



**THOMPSON  
RIVERS  
UNIVERSITY**

# **Strategic Assessment of Institutional Learning (SAIL): Findings and Recommendations**

**August 11, 2021**

**Submitted by**

**SAIL Pilot Project Team**

**On behalf of**

**Learning Outcomes and Assessment Taskforce**



## SAIL Pilot Project Team

### Co-Principle Investigators

Carolyn Hoessler, Learning and Faculty Development Coordinator  
Alana Hoare, Quality Assurance and Accreditation Liaison Officer

### Project Manager

Teresa Dickmeyer, Office Coordinator, Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching

### Faculty Members

Blair McDonald, Faculty of Arts, Journalism, Communication, and New Media

Jenny E. Shaw, Faculty of Arts, Sociology

Lian Dumouchel, Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts, and Tourism, Tourism Management

Robin Reid, Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts, and Tourism, Tourism Management

Lorry-Ann Austin, Faculty of Education and Social Work, Social Work and Human Service

Faculty Member, Faculty of Education and Social Work, Education

Faculty Member, Faculty of Education and Social Work, Education

Oleksandr (Sasha) Kondrashov, Faculty of Education and Social Work, Social Work and Human Service

Tara Bond, Faculty of Student Development, Career and Experiential Learning

Faculty Member, Faculty of Student Development, Career and Experiential Learning

Faculty Member, Faculty of Student Development, Career and Experiential Learning

Faculty Member, Faculty of Student Development, Career and Experiential Learning

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
Quality Assurance .....	5
Project Methodology.....	6
Results and Discussion .....	8
Recommendations .....	12
Next Steps and Future Considerations .....	12
Conclusion.....	14
References .....	15
Appendices.....	17
Appendix A Citizenship Rubric.....	17
Appendix B Critical Thinking & Investigation Rubric .....	17
Appendix C Lifelong Learning Rubric.....	17
Appendix D Assessor Instructions.....	17
Appendix E Assessor Rating Sheet .....	17
Appendix F Student Consent Form.....	17

## Executive Summary

In 2019, Senate approved changes to policy [ED 16-0 Types of Undergraduate and Graduate Credentials](#), which incorporates eight Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) into all baccalaureate degrees: Communication, Teamwork, Lifelong Learning, Social Responsibility, Knowledge, Critical Thinking and Investigation, Intercultural Awareness, and Indigenous Knowledges and Ways. ILOs are created to inspire and articulate a shared vision of knowledge, skills, and abilities students are expected to develop during their studies. The development of a TRU-relevant process for faculty to assess, reflect on, and act on students' achievement of these ILOs was the next identified step.

Between November 2020 and June 2021, TRU undertook the Strategic Assessment of Institutional Learning (SAIL) project to pilot a model for assessing the degree of student achievement of ILOs in ILO-approved courses. The pilot was conducted on behalf of the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Taskforce, under the guidance of the Teaching and Learning Committee of Senate and General Education Taskforce. The SAIL pilot project sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the efficacy of institutional rubrics for assessing and demonstrating the degree of student achievement of ILOs in ILO-approved courses at TRU?
2. To what degree can the assessment results be used to inform learning support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes?

Findings from the pilot will inform recommendations for a cyclical process whereby faculty identify relevant assessments, and then collect, reflect on, and act on, as appropriate, meaningful data regarding student learning and achievement of institutional learning outcomes.

Twelve faculty members representing six disciplines—tourism management, social work, education, communication, sociology, and cooperative education—participated in a community of practice of co-investigators planning, discussing, and learning about assessment of ILOs. Faculty engaged in ILO-specific community of practices called ILO pods, co-developed institutional rubrics and piloted a process for assessing the extent to which students are achieving Critical Thinking and Investigation, Social Responsibility, and Lifelong Learning in ILO-approved courses based on course-embedded assignments.

Faculty volunteered, and students were asked for consent for one of their assignments to be assessed by two faculty members as per research ethics approved protocol and privacy guidelines.

Based on the value faculty noted for the peer-to-peer learning and other findings of the SAIL pilot project, we recommend that TRU adopt a community of practice approach, via interdisciplinary ILO pods, to assess the degree of student achievement of ILOs in ILO-approved courses, and that faculty engage in peer assessment using the faculty-created institutional rubric, where appropriate.

**Recommendation 1: To foster faculty peer-to-peer learning among those teaching ILO-approved courses, TRU should create an interdisciplinary ILO pod, a community of practice, for each of TRU's eight institutional learning outcomes. In addition, ILO pods should be coordinated through the Centre for Excellence in**

**Learning and Teaching and supported by educational developers. Faculty members who teach ILO-approved courses will be invited and encouraged to participate in the ILO pods**

**Recommendation 2: Faculty participating in an ILO pod will measure student achievement of an ILO in an ILO-approved course using an institutional rubric. Using the institutional rubric, two faculty members will peer assess, compare ratings, and reflect on and act as appropriate regarding student learning.**

Note, where faculty identify highly sensitive student reflections or topics, or the institutional rubrics require adaptation to assessment types, two additional options may be considered by faculty and their ILO pods, including: (a) the faculty member using the institutional rubric as part of course-embedded assessment to measure student achievement of the ILO; or (b) a faculty member using a course-specific assessment tool or rubric aligns this method to the ILO foci to measure student achievement of the ILO. In both (a) and (b), faculty peer assessment does not occur. In addition, attention to assessor platform, sampling, student consent rates, and process will be important for scalability.

Formative, collaborative faculty peer feedback and opportunities for peer-to-peer learning were identified as the greatest strengths of the SAIL pilot project. A developmental, faculty-led approach that fostered trust, collaboration, and cross-disciplinary conversations facilitated a reflexive approach to learning. Therefore, we recommend that TRU adopt a community of practice approach that fosters cross-disciplinary and generative conversations as part of a regular process whereby program faculty collect, reflect on, and act as appropriate on meaningful data regarding student learning.

### **Quality Assurance**

TRU strives to build a quality culture through high standards of excellence and continuous quality improvement, which are informed by two quality assurance frameworks: (1) Quality Assurance Process Audit (QAPA), and (b) Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU).

In 2019 - 2020, TRU underwent a QAPA—a process intended to ascertain whether TRU continues to meet the program review policy requirements outlined in the Degree Quality Assessment Board's *Exempt Status Criteria and Guidelines* and *Degree Program Review Criteria and Guidelines*. Recommendations from the review included the need for TRU to “develop policies and procedures for institutional-wide curriculum review...” and the modification of “program review procedures [to] include an assessment of program learning outcomes” (pp. 3-4).

In 2019, TRU achieved accreditation with the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, effective September 1, 2018, with the requirement that by the Spring 2022 mid-cycle evaluation, TRU will have implemented approaches for assessing institutional and program learning outcomes, as well as an assessment plan for the general education model.

Since 2014, TRU has been making consistent progress towards the development of institutional, program, and course level learning outcomes. Progress includes:

- Senate approved eight ILOs and ILO-courses;
- Learning Outcomes and Assessment Taskforce drafted *Principles and Procedures for Learning Outcomes and Assessment*;
- Learning Outcomes and Assessment Taskforce piloted the SAIL research project to determine utility of institutional rubrics for assessing student achievement of ILOs in ILO-approved courses; and,
- Office of Quality Assurance revised the program review Self-Study Report template to include methods for documenting assessments of student achievement of program learning outcomes and ILOs.

The Learning Outcomes and Assessment Taskforce is in the second year of its two-year mandate to establish an approach for the regular review of learning outcomes and assessment. One key area of work remains, as per its terms of reference: “Recommend a model of continuous learning outcomes assessment and curriculum review which would fit within structures and processes that are already established.” In the following section we will describe a research project designed to determine the validity of a model of continuous learning outcomes and assessment at TRU.

After robust discussion of learning outcomes and assessment options and with the aim of improving student learning, the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Taskforce decided to pilot rubric-based assessment of student assignments, which builds upon the ILO criteria. Curcio (2018) suggests that the use of rubrics is an accepted method in assessing learning outcomes in undergraduate education.

### **Project Methodology**

To address institutional goals of assurance of learning through ILO assessment, as well as meeting QAPA and NWCCU recommendations, TRU undertook the Strategic Assessment of Institutional Learning (SAIL) research pilot from November 2020 to June 2021. Twelve faculty members participated in the SAIL pilot to explore whether selected course-embedded assignments provided students with the opportunity to achieve the qualities and learning intended by the ILOs. Courses at TRU are identified as meeting the criteria for one or more ILOs based on ILO foci tools. The criteria reflect research-informed practice, accommodate diversity in disciplinary techniques and theory, and are meaningful to the institutional context.

The project was coordinated through the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT) by a faculty learning and development coordinator and quality assurance officer and managed by an office coordinator within CELT. The SAIL pilot was submitted to the research ethics board for review with faculty as co-researchers and was approved in February 2021 prior to students being contacted.

Considering the university’s comprehensive programming, the pilot intentionally included faculty representatives from a diversity of disciplines. In total, twelve faculty members representing six disciplines engaged throughout the pilot: tourism management, social work, education, communication, sociology, cooperative education. In addition, two faculty (nursing and biology) were invited during rubric creation to expand the disciplinary perspectives involved.

During the SAIL pilot project, faculty collaboratively developed rubrics, sought student consent, and assessed anonymized students' assignments to determine the degree of student achievement of three ILOs: Critical Thinking and Investigation, Social Responsibility, and Lifelong Learning. Piloting three ILOs is adequate for testing as demonstrated by Norman's (2017) use of three VALUE rubrics: critical thinking, quantitative literacy, and written communication.

For each ILO, a rubric was developed by faculty in facilitated sessions. The rubrics included consideration of theoretical principles, knowledge, reflection, application, and other skills that align with assessable knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Stassen, Doherty, Poe, 2004). In addition, each course instructor identified a relevant course-embedded assignment. This use of direct (e.g., Allen, 2008) and authentic task assessments and rubrics reflects established practices in the United States (e.g., NILOA, 2016; Nunley, Bers & Manning, 2011), though is still relatively uncommon in Canadian contexts outside HECQO and OCAV funded projects in one Canadian province (e.g., Simpler, Frank, Scott, & Kaupp, 2018).

The SAIL process aligned with the six guiding *Principles for Learning Outcomes and Assessment* drafted by the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Taskforce with the intent to guide a values-based and research-informed learning outcomes and assessment practice at TRU. The six principles are listed below:

- Equitable and Learner-Centred
- Growth and Learning-Oriented
- Purposeful and Holistic Design
- Rigorous, Ongoing Cyclical Improvement
- Faculty-designed for Learning
- Reflexive Approach to Learning

A breakdown of the timeline and associated activities is provided in **Table 1**. The duration of the SAIL pilot project was 6 months (January to June).

**Table 1** SAIL *Timeline and Activities*

Date	Task
Nov. 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received approval for SAIL pilot project from Associate Vice President Academic</li> </ul>
Dec. - Jan. 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruited 12 faculty members across six disciplines (sociology, communications, co-op, education, social work, tourism management).</li> <li>• Selected three ILOs for assessment: Social Responsibility, Lifelong Learning, Critical Thinking and Investigation</li> </ul>
Jan. - Feb. 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received Research Ethics Board approval</li> <li>• Developed institutional rubrics</li> <li>• Sought student consent</li> </ul>
Mar. - Apr. 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anonymized student assignments</li> <li>• Conducted assessor training</li> </ul>
May 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessed student assignments</li> </ul>
Jun. 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debriefed with faculty members</li> </ul>
Jun. 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disseminated research findings</li> <li>• Reported on research findings</li> </ul>

Below is a summary of the activities that faculty engaged in during the pilot project:

1. Determined the ILO and ILO-approved courses for assessment.
2. Co-created a useful and relevant rubric with colleagues based on ILO foci and disciplinary program learning outcomes. The institutional rubrics built upon existing foci tools for ILOs developed by the General Education Taskforce.
3. Identified relevant student artifacts (course-embedded assessments).
4. Assessed two sets of artifacts with the faculty-developed institutional rubric.

Faculty members who participated in the SAIL pilot project received \$250 professional development supplements in addition to assessor training, which is detailed below.

Faculty met in their ILO pods for assessor training in the last week of April. The two-hour sessions included a brief overview of the SAIL process, a review of the rubric developed in January and the rating sheet, practice and calibration time where faculty assessed the sample provided (a publicly available sample assignment from an institutional website) and then shared and discussed their ratings. Minor clarifications were made to the rubrics. Faculty members were then provided with a package via Microsoft Teams that contained:

- ILO rubric (Appendices A, B, C)
- Assessor Instructions (Appendix D)
- Assessor rating sheet to record scores and brief comments (Appendix E)
- Anonymized assignments

The approach followed the classic curriculum improvement principles of being faculty-driven, educational developer supported, and data informed (Wolf, 2007), and built upon prior work undertaken by LOATF and the General Education Taskforce.

## **Results and Discussion**

Twelve faculty members representative of six disciplines and three ILOs participated in the inaugural SAIL research pilot project. At the end of the project, faculty participated in a facilitated debrief session to discuss their perspectives regarding the strengths and opportunities to inform improvement and address the initial research questions:

1. What is the efficacy of institutional rubrics for assessing and demonstrating the degree of student achievement of ILOs in ILO-approved courses?
2. To what degree can the assessment results be used to inform learning support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes?

Below is a summary of faculty members' feedback.

### **Interdisciplinary Community of Practice Approach**

When faculty members were asked what the greatest strength of the research pilot was, they agreed that the opportunity to collaborate across disciplines with colleagues was the most valuable aspect of the pilot. Faculty participants valued the ILO pod format—small groups—to discuss what the ILOs looked like in their courses, and to peer-assess student learning. Faculty described collaboratively designing the rubric and reflecting upon assessment as highlights of the experience. Furthermore, faculty said it was helpful to have other faculty colleagues assess their students' assignments and to receive feedback. For faculty participants, it was useful to see how their colleagues had interpreted the ILO and how the ILO was assessed in other

courses; therefore, the interdisciplinary design of the ILO pods was an asset. Faculty appreciated the “collaborative adventure” as part of the co-creation of rubrics and missed the community when assessing assignments individually.

While faculty members enjoyed the opportunity for peer-feedback, some noted during the debrief that they had a desire to assess their own students’ work using the institutional rubric. Faculty members’ feedback also highlighted the sometimes vulnerable and sensitive nature of trust and openness of student with faculty in written assignments. As a result, it was proposed that several options be made available to faculty, such as: (a) peer assessment using the institutional rubric, or (b) faculty assessment of their own students using the institutional rubric. Faculty were also interested in piloting the use of their own assignment rubrics with more specific criteria and then connecting their results with course outcomes and ILO foci—in this approach faculty would assess their own students.

This past year was noted as an especially challenging time, as participants reflected upon feeling vulnerable—this applied both to faculty and students—which potentially impacted the student consent rate. It also highlighted for faculty the need to build and share trust among peers within the ILO pods. Therefore, faculty members recommended that the process for learning outcomes and assessment be built on trust, reciprocity, and collaboration.

Implementing a community of practice approach will need to be done carefully, with significant attention to building an environment in which faculty feel safe to share with their colleagues. Being able to “ease in” through the ILO pod approach to sharing with peers about their assessment was seen as valuable. Duration of the time spent in the ILO pods is critical to success, as such, consideration should be given to running the ILO pods on a two-year cycle of building trust, planning, assessing, revising, and re-assessing, with regular and frequent opportunities to connect (e.g., roughly two to three times a semester over a span of two years).

### **Efficacy of Institutional Rubrics**

The relevance and efficacy of the faculty-developed institutional rubrics (Appendices A, B, and C) was dependent upon the alignment of the rubric with the course assignments selected. When assignments were well-matched to the rubric, they were easy to assess; however, if the assignments were not, then it was more challenging for faculty to assess them using the rubric. Faculty participants noted that if they had time prior to the start of the course with the rubric, several noted they would or could have designed the assignments with the ILO foci further in mind. Therefore, we recommend that future pilot projects be conducted over two semesters to allow faculty to build the rubric in advance of course delivery.

Faculty participants also cautioned that the ILO rubrics should be general enough to allow for disciplinary diversity. Two of the three ILO pods—Social Responsibility and Critical Thinking and Investigation—allowed for testing across three disciplines; however, the third pod—Lifelong Learning—occurred across disciplines but within one course type (co-op). Therefore, we recommend that future pilot projects have expanded disciplinary diversity when testing the validity of the rubrics.

A third consideration raised by faculty participants was the variation in relevance across the ILO foci for each assignment. Faculty peer-assessors noted, it would have been helpful if faculty identified the rubric rows that were relevant for their course assignment in advance of peer-

assessing. Faculty noted it would be useful in some assessments if faculty members shared their assignment criteria with their peer assessors.

Finally, only 14.6% of students consented to participate in this pilot limiting conclusions about rubrics and student achievement of ILOs based on the use of institutional rubrics. Future pilots need to address student consent. We discuss this further below under the heading *Student Consent Rate*.

### **Utility of Assessment Process: Challenges and Limitations**

A significant challenge for faculty members during the assessment process was navigating the platform (Microsoft Teams) and juggling three documents (student assignment, rubric, and rating sheet). This added unnecessary time and frustration to the assessment process. Several faculty members noted that navigating several documents was cumbersome, and that they needed multiple computer screens to complete the process. It was suggested that future SAIL projects should test a different platform, such as Moodle, and model practices used in Open Learning, such as fillable rubrics. Faculty agreed that, for this to be scalable to a larger number of student assignments, the platform and process will need to be more efficient.

Another concern raised by faculty participants was the utility of the rubric for non-written assignments. Future pilots should test the rubric with alternate assignment modes, such as presentations, posters, group projects, or practicum observations, just to name a few. This approach should also consider how to navigate observed ILOs, such as communication or presentations, specifically how to navigate student privacy for recorded presentations or incorporate faculty peer assessment for in-class presentations, for example.

Faculty also raised concerns about increased workload, particularly when engaging in peer assessment of another faculty members' assignments. Consideration should be given to the length of time it takes to assess students' work using the rubric, and whether a representative sample—as opposed to the entire class—is a more viable option. In addition, consideration should be given for staff time to anonymize student assignments as a part of the peer assessment process, and whether recruiting teaching assistants is a possibility or instances where students consent for non-anonymized review by the additional faculty member.

Finally, timing and assignment choice was particularly critical for determining student achievement of the ILOs. For example, the timing of the SAIL pilot project—January to June—did not align well with timing for cooperative education (COOP). As a result, the mid-term assignment was selected for assessing but faculty noted it was not as good of a match for the rubric as the final assignment would have been. Future pilots should adjust timing to allow for the diversity of programming offered at TRU, including Open Learning courses.

### **Student Consent Rate**

In this first SAIL pilot, students enrolled in the participating courses were invited to voluntarily consent (see Appendix F for copy of student consent form) to have one assignment assessed by two faculty members who were not their instructor. Student consent was sought within an ethics and privacy reviewed protocol to collect, anonymize, and assess one assignment for the pilot project. Students' consenting was kept confidential, and assignments anonymized. In addition, students' instructors did not know which students consented. Having the invitation convey that TRU was seeking student assignments regardless of quality (and grade point

average) was seen as important. Faculty saw consent being anonymous and voluntary as valuable for students.

The overall student consent rate was 14.6 percent (46 out of 316 enrolled students). Response rates ranged from 2.4 to 50 percent across the nine courses out of a total possible 11 courses. Two of these courses were not assessed. Of the two courses, one course had a high consent rate; however, the assignments were not sufficiently completed to be assessed. The second course was not assessed as one of the faculty members retired during the SAIL pilot project and consequently her course was removed from the pilot.

A key issue discussed by faculty was the low student consent rates. Faculty hypothesized that trust was an important factor when students choose whether to consent. Initially, faculty were surprised by the low student consent rate; however, upon further reflection, several factors were suggested as possibly impacting the student consent rate. Firstly, shifting to remote learning stimulated by the pandemic may have impacted the ability for faculty to foster trust with their students. In faculty experience, students were less open to sharing their work than in previous face-to-face cohorts across activities, and fewer responses were seen with course evaluations. Faculty hypothesized that students might have felt more vulnerable this year as some students have never met their instructor in person.

A second hypothesized reason the student consent rate was low may be that the personal nature of some assessments. For example, in the Lifelong Learning ILO, assignments for COOP students were frequently designed to encourage reflection. It was suggested that more personal assignments might be best assessed by the instructor who has established trust with their students. Alternatively, students may be more hesitant to consent to having other faculty assess their written work if they feel it is personal. This seemed to be relevant across several of the courses participating in the pilot project. Therefore, we recommend the consideration of an additional assessment model to accommodate assignments with personal reflections, where the faculty member is the only assessor which does not require student consent.

It is important for TRU to be ethical and transparent with students when seeking consent, as well as relevant to students. Ideally, consent should be sought by a source that the student feels typically heard by, and whom the student has a constructive/positive relationship with. Possibilities for increasing student consent rate include attending class to request consent when students are on campus rather than solely electronic surveys, adapting the language so that it is accessible to a wider audience, approaching students earlier with information, and emphasizing the benefit for students. In addition, hearing about the previous or potential value and impact of the process may also be relevant or hearing from those who have the capacity to make changes, such as from the institution/faculty/school. The SAIL project coordinators noted that this initial pilot did not have student feedback or focus group options, it may be useful to have greater engagement with students in the future.

Finally, faculty noted that students may have a limited understanding or connection with TRU's ILOs, as such the benefit of the SAIL pilot project in terms of student success was not easily evident for students. Considering that ILOs are a relatively new concept at TRU, we anticipate growing awareness of their value over time, particularly as the ILOs are integrated into the TRU lexicon, such as appearing in the Academic Calendar, marketing and recruitment materials for future students, on course syllabi, and program webpages.

## Recommendations

Based on the findings of the SAIL pilot project, we recommend that TRU adopt a community of practice approach, via interdisciplinary ILO pods, to assess institutional learning outcomes in ILO-approved courses. A community of practice is formed when a group of people want to share common experiences and knowledge that are related to a particular area of expertise. Communities of practice are organized around what matters to people (Wenger, 1998). The three main characteristics are: a shared domain of interest or competence that is distinct from other domains; the community engages in shared activity that supports relationship building; and the practice of the practitioners is the focal point of that activity (Wenger et al., 2002).

**Recommendation 1: To foster faculty peer-to-peer learning among those teaching ILO-approved courses, TRU should create an interdisciplinary ILO pod, a community of practice, for each of TRU's eight institutional learning outcomes. In addition, ILO pods should be coordinated through the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching and supported by educational developers. Faculty members who teach ILO-approved courses will be invited and encouraged to participate in the ILO pods.**

Additional findings from the pilot project suggest that the use of a standardized institutional rubric for measuring achievement of an ILO within an ILO-approved course shows promise.

**Recommendation 2: Faculty participating in an ILO pod will measure student achievement of an ILO in an ILO-approved course using an institutional rubric. Using the institutional rubric, two faculty members will peer assess, compare ratings, and reflect on and act as appropriate regarding student learning.**

Note, where faculty identify highly sensitive student reflections or topics, or the institutional rubrics require adaptation to assessment types, two additional options may be considered by faculty and their ILO pods, including: (a) the faculty member using the institutional rubric as part of course-embedded assessment to measure student achievement of the ILO; or (b) a faculty member using a course-specific assessment tool or rubric aligns this method to the ILO foci to measure student achievement of the ILO. In both (a) and (b), faculty peer assessment does not occur. In addition, attention to assessor platform, sampling, student consent rates, and process will be important for scalability.

It is important to note that the faculty members participating in the research project and members of the SAIL pilot project team recognize that this process may involve a cultural shift at TRU. Teaching is an intensely personal endeavor and opening oneself up to critique and peer feedback requires an approach grounded in an ethic of care and collegiality. To sustain the integrity of the pilot project, we recommend the continued level of resourcing in terms of project management and rubric development and assessment facilitation for the duration of the pilots.

## Next Steps and Future Considerations

To support TRU in the establishment of a regular process whereby program faculty collect, reflect on, and act as appropriate on meaningful data regarding student learning and the

achievement of ILOs, we recommend the continuation of the SAIL research project in slightly modified forms:

1. **Revise and Re-test:** In Fall 2021, expand disciplinary perspectives to review and possibly revise the rubrics and consent form. In Winter 2022, re-test the institutional rubrics for Social Responsibility, Lifelong Learning, and Critical Thinking & Investigation ILOs with the first faculty cohort.
2. **Build ILO Rubrics for Remaining ILOs:** Within the next two years, replicate the SAIL pilot project to complete the development of the five remaining ILO rubrics with several new cohorts of faculty prior to the start of the term they are teaching in and distributed over the next two to three years, for example:
  - In Winter 2022, develop rubrics for Communication, Teamwork, and Knowledge.
  - In Fall 2022 to Winter 2023, implement ILO pods for Communication, Teamwork, and Knowledge.
  - Between 2022 and 2024, develop rubrics for Intercultural Awareness and Indigenous Knowledges & Ways and assess student achievement of the ILOs in 2024-2025 and 2025-2026.

Once the eight institutional rubrics have been developed and tested, consideration should be given for a multi-year cycle of ILO assessment at TRU. For example, we may consider assessment of ILOs on a two-year or four-year cycle as shown below (**Table 3** and **Table 4**):

**Table 3: Two-year cycle of assessing four ILOs**

	Connection		Engagement		Exploration		Local-to-Global	
	Communication	Teamwork	Lifelong Learning	Social Responsibility	Knowledge	Critical Thinking & Investigation	Indigenous Knowledges & Ways	Intercultural Awareness
Year 1								
Year 2								
Year 3								
Year 4								
Year 5								
Year 6								
Year 7								
Year 8								

**Table 4: Four-year cycle of assessing two ILOs**

	Connection		Engagement		Exploration		Local-to-Global	
	Communication	Teamwork	Lifelong Learning	Social Responsibility	Knowledge	Critical Thinking & Investigation	Indigenous Knowledges & Ways	Intercultural Awareness
Year 1								
Year 2								
Year 3								
Year 4								
Year 5								
Year 6								
Year 7								
Year 8								

We recommend that the cycle of assessment be built into the work of the ILO pods, hosted by CELT, and facilitated by educational developers. Further, we recommend that the assessment cycles occur in two-year blocks, with the first year attending to planning and assessing, and the second year attending to revising and re-assessing. In addition, the ILO rubrics should be made available to all faculty members for use in their courses, regardless of whether they are part of an ILO pod.

In addition, baccalaureate degree students must complete a capstone course. The capstone course consolidates prior academic experience as the student synthesizes, integrates, demonstrates, and expands upon knowledge developed within their program of study. To complete the capstone, students must demonstrate achievement of program learning outcomes and reflect upon the four general education model themes; thus, the capstone course offers another avenue for measuring student achievement of the ILOs that can be explored as part of TRU's strategic assessment of institutional learning project.

Additional future considerations should explore opportunities for embedding the ILO pods within existing TRU processes, such as peer review or cyclical program review. Finally, TRU should explore avenues for engaging students throughout the cycle of assessment. For example, students could provide feedback on the rubric or be taught how to use the rubric and engage in peer assessment thus supporting scalability of the project.

### Conclusion

The SAIL project, with its aim to inform improvements to courses and student learning at TRU, builds on growing consensus that “harnessing evidence of student learning, making it consequential in the improvement of student success and strengthened institutional

performance is what matters” (Kuh et al., 2015, p. 4). Findings from the inaugural SAIL pilot project suggest that TRU, both structurally and culturally, align with fostering a collaborative approach to learning outcomes and assessment that will lead to continuous quality improvement and student success. Attention to assessor platform, sampling and student consent rates and process will be important for scalability. Formative, collaborative peer feedback and opportunities for peer-to-peer learning were identified as the greatest strengths of the SAIL pilot project. Therefore, we recommend that TRU adopt a community of practice approach that fosters interdisciplinary and generative conversations as part of a regular process whereby program faculty collect, reflect on, and act as appropriate on meaningful data regarding student learning.

## References

- Allen, M. J. (2008). *Strategies for direct and indirect assessment of student learning*. SACS-COC Summer Institute.
- Curcio, A. A. (2018). A simple low-cost institutional learning-outcomes assessment process. *Journal of Legal Education*, 67(2), 489-530.
- Kuh, G. D., Ikenberry, S. O., Jankowski, N. A., Cain, T. R., Ewell, P. T., Hutchings, P., & Kinzie, J. (2015). *Using evidence of student learning to improve higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (2016, May). *Higher education quality: Why documenting learning matters*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, Author.
- Norman, C. R. (2017). Students' performance on institutional learning outcomes. Retrieved from [https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1013&context=hied\\_etds](https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1013&context=hied_etds)
- Nunley, C., Bers, T., & Manning, T. (2011). NILOA's learning outcomes assessment in community colleges. Retrieved from: [www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/documents/CommunityCollege.pdf](http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/documents/CommunityCollege.pdf)
- Simper, N., Frank, B., Scott, J., & Kaupp, J. (2018). [Learning Outcomes Assessment and Program Improvement at Queen's University](#) (pp. 1–53). Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.
- Stassen, M. L.A., Doherty, K., & Poe, M. (2004). Program-based review and assessment: Tools and techniques for program improvement. Retrieved from [www.umass.edu/oapa/sites/default/files/pdf/handbooks/program\\_assessment\\_handbook.pdf](http://www.umass.edu/oapa/sites/default/files/pdf/handbooks/program_assessment_handbook.pdf)
- Wenger, E (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W.M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Wolf, P. (2007). A model for facilitating curriculum development in higher education: A faculty-driven, data-informed, and educational developer-supported approach. In P. Wolf & J.

Christensen Hughes (Eds.), Curriculum development in higher education: Faculty-driven processes and practices (pp. 15-20). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 112.

DRAFT

## Appendices

Appendix A Social Responsibility Rubric

Appendix B Critical Thinking & Investigation Rubric

Appendix C Lifelong Learning Rubric

Appendix D Assessor Instructions

Appendix E Assessor Rating Sheet

Appendix F Student Consent Form

DRAFT