

Documentation of Scholarly Teaching
Dr. Shelly Stovall, Director of Assessment
New Faculty Orientation
Friday, January 07, 2011: 10:30am – 12:00pm

Workshop Presentation: New Faculty Orientation, Teaching Academy, “What every faculty member needs to know about assessment” (renamed “Using Assessment to Document Scholarly Teaching”)

Overview:

- Twelve (12) new faculty members attended a 90 minute workshop on student learning assessment and documenting scholarly teaching as a part of the new faculty orientation.
- Learning objective: New faculty will use assessment of student learning to provide evidence of scholarly teaching.
- Learning outcomes:
 - New faculty will document an assessment of student learning to provide evidence of scholarly teaching.
 - New faculty will identify and qualify essential components of the student learning assessment process.

The second outcome was chosen to be assessed during the session – I will not have access to information that will provide evidence of the first outcome.

Instructional Strategies:

- Workshop was in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, with hands on activities for the participants (see literature citations).
- Two rubrics were introduced to the class: one for them to apply in peer review of each other’s work and to guide their achievement of the learning objective; the other to provide more in depth information about the components of assessment necessary for documenting scholarly work, and for them to apply to the actual workshop components.

Assignment used to measure participant learning: “Identify five essential components of the assessment of student learning process that can subsequently be used to provide evidence of scholarly teaching. Be sure to qualify specific criteria for each component that can impact the viability of that component. Be concise - do not exceed 3 sentences per component.”

- A sheet of paper, numbered 1 – 5 was provided for each participant to answer the question. Students were given a pre- and a post-test. The pre-test was given to highlight any cognitive dissonance; to provide immediate information to me about current level of understanding of the subject matter; and to demonstrate the difference between individual student evaluations and use of aggregated data to inform teaching.

Methods/Findings:

- A rubric (also used by participants in the session) was used by me to evaluate student performance on both the pre- and post-test.
- Results: Nine (9) faculty submitted pre-tests and 7 submitted post-tests. All 7 who submitted a post-test also submitted a pre-test. Rubrics with aggregated scores are attached. Scores ranged from 0 (no knowledge) to 3 (decidedly clear, distinct & insightful).

○ PRE-TEST		Percentage <i>Clearly Aware/Decidedly Clear:</i>	
Avg scores:			
Direct Learning Outcome	0.89	Direct Learning Outcome	22%
Appropriate Assignment	1.44	Appropriate Assignment	44%
Rubric	0.44	Rubric	11%
Evaluation	1.78	Evaluation	67%
Summarization/Reflection	0.22	Summarization/Reflection	0%
○ POST-TEST		Percentage <i>Clearly Aware/Decidedly Clear:</i>	
Avg scores:			
Direct Learning Outcome	2.57	Direct Learning Outcome	100%
Appropriate Assignment	2.43	Appropriate Assignment	100%
Rubric	2.71	Rubric	100%
Evaluation	2.29	Evaluation	100%
Summarization/Reflection	2.29	Summarization/Reflection	100%

There is clear improvement in all scores from pre- to post- testing. There is a total of 2 points improvement in 'rubric' and 'summarization/reflection,' and almost 2 points of improvement in 'direct learning outcome'. There was essentially 1 point of improvement in 'appropriate assignment'. The least amount of improvement was in 'evaluation,' which was the highest average score on the pre-test. Likewise, the percentage of participants scoring in the "clearly aware" and "decidedly clear" categories improved, to the degree that all those who submitted the post-test scored in one of these two categories.

Summary & Reflection: While it is certainly possible that participants who did not submit the assignment might have impacted the results, it does not diminish the significant improvement on the assignment. Some of improvement may be attributed to the participants' uncertainty about the expectations on the pre-test, while post-test expectations were clear. Also, the close proximity between the presentation of the material and the assessment likely had some positive impact on the results. While the results of the post-test were worthy, the question remains as to whether or not participants will retain the information into the ensuing weeks/months, and more importantly, whether or not they will actually use the techniques introduced in this workshop.

Indirect Assessment: An evaluation/survey of participant reaction to the workshop was also collected. Ten (10) participants completed the survey. It is not clear whether the 9 participants that submitted the pre- (and post-) test were all included in the 10 evaluation surveys (as there were 12 participants total), and there is some indication that they were not. While a gain in performance of the intended outcome appears to have been successful, comments from the evaluation/survey indicate participants were widely split on their perception of the value and presentation of the material. Some participants were highly enthusiastic, while others were vehement in their critique. This is both interesting and disturbing. While I am pleased performance on the outcome improved, I am concerned that the workshop may have alienated some participants. My overriding goal is to make assessment amenable and valuable to faculty. I am concerned that I may have done the opposite. As far as speculating as to the divergence of opinions, it may be that those with more assessment background/experience found the structure of the workshop meaningful, and perhaps even enlightening, whereas individuals with less knowledge/background found it confusing/frustrating. This will certainly weigh in my decision about when/if/where to use this type of workshop in the future. Because of the positive comments, both written and verbally communicated to me by some participants after the session, I am considering that part of the problem may have been that this was the wrong audience for this particular workshop.

Finally, one participant made suggestions in the session about peer review vs. self-review, and order of application of the second rubric. I will certainly take her suggestions to heart.

Literature citations:

Ford, M. J. (2010). Critique in Academic Disciplines and Active Learning of Academic Content. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 40(3), 265-280.

McLeod, S. G., Brown, G. C., McDaniels, P. W. & Sledge, L. (2009). Improving Writing with a PAL: Harnessing the Power of Peer Assisted Learning with the Reader's Assessment Rubrics. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(3), 488-502.

Reddy, Y. M., & Andrade, H. (2010). A Review of Rubric Use in Higher Education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(4), 435-448.

Rotgans, J. I., & Schmidt, H. G. (2011). The Role of Teachers in Facilitating Situational Interest in an Active-Learning Classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 27(1), 37-42.

Assessment of Student Learning to Provide Evidence of Scholarly Teaching

Components	No evidence	Emerging Evidence	Clear Documentation	Insightful and Skilled Documentation
Direct Learning Outcome	No learning outcome was stated.	Learning outcome was stated, but is unclear, indirect, or does not appear to be measureable; may or may not be aligned with an objective/goal.	A direct learning outcome is clearly stated, appears to be appropriate to the course and appears measureable.	The direct learning outcome is clearly stated, appropriate to the course and course level, measureable, and is clearly aligned with a learning objective/goal.
Appropriate Assignment	No assignment is identified, or assignment has no alignment with the learning outcome.	Assignment appears to be somewhat aligned with the learning outcome, but alignment is unclear or questionable.	Assignment is clearly aligned with the learning outcome and will likely provide evidence of achievement/non-achievement of the learning objective.	Assignment is carefully and completely aligned with the learning outcome as evidenced by consistent language, and specifically addresses content aimed at answering questions of achievement identified in the learning outcome.
Rubric	No rubric is identified, or rubric is not aligned with the learning outcome or the assignment.	Rubric is present, but content is overly vague, unclear, or often unrelated to the learning outcome and/or assignment.	Rubric has a clear connection to the learning outcome and assignment; scores on the rubric will likely reflect level of learning on the desired outcome and performance on the assignment.	Rubric is highly aligned with the learning outcome, is written in a way that is accessible to students, and provides valuable information to the student about expectations and discrepancies in levels of performance.
Evaluation of Student Product	There is no evidence that student products have been evaluated.	There is some indication student products were evaluated, but evaluation appears inconsistent or questionable; no aggregated student performance data is presented, or data presented is unclear or overly generalized.	Evaluation of student products appears to be consistent and complete; clear data on aggregated student performance is provided.	Evaluation of student products is consistent and complete; method of evaluation is explained; clear and specific data on various aggregated student performance indicators is provided.
Summarized Reflection	No summarization or reflection of student performance or teaching practice is provided.	Summarization of and/or reflection on student performance is provided, or reflection on teaching is provided, or summarization/reflections appear inadequate, superficial, or unrelated to data.	Summarization and reflection of student performance <i>and</i> teaching is provided; is clearly tied to the data; and clearly indicates commitment by the instructor to better understand student learning.	Summarization and reflection of student performance and teaching is provided, is clearly tied to data, is insightful and creative; citations of scholarly literature concerning the content area and/or student learning are included; there is a clear commitment by the instructor to understand and improve student learning.

Knowledge of Elements
Assessment of Student Learning Essential to Providing Evidence of Scholarly Teaching

Components	No Knowledge	A Sense of Awareness	Clearly Aware	Decidedly Clear, Distinct & Insightful
Direct Learning Outcome	A direct learning outcome/objective was not mentioned.	Something about a learning outcome or objective was mentioned, but it was not clearly identified as a necessary element.	A direct learning outcome or objective was identified as a necessary element in assessing student learning.	A direct learning outcome or objective was identified as a necessary element in assessing student learning, and qualifiers such as* “appropriate to the course/course level; measureable; aligned with a learning objective/goal” were included.
Appropriate Assignment	An ‘assignment,’ ‘student product’ or comparable element was not mentioned.	There was reference to an ‘assignment’ or ‘student product,’ but only vaguely and it was not clearly identified as a necessary element.	An ‘assignment’ or ‘student product’ was clearly identified as a necessary element in assessing student learning.	An ‘assignment’ or ‘student product’ was clearly identified as a necessary element in assessing student learning, and additional qualifiers such as* “aligned with the learning outcome; provides evidence of achievement of the learning outcome” were included.
Rubric	A rubric or ‘learning measurement tool’ was not mentioned.	There is a vague reference to the need to measure student learning (other than grades!), but no clear identification of a rubric or measurement tool as a necessary element was made.	A rubric or ‘learning measurement tool’ was clearly identified as a necessary element in assessing student learning.	A rubric or ‘learning measurement tool’ was clearly identified as a necessary element in assessing student learning and additional qualifiers such as* “aligned with the learning outcome and/or assignment; provides information to the student about expectations/performance levels” were included.
Evaluation of Student Product	Evaluation of student products was not mentioned.	The need to evaluate student products was implied or assumed, but not explicitly identified as a necessary element.	Evaluation of student products was clearly identified as a necessary element in assessing student learning.	Evaluation of student products was clearly identified as a necessary element in assessing student learning, and additional qualifiers such as* “an explanation of how products were evaluated” were included.
Summarized Reflection	There was no mention of the need to summarize or reflect on student performance or teaching practices.	There appears to be some awareness that summarized reflection is a part of the assessment process, but it is not overtly stated.	Summarization and reflection of student learning and/or teaching practices is clearly identified as a necessary element in assessing student learning.	Summarization and reflection of student learning and teaching practices is clearly identified as a necessary element in assessing student learning, and additional qualifiers such as* “tied to data; including literature citations” were included.

**but not limited to*

PRE-TEST

Components	No Knowledge 0 points	A Sense of Awareness 1 point	Clearly Aware 2 points	Decidedly Clear, Distinct & Insightful 3 points
Direct Learning Outcome	4	3	1	1
Appropriate Assignment	1	4	3	1
Rubric	7	1	0	1
Evaluation of Student Product	1	2	4	2
Summarized Reflection	7	2	0	0

POST-TEST

Components	No Knowledge 0 points	A Sense of Awareness 1 point	Clearly Aware 2 points	Decidedly Clear, Distinct & Insightful 3 points
Direct Learning Outcome	0	0	3	4
Appropriate Assignment	0	0	4	3
Rubric	0	0	2	5
Evaluation of Student Product	0	0	5	2
Summarized Reflection	0	0	5	2