Lessons Learned from
A Decade of PEER REVIEW
Peer Review: The Early Years (2007-2010)

- Impetus was HLC visit.

- How can assessment findings from 116 programs be shared, examined and constructive feedback provided?

- Half-day event where all program assessment leaders offered feedback and formative evaluation of each other’s program reports in a group of 4-6 per table, using a simple cycle-completion rubric.

- Completed rubrics shared with chair, dean and aggregated for percentage of programs meeting or exceeding quality indicators.

- [https://streaming.mu.edu/Watch/Sx35Ncd4](https://streaming.mu.edu/Watch/Sx35Ncd4)
2012: Talk about Results!

- How effectively does the evidence address the related student learning outcomes?
- How useful is the evidence for making decisions about the program?
- What are the challenges to using your evidence in a meaningful way?
- What would improve the quality of the evidence?
2013:
Is it time for an [extreme] assessment makeover?

• Formative, cohort-based.

• Problem-based approaches.
Your program may be a candidate for an assessment makeover if:

- You’ve had the same assessment plan since 2006.
- You’ve had significant changes in faculty or curriculum (staff or programming) since the last assessment plan.
- Your stated learning outcomes are “packed” and you’ve never really figured out a way to assess them.
- You are using only grades or aggregated test results to assess.
- Every year your conclusions state that you are satisfied with assessment results.
- You don’t really believe that your assessment results say anything meaningful about the learning that is most important to your faculty.
- There is no enthusiasm in your department for assessment.
2014:
The World Café – *having a conversation that matters.*

Session 1: The Maturity Model
Assessing the state of assessment

Session 2: The Examen
Consolation vs. desolation

Session 3: The Marquette Experience
What sets your program apart?
# Maturity Model for Program Assessment Reports

### Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Very characteristic of my program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all characteristic of my program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Program level learning outcome statements clearly articulate what students should be able to do, achieve, demonstrate or know upon graduation. The outcomes reflect goals that faculty value and believe are important.

2. Learning outcomes are observable, measurable and achievable. Outcomes are communicated to students and easily accessible on the program’s website.

3. Program faculty understand the relationship of the courses they offer to the program-level learning outcomes. The program has a chart, matrix, map or diagram that identifies the places in the curriculum where students are introduced to, practice and achieve each learning outcome.

4. Assessment is based on direct examination of students’ work, either formatively (in progress) or summatively (toward the end of the program.) Indirect measures, including students’ self-assessment, supplement and support direct evidence. Assessment methods are appropriate to the stated learning outcomes.

5. Results provide evidence of the levels at which students achieve the learning outcomes. Results indicate whether the target is met. Results produce evidence of learning that is credible to the faculty.

6. Responsibility for gathering assessment data is shared among faculty. Collaborative discussions about evidence and its use to provide student learning takes place across the program. There is a clear decision-making process for approving and implementing recommendations that derive from assessment results.
2015: Best practice presentations

- Writing student learning outcomes
- Rubrics
- Curriculum maps
- Data analysis
- Writing reflections
Small group discussion

• What might work on your campus or what already works?

• What are the impediments and challenges?

• What questions come to mind about implementing peer review on your campus?
Peer Review Logistics

- How tables are configured
- How assessment reports are shared
- Time allotted to discussion
- Is attendance required? How enforced?
- Facilitators and recorders
- Using feedback cards
- Support from the University Assessment Committee
For copy of the slides, please visit http://www.marquette.edu/assessment/ under Assessment Resources
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