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Validated Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE)

- Launched in 2007 as part of AAC&U’s LEAP initiative.
- Campus-based assessment initiative developing tools through which campuses can assess authentic student work in order to assure that students are reaching desired levels of competency and can demonstrate their accomplishment.
- Developing approaches through which faculty can improve teaching and learning.
VALUE Rubrics

- 16 rubrics aligned with LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes
- Developed by faculty reflecting common elements of existing campus rubrics
- Tested in multiple rounds on hundreds of campuses using actual student work
List of VALUE Rubrics

- **Knowledge of Human Cultures & the Physical & Natural Worlds**
  - Content Areas → No Rubrics

- **Intellectual and Practical Skills**
  - Inquiry & Analysis
  - Critical Thinking
  - Creative Thinking
  - Written Communication
  - Oral Communication
  - Reading
  - Quantitative Literacy
  - Information Literacy
  - Teamwork
  - Problem-solving

- **Personal & Social Responsibility**
  - Civic Knowledge & Engagement
  - Intercultural Knowledge & Competence
  - Ethical Reasoning
  - Foundations & Skills for Lifelong Learning
  - Global learning

- **Integrative & Applied Learning**
  - Integrative & Applied Learning
The Anatomy of a VALUE Rubric

Criteria

Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric

### Definition

Integrative thinking begins as understanding and is a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and cocurriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transforming learning in new and challenging contexts within and beyond the campus.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (self or level) performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Performance Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to Experience</td>
<td>Meaningfully synthesizes connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom (including life experiences and academic experiences such as internships and travel abroad) to deepen understanding of fields of study and to broaden own points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to Discipline</td>
<td>Independently creates wholes out of parts (synthesis) or creates conclusions by combining examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Adapts and applies independently, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations or solves difficult problems or explores complex issues in original ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Communication</td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) in ways that demonstrate understanding of the meaning of the material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection and Self-Assessment</td>
<td>A learner, building on prior experiences, is responsive to new and challenging contexts (may be illustrative or reflective, or concrete work)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Performance Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels 1</td>
<td>When prompted, presents examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels 2</td>
<td>When prompted, presents examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels 3</td>
<td>Uses skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation to contribute to understanding of problems or issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels 4</td>
<td>Uses, in a basic way, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Institutions Accessing the Rubrics

Representation also includes:
- All US states and territories
- Higher education consortia
- International institutions
- K-12 schools and systems
The Power of Rubrics for Assessment and Learning

- Rubrics to help guide students and faculty
- Places individual faculty judgment within national shared experience; national benchmarks
- Encourages students’ best work, encourages self-assessment, and allows for mining of samples for assessment purposes
- Allows learning to be seen as portable, for cumulative learning and assessment, to complement other high-impact practices, e.g. e-portfolios
- Can build up from course level to institutional reporting needs AND down from general to specific program/course context
What Problems are We Trying to Solve?

- Need for assessment approaches aligned with high-level, cross-cutting learning outcomes
- Need for assessment approaches that are embedded in work we are requiring students to do (their best work)
- Need for evidence that faculty and students can use to improve learning and design of curricula, assignments, courses
- Need to respond with authentic data to accountability demands
Purpose and Vision for the Multi-State Collaborative

Change the dialogue currently focused on:

Access $\rightarrow$ Completion

To...

Quality $\rightarrow$ Success
The Challenge in Generating Evidence to Meet the Vision

“...existing assessment methods (e.g., grades, standardized tests, student surveys, etc.) are inadequate to accurately gauge and consistently share information about important college-level learning outcomes, including what students know, understand and how they apply their knowledge.” – SHEEO press release (11/15/2013)
What is Needed for the Vision:

- Direct assessment of student learning
- Use of students’ authentic demonstrations of learning
- Student understanding of how to use their best work
- Faculty involvement
- Statewide collaboration
- Project database capability to promote transparency and accessibility of demonstrated learning
The Model

Mapping the Vision to a Model for Action

Direct assessment across a range of learning outcomes that exemplify what a student should know for life and career success (i.e. AAC&U Essential Learning Outcomes)

Demonstrations of learning that exemplify a range of student work products (e.g. projects, papers, presentations, performances, portfolios) assessed using rubrics developed by national teams of faculty (i.e. AAC&U VALUE Rubrics)

Direct assessment of learning at multiple points throughout a student’s time in college to illustrate development over time

A representative sample of states, institutions and students in order to create useful benchmarks of learning to guide and inform campus-level work and accountability

Assessment management system (i.e., database) that will enable electronic uploading of campus-level data, online access of student work for scoring, analysis of state data, generation of reports, while assuring confidentiality and security of data
From Model to Pilot

### The Model

- Direct assessment across a range of learning outcomes
- Demonstrations of learning that exemplify range of work products
- Assessment of learning at multiple points throughout a student’s time in college
- A representative sample of states, institutions
- Assessment management system (i.e. database) that will enable electronic uploading of campus data, online access of student work for scoring, analysis of state data, generation of reports, confidentiality & security of data

### The Pilot

- Written communication, Quantitative literacy (Critical thinking, optional)
- Assignment guidelines have been developed (targeted minimum of 75–100 work products/outcome)
- Sample of students who have completed 75% of total number of credits required to graduate
- 9 states, approx. 70 public institutions, 2 & 4 year
- Management system chosen for pilot study
Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment

MSC

Participants: CT, IN, KY, MA, MO, MN, OR, RI, and UT

Steering Committee: State point persons from each state + reps. from SHEEO & AACU.

Institution Point Persons: Institution point person from each campus in each state.

Pilot Study Team: consisting of reps. from each state, SHEEO, & AAC&U
Foundational Work for Success of the MSC Pilot:
State-Level Capacity

- States bringing assessment experience to the table
  - Vision Project in Massachusetts
  - Institution-based assessment in Missouri
  - Indiana, Kentucky, Oregon, Utah – LEAP states

- States have expectations related to local initiatives

- MSC model seeks to draw from and satisfy a number of assessment needs
Phase 1 (completed)

- Spring/Summer 2014
  - Development of protocols, templates and guidelines for selecting pilot campuses
  - Identification of campuses and state and campus liaisons
  - Development of campus plans for collection of artifacts
  - Faculty development workshops, webinars, and summits

- Fall 2014
  - Collection, coding, and uploading of artifacts – targeted minimum of 75–100 student artifacts per outcome per institution
  - Development of scoring protocols and guidelines for selecting faculty scorers, selection of faculty scorers, and continued faculty development

Phase II

- Spring 2015
  - Scoring of artifacts
  - Data analysis and presentation of results
Kentucky Institutions

- University of Kentucky
- Northern Kentucky University
- Bluegrass Community and Technical College
- Hazard Community and Technical College
Why Participate?

To lend support from Kentucky to help the MSC launch the pilot successfully. Institutions would offer data from the University of Kentucky, Northern Kentucky University, Bluegrass and Hazard Community & Technical Colleges so that proof of concept, feasibility, and, as much as possible, validity for the approach to system-level assessment can be tested.
University of Kentucky Goals

- To measure the student performance in written communication and quantitative literacy at the University of Kentucky as a whole and also in comparison to peer institutions.
- To determine if student demonstration of learning meets expectations at the University of Kentucky and across institutions.
- To measure growth in demonstration of learning by comparing results from learning assessment in MSC to learning assessment in the UK Core.
- To develop reliable and cost-effective, sustainable scoring protocols for student learning assessment.
Bluegrass Community & Technical College Goals

- Enhance BCTC assessment and accountability measures through authentic student work.
- Determine the feasibility of this model for college-wide implementation.
- Develop strategies for improvement based on analysis of findings and institutional comparisons.
- Increase collaboration with CPE and other KY institutions.
# Results from Phase I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK-WC</th>
<th>UK-QL</th>
<th>BCTC-WC</th>
<th>BCTC-QL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Recruitment</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts Collected</td>
<td>54/75</td>
<td>181/75</td>
<td>36/32</td>
<td>58/32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University of Kentucky
Lessons Learned

- **Institution**
  - Upper administration presence helps
  - Need support for MSC Kick–Off

- **Faculty**
  - Insufficient time in recruiting faculty
  - Less manual work for faculty the better
  - Provide multiple options:
    - In collecting the artifacts
      - hard copies
      - electronic copies
      - permission to access via Bb
    - In communicating with students
      - sent via email
      - printed and distributed in class
      - uploaded to the Bb course shell
  - Timing of Phase II Internal Scoring
Bluegrass Community & Technical College Lessons Learned

- Faculty and Assessment Committee Support (“Buy In”)
  - Increase awareness and understanding of project and its benefits
  - Provide professional development opportunities
  - In service for participating faculty

- Submissions
  - Review artifacts and “key” for quality
  - Database formatting

- Timeliness
  - Additional time needed to recruit volunteers and identify appropriate artifacts
  - Spring submission rather than Fall submission
Next Steps

- Pending Results
- Implementing awareness across campus
  - Marketing
  - Faculty Senate
  - Assessment Councils/Committees
  - Department Area/Program Coordinators
- Streamlining the process based on barriers encountered
- Budgeting
  - Professional Development
  - Cost to implement full scale
Discussion & Questions
Contact Us

Dr. Debra Humphreys, VP for Policy and Public Engagement  
Association of American Colleges and Universities  
www.aacu.org

Dr. Melissa Bell, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs  
KY Council for Post Secondary Education  
melissa.bell@ky.gov

Mrs. Tara Rose, Director of University Assessment  
University of Kentucky  
tara.rose@uku.edu

Mrs. Karman Wheeler, Assessment Coordinator  
Bluegrass Community & Technical College  
karman.wheeler@kctcs.edu