Assessment just became even easier and perhaps a little more efficient. The UMKC Office of Assessment recently acquired 70 Response Card NXT clickers, a tool increasingly being adopted on college campuses across the country. The clicker technology can be used to not only enhance interactivity with students, but also to conduct both direct (quizzes and exams) and indirect (pre and post-course survey) assessments. Any exam or survey can be created to consider as many as two hundred assessable questions per session.

The Response Card NXT is considered to be top of the line in clicker technology with its phone text style capabilities. These clickers can be used for short answer, fill-in-the-blank, and even essay questions, along with the usual multiple choice and true/false items. It is ideal for classrooms as small as 10 and as many as 1,000 students! Two unique benefits of the software and clickers from Turning Point Technologies are the ability to integrate PowerPoint presentations with the assessment questions, and the ability to generate reports through Microsoft Excel. The software can quickly produce up to thirty different types of reports that can be used in the analysis and research process.

As the fall semester approaches, I hope that you will be working to complete your assessment reports for 2011-2012, which are due in WEAVE on October 1st. Similar to last year, in addition to your WEAVE items (Mission Statement, Goals, Learning Outcomes, etc.), you need to submit an “Assessment Narrative.”

The purpose of this report is to accurately depict your program’s assessment activities and development dur-
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...the past year, and it gives you the opportunity to briefly tell your “assessment story” in 1-2 pages. This report should be submitted via the “Document Management” tab in WEAVE Online, and there should be four sections of your report (as outlined below):

**Process:** Please describe the specific activities and efforts used to design, implement, and analyze your assessment plan during this academic year. This narrative might be organized chronologically, listing meetings, mentoring sessions, and experiments at each stage of the development process including the names of people involved in various capacities.

**Positives:** Please describe what was most useful about the assessment process, or what went well. What did you learn about your faculty, students, or program through this experience?

**Challenges:** Please describe the challenges you encountered in terms of the development or implementation of your assessment procedures, as well as the lessons you learned from this experience and your efforts or plans for overcoming them. This section might be organized topically.

**Support:** Please describe your program’s experience during the past year with the support and administrative structures in place at UMKC for Assessment: the Provost’s Office, the University Assessment Committee, FaCET, and so on. If there are ways in which these areas could be improved to better support your efforts in assessment, please make those suggestions here.

Again, this is the exact format that was used previously, and I look forward to seeing how these narratives compare with the reports submitted last October.

The last item I will mention is our efforts to use the data from our standardized tests more effectively. Over the summer, we have been analyzing the results from the ETS-Proficiency Profile and the Major Field Tests from eight different disciplines. During the fall semester, I will meet with representatives from each of the areas that have a Major Field Test, in order to review the findings and to develop action steps. It should be very beneficial to combine these findings with the embedded assessments that are conducted within the classroom.

~ Nathan Lindsay

---

**2012-2013 Proposed Assessment Sessions for FaCET**

- **August 10, 2012** - New Faculty Orientation Presentation
- **August 17, 2012** - FaCET Symposium on Gen. Education Assessment
- **September 2012** - Workshop on Assessment Basics
- **October 2012** - Workshop on Using Clickers for Assessment
- **November 2012** - Workshop on Department/Unit Assessment Teams
- **January 2013** - Workshop on Major Field Tests
  
  /ETS-Proficiency Profile/RooWriter
- **February 2013** - Workshop on Departmental Satisfaction/ Learning Outcomes Surveys
- **March 2013** - Workshop on Curriculum Maps
Assessing experiential learning in pharmacy education can be particularly challenging for a number of reasons. For example, experiential learning involves the application of knowledge and skills in a wide range of practice settings. Students’ achievement of learning outcomes is usually subjectively assessed. The development of pharmacy practice skills requires multiple opportunities to practice while receiving corrective feedback (formative assessment).

In the doctor of pharmacy program almost 1/3 of the curriculum is experiential learning. Introductory Pharmacy Practice Experiences (IPPE) are connected to foundational knowledge taught in didactic courses. Students are tested and receive feedback in a number of ways. Students complete objective tests of the course content. Faculty/preceptors provide a subjective assessment of students’ application of course knowledge and skill in the practice setting. A midterm subjective assessment of skill application provides formative feedback for students. At the end of the experience, a summative assessment of skill application is completed.

In the 2006-2007 academic year, students’ evaluations of the IPPE raised concerns about the consistency of instructional delivery; the attainment of common student learning outcomes across practice sites; and students’ knowledge, skill, and confidence with regard to the IPPE course objectives.

In response to the student evaluations, additional data were collected through student and faculty/preceptor surveys. Students described more specifically the inconsistencies across practice sites in content delivery for a number of important conceptual and skill-based learning outcomes. Faculty responses revealed disparities across faculty in their perceptions of instructional delivery and outcomes. In response to the data, the IPPE course developers created 20 online instructional modules that complemented classroom instruction in order to standardize the delivery of the foundational knowledge.

In addition, a multi-factored assessment process was implemented to assess knowledge (pre and post-module quizzes), skill (midterm and final rubrics with specific performance criteria), and self-efficacy (pre and post-course). A measure of self-efficacy was added because of the importance of students’ confidence in being able to enact the skill in the practice setting. Students also report the extent to which didactic learning is applied in the practice setting and if they believe course objectives are met. The revised instruction and assessment process was instituted in the Fall of 2008.

From 2008-2010, more than 85% of the students reported that they applied the IPPE skills in practice, students’ confidence increased during the course in all areas, and more than 70% of students agreed/strongly agreed that all 13 competencies within the course were met. The instructional modules, quizzes, and assessment rubrics have been modified as needed. For example, 6 modules have been removed, and in turn, new structured exercises have been incorporated to emphasize application of material through practice activities. Course developers continue to collect and analyze the course assessment data to improve the course.

To read more, please see http://www.ajpe.org/doi/full/10.5688/ajpe76469

~ Linda Garavalia
The School of Education approaches assessment through a systematic collection of data which is then reported, analyzed and used to prepare reflective practitioners as well as improve program and unit performance.

The SOE assessment system supports the school’s mission to recruit, prepare, and support outstanding teachers, mental health professionals, and administrators who will create lifelong opportunities through education for America’s diverse urban communities and is based on a conceptual framework which includes six core values (as shown in the diagram): academic excellence, inquiry leading to reflective decision-making and problem-solving, skilled and knowledgeable professionals working collaboratively, democracy and social justice, caring and safe environments, and strategic innovation.

For each of the six core values, the school has identified competencies that are reflected in students’ knowledge, skills, or dispositions. As faculty members identify program-specific goals and learning outcomes, many of which are based on relevant national and professional standards, each is linked to one or more of the values identified in the conceptual framework.

The identified program-specific goals and learning outcomes or key assessments related to success are measured at critical transition points: entry to program, entry into culminating experience, culminating experience, exit from program, and follow-up. The use of multiple assessments over the span of a student’s progress within a program ensure that appropriate levels of learning and mastery are achieved as the student progresses toward program completion. This approach also identifies students who may need remedial assistance or who may need to be counseled to pursue an alternative academic path.

The unit-wide use of this comprehensive assessment system as well as the wealth of data and documentation of program improvements based on data was a key factor in the School of Education’s recent successful reaccreditation. The infusion of professional, state, and national standards within the assessment system clearly aligned to the unit’s mission, vision, and goals assured the accrediting agencies’ review teams that the School of Education was indeed meeting and often exceeding accreditation standards.

~ Carol Sargent
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http://www.aacu.org/meetings/stem/12/index.cfm
In 2002, the Bloch School underwent a review process leading to reaffirmation of accreditation. While the school received accreditation for an additional ten years, the visitation team was concerned about the lack of an established assurance of learning process. This weakness was not unusual for business schools, but it was something on which we needed to work. It seemed like a huge task, however, and with ten years until our next review and little guidance on how to start the process, we put it on the proverbial backburner. It stayed there for five years until we felt the looming pressure of another accreditation visit.

So, in the Fall of 2006 the Bloch School formed an ad hoc committee, charging it with establishing an assurance of learning program for the Bloch School. Members of the faculty comprised the committee under the leadership of Associate Dean Karyl Leggio. No one on the committee had experience with the process, and we struggled mightily trying to determine how to proceed. We started by requesting student learning outcomes (SLOs) from the lead person for each degree program offered by the school. Bafflement was a common response to this request, and it took several iterations until the SLOs were measurable. We soon learned to add action verbs to the SLOs, and after a month we were pleased to have most of the SLOs in place and approved by the faculty.

Our pleasure was short-lived, however, as the next task was to produce rubrics with which to measure achievement. Similar to establishing SLOs, no one on the committee had any experience with these odd-looking grading matrices. We went through numerous attempts at each rubric, seeking advice from the individuals who would be employing them as we went. Eventually, the rubrics were approved by the faculty, and implemented in the Spring of 2007.

The implementation process was not as smooth as the committee hoped. Some of the faculty members were not interested in the extra work involved in using the rubrics. Other faculty members viewed assessment as an intrusion into their academic freedom. Almost all faculty members were resistant to the idea of “closing the loop,” which involved someone telling them that their students were not achieving at the desired level on some of the measures of the SLOs. At one of the faculty meetings a faculty member stated “Whoever comes to tell me what I need to do differently in my classroom better have paid-up life insurance.” We chose to interpret this comment as a joke, but paid our insurance premiums just to be sure.

However, with each passing semester, we learned from our mistakes, adapted the rubrics, learned how to close the loop, and slowly learned to accept assessment as an integral part of the education process. In the Fall of 2011, I input all of our results into WEAVE Online, and printed a 70 page report which became an appendix to our reaffirmation of accreditation report.

During the accreditation visit, two of the three members of the visitation team chose not to be present during the discussion of assurance of learning because their review of the 70 page report gave them confidence that the system was functioning well. The third member of the team hosted the session, and spent most of the time asking us how we had managed to implement the system. He was asking because his university was struggling with the process. They were five years behind us. At the end of the session, he sat back and said “Congratulations on an excellent assessment program.” That was the result of five years of effort, and was great to hear.

I still pay my life insurance premiums, though.

~David Cornell
## UMKC Assessment Plan Timeline 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring/Summer 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring/Summer 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop University Assessment Plan, as well as General Education Assessment Plan</td>
<td>1. Require learning outcomes for New Course Proposals and New Degree Proposals</td>
<td>1. Establish mechanism for student representation in the assessment infrastructure so students are heard</td>
<td>1. Implement full General Education Assessment Plan, including embedded and standardized assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct pilot studies on General Education Learning Outcomes (continuing until Fall 2013)</td>
<td>2. Post assessment plans for all academic degrees in WEAVE Online by October 1st (every fall)</td>
<td>2. Disseminate best assessment practices at Annual UMKC Faculty Symposium (every January)</td>
<td>2. Implement the “Roo Writer,” a diagnostic writing instrument that will replace the WEPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Initiate Quarterly UMKC Assessment Newsletter, identify other communication strategies</td>
<td>3. University Assessment Committee (UAC) reviews program level assessment plans and provides feedback to departments (every fall)</td>
<td>3. Develop ways to support faculty scholarship in assessment; offer honors and awards for assessment achievements (every year)</td>
<td>3. Require each academic degree to develop a curriculum map, connecting their learning outcomes to their courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collect assessment findings for all academic majors, and create assessment plans for minors and certificates</td>
<td>4. Implement process for approving new General Education courses, each of which will require learning outcomes and measurements; provide mentoring in the development of these assessments</td>
<td>4. Incorporate UAC assessment feedback and response to program achievements into PEC reports</td>
<td>4. Highlight illustrations of assessment initiatives that improved student learning, taken from annual assessment reports and program review self-studies; these will be posted on the Provost’s website and noted in WEAVE Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integrate learning outcomes assessment into Program Evaluation (PEC) reviews</td>
<td>5. Require departments to post their learning outcomes on their websites</td>
<td>5. Initiate assessments on high impact practices at UMKC (e.g., service learning, study abroad, undergraduate research, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Analyze and disseminate ETS-PP and Major Field Test Scores</td>
<td>6. Encourage departments to establish department level assessment committees, and to identify &quot;second generation&quot; assessment leaders</td>
<td>6. Evaluate connection between assessment initiatives and retention efforts (e.g., course redesigns, University College implementation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provide mentoring sessions and workshops sharing best practices through FaCET (every semester)</td>
<td>7. Write Annual Assessment Report, summarizing assessment activities across campus (every year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>