

Instructions for Artifact Review

These instructions are meant to assist you in completing your review of student artifacts as part of the university's general education assessment program. If you have questions about your role in this process, contact Dr. Lisa Bonneau at Lisa.Bonneau@usd.edu.

Your chief responsibility in this project centers on the assessment of student learning outcomes through a direct review of student artifacts. This process is described below in two steps (which are illustrated with a hypothetical example on the following page).

Step 1 – Selection of Artifact Type(s)

Your first task is to select one or more artifact types (e.g., mid-term essay, research paper, final exam) through which the reviewed goal's student learning outcomes can be directly evaluated. The selected artifact type(s) should offer an effective means of measuring student achievement of at least one goal-associated learning outcome. You must select at least one artifact type for each student learning outcome, but may use the same artifact type for multiple learning outcomes. For instance, for a goal with two student learning outcomes, you may evaluate the two outcomes using two different artifact types (e.g., an essay and a portfolio) or a single artifact type (e.g., the essay alone). See the [IRPA Assessment Resources website](#) for a list of student learning outcomes associated with your reviewed goal and a list of suggested artifact types.

Step 2 – Review of Student Artifacts

Once you have selected an appropriate artifact type (or types), you may proceed with the actual review of student artifacts. All artifact reviews must be conducted using a rubric approved by the system General Education Committee. Approved rubrics are available on the [IRPA Assessment Resources website](#).

For course sections with 30 or fewer enrolled students, all artifacts (of a given type) should be reviewed using the rubric. For example, if you elect to use your course's final exam as a selected artifact type, you should assess (using the rubric) final exams submitted by all students enrolled in the section. However, for large sections (those with more than 30 enrolled students), 30 artifacts should be *randomly* sampled for review. IRPA staff will – upon your request – assist in the sampling of students in large sections. *Be aware that, if you routinely return graded assignments to students, you should conduct rubric reviews at the time of regular assignment grading to ensure that artifacts are not lost prior to being reviewed.*

Rubric reviews will result in the assignment of all reviewed artifacts into one of three performance categories: *below proficient*, *proficient*, and *exemplary*. Accordingly, you will flag every reviewed artifact with one of these classifications. Descriptions and criteria for these categories are provided in the rubrics. Following your review of artifacts, you should record the overall scoring distribution for your section on the cover sheet template associated with your reviewed goal found on the [IRPA Assessment Resources website](#).

To close the process, you must transmit the following materials to IRPA staff:

- (1) The completed cover sheet template showing the aggregate results of the rubric review
- (2) The syllabus for the reviewed section
- (3) Electronic copies of all reviewed artifacts with associated rubric grading

IRPA staff will work with you to arrange an efficient, secure file transfer method for all deliverables listed above. All materials must be transmitted to IRPA staff no later than the regular grading due date for the term of review.

Example

Professor Jones leads a section of MATH-115 (Precalculus) that has been selected for general education assessment (Goal 5 – Mathematics). The section enrolls 39 students. The mathematics goal is defined by two student learning outcomes:

- Outcome 1: *Use mathematical symbols and mathematical structure to model and solve real-world problems*
- Outcome 2: *Demonstrate appropriate communication skills related to mathematical terms and concepts*

Step 1 – Selection of Artifact Type(s)

For the first learning outcome, Professor Jones selects the course’s “Exam #4” – which includes a heavy emphasis on applied problems – as the selected artifact type. For the second learning outcome, Professor Jones selects “Homework #3” – which includes an expository writing component – as the selected artifact type. Both of these projects are assigned late in the semester, so Professor Jones believes they are well-suited to measure student achievement of the general education goal’s learning outcomes. Alternatively, Professor Jones could have used a single artifact type to evaluate both student learning outcomes.

Step 2 – Review of Student Artifacts

Because this section enrolls more than 30 students, samples of artifacts (rather than all artifacts) will be reviewed. For each learning outcome, Professor Jones randomly selects 30 student submissions (of the selected type) and reviews them using the mathematics rubric. Based on this review, Professor Jones records the following tabulations on the cover sheet template:

Complete the table below and answer questions 1 and 2.

Outcome 1: Students will use mathematical symbols and mathematical structure to model and solve real world problems.

Outcome 2: Students will demonstrate appropriate communication skills related to mathematical terms and concepts.

Artifact Name	Weight of artifact in final grade ¹ (%)	Proctored ² (y/n)	Calculator used (y/n)	Revisions allowed? (y/n) How many? (#)	Use of books, notes, or similar? (y/n)	Below Proficient Count (#)	Proficient Count (#)	Exemplary Count (#)
Outcome 1: Exam #4	10%	Y	Y	N	N	10	15	5
Outcome 2: Homework #3	5%	N	Y	N	Y	5	5	20

Professor Jones then submits the completed cover sheet template, the section’s course syllabus, and all reviewed artifacts (along with assigned rubric grading) to IRPA staff. All materials are submitted no later than the normal “grades due” date for the term.