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BACKGROUND

• This work is inspired by the Assessment Progress Template (APT) rating process at JMU.

• The purpose is to help academic programs to make data-driven decisions to improve student learning.

• Each academic and certificate program offered at JMU completes a separate template.

• Each report is evaluated independently by two people using a rubric.

• The ratings are intended to be diagnostic regarding programs’ assessments.
MOTIVATION

• Responsibility and authority for assessment activities are distributed across units.
• A wide variety of methods are used in assessment endeavors.
• The areas being assessed are as varied as the methods used.
• Staff members who shepherd assessment activities may not have attendant skills and competencies.
• Need for an effective structure to support, advance, and sustain assessment efforts.
PURPOSE

• The purpose of this framework is to provide a toolkit to evaluate the quality and methodological rigor of assessment plans and reports in libraries.

• The toolkit is based on modified version of JMU’s Assessment Progress Template and rubric to assess academic degree and certificate programs.
TOOLKIT DESIGN

Toolkit includes:

• Assessment Progress Template
  To provide the most current assessment-related information.

• Assessment Progress Evaluation Rubric
  To be used to rate assessment progress template.
First things first: what is the best practice?
ELEMENTS OF ASSESSMENT

Methods, techniques
Instruments
Target groups, population
Data gathering process
Use of information
Purpose
Dissemination of results
Assessment evaluation
Data analysis
Organizational goals
Recommendations
Results report
Validity, reliability
Direct/indirect measures
Sampling techniques, sample sizes
Communication
ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Establishing objectives
2. Selecting methods and instruments
3. Data collection
4. Analysis and interpretation
5. Use of results
6. Dissemination of results
STAGES OF ASSESSMENT CYCLE

I. Objectives
(What are the objectives and how were they formulated?)
- Objectives’ clarity and specificity
- Target users

II. Methods And Data Collection
(How is success in achieving the objectives measured and tracked?)
- Relationship between objectives and measures
- Types of measures
- Targets for measures
- Data sources and data collection process
- Evidence of validity

III. Analysis And Interpretation
(How are results presented and interpreted?)
- Communication
- Improvement of services, collections or spaces
- Improvement of assessment process

IV. Use Of Results
(How are results shared and used in improvement of the libraries and assessment plan?)
- Presentation of results
- History of results
- Interpretation of results
The toolkit: standardized, step-by-step mechanism to create and evaluate assessment plans and reports.
ASSESSMENT PROGRESS TEMPLATE

- Library or unit description
- Description of target population
- Objectives
- Which objectives are to be assessed this year and why?
- Methods
- Data collection process
- Results
- Communication
- Improvement of services, collections, spaces
- Improvement of assessment process
EVALUATION RUBRIC

See the handout.
### EVALUATION RUBRIC

**Rating Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. How are results presented and interpreted?</th>
<th>Beginning 1</th>
<th>Developing 2</th>
<th>Good 3</th>
<th>Exemplary 4</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Presentation of results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. History of results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Interpretation of results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each criterion on the rubric is evaluated on a four-point scale: (1 = Beginning; 2 = Developing; 3 = Good; 4 = Exemplary)
### III. How are results presented and interpreted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Presentation of results</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning - 1</strong></td>
<td>No results presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing - 2</strong></td>
<td>Results are present but it is unclear how they relate to the objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good - 3</strong></td>
<td>Results are present and they relate to the objectives but presentation is sloppy and difficult to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemplary - 4</strong></td>
<td>Results are clearly presented and relate to the objectives, and derived by appropriate statistical analyses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABOUT Raters AND RATING PROCESS

• Each report is evaluated by two people independently using the rubric.
• Pair of raters adjudicate their responses.
• Each rater team provides comments.
• Units respond to feedback and make their assessments stronger and more useful.
IMPROVEMENT OVER TIME

![Graph showing improvement over time for different criteria (1A to 4C). Each year (2009, 2010, 2011) has a different line color: blue, red, and green, respectively. The x-axis represents the criteria, and the y-axis represents the rating. The graph illustrates the trend of improvement or decline in each criterion across the years.]
APPROACH

• Performance evaluation is benchmarked to best practice.
• Emphasis is on improvement, not comparisons with others.
• Iterative process over time.
• Visible progress with each iteration.
I. Objectives

1. Improvement of assessment process
2. Improvement of services
3. Link between objectives and organizational goals

II. Methods

1. Evidence of validity
2. Reasonable interpretations
3. History of results
4. Specific and clear

III. Analysis

1. Evidence of validity
2. Reasonable interpretations
3. History of results

IV. Use of results

1. Improvement of assessment process
2. Improvement of services
3. Link between objectives and organizational goals
4. Specific and clear
It can take some long years before a rubric matures and best practices for its use come out.

THANK YOU!