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 though 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.