Description of Assessment Activities

Though implementation of the professional ePortfolio will vary depending on the stage of development of the department (see description above), we will be able to compile data on student learning outcomes and determine the degree of progress for each of the learning outcomes using a number of existing instruments, modified to incorporate the learning outcomes of the ePortfolio Project.

Departmental Activities

We believe faculty in departments and co-curricular programs are in the best position to do direct assessment of professional ePortfolios from students in their programs. Direct assessment will happen either: 1) By course instructors when the professional ePortfolio is compiled, skills are practiced, or artifacts are created in a course; and/or 2) By departmental or co-curricular committees when the professional ePortfolio is compiled outside of courses or submitted as part of a graduation requirement for that program/department. Whether a course is a senior capstone project or occurs elsewhere in the curriculum, the course instructor is best situated to determine whether the student has demonstrated specific learning outcomes. Likewise, it is the course instructor who can determine whether an assignment provides an opportunity to create an artifact or practice skills like reflection that are essential to creating a professional ePortfolio at a later date. Though the ePortfolio Project encourages departments to provide many opportunities across a variety of courses for creating artifacts and practicing the selection and arrangement necessary for an ePortfolio, assessment of the student learning outcomes associated with the ePortfolio Project need not occur in every course where some component is included. We believe the cohort participants will need to think carefully about what questions they are trying to answer as they undertake assessment, how they can sustain their assessment efforts, and how they can best provide information to the ePortfolio Assessment Subcommittee that will inform subsequent decisions about the ePortfolio Project. The range of specific components in each outcome will vary across different disciplines so faculty in the disciplines will need to determine which components of each outcome are appropriate for their students. The year-end reports from the cohort participants will include course embedded assessment data as well as departmental level assessments. The cohort participants in collaboration with the Assessment Subcommittee will test the ePortfolio evaluation rubric in Year 1 and make recommendations for revisions.

Sample Evaluation Rubric for Professional ePortfolios

The specific features for a professional ePortfolio must be adjusted to fit the expectations of different disciplines, but the sample evaluation rubric in Table 12 illustrates how a department can differentiate levels of proficiency across the four learning outcomes associated with the ePortfolio Project. This rubric must be tested and revised with the cohort participants in Year 1, but such a rubric should allow the Assessment Subcommittee and the Grants and Awards Subcommittee to assess sample portfolios created by students in different disciplines or programs.

Some departments will choose to use professional ePortfolios as part of their program assessment. In such cases, the portfolios, or representative sample portfolios, will be evaluated by faculty mem-

	NOVICE	DEVELOPING	PROFESSIONAL
EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION	■ Some of the documents are appropriate for the audience and/or purpose, but there are either too few to gauge proficiency or are inappropriate for a professional audience ■ Visual materials are not well handled ■ The overall effect of the portfolio creates some concern about the student's communication skills or ability to move across a range of genres ■ The number and kinds of documents suggest little awareness of the audience's expectations	■ Most documents are well selected but some are inappropriate for the purpose and/or audience ■ Occasional errors within documents do not interfere with the message ■ Visual materials within documents are appropriate but in some cases could be better handled ■ The overall effect of the portfolio suggests good communication skills across a limited range of documents and/or genres ■ The number and/or kinds of documents show inconsistent attention to audience expectations	■ Documents are well selected for the audience and purpose ■ Documents demonstrate attention to conventions and proofreading ■ Where visual materials are included in these documents, they are appropriate and well done ■ The overall effect of the portfolio suggests strong communication skills across a range of documents and genres ■ And does so with attention to the number and kinds of documents the audience will expect
CRITICAL THINKING THROUGH REFLECTION	■ The portfolio shows little attention to selection and arrangement of artifacts ■ Contextual material is usually missing and/or does not contribute to the demonstration of critical thinking abilities ■ The identity created is insufficiently professional	■ The selection and arrangement of artifacts often demonstrates careful synthesis and connecting of experiences ■ There is some inconsistency in the professional identity ■ Contextual information is inconsistent and/or missing	■ The selection and arrangement of artifacts and the contextual information provided with the individual artifacts demonstrates careful consideration of the connections across time and experiences ■ A professional identity is consistently present throughout the portfolio
TECHNICAL COMPETENCY	■ The portfolio demonstrates very limited technical skill ■ Links are often broken and artifacts sometimes will not open ■ The site mixes features of a social networking site and a professional portfolio enough that viewers wonder if the student understands the difference ■ The portfolio follows a very rigid template showing little awareness or control of the technology	■ The portfolio demonstrates a limited range of technical skills because most of the artifacts are of the same type and/or a standard template has been utilized without evidence of personalization ■ At some points the site employs features more appropriate for a social networking site ■ The quality and effectiveness varies depending on the platform used to access the material	■ The portfolio demonstrates a range of technical skills both within artifacts and across the Web site itself ■ Care has been taken to ensure that the site is accessible from different platforms ■ There is enough variety and attention to details to suggest that the student understands the conventions and differences between social networking sites and a professional ePortfolio
VISUAL LITERACY	■ The portfolio is rarely visually effective ■ Some artifacts include visual elements but the overall effect is that little attention has been paid to the design elements or the effectiveness of any visuals that are included	■ The portfolio is usually visually effective but some flaws in the design occur ■ Attention to design principles is often present but is not consistent suggesting a more limited understanding of these principles and how to execute them	■ The portfolio is visually effective and well designed ■ There is a consistency to the design that suggests a deep understanding of design principles and the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of both individual artifacts and the site as a whole

Table 12: Sample Evaluation Rubric