Graduate Program Assessment: From Student- to Program-level Assessment

Assessment Office

- Faculty managed
- Mission: improve student learning through program assessment
- Collaborate with faculty, staff, and administrators
- Workshops, consultations, events, website
Purpose of Program Assessment:

Evolution

Improvement

Program Assessment Cycle

Learning Outcomes

Improvement Plan

Goals & Mission Statement

Learning Opportunities

Collection & Analysis of Evidence

Assessment Results

Today’s Outcome

You will leave knowing how to approach graduate-level program assessment.

Program assessment is for program evolution and/or improvement.
Shift from individual focus to PROGRAM LEVEL

The last oral defense I attended was impressive.
Our grad program does not have courses that all students take.
The PhD program is specific to each individual.
My students have won awards and published in the field.

Ask a Meaningful Question

• To what extent do students meet each program outcome?

Answer the Question

To what extent do students meet each program outcome?

• Step 1: Identify data source(s)
• Step 2: Use a form/system to record how well each student performs on each outcome
• Step 3: Aggregate & analyze the student performance evaluations
• Step 4: Report & use the results
Example

Program SLOs
Students who successfully complete the program can
1. Demonstrate mastery of the theories and methodologies of the discipline of history
2. Communicate both orally and in writing at a high level of proficiency
3. Conduct independent original research

Step 1: Identify Data Sources

Learning Opportunities: Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SLO 1: Theory</th>
<th>SLO 1: Methods</th>
<th>SLO 2: Oral</th>
<th>SLO 2: Written</th>
<th>SLO 3: Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Exam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Exam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2: Record How Well Students Perform

STUDENT: ______________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO1: Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO1: Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2: Oral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2: Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO3: Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Step 3: Aggregate & Analyze

Dissertation Defense Results 2008-2010 (percentages)

- Theory: 20%, 5%
- Methodology: 25%, 15%
- Oral Comm: 8%, 8%
- Written Comm: 0%, 0%
- Research: 0%, 0%

Unacceptable • Marginal • Acceptable • Exceptional

Step 4: Report & Use Results

- Share good news!
- Consider incorporating more theory into requirements
- Consider providing more opportunities for students to review theory
- Reconsider the breadth and depth of theory requirement

Logistics:
Evaluation Process

- Each faculty member submits a student evaluation
- One faculty member submits a student evaluation, based on the input from a committee/department group
Logistics: Faculty Submit Student Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty submit by . . .</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pen &amp; Paper</td>
<td>Portable, easy to use</td>
<td>Manually input data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Doc/Form Fill-able PDF</td>
<td>Easily distributed</td>
<td>Manually input data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel Form</td>
<td>Easy to compile data</td>
<td>Everyone must be an Excel user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online survey (e.g., Survey Monkey)</td>
<td>Easy to compile data</td>
<td>Set-up time, security concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Anthropology PhD

- **Meaningful question:** Are program policies allowing slippage between the requirements and SLOs?
- **Data source:** Research proposal defense
- **Data collection:** Discussion with faculty
- **Aggregate & analyze:** Grad chair & assessment coordinator
- **Report & use results:** Considering policy change in timing of research proposal defense

Example: Social Work

- **Meaningful question:** Does our curriculum meet the needs of the community our graduates will be serving?
- **Data source:** Conference attendees, students, and the community
- **Data collection:** Surveys over 2 years
- **Aggregate & analyze:** Assessment coordinator presented survey results to department
- **Report & use results:** Refocused curriculum
Your turn:

- What is your program’s meaningful question?
- How might you use what has been presented today to answer that question?

Wrap Up

Q & A Time

Please complete a workshop evaluation

Next workshop

Making the Most of Your Curriculum Map
Thursday, March 17, 2011
1:30 – 2:45 pm
Hawaii Hall 309

Thank You!

Assessment Office
airo@hawaii.edu
http://manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment

Marlene P. Lowe
mplowe@hawaii.edu

Monica Stitt-Bergh
bergh@hawaii.edu
GRADUATE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT:
From Student- to Program-level Assessment

Example

Step 1: Identify data source(s)
Refer to Learning Opportunities: Curriculum Map

Step 2: Evaluate student performance on each outcome

Student: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Topic: (circle) Progress Evaluation Comp. Exam Proposal Defense

Thesis Dissertation Final Oral Defense

Program SLOs

Upon completion of the program, students can:
1. Demonstrate mastery of theories and methodologies of the discipline of history.
2. Communicate both orally and in writing at a high level of proficiency.
3. Conduct independent original research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO1: Theory</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO1: Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2: Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2: Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO3: Original Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Assessment

Comments:
GRADUATE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT: From Student-to Program-level Assessment

Example (con’t)

Step 3: Aggregate & analyze student performance evaluations

Example Results: Dissertation Defense Results 2008-2010 (percentages)
n=15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There were no “Unacceptable” ratings

Themes From Comments:
- Theory is a problem, lack breadth understanding
- Methodology skills are strong

Step 4: Report & use results