Campus Conversations on the **Assessment of Student Learning**

Spring Semester 2009



Context (Past) Current Status (Present) Initiatives (Future)

- General
- Specific



University Assessment Committee Members 2008-2009

- Lee Budesheim (A&S)
- Brenda Coppard (SPAHP)
- Maria Teresa Gaston (CCSJ)
- Kathryn Huggett (Medicine)
- Gail Jensen (Grad School)
- Jim Knudsen (CoBA)
- Jeff Maciejewski (A&S)
- Tom Meng (Dentistry)
- Michael Monaghan (SPAHP)
- Tom Kelly (A&S)

- Fran Klein (A&S)
- Joan Norris (Nursing)
- Colette O'Meara-Hansen (DoIT)
- Richard Rossi (Student Services)
- Palma Strand (Law)
- Richard Super (RSP)
- Paul Turner (SPAHP)
- Stephanie Wernig (Institutional Research)
- Mary Ann Danielson, Chair (Office of Academic Excellence and Assessment)



Context

- Self-study in preparation for accreditation visit by Higher Learning Commission of North Central Association of Colleges and Universities
- Identification of three general needs:
 - 1. Coordination of existing assessment work on campus
 - Explicit university-wide articulation of values and valued outcomes for student learning
 - 3. Holistic consideration of the experience of Creighton students



Context

- Much of the necessary assessment work was found to be occurring already but not coordinated, explicit, articulated
- Creighton committed to four-year process of participation in the Academy for the Assessment of Student Learning to work on three identified areas of need
- Why the necessity?



- Assignment of lead role to University
 Assessment Committee with campus-wide representation
- Articulation of University Level Outcomes from
 - Mission Statement of Creighton University
 - Mission Statements of individual schools
 - Public statements by Father Schlegel



Six University Level Outcomes

All Creighton graduates will demonstrate:

- Disciplinary competence and/or professional proficiency,
- 2. critical thinking skills,
- 3. an ability to communicate clearly and effectively,



- 4. Ignatian values, to include but not limited to a commitment to an exploration of faith and the promotion of justice,
- 5. deliberative reflection for personal and professional formation, and
- an ability to effectively work across race, ethnicity, culture, gender, religion, and sexual orientation.



University Level Outcomes

- Are phrased generally and invite interpretation and appropriate application by individual schools and departments
- Give individual schools the ability to align them with existing goals and specific accreditation requirements
- 4., 5., and 6. in particular recognize Creighton's
 Jesuit, Catholic character, are less developed, and
 call for focused attention

 Creighton

University Assessment Committee

Poised now at the beginning of the next stage:

- Data collection and organization as to University Level Outcomes from schools, especially with regards to 1., 2., and 3.
- Campus conversations regarding 4., 5., & 6.
- Identification, peer review, and sharing of assessment practices currently being used across schools and programs



Initiatives (General)

"Outside In"

Accrediting Bodies

- traditionally have focused on 1., 2., and 3.
- increasing focus on 4., 5., and 6.
- * Note that University Level Outcomes apply to <u>programs</u> rather than individual classes or opportunities.



Initiatives (General)

"Inside Out"

Faculty Inquiry

- Empowering change for continuous quality improvement
- Creating continuous feedback loops: "How do we get better?"
- "What will we not do this year that we did last year?"



Initiatives (Specific)

Spring 2009:

Individual school initiatives on chosen University Level Outcome—examples:

- Faculty work this spring to be incorporated in syllabi in the fall
- Faculty discussions of program-level coverage of all six University Level Outcomes
- Paired conversations—one school with another sharing assessment practices

University Assessment

Initiatives (Specific)

- Data collection
- Campus-wide conversations regarding 5. deliberative reflection for personal and professional formation
- Focus on full set of student experiences
- University Assessment Committee as resource



Conclusions

- Not new—already doing this
- Makes assessment explicit and creates unified message
- Using structures that are already in place
- Anticipate external (accreditation) requirements
- Clarify value added by Creighton in hard economic times for marketing purposes



Questions:

- How can the University Assessment Committee be a resource?
- What are the individual schools' areas of strength from an assessment point of view?
- What areas have been or will be more challenging?
- What is the posture of the school's accrediting body?



OVERVIEW OF ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

