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Part I: The Conceptual Framework for Learning Outcomes Assessment

Introduction

Assessment of student learning outcomes to enhance student success is a core value of and ongoing activity at UMKC. Engagement in assessment of student learning encourages us to think deeply about the outcomes we desire for our students and the educational experiences we create to support achievement of the identified learning outcomes. Assessment provides reliable data to determine whether our students are achieving the desired outcomes, to make decisions concerning programmatic alterations to enhance learning, and to communicate the quality and effectiveness of our efforts to support and enhance student learning to our various stakeholders.

This Assessment Handbook is designed to communicate the conceptual framework for assessment at UMKC and to serve as a guide to programs concerning expectations and processes for continuous engagement in assessment. Additional information concerning the assessment process, assessment resources, and the work of the University Assessment Committee is available on the assessment website at www.umkc.edu/assessment. Programs are encouraged to contact the Director of Assessment for support in developing and implementing assessment plans.

Conceptual Framework for Assessment at UMKC

Assessment of student learning achievement to enhance student success and improve teaching and learning is a core value and ongoing activity at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. Assessment of student learning supports the university’s emphasis on continuous improvement and its strategic goal to improve student success. The overriding goal of assessment at UMKC is to demonstrate that the institution is fulfilling the promises it makes students and other stakeholders (Finley, 2014; Suskie, October 26, 2010), which are communicated through university and unit mission statements and through the student learning outcomes identified for programs and courses.

Ultimately, the purposes of assessment are: 1) to ensure that we are delivering on what we care about, which is that students get the best possible education and learn what is important, and 2) to ensure that learning is of the appropriate scope, depth, and rigor for the program level (Suskie, October 26, 2010). Assessment is a systemic process of gathering and interpreting information to determine if a program is meeting its identified outcomes, and then using the information to make programmatic enhancements. As Doug Eder suggests, there are three basic questions that guide our assessment framework and processes:

1. What have our students learned?
2. Are we satisfied with what they have learned?
3. If not, what are we going to do about it? (Eder, cited in Suskie, October 26, 2010)
Assessment involves asking questions and considering information that are important to the program. As emphasized by Hubba and Freed (2000), assessment is understanding, confirming, and improving student learning. That is, programs should recognize and preserve successful practices in supporting student learning, as well as identify areas in which students are not achieving at desired levels and make programmatic improvements to enhance student success.

Assessment occurs at the institutional, program, and course levels for both graduate and undergraduate education. Institutional-level assessment gathers data concerning student achievement of student learning outcomes identified in the General Education Core. In addition to the General Education Core assessment plan described below, data concerning student achievement of the general education learning outcomes are collected through the ETS® Proficiency Profile and through specific items on the National Survey of Student Engagement and the UMKC Senior Survey. Program-level assessment encompasses major programs of study, stand-alone minors, certificate programs, and the General Education Core, as well as high-impact practices, student affairs programs, and co-curricular programs. (See below for information concerning assessment of the General Education Core.) Course-level assessment at UMKC encompasses courses offered through the High School/College Dual Credit Partnership program to ensure that the quality of the educational experiences, the learning outcomes, and expectations for student achievement for the dual credit courses are equivalent to those of the campus-based courses. Faculty also engage in course-level assessment to obtain formative feedback that is used to inform improvements in teaching and learning. Assessment of learning in online programs and courses follows the framework and processes used for onsite offerings and, where applicable, ensures that learning achievement in the online environment is equivalent to that of the onsite offerings.

UMKC’s assessment initiatives are informed by research, theory, models developed by nationally-recognized experts in assessment and evaluation, examples of best practices in assessment from colleges and universities across the country, and the experiences and expertise of UMKC faculty and staff. Assessment practices at UMKC are also informed by the HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation, the policies of the Missouri Department of Education and the University of Missouri System, and the standards for accreditation established by the organizations that accredit specific units and programs at UMKC.

Moreover, the assessment framework adopted by UMKC recognizes that the ultimate responsibility for academic assessment belongs to the faculty. Given their curricular role and responsibility, faculty and academic units at UMKC have primary responsibility for the development, implementation, and ongoing maintenance of academic program assessment activities. The responsibility for of assessment of Student Affairs programs, high-impact practices, and co-curricular programs resides with the unit administrators and program directors.

Assessment of student learning achievement at UMKC is an ongoing process. Programs are required to report annually assessment findings, action plans for programmatic alterations to enhance teaching and learning, and the status of action plans created in previous assessment cycles. The University Assessment Committee reviews the annual reports and provides feedback
to the programs concerning assessment methods and use of findings. Details concerning the assessment framework and assessment process are contained below in Part II of this Handbook.

Support for Assessment at UMKC

Infrastructure

The Office of Assessment is located in Academic Affairs and reports to the Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs. Learning outcomes assessment at UMKC is coordinated by the Director of Assessment and the University Assessment Committee. Responsibilities of the Director of Assessment include

• leading institutional assessment policy development, implementation, and review;
• developing and monitoring implementation of the university’s Assessment Plan and Timeline (located in Appendix A);
• supporting the development of high quality academic, student affairs, and co-curricular program assessment plans;
• ensuring compliance with the Higher Learning Commission’s accreditation standards related to student learning assessment;
• collaborating with Institutional Research and academic units to analyze and disseminate student performance data;
• implementing the General Education Core Program assessment plan; and
• providing faculty and staff development opportunities to enhance assessment practices.

The Director of Assessment also provides leadership for the University Assessment Committee, which is charged with encouraging, supporting and guiding the growth of effective student learning outcomes assessment practices at UMKC. The Committee is responsible for guiding the development and integration of student learning outcomes assessment into a university-wide assessment and evaluation system that is effectively linked with planning and budgeting processes. The Committee reviews program-level assessment plans for all academic programs and provides recommendations for plan improvements to department chairs and program directors. The Committee also works with the General Education Coordinator and the General Education Curriculum Committee to develop, monitor, and revise the plan for assessment of the General Education Program. The Committee works with the Institutional Research staff to review and disseminate results of institutional assessments. (See Appendix A for a complete description of the charge and membership of the University Assessment Committee.)

The Office of Assessment works closely with the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching (FaCET) to provide professional development opportunities designed to broaden and deepen engagement in assessment. The Office of Assessment collaborates with FaCET to provide workshops, disseminate assessment findings, and share examples of good practices in assessment at UMKC. In addition, FaCET and the Office of Assessment partner to support the FaCET Faculty Fellow for Assessment. The Faculty Fellow provides mentoring to academic programs to enhance assessment efforts, identifies general and program-specific assessment resources, and offers workshops and other professional development sessions in conjunction with FaCET.
Each academic program is required to identify two Assessment Coordinators. These individuals are responsible for working with their colleagues to develop, implement, and maintain the program’s assessment efforts, meeting with program faculty to discuss assessment findings and develop action plan, and entering and updating assessment information in Weave, including posting the annual assessment report. Together with the unit dean and the department chair, the assessment coordinators receive the feedback from the University Assessment Committee concerning the annual reports and are expected to work with their colleagues to develop strategies to enhance assessment efforts as needed, as well as to improve student learning.

**Institutional policies and procedures related to assessment**

Indicative of the priority and value the institution places on ongoing assessment of student learning, in addition to the infrastructure that supports engagement in assessment and the expectation that academic programs engage in annual assessment cycles, UMKC has developed policies and procedures to ensure ongoing assessment planning, data collection, and use of results to inform programmatic alterations.

According to university policy, proposals for new degree programs, minors, and certificate programs must include the intended student learning outcomes and assessment methods for the proposed program. Additionally, proposals for new or modified courses must include student learning outcomes. Programs are advised to work with the Director of Assessment to develop the student learning outcomes and the assessment plans prior to submitting the proposal. The Director of Assessment is responsible for reviewing and approving the student learning outcomes and assessment plan before the proposal is sent to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Council for approval. Detailed information concerning curriculum policies and procedures is available at [http://info.umkc.edu/ucc/forms-procedures](http://info.umkc.edu/ucc/forms-procedures).

SLOs for all academic programs are published in the UMKC catalog. Faculty are required to include the SLOs for each course on the syllabus. The UMKC syllabus guidelines are located on the Provost’s website: [http://www.umkc.edu/provost/](http://www.umkc.edu/provost/).

Under the direction of the Provost, each academic unit engages in a comprehensive program review process every five years. Recognizing the role of assessment of student learning in both demonstrating where academic units are succeeding and where meaningful changes are needed, the university’s Academic Program Review Guidelines require programs to describe assessment processes, findings, and use of results. Detailed information concerning the academic program review process is available from the Office of the Provost.
Part II: Guide to Assessment of Student Learning Achievement at UMKC

The following is intended as a brief introduction to the assessment process. For assistance with any aspect of developing an assessment plan, collecting and analyzing assessment findings, or reporting results, please contact the Director of Assessment. Additional resources to support development and implementation of assessment plans are available on the assessment website at www.umkc.edu/assessment. A short list of print and online resources is located at the end of this document.

Guidelines for Assessing Student Learning Outcomes in Degree, Minor, and Certificate Programs

Assessment Plan Framework

All academic programs (graduate and undergraduate majors, stand-alone minors, and certificates), student affairs programs, and co-curricular programs are expected to continuously engage in assessment of student learning and to use assessment results to make program alterations that result in enhance student learning.

Following is the framework used by UMKC for assessment plan development and implementation and a brief guide to developing an assessment plan. Recommended resources are provided in the text, and an extensive list of resources is provided in the appendix. Programs should contact the Director of Assessment for assistance with assessment planning and implementation.

- **Mission**: describes the primary purposes of the program, stated in student-centered language. The program’s mission should be linked to the unit’s and the university’s mission statements.

- **Program Goals**: broad statements about desired ends for the students. The program goals should be linked to the program’s mission and describe the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that student should exhibit following graduation, as well as the aspirations faculty have for their graduates concerning careers and further study. Examples of Program Goals are:
  - Students will be able to conduct, analyze and interpret experiments, and apply experimental results to improve processes.
  - Students function effectively on teams.
  - Student will possess the ability to assess his/her own work and actively plan for continued growth.
  - Students will develop creative and innovative approaches to problems solving and solutions.
  - Students will perform artistically and confidently in public settings.
• **Outcomes/Objectives (SLOs):** what students are expected to be able to do at or near the time of graduation. The SLOs describe detailed aspects of the program goals. SLOs must be measurable and are usually stated in the form of <one action verb> + <one something>. SLOs must be cognitively appropriate to the degree level (e.g., SLOs for master’s programs reflect higher order cognitive skills than those for baccalaureate programs). Student learning outcomes should represent the collective agreement of program faculty concerning:

  o what students will learn, instead of what they will be taught;
  o what students will demonstrate, represent, or produce because of their learning;
  o how knowledge and skills of the discipline are used and applied; and
  o essential qualities of individuals who work in the discipline (Jonson, 2006).

Here are some examples of measurable SLOs for a variety of disciplines. Students will be able to:

- identify the role that cultural diversity plays in defining what it means to be a social being.
- evaluate the validity and limitations of theories and scientific claims in experimental results.
- analyze the meaning of major texts from both Western and non-western culture.
- distinguish between correct and incorrect applications of scientific principles when given examples of each on an objective exam.
- demonstrate an understanding of curriculum theory and standards by preparing a two-page curriculum plan and providing justification from the literature for the chosen curriculum method.
- consider and use multiple choices, beliefs, or diverse ethical frameworks when making decisions to respond to ethical dilemmas or problems.
- use various measurements, data-gathering techniques, sampling, probability, and descriptive and inferential statistics to support or reject claims of size, relationship, or relative accuracy.
- construct a marketing plan and prepare written and oral communications appropriate to a client firm.
- write an essay in which they select and defend a position on a debatable issue, support their position with evidence from their readings, and address counterarguments.
- review the literature and propose a research question and a research project that might move the field forward.
- recognize common biotic and abiotic stresses, their potential effects on plants at various stages or plant development, and options for reduction of stresses with minimal disturbance to the environment and human beings.
- write a five-page essay reflecting on the work of an author of their choice that presents a clear and well-organized argument and uses examples from the author’s work to support the argument.
- apply anthropological theory to the analysis of a linguistic, cultural, or archeological phenomenon.
Recommended reading for developing learning outcomes is Chapter 8 of Linda Suskie’s *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide*. (Please note that Suskie uses the term “learning goals” for those elements in the UMKC framework labeled as “student learning outcomes.”)

- **Curriculum Map**: a table or grid indicating in which courses each SLO is addressed and at what level of complexity, and in which course(s) the SLO is assessed. An example of a curriculum map is located in the Appendix.

- **Measures**: the methods (e.g., rubric applied to capstone project, specific items on an exam) by which student achievement, in the aggregate, will be determined. The program should identify at least one direct measure for each outcome. Direct measures require that students demonstrate their knowledge or skill. Examples of direct measures are specific items on an exam and the use of rubrics to evaluate student artifacts such as presentations, papers, projects, performances, and media or visual art projects.

Please note that summative project or course grades are not appropriate measures of student learning. Summative exam or project grades do not provide detailed information concerning student achievement of each student learning outcome. Course grades are based on overall satisfaction of course requirements, rather than on performance on specific learning outcomes. Moreover, course grades frequently include factors such as attendance, participation, and timeliness of submission of assignments that are not indicative of the quality of student learning.

Indirect methods include surveys, focus groups, interviews, job placement data, and admission to graduate and professional programs. Indirect measures do not require students to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes. While such measures can provide valuable information concerning program effectiveness, they yield little information that is useful in understanding how well students are achieving the desired learning outcomes.

- **Annual Assessment Cycles**: identify the specific SLOs to be assessed each academic year over a three-year cycle. Rather than assessing every outcome every year, programs should develop three-year assessment cycles, assessing about one-third of the outcomes each year. For example, if a program has seven student learning outcomes, SLOs 1 and 2 would be assessed in the first year of the cycle; SLOs 3, 4, and 5 would be assessed in the second year; and SLOs 6 and 7 would be assessed in the third year. The three-year cycle would then be repeated. Collecting data on a few outcomes each year provides the opportunity for programs to analyze the assessment findings and plan and implement programmatic enhancements prior to the next cycle of data collection for a particular outcome.

- **Targets**: expected level of student achievement, in the aggregate, for each measurement method. Targets are usually expressed in terms of the number or percentages. For example, a target might be expressed as: at least 85% of the students will achieve a 3 or higher on each criterion of the rubric used to evaluate the research presentation.
• **Findings:** a summary of the results, indicating whether the target was achieved. The findings section may include the program faculty’s reflections on conditions that may have supported or hindered student achievement of the outcome.

• **Action Plan:** what alterations will be made to educational experiences, pedagogy, the assessment plan, or other program areas to enhance student achievement and/or assessment efforts; and

• **Action Plan Tracking:** Whether each action has been completed, is in progress, or was not implemented.

By October 15th of each year, each program is required to submit an Annual Assessment Report, using the template available on the assessment web site: [www.umkc.edu/assessment](http://www.umkc.edu/assessment). The annual report should be uploaded to the program’s assessment folder in the UMKC Box application.

While programs are expected to engage in annual assessment cycles, it is not a requirement that every student learning outcome is assessed every year. As part of the assessment planning process, programs should identify a three-year cycle. (Please note, units and programs with specialized accreditations may be required by the accreditors to assess each outcome every year and must follow the accreditation standards.)

Recognizing that assessment is an iterative process and that curricula are frequently revised, programs should annually review the mission statement, program goals, student learning outcomes, and assessment. The information should be updated as necessary on the documents archived in the program’s UMKC Box application. Programs should also ensure that current learning outcomes are included in the university catalog.

Feedback to programs concerning their assessment plans and annual assessment reports is provided each year by the University Assessment Committee, using a rubric that describes the criteria for evaluating the assessment plans. This rubric is available on the assessment web site: [www.umkc.edu/assessment](http://www.umkc.edu/assessment). The annual feedback is shared with program directors, department chairs, deans, and student affairs administrators and is analyzed by the Director of Assessment to identify mentoring opportunities and professional development programming.

Departments and schools are expected to routinely engage in course- and program-level outcomes assessment, with project cycles undertaken and completed every year. Departments and schools should also participate in institution-level assessments as requested, helping to define, measure, and improve general education outcomes and other outcomes related to the institution as a whole.

In addition, the university’s five-year program review process requires each academic unit to report its use of assessment results in planning program improvements. Information about UMKC’s program review criteria and processes is available at [www.umkc.edu/provost](http://www.umkc.edu/provost).

**Assessment of the General Education Core program**
UMKC’s General Education Core Program designed to provide students with an opportunity to enhance their capacity for intellectual inquiry and discovery, critical reasoning, and effective communication. These abilities are essential to assisting all students to become life-long learners and providing them with the opportunity to be successful in their chosen fields. The following Student Learning Outcomes provide the foundation for this program and the fulfillment of the University mission. Upon completion of the program of general education, students will show evidence of learning in the following eight areas:

- **Communication Skills**: Students will develop effective written, oral, and visual/spatial communication competencies with the ability to communicate with a variety of audiences. They will develop their capacity to interpret information presented in a variety of formats. They will be able to evaluate the context of their message and use proper form and style to engage audiences using a variety of media. They will demonstrate their critical engagement with audiences through reading, listening, reflecting, and responding.

- **Technology and Information Literacy**: Students will demonstrate effective use of research resources and can incorporate the information obtained into their academic and creative endeavors. They will demonstrate their ability to locate, evaluate, organize and use research material from a broad range of sources. Students will be able to format and document source material in properly constructed papers, presentations, and a variety of visual formats.

- **Scientific Reasoning and Quantitative Analysis**: Students will apply principles and methods of science, math, statistics, and logic to solve problems and draw logical inferences. They will develop a level of quantitative literacy that enables them to comprehend and evaluate information in a broad range of contexts. Students will understand methods and principles of scientific discovery and their application to all areas of learning including the natural and social sciences.

- **Arts and Humanities**: Students will develop an understanding of the human condition by exploring the variety of creative works and methods in the humanities as well as the visual and performing arts. They will be able to explain the historical, cultural and social contexts of the humanities and fine arts. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the connections between the humanities and other areas of intellectual inquiry.

- **Interdisciplinary and Innovative Thinking**: Students will demonstrate the ability to contextualize information and use the proper methods and theories as modes of understanding. Focusing on specific problems and issues, students will demonstrate the ability to consider new modes of analysis drawn from a range of fields. Students will be able to see and understand how thinking beyond disciplinary boundaries leads to innovation in all fields.

- **Culture and Diversity**: Students will draw on a variety of disciplines to develop an understanding of the complexities of human cultures, past and present, and come to an informed sense of self and others. Students will demonstrate an awareness of a global culture that may include economic, environmental, political and social issues facing all cultures. They will develop an understanding of the factors defining cultural identities.
• **Human Values and Ethical Reasoning:** Students will understand principles of value and civic duty in a wide range of settings, and will demonstrate an understanding of personal values and the values of others. Students will also be able to identify ethical problems utilizing their understanding of ethical theory and moral reasoning.

• **Civic and Community Engagement:** Students will be able to identify the problems, challenges, and opportunities of an urban university. Students will also understand their relationship to both a local and global community and the social, political, and cultural issues therein. They will develop an appreciation for the meaning and global impact of urbanization. They will have an understanding of the U.S. and Missouri Constitutions and their impact on issues facing these various communities. They will engage with the UMKC community of learners.

Assessment of the General Education Core learning outcomes is coordinated by the University Assessment Committee and the Director of Assessment, in conjunction with the General Education Coordinator, the Discourse Coordinator, and the General Education Curriculum Committee. Primarily, direct assessment of student learning is conducted by faculty teaching in the general education program, using faculty-developed shared rubrics to evaluate student achievement of the learning outcomes. (The rubrics are available on the General Education Core web site [www.umkc.edu/core](http://www.umkc.edu/core/).) Beginning in 2015-16, data collection for assessment of the General Education Core will occur over a three-year cycle as follows:

- 2017-18: Anchor I, Discourse I, and Focus C;
- 2015-16: Anchor II, Discourse II, and Focus A; and
- 2016-17: Anchor III, Discourse III, and Focus B.

In addition to faculty evaluation of student achievement using shared rubrics to evaluate student artifacts, direct assessment of the General Education Core learning outcomes includes the ETS Proficiency Profile, which is required for all undergraduate degree-seeking students prior to graduation. This standardized exam evaluates students’ achievement in reading, writing, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning. The RooWriter, a required, self-directed writing assessment students must complete after finishing Discourse II (or its equivalent for transfer students) and prior to enrolling in Discourse III or Writing Intensive courses, provides direct feedback to students concerning their critical reading and writing ability. Aggregate results of the RooWriter contribute to direct assessment of Discourse I and II. Results also provide indicators concerning areas of needed additional support for student writing achievement in the upper-level courses.

Indirect assessments of the general education learning outcomes include specific items on the National Survey of Student Engagement, which is administered every three years, and the institution’s Senior Survey, administered each semester, which includes items that ask students to indicate the extent to which the university has helped them achieve the university-wide learning outcomes.
Course-Level Assessment

Faculty are responsible for guiding and monitoring student learning throughout the educational process, beginning at the course level. When planning new courses or revising current offerings, programs must have student learning outcomes (SLOs) clearly articulated in the course proposal form. The SLOs for courses should align with and support student achievement of the program-level SLOs. It is suggested that faculty consult with the Director of Assessment concerning development of the SLOs prior to submission of the course proposal form. As part of the course approval process, the Director of Assessment must approve the SLOs before the proposal moves to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Council. Additionally, faculty are required to include the SLOs for all course on the syllabi. The UMKC syllabus guidelines are located on the Provost’s website: http://www.umkc.edu/provost/.

While formal formative and summative assessment of student learning in courses occurs through the evaluation of tests, projects, assignments, and other student artifacts, faculty are also encouraged to engage in ongoing formative assessment of the teaching-learning process. One method of conducting informal, formative assessment to gauge student learning and the effectiveness of instructional methods is known as classroom assessment techniques.

Classroom Assessment Techniques

Related to program assessment, classroom assessment techniques (CATs) provide information to improve the teaching-learning process. CATS are formative evaluation methods that assist faculty in quickly assessing the degree to which students understand course content and provide information concerning the effectiveness of the educational experiences in supporting student learning. CATS are generally simple, non-graded, anonymous, in-class activities designed to give faculty and students immediate feedback on the teaching-learning process.

For faculty, CATs can:

- provide day-to-day feedback that can be applied immediately to improve teaching and learning;
- provide useful information about what students have learned, while requiring less time and effort than traditional assignments;
- allow faculty to address student misconceptions or lack of understanding in a timely way; and
- foster good working relationships with students and encourage them to understand that teaching and learning are on-going processes that require full participation.

For students, CATs can:

- help develop skills to monitor learning;
- reduce feelings of isolation and anonymity, especially in large classes;
- increase understanding and ability to think critically about the course content;
- foster an attitude that values understanding and long-term retention; and
- provide evidence that the instructor cares about student success.
The standard references on CATs is *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers*, 2nd edition, by Thomas A. Angelo and K. Patricia Cross (Jossey-Bass, 1993). This book includes 50 CATs, indexed in a variety of useful ways. There are also examples of CATs posted on a number of university websites.

**Summary**

This document is intended to provide a general overview of the purposes and processes for assessing student learning achievement and using assessment results to make programmatic alterations to enhance student learning. The framework has as its foundations the recognitions that assessment of student learning is the responsibility of faculty and that effective assessment is driven by faculty questions about student learning, by program learning outcomes identified by faculty, and by disciplinary and accreditation factors. Faculty are encouraged to contact the Director of Assessment, the FaCET Faculty Fellow for Assessment, members of the University Assessment Committee, and unit Assessment Coordinators for assistance in broadening and deepening engagement in assessment.

The ultimate purpose of assessment is making programmatic alterations that result in enhanced student learning. Thus, completing the assessment cycle involves measuring the impact of the actions taken to improve student learning. “Taking time to reflect on assessment results, documenting what changes were made, and most important, examining whether the implemented changes have been successful, are all vital steps” (Kinzie, Hutchings, & Jankowski, 2015).
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Appendix
University Assessment Committee

The Committee is charged with encouraging, supporting and guiding the growth of effective student learning outcomes assessment practices at UMKC. The Committee will also be responsible for guiding the development and integration of student learning outcomes assessment into a university-wide assessment and evaluation system that is effectively linked with planning and budgeting processes. The Committee will review program level assessment plans for all academic programs and provide recommendations for plan improvements to department chairs and program directors. The Committee will be responsible for working the General Education Coordinator and the General Education Curriculum Committee to develop, monitor, and revise the university plan for assessment of the General Education Program. The Committee will be responsible for working with the Institutional Research staff to review and disseminate results of institutional assessments.

The Committee’s responsibilities include:
1. monitor and evaluate implementation of the University Assessment Plan;
2. develop or adopt research-based and/or best practice guidelines that promote effective integration of learning outcomes assessment practices at course, program, and campus levels and that help achieve the University’s mission and strategic goals;
3. review program assessment plans and annual reports to ensure that they meet the University's guidelines;
4. facilitate sharing effective assessment practices within and between program, department, and unit level organizations;
5. make recommendations to the Provost concerning student learning outcomes assessment policy and effective integration/linkage of learning outcomes assessment with strategic planning, budgeting, and resource allocation;
6. work with the program review process to integrate learning outcomes assessment with academic program review;
7. oversee the assessment management system for UMKC that archives and tracks program-level learning outcomes assessment activities and the use of results for program improvement purposes; and
8. track and disseminate results of institutional assessments, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement, the university’s senior exit survey, the ETS Proficiency Profile, and the RooWriter for use in university strategic planning and to inform program improvements to enhance student learning.

A complete description of the University Assessment Committee, including its membership, is available at www.umkc.edu/assessment.
AAHE Nine Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning

1. **The assessment of student learning begins with educational values.**
   Assessment is not an end in itself but a vehicle for educational improvement. Its effective practice, then, begins with and enacts a vision of the kinds of learning we most value for students and strive to help them achieve. Educational values should drive not only what we choose to assess but also how we do so. Where questions about educational mission and values are skipped over, assessment threatens to be an exercise in measuring what's easy, rather than a process of improving what we really care about.

2. **Assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional, integrated, and revealed in performance over time.**
   Learning is a complex process. It entails not only what students know but what they can do with what they know; it involves not only knowledge and abilities but values, attitudes, and habits of mind that affect both academic success and performance beyond the classroom. Assessment should reflect these understandings by employing a diverse array of methods, including those that call for actual performance, using them over time so as to reveal change, growth, and increasing degrees of integration. Such an approach aims for a more complete and accurate picture of learning, and therefore firmer bases for improving our students’ educational experience.

3. **Assessment works best when the programs it seeks to improve have clear, explicitly stated purposes.**
   Assessment is a goal-oriented process. It entails comparing educational performance with educational purposes and expectations—those derived from the institution's mission, from faculty intentions in program and course design, and from knowledge of students' own goals. Where program purposes lack specificity or agreement, assessment as a process pushes a campus toward clarity about where to aim and what standards to apply; assessment also prompts attention to where and how program goals will be taught and learned. Clear, shared, implementable goals are the cornerstone for assessment that is focused and useful.

4. **Assessment requires attention to outcomes but also and equally to the experiences that lead to those outcomes.**
   Information about outcomes is of high importance; where students "end up" matters greatly. But to improve outcomes, we need to know about student experience along the way—about the curricula, teaching, and kind of student effort that lead to particular outcomes. Assessment can help us understand which students learn best under what conditions; with such knowledge comes the capacity to improve the whole of their learning.

5. **Assessment works best when it is ongoing not episodic.**
   Assessment is a process whose power is cumulative. Though isolated, "one-shot" assessment can be better than none, improvement is best fostered when assessment entails a linked series of activities undertaken over time. This may mean tracking the process of individual students, or of cohorts of students; it may mean collecting the same examples of student performance or using the same instrument semester after semester. The point is to monitor progress toward intended goals in a spirit of continuous improvement. Along the way, the assessment process itself should be evaluated and refined in light of emerging insights.
6. **Assessment fosters wider improvement when representatives from across the educational community are involved.**

   Student learning is a campus-wide responsibility, and assessment is a way of enacting that responsibility. Thus, while assessment efforts may start small, the aim over time is to involve people from across the educational community. Faculty play an especially important role, but assessment’s questions can’t be fully addressed without participation by student-affairs educators, librarians, administrators, and students. Assessment may also involve individuals from beyond the campus (alumni/ae, trustees, employers) whose experience can enrich the sense of appropriate aims and standards for learning. Thus understood, assessment is not a task for small groups of experts but a collaborative activity; its aim is wider, better-informed attention to student learning by all parties with a stake in its improvement.

7. **Assessment makes a difference when it begins with issues of use and illuminates questions that people really care about.**

   Assessment recognizes the value of information in the process of improvement. But to be useful, information must be connected to issues or questions that people really care about. This implies assessment approaches that produce evidence that relevant parties will find credible, suggestive, and applicable to decisions that need to be made. It means thinking in advance about how the information will be used, and by whom. The point of assessment is not to gather data and return "results"; it is a process that starts with the questions of decision-makers, that involves them in the gathering and interpreting of data, and that informs and helps guide continuous improvement.

8. **Assessment is most likely to lead to improvement when it is part of a larger set of conditions that promote change.**

   Assessment alone changes little. Its greatest contribution comes on campuses where the quality of teaching and learning is visibly valued and worked at. On such campuses, the push to improve educational performance is a visible and primary goal of leadership; improving the quality of undergraduate education is central to the institution's planning, budgeting, and personnel decisions. On such campuses, information about learning outcomes is seen as an integral part of decision making, and avidly sought.

9. **Through assessment, educators meet responsibilities to students and to the public.**

   There is a compelling public stake in education. As educators, we have a responsibility to the publics that support or depend on us to provide information about the ways in which our students meet goals and expectations. But that responsibility goes beyond the reporting of such information; our deeper obligation—to ourselves, our students, and society -- is to improve. Those to whom educators are accountable have a corresponding obligation to support such attempts at improvement.
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# Sample Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BA Curriculum Map</th>
<th>O1: Knowledge of the Past</th>
<th>O2: Research</th>
<th>2.1 Primary-Source Research</th>
<th>2.2 Secondary-Source Research</th>
<th>03: Contextualization</th>
<th>3.1 Historical Context</th>
<th>3.2 Historiography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Women in the Ancient World</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Success and Failure in Amer,</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Historiography &amp; Method</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>America, 1000-1763: The For</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>American Revolution</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Latin America: Crises/Opport</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Teaching Reg Hist/Watkins M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Religion in America</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Modern Latin America</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Medieval Women and Child</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Medieval England 1066-1485</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>History of Britain</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>Medieval Methods &amp; Paleogr</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Senior Capstone</td>
<td>M/A</td>
<td>M/A</td>
<td>M/A</td>
<td>M/A</td>
<td>M/A</td>
<td>M/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- **I** = Introduced
- **D** = Developed/reinforced, with opportunities to practice
- **M** = Mastery
- **A** = Assessment evidence collected