

Resources collected by Janine Lim

This file is copyrighted (2010) and a part of my Leadership Portfolio found at <http://www.janinelim.com/leadportfolio>. It is shared for your learning use only.

Difference between Assessment and Evaluation

See the table here: http://matcmadison.edu/cetl/resources/archive/efgb/4/4_1_2.htm

Some Types of Assessment

Direct: measures student work

Indirect: asking students how well they thought they learned, tracking graduate school or job placement rates, etc.

Rubrics, which make the criteria explicit (Walvoord, 2004)

Institutional assessment: (* are her top three recommendations) (Walvoord, 2004)

- *retention and graduation statistics
- graduate student publications, fellowships, post-docs
- placement in jobs
- * student perceptions of learning (using a national student survey)
- student scores on standardized tests
- measures of faculty behaviors that research has shown is linked to learning
- data on campus-wide teaching practices or attitudes that research has shown is linked to learning
- * portfolios of student work
- random samples of student work
- faculty surveys of student strengths and weaknesses

Department direct measures of student work (Walvoord, 2004)

- Review of senior projects by external evaluators
- National or state exam that your students must take
- Places where multiple faculty members examine student work
- Entrance exams

Department indirect measures (Walvoord, 2004)

- Career development of alumni
- Student evaluations

- Alumni surveys
- Student activities
- Teaching strategies
- Program review

General education indirect measures: (Walvoord, 2004)

- Student or alumni questionnaires on how they've achieved general education goals
- Measures of student or alumni behaviors, such as volunteer service

General education direct measures: (Walvoord, 2004)

- Examination of student work in general education classes evaluated by a faculty committee
- Asking a random sample of student to submit work from general ed classes
- Institution wide test administered to all students

Authentic Assessment (Janesick, 2006)

- Requires quality performance or product
- Is connected to the student's world
- Is complex and multilayered
- Is continuing with multiple tasks
- Provides complex feedback continually recurring
- Looks for higher-order skills with a demonstration of knowledge

Examples of Authentic Assessment (Janesick, 2006)

- Performances
- Demonstrations
- Simulations
- Oral presentations
- Progress interviews
- Writing samples
- Formal observations
- Self-assessment
- Evaluations of case studies
- Recordings of readings or performances

- Journal writing
- Writing folders showing development
- Role plays
- Portfolios
- Digital storytelling

Types of Evaluation

General Evaluation Model (McNeil et al., 2005)

- Stage 1: Needs assessment
- Stage 2: Baseline data
- Stage 3: Procedures to achieve objectives
- Stage 4: Program implementation assessment
- Stage 5: Post assessment

CIPP Evaluation Model (Stufflebean 2001 quoted in (McNeil et al., 2005)); additional information from

<http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/cippchecklist.htm>

- Context (Contractual Agreements, Context Evaluation)
- Input (Input Evaluation)
- Process (Process Evaluation)
- Product (Impact, Effectiveness, Sustainability, Transportability Evaluations, and finally Metaevaluation)

Other Evaluation Models

http://www.edtech.vt.edu/edtech/id/eval/eval_models.html

- **Connoisseurship Evaluation (Eisner)** involves a connoisseur or expert in a field of study estimating the worth of a new innovation. Obvious biases and threats to validity exist. (See [Program Evaluation](#), Venedam).
- **Goals-Oriented/Objectives-Based (Tyler, 1949)** describes whether or not students have met their goals, with the results informing how to handle a new instructional strategy (i.e., revise, adopt, reject). One weakness is the evaluator may overlook unexpected outcomes or benefits of instruction beyond original goals. (See [Program Evaluation](#), Venedam).
- **Goals-Free Evaluation (Scriven)** supplements inherent weaknesses in a goals-oriented approach by providing an unbiased perspective of ongoing events. (See [Critique of Accreditation](#)).
- **Judicial/Adversary Evaluation** focuses on comparing or describing all sides of an innovation, both positive and negative. Analogous to the defense and prosecution of a court room. (See [Evaluation Exploration](#), Crawford).

- **Kirkpatrick's 4-Level Model** describes student "reactions" to and "learning" from an innovation, as well as "behavior" changes in real job performance, and other potpourri "results." (See [Evaluating Training](#), Nickols, 1999; and [Instructional Systems Evaluation](#), Clark, 1997).
- **Situated Evaluation** describes the characteristics of varying contexts that cause innovations to fail or succeed differently. Proponents of situated evaluation argue that educational innovations are situated within their context of use. (See [Situated evaluation for cooperative systems](#), Twidale et al., 1994).

References

Janesick, V. J. (2006). *Authentic assessment*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

McNeil, K. A., Newman, I., & Steinhauser, J. (2005). *How to be involved in program evaluation: What every administrator needs to know*. Lanham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.

Walvoord, B. E. (2004). *Assessment clear and simple: A practical guide for institutions, departments, and general education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.