Core Curriculum Assessment Basics

How to Assess Your Core Curriculum Course
Overview

- Forms & Resources
- Instructional Cycle
- Consistency & Evenness Across Sections
- 5 Steps in Assessment
  - Focus on Steps 4 & 5
- How to use data to identify areas of improvement in course content
  - Using Embedded Objective Exam Questions
  - Using Rubrics
- Use of Results for Improvement Report
For forms & resources

See files titled:

“Steps in the Assessment Process”

“Assessment Calendar”

Also see section titled “Resources”

Under “Forms”

Assessment Report Templates

Use of Results for Improvement Report form
Instructional Cycle (Closing the Loop)

Plan → Collect → Record/Reflect → Act → Focus
Quality Assessment Requires Consistency & Evenness Across Sections

- There should be faculty consensus across course sections regarding the specific SLOs, as well as the embedded exam questions &/or rubric criteria.

- Only with consistency & evenness in the course and assessment method is it possible to evaluate SLOs across the entire course.
5 Steps in the Assessment Process

Assessment Plan (Steps 1-3)

- Step 1: Define Student Learning Outcomes
- Step 2: Determine Assessment Methods & Frequency
- Step 3: Set Criteria & Timetable

Assessment Report add to Plan

- Step 4: Collect & Analyze Data
- Step 5: Use the Results ("Close the loop")
Step 4. Collect & Analyze the Data

- Faculty collect data & review assessment results compared to benchmark criteria determined in Step 3.

- Do you have to assess every section of every course? (No)

- However, it is imperative to obtain a representative sample so that your results are informative & useful.
Who decides how much data is “enough”?  

The Academic Department will determine the representative sample size for each course by following the University-wide guidelines and by considering the:

(1) **Course enrollments**
(2) **Number of sections offered &**
(3) **Format of assessment**

E.G.: If embedded Multiple-Choice items are used, your sample size could easily be much higher than the minimum.
# University Guidelines
Developed by Core Curriculum Assessment Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Format</th>
<th>Total Course Enrollment</th>
<th>Minimum Acceptable Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective Embedded Exam Questions</td>
<td>120 or more</td>
<td>20% of students enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Embedded Exam Questions</td>
<td>119 or fewer</td>
<td>40% of students enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Writing Intensive Assessment Method, i.e.: Rubric</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10% of students enrolled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 5. Use the results to identify areas of improvement in . . .

1. course content

&/or

2. alignment between the syllabus & assessment plan
How to use data to identify areas of improvement in course content

Using embedded objective test questions
If there are a number of embedded questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Test Items addressing this learning outcome</th>
<th>Proportion of students answering these questions correctly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles of health promotion</td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 7, 9</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories of behavior and health</td>
<td>2, 4, 6, 8, 10</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion:** An aggregate average of 75% or more of the students will correctly answer questions related to the outcome.


**NOTE:** The above data table would be for your records and not reported in TracDat.

This method of data reporting is useful to faculty because it reveals

- **areas of strength to be retained** (principles of health promotion) *as well as*
- **areas where instruction should be reviewed and possibly revised** (theories of behavior & health).

Based on these results, you are able to determine areas that may need improvement.
Alternatively, if there are only a few embedded questions:

**Criterion:** 75% or more of the students will correctly answer all questions related to the outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic of Question</th>
<th>Test Items addressing this learning outcome</th>
<th>Percent of students answering these questions correctly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between behavior and health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health promotion theory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between qualitative and quantitative research methods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining health promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of theory in health promotion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The above data table would be for your records and not reported in TracDat.

This disaggregated data is useful to faculty because it highlights in greater detail the:

- **areas of strength to be retained** (the relationship between health and behavior; defining health promotion; and application of theory in health promotion) *as well as*

- **areas where instruction should be reviewed and possibly revised** (health promotion theory; and the difference between qualitative and quantitative research methods).
Using rubrics
Criterion: “At least 75% of students will demonstrate a proficiency of (2) or higher on a scale of 1 to 3 (3 = Excellent, 2 = Good, 1 = Poor) on each rubric dimension”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Dimensions (from sample above)</th>
<th>Proportion of students achieving proficiency of (2) or higher on scale of 1-3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Problem statement</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Flow of the report</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clarity of writing</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Synthesis of ideas and hypothesis/RQ</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Citations</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Rubric for Assessing a Literature Review: [http://edweb.sdsu.edu/Courses/Ed690DR/grading/literaturereviewrubrique.html](http://edweb.sdsu.edu/Courses/Ed690DR/grading/literaturereviewrubrique.html)

This disaggregated data is useful to faculty because it highlights in greater detail the

- *areas of strength to be retained* (problem statement; content; synthesis of ideas; citations) *as well as*

- *areas where instruction should be reviewed and possibly revised* (flow of report; writing clarity).

NOTE: The above data table would be for your records and not reported in TracDat.
If there are a number **rubric dimensions** (probably more than in this example):

**Criterion:** An aggregate average of 75% or more of the students will demonstrate a proficiency of (2) or higher on a scale of 1 to 3 (3 = Excellent, 2 = Good, 1 = Poor)” on rubric dimensions related to content and style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Rubric dimensions addressing the topic</th>
<th>Average proportion of students demonstrating proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content (i.e., invention)</td>
<td>1, 3, 5</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style (i.e., arrangement)</td>
<td>2, 4, 6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Students gave a clear problem statement, covered appropriate content, and gave a succinct, precise and insightful conclusion. These data suggest that these are areas of strength to be retained.

However, students did not reach the benchmark for proficiency in stylistic elements (including organization, clarity, and appropriate citation format). Thus, these areas should be carefully considered by faculty.
Use of Results for Core Improvement Report

- Faculty review, consider data collected over 2 year period.

- Due annually, November.

- Briefly respond to 3 questions related to:
  1. Trends in results over the past 2 years
  2. Improvement strategies implemented
  3. Improvement strategies planned

*Available under “Forms”*
Assessment is about . . .

Continuous course improvement

The journey (not a destination)