One pager on Assessment and Faculty

There are multiple points at which faculty are a part of the assessment process. Faculty participate in outcomes assessment at multiple stages of the assessment process:

* Program-level Outcomes Assessment
	+ Creation of program-level outcomes
	+ Assessment of program-level outcomes
* Institutional-level Assessment
	+ Participation in Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC)
	+ Participation in Meta-Assessment Committee (MAC)
	+ Support from Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)
	+ Assessment of Institutional-level Core Competencies at the course level

At the program-level, faculty are intricately involved in the assessment of learning outcomes pertinent to each program. At the root, this involves faculty developing their own program-level learning outcomes where faculty within a program decide what learning outcomes meet their expectations for their program’s students. Once decided, they map their learning outcomes to their courses, indicating where learning outcomes are introduced, practiced, and mastered. This process is expected to be revisited when there are major changes to either program-level learning outcomes and/or courses. In terms of assessment at the program-level, faculty who teach the specific courses mapped to the learning outcomes identified, “score” students in their courses using criteria specifically linked to the learning outcomes. The program faculty decide on the criteria and the best method for assessing the outcomes. Program faculty then analyze the data, discuss the findings, and make recommendations that focus on next steps. In essence, faculty are the ones who conduct the assessment process from start to finish at the program-level. This entire process is known on campus as the Annual Assessment Reports (AARs) for program-level assessment.

At the institutional-level, faculty are involved in both oversight and assessment work. For oversight, faculty sit on the AAC, rotating every two years. The AAC review accreditation reports, participate in reviews of technology solutions, and provide feedback on both institutional-level assessment of core competency assessment and annual assessment reporting. On the MAC, faculty provide direct feedback to programs on their program-level AARs. Working with the Director of Evaluation and Assessment, the MAC reviews AARs, score them using a rubric to track development over time, and provide positive-minded feedback to encourage further improvement of program-level assessment processes. While the Director of Evaluation and Assessment reviews all feedback and reports, the MAC is key to increasing assessment knowledge through faculty participation in it, but also creating an internal peer review process of our own assessment processes at the program-level. In terms of CEP, the Director of Evaluation and Assessment partners with them on institutional-level assessment processes. Annually, the Director of Evaluation and Assessment shares core competency assessment report findings and discusses the recommendations made, and discusses methodology changes to future assessments of core competencies. This allows faculty on CEP to provide input before an institutional-level assessment occurs and after it is completed. The common thread in the AAC, MAC, and CEP is faculty involvement at multiple stages and levels of assessment at UCR.

Without faculty feedback, we would not have progressed from a juried assessment process evaluating only a few hundred samples of student work, to one that evaluates thousands of samples of student work and leverages CANVAS to dig deeper and disaggregate data using student demographics. Which leads us to involvement of hundreds of faculty in the assessment process at the institutional-level. When assessing core competencies, we previously used a juried assessment process where 10-member team of faculty from across campus scored samples of student work. This was an arduous process, that had challenges. Through discussions with AAC and CEP, we transitioned to the use of CANVAS and a distributed assessment process. This helped us increase faculty participation in institutional-level assessment from a centralized team of 10, to a team of hundreds across multiple disciplines and still kept the entire process voluntary.