Process Overview

1. Reviewers develop interrater reliability
2. Program writes and submits report
3. The program is assigned to 2 reviewers
   • 1 in the same college and 1 other (typically)
4. Reviews are completed separately
5. The 2 reviewers must meet and reconcile
   • 1 report is written
   • Each rubric element has 1 score and feedback

Reliability

• Discussion of the rubric
• Sample report 1
  • Sent in Chalk and Wire
  • Individually reviewed
  • Committee meets and reviews together
    • Discuss rating and reasoning
• Sample report 2
  • Same as above

Program Writer

• Given a program account
• Some may have additional account for other purposes
• Template and rubric are emailed
• Summer time typically

Program

• Report is written
• Submitted to chair/Dean, etc.
  • For some colleges
• Writer submits report (Word or pdf)
  • Chalk and Wire
• They are assigned (college and other)
  Any reader should be able to follow a well written product.

Review Process Reviewer

• The report is viewed in Chalk and Wire
### Consider the Method of Review
- The report is opened in the browser or downloaded and opened.
- The rubric is opened in Chalk and Wire.
- The reviewer goes back and forth between the report and the rubric.

### The Rubric

#### Rubric Levels
- There are 4 levels and several elements per level.
- If any of the elements is missing the reviewer drops back to the next level.

#### Feedback
- Feedback will vary by reviewer.
  - Keep in mind - this is very time consuming.
  - Most feedback will be to show how the program can get to the next level.
  - Sometimes the information in the report just doesn’t make sense to a outside reader.

### Reconciliation
- Both Reviewers must get together and complete joint review report.
- They must agree on one score.
  - Scores may or may not be provide to the program.
- They must provide a single set of feedback.

### Dos and Don’ts

#### Dos
- Follow the rubric.
- Write so anyone can follow it.
- Explain everything.
  - Provide context.
- Have good SLOs.
  - Connect everything to the SLOs (measures, discussion, action plan).
- Avoid discipline specific language and acronyms.

#### Don’ts
- Assume the reviewer will understand.
- Make the reviewer search for something.
- Put information in the wrong place.
- Assume all elements of the rubric are equal.
- Assume everyone does it the way you do it.
The Rubric

Key Elements

The Focus is the Program
• Department, university, and course-level assessments are not the focus
• Statement identifies program goals and/or activities that impact specific elements of the institutional mission.
• Statement is aligned with the standards of an external professional organization, if applicable.

Mission

SLOs
• Reasonable number (4-6)
• Concentrates on the most important skills or knowledge
  • Reasonable Blooms taxonomy action verb based on type of program/degree

SLO
• SLO is clear about what group of students will achieve mastery of it, and at what point in their progression through the program they will do so (e.g., “seniors,” “graduates”).
• SLO contains precise, measurable, and observable verbs that reflect an appropriate depth of knowledge for the program.

Teaching Strategies
• Experiences are linked to SLOs with multiple and diverse opportunities for students to obtain the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions specific to the discipline in the SLOs.
  • All program courses (with experiences) and SLOs are shown on the curriculum map, and the map indicates the depth of coverage for SLOs in appropriate courses (build on each other).

Measurements
• Most measures are direct measures.
  • They may be supplemented with indirect measures.
  • Includes both formative and summative measures.
  • Match the SLO
    • A description of the development process for the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) is included to illustrate their appropriateness to the SLO.
Data Collection

• Involves multiple faculty members.
• Clear and understandable procedures of collection and dissemination

Results (Data)

By SLO

• Results are easily understood, as well as their implications.
• Broken down so strengths and weaknesses in student learning are easily identified.
• Give Context

Types of Data

• Raw data
• Standard scores
• Percentages
• Tables, graphic, and/or narrative

Discussion (Meaning of data)

• Interpretation directly addresses the program’s mission, SLOs, and action plans.
• Interpretation identifies possible areas of improvement, thus initiating future actions.
• Interpretation includes how courses, teaching experiences, and/or the assessment process might have affected results.

Action Plans

• Past year’s Action Plan
  • Impact of past improvements and changes
  • All proposed actions from the prior year’s action plan were specifically addressed, including who implemented them, when they were implemented, and the outcome of the implementation.
• Upcoming year’s Action Plan
  • Connect to findings (data/discussion)
  • Use of assessment results for program improvement

Questions/Discussion?