



LEAP Texas

Texas Assessment Collaborative: Update

LEAP Texas: Texas Assessment Collaborative Webinar
February 20, 2017@ 3:40-4:30pm



What is LEAP Texas TAC?

Faculty from multiple Texas colleges and universities assessing our students' work against LEAP VALUE rubrics to better understand student attainment of Texas core objectives.



What is LEAP Texas TAC?

- Texas Assessment Collaborative
- LEAP Texas Fellows & Development Hub
- State-wide, inter-institutional general education outcomes assessment project
- Modeled on Multi-State Collaborative
- Focused on LEAP VALUE based assessment of Texas core objectives



Project Goals

- **Short-Term:** Faculty from multiple Texas colleges and universities assessing our students' work against LEAP VALUE rubrics to better understand student attainment of Texas core objectives.
- **Mid-Term:** Faculty collaboratively developing a state-wide interpretation of LEAP VALUE rubrics aligned with the Texas Core Objectives in order to inform local assessment methods and practices.
- **Long-Term:** LEAP Texas colleges and universities leveraging collaboratively developed, state-wide interpretation of LEAP VALUE rubrics to assess Texas Core Objectives, and interpreting local results within the broader context of Texas Higher Education.



Scope of this Project

- Pilot year, 1st LEAP Texas Inter-Institutional Assessment project
- 7 institutions
- 513 documents collected
- 400 documents sampled
- 30 evaluators



Participating Institutions

- El Centro College
- San Jacinto College
- Stephen F. Austin State University
- University of Houston Victoria
- University of North Texas
- University of Texas Arlington
- Weatherford College



Benefits for Faculty

- Benefit from and contribute to state-wide community of college and university faculty
- Gain in-depth, hands-on experience applying LEAP VALUE rubrics
- Gain a state-wide perspective of student success regarding Texas Core Objectives
- Contribute to development of state-wide interpretation of VALUE rubrics



Benefits for Assessment Leaders

- Inform, improve, and sustain local methods and practices for assessment of core objectives
- Initiate or advance local assessment of core objectives
- Inform local implementation and interpretation of LEAP VALUE rubrics
- Facilitate collaboratively developed benchmarks



Benefits for Institutions

- Contribute to development of a state-wide context for and alignment of assessment of core objectives
- Inform local methods and practice with alignment of LEAP VALUE rubrics across 2-year and 4-year institutions
- Frame within the state-wide context local discussions regarding student attainment of general education outcomes



What's been done?



Phase 1 Webinars

Two Perspectives:

1. Texas Assessment Collaborative focusing on the sampling plan for that project across the participating institutions.
2. Considerations for local institutions when sampling assignments for general education outcomes assessment against the LEAP VALUE rubrics.





Phase 1 Webinars

- Assignment Design
- Sampling Plans
- IRB and FERPA Considerations





Phase 2: Project Meetings

- IRB or Institutional approval
- Determine project sampling methods, e.g.
 - student's academic progress
 - number of documents per section or faculty or student
- Demographic data
- Scoring vs. Calibration
- De-identifying samples (Redact-it!)





Phase 3: Evaluation Session

- Institutions uploaded student work samples
- Evaluators identified
- Calibration session conducted (yesterday!)





What remains?



Phase 3: Evaluation Session

- Evaluators assess 15-20 student samples
- Session closes March 12 @ 11:59pm
- Crunch the numbers
- Return institutional data to institutions
- Project meetings, e.g. data analysis and presentation, other issues?



Phase 4: Webinar Series

Results, Recommendations, and Returns to be determined . . .





Calibration Tool

Control of Syntax and Mechanics

	Language	Meaning	Errors
1	Uses language		that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.
2	Uses language	that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity,	although writing may include some errors.
3	Uses straightforward language	that generally conveys meaning to readers.	The language in the portfolio has few errors.
4	Uses graceful language	that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency,	and is virtually error-free.





Hypothetically . . .

Criteria	By LOCAL Evaluator	By TAC Evaluator
Context of and Purpose for Writing	2	3
Content Development	3	4
Genre & Disciplinary Conventions	2	3
Sources and Evidence	2	3
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	3	4

- Do we better understand student attainment?
- How does that inform local practice?
- Does that place local results in state context?





Hypothetically . . .

Criteria	By LOCAL Evaluator	By TAC Evaluator
Context of and Purpose for Writing	3	2
Content Development	4	3
Genre & Disciplinary Conventions	3	2
Sources and Evidence	3	2
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	4	2

- Do we better understand student attainment?
- How does that inform local practice?
- Does that place local results in state context?





Interpretation

Level 4. In disciplines that use expository writing, *graceful language* may include more elegant transitions, use of figurative language, or parallel structure, etc. For *graceful language* perhaps across all disciplines, the writer is clearly in control of language and may appear to make deliberate choices for effect or emphasis and communicates nuances of meaning.

Level 3. Straightforward language will be focused on meaning; the writer appears to be more in control of language and their own vocabulary (in contrast to instances in which they may be reaching beyond their own vocabulary, as noted in Level 2).

Level 2 may include occasionally forced or awkward language (“thesaurus-ized”); the writer may not be fully in control of the language. It may include some errors that do not interfere with meaning (e.g. omission of a comma).

Level 1 may require the reader occasionally to read and re-read or to reinterpret a student’s writing (due to issues such as language choice, grammar, sentence structure, typos) to make meaning of it.

Level 0 may be difficult to understand; the reader may have to read and re-read more frequently or may be unable to determine meaning of a passage.

The type and nature of the error is a consideration. A repeated error of the same type may be considered only one error?

Student writing that has few, if any, noticeable errors is indicative of a *Level 3 or 4*.





Scaling Up?

For ONE outcome, state-wide evaluations . . .

52 community colleges

x 100 samples each = 5,200 documents

x 2.33 evaluations per document = 12,116 evaluations

/ 100 evaluations per evaluator = 122 evaluators

For ONE outcome, state-wide calibration . . .

52 community colleges

100 samples each evaluated internally

x 2.33 evaluations per document = 233 evaluations

/ 30 evaluations per evaluator = 8 evaluators





Questions?



LEAP Texas

Assessment Fellows

Larry J. King, Ph.D.

Professor of Communication

Stephen F. Austin State University 

lking@sfasu.edu
twitter@lking58

Chris Duke, Ph.D.

Assistant Vice Chancellor
Accreditation & Assessment

San Jacinto College 

chris.duke@sjcd.edu
twitter@cmduke