, an analysis of student publications and presentations, compared to those of peer departments, showed the number of publications was not as high as the department wished. We instituted a one-credit required seminar for all graduate students focusing on the production and placement of articles and presentations in 2011. Since then, the number of articles and presentations has risen 32%.</p> |
| <p>For Program Review and Program Assessment: Use of Assessment Results for Budgeting and Planning (current findings, actions, and budget/resource requests): Current Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2010, an analysis of student publications and presentations, compared to those of peer departments, showed the number of publications was not as high as the department wished. • Analysis of these over several years raised faculty concerns about the quality of student writing. <p>Action Plan: The department has charged the curriculum committee to develop a new 1-credit required seminar. The department also decided to provide writing resources and support to graduate students on their writing. Actions taken include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Curriculum Committee work with instructors to develop a one-credit required seminar for all graduate students focusing on the production and placement of articles and presentations. • The department hires a writing coach to work individually with each candidate on his/her writing. <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer stipend for instructor to complete the development of the 1-credit seminar. • Budget for hiring a writing coach. • Travel funding for graduate students to apply for to support their conference presentations. |
| <p>Sample Evidence (Please attach sample student works and assessment instruments.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student dissertation/thesis along with the evaluation results (scored based on the dissertation rubric). • Dissertation rubric • Summary of students' publication and presentation information • TA annual reports. |

*This report is adapted from Barbara Walvoord's example in *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education*

Resources

A: MAKING ASSESSMENT WORTHWHILE

Barbara E. Walvoord's book, *Assessment Clear and Simple*, is a straightforward guide that focuses on using carefully considered evidence to improve student learning. Some key points from the book are provided below. The book is available for check-out from the CTE faculty library.

Assessment as part of a broader initiative

A common pattern for institutions that are asked to “do assessment” is to ask every department or program to submit an assessment plan by October 15. The goal of “doing assessment” becomes an end in itself. Big mistake. Doing assessment by itself, with no link to anything else, has little reward, support, or motivation. For departments, being required to do an assessment report in a vacuum can product resentment, mere compliance, and waste of resources. **People don't want to “do assessment”; they want to realize a dream, improve what they're doing, or be excited by a new initiative.** So when you are asked to “do assessment,” link it to institutional dreams, goals, and processes that are important to the campus (p. 12).

Plan carefully for departmental collaboration in assessment

Assessment can be divisive and unnecessarily time consuming or it can be productive, inspiring, and thought-provoking for the department, helping the department to be more clear about its aims and more effective and cost efficient in achieving them. The challenge is to manage your departmental culture so as to achieve these desired outcomes. ... Before you begin any new moves in assessment, gather a group of the wisest heads in your department ... to brainstorm—not yet to make recommendations about your assessment structures but to plan how best to manage the assessment discussions you are about to have. Here is a guide for this discussion:

- What exactly is the department being asked to do and *not* asked to do about assessment, and why? How can we communicate these requirements accurately to everyone?
- Is there a difficult departmental issue we have managed well in the past that can teach us how to manage these discussions well? Is there a difficult issue we have managed badly? How can we avoid similar pitfalls?
- What fears to our department members have about assessment? Are there ways we can address those fears?
- What does each department member stand to gain from participating in assessment or at least not actively blocking it? How can we enhance those rewards? (p. 51–52)

Strengthen the department's assessment processes

As a result of analyzing your departmental assessment audit, you will generate recommendations for improving your assessment processes and structures. ... As these structures and processes become more effective, the department will feel the effects of the new information throughout all its decision making. Your primary focus should be not on onetime assessment or onetime fixes for whatever problems in learning turn up, but on building the structures and processes for ongoing assessment that yield good decision making in all areas consistently across time (p. 63).

B: DEVELOPING FRAMEWORKS

On the next few pages, you'll find an FAQ for developing frameworks, as well as an example of a framework from the Intercampus Program in Communicative Disorders, which is used to evaluate students during their program (see www.cte.ku.edu/gallery/units/splh).

Frequent questions in developing frameworks

1. How many levels should the scale contain?

It depends on your purpose ... Teachers often begin with two or three distinctions and then gradually find ways to distinguish additional levels. For frameworks to be used by multiple scorers, as in departmental or general education assessment, one school of thought holds that four levels are better than five levels, because with five levels, a large percentage of scorers may settle on the middle score of three.

2. What are the relations among levels in a scale?

One common strategy is to begin with the optimum performance as the top value and describe lower levels of performance as less than, or lacking, the qualities of the top performance. Another is to fully describe the baseline performance and then identify value-added features for the scale. A second approach is for the levels to represent different qualities (example: level 5 → student synthesizes the problem. Level 4 → student analyzes the problem).

3. What kinds of student performances can be scored by framework?

Almost any type of student performance—oral, clinical, artistic—involving higher-order thinking, creativity or integration of skills can be examined effectively with a framework. Team performances can also be examined effectively with frameworks.

4. What if the scale leads me to a score that does not feel right?

Suppose that you find yourself giving high scores to student work you find competent but somehow lacking in the originality, creativity or risk taking you want for A work. Often the problem is that you have not included in the scale all the traits you are using. Look again at the student work that makes you uneasy. Compare it with samples that score above and below it. Ask yourself these questions: *What is missing in my scale? What is most important? Try to capture that in the scale.*

5. Can frameworks be used for a portfolio?

Yes. A portfolio is defined as a collection of work by the same student completed over time. By using a portfolio instead of a single piece of work, students can be assessed by multiple works (for example, the consistency of a student across multiple situations, a broad range of student skills, or the flexibility with which the student applies principles to varying situations). Portfolios can be a collection of student work across multiple classes. Frameworks are useful to ensure consistency, as scorers must consider multiple pieces and student work may be read twice—by the original teacher for the grade and again by the portfolio scorers.

Reference

Walvoord, B.E. & Anderson, V.J. (2010). *Effective grading: A tool for learning and assessment in college*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Diagnostic Rubric

PLANNING

| Skill | Novice ¹ | Minimal Experience ² | Moderate Experience ³ | Program Completion ⁴ |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Collects case history information and integrates from all relevant sources | Inaccurate and inefficient Student omits/does not identify more than two relevant sources of information. Student does not identify clinical "red flag" requiring further clarification. Multiple errors of omission/accuracy/interpretation of case history information are present that compromise adequate evaluation planning. Student cites multiple instances of irrelevant information. Requires constant direct instruction. | Partially accurate, slow Student identifies at least two relevant sources of case history information. Student identifies clinical "red flags" but needs assistance in formulating questions of clarification. Support needed to develop at least one question for additional/clarity information. Follow-up phone calls to gain additional information may be required. Requires consistent direct instruction. | Accurate Student obtains all relevant case history information. Student develops questions to address clinical "red flags" and/or to clarify information obtained. Student independently identifies needed information to develop an adequate evaluation plan. This student requires consultation from faculty and intermittent direct or specific instruction. | Accurate and efficient Accurate, complete case history information is obtained efficiently. This student operates independently with student-initiated consultative guidance as needed. |
| Synthesizes information to develop appropriate diagnostic questions | Absent synthesis/interpretation Given the case history information, student is unable to form specific, individualized diagnostic questions. This student requires constant direct instruction. | Partial synthesis/interpretation Given the case history information, student independently develops at least one diagnostic question. This question(s) is partially accurate, and the student requires consistent direct instruction to modify existing questions and/or add questions based on case history information. | Complete synthesis/interpretation Given the case history information, the student independently develops multiple, accurate diagnostic questions with intermittent consultation. | Complete and efficient Multiple, accurate diagnostic questions are developed independently with student-initiated consultation as needed. |
| Obtains and reviews recommended resources in timely fashion | Absence of preparation Despite provision of supporting resources, student is not prepared to discuss relevant clinical disorder information in class/at pre-evaluation conference. This student requires constant direct instruction. | Partial preparation Student is partially prepared to discuss relevant clinical disorder information in class/at pre-evaluation conference, but still needs assistance in applying information to the individual client. This student requires consistent direct instruction. | Adequate preparation With provision of supporting resources, student applies relevant clinical disorder information to the individual client. Student demonstrates this synthesis during class/pre-evaluation conference. Intermittent consultation is required. | Efficient and thorough Student independently applies, synthesizes information gained from relevant coursework/supplemental information to client. Presents clear, thorough verbal presentation in class/pre-evaluation conference with student-initiated consultation as needed. |
| Develops appropriate and thorough evaluation plan | Inaccurate and inefficient Evaluation plan will not answer diagnostic questions. Selected procedures are incomplete or incorrect, given the case history information and diagnostic questions. The student requires constant direct instruction. | Partially accurate Evaluation plan partially answers diagnostic questions. No options for on-line modifications are presented. Student requires direction for selection of appropriate diagnostic materials and potential adaptations. Student requires consistent direct instruction. | Accurate Student develops adequate evaluation plan to address diagnostic questions. Student identifies 1-2 potential on-line modifications to plan. May need assistance identifying new or unfamiliar tools as well as additional/modified adaptations. Intermittent consultation required. | Accurate and efficient Student independently researches relevant diagnostic tools and subsequently develops thorough evaluation plan, including a variety of potential on-line modifications, with student-initiated consultation as needed. |

PLANNING (cont.)

| Skill | Novice ¹ | Minimal Experience ² | Moderate Experience ³ | Program Completion ⁴ |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Arranges environment suitable to client, clinician, family supervisor/faculty and observers | Absence of preparation No modification to existing diagnostic setting is made to accommodate individual evaluation needs. The student requires constant direct instruction. | Partial preparation Student identifies at least one potential modification to diagnostic setting that may be required to accommodate individual evaluation needs but may have difficulty generating alternative modifications. <i>Assistance with accommodations may be provided after evaluation has begun.</i> | Adequate preparation Based on case history information, student independently predicts what modifications to the evaluation setting may be required for optimal client performance. Consideration of supervisor/faculty, family and/or observer needs may or may not have been considered. <i>Accommodations may be made after evaluation has begun.</i> Intermittent consultation is required. | Adequate and efficient Based on case history information, student independently predicts what modifications to the evaluation setting may be required for optimal client performance. <i>Independently problem solves setting accommodations that need to be made during evaluation.</i> Setting has been arranged for adequate viewing by other observers/ participants. Student initiated consultation occurs on an as needed basis. |

IMPLEMENTATION

| Skill | Novice ¹ | Minimal Experience ² | Moderate Experience ³ | Program Completion |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Administers assessment measures accurately and efficiently | Inaccurate and inefficient Administration of measures is inaccurate and inefficient. Errors are made in administration and the client's attention and participation are compromised due to the time it takes to complete the assessment. This student requires constant direct instruction. | Partially accurate, slow Administration is partially accurate. Some measures are administered or collected accurately while others are not. Administration inaccuracies arise from inaccurate establishment of basal and ceiling on standardized measures and/or poor collection techniques for informal measures such as communication, language, and speech samples. Standardized measures are administered more efficiently but client's attention and participation have to be regained during assessment. Student requires consistent direct instruction | Accurate Administration and data collection of familiar tools are accurate and efficient. Student uses a narrow range of strategies in an attempt to maintain the client's attention and participation. This student requires consultation from faculty and intermittent direct or specific instruction. | Accurate and efficient Administration and data collection of multiple measures are consistently accurate and efficient. The client's attention and participation are gained and retained throughout the assessment using a variety of individualized strategies. This student operates independently with consultative guidance as needed. |
| Sets priorities and restructures within the diagnostic setting | Does not set priorities or restructure Continues with assessment as planned even when it is not appropriate based on client response to the situation and presentations. This student requires constant direct instruction. | Prioritizes but does not restructure Has priorities in mind but does not restructure within the diagnostic setting to meet those priorities. The student needs consistent direct instruction to restructure within the setting. | Prioritizes and restructures portions Priorities are set and restructuring takes place as needed within the diagnostic setting. Student is not able to articulate the factors that influenced the need to restructure and the choice of strategies to do so. Consistent consultation from faculty is needed. | Prioritizes and restructures Relates priorities and restructuring during the diagnostic setting to the purpose of the assessment. Is able to articulate the factors that influenced the restructuring. Student operates independently with consultation from faculty when requested. |

| IMPLEMENTATION (cont.) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Skill | Novice ¹ | Minimal Experience ² | Moderate Experience ³ | Program Completion ⁴ |
| Establishes and maintains rapport with client | <i>Does not have rapport</i> Is courteous and respectful but focuses more on self and the task at hand than on client's and/or family's needs and concerns. | <i>Establishes but does not maintain rapport</i> Is less focused on self but not able to maintain rapport; to obtain an optimal representative sample of client behavior. | <i>Establishes and maintains rapport</i> Gains and maintains client's attention and participation with support of supervisor during the assessment process to obtain an optimal representative sample of client behavior. Is able to gain needed information when prompted by supervisor while relating personally with the client. | <i>Establishes and maintains rapport</i> Gains and maintains client's attention and participation independently during the assessment process to obtain an optimal representative sample of client behavior. Is able to gain needed information while relating personally with client. Operates independently. |
| INTERPRETATION & RECOMMENDATION | | | | |
| Skill | Novice ¹ | Minimal Experience ² | Moderate Experience ³ | Program Completion |
| Diagnosis | <i>Inaccurate and/or unclear</i> Diagnosis is unclear or inaccurate. Interpretations of multiple diagnostic measures are inaccurate (and possibly narrow). Diagnostic measures may have been scored or completed inaccurately. | <i>Partially accurate, poorly justified, narrow</i> Clear but partially accurate diagnosis. Inaccuracies arise from inaccurate interpretations of some diagnostic measures and/or lack of experience with the specific communicative disorder. Justification may be narrow. Diagnosis also may not be comprehensive or may contain some inaccuracies in summarizing strengths and weaknesses in the areas examined. | <i>Accurate, limited justification, narrow</i> Clear and accurate diagnosis including level of significance, but justification is weak because only limited information is included to support the diagnosis. The information included is accurately interpreted. Diagnosis also may not be comprehensive, summarizing strengths and weaknesses in a few of the areas examined, but not all. | <i>Accurate, well justified, comprehensive</i> Clear and accurate diagnosis, including level of significance. Diagnosis justified by accurate interpretation of multiple pieces of information (e.g., standardized tests, developmental norms, informal observations, reports by others). Diagnosis is comprehensive, summarizing strengths and weaknesses in all areas examined. |
| Recommendation and referral | <i>Inaccurate and/or unclear</i> Recommendation is confusing or inappropriate. Recommendation for each area of weakness has shortcomings (e.g., absent or inaccurate). Recommendations are not explicitly tied to the diagnosis. Additional needed services are not recommended. | <i>Partially appropriate, narrow</i> Clear but partially appropriate recommendation. Treatment or monitoring is recommended for some areas of weakness but not others. Alternatively, recommendation may be inaccurate for some areas of weakness but accurate for other areas of weakness. Recommendation may not be explicitly tied to the diagnosis. Some additional needed services are recommended but others are not. | <i>Appropriate, vague, narrow</i> Clear and appropriate recommendation but some details are missing. Treatment or monitoring is recommended but the area identified may be general (e.g., "language") and/or the format of treatment or monitoring is not specified. Recommendation is explicitly tied to the diagnosis. Other services are appropriately recommended but recommendation is vague (e.g., additional SLP testing but areas to be tested not identified). | <i>Appropriate, detailed, comprehensive</i> Clear, appropriate, and detailed recommendation that identifies areas for treatment or monitoring and format of treatment or monitoring (e.g., frequency, duration, context). Recommendation is explicitly tied to the diagnosis. Other services are appropriately recommended, including specific follow-up testing by SLP and/or a specified plan for referral to other professionals. |

PROFESSIONALISM

| Skill | Novice ¹ | Minimal Experience ² | Moderate Experience ³ | Program Completion ⁴ |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Administrative and Professional Responsibilities | Absent Reports and/or other record keeping (e.g., billing, chart notes, progress notes) are not completed. | Inaccurate, late Reports and/or other record keeping (e.g., billing, chart notes, progress notes) are not completed accurately and on-time consistently. | Accurate, late Reports and/or other record keeping (e.g., billing, chart notes, progress notes) are completed accurately but not consistently on-time. | Accurate, on-time Reports and/or other record keeping (e.g., billing, chart notes, progress notes) are completed accurately and on-time. |
| Confidentiality | Does not maintain confidentiality Regularly violates HIPAA and/or clinic confidentiality standards. Student is unaware of HIPAA and/or clinic confidentiality standards. | Partially appropriate, narrow Student is knows HIPAA and clinic confidentiality standards but has difficulty applying these standards consistently. | Usually maintains confidentiality Usually maintains confidentiality according to HIPAA and clinic policies. Does not consistently make good clinical decisions based on understanding of the rationale for these policies. | Maintains confidentiality Maintains confidentiality according to HIPAA and clinic policies. Is able to make good clinical decisions based on their understanding of the rationale for these policies. |
| Oral Communication | Inappropriate Inappropriate professional communication across multiple individuals and/or settings. Rarely modifies terminology and/or amount of information based on individual's background and needs. Constant support required. | Inconsistent Inconsistent appropriate professional communication with a variety of individuals (e.g., client, family, other professionals). Modifies terminology and/or amount of information based on individual's background and needs with consistent support. | Consistent with support Appropriate professional communication with a variety of individuals (e.g., client, family, other professionals) most of the time. Modifies terminology and/or amount of information based on individual's background and needs with support. | Independent Consistent appropriate professional communication with various individuals (e.g., client, family, other professionals). Consistently independently modifies terminology and/or amount of information based on individuals' background and needs. |
| Written Communication | Unclear/inaccurate Synthesis of information is unclear and/or inaccurate. | Clear, accurate, inappropriate detail AND reading level Synthesizes information clearly, accurately. However, amount of detail may be inappropriate given the context. AND the level may not be appropriate for the primary reader. | Clear, accurate, inappropriate detail OR reading level Synthesizes information clearly, accurately. However, amount of detail may be inappropriate given the context OR the level may not be appropriate for the primary reader. | Clear, accurate, detailed, reader friendly Synthesizes information clearly, accurately with appropriate amount of detail at a level appropriate for the primary reader. |

| | General Evaluation | Topic-Specific Evaluation |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| ¹ Novice | No evaluation coursework, no clinical evaluation experience | No topic-specific coursework; no topic-specific clinical experience |
| ² Minimal Experience | Either has taken SPLH 860 OR has clinical evaluation experience | Either has taken a course in topic area OR has clinical experience in topic area |
| ³ Moderate Experience | Has taken SPLH 860 AND has clinical evaluation experience | Has had multiple experiences in topic area (e.g., course + clinical; multiple courses; multiple clinics) |
| ⁴ Program Completion | Has had multiple courses and clinical experiences evaluating numerous aspects of communication in a variety of settings. | |

C: SAMPLE DEPARTMENT PLAN

Evaluating the Doctoral Portfolio Examination in History

by Luis R. Corteguera, Director of Graduate Studies

A few years ago, the Department of History adopted a new format for the doctoral examination to replace the traditional comprehensive and oral examinations we had administered for years. The traditional examinations consisted of written essays addressing topics or responding to questions from professors with the aim of demonstrating the student's knowledge of three fields of specialization. During the oral examination, the faculty committee discussed those essays with the student and determined whether or not the student had the qualifications to write a dissertation. As part of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Initiative to Re-Envision the Ph.D, History faculty designed an alternative to the traditional written examinations consisting of a portfolio of materials that include the student's research papers, a dissertation prospectus, and a "professional essay." In 2005, the Department of History adopted the Doctoral Portfolio. (See Paula Wasley, "Portfolios Are Replacing Qualifying Exams as a Step on the Road to Dissertations," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 54, Issue 44 (July 11, 2008), p. A8.)

Since Fall 2008, I have worked with the CTE and the Provost's Project on Documenting Undergraduate and Graduate Learning Success to design rubrics that will enable the Department of History to evaluate the effectiveness of the Doctoral Portfolio. The wording in the rubrics comes from the "History Graduate Handbook," which describes the objectives and requirements in our doctoral program. I chose this language for two reasons: First, since it comes from a document approved by the Department of History and which has been in existence for many years, it avoids objections that the rubrics alter or reinterpret our standards and expectations. In fact, the rubrics simply provide a means to apply those standards and attempt to measure how students stand up to them. Second, the language in the rubrics is familiar to historians and therefore follows standards of performance easily understood by KU History graduate students and faculty, as well as historians across the US.

Description of Expectations for the Doctoral Portfolio (from the "History Graduate Handbook")

A. Professional Portfolio

The Professional Portfolio must contain the following items:

1. Table of Contents
2. C.V.
3. All research seminar papers
4. Major written work from all colloquia and readings courses, including historiographical essays, synthetic essays and annotated bibliographies
5. Any published historical works
6. A professional essay of 20-25 pages, explaining why you selected your fields, how those fields might be integrated and related to one another, and what you understand to be the leading research issues in the major field(s) (See Professional Essay, below)
7. A dissertation prospectus of 10 pages, plus bibliography and a 150-word abstract (See Dissertation Prospectus, below)
8. Synthetic essays (up to three, with a maximum of 25 pages each) if mandated by the field committee of the major field. These essays must be assigned when the student has completed 24 credits and must receive a grade of "satisfactory" to be included in the portfolio.

B. Dissertation Prospectus:

Students should begin to consider possible dissertation topics at the beginning of their degree program, consulting repeatedly with their advisor and other faculty members. They should endeavor to gain through their coursework and extra-curricular study the necessary background and skills for their proposed dissertation.

The prospectus should clearly state the topic of the proposed research and what questions and problems the work proposes to address and answer. Since the dissertation must be an original contribution to the discipline of history, the prospectus should make clear how the proposed work develops, challenges or departs from past research. It should demonstrate that the student has a sufficient and critical command of the historiography and the present state of the field. It should make clear what languages, methodologies and theories the student will use when examining the sources. The prospectus should identify the sources to be used and their locations. A tentative outline of chapters should provide some sense of the work's overall plan and structure. A tentative schedule in the prospectus should estimate how much time the various aspects of research, travel to collections, writing and revision will take. The text of the prospectus cannot be longer than ten pages. A bibliographical essay listing primary and secondary sources and unpublished doctoral and master's research may be included as an appendix.

A draft of the dissertation prospectus is included in the portfolio as presented at the Comprehensive Oral Examination. Following successful conclusion of the oral examination, students must deposit a copy of the final dissertation proposal, as revised in light of the examination, with the Graduate Office. It should be deposited within the same semester as the oral examination.

C. Professional Essay [Proposed by Don Worster for discussion]:

The central part of the portfolio presented at the time of the comprehensive examination is the professional essay. It should be 20 to 25 pages long and represent the candidate's best writing. The essay should not be autobiographical, casual or informal in tone, nor should it resemble the "personal statement" made in applying for admission to the program. The essay should offer an overview of the fields that the candidate has been studying and a scholarly assessment of their status, direction and needs.

The essay should identify the fields (major, minor) the candidate has chosen to pursue in colloquia and seminars and explain why those choices were made and how the candidate's thinking about them changed with professional growth. It should identify the leading issues confronting particularly the major field today, the "big questions" that the field is debating, and the kinds of research and evidence gathering that dominate current research. The candidate should indicate where he or she stands on those questions and venture appraisals or criticism of key works in the field. Overall, the candidate should demonstrate a firm knowledge of what the most influential works and interpretations have been in the field.

The essay should also present a concise discussion of the candidate's long-term ambitions as a historical scholar. It should answer such questions as these: What is lacking or inadequately understood in the field now? What interpretations need more evidence or more questioning? What kind of "trajectory" (or long-term research strategy) does the candidate envision for his or her work, at the dissertation stage and beyond? What research questions seem most important and significant to pursue as a professional historian?

Finally, the essay should make a case for the value of the fields studied. What is the significance of this work? What can non-specialists and the public expect to learn from the field, and why is that useful?

RUBRICS FOR EVALUATING THE DOCTORAL PORTFOLIO

Instructions for Evaluation Forms for the Doctoral Portfolio:

The five attached evaluation forms, which should be answered based on your assessment of the student's portfolio and performance during the doctoral examination, are exclusively to help us establish the effectiveness of the portfolio examination process and of the History doctoral program. The student's name must not appear on the forms, and answers will remain anonymous. The History Graduate Office will collect the forms, which a History committee will analyze and the report its conclusions to the Department of History. Please use this opportunity to provide honest assessment that will help us improve our graduate training. Thank you very much.

Instruction:

1. The chair of the committee will distribute these evaluation forms after the completion of the doctoral examination.
2. Committee members should not include the student's name. Please do not sign the forms or write your name on it.
3. Please answer the questions based on your evaluation of the student who has just completed the examination. In each row, please circle the statement that best reflects your assessment.
4. If you have additional comments, please write them at the bottom of the page where it is indicated.
5. The chair of the doctoral committee will collect the forms and turn in to the History Graduate Office along with the Progress to Degree Form with the committee's decision on the doctoral examination.

Thank you very much!

A. Research Paper 1 (same form used for Research Paper 2)

| Beyond expectations | Meets expectations | Below expectations |
|--|---|--|
| Extraordinary quality of the paper makes it worthy of an award | Professional-quality paper; suitable for consideration for publication in a scholarly journal | Paper not suitable for consideration for publication in a scholarly journal |
| Paper addresses a topic of major significance to its historical field | Paper addresses a significant topic | Paper does not clearly demonstrate that it addresses a significant topic |
| Paper offers a major original insight into that topic | Paper offers an original insight into that topic | Paper is largely descriptive, and does not offer an original insight into that topic |
| Paper's source base consists of new or little-studied primary sources in the original language | Paper's source base consists of primary sources in the original language | Paper's source base has few, or no, primary sources in the original language |
| Paper makes a significantly new contribution to the historiography in the secondary literature | Paper is integrated into the historiographical context of the secondary literature | Paper is not clearly integrated into the historiographical context of the secondary literature |
| Exceptionally thorough scholarly apparatus (usually footnotes/endnotes) | Full scholarly apparatus (usually footnotes/endnotes) | Incomplete or missing scholarly apparatus (usually footnotes/endnotes) |
| Unusually graceful and clear writing style | Accurate and graceful prose style | Numerous typographical errors and/or writing style not graceful |
| | Paper length is 20-60 pages | Paper length is less than 20 pages |
| The analysis of historical problems is unusually effective and convincing | Paper analyzes historical problems effectively and convincingly | Paper does not analyze historical problems effectively and convincingly |
| Comments: | | |

B. Dissertation Prospectus

| Beyond expectations | Meets expectations | Below expectations |
|---|---|---|
| Exceptionally strong background and skills for the proposed dissertation | Student has necessary background and skills for proposed dissertation | Weak or insufficient background and skills for the proposed dissertation |
| Prospectus demonstrates that proposed project will make an unusually important or original contribution to historical knowledge | Prospectus demonstrates that proposed project will make a significant and original contribution to historical knowledge | Does not make sufficiently clear the project's contribution to historical knowledge |
| Prospectus is exceptionally clear about its research topic and what questions and problems the work proposes to address and answer | Prospectus clearly states the topic of the proposed research and what questions and problems the work proposes to address and answer | Prospectus does not state sufficiently clearly topic of the proposed research and what questions and problems the work proposes to address and answer |
| Makes an unusually strong case for how proposed work develops, challenges or departs from past research | Makes clear how the proposed work develops, challenges or departs from past research | Does not make sufficiently clear how the proposed work develops, challenges or departs from past research |
| Demonstrates student's extraordinary command of the historiography and the present state of the field | Demonstrates that student has a sufficient and critical command of the historiography and the present state of the field | Does not demonstrate sufficient and critical command of the historiography and the present state of the field |
| Demonstrates an exceptional command of languages, methodologies and theories to be used | Make clear the languages, methodologies and theories to be used | Does not make sufficiently clear the languages, methodologies and theories to be used |
| Discovery of new or little-known sources to be used | Identifies the sources to be used and their locations | Does not adequately identify sources to be used and their locations |
| Outline of chapters provides an exceptionally clear sense of the work's overall plan and structure | Outline of chapters provides some sense of the work's overall plan and structure | Outline of chapters does not provide a clear sense of the work's overall plan and structure |
| Provides an unusually clear schedule of time to complete the various aspects of research, travel to collections, writing and revision | Tentative schedule in the prospectus estimates how much time the various aspects of research, travel to collections, writing and revision will take | Unclear or unrealistic schedule of various aspects of research, travel to collections, writing and revisions |
| Comments: | | |

C. Professional Essay

| Beyond expectations | Meets expectations | Below expectations |
|---|---|--|
| Essay offers an exceptionally good discussion of the choice of fields and how the candidate's thinking about them changed with professional growth | Essay explains the choice of fields and how the candidate's thinking about them changed with professional growth | Essay does not offer sufficient explanation for the choice of fields and how the candidate's thinking about them changed with professional growth |
| Essay does an admirable job of identifying the leading issues confronting particularly the major field today, the "big questions" that the field is debating, and the kinds of research and evidence gathering that dominate current research | Essay identifies the leading issues confronting particularly the major field today, the "big questions" that the field is debating, and the kinds of research and evidence gathering that dominate current research | Essay does not identify sufficiently well the leading issues confronting particularly the major field today, the "big questions" that the field is debating, and the kinds of research and evidence gathering that dominate current research |
| Essay offers an exceptional discussion of where the candidate stands on the big questions in the field | Essay indicates where the candidate stands on the big questions in the field | Essay does not indicate sufficiently clearly where the candidate stands on the big questions in the field |
| Essay ventures highly original appraisals or criticism of key works in the field | Essay ventures appraisals or criticism of key works in the field | Essay does not venture appraisals or criticism of key works in the field |
| Essay presents an exceptionally compelling discussion of the candidate's long-term ambitions as a historical scholar | Essay presents a concise discussion of the candidate's long-term ambitions as a historical scholar | Essay does not present an adequate discussion of the candidate's long-term ambitions as a historical scholar |
| Essay offers an unusually lucid overview of the fields that the candidate has been studying | Essay offers an overview of the fields that the candidate has been studying | Essay offers an inadequate overview of the fields that the candidate has been studying |
| Essay offers an impressive scholarly assessment of the status, direction and needs of the fields studied | Essay offers a scholarly assessment of the status, direction and needs of the field studied by the candidate | Essay is autobiographical, casual or informal in tone, more of a "personal statement" |
| Essay makes an unusually compelling case for the value of the fields studied | Essay makes a case for the value of the fields studied | Essay does not make a sufficiently strong case for the value of the fields studied |
| Essay represents exceptional writing for a graduate student. | Essay represents the candidate's best writing | Essay does not represent the candidate's best writing |
| | Essay is 20 to 25 pages long | Essay is less than 20 pages long |
| Comments: | | |

D. Oral Examination

| Beyond expectations | Meets expectations | Below expectations |
|---|--|--|
| Extraordinary or unusually strong command of the field | Demonstrates command of the field | Weak or unacceptable command of the field |
| Extraordinary or unusually strong ability to define and express the state of the field | Demonstrates ability to define clearly and express coherently the state of the field | Unable to define clearly and express coherently the state of the field |
| Exceptional ability to discuss questions and issues with faculty from a variety of fields | Demonstrates overall ability to discuss questions and issues with faculty from a variety of fields | Less than desirable ability to discuss issues with faculty from various fields |
| Exceptionally professional performance during the examination | Overall performance during the examination was professional | Lack of professional or serious performance during the examination |
| Comments: | | |

D: SAMPLE STUDENT PERMISSION FORM

STUDENT CONSENT FORM – SHARING COURSE WORK

I will randomly select several students whose work will be copied and included in an archive of student work that my department will keep for this course. That archive is important to our continued reflection on how well students are learning in our program. There are also two additional ways that I sometimes use a small portion of the archive of student work. First, I may use prior students' work as a point of comment for later students who are preparing for examinations. I post various questions and answers on a web site and invite students to comment on how well the answers address the questions. Second, I may develop a course portfolio in which I write about the quality of student performance that is generated in the course. These examples are a very important piece of my work that I show to other professors to indicate how much and how deeply students are learning. If I complete a course portfolio, it will be made available to a wider audience of professors on a public web site on teaching and learning in higher education (www.cte.ku.edu/gallery).

This form requests your consent to have your work possibly included in discussions of understanding for future students and in any versions of my writing about teaching in a portfolio. There is only a small chance your work would be randomly included in my private archive for any assignment, but I ask all students for their permission should that be the case. Note that you have the choice to have your work be anonymous or have your name be part of the work.

Please check the following designated purposes (if any) to which you give your consent:

I am willing to have copies of my coursework available so later students can use it for preparation.

I am willing to have copies of my coursework included in the department's portfolio.

I am willing to have copies of my coursework included in the public web site.

Please check one of the following:

I wish to have my name remain on any work that is used.

I wish to have my name removed on any work that is used.

Additional restrictions on the use of my texts (please specify):

Print Name _____ Date _____

Phone Number () _____ Email _____

Course Title _____ Professor _____

By signing below you give your permission that work you produce for this course may be used with the restrictions and for the purposes you indicated above. You understand that your grade is NOT connected in any way to your participation in this project, and I will not receive the list of students who have given permission to have their work shared until after I have turned in the grades for the course. Your anonymity will be maintained unless you designate otherwise. Finally, you understand that you are free to withdraw consent at any time, now or in the future, without being penalized.

Signature _____

Please address questions to: *name of faculty member, department, phone number, email.*

NOTE: For a copy of this form in Word or PDF, see www.cte.ku.edu/resources/index.shtml; look under the heading "Forms and Documents."

E: SUGGESTED READINGS

These materials can be checked out from the CTE library in 135 Budig Hall:

Banta, T. W., Lund, J. P., Black, K. E., and Oblander, F. W. (1996). *Assessment in practice: Putting principles to work on college campuses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Lovitts, B.E., and Wert, E. L. (2009). *Developing quality dissertations in the humanities*. Sterling, VA: Stylus

Lovitts, B.E., and Wert, E. L. (2009). *Developing quality dissertations in the sciences*. Sterling, VA: Stylus

Lovitts, B.E., and Wert, E. L. (2009). *Developing quality dissertations in the social sciences*. Sterling, VA: Stylus

Stevens, D. D., and Levi, A. J. (2005). *Introduction to rubrics*. Sterling, VA: Stylus

Susie, L. (2009). *Assessing student learning: A common use guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Walvoord, B. E. (2009). *Assessment clear and simple: A practical guide for institutions, departments, and general education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Wiggins, G., and McTighe, J. (1998). What is backward design? and What is a matter of understanding? In *Understanding by design* (pp. 7-37). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall