Using business process analysis to facilitate buy-in and effective assessment information flow
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Institutional Research

• What it is:
  – “… information gathered within an institution of higher education in order to provide information which supports planning, policy formation, and decision making.”

• What we do:
  – Provide data to help facilitate effective campus planning and decision making for institutional success
  – Support university-wide Institutional Effectiveness processes
  – Direct and indirect measures
In Relationship to Assessment

- **Academic Profiles**
  - Academic Indicator Report
  - Retention and Graduation Rates

- **Alumni**
  - Post Graduation Placement Survey
  - Alumni Survey – Bachelor Degrees Three Years Out

- **Ad Hoc Requests**
  - English and Mathematics Accuplacer Test Information

- **Student Opinion Surveys**
  - National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
  - Student Satisfaction with transactional Areas

- **Discover and Develop**
  - Diversity of Ethnicity and Race
Office of Assessment
Definitions

• Assessment
  – The process of determining the extent to which students have mastered some instructional objective or competency.

• Evaluation
  – A value judgment based on defensible criteria.
  – Using the same information and other criteria not only to determine the extent to which a performance measure has been met, but also to compare it with other criteria to make a decision.
What administrators think should happen at the institution...
Identify and/or (re)write outcomes
Develop and/or evaluate assessment strategy that includes direct and indirect measures
Identify (potential) gaps between desired outcomes and actual results
Develop strategy for closing any identified gaps

Analyze evidence and data
Reflect upon results

Gather documented evidence and data
Implement assessment strategy

Office of Academic Affairs
Office of Assessment
Office of Institutional Research
Assessment Task Force: Key Players

**Academic Departments**
- 18 total departments
- 23 assessment liaisons
- Student representative(s)
  - (undergraduate and/or graduate)

**Institutional Services**
- Facilities
- Human Resources
- CELTSS
- Faculty representative(s)
- Student representative(s)
  - (undergraduate and/or graduate)

**Student Services**
- **Group A**
  - Library
  - Informational Technology
  - Business office(s)
  - Res Life/Dining Services
  - Academic Support and Advising
  - Registrar and Student Records
  - Alumni Office
- **Group B**
  - Financial Aid
  - Bookstore
  - Student Accounts
  - Enrollment and Student Development
  - Education Technology Office
  - Student Affairs
  - Career Services and Employer Relations
  - Graduate and Continuing Education
- **Group C**
  - Orientation and First-Year Programs
  - Placement Testing
- **Group D**
  - Multicultural Affairs
  - Health Services
  - International Students and Study Abroad Programs
  - Student representative(s)
    - (undergraduate and/or graduate)

**Office of Assessment**
**Office of Institutional Research**
**Office of Academic Affairs**
**President’s Office**
Technology

• Internal
  – Automated data request forms
  – Assessment software
  – Blackboard

• External
  – Website
It’s *Not* About You

It is *not* up to the administrators to make these decisions.

It’s up to the FACULTY and STAFF.

To get there...

*meet, listen, meet, listen, meet, listen*...
Faculty Perspective
Faculty Resistance

Faculty resistance to assessment occurs for very real reasons:

• Been there, done that.
• Assessment hasn’t often served us well.
• Assessment hasn’t often served our students well.
Addressing Faculty Resistance

Assessment results have to be available to faculty, in a form that faculty can understand and use.

Which means that the results need to derive from assessment instruments that faculty can use and find valuable.

Which means that faculty need to be integrally involved in developing the assessments and the instruments.
Case Study: English Major at FSU

Our English major has six goals:

1. To demonstrate an aesthetic appreciation of language and literature.
2. Interpret a range of texts in American, British, and world literature, providing those texts with appropriate historical and cultural contexts.
3. Demonstrate advanced analytical reading skills.
4. Understand a variety of critical theories, approaches, and methodologies and apply them to the interpretation of texts.
5. Demonstrate substantial communication skills, including the ability to write lucid prose for specific rhetorical situations.
6. Demonstrate advanced ability to conduct and use academic research, from locating and evaluating print and electronic sources to integrating research materials into substantial critical essays.
## Research Rubric for Seminar in Literature

**Source Selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Selection</th>
<th>Least Use</th>
<th>Adequate Use</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use</th>
<th>Strong Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority (Reliability of sources)</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/writing of supporting documents</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of references to evaluate a theme or specific point</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Sources in Body of Paper</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of writer's voice and argument</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of quotations (style, block, citation, etc.)</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation of materials in text</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of quotation</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of Sources in Body of Paper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Sources in Body of Paper</th>
<th>Least Use</th>
<th>Adequate Use</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use</th>
<th>Strong Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension of sources</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful use of references and quotations</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for student's thesis</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of writer's voice and argument</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of quotations (e.g., introduction, explanation, generation, investigation)</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of quotation</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Works Cited List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works Cited List</th>
<th>Least Use</th>
<th>Adequate Use</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use</th>
<th>Strong Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of MLA Style</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing of materials in text</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of quotation</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources in Works Cited list appear in paper</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th>Least Use</th>
<th>Adequate Use</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use</th>
<th>Strong Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this student know how to use outside sources as evidenced in this paper?</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Selection</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of sources</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall use of MLA format</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this student use outside sources as evidenced in this paper?</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Selection</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Research Rubric for Senior Seminar Papers**

**Source Selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Selection</th>
<th>Least Use</th>
<th>Adequate Use</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use</th>
<th>Strong Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority (Reliability of sources)</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/writing of supporting documents</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of references to evaluate a theme or specific point</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Sources in Body of Paper</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of writer's voice and argument</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of quotations (style, block, citation, etc.)</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation of materials in text</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of quotation</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of Sources in Body of Paper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Sources in Body of Paper</th>
<th>Least Use</th>
<th>Adequate Use</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use</th>
<th>Strong Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension of sources</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful use of references and quotations</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for student's thesis</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of writer's voice and argument</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of quotations (e.g., introduction, explanation, generation, investigation)</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of quotation</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Works Cited List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works Cited List</th>
<th>Least Use</th>
<th>Adequate Use</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use</th>
<th>Strong Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of MLA Style</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing of materials in text</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of quotation</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources in Works Cited list appear in paper</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th>Least Use</th>
<th>Adequate Use</th>
<th>Satisfactory Use</th>
<th>Strong Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this student know how to use outside sources as evidenced in this paper?</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Selection</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of sources</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall use of MLA format</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this student use outside sources as evidenced in this paper?</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
<td>Strong use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working with this Rubric...

Caused changes to the rubric itself
Caused changes to the rubric itself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of reference(s) to evaluate or illustrate specific point</th>
<th>Doesn’t use references or quotes or references don’t seem to be serving any purpose are just “stuck in”</th>
<th>Quotes or references serve a purpose but are generally not well used</th>
<th>Uses references or quotes effectively: • for background information • to support student’s thesis • as support for a specific point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of reference(s) to evaluate or illustrate specific point</td>
<td>Doesn’t use references or quotes or references don’t seem to be serving any purpose are just “stuck in”</td>
<td>Quotes or references serve a purpose but are generally not well used</td>
<td>Uses references or quotes effectively: • for background information • to support student’s thesis • as support for a specific point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful use of references and quotations that demonstrates engagement in a critical conversation</td>
<td>No references or quotations or references don’t seem to be serving any purpose</td>
<td>Purposes unclear and/or inappropriate</td>
<td>Purposely limited or incomplete use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of purposes for referenced material</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for thesis</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for specific point</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession/Rebuttal</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Weak use</td>
<td>Adequate use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of sources</td>
<td>Sources treated as entirely independent of one another</td>
<td>Sources occasionally placed in proximity but not synthesized</td>
<td>Sources juxtaposed but not effectively synthesized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of language of quotations from primary source(s)</td>
<td>No analysis of specific language</td>
<td>Limited analysis of specific language</td>
<td>Some good analysis of specific language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of language of quotations from secondary source(s)</td>
<td>No analysis of specific language</td>
<td>Limited analysis of specific language</td>
<td>Some good analysis of specific language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caused changes to our program and pedagogy:

- Conversations among capstone faculty
  - Pedagogy Sharing
  - Course Guidelines in Process

- Conversations among our Literary Study faculty
  - Pedagogy Sharing
  - Course Guidelines in Place

- Conversations amongst our 300-level course faculty
  - Pedagogy Sharing
  - Program-level Discussions about Intermediate Source Engagement Instruction
How’s It Working?

• Still some resistance – but less – and particularly less resistance to efforts on other goals.
• More buy-in from more faculty, including a desire to see the results.
• More frequent conversations about pedagogy and the program.
Why Is It Working?

• It’s about us and our students.
• We are driving the process. We are doing the prioritizing.
• We are highly aware of the other commitments our faculty have, so we respect their time and efforts.
• We are applying the results to our program and our students, and the changes are obvious to those who teach these courses.
Always Remember and Remind…

The purpose of assessment is not to gather data and return “results,” but to illuminate ways to **strengthen curriculum, instruction, and student learning.**

*(Parsons, 2006)*
Business Process Analysis

A journey where we as individuals...
Business Process Analysis

... work together to build a more cohesive and effective process to meet the overall goals and objectives of the given process.
Business Process Analysis

• Bringing the key players together to:
  – Clearly state/communicate the overall goal
  – Identify all the process activities and their dependencies
  – Develop a detailed process flow diagram with clearly defined boundaries
  – Identify the obstacles and their impact on the process
  – Identify the opportunities
Business Process Analysis

• Result:
  – Clearly defined and documented process showing all activities and dependencies
  – Consistent understanding of the process and overall goal
  – Responsible individuals identified
  – Comprehensive project plan developed with deadlines and responsible individuals assigned
  – Checkpoints identified with relevant measures of success
How did Framingham State University apply this practice to the assessment process for General Education goals?
Business Process Analysis

• Developed an Assessment Advisory Group
  – Director of Assessment
  – Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs
  – Assessment Liaison (faculty) from each academic department
Business Process Analysis

• Established General Education small groups
  – Critical Thinking
  – Written Communication
  – Quantitative Literacy
Business Process Analysis

• Small groups tested modified Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) rubrics
• Results reviewed by small groups and Director of Assessment
Business Process Analysis

• Assessment Advisory Group
  – Reviewed small group testing results
  – Identified commonalities, obstacles and opportunities
Business Process Analysis

• Assessment Advisory Group
  – Clearly restated the overall goal
  – Identified short-term goals
  – Diagramed the process flow with input from the Liaisons
  – Identified responsible individuals and groups
  – Documented obstacles and their impact on the process
  – Established deadlines
  – Established a measure of achievement
  – Developed, documented and shared overall project plan
Assessment Plan, Fall 2011

- Pilot-test AAC&U rubrics
  - Assessment Advisory Group establishes project plan
    - Identify “revised” General Education goals
    - Translate General Education goals to outcomes
  - Sept 22

- Present measureable outcomes to Gen Ed subcommittee
  - Write measureable outcomes
  - Create smaller teams dedicated to each outcome
  - Oct 6

- Receive feedback from Gen Ed subcommittee
  - Oct 7

- Establish measurements for objectives
  - Nov 15

- Map Gen Ed outcomes to courses; and Develop comprehensive plan
  - Dec 15

- Implement assessment plan
  - Spr 2012
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