

**Goucher College Office of Institutional Research  
Assessment Activities: Past, Present, and Future  
June 16, 2008  
(updated November 3, 2008)**

## Summary Topical Outline

- I. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA)
  - A. Goucher College Assessment Plan
  - B. Office of Institutional Research and Assessment
  - C. Office of Institutional Research and SLOA
  - D. Office of Institutional Research Activities 2006-2008: Workshops, Department Level Assessments, Analyses, and Reports
  - E. The End of the 2006-2008 Assessment Cycle: Recommendations and Changes
  - F. APR and SLOA: Spring 2008-2013
  
- II. Office of Institutional Research Survey Activities
  - A. Alumnae/i Surveys
  - B. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Surveys
  - C. Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman and Your First College Year (YFCY) Surveys
  - D. Faculty Surveys
  - E. Surveys for Departmental APR/Self-Study
  - F. Survey Schedule
  
- III. Data Tracking, Assessment, and Institutional Effectiveness
  - A. Fact Book: Trend Data
  - B. Retention/Persistence and Graduation Rates: Trend Data
  - C. Fact Sheet
  - D. Weekly Headcount Enrollments
  
- IV. Bibliography
  
- V. Appendices
  - A. Office of Institutional Research Chapter for Goucher College's Five-Year Middle States Review
  - B. Example Course Assessment Plans and Report Form—Frontiers
  - C. Example Course Assessment Plans and Report Form—Theatre
  - D. Example Course Assessment Plans and Report Form—Art and Art History
  - E. Example Course Assessment Plans and Report Form—Spanish
  - F. Example of an Assessment Report—Art
  - G. Survey Reports
  - H. Trend Retention and Graduation Rate Data
  - I. Fact Book Link
  - J. Revised APR Cycle with Departmental Yearly Schedule Including Office of Institutional Research Assessment Activities
  - K. Provost's APR Schedule 2008-2013

## **I. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA)**

### **A. Goucher College Assessment Plan**

The Academic Dean's Office (currently the Office of the Provost) developed the first version of the Goucher College SLOA plan for General Education and Programs in 2005. The Assessment Plan was revised by the extant assistant director of institutional research for outcomes assessment and research in late spring 2006. This document [1] was updated in spring 2007. It can be found under "Assessment" on the Office of Institutional Research's webpage at [www.goucher.edu/ir](http://www.goucher.edu/ir).

### **B. Office of Institutional Research and Assessment**

Since 2001, Goucher College's Office of Institutional Research has played a key role in assessment at the institution but mainly in terms of institutional effectiveness rather than student learning outcomes. The Office of Institutional Research has produced (and continues to produce) substantial fact books with trend data, conducted alumnae surveys and reported on outcomes, provided administrative support for various student surveys such as Cooperative IR Program, Your First College Year, and National Survey of Student Engagement.

### **C. Office of Institutional Research and SLOA**

The Office of Institutional Research first became involved in SLOA [2] when two half-time positions were combines. The Academic Dean's Office was going to be given a half-time position for academic assessment, and the Office of Institutional Research was going to be given a half-time position to help with the IR workload. The academic dean and the director of IR decided it would be easier to hire a good professional if the two half-time positions were combined into one position with half-time work responsibilities in each of the two positions. The president decided that the position would report to the director of IR.

So, through the newly created half-time position, the Office of Institutional Research became directly involved in SLOA when Peggy Waxter became the first assistant director of assessment and research in the summer of 2005. Because of family health issues, Ms. Waxter resigned in the summer of 2006 after revising Goucher's assessment plan. Ms. Waxter also began the planning process with several departments and provided assessment workshops. After Ms. Waxter left, Dr. Wisan continued the process of working with programs and departments on developing their SLOA plans. Dr. Wisan provided assessment workshops to the Frontiers program, the academic program directed at the first-year students. (Note: the PowerPoint slides from the Frontiers and other assessment workshops are available on the Office of Institutional Research's website.) After Dr. Pallabi Roy joined the Office of Institutional Research as the assistant director for assessment and research in December 2006, she and Dr. Wisan shared in many

SLOA activities, such as providing SLOA workshops and working with departments on their outcomes reports. Currently, Dr. Roy divides her time between outcomes assessment activities (including academic program review (APR)/self-study and survey research) and other institutional research tasks.

#### D. Office of Institutional Research Activities 2006-2008: Workshops, Department Level Assessments, Analyses, and Reports

The academic dean selected a department from each of the four undergraduate academic divisions to assess learning outcomes. In addition, a non-departmental program was also included in the assessment cycle. The assessment cycle began in fall 2006 with the goal to follow a two-year assessment cycle of planning, implementation, assessment, and reviewing/report with suggestions for modification and improvement in student learning outcomes.

Two templates [3]—one for the assessment planning and the other for assessment reporting—were produced for faculty members to use for their course assessment. (Note: the two downloadable forms are under “Assessment” on the Office of Institutional Research website.) The Provost’s Office and the Office of Institutional Research shared the goal of providing some standardization of Goucher’s classroom-based assessment. The form includes program goals, corresponding course goals, and measurable student learning outcomes, specifying the specific methods for measuring the learning outcomes. The Assessment Project Plan provides Goucher’s academic programs, departments, and classes with an overarching framework for SLOA. The Assessment Project Plan provides a place to designate the leadership (i.e., the assessment team leader), identifies the objectives to be accomplished, and provides a timeline that details specific actions and anticipated completion dates. The report form asks for findings, challenges, and suggested improvements.

##### 1. Department Assessment Cycles

A bottom-up approach starts at the course level and ends at the institution level. A model of the two-year assessment cycle at the course level was established and proposed to the academic divisions. The departments may modify the model according to their needs and resources.

Table 1 displays the cycles that began in fall 2006 and fall 2007. The specific courses were chosen after consulting with the program chairs. Introductory and advanced-level courses in each department were included in the assessment cycle.

Division	Arts	Humanities	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences	Interdisciplinary
<b>Fall 2006-Spring 2008</b>					
Department	Theatre	English: Writing Program	Management	Chemistry	Frontiers: First-Year Seminar
Course	THE140	ENG103	MGT110	CHE000	FRO100.001
Course	THE220	ENG104	MGT245	CHE000	FRO100....
Course	THE390	ENG105	MGT380	CHE000	FRO100.029
Course	THE391	ENG106			FRO140.001
<b>Fall 2007-Spring 2009</b>					
Department	Art	Modern Languages	Sociology	Mathematics	Frontiers: First-Year Seminar
Course	ART100	FR/SP/...110*	SOC000	MAT000	FRO100.001
Course	ART102	FR/SP/...120*	SOC000	MAT000	FRO100.029
Course	ART330	FR/SP/...130*	SOC000	MAT000	FRO140.001

**Table 1: Department Assessment Cycle**

\* FR = French, SP = Spanish, German, Italian, Russian

The first year of the two-year cycle was to be spent on planning, assessment, and analysis; the second year of the cycle was to be spent on implementing recommended changes to improve student learning. A report is expected from the instructors at the end of an assessment cycle.

In managing the SLOA projects for selected courses, the Office of Institutional Research has adhered to the following steps:

- Communicate and meet with the departmental chairs and other department members to determine which courses and faculty will be formally involved the department's assessment project.
- Present the fundamentals of SLOA to all faculty members during the set departmental faculty meetings.
- If possible, offer a workshop for faculty to become familiar with course based assessment [4].
- Structure the department assessment process.
- Circulate the plan, report template, and example rubrics.
- Lend aid to faculty in defining their course-related learning outcomes and suitable rubrics [5] to quantify the learning outcomes.
- Finalize the course specific plans including goals, corresponding learning outcomes, and methods after discussing several times with the faculty.
- Prepare the scoring sheet for faculty. Departmental faculty enter student outcomes data, i.e., students' scores related to course goals.

- Follow up and assist faculty so that they can complete the outcomes data collection and write their final report using the Office of Institutional Research's report template.

Due to teaching and research load, faculty members are not always able to devote as much time as needed to complete their assessment projects. However, with an Assessment Project Plan and an implementation schedule, Goucher has made progress in SLOA in recent years. Despite some failures and stagnant processes, Goucher's SLOA initiatives are, overall, moving in the right direction. A brief description of the progress and current status of departmental learning assessments is provided in the following sections.

## 2. Writing Program

- The first round of the Writing Program assessment was completed in spring 2007. The first round consisted of faculty training and two iterations of evaluating students' papers anonymously in fall 2006 and spring 2007. The Writing Program faculty modified the writing rubric provided by the Office of Institutional Research and took ownership of writing assessment, working to modify the rubric so it would better reflect their Writing Program's goals and the faculty's valued criteria. The grading scheme emphasized specific writing skills students are expected to achieve. The Office of Institutional Research prepared and shared with faculty a report [6] based on the data collected.
- For the second round of assessment in fall 2007, the Writing Program faculty wanted to explore a different assessment method. The Office of Institutional Research met with a few faculty selected by the chair on October 31 for a preliminary discussion on various topics related to the new assessment cycle raised by the faculty. The Office of Institutional Research also received the responses for an internal survey conducted by the Writing Program for their faculty.
- The Office of Institutional Research worked actively with the Writing Program's assessment committee, helped revise the student prompt for assessment, and collaborated with IT/CTLT to create a special e-mail account to keep student work confidential.
- The Office of Institutional Research organized and administered the entire process of sending, receiving, and following-up the prompts to ENG 103, 104, 105 and 106 students and shared the response statistics with the faculty.

- The grading was done by 10 Writing Program faculty at the end of the spring 2008 semester, based on a rubric developed by the faculty.
- The Office of Institutional Research prepared and shared with faculty a two-part report based on the data collected from student responses and the data collected on the faculty survey.

### 3. Theatre

- The director and assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research met with the Theatre Department chair and other Theatre Department faculty. The chair and other faculty selected courses and faculty to develop formal Assessment Project Plans.
- The plan for THE 140—with learning outcomes, methods, and rubrics—was finalized, and the data collected with assistance from the Office of Institutional Research.
- The assessment plan with learning outcomes for THE 390/391 was reviewed by the Office of Institutional Research, which then had a discussion with the Theatre Department chair and other involved faculty members who proposed some changes, and offered useful suggestions. The final documents, the plan, rubrics, and the scoring sheet were shipped to Theatre Department faculty Jen Spieler and Becky Free.
- The completed scoring sheet for THE 390 was expected at the end of fall 2007 but was not received. The Office of Institutional Research looks forward to the data for both THE 390 and 391 at the end of spring 2008.
- The instructors who engaged in course assessment were asked for a report using the Office of Institutional Research's assessment report form template. The Office of Institutional Research has yet to receive any report.

### 4. Chemistry

- Peggy Waxter met with the Chemistry Department and provided an assessment workshop for the department. In late fall 2006, the director and new assistant director for the Office of Institutional Research met with the Chemistry Department chair, Esther Gibbs, and discussed the possibility of beginning the assessment process. The process did not start because of a shortage of instructors and a

lack of enthusiasm about formal course assessment. Discussion was expected to resume in fall 2007.

- The director and assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research met with Professor Scott Sibley in fall 2007. They proposed formally assessing CHE 265. The Office of Institutional Research provided an assessment plan and the rubrics for the review but has not received any revised document even after a follow up. Following a suggestion from the provost, the Office of Institutional Research provided some insight into a useful chemistry assessment tool developed by Dr. Elaine Seymour with NSF funding.
- Currently, there are no plans for chemistry assessment until the next APR in the academic year 2010-2011.

## 5. Management

- After discussion with department chair D. Sherwin, MGT 110, 245, and 380 were chosen for assessment.
- For MGT110 and 245, the instructor and the Office of Institutional Research defined course goals, related learning outcomes, and developed rubrics. Exams and integration papers were used as methods for assessment.
- Available data were organized, analyzed, and managed for future use.
- The assessment plan for MGT 380 was reviewed by the Office of Institutional Research and discussed with the instructor, Alex Stein. All the assessment documents, including the plan, scoring guide, and the scoring sheet are finalized, and the data collection was to be completed by fall 2007.
- In late November 2007, the instructor sent the Office of Institutional Research an e-mail stating his unwillingness to grade students' papers for assessment. He cited the lack of time as the main reason for his inability to collect data. The Office of Institutional Research suggested completing part of the assessment in the current semester and completing the project next time the course is offered. No response was received from the instructor regarding this suggestion.
- In fall 2008, the Office of Institutional Research received a brief report on the MGT 110 and 245 course assessment.

## 6. Frontiers

- The Office of Institutional Research organized assessment workshops for the Frontiers faculty, revised the assessment forms for Frontiers courses, uploaded the form on the Office of Institutional Research website, and assisted the program director and other faculty in defining learning goals and corresponding rubrics.
- The Office of Institutional Research presented general assessment topics at Frontiers workshops in fall and spring of the academic year 2006-2007.
- The plan template with program and course goals was prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and reviewed by the Frontiers' program director. The plan and report forms were uploaded to the Office of Institutional Research website for easy faculty access.
- The Office of Institutional Research assisted the Frontiers program director in developing program learning outcomes and in creating rubrics for the Philosophy of Science Frontiers course. This project plan and the associated rubrics were then used as models in the Frontier workshop.
- The Office of Institutional Research provided more assessment training mainly for new Frontiers faculty during a workshop in fall 2007. During the Frontiers assessment workshop, the director and assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research assisted Frontiers faculty in preparing their individual Frontiers Assessment Project Plans and rubrics. During the workshop, the Frontiers faculty, working in small groups, discussed their Assessment Project Plans and provided feedback to each other.
- The Office of Institutional Research and Frontiers faculty continued to communicate after the workshop ended. The Office of Institutional Research reviewed faculty Assessment Project Plans, helped them create rubrics, provided grading sheets for their classes, and assisted them in setting up proposed assessment timelines.
- In January 2008, at a Frontiers faculty meeting targeting new Frontiers faculty, the Office of Institutional Research again presented an assessment workshop and participated in a discussion about assessment. The director and assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research explained the assessment forms and

discussed how some questions on the NSSE were affected by first-year students' experiences in their Frontiers classes.

- The NSSE questions dealt with Frontiers program goals such as critical thinking and diversity.
- NSSE questions related to Frontiers course goals were distributed to the faculty so they could ask students to respond to them early and late in the semester. Only six of 27 Frontiers faculty distributed the NSSE questions to their students and sent the assessment results to the assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research.
- The original two-year assessment cycle was terminated in September 2008. Assessment summary reports were received from most departmental faculty included in the formal assessment process.

## 7. Modern Languages

- The director and assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research met with the Modern Languages Department chair, Dr. Florence Martin, and the Spanish program acting chair, Professor Frances Ramos-Valdez, in June 2007. They discussed various aspects of foreign language course assessment including project plans, division and program goals, and specific student learning outcomes appropriate to the different language classes. The Spanish program chair and the Modern Languages Department chair were especially interested in identifying assessment software that could assist them with language achievement assessment and placement assessment.
- The assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research recorded detailed notes from the meeting and provided a summary of the issues for the Modern Languages Department heads.
- The Office of Institutional Research attended the Modern Languages general faculty meeting several times, presented general student outcomes training, modifying the presentation and discussion of SLOA to the modern languages context and perspective.
- During the meeting, the director and assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research made suggestions, answered faculty

questions on the Assessment Project Plan and report forms and language rubric, and discussed language assessment software.

- The Office of Institutional Research thoroughly evaluated the CAPE and CARLA placement tests, provided detailed feedback to the provost, the chair, and the faculty. The placement assessment application package CARLA was selected by the Spanish program. The software installation was put off until fall 2008 because of IT's schedule.
- In fall 2008, the Spanish program successfully used the CARLA software to provide reading and listening language tests to students at the beginning of the semester. All Spanish instructors administered CARLA assessment test in Spanish 110, 120, and 130 classes for pre-testing at the beginning of fall 2008. Moreover, these tests worked as achievement tests for students who had already completed Spanish courses at Goucher.
- The Office of Institutional Research expects the Spanish faculty to use CARLA for pre- and post-class language assessment tests. The Office of Institutional Research and the Spanish chair discussed future data analysis and SLOA in Spanish reading and listening.
- SP 110 was assessed in fall 2007. The plan, grading scheme, and scoring sheets were finalized by the two faculty members teaching SP 110. After consulting with the Spanish program director, the assessment plans for Spanish 110, 120, and 130 were examined critically with the respective instructors. The completed scoring sheets were received at the end of the fall 2007 and spring 2008 semesters.
- The Office of Institutional Research discussed the data reports with the instructors involved in the process.
- The instructors of the introductory Spanish classes, SP 110, 120, and 130, concluded their outcome assessment efforts by completing the report forms at the beginning of fall 2008.

## 8. Art

- The Office of Institutional Research had a brief but effective discussion in July 2007 about art course assessments [7] with the Art Department chair Allyn Massey. She briefed us on the existing plan, possible courses to assess in fall 2007, and names of the instructors to contact for specific course assessment.

- Courses proposed for assessment were ART 100, 102, and 330.
- Professor Massey suggested the following instructors be included in the formal department assessment: Gail Husch, April Oettinger, Ed Worteck, Pamela Thompson, and Laura Barnes.
- April Oettinger handed us her assessment report for her fall 2007 course, ART 100.
- Pamela Thompson, the ART 102 instructor, met several times with the Office of Institutional Research and exchanged ideas about Art SLOA. Professor Thompson developed an Assessment Project Plan and rubrics for her class. Dr. Roy provided Professor Thompson with a scoring sheet, and they finalized the plan and tools for her course. Both of Professor Thompson's spring 2008 sections were assessed, and the data were expected at the end of spring 2008.
- The art instructors sent in their course assessment reports.

#### 9. Sociology

- In late fall 2007, the director and assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research discussed sociology course assessments and sociology/anthropology issues with Dr. Joan Burton, the Sociology Department chair. The Office of Institutional Research provided enrollment data for the Sociology Department.
- Currently, there are no plans for assessment. The outcomes assessment will be part of the Sociology Department's next program review.

#### 10. Mathematics

- In late fall 2007, the director and assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research met with the Mathematics Department chair. They discussed mathematics course assessments, courses to assess, plans, and procedures.
- The meeting minutes in short are as follows:
  - Other than mathematics majors, most Goucher students must take at least one Math course as a general education requirement. Online placement test places students in three categories: low, medium, and high.

- Low-placed students may take MA 100, 110, or 113. The last two are mainly for education majors and are taught by Joan Morrison.
  - Medium-placed students may MA 140, 141, 165, or 155, where 140 and 141 are statistics courses, 160 is pre-calculus, and 155 is quantitative reasoning.
  - High-placed students take MA 170, 180, or 190, and all are calculus courses.
  - Issues:
    - Most students, including those who are placed high, take MA 100 because the course is easier and content-based, not skill-developing. B. Tutinus teaches some MA 100 sections
    - Statistics courses should be prepared with a focus on attracting more students.
    - The current placement test should be updated with better and more recent tests.
    - It is important to develop a test to measure outgoing students' quantitative skills just before graduation.
- Courses to be assessed include MA 100, 140, 141, and 160.
  - Because most faculty is involved in other college activities, the assessment process was put on hold until fall 2008.
  - The Office of Institutional Research worked with the Mathematics Department on their self-study including assessing relevant courses. The self-study is scheduled for the academic year 2008-2009.

#### E. The End of the 2006-2008 Assessment Cycle: Recommendations and Changes

The faculty members involved in the course-based SLOA are expected to provide recommendations for improving students' learning outcomes [8] based on their assessment experience. Completed assessment report forms were due by early fall 2008 from the instructors who were engaged in assessing course outcomes. The submitted assessment reports will be available on the Office of Institutional Research website by the end of fall 2008. The director and assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research also keeps a binder of all assessment materials, including the reports.

The new provost, Dr. Marc Roy, reinstated the formal APR process in late spring 2008. He revised the APR departmental review schedule and timeline. The Office of Institutional Research provides departments with enrollments and degrees and majors data to support their self-study.

## F. APRs and SLOA: Spring 2008-2013

In spring 2008, the Office of Institutional Research recommended that the provost consider merging the APR/self-study and SLOA process. In particular, the Office of Institutional Research suggested that the APR program schedule also be used for department SLOA in order to lessen departmental burden and focus the departmental energy generated during APR on SLOA. The provost considered the suggestions and decided to merge the SLOA into the APR schedule in late spring 2008. Both the APR/departmental self-study and the SLOA processes should benefit from the two important departmental activities merging.

A newly revised plan, guidelines, and schedule for program review at Goucher College were issued from the Office of the Provost in spring 2008. The extant plan was discontinued and the SLOA process was incorporated into the current APR/self-study. With the current SLOA plan phasing out, the Office of Institutional Research's outcomes assessment activities are focused on the department undergoing their APR/self-study. The current APR schedule [9] is posted on the Office of Institutional Research website. Preserving the same basic SLOA structure, the Office of Institutional Research is moving forward to collaborate with the departments/programs engaging in self-study (according to the provost's APR schedule). By including SLOA as part of the self-study, students, departments, and Goucher will all benefit. Please see the Office of Institutional Research website for the newly revised APR plan and the newly revised APR schedule with the Office of Institutional Research activities.

The Office of Institutional Research has met with the Mathematics, Physics and Peace Studies Departments to discuss how the assessment process can be an integral part of self study, which courses to assess, and how to develop assessment plans and rubrics. As the Mathematics Department was on the previous plan cycle, they are already on track. The Peace Studies Department chair discussed assessment with the faculty at their faculty retreat.

The Office of Institutional Research looks forward to a productive year in 2008-2009 where we will assist the various self-study departments, as needed, with, assessment planning, rubric refinement, measurement, data, and analysis. Goucher student learning and Goucher institutional effectiveness are expected to benefit from what we have learned. The Office of Institutional Research has worked toward improving assessment at Goucher College and spreading the word on the value of embedding assessment into courses, departments, and institutions.

## II. Office of Institutional Research Survey Activities

Administering student and faculty surveys, analyzing the survey data for management decisions, and/or benchmarking are a few of many significantly important tasks of the Goucher College Office of Institutional Research. A typical in-house survey process

includes generating a population file, extracting random samples, writing survey instruments, reaching out to the recipients, preparing and sending reminders at regular intervals, monitoring response rates, analyzing survey data, disseminating the report, and creating ad-hoc reports as needed. In the past, the director of the Office of Institutional Research handled the entire survey process efficiently.

Now the surveys are deemed as part of assessment activities and/or institutional effectiveness on campus since the survey results speak to student and faculty engagement, satisfaction, collaborative learning, campus environment, etc. Currently, the primary duties of the assistant director of the Office of Institutional Research include survey management and research.

In 2007, after a comparative study on cost benefit and applicability, the Office of Institutional Research purchased a professional license of the online survey tool SurveyMonkey, which proved to be elaborate and effective. The response rates have increased significantly over the most recent mail survey (45% vs. 30% in the most recent undergraduate alumnae/i survey). The Office of Institutional Research now uses SurveyMonkey for all surveys.

Following are the different surveys the Office of Institutional Research conducts or administers.

#### A. Alumnae/i Surveys

The Career Development Office previously conducted short surveys on jobs and postgraduate education, but since 2002, the Office of Institutional Research has regularly conducted alumnae/i surveys. See Appendix G for the report on one-year-out alumnae/i surveys for undergraduate classes.

#### B. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Surveys

For the national surveys such as NSSE, the Office of Institutional Research oversees the survey administrations and elucidates the survey data. NSSE was administered to the freshmen and seniors in the spring of 2000-03 and 2005-08. The NSSE report on the benchmarks and peer comparisons have provided Goucher College with much information on student engagement, student satisfaction, academic and social behavior, as well as faculty interaction as perceived by seniors and freshmen. The Office of Institutional Research works closely with the provost, assistant academic dean, and the dean of students to share information with various Goucher constituencies, including faculty, staff, senior staff, and the president.

#### C. Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshmen and Your First College Year (YFCY) Surveys

Both the CIRP and YFCY survey services are offered by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA “to promote institutional improvement through an increased understanding of higher education and its impact on college students.” The Goucher College Office of Institutional Research fulfills this mission by cooperating with other key administrative offices to administer the CIRP freshmen survey in the fall of the freshmen year and the YFCY survey at the end of the first college year and to share the data with various constituencies. The CIRP survey [10] has been administered for decades. The YFCY survey was given to the freshmen at the end of spring 2007 for the first time. The Office of Institutional Research recommended that if CIRP is administered, YFCY should also be administered in order to evaluate the impact on freshmen, especially in terms of improving the first-year retention rate. One interesting result from last year’s administration indicated that retention and satisfaction varied by residence hall. This information was shared with the dean of students and community living to identify the characteristics of residence with high retention, compared to those with low retention.

#### D. Faculty Surveys

The HERI faculty survey was completed in the academic year 2004-2005 to provide feedback to administration and faculty on various topics such as the following:

- teaching practices and research activities
- interactions with students and colleagues
- professional activities
- faculty values and attitudes
- perceptions of the institutional climate
- job satisfaction
- additional questions developed by the Goucher Faculty Executive Council
- peer comparison

Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education [COACHE] at Harvard Graduate School of Education administers a web-based junior faculty job satisfaction survey. Goucher College participated in the study in the academic year 2005-2006. The purpose of the study was to:

- enlighten academic leaders about experiences and concerns of full-time, tenure-track, junior faculty,
- provide data leading to informed discussion and appropriate action to improve quality of work life for junior faculty,
- take account of faculty voices with regard to promotion and tenure process, work-family balance, and organizational climate and culture, and
- provide feedback on job satisfaction.

The faculty survey reports [11] are available at the Office of Institutional Research website. Please see the survey schedule for the next planned faculty survey.

#### E. Surveys for Departmental APR/Self-study

With the newly revised APR guidelines and schedule, departments and programs should be focusing on using APR data to improve curriculum and instruction. As part of the course of actions, departments will sometimes survey their current students, alumnae/i, and faculty. The student and faculty perspectives will provide rich insights that will help the departments continue to improve the quality of education at Goucher. Sometimes, extant alumnae/i from the Goucher alumnae/i survey will provide the needed data. In spring 2008, the Master of Historic Preservation program worked closely with the Office of Institutional Research to survey their students, alumnae/i, and faculty. These surveys played a vital part in their 2008 APR/self-study.

#### F. Survey Schedule

The current survey schedule for all external agency surveys for the period 2008-2014 is available at the Office of Institutional Research website.

### **III. Data Tracking, Assessment, and Institutional Effectiveness**

#### A. Fact Book: Trend Data

The fact book is prepared by the Office of Institutional Research. The fact book is designed to answer questions about Goucher College; it provides current and historical information about Goucher, its students, faculty and staff, programs, and instruction. The fact book is a useful resource for the Goucher community. Sections of the fact book are available on the Office of Institutional Research website.

#### B. Retention/Persistence and Graduation Rates: Trend Data

The Office of Institutional Research regularly prepares reports on retention and graduation rates. The retention report is shared with senior management and the president. A section of the fact book is devoted to graduation and retention. For trend data, please see the “downloads” section of the Office of Institutional Research website.

#### C. Fact Sheet

The Office of Institutional Research publishes a one-page (double-sided) summary fact sheet. The fact sheet contains the most current data on headcount

enrollment, degrees, and undergraduate majors. The fact sheet is distributed in the board meeting.

#### D. Weekly Headcount Enrollments

Every fall, the Office of Institutional Research generates data on weekly enrollment of undergraduate and graduate students by student level. This report tracks weekly enrollments starting two weeks before the fall semester and ending when the add-drop period ends. This weekly report helps Goucher administration keep abreast of the registrations/enrollments and monitor the enrollment in light of the target enrollment at the beginning of a new academic year.

#### IV. Bibliography

1. SLOA plan, [www.goucher.edu/ir](http://www.goucher.edu/ir).
2. Maki, P. *Assessing for Learning*. 2004, Stylus, VA.
3. Departmental Assessment Forms, <http://www.goucher.edu/x11876.xml>.
4. Suskie, Linda. *Assessing Student Learning*. 2004, Anker Publishing Company, Boston, MA.
5. Stevens, D., and Antonia Levi. *Introduction to Rubrics*. 2005, Stylus, VA.
6. English Writing Program Assessment Report, <http://www.goucher.edu/x11876.xml>.
7. Walvoord, B. *Assessment Clear and Simple: a practical guide for institutions, departments, and general education*. 2004, Jossey-Bass, CA.
8. Nichols, James O. *A practitioner's handbook for institutional effectiveness and student outcomes assessment implementation*. 1991, Agathon Press, NY.
9. APR Schedule, <http://www.goucher.edu/x11876.xml>.
10. CIRP Freshmen Survey, fall 2006, <http://www.goucher.edu/x11876.xml>.
11. HERI and COACHE Faculty Survey Reports, <http://www.goucher.edu/x11876.xml>.
12. Maki, P. *Assessing for Learning*. 2004, Stylus, VA.
13. CIRP Freshmen Survey, fall 2006, <http://www.goucher.edu/x11876.xml>.
14. HERI and COACHE Faculty Survey Reports, <http://www.goucher.edu/x11876.xml>.
15. APR Schedule, <http://www.goucher.edu/x11876.xml>.

## V. Appendices

### A. Office of Institutional Research Chapter for Goucher College's Five-Year Middle States Review

The mission of the Office of Institutional Research is to provide the Goucher College community (top administration, board of trustees, staff, faculty, and students) with accurate, useful, and timely data and information that supports decision-making. The Office of Institutional Research currently comprises two-and-one-half positions: a full-time director of institutional research (Dr. Gail Wisan), a full-time research analyst (Dr. Pallabi Roy), and one half-time research analyst (Ms. Tina White). All of Goucher College's official numbers emanate from the Office of Institutional Research. The Office of Institutional Research's current activities are to:

- report officially to external agencies,
- produce the annual fact book,
- produce Dashboard Indicators for Board of Trustee meetings three times a year,
- assess the outcomes of college programs,
- provide analytic services, such as enrollment projections, to the Enrollment Management Division,
- use environmental scans to support strategic planning, and
- consult on converting to a new student information database system.

These activities are explained in the following sections.

#### 1. Official Reporting

The Office of Institutional Research is responsible for the College's official reporting and completes or, in a few cases, oversees federal reporting. The Office of Institutional Research completes the Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) surveys (in fall, winter, and spring), the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) surveys, the Maryland Independent Colleges and Universities (MICUA) surveys, the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS) surveys, and the Middle States Commission on Higher Education's (MSCHE) annual profile data questions.

#### 2. Fact Book

Dr. Wisan joined Goucher College as director of institutional research in August 2001. In winter 2002, the Office of Institutional Research produced the college's first fact book, followed in spring 2003 by an expanded edition covering fall 2002 and fiscal year 2002, and a third edition in spring 2004 covering fall 2003 and fiscal year 2003. To the

established sections on enrollment, degree data, graduation rate and retention rate, faculty, and institutional data, the Office of Institutional Research added to the 2004 edition:

- a new section on full-time equivalent students,
- A chart on first-time, full-time, first-year cohorts by SAT, ethnicity, gender, and admissions status of the cohort at various stages,
- new charts and tables on graduation rates by race and gender,
- a table on class by gender for the current year,
- tables on multiple majors,
- an expanded appendix including more national data on enrollment by major and gender, and
- an expanded faculty section, which includes staff data.

The annual fact books provide much more than just the current year's data. The majority of tables and charts include five to 10 years of trend data. Please see Appendix I for a link to a copy of the current edition of fact book. A copy of last year's fact book is also included to illustrate how the fact book has grown and developed. Also, at the end of this chapter, you can review selected Goucher College trend data, including Goucher's undergraduate headcount enrollment broken down by ethnicity and gender, full-time equivalent student counts for both undergraduate and graduate students, graduate headcount broken down by ethnicity and gender, bachelor's degree recipients by program and division, graduate degrees awarded, retention and graduation rates for all undergraduates and broken down by ethnicity and gender. For a deeper and wider view of Goucher's statistical data, please see the fact book.

### 3. Dashboard Indicators

Sanford Ungar became Goucher College's president in July 2001. The next month, he tasked the new director of the Office of Institutional Research to create a Dashboard Indicator for the College. Dr. Wisan's Dashboard Indicator shows the highest, lowest, and current value for a period of six years for each of over 30 indicators.

### 4. Assessment

#### a. Alumnae/i Survey

The Career Development Office has done short surveys on jobs and postgraduate education in the past. Since 2002, however, the Office of Institutional Research has conducted an alumnae/i survey that included all the core questions required by the state

of Maryland through the Maryland Higher Education Commission. See the Office of Institutional Research website for the Selected Student Learning Outcomes Report with information on graduate's employment, graduate school attendance, and satisfaction.

b. NSSE

The Office of Institutional Research oversees the administration of the NSSE and interprets the resulting data. NSSE has been administered to freshmen and seniors in the spring of 2000-03. NSSE data have provided Goucher with various types of information including academic engagement and student satisfaction. The Office of Institutional Research has generally worked closely with the vice president and dean of students, who has presented this data at the Board meetings and at faculty chair meetings.

c. CIRP and the College Student Survey (CSS)

Goucher College has participated in the CIRP survey for decades. In spring 2004, Dr. Wisan and Dr. Edmonds decided to participate in the CSS for the first time. Dr. Wisan and Dr. Edmonds selected a survey tool that could be linked to the CIRP data and which would facilitate assessing the impact of Goucher's programs, activities, and culture on four cohorts of first-year students. UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) will link student's responses to the CSS to their prior CIRP survey data and provide an analysis of how the cohorts have changed over time. HERI will also provide Goucher with comparative data on the changes experienced by comparable cohorts at other liberal arts colleges. The CSS will be linked to Goucher College's CIRP survey data for four cohorts (first-time, full-time, first-year students in 2000-03). The CSS survey will be sent out from Dean Edmonds but the Office of Institutional Research will administer the CSS and provide further analysis beyond the reports provided by HERI. The Office of Institutional Research also plans to use the CSS data, the linked CIRP data, and data from the National Clearinghouse (on students who leave) for further analysis of retention and attrition.

The Office of Institutional Research has also contributed to assessing individual departments and, occasionally, divisions. The Office of Institutional Research has contributed headcount data on majors, degree recipients, and enrollments.

The Office of Institutional Research has gathered peer data for Goucher College. Some data has been gathered from publications such as *U.S. News & World Report*, which provides some basic data on Goucher's peers. A considerable amount of data has also been gathered by using the IPEDS peer analysis tool. The Office of Institutional Research has gathered data using the IPEDS peer analysis tool on both the "traditional" set of peers, which was assembled prior to the existence of the current Office of Institutional Research, and also on potential peers who have emerged using the IPEDS peer analysis tool. The Office of Institutional Research plans to continue to update the peer data. The Dean of Students Office and the Office of Enrollment Management have both used this peer data.

#### 5. Enrollment Management

Dr. Wisan generates enrollment projections for the Vice President of Enrollment Management Roberto Noya and the Vice President of Finance Tom Phizacklea. Using past patterns of retention and current class size, her projections have closely approximated actual class sizes. Her tables and charts focus on cohort retention and graduation rates overall, as well as on retention rates and graduation rates by ethnicity and gender. See Appendix H for trend data on retention and graduation rates.

#### 6. Environmental Scan to Support Strategic Planning

The Office of Institutional Research supports strategic planning by providing environmental scans on strategic topics. For example, when the Strategic Planning Committee and President Ungar wished to explore the 4-1-4-calendar system, the Office of Institutional Research supported this effort by gathering and charting information on which schools had implemented such a calendar. Other options were also documented.

#### 7. Student Information System Implementation

The Office of Institutional Research staff serves on committees related to implementing the new Student Information System. The Office of Institutional Research is contributing to the database implementation in many ways, especially with regard to data mapping, coding requirements, and reporting needs.

## B. Example Course Assessment Plans and Report Form—Frontiers

Frontiers Course Plan: Goucher College, Office of Institutional Research



### ASSESSMENT PROJECT PLAN

Department/Program Name: Frontiers First-Year Seminar

Program/Course Being Assessed: Morality With and Without Religion

Assessment Team Leader: Linda Brown

Department/Program Goal Statement(s):

- Develop students' critical thinking skills
- Expose students to a multiplicity of perspectives and/or communities
- Foster an engaged intellectual community

#### Key words

Course Goal Statement(s): Select from program description in recent catalog; Goucher's liberal education goals; and/or Middle States core competencies, i.e., Communication, Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, Scientific or Quantitative Reasoning, and Technological Competency. Specific course goals may also be added.

Learning Outcomes (approximately 2-4): Specific, measurable learning outcomes that tie into course goals. What do you want your students to learn or be able to do upon completion of this course? Different course goals should correspond to different sets of learning outcomes.

Assessment Methods: Please state what methods will be used to evaluate student learning. These can be direct (e.g. term paper, capstone projects, reflective writing, portfolio, exams, exhibits, licensure, certification tests) or indirect methods (e.g., employer or alumni surveys or student perception surveys). If possible, use the same artifact for multiple learning outcomes and corresponding goal.

Assessment Scoring Tool: For direct measures, please attach the scoring tool that will be used to evaluate student learning (e.g., rubric, rating scale, etc.). The assessment tool should be based on a set of criteria for evaluating students' work.

#### **Course Goal 1:** Develop students' critical thinking skills

Learning Outcome:

Students will develop and defend their own views on various facets of the relationship between morality and religion.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method: Two 5-6 page essays. For the first essay, students will develop and defend their own view of the meaning of life and discuss whether it relies on God. For the second essay, students will develop and defend their own view of moral truth and motivation and discuss whether they rely on God.

Scoring Tool: Please see attached rubrics. The rubric assessment is made by the instructor.

#### **Course Goal 2:** Expose students to a multiplicity of perspectives and/or communities

Learning Outcome:

Students will investigate beliefs about morality and the meaning of life held by various world religions.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method: Group project and presentation.

Scoring Tool: Please see attached rubric. The project rubric is scored by the instructor.

Indirect Method: Group project and presentation evaluated by team members.

Scoring Tool: Attached is the team member evaluation form.

**Course Goal 3:** Foster an engaged intellectual community

Learning Outcome:

Students will prompt class discussion by presenting a brief analysis of one or two key points in the assigned reading.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method: Two individual student presentations.

Scoring Tool: Please see attached rubric. The presentation rubric is scored by instructor.

Timeline:

When do you expect to begin collecting the assessment information? Date: September 6, 2007

When do you expect to report assessment results? Date: December 20, 2007

Submitted by: Linda Brown Date: October 15, 2007

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chair

Be sure to attach your Assessment Scoring Tool (i.e., rubric or rating scale for each assessment strategy) to this plan.

Please forward a copy of this Assessment Project Plan and rubric to:

The Office of Institutional Research

[gwisan@goucher.edu](mailto:gwisan@goucher.edu)

[pallabi.roy@goucher.edu](mailto:pallabi.roy@goucher.edu)

Received by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Director, Institutional Research

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Academic Officer

## C. Example Course Assessment Plans and Report Form—Theatre

Theatre Course Plan: Goucher College, Office of Institutional Research



### ASSESSMENT PROJECT PLAN

Department/Program Name: Theatre

Program/Course Being Assessed: THE 391.001 (Senior Project Workshop)

Assessment Team Leaders: Allison Campbell/Rebecca Free (written by Jennifer Spieler)

Department/Program Goal Statement(s):

A student receiving a theatre degree from Goucher College will be able to do the following after his or her four-year study of the theatre curriculum:

- Work effectively in groups to solve production problems and to create theatrical moments and events.
- Demonstrate, across curricular sub-fields, skills in self-discipline, effectively applied to theatrical problems and the creation of theatrical moments and events.
- Apply analytical/critical skills to the creation of one's own theatrical art or scholarship on theatrical topics.
- Evaluate different theatrical forms, aesthetic values, and cultural contexts, as a way of deepening one's technical skills and expanding one's awareness of what is theatrically possible.

#### Key words

Course Goal Statement(s): Select from program description in recent catalog, Goucher's liberal education goals, and/or Middle States core competencies i.e., Communication, Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, Scientific or Quantitative Reasoning, and Technological Competency. Specific course goals may also be added.

Learning Outcomes (approximately 2-4): Specific, measurable learning outcomes that tie into course goals. What do you want your students to learn or be able to do upon completion of this course? Different course goals should correspond to different sets of learning outcomes.

Assessment Methods: Please state what methods will be used to evaluate student learning. These can be direct (e.g. term paper, capstone projects, reflective writing, portfolio, exams, exhibits, licensure, certification tests) or indirect methods (e.g., employer or alumni surveys or student perception surveys). If possible, use the same artifact for multiple learning outcomes and corresponding goal.

Assessment Scoring Tool: For direct measures, please attach the scoring tool that will be used to evaluate student learning (e.g., rubric, rating scale, etc.). The assessment tool should be based on a set of criteria for evaluating students' work.

Course Goal Statement(s): Each student majoring in theatre completes an intensive, integrated, collaborative senior project consisting of two parts. (During the workshop held fall semester, senior theatre majors meet in a seminar to study and analyze a play for production and develop the production concept.) In the spring semester, students produce that play for the main stage and assume production and performance roles. THE 390 is in the fall, THE 391 in the spring.

#### **Learning Outcome 1:** Collaboration/teamwork

Students will successfully collaborate with one another to realize the shared aesthetic goal for the production, as determined from work done in THE 390. There are two major avenues of focus for collaboration and teamwork—in the execution of one's production assignment, and the execution of one's performance role.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method(s): Production Process and Production Artifact—Each member of Senior Project is responsible for generating a production artifact as tangible evidence of his/her contribution to the production process. Examples of this artifact might include: costume design sketches with fabric swatches, set model to scale, lighting plot, lobby display, DVD, website, makeup sketches, director's book, theatre program, stage manager's call book, musical score, study guide, etc. Each artifact will be assessed in conjunction with the production's overall methodology and mission statement: does the artifact assist in expressing a clear singular vision for the production? Does the artifact demonstrate a sense of unity to the production process when paired with other production artifacts?

Rehearsal and Performance—Because the goal of the project is to successfully transform a play text into a fully realized production, a component to that production that must be assessed directly is the student's contribution to the rehearsal and performance process. The size of the role is not as important as the commitment of the student to the acting process. How does the student's acting work help contribute to the success of communicating core ideas established by the class group and faculty? Is a singular vision being expressed in the way the student helps to tell the story of the play? Is there a sense of unity to the performance aesthetic?

Scoring Tool:

Assessment rubric for production process and production artifact

Assessment rubric for rehearsal and performance

Indirect Method(s): Class Participation—This includes weekly preparation and participation in appropriate rehearsals and production meetings and attending these meetings with attentive focus, dedicated commitment and energy, and active engagement.

Production and Performance Initiative—As partially documented in production meeting reports and rehearsal reports (each generated by a member of the Senior Project group). This includes:

- Keeping abreast of the production process and assignments, foreseeing potential obstacles so that emergencies are avoided.
- Working collaboratively and productively by communicating effectively in interactions with fellow company members.

Using discernment in one's approach to work—recognizing when work is proceeding effectively. Listening and applying constructive feedback to improve one's work.

**Learning Outcome 2:** Critical, scholarly, and imaginative thinking skills. Students will use scholarly research, dramatic analysis, and creative materials from the previous semester by translating those avenues of inquiry into tangible, thoughtful craft. There are two major avenues of focus in applying these skills—in executing one's production assignment and performance role.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method(s): Production Process and Production Artifact—Each member of the Senior Project is responsible for generating a production artifact, as tangible evidence of his/her contribution to the production process. Examples of this artifact might include: costume design sketches with fabric swatches, set model to scale, lighting plot, lobby display, DVD, website, makeup sketches, director's book, theatre program, stage manager's call book, musical score, study guide, etc. Each artifact will be assessed in conjunction with the production's overall methodology and mission statement: does the artifact assist in expressing a clear singular vision for the production? Does the artifact demonstrate a sense of unity to the production process when paired with other production artifacts?

Rehearsal and Performance—As the goal of the project is to successfully transform a play text into a fully realized production, a component to that production that must be assessed directly is the student's contribution to the rehearsal and performance process. The size of the role is not as important as the commitment of the student to the acting process. How does the student's acting work help contribute to the success of communicating core ideas established by the class group and faculty? Is a singular vision being expressed in the way the student helps to tell the story of the play? Is there a sense of unity to the performance aesthetic?

Post Production Synthesis—This assignment is intended to facilitate the student’s practice in pulling together ideas and evidence about how the work that has been accomplished in this course may be of relevance and value outside the immediate framework of undergraduate life and Goucher College. This assignment will have two components—tangible documented evidence of the process (résumé, philosophy statement, artifact), and an oral presentation chronicling the Senior Project process.

Scoring Tool:

Assessment rubric for production process and production artifact

Assessment rubric for rehearsal and performance

Assessment rubric for post-production synthesis

Indirect Method(s): Class Participation—This includes weekly preparation and participation in appropriate rehearsals and production meetings and attending these meetings with attentive focus, dedicated commitment and energy, and active engagement.

Production and Performance Initiative—as partially documented in production meeting reports and rehearsal reports (each generated by a member of the Senior Project group). This includes:

Using discernment in one’s approach to work—recognizing when work is proceeding effectively. Listening and applying constructive feedback to improve one’s work.

**Learning Outcome 3: Informational literacy**

Students will continue to use appropriate library resources to gather research and assemble information needed to refine and finalize a dramaturgical foundation on which production concepts and design ideas are imagined and built. There are two major avenues of focus for further scholarly investigation—in executing one’s production assignment and performance role.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method(s): Production Process and Production Artifact—Each member of the Senior Project is responsible for generating a production artifact, as tangible evidence of his/her contribution to the production process.

Examples of this artifact might include: costume design sketches with fabric swatches, set model to scale, lighting plot, lobby display, DVD, website, makeup sketches, director’s book, theatre program, stage manager’s call book, musical score, study guide, etc. Each artifact will be assessed in conjunction with the production’s overall methodology and mission statement: does the artifact assist in expressing a clear singular vision for the production? Does the artifact demonstrate a sense of unity to the production process when paired with other production artifacts?

Scoring Tool:

Assessment rubric for production process and production artifact

Learning Outcome 4: Professionalism and leadership. Students will demonstrate professional attitudes through commitment and dedication in executing a play text fully from page to stage. Leadership will be demonstrated by inspiring and guiding other members of the production team during this process. There are two major avenues of focus for displaying professionalism and leadership—in executing one’s production assignment and performance role.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method(s): Assessment rubric for production process and production artifact (to be revised)

Assessment rubric for rehearsal and performance (to be revised)

Indirect Method(s):

Class Attendance—This includes responsibility in attending appropriate rehearsals and production meetings on time.

Class Participation—This includes weekly preparation and participation in appropriate rehearsals and production meetings and attending these meetings with attentive focus, dedicated commitment and energy, and active engagement.

Production and Performance Initiative- as partially documented in production meeting reports and rehearsal reports (each generated by a member of the Senior Project group). This includes:

- Keeping abreast of the production process and assignments, foreseeing potential obstacles so that emergencies are avoided.
- Working collaboratively and productively by communicating effectively in interactions with fellow company members
- Using discernment in one's approach to work—recognizing when work is proceeding effectively.
- Listening and applying constructive feedback in order to improve one's work.

**Learning Outcome 5: Writing proficiency**

Students will be able to articulate scholarly, imaginative, and critical ideas with clarity and confidence by successfully demonstrating strong writing skills.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method: post-production synthesis—This assignment is intended to facilitate the student's practice in pulling together ideas and evidence about how the work that has been accomplished in this course may be of relevance and value outside the immediate framework of undergraduate life and Goucher College. This assignment will have two components—tangible documented evidence of the process (résumé, philosophy statement, and artifact) and an oral presentation chronicling the Senior Project process.

Scoring Tool:

Assessment rubric for post-production synthesis

Indirect Method: Audience Information—the means by which ideas are expressed to an audience in written form (papers from THE 390, program note, lobby display, website, etc). Note that part of this written work may take the form of a student's production artifact.

**Learning Outcome 6: Oral communication proficiency**

Students will be able to verbally articulate scholarly, imaginative, and critical ideas with clarity and confidence during the production process. There are two major avenues where this proficiency will be demonstrated—in the execution of one's production assignment and performance role.

Assessment Methods:

Rehearsal and Performance—As the goal of the project is to successfully transform a play text into a fully realized production, a component to that production that must be assessed directly is the student's contribution to the rehearsal and performance process. The size of the role is not as important as the commitment of the student to the acting process. How does the student's acting work help contribute to the success of communicating core ideas established by the class group and faculty? Is a singular vision being expressed in the way the student helps to tell the story of the play? Is there a sense of unity to the performance aesthetic?

Post Production Synthesis—This assignment is intended to facilitate the student's practice in pulling together ideas and evidence about how the work that has been accomplished in this course may be of relevance and value outside the immediate framework of undergraduate life and Goucher College. This assignment will have two components—tangible documented evidence of the process (résumé, philosophy statement, and artifact) and an oral presentation chronicling the Senior Project process.

Scoring Tool:

Assessment rubric for rehearsal and performance

Assessment rubric for post-production synthesis

Indirect Method(s): Class Participation— This includes weekly preparation and participation in appropriate rehearsals and production meetings, and attending these meetings with attentive focus, dedicated commitment and energy, and active engagement.

Production and Performance Initiative—as partially documented in production meeting reports and rehearsal reports (each generated by a member of the Senior Project group). This includes working collaboratively and productively by communicating effectively in interactions with fellow company members.

Timeline:

When do you expect to begin collecting the assessment information? Date: \_\_\_\_\_

When do you expect to report assessment results? Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chair

Be sure to attach your Assessment Scoring Tool (i.e., rubric or rating scale for each assessment strategy) to this Plan.

Please forward a copy of this Assessment Project Plan and rubric to:

The Office of Institutional Research

[gwisan@goucher.edu](mailto:gwisan@goucher.edu)

[pallabi.roy@goucher.edu](mailto:pallabi.roy@goucher.edu)

Received by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Director, Institutional Research

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Chief Academic Officer/Provost

## D. Example Course Assessment Plans and Report Form—Art and Art History

Art and Art History Course Plan: Goucher College, Office of Institutional Research

### ASSESSMENT PROJECT PLAN



Department/Program Name: Art and Art History

Program/Course Being Assessed: ART 102 Design Fundamentals

Assessment Team Leader: Pamela Thompson

Department/Program Goal Statement(s):

- Demonstrate knowledge of aesthetic traditions and conventions, including contemporary criticism, in assessing the merit and value of artwork
- Analyze the methodologies used in art historical interpretations, theories, and arguments
- Acquire technical and craftsmanship skills across a wide range of media, along with practical knowledge of maintaining a well functioning studio and equipment
- Examine the role of art in light of social, political, religious, racial, aesthetic, and economic issues
- Develop research and problem solving skills

#### Keywords

Course Goal Statement(s): Select from program description in recent catalog, Goucher's liberal education goals, Middle States core competencies i.e., Communication, Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, Scientific or Quantitative Reasoning, and Technological Competency. Specific course goals may also be added.

Learning Outcomes (approximately 2-4): Specific, measurable learning outcomes that tie into course goals. What do you want your students to learn or be able to do upon completion of this course? Different course goals should correspond to different sets of learning outcomes.

Assessment Methods: Please state what methods will be used to evaluate student learning. These can be direct (e.g. term paper, capstone projects, reflective writing, portfolio, exams, exhibits, licensure, certification tests) or indirect methods (e.g., employer or alumni surveys or student perception surveys). If possible, use the same artifact for multiple learning outcomes and corresponding goal.

Assessment Scoring Tool: For direct measures, please attach the scoring tool that will be used to evaluate student learning (e.g., rubric, rating scale, etc.) The assessment tool should be based on a set of criteria for evaluating students' work.

**Course Goal 1:** Students will acquire technical ability and craftsmanship across a wide range of media. They will have a broad exploration of techniques.

Learning Outcome: Students will have the basic technical ability to use a skill knife, T-square, paper products, adhesives, acrylic paints, and brushes, as well as operate reproduction tools such as light box, photocopier, overhead projector, digital camera, and photo editing software, computer, and printer. They will be able to skillfully combine materials and techniques to make preliminary visualizations, as well as finished design statements.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method: Journal/sketch-book assignment and maquette presentation

Assessment Scoring Tool: The rubric is attached.

**Course Goal 2:** Students will develop research and problem-solving skills.

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to work through the different stages in a typical site-specific public visual design problem. They will be able to present and articulate a proposal using a design vocabulary that describes their individual problem-solving experience in working with the parameters of site-specific public art.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method: Journal/sketch-book assignment and verbal presentation

Scoring Tool: The rubric is attached.

Timeline:

When do you expect to begin collecting the assessment information? Date: May 8, 2008

When do you expect to report assessment results? Date: May 20, 2008

Submitted by: Pamela Thompson Date: 1/29/08

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chair

Be sure to attach your Assessment Scoring Tool (i.e., rubric or rating scale for each assessment strategy) to this Plan.

Please forward a copy of this Assessment Project Plan and rubric to:

The Office of Institutional Research

[gwisan@goucher.edu](mailto:gwisan@goucher.edu)

[pallabi.roy@goucher.edu](mailto:pallabi.roy@goucher.edu)

Received by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Director, Institutional Research

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Academic Officer/Provost

## E. Example Course Assessment Plans and Report Form—Spanish

Spanish Course Plan: Goucher College, Office of Institutional Research



### ASSESSMENT PROJECT PLAN

Department/Program Name: Modern Languages: Spanish

Program/Course Being Assessed: SP 110 Elements of Spanish I

Assessment Team Leader: Frances Ramos-Valdez

Spanish Program Goals:

- Develop communication skills
- Gain knowledge and understanding of the cultures of the Spanish-speaking world
- Connect with other disciplines and expand knowledge
- Develop insight through Spanish into the nature of language and culture
- Use Spanish to participate in communities at home and around the world

**Course Goal 1:** Develop communication skills

Learning Outcome 1: Speaking: Students will be able to engage in conversations and provide and obtain general information in areas related to their personal and family lives. Students will learn how to express their feelings and emotions, likes and dislikes, and talk about current events.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method: Oral exam

Scoring Tool: See attached rubric for graded oral exam.

Learning Outcome 2: Writing: Students will understand and produce basic written language on topics such as academic life, professions and occupations, pastimes, and travel.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method: Short written assignment and the writing and grammar component of Exam 3.

Scoring Tool: See attached scoring guide and the examination grading guidelines.

Learning Outcome 3: Reading: Students will be able to read and understand written texts or messages on topics such as academic life, professions and occupations, pastimes, and travel.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method: Reading component of Exam 3.

Scoring Tool: See criteria for grading exams.

**Course Goal 2:** Gain knowledge and understanding of Spanish-speaking countries

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of the diversity of cultures and peoples of the Spanish-speaking world, including the United States.

Assessment Methods:

Direct Method: Questions on Exam 3 related to culture.

Scoring Tool: See attached rubric.

Timeline:

When do you expect to begin collecting the assessment information?

Date: September, 2007

When do you expect to report assessment results?

Date: December 30, 2007

Submitted by: Frances Ramos-Valdez and Maite Gomis Quito

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair

Be sure to attach your Assessment Scoring Tool to this plan.

Please forward a copy of this Project Plan and rubric to: The Office of Institutional Research

[gwisan@goucher.edu](mailto:gwisan@goucher.edu)

[pallabi.roy@goucher.edu](mailto:pallabi.roy@goucher.edu)

Received by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Director, Institutional Research

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Chief Academic Officer/Provost

## F. Example of an Assessment Report—Art

### **What are the findings (e.g., results) from your assessment endeavors?**

*Based on the assessment data collected, please provide a summary report of the results (quantitative and/or qualitative) regarding student learning in your course or program. You may attach your report as a Word document.*

In assessing the final project in Art 102, I found some strengths and weaknesses in how students performed in this extensive design project.

Overall, students were motivated to use the tools and new technology in producing a comprehensive maquette. In their final presentations, students showed confidence in communicating their chosen subject matter for the assignment. Their classmates responded to, and respected their fellow students' ideas for the assignment. However, some students began their final maquettes before having fully developed their forms in the design process. Some waited until too late to visit the site to allow it to be influential in their design.

A great success during this project was the feedback session for their preliminary roughs. The class broke into small groups of four to five students in which they gave feedback on each others' preliminary design roughs. They risked giving more candid criticism of the design and its composition most likely because it was at an early stage. The groups appeared more focused and attentive than the usual large classroom critiques.

Student difficulty had to do with the ability to make connections between the exercises done earlier in the semester and time management. More thorough completion of each step in the design process was needed. Too much focus was placed on subject matter instead of fully developing their form and craft. The students did not produce the quantity of sketches and material exploration needed for the project. When prompted, the students could identify formal design qualities but verbalized their use of them as subordinate to their chosen subject matter.

Another concern for this design course, as well as other courses in the art department, is the lack of clean work space because of studio overcrowding. Students are overwhelmed with the difficulty of off-campus purchasing and transporting expensive supplies to the studios. When a presentation requires mounting or matting, the art department has no standard space for handling materials. Tables must be rearranged, cleaned, and covered outside class times. Tools such as mat cutters, large rulers, and t-squares must be secured from locked storage during business hours in other areas of the building. There is no overhead mechanical ventilation for spray cements or coatings. Once mounted, there is no storage for items waiting to be presented for class critiques or student shows.

### **How will those findings be used to improve student learning?**

*Please state how assessment results will be used for course/program improvement or any other action that may be taken to improve student learning.*

The results of assessing the one assignment will be used to improve the students' acquisition of skills and formal concepts within the course content. It will also be used to define the need for additional, clean, studio facilities.

### **What changes are suggested to improve student learning?**

*Please state what changes to the curriculum, rubric, or teaching style are necessary for course/program improvement or any other action that may be taken to improve student learning.*

Within the Design Fundamentals course, content adjustments will be made to the "depth and pace" of the assignments. In order for students to develop an aesthetic towards the use of materials, more assignments will repeat the use of paper as the primary medium. Non-objective work will be emphasized, focusing attention on the elements and principles of design as the primary source of expressivity. Large projects will be broken into short exercises no

more than two class sessions to better monitor time on tasks. Color theory exercises that require painting will be kept to a minimum or eliminated and replaced with colored paper studies. (Much paint mixing skill can be acquired through other painting courses.) Small group work will be integrated into two or three projects instead of one.

The design studio classroom doubles as a printmaking studio, which has become a major problem for mounting or matting artworks for professional display. The Art Department is searching for solutions to this unusual studio setup. Not all art disciplines and media are compatible under the same roof especially now that digital media has become an artist's tool.

Design Fundamentals is a broad based introductory course where students are required to conjure multiple solutions for creative problems as well as encouraged to let their ideas dictate what techniques they use. There are limitations to what even the most resourceful and self reliant student can professionally present. The art department is looking for alternatives for "it's cleaner" classes such as Design Fundamentals, outside the arts building.

Another consideration may be in partnering with another department to create a "prep shop" or "chop shop" for the entire college community. This would be a room or table area with some storage that serves as a mounting, matting, and framing workspace for graphic presentations. There appears to be a great need for a finishing facility (other than the print shop) for the flyers, charts, posters, signage, labels, and displays produced on campus by several academic departments.

G. Survey Reports

A report on Goucher's selected student outcomes, alumnae/i employment, graduate school attendance, and satisfaction based on alumnae/i survey responses is available on the Office of Institutional Research website.

H. Trend Retention and Graduation Rate Data

For retention and graduation rate trend data, please visit the Office of Institutional Research website.

I. Fact Book Link

<http://www.goucher.edu/x697.xml>

J. Revised APR Cycle with Departmental Yearly Schedule Including Office of Institutional Research Assessment Activities

<http://www.goucher.edu/x11876.xml>

K. Provost's APR Schedule 2008-2013

<http://www.goucher.edu/x11876.xml>