PSLO Meeting Notes, January 28, 2009

Initial Review Goals of the Meeting:

- What is good about the curriculum maps we have for review; what can be improved?
- Are there any maps we would want to offer others as models?
- Ultimate Goal: move from description of outcomes in curriculum maps to clarifying and/or identifying actual tools of assessment

Key questions: **What actual evidence of the learning outcome identified in the maps have departments collected? i.e., what student work are we able to use for establishing and completing the assessment process?**

Nomenclature for identifying stages in curriculum maps: should all depts./schools be using the same language for stages of development? i.e., the divergence between science and math’s map language of “Not observed...Lowest...Moderate...High...Highest” and School of Business’ use of only introduced and developed as measurements for levels of outcome actuation/achievement. How much consistency do we need across the individual curriculum maps? Are the maps similar enough in content without having/imposing similarities in the appearance of each MAP?

Outcomes that are regarded as of high importance should be evaluated more closely. How central is the learning outcome/Woodbury University principle to the outcome(s) of a particular class? Those outcomes regarded essential for a particular class/program should be considered for assessment.

**Need to develop a campus-wide assessment map template...** from separate curriculum map to guide department chairs from the curriculum to the assessment map: look at curriculum map and think about how to use that for your assessment map. Assess across three specific points in the curriculum maps (introductory, developing, developed as stages).

**Need to create an Assessment Package:**

2. Chairs: evaluate the alignment of program outcomes to explicitly stated syllabus outcomes.
3. Ask chairs to target specific classes that provide the most significant outcomes for the program. Then, target which specific assignment will be collected in each specific class.
4. Chairs will need to change their oversight roles over the development of their department or schools’ curriculum to achieve this plan.

Some possible guidelines:

1. When doing the assessment map, need to re-write the goals as actual outcomes. Can start this process by looking at actual projects students complete and work backward to curriculum map (once courses for assessment have been identified and student work that will become evidence of achieved outcomes has been collected).
2. Syllabi alignment: use syllabus template to conform all university syllabi to that form; ensure that syllabus contains the course outcomes that are being measured and assessed.

3. As part of assessment map, Dept chairs could produce a narrative of specific learning outcomes for the program and an accompanying narrative of student learning outcomes.

For EER’s consideration: plan more detailed workshops for Chairs completing the process of developing the assessment of their departments. A second step would be to create/offer workshops for faculty to align syllabi outcomes and class assignments to class and program outcomes.
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