

2004 AAHE Assessment Conference Research Forum

**Connecting Assessment that
Supports Learning
to Multiple Stakeholders**

A Research Agenda

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

What research best benefits educational policy and practice? The AAHE Research Forum annually involves individuals committed to scholarly teaching, learning, and assessment. Robert Mundhenk, the new Director of Assessment for AAHE, introduced the Research Forum by suggesting promising directions for inquiry in assessment. Then, through a specially designed group process begun by pre-conference participants, participants generated and critiqued a research agenda for studying and fostering assessment that supports learning. As in previous years, this final agenda will be broadly disseminated and used by AAHE in setting future directions.

Contents

Rationale and Process for the AAHE Research Forum	2
2004 Research Forum Leaders.....	4
2004 AAHE Research Agenda Topics:	
Using Standards, Rubrics, and Criteria for Outcomes Assessment.....	5
Transforming Institutional Cultures to Focus on Student Learning.....	9
Engaging Wider Publics	14
Curriculum-Embedded Approaches to Integrating Student and Program Assessment	17
Participants.....	21

What is the Purpose of the Research Forum? Involvement and critique from educators in dialogue with researchers is a critical element for achieving clarity about what research will benefit educational policy and practice. The AAHE Research Forum is convened biannually to involve individuals committed to research and scholarship in higher education. The Forum stimulates educators' involvement in creating a research agenda that speaks to current educational concerns. Each agenda is developed around the conference theme. Thus, educators and researchers can continually rely on the Forum agenda as an up-to-date source of common research questions that flow from the year's most central educational issues. The Forum enables educators to provide leadership and support for those researchers who share educators' interests, who speak clearly to educators about their findings, and who actively respond to educators' most pressing questions.

Since 1985, the AAHE Research Forum has provided leadership from educators for bridging the gap between research and practice, and has enabled educators and researchers to define the kinds of contexts that need to be reshaped within colleges and universities for research findings to benefit students.

The AAHE Assessment Conference has traditionally brought together a wide range of interested educators, and has been successful in defining current issues central to inquiry in higher education. There are other forums at which research results are presented and discussed, but many of them are not regularly attended by or directed toward higher education administrators and faculty. AAHE membership has the desire and potential to stimulate research among its members, and to engage the research community in continual dialogue about research questions and findings that directly relate to educational practices for governance, for teaching and learning, and for student development.

What is the Forum Process and Product?

1. **The Invitational Pre-Conference Session.** Educators (selected from conference experts) generated research questions on topics that emerged as central to the conference theme through a specially designed group process. Each topic group reviewed the current issues around their topic and discussed with those who currently, or are likely to, research the year's agenda. Questions were synthesized in each group, and session leaders edited and prepared them for distribution at the All-Conference session.
2. **The All-Conference Forum and Panel.** Forum leaders brought the questions generated in the pre-conference session to the attention of the conference membership and involved the larger audience in discussion of issues and research questions in their own settings. Forum leaders also elicited discussion of research questions by an expert on the year's conference theme. Our expert this year was *Robert Mundhenk*, AAHE Director of Assessment. Group discussions on each topic followed and allowed for more focused critique and discussion of the pre-conference questions.
3. **The Research Agenda and Its Dissemination.** Following the session, forum leaders edited and integrated questions from topic group syntheses and individual worksheets for a final agenda. The history and rationale for the American Association for Higher Education Research Forum are described in M. Mentkowski and A. W. Chickering, *Linking Educators*

and Researchers in Setting a Research Agenda for Undergraduate Education, *The Review of Higher Education*, 1987, 11(2), 137–160.

Prior Agendas:

- *The Classroom Researcher's Research Agenda*, 1987
- *A Research Agenda in Support of Our Highest Calling*, 1988
- *Improving the Odds for Student Achievement: A Research Agenda*, 1989
- *The Future of the Professoriate: A Look in the Mirror*, 1990
- *Achieving the Promise in Diversity: A Research Agenda to Inform the Issues*, 1991
- *Reclaiming the Public Trust: A Research Agenda to Explore the Validity of the Criticisms*, 1992
- *Reinventing Community: A Research Agenda to Create Common Purposes, Build Commitment, and Sustain Improvement*, 1993
- *A Research Agenda for Envisioning the 21st Century Academic Workplace Through Responsive Academic Citizenship*, 1994
- *The Engaged Campus: A Research Agenda to Serve Society's Needs*, 1995
- *Crossing Boundaries: A Research Agenda Toward Productive Learning and Community Renewal*, 1996
- *Learning, Teaching, and Technology: A Research Agenda for the Way We Work*, 1997
- *Taking Learning Seriously: A Research Agenda for Learning*, 1998
- *Organizing for Learning: A Research Agenda*, 1999
- *Diversity and Learning: A Research Agenda*, 2000
- *Private Gain and Public Good: A Research Agenda for Achieving Balance*, March 2001
- *Enacting a Scholarship of Assessment: A Research Agenda*, June 2001
- *Learning in Context: Who are our Students? How do they Learn? A Research Agenda*, March 2002
- *Supporting a Shared Commitment to Assessment: A Research Agenda*, June 2002
- *Good Work in Challenging Times: A Research Agenda*, March 2003
- *A Richer and More Coherent Set of Assessment Practices: A Research Agenda*, June 2003
- *Rethinking the Role of Research in Higher Education: A Research Agenda*, April 2004

Previous agendas are available from Marcia Mentkowski, Educational Research and Evaluation, Alverno College,
3400 South 43rd Street, P.O. Box 343922, Milwaukee, WI 53234-3922.

2004 RESEARCH FORUM LEADERS

Terrell Rhodes, Vice Provost for Curriculum and Undergraduate Studies, Portland State University

William Rickards, Senior Research Associate, Educational Research and Evaluation, Alverno College

Glen Rogers, Senior Research Associate, Educational Research and Evaluation, Alverno College

USING STANDARDS, RUBRICS, AND CRITERIA FOR OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Standards, rubrics, and criteria are the conceptual workhorses for the assessment of student learning outcomes. *Standards* typically attempt to specify a broad consensus of workplace, professional, disciplinary, or civic expectations for student learning outcomes so as to enable students to perform and contribute in diverse settings. Although standards often represent the center of a collective effort to specify level of expected performance, they may also primarily provide guidance on what should be taught and learned. *Criteria* specify the level that various aspects of a performance need to meet to adequately demonstrate the intended student learning outcome in the context of a specific assessment at a place in the curriculum. The application of specified criteria is always a judgment process and may also allow for variation in how students perform, for example crediting students who have met only some subset of the criteria. *Rubrics* function similar to criteria, but also attempt to scale performance on a particular assessment through scoring guidelines that yield grades. As a result, grades are linked to a broad aggregate description of student performance on the assessment.

Standards, rubrics, and criteria are implemented and understood differently in various institutional settings and practices. As the workhorses of assessment they may pull in many different educational practices in different directions. How well are they supporting program improvement, institutional accountability, and individual student learning? How explicit and public should they be to guide student performance? How open should they be to spur creativity in student performance and innovation in educational practice? How standardized should they be to support accountability to wider publics? Who should set standards and specify criteria and rubrics? How should they be modified over time and why? What are the conceptual frameworks that we need to articulate best practices in using standards, criteria, and rubrics?

On the Learning Impact of Criteria and Rubrics

Does the use of standards, rubrics, and criteria improve teaching and learning?

Are we just assuming that using rubrics informs curriculum and contributes back to improve the teaching/learning process?

Do rubrics in the classroom enhance learning?

Does the use of standards, etc. really foster/improve student learning? If so, under what conditions?

What is the perceived cost-benefit of the various assessment tools?

On Using Criteria and Rubrics to Integrate Learning and Assessment

How do we use rubrics or criteria so that students “connect the dots” between courses, programs, and activities?

How do you use standards with rubrics to measure improvement rather than excellence?

Is a rubric a tool or a process or both? How to integrate these together?

How does the use of a rubric feed back into student learning and curriculum development?

How can the complexity of perspective represented in a qualitative use of rubrics and criteria in describing performance be preserved when the application of rubrics is turned into numerical scores?

How can assessment tools (criteria, standards, rubrics) be integrated into the learning process?

On Developing a Community of Judgment on Campus

What does a good assessment system look like?

How do we open up a shared understanding of how faculty may interpretively apply rubrics and criteria?

Does collaboration in the development of rubrics and criteria improve teaching and learning?

The rubrics, standards and criteria are contextual. How does the context shape the nature of the standards?

How does one improve on what is often considered imperfect data?

Is it “valid” or useful to have students create rubrics for a certain class-do they know enough?

What is the contextual validity of a rubric, standard, or criteria for outcomes? How does the process of creating a rubric influence practice?

How are standards, etc. used to demonstrate “value added” contributions? (Excellent outputs, terrific students will yield terrific graduates, even if there is very little “value added” in our undergraduate process.)

On Multiple Stakeholders

Who defines standards and what do they really mean?

How do we balance the cost of assessment with the benefits? Are there different benefits for different stakeholders?

What are useful guidelines for developing and using complementary assessment tools?

What is the value added piece to using complementary assessment approaches?
How do institutions set priorities when selecting and developing assessment?

On Developing Common Rubrics

What is a standard? What is a criterion?

How do we develop and use assessment tools to assess difficult to measure outcomes (values)?

To what extent should standards, rubrics, and criteria be standardized across institutions and disciplines?

What is the difference between the process of creating rubrics for the “use” in grading versus the “use” of rubrics for public accountability?

How can we capture the non-content, non-skill, broader social, ethical, attitudinal and behavioral aspects of higher education-the very aspects of higher education that differentiates it from secondary education?

Can rubrics be specific beyond the program level or will they cater to marketing and political generalities only?

On Aggregating Faculty Judgment

What are useful guidelines for using imperfect assessment data? (knowing all assessment is imperfect)?

What are practical ways to improve imperfect assessment data? (e.g. triangulation, covariates)

How do we design statistically valid/reliable instruments?

What are useful guidelines for using alternative forms of assessment?

How can we expand our definitions of what counts as useful data?

How do we convince people to use “dirty data”?

On Transforming Assessment Culture

What would a learning centered institution look like?

How do we create a healthy department that will develop and use assessment tools?

Where do faculty now allow and participate in assessment? What kind of assessment does faculty respect?

How do we use criteria, standards, and rubrics to develop a bridge between an “old school” faculty view of disciplines as content to a broader view of assessment of what students know and can do?

How do we acknowledge the experience that faculty have in grading?

How do we communicate that it's about the process of developing assessment tools rather than just being about the assessment results?

How can assessment results (evidence) best be used to generate productive discussions among program presenters?

How do we have conversations that shift faculty's thinking about the usefulness of complementary assessments to further the development of self-regulated learners?

On Connecting to Wider Audiences

How do we explain what and how we are assessing to greater publics?

How can we connect external standards to the grass-roots assessment movement?

How can an effective outcomes assessment process be developed that can be used to communicate to wider audiences in understandable ways? Do the audiences have different levels of knowledge of outcomes assessments?

How can the use of rubrics help develop community-a public discussion-ownership-of student learning?

Does the use of standards, etc, help us communicate to external audiences? (e.g. legislators, etc.)? If so, what format/structure is most effective? For which audiences (as different audiences have different needs)?

Should academic institutions cater to external audiences such as political needs?

What makes assessment evidence "valuable" to various constituencies?

What are the "cost" benefits (to society, faculty, students) to using complementary assessment approaches?

TRANSFORMING INSTITUTIONAL CULTURES TO FOCUS ON STUDENT LEARNING

Educational reform in higher education has increasingly focused on the need to transform institutional cultures. Legislators emphasize accountability to particular societal needs, and educators emphasize improving particular forms of student learning. At the same time, there is general agreement on the need to foster collaboration in achieving institutional missions and that this requires a culture of improvement. Centering on student learning as an institutional goal can be the defining transformational step. Assessment within institutions is generally seen as a key lever for creating an institutional culture of improvement, inquiry, responsibility, and (in the language of some circles) quality. For example, regional accreditation agencies in the U.S. have increasingly emphasized demonstrating student learning outcomes and using assessment for improvement. In this context, achieving a shared clarity about program and institutional outcomes can be a key step. But, external demands may or may not encourage administrators and faculty to take collective responsibility for inquiry into learning outcomes. This kind of transformation of institutional culture requires creating effective venues for faculty to reiteratively probe their deeply held assumptions about learning and the relation of learning to curriculum and assessment. What kind of assessment fosters a culture of collaborative inquiry into student learning outcomes? What assumptions do faculty, administrators, and students now hold about how learning is fostered? What assumptions do faculty and administrators hold about their respective roles in program and institutional assessment? How will the roles, commitments, and identities of faculty and staff formed in one culture be appreciated or changed as part of the process of transforming culture?

On Making Our Values Explicit

How do we, as institutions of higher learning, define our values? What is our purpose? What do we want to be?

What is the impact of making our values explicit? Does the understood “purpose of assessment” align with our espoused values?

What are the best models of the kind of community or culture we desire? What characteristics do they have?

How do we link the assessment of learning from course-program-institution in a meaningful way?

How do we demonstrate the value of shifting the teaching/learning paradigm?

How can we leverage the textual statements, traditions, and stories to signal our commitment to learning and development?

On Transforming Institutional Culture

How do we manage a change of culture toward our stated values? How do we spread that culture outward?

How do we foster a commitment to development and intentional learning in faculty and students?

Can there be a common language about assessment that can transform a culture?

What kinds of evidence will be credible to external publics to describe the advantages of transparency in assessment?

What shifts in institutional cultures support the use of outcomes and student assessment for learning about instructional improvement?

How have institutions shifted from student assessment to program assessment that utilizes a broad range of data sources?

How long does it take to change a very traditional faculty reward system to embrace assessment?

Are there specific disciplines that are more readily accepting of the need to do assessment? How to get professional disciplines to buy into the need/purpose of assessment?

In a culture of individualism, our current academic culture, how do we establish values of collaboration that seem central to “assessment”?

How do we move from doing this because we “have to” to realizing the value for program improvement?

How do you break down the barriers between administrative levels about assessment?

On Institutional Support

What motivates administrators, faculty and students to focus on assessing student learning?

What are the reward systems that best promote faculty’s active participation in assessment?

How do reward systems foster a culture of development and intentional learning?

What are the best examples of institutional support?

What examples of faculty reward systems exist that best support a focus on student learning?

What resources beyond money (e.g., time, energy) help us become better aligned with our values?

What aspects of the roles and structure can be modified to support transforming institutional culture to focus on student learning, i.e., public/private, research versus liberal arts, etc.?

What are the extant motivations for doing assessment? Is it personal satisfaction, professional growth, institutional mandate?

How does one continue a culture of assessment in face of diminishing resources?

How does one change a traditional institutional reward system to embrace a focus on teaching and learning? Embrace assessment?

How do hiring practices and initial faculty orientation practices need to be revised to encourage a greater focus on collaborative work and student learning?

What role does a regional and/or professional accreditation agency play? Are institutions transforming or merely complying in response?

How do national disciplinary communities value and support-or discourage-assessment of student learning?

On the Role of Students

How do we engage students in an active role in the assessment process?

How do we involve students in a culture of assessment? What is the value of assessment interventions such as new student orientation?

What is the student's role in transforming the institutional culture to focus on student learning?

How can we best foster student acceptance of this culture change? What is their role?

On Strategies for Focusing on Student Learning

How do we use existing models of exemplary practice of transforming a culture to inform our effort to embed assessment through the institution?

How might cross-cultural efforts that are faculty-driven inform our cultural transformation at an institutional level?

How do we encourage our pilot projects supported by external funding to share their experiences more locally and serve as case studies for others?

How will service learning initiatives be used to enhance the focus on student learning?

How can new faculty orientation programs and students' orientation programs be designed to include the focus on student learning at our campus?

On Demonstrating Student Learning

What outcomes demonstrate to administrators that faculty intensive focus on student learning produces graduates that have better developed the abilities expected of them?

How do we show the value-added and the results in student learning?
How do we blend quantitative and qualitative data?

Can we devise more research about how learning improved (if it did) because of cross-disciplinary projects?

What are the long-term consequences of not transforming the culture to focus on student learning? Is the status quo really that bad? Do we have the data to support the need for transformation?

On Leadership Strategies

What institutional leadership strategies best foster institutional commitment to assessment of student learning?

What is the role of leadership at different levels in transforming the culture (state level, president, provost, dean, chair, program director, faculty leaders)?

What impact would a mandate to make student learning outcomes explicit and transparent by program and by institution have on transforming institutions?

How does leadership strike a balance between setting expectations, allowing grassroots development, and providing sufficient support?

What are the roles of institutional leaders, including students, in transforming the culture—expectations for collaborative work, active learning, formative assessment?

What is the effect of administrative leadership in facilitating change across units/schools in a complex, comprehensive institution?

How might one determine the readiness level of administrators, faculty (early career, mid-career, and experienced faculty) and students for engaging in a culture of assessment to promote student learning?

Does or will change in the strategic plan have an input on changing institutional culture/assessment?

How do we motivate/engage faculty to buy in to the need or idea of assessment?

How do we draw on the experience and expertise of faculty in disciplines who have done more to explicitly articulate expected student learning outcomes to bring others along?

On Developing Leadership

How do we change the culture of administration to buy-in on assessment?

Does the same efforts that promote cultural change among faculty work for administrators?
Should the approach to these two groups be different?

How can faculty circumvent an unsupportive administration to transform the culture?

How do we encourage academic leaders to make student learning a focus of their public statements and reward practices?

ENGAGING WIDER PUBLICS

Connecting public audiences to our work is the theme of this year's AAHE Assessment Conference. In the program brochure Clara Lovett notes that this theme "makes explicit our interest in sharing with those outside the academy—state and federal legislators, accreditors, media representatives—our rich inventory of concepts and practices related to assessment of student learning." As she notes, there are tensions between responding to external audiences and remaining centered in the practices and values of an educational institution. And, meaningfully representing the complexity and multidimensionality of student learning is a formidable challenge. But, the phrase "engaging wider publics" that is offered here suggests an even higher challenge: developing some sense of mutuality while communicating with broader publics. How can we project what we are learning from engaging diverse public stakeholders? Beyond communicating assessment results, how might we engage these stakeholders in a dialogue that reveals the complexity and meaningfulness of undergraduate student learning in relation to their lives after college? How can we invite those with open, curious, and benevolent minds into our inquiries into student learning in a way that goes beyond tracking the dashboard or merely satisfying the seemingly ubiquitous interest in college rankings? How can we invite interested stakeholders into the process of qualitatively examining what learning looks and sounds like at the level of the student, as well as at the level of the program and institution? How can we engage stakeholders in our thinking about the curricular causal processes that underlie the learning outcomes we observe? How can we effectively bring interpretation of numerical data into these kinds of discussions? Assuming we all will need to build recognition for the quality of our programs, are there emerging approaches to communicating student learning outcomes that are both centered in our educational values and meaningful to a wider public?

On Responsibility for Engaging Publics

Who are the various publics—for institutions, for the program?

Who is responsible for engaging the "publics" in assessment and who decides?

What aspects of our assessments and our data analysis should/can be published? Who decides?

How do we involve the publics in choosing outcomes?

On Planning for Engaging Publics

Who will be the publics in the future?

How does the institution scan trends?

How do we shift the function of engaging publics so that the institution is proactive?

On Developing Strategies for Engaging Wider Publics

How do we learn to present the data information in the "sound-bite" format that attracts the preferred audience?

Some private campuses need to communicate directly with the public (i.e., potential students, employers). How can higher education engage with employers who will potentially employ our graduates?

How can we understand/assess the effectiveness of communication of assessment data with external publics?

On Communicating Results and Epistemological Frameworks

How do we translate qualitative data in research to external publics?

How do we communicate what we do to the public including an understanding of the epistemological frameworks that underlie our inquiry?

Where there is an increased movement towards national standards and testing, there is still loaded biases against certain groups i.e. women, students of color on certain scales/test scores. How can we communicate and value individual performance over a measurement score? Is this a real indication of performance even with a biased instrument? There does not seem to be a “one size fits all” based on research. How do we shift this paradigm?

American audiences are accustomed to “sound bites” in communicating results. Yet our own student populations are not homogenous and should not be treated as such. How can we communicate the different varieties of educational outcomes without diminishing its complexity in sound bite fashion?

On Building Mutuality among Faculty and External Publics

How do we define effective engagement with each of our audiences (employers, citizens, community members, alumni, legislators, peers, futurists, and students)?

Which institutions have engaged their publics in a way that effectively fosters mutuality in understanding and interpreting the institution’s assessment findings?

Faculty not in professional areas often do not see the need to engage wider audiences. How can general education create and articulate a persistent commitment?

How do you engage faculty in the process of communicating with the wider audience?

How do we get faculty engaged at multiple levels?

How can we engage wider audiences to create more relationships?

On Consequences of Engaging Wider Publics

Is the problem really engaging wider publics? This assumes that “good” outcomes will usher in support from programs. What counts when we look at “good” results and will communicating these results end up in support?

What information most effectively presents work in such a way that regulatory audience embraces our agenda rather than imposing their agenda?

An increasing segment of our audience is the US population which has greater numbers of minorities who are disenfranchised or disengaged in higher education. What does this mean for higher education and its further support?

How do we factor in issues of social consequences or influences in assessment? For example, how can we engage faculty in concern for success of minority students?

How does the institution connect outcomes to strategic planning?

CURRICULUM-EMBEDDED APPROACHES TO INTEGRATING STUDENT AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Curriculum-embedded assessments are an integral part of the work that a student does in a learning program, including but not limited to assessments completed in a course. Some accrediting agencies are trying to draw forth more committed institutional responses by explicitly encouraging embedded assessment approaches. Faculty are increasingly developing capstone courses, portfolios, and other embedded assessment strategies in order to both promote integrative student learning and for the purposes of program improvement and accountability. To promote student learning, faculty typically use an iterative process of explicitly defining intended student learning outcomes and corresponding rubrics in relation to assessment stimuli that elicit high fidelity performance. In addition to judging performance, faculty also give students individualized feedback, inasmuch as student learning is the goal. However, aggregating judgments of high fidelity performance assessments for program accountability purposes often requires additional steps that strengthen the credibility and transportability of judgments. These strategies might involve faculty jointly reviewing student performances at the department level or additional judges systematically rejudging selected performances. In either case, the integration of student and program assessment also generally requires rethinking faculty roles and rewards. What features of curriculum-embedded assessment promote collective responsibility for student learning outcomes and program improvement? What features promote accountability to policy-makers? What features promote student achievement, engagement in their learning, and the coherence of the degree? What are implications for faculty development?

On Implementing Curriculum-Embedded Assessment

How do we link the curriculum-embedded assessments of student learning with program level outcomes? How do we make this a continuous feedback process?

How can we use existing and successful embedded assessment methods (at the classroom or course level) to also serve general education assessment needs with minimal change/disruption/addition to faculty practices?

How can course embedded assessments be aligned tightly with the learning outcomes of the degree program as a whole?

How amenable are institutions to program-level curriculum-embedded assessment?

How can we insure that the process/outcomes are even in quality throughout the campus? Some schools are “better” at assessment than others.

What disciplines or programs are most likely to develop embedded assessments? Why those disciplines?

How can students be involved in the processes of the creation of assessment? If they are included, how does their involvement impact their learning?

On Institutional Improvement

How can our curriculum-embedded assessment results reveal to what degree we have a culture of learning at our institutions?

What changes are being made in institutions as a result of curriculum-embedded assessment?

Which structures and processes for curriculum-embedded assessment lead to the most significant changes in practice (at the course, program, and institutional level)? What types of evidence lead to the greatest impact?

How do we change the institution's cultural environment to apply assessment for learning?

How do we use data to make decisions? How much context does the data need?

How can we sustain the process?

On Evaluating Curriculum-Embedded Assessments

From an organizational/structural perspective, how do you determine the effectiveness of the institution's curriculum-embedded assessment plan?

What are the values and benefits of using embedded assessment techniques over other focus of learning assessment?

Where is the value added in assessment?

How can institutional investment in curriculum-embedded assessment be quantified, and return on investment determined?

On Faculty Development and Collaboration

What are the best ways to support faculty in the processes of developing curriculum-embedded assessment?

How do we change the institutional culture to encourage and reward faculty for participating in these activities?

How do we best help faculty learn how to develop good assessments, i.e. faculty development programs?

What faculty professional development opportunities are necessary and/or valuable in supporting their participation in curriculum-embedded assessment?

What are the available resources and faculty development strategies for facilitating development of embedded assessments?

How do we get the faculty trained in writing outcomes, resources and development programs?

How can a group of faculty collaborate on a common set of embedded assessments?

How does implementing embedded assessments in programs change the way faculty members perceive their roles?

How do we shift from the traditions of faculty autonomy/independence to a culture of collaboration and common ground required for effective embedded assessment?

How can participation in curriculum-embedded assessment itself serve as a faculty professional development opportunity? (e.g. instead of or in addition to traditional workshops).

How do we engage in peer review as part of the scholarship of assessment?

On Validity

How does one do curriculum-embedded assessment with valid and reliable methods in an efficient and effective manner? Where can cost-efficiencies be developed?

How do we get meaningful results out of curriculum-embedded assessment? How can these results be most efficiently used for improvement?

How can we make curriculum embedded approaches more valid?

What kinds of validity do we need to address (with any given curriculum-embedded assessment) to communicate to multiple audiences?

Is the goal of rater training (in multi-rater scoring) only to have high reliability?

How do we know if highly reliable assessments are also valid?

How do we know rater-training is effective other than by reliability (inter-rater)?

What is the meaning of validity among different audiences or stakeholders to assessment? Assessment involves measurement and what is valued to one stakeholder may not be valued to the next.

What are good/fundamental design characteristics/elements of effective embedded assessments and reading rubrics?

On Communicating to Wider Publics

How do we involve relevant stakeholders? How do we identify them?

How do we identify our audiences and make the process/outcomes address their needs?

Does one size fit all?

How can we protect the institution's uniqueness and still link to an overall standard of achievement at a national and state perspective? Can cross-institution benchmarks be developed? How valuable are our results to constituencies outside the institution?

How do we shift the curriculum-embedded assessment results we report from a product to a process? How do we include dialogue in the process?

How do we get meaningful results to constituencies outside the institution? How is the process funded and rewarded?

What is it that we need to do to validly measure something that can be communicated and has meaning to external audience?

How can we become more aware of the social consequences of measurements/assessments and how do we accurately communicate that to external audiences?

How can we educate external constituencies about assessment?

What do the students get out of this?

PARTICIPANTS

Guadalupe Anaya
University of California,
Davis

Heidi Anderson
University of Kentucky

Craig Bach
Kaplan College

Don Bacon
University of Denver

Alan Belcher
University of Charleston

Jim Benner
Northampton Community
College

Karen Black
Indiana University, Purdue
University Indianapolis

JoAnn Canales
Texas A&M University,
Corpus Christi

Michelle Cook
Iowa State University

David Deitemyer
Moraine Valley Community
College

Dave DePue
Washburn University

Douglas Eder
Southern Illinois University,
Edwardsville

Eliot Elfner
St. Norbert College

Norman M. Fischer
Pepperdine University

Lorraine Fleming
Howard University

Elizabeth Fountain
City University

Hesta Friedrich-Nei
Central University of Technology

Paula Garcia
Northern Arizona University

Dianne Gardner
Illinois State University

Brenda Gleason
St. Louis College of Pharmacy

Virginia Gonzalez
Northampton Community College

Monica Jacobs
Universidad Peniama de Ciencias
Aplicadas

Gail Jensen
Creighton University

Karen Jogan
Albright College

Linda Johnson
Southeast Technical Institute

Claudia Johnston
Texas A&M University, Corpus
Christi

Steven Jones
United States Air Force Academy

Richard Kellems
Brigham Young University

Audrey Kleinsasser
University of Wyoming

Ron Krug
University of Pittsburgh at
Johnstown

Antonia Levi
Portland State University

Margarat Malberg
University of Charleston

Jeremy McMillen
Texas A & M University,
Commerce

Barbara McNicol
Mount Royal College

Caron Mellblom
California State University,
Dominguez Hills

Dorothy J. Minear
Florida Department of Education

Deborah A. Morris
Florida Community College at
Jacksonville

Robert Mundhenk
American Association for Higher
Education

Neil Pagano
Columbia College Chicago

Beverly Parsons
InSites

Barbara Pennipede
Pace University

Melinda Piket-May
University of Colorado

Joseph Polka
Southern Connecticut State
University

George W. Rausch
Valencia Community College

Rita Reaves
East Carolina University

Terrel Rhodes
Portland State University

William Rickards
Alverno College

Glen Rogers
Alverno College

William Roweton
Chadron State College

Beth Rubin
College of the New York
Institute of Technology

Ed Rugg
Kennesaw State University

David Sill
Southern Illinois University,
Edwardsville

James Stenerson
Pace University

Rosemary Sutton
Cleveland State University

Sheila S. Thompson
University of Denver

Dannelle Stevens
Portland State University

Jim Walter
University of Nebraska

Marsha Watson
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Joyce Weinsheimer
University of Minnesota

Valerie Whittlesey
Kennesaw State University

Mary Wiedenhoef
Iowa State University

Thomas Zlatic
St. Louis College of Pharmacy