

E-Portfolios: Methodology to Support and Model Continuous Improvement in Institutional Effectiveness for Academic Programs

Carol Kominski, Institutional Effectiveness and Research
Mary Bold, Family Sciences

Texas Woman's University

© 2008 Texas Woman's University

Challenges

- Many, diverse academic programs
 - Structured & accredited professional programs
 - Other less focused programs
- Uneven quality of IE documents
- IE one of many “burdens” for chairs
- Limited staff and budget

Broad Principles

- We assess what we value.
- Results are shared.
- We track changes and impact of improvements.
- We don't always succeed but we always learn.
- Ultimate objective: capitalize on what works so that we don't waste time and resources on what doesn't.

Overall Goals

- Clearly articulated expectations
- Transparency in communication
- Use of assessment for improvement
- Deep faculty involvement
- Improved student learning

Goals for Faculty

- Understand assessment- learning link
- Articulate learning outcomes at all levels
- Use triangulated, authentic assessments
- Work cooperatively
- Evaluate each others' outcomes
- Mentor other faculty

Methodology

- Rubric scoring
- Multiple, volunteer evaluators
- Revision opportunities
- Metrics to assess cyclical changes and impact of feedback

Benefits of Marriage of E-portfolio Software to IE System

- System models authentic assessment institutionally.
- Sharing of documents is simplified.
- Communication at all levels is enhanced.
- Reporting templates make IE operation more “effective.”
- Web portfolios makes public display manageable.
- Modeling of best practices is facilitated.
- Path to e-portfolios in student assessment is clearer.
- Need for paper is reduced.

Examples of System in Operation

- Rubrics
- Completed Evaluation
- Detailed University Report to Track Improvements
- Evaluator Comparisons
- Detailed Program Performance Data
- Detailed Process Information
- What Evaluator Sees
- Model Program Display for Web

Institutional Effectiveness Plan Rubric: What Evaluator Completes

IE Plan: 2007-08 Plan

Evaluation of: BA/BS Biology
Work submitted on: 8/20/2007 6:52:04 PM (CST)

Notes to Evaluator: Please add up points to obtain a total score. Minimum score for each rubric element is a "1," not a "0." Double check addition for accuracy.

1 Evaluate work using rubric criteria below Show criteria descriptions
 Show comment areas

Rubric being used: Master Rubric to Evaluate Academic Assessment Plans 2007-08

Program Description page is complete and provides a comprehensive view of the program's goals and other relevant details.

7 A Model for Others	6 A cut above acceptable but not quite a model	5 Acceptable	4 Needs only slight modification to be acceptable	3 Needs some modification to be acceptable	2 Needs major modification to be acceptable	1 Unacceptable
Program description has all required elements and does an especially effective job of describing its mission, its students, and other relevant aspects of the program.		Program has adequately supplied information about all required elements.		Program description is incomplete or unclear in some areas.		Program description is missing or lacks critical information in most areas.

Comment on this criterion (optional)

Enter Score (0-7):

[Save Draft](#)

Program has at least one clearly explained administrative outcome statement taken from its strategic plan.

7 A Model for Others	6 A cut above acceptable but not	5 Acceptable	4 Needs only slight modification to be . . .	3 Needs some modification to be acceptable	2 Needs major modification to be . . .	1 Unacceptable

Institutional Effectiveness Report Rubric: A Cleaner View

Rubric for Year End IE Reports 2006-07

created with
TaskStream
Tools of Engagement

<i>Levels:</i>	<i>Criteria:</i>	A Model for Others	A cut above acceptable - not quite a model	Acceptable	Needs only minimal changes	Needs some modification	Has the beginnings but little more	Unacceptable	Score
	Learning Outcome #1: Assessment results are clearly and completely presented.	Assessment results are displayed analytically so that the reader can easily understand their meaning and implications for strengths and weaknesses.		Assessment results are clearly and completely presented.		Assessment results are incomplete or confusingly presented.		Assessment results are vague, unclear, or missing.	
	Learning Outcome #2: Assessment results are clearly and completely presented.	Assessment results are displayed analytically and creatively so that the reader can easily understand their meaning and implications for strengths and weaknesses.		Assessment results are clearly and completely presented.		Assessment results are incomplete or confusingly presented.		Assessment results are vague, unclear, or missing.	
	Learning Outcome #3: Assessment results are clearly and completely presented.	Assessment results are displayed analytically and creatively so that the reader can easily understand their meaning and implications for strengths and weaknesses.		Assessment results are clearly and completely presented.		Assessment results are incomplete or confusingly presented.		Assessment results are vague, unclear, or missing.	
	Administrative Outcomes	Assessment		Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	

Completed Evaluation: Summary Comments

Evaluation Summary for IE Year-End Report: 2006-07 Report

Final Score: 37.50 (out of 56)

Overall comments: Overall a very excellent report! Only minor revisions are recommended and these will be easy to make, I think.

With the exception of learning outcome #5 and the administrative outcome, the results are presented in a very effective manner with strengths and weaknesses presented based upon the results.

Without exception, the actions to be taken are vague and lack timelines to implement (i.e. there's no accountability). In other words, the actions to be taken appear to be ideas rather than specific improvement actions based upon identifiable results.

Learning outcome #5 might have dragged down the overall score but reports on only three outcomes were expected so this feedback is given without any penalty attached to the inadequate reporting on this specific outcome.

Administrative outcome: this one is a weakness. Rather than focusing on a target, the focus should be on something that will aid in the improvement process.

Detailed results (Rubric used: Rubric for Year End IE Reports 2006-07)

Learning Outcome #1: Assessment results are clearly and completely presented.

(7) A Model for Others	(6) A cut above acceptable - not quite a model	(5) Acceptable	(4) Needs only minimal changes	(3) Needs some modification	(2) Has the beginnings but little more	(1) Unacceptable
Assessment results are displayed analytically so that the reader can easily understand their meaning and implications for strengths and weaknesses.		Assessment results are clearly and completely presented.		Assessment results are incomplete or confusingly presented.		Assessment results are vague, unclear, or missing.

Evaluation Report: Detail Comments

Criterion Score: 5.00 (Acceptable)

Comment: Learning outcome #1: a good job is done of identifying strengths (overall scores) and weaknesses (seen from the graph).

Learning outcome #2: a good job is done of identifying strengths and weaknesses.

Learning outcome #3-4: a good job is done of identifying strengths and weaknesses.

Learning outcome #5: Is incomplete, some strengths and presented but the reader is not given enough information to evaluate.

Good job for the most part at identifying strengths and weaknesses!

All administrative outcomes: Strengths and weaknesses are identified.

(7) A Model for Others	(6) A cut above acceptable - not quite a model	(5) Acceptable	(4) Needs only minimal changes	(3) Needs some modification	(2) Has the beginnings but little more	(1) Unacceptable
Program does a particularly excellent job of identifying and describing strengths and weaknesses emerging from assessment results.		A comprehensive list of strengths and weaknesses emerging from assessment results is identified and described.		Assessment results identify strengths or weaknesses but not both.		Assessment results do not include any assessment of strengths and weaknesses.

Criterion Score: 3.00 (Needs some modification)

Comment: Strengths (meeting the target) are identified, there are no weaknesses identified.

There is really no analysis of the forces impacting enrollment or any real elaboration as expected. A strength is clearly identified in the result that already exceeds the target but no possible weaknesses are mentioned.

Actions to be taken as a result of assessment appear to be clear, logical, and feasible.

(7) A Model for Others	(6) A cut above acceptable - not quite a model	(5) Acceptable	(4) Needs only minimal changes	(3) Needs some modification	(2) Has the beginnings but little more	(1) Unacceptable

Detailed University Performance Report

Summary of Performance for Authors using DRF: IE for Academic Programs

[Print View](#) [Export to Excel](#)

Program: Academic Institutional Effectiveness System [Save Report](#)
Authors: 104 Authors matched search criteria [[Show Full List](#)]
Report Generated: Wednesday, January 30, 2008
Show: Group Average Group Median Standard Deviation Graph (Avg. for Group)

IE Plan

Folio Area Assessed	Authors Evaluated	Results for Group	Graph (Avg. for Group)				
			0%	20%	40%	60%	80%
2006-07 Plan	96 of 104 (92%)	Avg.=21.19/30 (71%)					
2007-08 Plan	1 of 104 (1%)	Avg.=50.00/66 (89%)					
2006-07 Plan Revision	74 of 104 (71%)	Avg.=26.07/30 (87%)					

IE Year-End Report

Folio Area Assessed	Authors Evaluated	Results for Group	Graph (Avg. for Group)				
			0%	20%	40%	60%	80%
2006-07 Report	76 of 104 (73%)	Avg.=27.63/66 (49%)					
2007-08 Report	0 of 104 (0%)						

Evaluator Comparisons Report

Multiple Evaluation/Reconciliation

[Reports Home](#) > [Select DRF/Users](#) > [Main Results](#) > Multiple Evaluation/Reconciliation History

Multiple Evaluation & Reconciliation History for Folio Area: 2006-07 Plan [Print View](#) [Export to Excel](#)

DRF Template: IE for Academic Programs [New Search](#)
Used in Program: Academic Institutional Effectiveness System
Report Generated: Wednesday, January 30, 2008
Change View: Multiple Evaluation & Reconciliation History [Go](#)
Filter By: All Authors with Reconciled/Final Evaluations (96 Authors) [Go](#)
Compare: Select to Select [Go](#)
Show: Individual Evaluations Standard Deviation

Author	Evals. Complete / Required	Average	Range	Standard Deviation	Reconciled (Final) Evaluation
BA Art	3 / 3	20.83	7.50	3.88	20.83
BFA Art	3 / 3	17.33	3.50	1.76	17.33
MA Art	3 / 3	22.67	6.50	3.40	22.67
MFA Art	2 / 2	19.75	3.50	2.47	19.75
BA/BS Biology	2 / 2	21.50	3.00	2.12	21.50
MS Biology	2 / 2	20.00	0.00	0.00	20.00
BS/BBA Business Administration	2 / 2	13.25	2.50	1.77	13.25

Detailed Performance Data on Programs

Final Scores for Folio Area: 2006-07 Plan Revision (Optional)

[Print View](#) [Export to Excel](#)

DRF Template: IE for Academic Programs

[New Search](#)

Used with Program: Academic Institutional Effectiveness System

Authors: 74 Authors matched search criteria [View All Authors](#)

Report Generated: Wednesday, January 30, 2008

Change View: Final Scores

[Go](#)

Author	Final Score Max = 30	Rubric: Master Rubric to Evaluate Academic Assessment Plans								Average Rubric Score
		Criterion 1 Program Description ...	Criterion 2 Program has at least...	Criterion 3 Program has at least...	Criterion 4 Learning outcomes st...	Criterion 5 Learning outcome #1...	Criterion 6 Learning Outcome #2...	Criterion 7 Learning outcome #3...	Criterion 8 Administrative Outco...	
BA Art	25.00 View Work/ Evaluation	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.13
BFA Art	25.50 View Work/ Evaluation	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.19
MA Art	24.00 View Work/ Evaluation	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00
MFA Art	24.00 View Work/ Evaluation	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00

Detailed Information on Process

Program Activity for Area: 2006-07 Report, All Statuses

[Print View](#) [Export to Excel](#)

DRF Template: IE for Academic Programs

[New Search](#)

Program: Academic Institutional Effectiveness System

Authors: 104 Authors matched search criteria

Report Generated: Wednesday, January 30, 2008

Filter By: Show summary report (do not filter)

[Go](#)

Sort By: Name of Author (Lastname, Firstname)

[Go](#)

Author	Work Status	View Work	Submitted	Last Evaluated or Sent Back	Last Evaluator
BA Art	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluated-Released	View Work/ Evaluation	8/13/2007	11/26/2007	
BFA Art	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluated-Released	View Work/ Evaluation	8/13/2007	12/4/2007	Carol Kominski
MA Art	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluated-Released	View Work/ Evaluation	8/13/2007	11/30/2007	Carol Kominski
MFA Art	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluated-Released	View Work/ Evaluation	8/13/2007	1/11/2008	Carol Kominski
BA Art Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Work not Started				
BA/BS Biology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluated-Released	View Work/ Evaluation	8/20/2007	1/4/2008	Carol Kominski
MS Biology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluated-Released	View Work/ Evaluation	8/14/2007	11/28/2007	Assessment Advisory Committee
BS/BBA Business Administration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluated-Released	View Work/ Evaluation	9/25/2007	1/4/2008	Carol Kominski

Evaluation Page Before Submission

Comment on this criterion (optional)

Enter Score (0-7):

Save Draft

2 Enter the final score

Enter a numeric score (Max = 56)

3 Add overall comment

Save Draft

4 Decide what to do with this evaluation

Provisional evaluation/score

- Send back for revision
This report cannot be sent back as a provisional evaluation because another evaluator has already made an evaluation.

Final evaluation/score

- Record as my final score
By marking this item as final, your evaluation will be included as one of the required evaluations (multiple are needed). When the required number of evaluations are complete, a reconciler will then reconcile the evaluations release this final evaluation to the author.

Spell Check

Save Draft

Cancel

Preview Before Submitting

Submit

Model Program Display

M.S. in Family Studies, Texas Woman's University

created with
TaskStream
Tool of Engagement

Home

Outcomes

Program Information

2006-2007 IE Plan

Faculty

Students

Distance Learning

Author: Mary Bold
Last modified:
12/11/2006 11:37:57 PM CST

M.S. in Family Studies, Texas Woman's University

The mission of the **Master of Science in Family Studies** is to prepare family professionals who will take an active role in their community to enhance the quality of life for individuals and families in a global society. Based on a systems approach to interaction between groups, students are empowered to plan and implement family programs and policy. Students are introduced to the role, process and implications of research.

- * [1 - Family Studies at TWU](#) (Web Link)
- * [2 - Department of Family Sciences](#) (Web Link)
- * [3 - College of Professional Education](#) (Web Link)

Strengths of System

- Structured rubric makes feedback consistent and fair.
- Scoring report acts as stimulus for improvement.
- Feedback makes revisions more straightforward.
- Revisions lead to quantifiable improvements.
- Evaluation in a committee effort builds assessment culture.

What We've Learned

- Scoring is not as easy as it might look.
- Calibration among evaluators is important.
- Initial score reports must be tactfully handled.
- Opportunity for revision is critical at start-up.
- Hands-on help is often necessary.
- Mentoring by high performers is a good idea.
- Coaxing of laggards is always a challenge.
- Broad faculty involvement remains a future goal.

Recommendations for Ideal System

- Integrate with strategic planning, budgeting, and program review.
- Conduct intensive training for evaluators at start.
- Mix group and individual evaluations.
- Reward and recognize evaluators.
- Encourage emulation of exemplary programs.
- Give all faculty and staff access to system.