

Assessing General Education Programs Worksheet

Mary J. Allen, mallen@csu.edu Texas A&M Assessment Conference
College Station, TX February 22, 2009

Academic Program Assessment

Program assessment is an on-going process designed to monitor and improve student learning.
Faculty:

- develop explicit statements of what students should learn.
 - verify that the program is designed to foster this learning.
 - collect empirical data that indicate student attainment.
 - reach a conclusion (faculty are satisfied or disappointed with student learning)
 - use these data to improve student learning.
-

In general, the plan should focus on direct, authentic, summative assessment with triangulation.

Learning Outcomes

How would you assess each of the following outcomes?

1. Students can list major events in American history.
 2. Students can describe major events and trends in American history.
 3. Students can apply their knowledge of American history to examine contemporary American issues.
-

Program Alignment Matrix (Curriculum Map)

GE Requirement	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5
1	I, D				I
2		I			
3	D		I		D
4					
5			D		D
6					D
7					
GE Capstone			M		D, M
Majors	M		D, M		D, M

I = Introduced, D = Developed & Practiced with Feedback, M = Demonstrated at the Mastery Level Appropriate for Graduation

Sample Assessment Plan

Outcome 3, dealing with quantitative reasoning, will be assessed every fourth year starting in 2010/11 by assessing the quality of students' interpretation of quantitative research findings in the GE capstone course (taken at the end of the GE program) and by embedding relevant questions in final exams in this course. An ad hoc faculty committee will develop and score the test items, and they will develop and apply a rubric to analyze the research interpretations.

Does this plan involve:

- Direct or indirect assessment?
- Authentic assessment?
- Formative or summative assessment?
- Triangulation?

Properties of Good Assessment Results

- Valid
- Reliable
- Actionable

Rubrics

There are two major types of scoring rubrics:

- Holistic
- Analytic rubrics

Portland State University Studies Program Holistic Critical Thinking Rubric*

Inquiry and Critical Thinking Rubric

Students will learn various modes of inquiry through interdisciplinary curricula—problem posing, investigating, conceptualizing—in order to become active, self-motivated, and empowered learners.

6 (Highest)—Consistently does all or almost all of the following:

- Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
- Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
- Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view.
- Generates alternative explanations of phenomena or event.
- Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons.
- Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.
- Makes ethical judgments.

5—Does most the following:

- Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
- Thinks through issues by identifying relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
- Offers analysis and evaluation of obvious alternative points of view.
- Generates alternative explanations of phenomena or event.

- Justifies (by using) some results or procedures, explains reasons.
- Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.

4—Does most the following:

- Describes events, people, and places with some supporting details from the source.
- Make connections to sources, either personal or analytic.
- Demonstrates a basic ability to analyze, interpret, and formulate inferences.
- States or briefly includes more than one perspective in discussing literature, experiences, and points of view of others.
- Takes some risks by occasionally questioning sources or by stating interpretations and predictions.
- Demonstrates little evidence of rethinking or refinement of one's own perspective.

3—Does most or many of the following:

- Respond by retelling or graphically showing events or facts.
- Makes personal connections or identifies connections within or between sources in a limited way. Is beginning to use appropriate evidence to back ideas.
- Discusses literature, experiences, and points of view of others in terms of own experience.
- Responds to sources at factual or literal level.
- Includes little or no evidence of refinement of initial response or shift in dualistic thinking.
- Demonstrates difficulty with organization and thinking is uneven.

2—Does many or most the following:

- Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
- Fails to identify strong, relevant counter arguments.
- Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions.
- Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons.
- Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.

1 (lowest)—Consistently does all or almost all of the following:

- Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others.
- Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counterarguments.
- Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view. Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons and unwarranted claims.
- Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons.
- Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.

X—No basis for scoring. (Use only for missing or malfunctioning portfolios.)

*taken verbatim from Stevens, D. D., & Levi, A. J. (2005). *Introduction to Rubrics*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, pp. 122-123

Northeastern Illinois University General Education Critical Thinking Rubric

Downloaded 3/2/05 from <http://www.neiu.edu/~neassess/gened.htm#rubric>

Quality Macro Criteria	No/Limited Proficiency (D&E)	Some Proficiency (C)	Proficiency (B)	High Proficiency (A)
1. Identifies & Explains Issues	Fails to identify, summarize, or explain the main problem or question. Represents the issues inaccurately or inappropriately.	Identifies main issues but does not summarize or explain them clearly or sufficiently	Successfully identifies and summarizes the main issues, but does not explain why/how they are problems or create questions	Clearly identifies and summarizes main issues and successfully explains why/how they are problems or questions; and identifies embedded or implicit issues, addressing their relationships to each other.
2. Distinguishes Types of Claims	Fails to label correctly any of the factual, conceptual and value dimensions of the problems and proposed solutions.	Successfully identifies some, but not all of the factual, conceptual, and value aspects of the questions and answers.	Successfully separates and labels all the factual, conceptual, and value claims	Clearly and accurately labels not only all the factual, conceptual, and value, but also those implicit in the assumptions and the implications of positions and arguments.
3. Recognizes Stakeholders and Contexts	Fails accurately to identify and explain any empirical or theoretical contexts for the issues. Presents problems as having no connections to other conditions or contexts.	Shows some general understanding of the influences of empirical and theoretical contexts on stakeholders, but does not identify many specific ones relevant to situation at hand.	Correctly identifies all the empirical and most of theoretical contexts relevant to all the main stakeholders in the situation.	Not only correctly identifies all the empirical and theoretical contexts relevant to all the main stakeholders, but also finds minor stakeholders and contexts and shows the tension or conflicts of interests among them.
4. Considers Methodology	Fails to explain how/why/which specific methods of research are relevant to the kind of issue at hand.	Identifies some but not all methods required for dealing with the issue; does not explain why they are relevant or effective.	Successfully explains how/why/which methods are most relevant to the problem.	In addition to explaining how/why/which methods are typically used, also describes embedded methods and possible alternative methods of working on the problem.
5. Frames Personal Responses and Acknowledges Other Perspectives	Fails to formulate and clearly express own point of view, (or) fails to anticipate objections to his/her point of view, (or) fails to consider other perspectives and position.	Formulates a vague and indecisive point of view, or anticipates minor but not major objections to his/her point of view, or considers weak but not strong alternative positions.	Formulates a clear and precise personal point of view concerning the issue, and seriously discusses its weaknesses as well as its strengths.	Not only formulates a clear and precise personal point of view, but also acknowledges objections and rival positions and provides convincing replies to these.