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

Avg scores:		Percentage *Clearly Aware/Decidedly Clear:*	
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

Avg scores:		Percentage *Clearly Aware/Decidedly Clear:*	
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.