Program Learning Outcomes Assessment at UCSB:

Group 3 Reintroduction
Open these slides on your computer!

https://tinyurl.com/UCSBassessment2023
Please introduce yourselves!

- Name and department
- If you are here with someone else from your department, please ask them to introduce themselves after you do
Assessment: who’s here to help?

Josh Kuntzman
Assessment coordinator

Jin Sook Lee
Associate Dean, Grad Division
Professor, GGSE

Linda Adler-Kassner
Faculty Director, CITRAL
Accreditation Liaison Officer

Laurel Wilder, Associate
Director, Institutional Research

Amanda Brey
Director, Program Review and Accreditation
Co-Chair, Council on Assessment
Assessment.ucsb.edu - a fantastic resource!
Assessment: why?

Because it’s our privilege to identify what we want students to learn and know how to do and our responsibility to help them achieve the goals we set.

Assessment helps us to do that, and to make adjustments when necessary.

• Are we creating an environment where all students can meet expectations for learning? If not, what changes can we make to our environment?
All institutions that receive federal funding must be accredited. This includes:
- Federal grants
- Financial aid
- …and other forms of federal monies.

To be accepted to accredited graduate schools, students must graduate from accredited institutions.
You are here (again)
Assuring the Community of Quality

Assuring the educational community and the general public that an accredited institution has demonstrated it meets the Commission’s Core Commitments to Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness, and has been successfully reviewed under Commission Standards.

Developing and Applying Standards

Developing and applying Standards to review and improve educational quality and institutional performance, and validating these Standards and revising them through ongoing research and feedback.

Promoting a Culture of Evidence

Promoting within institutions a culture of evidence where indicators of performance are regularly developed and evidence collected to inform institutional decision making, planning, and improvement.
Program Review and PLO Assessment

PLO Assessment is required for Program Review

- All assessments (beginning with first cycle) and any progress reports
- Also must reflect on assessment in the Self-Assessment written by the department

PLO Assessment is required to be included during your External Review Committee (ERC) visit

- An ERC member will have a formal/scheduled meeting with your assessment faculty during your visit
# Timeline for PLO Assessment Reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021 - now</th>
<th>January 2024</th>
<th>January-April</th>
<th>September 2024-2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclude prior (2021-2023) assessment(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Submit assessment plans</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment plans reviewed by CoA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Undertake new assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are the assessments that you proposed as your round 2 efforts.</td>
<td>Assessment plans include results from prior assessment and plans for next (2024-2026) assessment</td>
<td>You will receive a memo approving your assessment or asking for revisions (including explanations of possible revisions). Revisions are due in June/July 2024.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choosing your plan’s focus:

**Start Here**

**Look at** - Institutional Data:
department profiles, equity dashboards, course grade distributions on Tableau; other pertinent data from UCSB/UCOP; etc.

**Ask** - Questions about UG/G Learning in your Program:
- What details in the data do you find interesting, thought-provoking?
- What issues do these raise?
- Who is being impacted?
- Where/when in degree prog. is this important?

**Prioritize** - Areas of interest most important:
For equitable achievement of student learning.

**List** - Other Useful Data
Related to this topic of interest.

**Target** - Learning outcomes related to program courses and instruction.
and Direct / Indirect Evidence of this.
Sharpening the focus: Equity and Student Learning

With regard to your questions:

• What questions do dept data raise about who is being well/less well supported?
• What additional information might you need to learn more?
• How is this tied to your PLOs?
Focus: questions related to/rooted in data (more on this later)

Undergraduate data: Tableau

Graduate data: PowerBI and UCOP dashboards

Everyone here should have Tableau access; everyone here does have access to PowerBI and UCOP dashboards

Every dept. has Access (anyone not?)

https://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/graduate-statistics
Focus: courses in your program

GE courses

Courses in your major (or “program”)

Electives
Questions thus far?
Small group Breakout: 10 minutes

Talk with colleagues from other departments about at least one of the following questions:

• What did you do for your round 2 assessment?
• What did you learn?
• What went well?
• What new questions did it raise about student learning in your program(s)?
Template Review: I. Contact information

Faculty contact for this assessment
Undergrad/grad plan
Name of department/program
I. CONTACT INFORMATION/DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM

The faculty assessment contact and the department chair will be included in all communication from the Council on Assessment.

1. Name/email address of a faculty contact for this assessment project:
   - Prof. Jean Marie Schultz
   - Prof. Didier Maleuvre

2. What department/program is this plan for?
   - Department of French and Italian—French Undergraduate Program, Senior Level
Template review: II. Prior assessment

1. Describes what you did/how you did it
2. Provides a summary of results - what you learned, what you did with what you learned
3. Audience: People not in your discipline.
We completed all of the assessment from Cycle 1.

We were very pleased to find through this assessment that the vast majority of <redacted> majors who participated in the Capstone Colloquium are meeting or exceeding expectations in (A) [outcome element] and (B) [outcome element].

The numbers break down as follows:

- **Spring 16:** 12 students total
  - 3 assessors found on average:
    - 61% (7.3 out of 12) of students exceed expectations
    - 39% (4.6 out of 12) of students meet expectations
    - 0% of students did not meet expectations

- **Spring 18:** 8 students total
  - 3 assessors found on average:
    - 32.5% (2.6 out of 8) of students exceed expectations
    - 50% (4 out of 8) of students meet expectations
    - 16.25% (1.3 out of 8) of students did not meet expectations

- **Winter 19:** 14 students
  - 3 assessors found on average:
    - 43% (6 out of 14) of students exceed expectations
    - 57% (8 out of 14) of students meet expectations
    - 0% of students do not meet expectations

In order to ensure success for this PLO (#8), the department has added oral presentations in several classes that lead up to the Capstone Seminar in order to allow students to practice and develop the skills necessary to meet or exceed faculty expectations. These courses are also smaller seminar-style courses in which instructors can offer sustained individual attention to students (redacted).
Sample Assessment Plans

**Humanities & Fine Arts:**
- Comparative Literature (Undergraduate)
- Film & Media (Undergraduate)
- French (Undergraduate + Rubric)
- History of Art & Architecture (Graduate)

**Social Sciences:**
- Anthropology (Graduate)
- Economics (Undergraduate)

**Math & Hard Sciences:**
- Psychology & Brain Sciences (Undergraduate)
- Molecular Cellular & Developmental Biology (Graduate + Rubric)
- Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology (Graduate + Rubric)

**Engineering:**
- Chemical Engineering (Undergraduate + Rubric)
- Mechanical Engineering (Graduate + Rubric)

**Other Colleges:**
- Education (Graduate)

---

**(A). What did you learn?**

(i). Students clearly feel that the MCDB 221 Proposal Writing class is useful as a professional development opportunity and in preparing them for the Preliminary Exam and writing proposals on their own research. In each cohort, all students have passed the course with a grade of B or better and their comments on course evaluations and surveys are overwhelmingly positive (see below). With regard to the 2nd year Preliminary Exam, the outcomes are largely positive (Table 1) and although the numbers are small, the trend is certainly toward the positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Outcomes of 2nd year PhD student Preliminary Exams.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Pass-Repeat oral only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Pass-Rewrite only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Pass*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All but one student, in 2018-19, passed upon re-examination.

(ii). It is not easy to develop a “perfect” writing rubric that is useful to both the writer and to the evaluator; we need to (continue to) improve ours for clarity and provide examples to help students gauge their performance and progress. However, the majority of the students used the rubric and found it useful (Figure 1).

---

![Figure 1. Student feedback on how useful the writing rubric was for their assignments in MCDB 221 (A), peer review (B), and the exam preparation (C). Responses are based on 7 of 9 solicited responses for the Fall 2019 cohort.](https://assessment.ucsb.edu/assessment/create)
Template review: III. New plan

Please indicate whether, during the next three year cycle, your program will:

• Continue investigating initial question(s)/outcome(s) you investigated during the prior three year cycle?

• Pursue a modification of the initial question(s)/outcome(s) during the prior three year cycle?

• Investigate new question(s)/outcome(s)?

• Other (please describe)
Q 12:
12. What equity-focused question(s) will your department investigate in this plan? (Refer to #6 on the equity-focused guiding questions for these questions if useful.) Remember that equity-focused questions should be associated with achievement of one or more PLOs.
[Answer here.]

A. What do you already know about these issues in your program (what have you done; what have you learned)?

B. What do you still wonder about, want to know, or feel frustrated by?

C. What data did you use to formulate these questions? Please include a screenshot of relevant dashboard(s)
13. What can Change?

13. Where in the program do you see opportunity/agency for change (that this three-year investigation can inform)? This statement should address how _____ <what you will do> will address ________ <potential equity-related issue> in students’ educational experiences.

[Answer here.]

A. What courses, learning processes, or departmental policies may be affected by your findings?

B. What types of changes are feasible in the short-term? In the mid-to-long-term (what are new options)? (e.g., changing when courses are offered via curriculum plan, examining changes to course policies, revising pedagogy or curriculum). Note that these need only be possibilities - you are not making firm commitments here.
14. Direct/Indirect Evidence?

14. What quantitative or qualitative data do you already have related to your question or interest, if any?
[Answer here.]

A. Describe the direct evidence (actual student work) you will collect to investigate the question, and your method for evaluating this evidence. Please ensure the sample of direct evidence is representative. Please include a rubric or scoring guide that defines levels of performance/achievement, via attributes of student work.

B. Will any indirect evidence (student perceptions of their learning) be collected? Note: use of indirect evidence is optional.
Please describe the direct evidence (actual student work) you will collect to investigate the question. Please ensure the sample of direct evidence is representative.

We will collect a random sample of student papers from each laboratory class offered every quarter. The papers will be scored using a general rubric by two different graduate students so that we can assess reliability of our measure.

The assessment committee will spend the Fall quarter working with two graduate students serving as assessment coordinators to collect the paper rubrics from each laboratory course and develop a general rubric by finding the overlap in concepts and determine what represented competence in writing a APA style research paper.

Our labs range in size from 40-120 students per quarter, and so the department offers laboratory classes to 200-250 students a quarter. We would like to randomly sample 15-20% of the papers from each lab in Winter and Spring quarters.

We are planning on applying for an assessment grant (attached) to provide support to two graduate students to be assessment coordinators to help carry out this plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Assessment Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Arts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comparative Literature (Undergraduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Film &amp; Media (Undergraduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- French (Undergraduate + Rubric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- History of Art &amp; Architecture (Graduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Anthropology (Graduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Economics (Undergraduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Hard Sciences:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychology &amp; Brain Sciences (Undergraduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Molecular Cellular &amp; Developmental Biology (Undergraduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ecology, Evolution, &amp; Marine Biology (Undergraduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chemical Engineering (Undergraduate + Rubric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mechanical Engineering (Graduate + Rubric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Colleges:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education (Graduate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direct Evidence: Direct evidence will include samples of students’ technical writing in course assignments, as well as instructors’ written and graded evaluations of these samples. The introduction of technical communication is expected to be implemented as part of one course lecture in each of the target courses (ChE 5,10,120B). This strategy is currently implemented in ChE 110A. We expect that the instructor of the targeted courses will dedicate lecture time to highlight examples of one pre-selected sub-category of technical writing. An example of a writing intervention in a junior-level course would be the coverage of how to compose a technical memorandum that communicates the analysis and results of a design calculation. An example of a proposed writing assignment that has previously been used for a class involving heat transfer is attached (Appendix E: Sample Assignment). Documented lecture material as well as the instructor’s evaluation using a consistent rubric (Appendix F: Sample rubric) will be collected for all students or student groups.

Experimental Methods
Apparatus is adequately described in text, including:
- Informative schematic of experimental system(s)
- All relevant parts of apparatus are indicated and appropriately labeled
- Manipulated / measured variables clearly labeled on schematics

Brief outline of experimental procedure given
Data being measured during experiment are clearly stated
Data analysis procedures are briefly outlined in light of theoretical background
(e.g., how GC, refractometer, etc. were used, what parameters / data were varied & measured)

Presentation of Results
Calculation procedure is clearly stated with reference to relevant theory & equations
Experimental data are logically presented in figures and tables, including:
How will you analyze?

What do different levels of performance look like in your discipline, with this task?

Discipline-specific
- Developed by looking at student work
- With sufficient levels of distinction - but not too granular.

*Again: Rubric making workshop coming later this quarter!
Indirect evidence: Optional


Indirect evidence: Self-reports from students about their learning. (Surveys, focus groups, interviews.) Optional.
Indirect Evidence: Likert scales will be developed and administered to students exiting the 180A class to evaluate their perception of both technical writing improvement throughout the curriculum as well as their perception of where they gained proficiency in technical writing. The ChE department administers an exit survey to graduating seniors at the end of each academic year. This survey already contains several questions related to students perceived level of importance of and proficiency with technical writing.
Your new plan(s) – separate for undergrad and grad

1. Present your findings
2. Present your (new) question
3. Describe your assessment – sample size, methods, artifacts you’ll analyze, etc.
4. Describe the process – what faculty will be involved? How will you conduct the assessment over a THREE YEAR PERIOD?
Equity Assessment Guiding Questions

Start with your questions.
Today: focus on undergraduate dashboards (unless you don’t have an undergraduate major)
Using the VPN (virtual private network)

https://www.it.ucsb.edu/ivanti-secure-access-campus-vpn/get-connected-campus-vpn
Dashboards

https://tableau.ets.ucsb.edu/#/views/UCSBUndergraduateEquityDashboard/CoverPage
https://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/ucsb-graduate-statistics
https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/about-us/information-center/doctoral-rates
https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/about-us/information-center/doctoral-program
Describing the data: Effectors of Opportunity

The majority of UCSB undergraduates have experienced effectors of opportunity: manifestations of systemic inequities that have been shown to have an effect on academic performances.

First Generation
Low Income
Minoritized identities
### Demographic Profile of Current Majors as of Fall 2022

- **n = 3,455**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% URMs</th>
<th>% First Generation</th>
<th>% Pell-Eligible in Yr 1</th>
<th>% with 1-3 Effectors of Opportunity</th>
<th>% Pre-Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% n=1,105</td>
<td>25% n=1,062</td>
<td>34% n=1,176</td>
<td>32% n=2,467</td>
<td>80% n=2,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30% n=1,038</td>
<td>26% n=1,990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22% n=794</td>
<td>53% n=41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% n=64</td>
<td>48% n=1,869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14% n=81</td>
<td>19% n=973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% International</th>
<th>% Transfer Students</th>
<th>% with Entering HS/TR GPA Below the 25th Percentile (of Admit GPA)</th>
<th>% DBL-Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64% n=2,225</td>
<td>55% n=4,231</td>
<td>18% n=1,363</td>
<td>9% n=312</td>
<td>37% n=1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9% n=1,260</td>
<td></td>
<td>39% n=3,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** This is sample data (not representative of any particular department/program)
Possible questions to ask:

* Are there noticeable patterns in switching in/out?

* Are there differences in the rates at which students with different numbers of effectors switch in/out?
Possible questions to ask:

* Any noticeable patterns?
* If so: do these connect to -- questions about student learning -- "felt sense" of achievement of particular outcomes?
  -- students' experiences developing outcomes-related skills and knowledge as reflected in curriculum map?
  -- students' experiences developing outcomes-related skills and knowledge as reflected in course assessments and other design elements?
2c: Enrolled majors - premajor by effector group- premajor depts only

Possible questions to ask:
*Any noticeable patterns?  
*If so:
How do premajor courses in the department provide support for skills and knowledge associated with the outcomes?  
Do different groups of students experience this support differently?

For students who enter the full major:
Does the quarter of entry have any relationship to students’ abilities to learn/practice with skills and knowledge associated with outcomes?
2f: Enrolled majors - major completion rates by # of effectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select a Department</th>
<th>Select FR or TR</th>
<th>Show by:</th>
<th>Group or ungroup cohorts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td># of Effectors</td>
<td>Ungroup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Show majors who Started in and/or Switched in:
- [ ] Started in
- [ ] Switched in

Choose

**Possible questions to ask:**

*Are all students graduating in the major (aka demonstrating knowledge/skills associated with PLOs) at the same rates?*

*If not: Where might students be leaving the major or encountering challenges?*
Undergraduate Major Flow from Fall 1 to Degree
2009 to 2019 Entering Freshmen Cohorts Combined

- Light brown: premajor
- Gold: in the major
- Blue: other major
- Gray: no degree
Possible questions to ask:
Are there variations in qtrs OR in populations switching into/out of a major?

Is it possible to identify qtrs after which students leave/enter?

How is the department supporting students who switch into OR leave majors in relation to PLOs in the major (or particular PLOs in the major)?
--in specific courses in particular terms (if major is structured)
--in patterns among courses most frequently taken by students in particular terms (if major is less structured)
--prior to specific courses/terms

**NOTE: We can also provide data on enrollment patterns in departments over the last X years**
Questions to ask:

Referring to your program’s PLO curriculum maps:

*In key courses supporting learning outcome(s) on which your assessment will focus, do you see patterns in grade distributions?

*Do these grade distributions indicate populations who are more/less supported in the course?

*What might the department focus on to affect achievement of the outcomes (as reflected in grade distributions) as a basis for action in or from the assessment?
Graduate Dashboards (UCSB and UCOP)

UCSB dashboards (https://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/graduate-statistics)
Admissions/Enrollment
Time to degree and advancement
Exit Survey

UCOP dashboards (https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/content-analysis/graduate/index.html)

UCSB: Student Enrollment

What is the overall makeup of <degree objective> students <in my program> <in the division/college> <at UCSB>?
Are there noticeable patterns among students who are within normative time to advancement and those who are not?
Are there patterns among time to degree among different groups?
Possible questions to ask:
Do the data point to trends that are of interest to the department in relation to graduate PLOs?

Are there variations in results among respondents of different races/ethnicities?

Are the “attributes/behaviors/skills” questions aligned with PLOs?

Variations between respondents in relation to these questions?
Review your departmental data: UG or G (for today)

UG:
Current majors profile
2a: enrolled majors profile
2b: enrolled majors: Yr1 probation by effectors
2c: enrolled majors - premajors (if applicable)
2f: enrolled majors by completion
Course flow diagrams
Course grade distribution

G:
UCSB graduate data dashboards
UCOP dashboards:
Academic Progress and Skills
When are plans due?

JANUARY 20, 2024

Keep your plans away from your dog(s).