Collecting, Analyzing, and Using SLO Results to Improve Student Learning

Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Initiatives
Northern Virginia Community College
Steps to Assess Student Learning Outcomes

1. Identify student learning outcomes for your program
2. Determine practices used to achieve outcomes through curriculum mapping
3. Determine methods of assessment
4. Gather evidence
5. “Close the loop” (use results to continuously improve student learning)
Identify Student Learning Outcomes

Use Results

Assessment at NOVA

Map Curriculum to SLOs

Select Methods of Assessment

Gather Evidence
Assessment is...

• an **ongoing process** aimed at understanding and improving student learning.  (AAHE Bulletin, Thomas A. Angelo, 1995)

• an **integral component of teaching and learning**.
Levels of Assessment

- Institution
- Program
- Course
- Classroom
Different Levels of Statements of Learning

• Institution
  • General Education Goals

• Program
  • Student Learning Outcomes

• Course
  • Course Objectives
Step 1: Defining SLOs
What are student learning outcomes?
Student Learning Outcomes

• Student learning outcomes are the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values (KSAs) that students gain from a learning experience.

Think about: What should students know, be able to do, and value by the end of degree or certificate program at NOVA?
Programs at NOVA

• Have 6 to 10 SLOs
• Review SLOs and their results at Cluster Meetings
• Update and revise SLOs to meet current needs and standards in field/program
• Send SLO revisions to OIR for approval – by Nov. 15th
Student Learning Outcomes/ Program Goals

What did we assess?

- Were at least 4 SLOs assessed for the academic year?

- Which program goals were assessed? Do the program goals include one devoted to program-placed students and one devoted to graduates?

- Were only those SLOs and program goals for which you have gathered data this cycle (2012-13) included?
Step 2: Mapping SLOs to the Curriculum
## Mapping SLOs to the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Course 4</th>
<th>Course 5</th>
<th>Course 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Test questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Problem Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I- Introduced  P- Practiced  M-Mastered
## APER Checklist - Assessments Methods

### Assessment Methods

*How did we assess?*

- Where do the data come from? If an embedded assignment was used, provide the course name, number, and brief assignment description. If not an embedded assignment, also include the source and a brief description (such as, specific OIR documents, Fact Book, websites, national tests, etc.).
Step 3: Determining Methods of Assessment
Begin with the End in Mind:

What does the program want to know about SLO/program goal?

What decisions might your assessment results inform?

What kinds of changes can your program actually make?

Make Assessments Useful!
Typical SLO Assessment Questions at Program-Level

- Are students learning the aspects of the SLO we want them to gain from this program?
- Is the course level appropriately targeted for the ability(ies) of the students when they begin?
- Are students learning what they need to succeed in future courses in the sequence or endeavors?
- Are we getting better at helping our student learn? Do recent innovations help students learn more effectively?
Direct Methods of Assessment

- Locally developed tests/test questions
  - Limited-choice (T/F, MC, matching, etc.)
  - Open-ended (+ rubric)
- Student work evaluated with rubrics:
  - Essays
  - Research papers
  - Homework assignments
  - Capstone/culminating projects
  - Lab work
  - Exhibits
  - Presentations
  - Performances
  - Portfolios of student work
- Standardized tests
Indirect Methods of Assessment

• Surveys
  • Student
  • Alumni
  • Employer
• Exit interviews
• Focus groups
• Job placement rates
• Course evaluations
Course-Embedded Assessments

• Main source of evidence for program-level assessments of student learning
  • No extra time for student or faculty
  • Student motivation is great
  • Provides both formative and summative data
  • Faculty-driven and therefore more likely to be used for improvements
• Assesses what is actually taught
  • Linked to curriculum
  • Can identify specific curricular needs/areas for improvement
  • Feedback to faculty and students is quick
## APER Checklist - Assessments Methods

### Assessment Methods

**How did we assess?**

- **Where do the data come from?** If an embedded assignment was used, provide the course name, number, and brief assignment description. If not an embedded assignment, also include the source and a brief description (such as, specific OIR documents, Fact Book, websites, national tests, etc.).

- **Was at least one direct measure used for each SLO?**
- **Is each direct method attached/described?**
  - Assignment instructions
  - Quiz/test
  - Grading system (e.g., rubric, checklist)
  - SLO-specific items/criteria highlighted
  - If method is from an outside body, provide link to that organization.

- **Are there any additional methods (e.g., student surveys, interviews, etc.) provided?**

- **If method is different from previous assessment(s), what was the earlier method?**
Step 4: Gathering, Summarizing, and Analyzing Evidence
Setting Achievement Targets/ Standards
Setting Targets

• Can be set before gathering and reviewing data or after

• Helps determine if students are attaining the specified SLO(s) at an acceptable level.

• Faculty should think about and collectively decide the level which students ought to perform (ideal state) rather than where faculty know that students can achieve and is “safe” to assess

• To determine targets
  • Do some research
  • Involve others in the process
  • Use samples of student work
Common Types of Targets/Standards

• Local standards
  • Faculty determine target/standards

• Historical trends benchmark
  • Compare with past performance

• Strengths-and-weaknesses perspective
  • What areas are weaker/below average
Activity

• If you teach, what kinds of standards or benchmarks do you use most often when you evaluate students work in your classes?
• How do you determine if work is acceptable or not?
  • Why do you use these standards or benchmark(s)?
  • If you use a local standard, how do you decide on the cut-off point for each grade?
Setting Targets/Standards

• Common way to set standards:

  • **Overall score** of 90-100 is an A, overall score of 80-89 is a B, etc.
Setting Targets
Two common ways to set targets for SLOs:

1. Minimum average score (or subscore)

2. Percent of students meeting minimum acceptable standard
   • Linda Suskie believes the % of students meeting minimum acceptable standard is more understandable and useful.
Possible Questions for Setting Targets/Standards

• Which examples represent exemplary work? Why? Would it be realistic to establish these as targets we aim for in all students?

• Which examples are unacceptably inadequate? Which would embarrass you if they were from students finishing your course/graduates of program? Why?

• What kinds of student performance represent minimally acceptable work for a student finishing your course/graduating from the program?

• How do the exemplary, acceptable, and inadequate examples differ?
Setting Targets to Improve Learning

With overall grade/score, how can the program determine possible areas for improvement?
Setting Targets/Standards with Subscores

- Both tests and rubrics can have sub scores in addition to overall scores.
  - Tests – individual items, groups of items
  - Rubric – evaluation criteria

Possible ways to set targets:
- The minimum standard met for each sub score
- Minimum standard for the sum or average of all sub scores
- Minimum standard for certain traits met for entire work to be considered adequate
Setting Targets/Standards for Tests

• Use a minimum target for each test item or group of test items
  • Based on difficulty and importance

• The expectation should be that no more than 50% of students answer the item or group of items incorrectly.
Setting Multiple Targets

- Consider multiple targets
  - 90% of students earn the minimally acceptable score/rating
  - And at least 30% earn the exemplary score/rating

- Example categories for levels of performance:
  - Exemplary, Acceptable, Developing, Unacceptable

- Be open to adjusting standards and targets
Example – Quiz/Test

SLO to Assess:

• Identify parts of the human body

Method of Assessment:

• Biology 141: Human Anatomy and Physiology I
• Fill-in-the-blank quiz with drawing of human body
  • 100 items
    • 45 – Legs
    • 35 – Torso
    • 20 – Arms, Neck, and Head
If Using Mean: Example - Quiz/Test

• Determine target(s) for mean
  • Target: 80% average total score
    Or
  • Target: The average for correct answers should be at least 70% for each group of items
    Or
  • Target: The average for correct answers for a given group of items should be higher than the average % total score
REMEMBER

If one method was used to assess more than one SLO (or anything in addition to the one SLO), then the overall score cannot be used as an accurate representation of achievement of the one SLO.

Assessment items/criteria must be specific to each SLO; there should be no overlap.
Gathering Evidence
1. Develop an action plan for collecting and organizing data
   - Which semester(s) will SLO be assessed?
   - How many sections and from which campuses/from total offered?
   - Which sections/faculty will collect data? Assign responsibility.
   - How many students? Using sample or including all students? **If using a sample, contact OIR.**
   - What is the timeline for data collection?
2. Determine means to collect student work
   • Format: Test, quiz, short answer, project, etc
   • Assessment method is part of grading in course
   • Assessment method is not part of grading

3. Develop a timeline for collecting and sharing information
   • When during the semester will the assessment take place?
   • How will assessment process be communicated to faculty? Provide information in a timely manner to all those involved in assessment process
Gather Evidence – Program-Level

4. Who will gather together, summarize, and analyze data?
   • SLO Lead, Course Faculty, Assigned Group, other

5. Determine how data will be submitted once collected.
   • Excel spread sheet, word table, other?

6. Where will data be stored? Compile data into one document.
Summarizing Results

• Organize and summarize results
  • Organize by SLO

• Ways to summarize results
  • Tallies (frequencies)
  • Percentages
  • Aggregates (overall and for subscore)
  • Averages (mean; median)
  • Qualitative
Review Data

- Make sure that components of the method align with SLO
  - This would have been done when developing the method, but should confirm after data collection.

- Organize data for each SLO being assessed
  - Test items/groups of test items (test blueprint)
  - Rubric subscores
Testing Blueprint Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLOs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total Number of Items</th>
<th>% of Test Out of 23 Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1 – criteria a</td>
<td>1,2,6,8,9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1 – criteria b</td>
<td>3, 7, 10,13,17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2 – criteria a</td>
<td>4, 12, 18, 19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2 – criteria b</td>
<td>5, 14,20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2 – criteria c</td>
<td>11, 21-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Testing Blueprint Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLOs to be assessed</th>
<th>% of period being devoted to SLO.</th>
<th>Level of Understanding (from Bloom’s Taxonomy)</th>
<th># of questions</th>
<th>% of test devoted to SLO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions measuring recall/comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions measuring application/analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions measuring synthesis/evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of test devoted to each level of understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric Example

• SLOs to Assess:
  • Students will create unified, coherent, well-developed texts that demonstrate a self-critical awareness of rhetorical elements such as purpose, audience, and organization.
  • Students will appropriately employ grammatical and mechanical conventions

• Method of Assessment:
  • English course
  • Essay and rubric
Rubric Example

• Align criteria of rubric with specific SLOs / SLO components

• Holistic rubric vs. Analytical rubric
Writing Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Rubric Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will create unified, coherent, well-developed texts that demonstrate a self-critical awareness of rhetorical elements such as purpose, audience, and organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will appropriately employ grammatical and mechanical conventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Writing Rubric (CSU-LB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Rubric Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students will create unified, coherent, well-developed texts that demonstrate a self-critical awareness of rhetorical elements such as purpose, audience, and organization. | Presentation - #1, 2, 3  
Content - # 6, 7  
Thinking - #9, 10  
Assignment Specific Criteria - # 15 |
| Students will appropriately employ grammatical and mechanical conventions | Presentation - #4, 5  
Assignment Specific Criteria - # 14 |
Analyze Evidence for Current Assessment

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Rubric Results: - target = minimum 80% score
• Target was met for Average Total Score (80%).
• Target was exceeded for 1 (88%).
• Target was met for 2 (82%).
• Target was not met for 3 (69%).
## Compare Current Results to Previous Assessments

### Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>+21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>+17.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison to Previous Results
- All scores increase
  - from 14 to 22 percentage points.
APER Checklist - Assessment Results

When did we assess?  Who was involved?  What did we find out?

2012-13 Assessment Results

- In what semester(s) were the data collected?
- Who was involved in the assessment activity?
  - How many sections and from which campuses/from total offered
    (Contact OIR if using a sample)
  - Assessed on each campus offered, including ELI?
  - How many students
  - Total sample

- What were the actual results? What strengths and weaknesses were uncovered during this assessment?
  - Average criterion scores and overall rubric scores
  - Average scores for SLO-specific test items/sections/etc.
  - Frequencies
  - Percentages at competency levels

- What was the achievement target? This refers to minimum score required for results to be satisfactory (e.g. achievement target is at least 80% of students will receive rubric score of 3 or higher)
APER Checklist- Assessment Results continued

Comparison to previous assessment(s)

• What were the results from the previous assessment(s)?
• How do the current (2012-13) re-assessment results compare to previous assessment results?
• Did student learning improve?

• If using OIR data for program goals, are data for previous five years included?
Step 5: Using Results
aka
Closing the Loop
Closing the Loop

A. In what ways did students accomplish the SLO(s)?

B. How could the SLO be improved?

C. What did we learn from this experience?
Part A.

In what ways did students accomplish the SLO(s)?

Analyzing Evidence: Compare actual results to target(s)

Was target exceeded?

Was target met?

Was target partially met?

Was target not met?
Example A – Quiz/Test

• Gather evidence of student learning
  • Collect quizzes from all students
• Record scores in spreadsheet
  • Overall score per students
  • Score for each group of items
  • Number of correct answers for each body part
• Analyze scores
  • Overall mean for all students (Excel function)
  • % correct for each body part/group of items (Excel function)
Example - Quiz/Test – Using Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Legs</th>
<th>Torso</th>
<th>Arms, Neck, Head</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Target: 80% average total score
- Target: The average for correct answers should be at least 70% for each group of items
- Target: The average for correct answers for a given group of items should be higher than the average % total score
Example - Quiz/Test – Using Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legs</th>
<th>Torso</th>
<th>Arms, Neck, Head</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Target: 80% average total score

Exceeded, Just Met, Met, Did not Meet
Example - Quiz/Test – Using Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legs</th>
<th>Torso</th>
<th>Arms, Neck, Head</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Score</strong></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Target: The average for correct answers should be at least 70% for each group of items

*Exceeded, Just Met, Met, Did not Meet*
Example - Quiz/Test – Using Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legs</th>
<th>Torso</th>
<th>Arms, Neck, Head</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Target: The average for correct answers for a given group of items should be higher than the average % total score

*Exceeded, Just Met, Met, Did not Meet*
Example – Test/Quiz – Using Performance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary 85-100%</th>
<th>Acceptable 70-85%</th>
<th>Not Acceptable below 70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of students at level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torso</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms, Neck, Head</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For total score and each subscore

- Target: At least 75% of students will perform at the Acceptable or Exemplary level.
- Target: At least 25% will perform at the Exemplary level
Analyzing Evidence to Review the Method

• Possible ways to review method

  • Review results for each test item/test item group/rubric criteria
    • 50% guideline

  • Discriminate between high and low scorers
    • Higher scorers should generally perform better than lower scorers
Closing the Loop: Part B

How could student learning be improved?
Analyzing Evidence:

Compare actual results to target(s)

• If overall target was met, program should examine subscores for areas to improve.

• If subscore targets were also met, program should still consider ways to improve or raise their expectations (i.e., standards, target).

• If target was not met, program must determine possible changes to improve student learning (examples of changes in later slide)
Example – Test/Quiz – Using Performance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary 85-100%</th>
<th>Acceptable 70-85%</th>
<th>Not Acceptable below 70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of students at level</td>
<td>% of students at level</td>
<td>% of students at level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torso</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms, Neck, Head</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For total score

Target: At least 75% of students will perform at the Acceptable or Exemplary level.

Exceeded, Met, Did not Meet
### Example – Test/Quiz – Using Performance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary 85-100%</th>
<th>Acceptable 70-85%</th>
<th>Not Acceptable below 70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of students at</td>
<td>% of students at</td>
<td>% of students at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torso</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms, Neck, Head</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For total score

- **Target:** At least 25% will perform at the Exemplary level

**Exceeded, Met, Did not Meet**
### Example – Test/Quiz – Using Performance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary 85-100%</th>
<th>Acceptable 70-85%</th>
<th>Not Acceptable below 70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of students at level</td>
<td>% of students at level</td>
<td>% of students at level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torso</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms, Neck, Head</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For total score and each subscore:

- **Target:** At least 75% of students will perform at the Acceptable or Exemplary level.

**Exceeded, Met, Did not Meet**
### Example – Test/Quiz – Using Performance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary 85-100%</th>
<th>Acceptable 70-85%</th>
<th>Not Acceptable below 70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of students at level</td>
<td>% of students at level</td>
<td>% of students at level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torso</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms, Neck, Head</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For total score and each subscore:

- **Target:** At least 25% will perform at the Exemplary level

**Exceeded, Met, Did not Meet**
Example – Test/Quiz – Using Results

1. Target was exceeded for Legs and met Arms, Neck, Head. *Faculty reviewed the types of activities done for Legs and has adapted them for Arms, Neck, Head.*

2. Target was not met for Torso. *After reviewing the syllabus,* faculty took one class meeting devoted to Legs and added it to the Torso portion of the course.

3. Re-assessment has been scheduled for the next cycle.
Determining Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Based on the review and analysis of evidence, ask …

• What is working in the program, or for the students?

• What areas need tweaking or improvement?

• What is a reasonable plan for making changes over the next semester(s)?
If our students are not learning some aspects of the SLO, what are their stumbling points? How might we change what we are doing to help them learn more effectively?

Might new pedagogies or new technologies lead to improved student learning? Would new or increased resources help students learn more effectively? Where and how would those resources have the greatest impact on student learning?
Internal Uses for Results

• Revising existing courses
• Adding or modifying assignments, tests, readings, projects, etc.
• Reviewing methodology of delivering course materials
• Incorporating effective use of technologies
Internal Uses for Results

• Realignment between SLOs and teaching methods
• Modifying assessments -
  • Revising assessment method
  • Modifying SLO
  • Changing target level of achievement

• For program-level, discuss changes across program with cluster involvement
More Internal Uses for Results

- Sequencing of courses
- Adding or deleting a course
- Changing requirements/pre-requisites
- Improving educational and support programs
- Identifying training needs/professional development
- Guiding resource allocations
Determining Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Based on responses, ask: …

What changes to the program

…could be easily accomplished?

…might be done in one or two semesters?

…should be considered as long-range goals?

…would have the greatest positive impact on students?

…would require additional departmental resources (faculty, staff, money, space, or equipment)?
Making Changes to Improve Student Learning

• Use data as evidence for changes

• Assessment results for a method alone should never dictate decisions.
  • “We should always use our professional judgment to interpret assessment results and make appropriate decisions.” (Suskie, p. 298)
  • Importance of using multiple methods

• Be as specific/concrete as possible

• Develop an action plan and assign roles
# APER Checklist: Use of Results

## What have we been doing to improve student learning?

### Previous actions to improve SLO

- What change(s) has the program implemented to improve student learning prior to the current assessment?
  - Who was involved? (Cluster, assistant dean, faculty teaching course(s), dean, Advisory Board, other - please specify)
  - When were the actions taken? (Semester/year)
### APER Checklist- Use of Results continued

#### 2012-13 Results

- Since this/these action/s, has the outcome improved compared to previous assessments? Explain.

- Was the achievement target(s) for 2012-13 met?
APER Checklist- Use of Results continued

Current actions to improve SLO

- Based on analysis of the current assessment results (2012-13), what area(s) could be improved?
- What action(s) have been/will be taken to improve these areas?
- Who was/is to be involved in improving student learning? (Cluster, assistant dean, faculty teaching course(s), dean, Advisory Board, other - please specify)
- When were/are steps to be taken? (Semester/year)

- When will the SLO be assessed next? (Semester/year)
Sharing Results – Program-Level

How/where/when can results be shared with the cluster?
Reviewing and Analyzing Evidence – Program-Level

- Set aside designated time for review
- Share results widely and transparently
- Involve those with a stake in decisions stemming from results
- Discourage others from making inappropriate interpretations or misleading statements about the data
- Don’t penalize faculty who have less-than-positive-results
- Keep faculty informed about how evidence will be or was used to support decisions
Sharing Results – Program-Level

- For program-level – share results
  - Share only aggregated results (no information on individual students)
  - Share basic information for the group
    - But offer to make additional information available
  - Consider variety of ways to present results
    - Narrative/text
    - Table
    - Graphic (pie chart, bar chart, etc.)
Making Changes and Measuring Effectiveness of Changes

• Act on and document recommended changes

• An important component of the definitions of assessment is the “ongoing process” part >> the assessment cycle continues

• Re-assess and continue with assessment loop

Assessment is a means to continuous improvement
Closing the Loop: Part C

What did the program learn from this experience?
Evaluate the Assessment

• Has the process produced the kind of data necessary for making program decisions?

• Has the program developed a process that is useful and beneficial to all involved—the program as well as students?

• Can and will the process be practically replicated as time and circumstance require?
• For future comparison and accountability

• Ensure the following has been saved and is available to others:
  • Listing of the raw data
  • Notes on coding (Excellent =5, Good=4, etc.)
  • Copies of assignment (instructions), rubrics, surveys, tests, etc.
  • Complete summary and analysis of data
  • Samples of good, bad, and mediocre work as evidence of standards
  • List of actions to be taken. When? And By whom?

Any other suggestions?
### Annual Planning and Evaluation Reports for 2012-13

#### SLO Documentation: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August</th>
<th>Data from OIR for the Annual Planning and Evaluation Reports are posted online at <a href="http://www.nvcc.edu/depts/planning/data/">http://www.nvcc.edu/depts/planning/data/</a>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-August</td>
<td>At the fall cluster meeting, faculty discuss results from previous semester(s) for SLOs and for program goals (for some program goals, data are provided by OIR in the summer) in preparation for the submission of the Annual Planning and Evaluation Report in September. This discussion should include possible areas for improvement and actions the program has undertaken and will undertake to continue to improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>Provosts submit completed drafts of Annual Planning and Evaluation Reports for the 2012-13 cycle to OIR. Completed drafts will contain entries for both SLOs (minimum of four) and for program goals. Regarding program goals, all programs are required to have one goal that relates to graduates and one that relates to program-placed students/enrollments. Programs may have additional program goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>OIR provides feedback on Annual Planning and Evaluation Reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30</td>
<td>Provosts submit the final Annual Planning and Evaluation Report for the 2012-13 cycle to OIR. Additional drafts will be required when necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Template for the 2012-13 Annual Planning and Evaluation Report:

Programs should use this form for completing the Annual Planning and Evaluation Report.

Checklist for Annual Planning and Evaluation Report:

This checklist should be used by both programs (when completing the report) and deans (when reviewing the reports). It details what should be included/addressed in the Annual Planning and Evaluation Report.

SLO Assessment Process Checklist:

A very detailed checklist for every step of the assessment process.

Sample Entries - Use of Results to Improve Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Mapping Effective SLOs/Course Objectives</td>
<td>Fri, 10/4/2013</td>
<td>Loudoun</td>
<td>11-12:30pm</td>
<td>LC 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting and Designing Assessment Methods that Align with SLOs/Course Objectives</td>
<td>Fri, 10/18/2013</td>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>12:30-2pm</td>
<td>CG 202C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting and Designing Assessment Methods that Align with SLOs/Course Objectives</td>
<td>Thurs, 10/24/2013</td>
<td>Medical Education</td>
<td>12-1:30pm</td>
<td>205A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting, Summarizing, and Analyzing Assessment Results</td>
<td>Fri, 11/1/2013</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>11-12:30pm</td>
<td>Bisdor 479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and Using Results to Improve Student Learning</td>
<td>Fri, 11/22/2013</td>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>11-12:30pm</td>
<td>WS 233D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Mapping Effective SLOs/Course Objectives</td>
<td>Fri, 12/6/2013</td>
<td>Manassas</td>
<td>10-11:30am</td>
<td>MH 317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions

Contact: Sharon Karkehabadi
Student learning Outcomes Specialist
Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment
703-764-7390
skarkehabadi@nvcc.edu