ASSESSING EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORK
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Centre for Teaching Excellence
ICE BREAKER

• At each table, for 30-60s each, introduce your interest in this topic and a big question you hope to have addressed in some way by the end of the workshop (1 person per inst.)

• Designate a recorder to capture Big Questions – 1m report-back per table
ASSESSING EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORK AT UW: CONTEXT & PRINCIPLES
THE WATERLOO CONTEXT

- Research-intensive, comprehensive Uni
- ~ 36,000 students
- 1,100+ faculty members
- University-wide strategic plan 2014-2018
- Teaching centre in place since 1976

“Teaching and research excellence remain core to Waterloo’s mission.” (https://uwaterloo.ca/about/what-we-stand)
CENTRE FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE (CTE) CONTEXT

• First strategic plan: 2009
  » main intention was to clarify areas of responsibility and build trust given our merger

• Programming outcomes: 2010

• Update strategic plan projects: annually
  » based on individual performance review goals

• Assessment plan started: 2013
  » Staff of 19 FTEs + students – need a comprehensive plan to assess our work
Vision
• To inspire teaching excellence, innovation, and inquiry

Mission
• CTE fosters teaching and learning of the highest quality. We work collaboratively with departments and individuals at all career stages to support the development of instruction, and we promote the importance of effective teaching and meaningful student learning.

Aims
• Build capacity
• Build community
• Promote and advocate for an institutional culture that values teaching and learning
CTE ASSESSMENT PRINCIPLES

• Collaborative – staff, faculty, administrators
• Defensible – situated within the literature and best practices
• Comprehensive – Centre, not just programs
• Prioritized – what’s most critical to assess and when?
• Sustainable – what can we maintain over the long term?
YOUR TURN

• Using the first table on the front of your booklet, complete the checklist as best you can
• 5-7 mins, including clarification questions
SELECTED EXISTING MODELS FOR ASSESSING ED WORK
## Possible Elements to Assess

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Focus</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>Satisfaction/perceptions; knowledge; beliefs/conceptions of teaching/learning; approaches to teaching; confidence; motivation to change; behaviours/teaching performance; community-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Perceptions; learning; approaches to learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Culture around teaching/learning; ED needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Centre</td>
<td>Workload; staffing; budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from: Belanger et al., 2011; Chism & Holley, 2012; Grabove et al., 2012; Kreber & Brook, 2001; Parsons et al., 2012; Stes et al., 2010; Wright, 2011
## Levels of Impact Model

(Kirkpatrick, 1996; Guskey, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Example Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Participant counts, satisfaction measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Learning</td>
<td>Pre/post surveys of knowledge, comfort level taking risks with practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Faculty: teaching practice (self-report, observed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational: ED resource allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of Changed Practice</td>
<td>Changed teaching practices: self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students: SET scores, student data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching culture: indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Cohen & Tennill, 2012; Grabove et al, 2012; Wilson & Ens., 2010)
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Levels of data collection and/or analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>UNIT OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>Departmental/Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mega</td>
<td>Professional Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Weston et al., 2008)
### QUESTIONS-BASED MATRIX MODEL

(Wright, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>???</th>
<th>DATA SOURCES YOU WILL USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Wright, 2011)
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QUESTIONS-BASED MATRIX MODEL: UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

• Questions you want answered
  » How many clients (demographic categories)?
  » What value/utility do programs & services have?
  » What changes are intended and occur (knowledge, behaviours, attitudes)?
  » What’s the long-term transfer of learning?
  » What are the needs for new initiatives?

• Data sources you will use
  » e.g.: registrations, questionnaires, focus groups (Wright, 2011)
## Logic Model

### Inputs
- **What we invest**

### Outputs
- **Activities**
- **Participation**
  - **What we offer**
  - **Who we reach**

### Outcomes
- **Short**
  - 1-3 Years
- **Medium**
  - 3-5 Years
- **Long**
  - 5+ Years

### Assumptions

### External Factors

---

Source: [Http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodelworksheets.html](http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodelworksheets.html)
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YOUR TURN

• Look at the second table on the front of your booklet: identify models you know, use, and any that you’d like to add to the mix!
• 10 mins, including identification of any other models & where we might find out more about them…
CONSTRUCTIVE ALIGNMENT

• Goal for us in selecting a model was to achieve constructive alignment (Biggs & Tang, 2011)

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM/SERVICE ALIGNMENT

OUTCOMES

ACTIVITIES

ASSESSMENT
CONSTRUCTIVE ALIGNMENT

COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT PLAN ALIGNMENT

OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES

CONTEXT

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

CONTEXT

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

CONTEXT
ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES

• Reminder about our Aims

Aims
• Build capacity
• Build community
• Promote and advocate for an institutional culture that values teaching and learning

• Alignment of these Aims to our activities
  » Activities include
    • programs,
    • events,
    • consultations
    • resources
CREATING AN ASSESSMENT PLAN

OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES

CONTEXT

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

CONTEXT

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS
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CREATING AN ASSESSMENT PLAN
4 KEY STEPS [BUT ARE ITERATIVE]

Identify evidence to gather
Gather evidence
Analyze and interpret evidence
Disseminate & use results
YOUR TURN

• Use the third table on the front of your workbook: identify any stages you have already undertaken, if possible
• 5 minutes, then questions
ASSESSMENT PLAN: STEP 1
IDENTIFY EVIDENCE TO GATHER
1) IDENTIFY EVIDENCE TO GATHER

Three Decision Areas:

• Audience
  » Who will review and use the assessment results?
  » What evidence is of most use to them?

• Purpose
  » Why are you assessing the work of your Centre?
  » What key question(s) do you want answered?

• Model selection
  » What model(s) will best address your needs?
IDENTIFY EVIDENCE TO GATHER

- **Audience**
  - Senior administrators, our clients, our staff
- **Purpose**
  - Overall, what is the impact of our work?
  - Our intended impact is to meet our 3 Aims: build capacity, build community, promote culture
- **Model selection**
  - Questions-based streamlined logic model = identify questions, outputs, and outcomes
Our question-based matrix focuses on not only outcomes but also outputs.

“It’s not possible and there’s no point to measure impact on student learning and teaching if participation is not present.”

(Hines, 2011, p.284)
QUESTIONS AND DATA SOURCES

Questions
• Who comes to us?
• To what extent are we meeting our clients’ needs?
• What intended outcomes are our clients meeting?
• How effective are our processes?

Data Sources
• Outputs: event reg & staff reports; resource hits; internal planning
• Outcomes: surveys (post-event & long-term); participant reports/narratives; interview & focus groups; other data
ASSESSMENT PLAN: STEP 2
GATHER EVIDENCE
TRACKING OUR WORK

- What to track? All vs. significant interactions
- How to track? Online tools, records, archives
- How often to gather, and with what queries?
2) GATHER EVIDENCE

- Counting since 2007 online, paper prior to that
- Worked closely with IT and HR to activate a “training module” within existing self-service system that would register and track
- Built reports that were future-proofed in terms of assessment, knowing we’d need the data
- This, + consultation, curriculum tracking surveys
- Examples (general) of archive and output data
YOUR TURN

• On the back of booklet, complete the frequency tool (what, when, how often, any external drivers?)

• 15 mins, 5 mins share with partner
BREAK!

- 15 mins please and thank you
ASSESSMENT PLAN: STEP 3
ANALYZE AND INTERPRET EVIDENCE
3) ANALYZE AND INTERPRET RESULTS

Analysis:
• Secure expertise on staff (or elsewhere)
• Use appropriate, time-saving tools
• Decide on the necessary unit of analysis
• Focus on addressing assessment questions

Interpretation:
• Keep a record of your Centre’s history
• Look for trends – what = “success”?
YOUR TURN

• What analyses do you currently apply?
• What more would you like to know about ours or others’ approaches to analysis and interpretation?
• Pick a program or activity and work it through the middle of the booklet with a partner doing the same
• 10 mins work time, 10 mins discuss
ASSESSMENT PLAN: STEP 4
DISSEMINATE & USE RESULTS
4) DISSEMINATE & USE RESULTS

- Much current effort: 3 newsletters annually
- Replace one with report to stakeholders?
- Walking our talk: analogous work to
  - Program review
  - Individual teaching evaluation
- Annual summary, w. blog posts and Tweets
- Deeper analysis of some work in rotation
DISSEMINATE AND USE, CONT.

• Director visits Deans, Chairs: slice some results out, address trends in Faculties; present to Exec Council, post on website

• Want #s, infographics, narratives in our annual report to make the results engaging and dynamic – NOT a paperweight!

• Address any gaps and overlaps in our work
YOUR TURN

• How do you currently share and use assessment results, if at all? How might you?
• 25 mins discussion

• Wrapping up: With whom will you connect when you get back to your home institution
• 5 mins (last worksheet page)
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