

Intervention and Improvement; Leveraging Feedback-Driven Assessment through Technological Innovations and Other Best Practices

Dan Stroud and Jarvis Hampton



Assessment as Bureaucracy

Why do faculty distrust assessment?

1. Never enough time in a day, week, month, semester!
2. “I already know my teaching is effective.”
3. It’s just another tool of the accreditors and collegiate administration.
- 4. What’s the point, nobody reads this stuff anyway!!**



Institutional
Effectiveness

Improvement in Action

What's so important about trying to improve?

“Assessing learning does not by itself result in increased student accomplishment, much like a pig never fattened up because it was weighed.”(Fulcher, et. al., pg. 3, 2014)



Institutional
Effectiveness

Improvement in Action

What's so important about trying to improve?

- Learning becomes more meaningful.
- Change, through intervention, creates positive increases in learning, year by year.
- Student learning, lacking growth, becomes stagnant and mundane.
- Assessment without improvement, is unreadable and underwhelming busy work.



Institutional
Effectiveness

Improvement in Action

What are some elements of Improvement?

1. Your assessment needs to measure meaningful areas of necessary excellence in a given field.
2. Practice makes perfect.
3. Development of a baseline is essential – you must know where you are before deciding how much farther one has to go.



Institutional
Effectiveness

Improvement in Action

What are some elements of Improvement?

4. Feedback necessitates intervention.
5. Intervention leads to positive change and eventual **improvement**.
6. Conversely, a lack of feedback can leave one standing in the same place ... potentially minimizing paths forward.



Institutional
Effectiveness

Feedback as Process

- Feedback is a learning centric process, in which individuals must be able to comprehend given information with regard to their performance that can then be acted upon as a means to improve future efforts/results (Carless, 2015; Boud and Molloy, 2013).
- A critical analysis of feedback practices in general are that such information is not geared toward an actionable end. That such information is merely cast for the purpose of justification, rather than something that could lead to intervention with the ultimate goal of improvement (Li and DeLuca, 2004; Walker, 2009).



Feedback as a Bridge

- Direct
- Detailed for clarity, rather than vague and disjointed.
- Actionable
- Not just comments about work done, but how does it connect to future projects/tasks.
- In assessment, both in process and performance, **improvement** is always the intentional standard.



Table Discussion

Does your campus routinely supply feedback on learning assessment reporting?

If so, what does that feedback look like on your campus?



The Evolution of Improvement at West Texas A&M University

Creation of Buffs Improve Feedback Form

- Fillable PDF
- Uniform
- Easy/quick data entry



Bufs Improve! Feedback

Student Learning Outcomes

1. Are there at least three Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) that address what skills and abilities students will have upon completion of their degree at WT?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Are the SLO(s) specific and meaningful to the program and students?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. How are the SLOs measured? What instrument(s) is/are Used?

4. Do the measures for the SLO(s) have reasonable targets/benchmarks set in place? Are the measures challenging or can they be enhanced to maximize SLO improvement?

Improvement Narrative

1. Does the narrative describe the outcomes based assessment findings that were used by the program to complete Improvement plans from the previous year?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Does the narrative discuss the program's process in working as a unit on their outcomes to continuously improve the program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Is there a new outcomes based improvement plan (Outcome specific and including specific Curriculum adjustments/suggestions) with specific actionable details in place for this academic cycle?

☐ Yes ☐ No



Institutional
Effectiveness

Components

Process

Positives

Challenges

Action Plan



Institutional
Effectiveness

Additional Comments

☐ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient

Contact Dan Stroud at dstroud@wtamu.edu or at ext. 3452 for clarification of any feedback.

Reviewed by: ☐ Dan Stroud ☐ Academic Affairs Office ☐

Date:

The Evolution of Improvement at West Texas A&M University

Improvement of Buffs Improve Feedback Form

Via Qualtrics



Select which college is being assessed.

☐ ANS

☐ COB

☐ COE

☐ ESS

☐ FAH

☐ NHS





Select which department in **ANS** is being assessed.

Agricultural Sciences

Chemistry & Physics

Life, Earth, & Environmental Sciences



Institutional
Effectiveness

Select which program is being assessed in the **Department of Agricultural Sciences.**

Agribusiness BS

Agricultural Business & Economics BS

Agricultural Media & Communication BS

Agriculture BS

Agriculture MS, MAG

Agriculture PhD

Animal Science BS

Animal Science MS

Equine Industry & Business BS

Plant, Soil, & Environmental Science BS

Plant, Soil, & Environmental Science MS



Assessment Outcomes are **Specific**:

Learning Outcomes are specific, direct, and to the point.

- ☐ Very Specific (10 pts)
- ☐ Moderately Specific (5 pts)
- ☐ Could use improvement (2pts)



Assessment Outcomes are **Measurable:**

Measures offer solid criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of learning in reaching the desired outcome.

- ☐ Strong Measures (Variation of assessments) (10 pts)
- ☐ Moderately Strong Measures (Little variation) (5 pts)
- ☐ Could use improvement (Weakly structured – see Director for assistance) (2pts)

Minimum number of measures (2) per outcome has been reached

- ☐ Yes (5 pts)
- ☐ No (1 measure = 2 pts)



Bonus:

Average amount of Measures: (Measures in excess of 2 = 2pt bonus per measure. Cannot exceed 6 points/5 measures per outcome.)

- ☐ Average of 3 measures per outcome (2 points)
- ☐ Average of 4 measures per outcome (4 points)
- ☐ Average of 5 measures per outcome (6 points)

Measures include Direct and Indirect assessment.

- ☐ Yes (15 pts)
- ☐ No (10 pts)



Assessment Outcomes are **attainable**:

Reasonable targets/benchmarks have been set for outcome attainment. (Expectation 70% or above)

- ☐ Targets have been adjusted from one year to the next based on findings (10 pts)
- ☐ Targets are in place (5 pts)
- ☐ Targets show a minimal expectation of achievement (status quo assessment) (2 pts)
- ☐ Targets are not properly structured (0 pts)

Artifacts, Rubrics, Exams. (Degree of assessment execution.)

- ☐ ARE have been designed specifically to observe and improve outcome performance (10 pts)
- ☐ ARE offers assessment of relevant information but could be tweaked for precision and to improve measurement of outcomes (5 pts)
- ☐ ARE is in place but offers minimal data to promote improvement in outcome performance (2 pts)



Assessment is **timely** and geared toward improvement.
(Three years of assessment minimum).

Selected outcomes are designed with a three year cycle of assessment in mind.

Year 1, initial design and measurement (Baseline data collected, intervention set in motion).

Year 2, based on intervention, measurement of data - improve or no - new interventions.

Year 3, repeat assessment strategy from the previous year, make decision to continue assessment or shift to a new three year outcome assessment.

*Exceptions to the three year minimum in case of exceptional improvement can be justified.

☐ Three year process is on track - Year (1,2,3,?) (20 pts)

☐ Three year process ended early - new assessment set in place (15 pts)

☐ No track has been set in place to show improvement (5 pts)



Improvement Narrative is complete and positioned to seek improvement in the coming year.

- ☐ Yes, Narrative is positioned through the action plan to set up next year's assessment process discussion. (20 pts)
- ☐ No, the narrative is not built using the proper outline (Process, Positives, Challenges, Action Plan). (0 pts)



Points received for the program for the AY 2022-2023 are: 25

Select Program Assessment Status

Green Status - 81 points or more

Yellow Status - 44-80 points

Red Status - 44 points or below

Additional Comments





We thank you for your time spent taking this survey.
Your response has been recorded.



Institutional
Effectiveness

The Evolution of Improvement at West Texas A&M University

Improvement Database,

Comma Separated Values,

Dashboard

Solution =

<https://analytics.wtamu.edu/improvement/index.html>



Institutional
Effectiveness

The Evolution of Improvement at West Texas A&M University



Institutional Effectiveness

Contact Us

Assessment for Improvement Scorecard

Overall Scores by Department by Program:

Colle...	Department	Program	
ANS	AGS	Agribusiness BS	74
		Agricultural Business & Economics BS	82
		Agricultural Media & Communication BS	95
		Agriculture BS	92
		Agriculture MS, MAG	64
		Agriculture PhD	69
		Animal Science BS	92
		Animal Science MS	90
		Equine Industry & Business BS	82
		Plant, Soil, & Environmental Science BS	57
		Plant, Soil, & Environmental Science MS	30
	CP	Chemistry BA,BS	101
		Physics BS	102
	LEES	Biology BA,BS	99
		Biology MS	95
		Environmental Science BS	95
		Environmental Science MS	95
		Wildlife Biology BA,BS	95
COB	AEF	Accounting BBA	101
		Accounting BBAMPAC	95
		Accounting MPACC	95
		Economics BA, BS	99
		Economics BBA	101

College
(All)

Department
(All)

YEAR
2022-2023

View on Tableau Public

Share

[View Individual Reports](#)



The Evolution of Improvement at West Texas A&M University



Institutional Effectiveness


Contact Us

Learning Assessment Feedback Dashboard

Program:

Accounting BBA

101

Program Outcomes Status: Maximum 10 pts 

Very Specific (10pts)

Measurable Outcomes: Maximum 15 pts (Up to 6 bonus pts for measures beyond first two) 


Strong Measures (Variation of assessments) (10 pts)

Two measures per outcome have been reached (5 pts)

Bonus: Average of 5 measures per outcome (6 points)

Measures include Direct and Indirect assessment: Maximum 15 pts 

Use of Direct and Indirect Measures not Present (10 pts)

Attainable Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs): Maximum 10 pts 


(Targets/Benchmarks positioned for maximal attainment, 70% or above)

Targets/findings adjusted year to year. (10 pts)



Institutional
Effectiveness

The Evolution of Improvement at West Texas A&M University

Narrative complete and actionable to seek improvement: **Maximum 20 pts** 

[Yes \(20 pts\)](#)

Artifacts, Rubrics, Exams [ARE] (Degree of assessment execution.): 

Maximum 10 pts

[ARE have been designed specifically to observe and improve outcome performance \(10 pts\)](#)

Assessment is timely and geared toward improvement: **Maximum 20 pts** 

[Yes \(20 pts\)](#)

Comments:

[Well done!!](#)

[Lets work to find an indirect measure \(exit survey?\) for at least one of the outcomes. Having both direct and indirect measures assessed in tandem can only make outcome improvement that much stronger!! And understanding of student knowledge along with their perception of having that knowledge or not, makes for the strongest indicator.](#)

 [View on Tableau Public](#)

        [Share](#)

[View Individual Reports](#)



Institutional
Effectiveness

References

Boud D, Molloy E (2013) Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 38(6): 698–712.

Carless D (2015) *Excellence in University Assessment: Learning from Award-Winning Practice*. London: Routledge.

Fulcher, K. H., Good, M. R., Coleman, C. M., & Smith, K. L. (2014, December). A simple model for learning improvement: Weigh pig, feed pig, weigh pig. (Occasional Paper No. 23). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA).

Li J, De Luca R (2014) Review of assessment feedback. *Studies in Higher Education* 39(2): 378–93.

Suskie, L. (2018). *Assessing Student Learning; A Common Sense Guide*. (3rd Edition). Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Walker M (2009) An Investigation into written comments on assignments: Do students find them usable? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 34(1): 67–78.

Contact Us



Mr. Jarvis Hampton
Assistant Vice President
of Institutional Research
& Effectiveness
jhampton@wtamu.edu



Dr. Dan Stroud
Director of
Assessment
dstroud@wtamu.edu



Institutional
Effectiveness