



# Learning Outcomes: Evolution of Assessment

October 17 – 18, 2016  
DoubleTree by Hilton Hotel  
Toronto, Ontario

# Conference Organizers & Staff

## PROGRAM COMMITTEE

**ALICE PITT**, Chair

Vice Provost (Academic), *York University*

**KAREN BELFER**

Executive Director, *Ontario College Quality Assurance Service (OCQAS)*

**DAPHNE BONAR**

Manager, Degree Development and Academic Pathways, *George Brown College*

**PAUL GOOCH**

Chair, *Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance*

**PETER GOOCH**

Senior Director, Policy and Analysis, *Council of Ontario Universities*

**LAURA JO GUNTER**

Senior Vice President Academic, *George Brown College*

**MARY CATHARINE LENNON**

Senior Policy Advisor, *Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB)*

**ANDRÉ LOISELLE**

Assistant Vice-President (Academic), *Carleton University*

**JOHN SHEPHERD**

Vice-President (Academic), *Carleton University*

**ARLENE WILLIAMS**

Policy and Programs Director, *Ontario Council on Articulation & Transfer (ONCAT)*

**MARY WILSON**

Director, Centre for Academic Excellence, *Niagara College*

## SECRETARIAT SUPPORT

**JULIA COLYAR**

Senior Policy Analyst, *Council of Ontario Universities*

**CINDY ROBINSON**

Manager, *Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance*

**BRIAN TIMNEY**

Executive Director, *Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance*

**DONNA WOOLCOTT**

Executive Director (Retired), *Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance*

---

# Sponsors

We would like to acknowledge the generous support of our conference sponsors:



[www.cou.on.ca](http://www.cou.on.ca)



Ontario College Quality Assurance Service

Service de l'assurance de la qualité des collèges de l'Ontario

[www.ocqas.org](http://www.ocqas.org)

**PEQAB**

Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board  
Commission d'évaluation de la qualité de l'éducation postsecondaire

[www.peqab.ca](http://www.peqab.ca)



ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES  
COUNCIL on QUALITY ASSURANCE

[www.oucqa.ca](http://www.oucqa.ca)



[www.oncat.ca](http://www.oncat.ca)

We would also like to acknowledge the generous sponsorship of the following:

**Reception (Day 1)**

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON  
**GRADUATE STUDIES**

An affiliate of the  COUNCIL OF ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES

<http://cou.on.ca/about/affiliates/ocav/ocgs/>

---

# Monday, October 17, 2016

**REGISTRATION AND BREAKFAST****MANDARIN BALLROOM****7:30 a.m. – 8:15 a.m.****WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS****MANDARIN BALLROOM****8:15 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.****ALICE PITT**, Chair, Conference Planning Committee**PLENARY PANEL 1****MANDARIN BALLROOM****8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.*****Communicating Learning Outcomes: Employer and Institutional Perspectives***

**PANEL:** **JAMIE CLEARY**, President, Ontario Undergraduate Student Association,  
**NANDA DIMITROV**, Acting Director, Teaching Support Centre, Western University,  
**TRACY GEDIES**, Director, Centre for Academic Excellence, Fanshawe College, and  
**VALERIE WALKER**, Vice President, Innovation and Skills, the Business Council of  
Canada

**MODERATOR:** **BRIAN TIMNEY**, Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

Although universities and colleges have done a very good job at defining and assessing learning outcomes, there is still a gap in the way that these are expressed by students in terms of their understanding of the competencies that are needed within the workforce. Panelists (from the business, university, and college sectors, including students), will discuss the competencies that are expected from students as they transition into new jobs, and ways in which they might better articulate to their (potential) employers the learning and skills sets they have obtained through the course of their studies. The emphasis will be on the development of best practices to ensure that students' capabilities are recognized after they leave their educational institutions.

**COFFEE BREAK****10:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.****ALL CONFERENCE ROOMS**

**WORKSHOPS – DAY 1, SESSION 1****10:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.****WORKSHOP A****VICTORIA A & B****Informal Discussion*****Accommodation, Learning Outcomes and Graduate Studies*****DISCUSSION LEADER:** **LINDA MILLER**, Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, Western University

In this informal discussion, participants will consider how to meet and measure program-level learning outcomes for graduate students needing accommodation. Participants will share best practices and approaches for ensuring student success while also maintaining program rigour and essential requirements.

**WORKSHOP B****TORONTO BALLROOM****(10:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.)*****International Trends and Activities*****SPEAKERS:** **ROGER BENJAMIN**, President and CEO, Council for Aid to Education (CAE), **MARY CATHARINE LENNON**, Senior Policy Advisor, Postsecondary Education Quality Assurance Board (PEQAB), **TOM VAN ESSEN**, Executive Director, Educational Testing Service (ETS)**CHAIR:** **CHARLES BLAICH**, Center of Inquiry at Wabash College and the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS)**LEVEL:** All

A wide range of learning outcomes assessment activities are supporting global understanding and comparisons of student capacities, and furthering best practices in policy development supporting these goals. Three presentations will focus on different aspects of the international environment. The first presentation approaches learning outcomes as a policy issue in system-level quality assurance activities, and discusses findings from a global study on the trends and impacts of different types of learning outcomes goals and activities. The next considers the value of generic skills and discusses the OECD's second phase of worldwide testing using the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) as a means of capturing educational quality. The final discussion shifts the focus onto discipline specific assessments, presenting the work of the EU-funded Measuring and Comparing Achievements of Learning Outcomes in Higher Education in Europe (CALOHEE) project that is developing Europe-wide assessments of students in five different disciplines. Together these three presentations will highlight global activities in learning outcomes assessment, demonstrate the variety of rationales for learning outcomes activities, and introduce the second generation of large-scale assessments.

**WORKSHOP C****VANCOUVER*****Building Trust in the Adoption of an Outcomes Assessment Based Process for Curriculum Improvement*****SPEAKERS:** RANIA AL-HAMMOUD, SAMANTHI SOORIYABANDARA, and DEREK WRIGHT, Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Waterloo**CHAIR:** PHIL BATES, Royal Military College of Canada**LEVEL:** All

The outcomes process is a fairly new methodology that has been introduced to the engineering curriculum in Ontario. The novelty of the process has created a sense of mistrust and misunderstanding about its value in program assessment, making wide spread acceptance/adoption within the faculty of engineering at the University of Waterloo a challenge. In order to overcome this barrier the accreditation and graduate attributes team has proposed a three pronged approach: Garner stakeholder support by 1) comparing the engineering departments' outcomes process to a successful change management model from the business world. One of the models used in this comparison is Demming's Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle; 2) creating a need for change by presenting assessment results from the pre and post outcomes process, with related business cases in an effort to enlighten stakeholders of the cyclic, continuous testing and scientific nature of the outcomes process; 3) highlighting the advantages of supporting and sustaining the outcomes process, all the while drawing parallels from successful business concepts such as stakeholder engagement, value addition, pooling of resources, etc. The above approach will prove to be of tactical advantage in fostering an environment accepting of changes that will result in continuous improvements.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Create a platform on which to garner support from faculty and staff for the outcomes process, achieved by comparing the departmental outcomes process to a successful continuous improvement model from the business world; and (ii) Generate ideas on the use of assessment results from the pre and post outcomes process to enlighten stakeholders of the cyclic, continuous testing and scientific nature of the outcomes process.

**WORKSHOP D****HONG KONG*****From the Ground Up: A Decision Aid for Outcomes-Based Assessment – Introduction and Use*****SPEAKERS:** NATALIE CHOW, KENNETH MCKAY and MEHRDAD PIRNIA, Management Sciences, University of Waterloo**CHAIR:** JEFFREY BERRYMAN, University of Windsor**LEVEL:** All

In response to the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) requirements for measuring graduate attributes, the Department of Management Sciences at University of Waterloo has created an innovative outcomes-based assessment (OBA) tool and implemented it for two academic terms. This workshop will introduce participants to the functionalities of the tool. Designed and developed alongside instructors through one-on-one consultations, the OBA workbook offers flexibility and robustness. It can be customized using course-specific indicators and assessment methods that align with CEAB graduate attributes. Instructors are asked to report students' marks at the end of each academic semester, whereby the input of students' marks enables a direct analysis of overall class and individual performance. While we are in the preliminary stage of data analysis, we are hopeful that this process will help inspire pedagogical reflection and discussion across the Department. In

---

addition to describing the tool, the facilitators will share insights from using a bottom-up approach and welcome feedback from participants. The software can be made available to attendees, upon request.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Gain insight into an Excel-based tool specifically designed for CEAB outcomes-based assessment through a live demonstration; and (ii) Reflect on the complexities of implementing a bottom-up approach in the continuous program improvement framework.

**WORKSHOP E****SHANGHAI****Informal Discussion*****Does the "A" - "F" Letter Grading System Serve Outcomes Based Pedagogy?***

**DISCUSSION LEADERS:** CHRIS SINCLAIR and CONNIE WINDER, Office of Academic Excellence, George Brown College

This informal discussion will focus on the appropriateness and applicability of current grading systems in postsecondary institutions that embrace “outcomes-based” pedagogy. There have been significant changes in the way colleges and universities conceptualize learning and construct courses over the past 25 years. One of the most impactful and widely embraced changes is the move towards clear articulations of course and program objectives stated in terms of the specific skills, knowledge, values and attitudes that students will be required to demonstrate at the conclusion of a course and/or program. These outcomes are generally developed within the context of a set of conditions related to a discipline, profession or trade. There is a well-established and growing body of research focused on the utility and limitations associated with outcomes-based learning and the extent to which it promotes more learner centered pedagogy. There has been far less scrutiny of grading systems that have, for the most part, remained static despite these significant pedagogical shifts. In this discussion, we hope to re-examine the purposes of grading (for simplicity we'll focus on the “A” – “F” system) and explore the compatibility between existing systems and outcomes-based learning.

**WORKSHOP F****DENVER****Informal Networking****WORKSHOP G****SAN FRANCISCO****Informal Discussion*****Communicating Learning Outcomes: Employer and Institutional Perspectives  
(continued from Plenary Panel)***

**DISCUSSION LEADER:** VALERIE WALKER, Vice President, Innovation and Skills, the Business Council of Canada

Participants will have an opportunity to discuss in more depth some of the themes and issues that arose during the morning's Plenary Panel presentation.

---

## WORKSHOPS – DAY 1, SESSION 2

11:15 A.M. – 12:15 P.M.

### WORKSHOP A

VICTORIA A & B

#### *Trends and Insights from Analyzing Program Review Self-Study Documents*

**SPEAKERS:** **KLODIANA KOLOMITRO** and **CLAIRE O'BRIEN**, Centre for Teaching and Learning, **JILL SCOTT**, Office of the Provost, and **DENISE STOCKLEY**, Faculty of Health Sciences, Queen's University

**CHAIR:** **JULIA COLYAR**, Council of Ontario Universities

**LEVEL:** Intermediate / Advanced

Five years into the new quality assurance process, Queen's University has undertaken a comprehensive analysis of cyclical program review self-study documents. The goal of the project has been to identify key issues and trends, and to use those findings to inform the ongoing development of quality assurance processes and to inform institutional strategic planning. Cyclical Program Review provides an opportunity for academic programs to articulate or validate their program learning outcomes and map their entire curriculum to ensure alignment of course- and program-level LOs, and to articulate any key innovations. Queen's has invested substantial resources into quality assurance, thus it is important to evaluate the overall impact of the process on program quality and to identify gaps, opportunities and lessons learned. Our methodology for this project has been a process of qualitative analysis grounded in a developmental evaluation framework (Patton, 2010), of all 35 self-study documents using the Atlas.ti program. In this session we will share with the participants particular trends that have emerged, as well as areas that require further attention.

**By the end of this session participants will:** (i) Identify emerging trends and gaps in the development and assessment of learning outcomes; (ii) Examine your institutional quality assurance processes in light of study findings; and (iii) Explore opportunities for your institution to engage in evaluation of quality assurance processes.

### WORKSHOP B

VANCOUVER

#### *The Reluctant Leader: Encouraging and Including Librarians in Learning Outcomes Development and Assessment*

**SPEAKER:** **HEATHER CAMPBELL**, Advanced Learning and Teaching Centre, Brescia University College, Western University

**CHAIR:** **EILEEN DECOURCY**, Humber College Institute of Technology & Advanced Learning

**LEVEL:** All

Thorough development and assessment of learning outcomes is a time-intensive process: a recent survey by Queen's University found that the majority of Teaching and Learning Centres do not have sufficient resources to dedicate to assessment, and frequently need to forgo authentic or learning outcomes assessment as a result (Kolomitro, 2016). Kezar and Lester (2009) argue that re-organizing our institutions for collaboration, rather than traditional silos, is the best way to address such 21st century educational priorities. While campus partnerships are being identified and explored on many campuses, one group often overlooked are librarians. Their experience with authentic

assessment, articulating non-disciplinary or work-ready learning outcomes, and faculty mentorship make them potential leaders in outcomes development and assessment; but this proficiency is often lost behind the other services they provide. This interactive session will challenge participants to reconsider the expertise of librarians and collaboratively explore strategies for fostering their inclusion in learning outcomes development and assessment. Participants will be introduced to one university where librarians helped to lead the adoption of an outcomes-based model of education, and will be encouraged to match their own learning outcomes assessment needs with opportunities for librarians.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Identify the learning outcomes development and assessment expertise of academic librarians by engaging in workshop activities and discussion; and (ii) Through small and large group discussion, participants will identify and evaluate opportunities for including librarians in the development and assessment of learning outcomes.

**WORKSHOP C****HONG KONG*****Evaluation Mapping: An Interactive Workshop to Create and Review Alignments in Your Course***

**SPEAKERS:** MELISSA BARNARD and PATRICIA KAYE, Centre for Academic Excellence, Fanshawe College

**CHAIR:** KAREN BELFER, Ontario College Quality Assurance Service

**LEVEL:** Beginner / Intermediate

The Evaluation Mapping Tool was designed at Fanshawe College to support faculty in course design and development incorporating alignments of vocational learning outcomes, course learning outcomes, level of skill, domain (cognitive, affective, psychomotor), and the corresponding evaluation and weighting of evaluation. This tool was developed in support of the longstanding trend in Ontario, and indeed globally, toward outcome-based education that promotes learning towards those identified outcomes created with student success in mind. This session will provide an overview of the Evaluation Mapping Tool and will engage participants in a mock application of the Tool to a course outline. An overview of the results of the pilot study conducted at Fanshawe on faculty perception and reception of the tool will also be shared along with plenty of opportunity for questions and answers. Feedback from participants on the use of the Evaluation Mapping Tool will be sought. Participants will also receive an electronic copy of the Evaluation Mapping Tool itself for future reference and application.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Identify the relationship between Vocational Learning Outcomes and Course Learning Outcomes; (ii) Determine the domain(s) associated with the course outcomes in accordance with Bloom's Taxonomy (revised) and relationship to evaluation; and (iii) Explain the relationship between time spent teaching and weighting of evaluation.

**WORKSHOP D****SHANGHAI*****Integrating New Accreditation Standards***

**SPEAKERS:** ELIZABETH DEMARSH and HEATHER FARMER, Centre for Teaching and Learning, Sheridan College

**CHAIR:** DAPHNE BONAR, George Brown College

**LEVEL:** Intermediate

---

Programs must evolve over time to remain relevant and current in order to meet the needs of graduates entering into the workplace. What does it look like when an existing program is faced with integrating a new accreditation standard? Join us to hear about the exciting story of one brave degree program that underwent program review, accreditation and consent renewal in one fell swoop. As well, we will examine some of the successes and learning points this program had on their voyage as a group. Through round table discussions and small group activities, participants explore the critical alignment between Accreditation Standards, Program Learning Outcomes and Course Learning Outcomes and how we can map these alignments to inform each of our program stakeholders. No matter the credential, many programs within the system have outside bodies that they need to be accountable to. E.g., Arts, IT, Health, Engineering etc. If you have an accrediting body and your program learning outcomes are not melded together, then you are answering to two masters: PEQAB + CVS + accreditation body > Program Outcomes.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Describe the benefits of tying accrediting standards to PLOs for both the students and industry; (ii) Discuss the critical alignment between Accreditation Standards and Program Learning Outcomes and the impact on course development; and (iii) Define ways to map the alignment of Accreditation Standards and PLOs to inform program stakeholders.

**WORKSHOP E****DENVER**

***The Evolution of Assessment on Creativity:  
Defining What “A” Means in Creativity Assessment***

**SPEAKER:** BERNIE MURRAY, Fashion, Ryerson University

**CHAIR:** BRIAN TIMNEY, Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

**LEVEL:** All

In this workshop participants focus on criteria to measure creativity or creative products. The question to guide discourse in this session is: What does “A” mean in terms of assessing creativity in process work, performance, or product? Additionally, the findings from a research study on the assessment of creativity informs this presentation. Problems for creativity assessment include the identification of assessment criteria, different perceptions and definitions of creativity, or clarity of the assessment goals. This session will engage the audience by exploring how individuals and groups are creative. Using visual exemplars the audience will examine the evolution of creativity assessment from the past and present, and make recommendations about how innovative work may be assessed in the future. The audience will compare their results and produce a list of criteria. The second goal of the session will include a short presentation on students’ perceptions about assessment and learning in a design and communication program in higher education. Discussion will focus on how to assess process, performance, and product. Finally, the third goal engages the audience by developing individual and group assessment for a performance or product.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Explore how individuals and groups are creative. How have they been assessed in the past, present, and the future; (ii) Report and examine criteria to assess products including artwork, installations, designs, and conceptual ideas from a creativity study. Criteria may include process work, products, and group work; and (iii) Discuss and develop assessment standards for individual and group creativity: What does “A” mean in creativity assessment?

---

**WORKSHOP F****SAN FRANCISCO*****Evaluating and Mapping Course and Major Progressions  
using a Learning Outcomes Framework***

**SPEAKERS:** JOHN DAWSON and PAISLEY WORTHINGTON, College of Biological Science Office of Educational Scholarship and Practice (COESP) and DALE LACKEYRAM, Centre for Open Learning and Educational Support, University of Guelph

**CHAIR:** JOHN DOERKSEN, Western University

**LEVEL:** Intermediate

Widely-accepted student learning outcomes (LOs) assessment tools that can inform curricular discussions and resourcing decisions are not available. In this session we present the findings of applying a LO framework as one such tool. Undergraduate students collected course LOs (CLOs) and 1,574 questions from eight interconnected core courses and assigned Bloom's taxonomy cognitive levels and CLOs to all questions. Connections between CLOs, major LOs (MLOs), and question cognitive levels were then examined. During this session we will present baseline data describing the emphasis and cognitive level of assessments for different CLOs in the core courses. We will also facilitate discussion about the limitations of our work and break out into groups to brainstorm ways to determine an appropriate emphasis of LOs within courses and majors and the desired cognitive level of assessments through a progression of core courses. Finally, we will also discuss how the LO framework provides data revealing resource issues within courses and programs and how these data might impact resourcing decisions.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Describe the LO framework used in the work, its limitations, and the importance of undergraduate student input into LO application in courses and programs; (ii) Develop ideas for determining the appropriate emphasis of LOs in courses and programs through discussion, brainstorming, and prioritizing ideas; and (iii) Examine how the LO framework provides data revealing resource issues in curricula and informing resourcing decisions through discussion of the implications of the collected data.

**LUNCH****12:15 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.****MANDARIN BALLROOM****WORKSHOPS – DAY 1, SESSION 3****1:15 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.****WORKSHOP A****VICTORIA A&B*****Assessing and Addressing Prior Knowledge to Support Student Learning***

**SPEAKERS:** CONNIE WINDER and CHRIS SINCLAIR, Office of Academic Excellence, George Brown College

**CHAIR:** ARLENE WILLIAMS, Ontario Council on Articulation and Transfer

**LEVEL:** Beginner / Intermediate

---

This workshop focuses on strategies that instructors might employ to assess aspects of students' prior knowledge and beliefs in order to identify gaps and misconceptions that may hinder the learning of new material. Students enter postsecondary classrooms with diverse experiences, knowledge, skills, beliefs, and attitudes, all of which influence how they interpret, organize and understand new information. David Ausubel (1968) argued that prior knowledge is the most important influence on learning and that teachers must accurately assess it in order to teach effectively. Prior knowledge acts as a filter; it provides a foundation or bridge when new information is congruent and creates impediments to accurate understanding when new information is inconsistent with prior understanding (Winder & Corter, 2016). Effective preliminary assessment of prior knowledge provides vital information that allows instructors to remove barriers and leverage existing knowledge to help students achieve a deeper understanding of key concepts in support of the achievement of learning outcomes. Participants will work in small groups to identify and share potentially problematic aspects of prior knowledge, discuss the usefulness of a variety of methods to assess students' prior learning and consider how students' pre-existing conceptualizations might be used to facilitate the achievement of learning outcomes.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Identify, based on the current research and your own experience in the discipline in which you teach, common examples of prior knowledge students bring to your classroom that act as impediments to learning; (ii) Discuss and assess the usefulness of a variety of strategies to assess the breadth and depth of students' prior learning related to your discipline; and (iii) Outline potential strategies to more effectively incorporate students' pre-existing conceptualizations to facilitate the achievement of learning outcomes.

**WORKSHOP B****TORONTO BALLROOM*****Barista or Better? Where a College or University Diploma Will Take You –  
A Tax Data Linkage Approach***

**SPEAKER:** ROSS FINNIE, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, Education Policy Research Initiative, University of Ottawa

**CHAIR:** PAUL GOOCH, Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

**LEVEL:** All

This presentation is rooted in the construction of a new and unique dataset which links administrative data on students from 14 colleges and universities in four different regions across Canada with tax record data. This allows the post-schooling labour market outcomes of graduates to be tracked on a year-by-year basis for all those who graduated from 2005 through 2012, with all graduates followed through to 2013. Earnings profiles are broken down by graduating cohort, area of study, gender, and in other ways so that patterns in starting earnings levels and earnings growth can be identified and compared. The results point to the continuing overall value of post-secondary education, although notable and interesting differences in these patterns across cohorts and groups are also identified.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Gain an understanding of the labour market outcomes of recent PSE graduates from the presentation and from the follow up questions and discussions; (ii) Gain an understanding of various methodological approaches, including how to use existing datasets to extract the data needed for an analysis of this type from the presentation and from the follow up questions and discussions; and (iii) Gain an understanding of the implications for further research and related policy issues from the presentation and from the follow up questions and discussions.

**WORKSHOP C****VANCOUVER*****Assessing the 'Whole Person': Creating Common Rubrics to Assess Learning Outcomes Across the Entire University Experience*****SPEAKERS:** HEATHER CAMPBELL and JOHN MITCHELL, Advanced Learning and Teaching Centre, Brescia University College, Western University**CHAIR:** DANIELLA MALLINICK, University of Toronto**LEVEL:** Beginner / Intermediate

This workshop will introduce participants to a model of creating common institutional rubrics that can be used to assess 'the whole person' – learning outcomes that cover the entire student experience, not just classroom-based academic skills. Participants will have a chance to review Brescia University College's rubrics before discussing with colleagues how the model can be customized to their own institutions. Participants will also be encouraged to discuss the benefits and challenges of assessing affective or values-based learning outcomes at an institutional level.

**By the end of this session participants will take away concrete examples to:** (i) Articulate the value (and challenge) of developing institutional assessment methods that suit both curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities through small- and whole-group discussion; and (ii) Discuss strategies for developing rubrics to assess affective or values-based learning outcomes by applying a model of rubric development to their own institution.

**WORKSHOP D****HONG KONG*****Online Rubric Builder - "BASICS," A Starting Point for Assessment of Cognitive Skills*****SPEAKERS:** JILL SCOTT and NATALIE SIMPER, Office of the Provost, Queen's University**CHAIR:** SOFIE LACHAPPELLE, University of Guelph**LEVEL:** Beginner / Intermediate

Instructors at post-secondary institutions are increasingly recognizing the importance of developing cognitive skills like critical thinking, creative thinking and problem solving. The challenge for some however is designing assessment rubrics that clearly describe the expected outcomes for students. A web application was built at Queen's to meet this challenge. Data and lessons learned from the Learning Outcomes Assessment project were leveraged to design and create a rubric building web-application to support instructors. The tool is called "Building Assessment Scaffolds for Intellectual Cognitive Skills" (BASICS). It is based on assessment dimensions from the American Association for Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics (Rhodes & Finley, 2013). In this session, participants will use the tool to create a rubric for a specific task, and then reflect on best practice for rubric creation, and the alignment of performance criteria for desired outcomes. BASICS provides a professional development opportunity, empowering instructors to engage in a process of backward design (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Define components of critical thinking, creative thinking and problem solving; (ii) Use the BASICS rubric builder to compose a rubric for a performance task; and (iii) Utilize the principles of backward design to reflect on the alignment between the rubric and performance assessment.

---

**WORKSHOP E****SHANGHAI*****Documenting and Assessing Learning Outcomes with Sesame*****SPEAKERS:** CAMILLE RUTHERFORD, Centre for Academic Excellence, Brock University and MARY WILSON, Faculty of Education, Niagara College**CHAIR:** MARCIA MOSHÉ, Ryerson University**LEVEL:** Intermediate

Join us for a hands-on exploration of innovative approaches for collecting, curating and assessing evidence of student achievement of learning outcomes. Innovative assessment strategies allow students and faculty to document student learning in any form, importing directly from their favorite applications. As a result educators can easily provide immediate feedback to students using their own assessment tools and curriculum standards. An innovative approach used at Niagara College and Brock University is to use Sesamehq.com as a visual means to capture dynamic learning, provide feedback and document learning outcomes in one place. Sesame offers access to common learning outcomes frameworks, but can also be used to import program specific learning outcomes and evaluation criteria, as well as those from certifying and accrediting bodies. More than just an e-portfolio, it allows faculty to connect collected evidence to curriculum materials including learning outcomes, syllabi, lesson plans, assessments, rubrics and faculty can choose to share their materials with colleagues to support scaffolding across courses and to inform collaborative work on integrated curriculum design and delivery.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Have the opportunity to compare and contrast traditional learning outcome assessment methods with innovative approaches that use a variety of technology resources; (ii) Gain an understanding of the ways in which the quality of student learning can benefit from timely feedback on learning that is explicitly tied to learning outcomes and standards. Session attendees will have opportunity to experiment with the platform, as a student would to collect, reflect upon, curate and share evidence of their own academic accomplishments; and (iii) Critically examine how access to a repository of evidence of student achievement of learning outcomes can be used by educators to reflect upon and improve constructive alignment in courses and curriculum.

**WORKSHOP F****DENVER*****Partnering for Student Success: Creating Course Outcomes that Integrate Institutional Information Literacy Learning Outcomes*****SPEAKER:** KIM MCPHEE, Western Libraries, Western University**CHAIR:** HEATHER BUCHANSKY, University of Toronto Libraries**LEVEL:** Intermediate

Librarians and faculty regularly collaborate in order to improve student learning. But how deep is that learning? Are the covered topics meaningful and contributing to lifelong learning? What are the elements of engagement for the students? The traditional one-shot database demonstration in a guest lecture style can feel disjointed from the class in question and appear like an optional component rather than a substantial piece of the larger course puzzle. We will argue that librarian-faculty collaboration can and should be much more substantial and that this collaboration should be reflected in course learning outcomes. That is, by partnering to determine the information literacy needs of students in a course, and across a program, the pair can create a seamless learning experience for students that allows them to make connections between information literacy concepts and course material, thus increasing student learning. Also, such integration leads to thoughtful assessments and learning activities that “count” in the course and are therefore more engaging and

motivating. Participants are requested to attend this workshop with a particular course in mind (please bring your syllabus, if possible, or use a provided sample), ready to consider students' information literacy needs.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Demonstrate how information literacy learning outcomes can be integrated into a course by systematically mapping information literacy learning outcomes onto their own (or provided) course outcomes.

**WORKSHOP G****SEATTLE*****Assessing International Graduate Students' Evolving Academic Literacies:  
Reflections on a Collaborative Model***

**SPEAKERS:** KATHERINE ANDERSON, STEPHEN ARMSTRONG, JAMES CORCORAN, ANGELICA GALANTE and BRUCE RUSSELL, International Foundation Program – New College, University of Toronto

**CHAIR:** BRENDA BROUWER, Queen's University

**LEVEL:** All

Drawing on experiences preparing international, multilingual (English as an additional language) graduate students for their professional Master of Engineering program at the University of Toronto, this presentation provides reflections on the efficacy of a collaborative model aimed at assessing students' language-based (reading, writing, and research skills) and content-based (core Engineering course) learning over the course of a semester-long bridging program. Following a brief overview of the bridging program, instructors responsible for the four foundational courses reflect upon the efficacy of their individual and collective assessment practices, highlighting various course-specific learning outcomes and assessment rubrics. The session includes interactive elements where participants reflect upon the potential and limitations of our model in relation to their particular Ontario post-secondary contexts, resulting in knowledge construction and exchange regarding the assessment of international graduate students' evolving academic research and writing skills. This presentation will be of interest to policy makers, educational leaders, English for academic purposes instructors, and all those interested in providing effective, targeted, and equitable support to the increasing population of international, multilingual scholars in Ontario Universities and Colleges.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Better understand the needs and academic learning trajectories of international multilingual students; (ii) Critically reflect on a collaborative instructional and assessment model in relation to home educational context; and (iii) Develop a tentative action plan for improving the efficacy of assessment of international students' learning outcomes at Ontario Universities.

**WORKSHOP H****SAN FRANCISCO*****How Do I Assess Critical Thinking, Anyway?***

**SPEAKERS:** JOHN DAWSON, DALE LACKEYRAM and PAISLEY WORTHINGTON, College of Biological Science Office of Educational Scholarship and Practice (COESP) and Office of Open Education, University of Guelph

**CHAIR:** JOHN SHEPHERD, Carleton University

**LEVEL:** Intermediate

The ability to think critically is an essential skill for the next generation of leaders. Post-secondary institutions are required to teach and assess critical thinking (CT) in our programs, but what is CT exactly

---

and how do you assess it? Many existing definitions of CT contradict each other, creating confusion about what CT is and what it looks like in practice. We developed the Model of Integrated Thinking Skills (MITS) based on common recurring themes about CT in the literature and have proposed this as a common definition to alleviate some of this confusion. In this seminar, participants will discuss the MITS definition of CT and how it can be applied to different disciplines. We will also talk about the struggles associated with facilitating student development of CT skills.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Understand the rationale behind the MITS definition of CT. This will be achieved through a brief summary of existing CT models that are represented by the MITS model; (ii) Identify and brainstorm solutions to the challenges associated with teaching/assessing CT; and (iii) Leave with an idea of how they may enhance students' development of CT skills.

## WORKSHOPS – DAY 1, SESSION 4

2:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

### WORKSHOP A

VICTORIA A&B

#### *Supporting the Evolution of Assessment: Authentic Assessment, Accessibility, and Deepened Course Alignment*

**SPEAKERS:** SHANNON DEA, Department of Philosophy and TREVOR HOLMES, Centre for Teaching Excellence, University of Waterloo

**CHAIR:** NANDA DIMITROV, Western University

**LEVEL:** Intermediate

Traditional assessment is not always well-aligned with intended learning outcomes at the course and program level. At Waterloo, we co-designed and piloted an advanced workshop for alumni of a week-long course design academy. Using accessibility and authentic assessment as conceptual tools, participants deepened the course alignment that they had previously worked on. An assessment is authentic if it invites learners to engage in disciplinary or “real world” practices. In addition to providing students with excellent practical training, authentic assessments can increase accessibility by reducing distractors that are irrelevant to the capacities being taught and learned. Moreover, emphasizing authentic assessments in course design supports deeper alignment between intended learning outcomes, learning activities, and assessments. In this session, we describe the UWaterloo workshop so that attendees can consider its applicability at their home institutions. Participants will experience short versions of the activities we use, and explore the relationships between authentic assessment, accessibility, and alignment.

**By the end of this session participants will:** (i) Explore the relations between authentic assessment, accessibility, and alignment in course design; and (ii) Consider how to apply this deepening of course design to the assessment of learning outcomes at their home campuses.

---

**WORKSHOP B****TORONTO BALLROOM*****Queen's Learning Outcomes Assessment Project: Tracking Student Achievement and Comparing Utility of Tools*****SPEAKERS:** BRIAN FRANK, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science, JILL SCOTT and NATALIE SIMPER, Office of the Provost, Queen's University**CHAIR:** PATRICIA TERSIGNI, University of Guelph**LEVEL:** Intermediate / Advanced

Transferable cognitive skills are essential outcomes for undergraduate education, for employability and broader contribution to society (Johnson, 2009). Queen's University is nearing the end of a four-year longitudinal study assessing the development of the transferable skills of critical thinking, problem solving, written communication and lifelong learning. This session will highlight lessons learned from the Learning Outcomes Assessment Project (Frank, Simper & Kaupp, 2016). Specific discussion points include the logistical obstacles; challenges to reliability; effort, time and motivation as significant factors for test scores; and the relative effectiveness and utility of the tools for evaluating student learning and providing feedback to instructors. In addition, task type and scaffolding of assignments will be discussed as factors for achievement on rubric assessment. Results from the project are provided to instructors to demonstrate comparative growth in specific areas of their students' skill development, leading to better informed evidence-based decision-making for course improvement.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Compare various approaches to skills assessment; (ii) Identify issues relating to skills assessment in post-secondary institutions; and (iii) Discuss current obstacles to implementation of skills assessment initiatives.

**WORKSHOP C****HONG KONG*****Developing a New Rubric to Assess College Degree-Level Learning*****SPEAKERS:** TRACY GEDIES and WM. PAUL MEAHAN, Centre for Academic Excellence, Fanshawe College**CHAIR:** JULIA COLYAR, Council of Ontario Universities**LEVEL:** Intermediate

In PEQAB's Handbook for Ontario Colleges (2015), the Program Content Standard outlines the importance of introducing and then further developing students' theoretical and practical knowledge of the core subjects. For non-core courses, Benchmark 7(b) indicates that students will experience "more than introductory knowledge ... outside the core fields of study" (p.21). In pursuit of PEQAB approval for the non-core degree-level curriculum, Fanshawe College produced a rubric that helped differentiate between "introductory" and "more than introductory" knowledge, primarily by working with faculty designing and delivering the non-core programming to outline the level of learning outcomes, the types and complexity of assigned readings, and the assessment methods used to validate the students' mastery of those outcomes. The next stage of our project, which forms the basis of this proposed workshop, is to take this rubric and to apply it to the core curriculum of degree proposals and renewals. Our goal is to outline the "types ... of student assessments" used to satisfy the program content benchmark of "provid[ing] exposure to increasingly complex theory at the degree level" (p.21, 20). Participants will engage with this rubric to advise on the correct level for a proposed course change within an existing college degree program.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Explain the relationship between course outcomes and level of skill to evaluation; (ii) Apply learning outcomes, assigned readings, and their

---

complementary assessments to the different levels of college degree-level core curriculum; and (iii) Evaluate the degree-level learning using the rubric to ensure the core-course programming offers sufficient rigour and depth to achieve the degree-level standard.

**WORKSHOP D****SHANGHAI*****Beyond the Collection of Data: Meaningful Mapping of Program Outcomes***

**SPEAKERS:** GENEVIÈVE GAUTHIER, JOVAN GROEN and PATRICK MILOT, Centre for University Teaching, University of Ottawa

**CHAIR:** ANDRE LOISELLE, Carleton University

**LEVEL:** Intermediate / Advanced

The concerns of curriculum design specialists have increasingly shifted from identifying and gathering program data (such as: learning outcomes, evaluation strategies and instructional approaches) to its visualisation and its interpretation (Veltri et al. 2011; El-Khawas, 2014; Hall, 2013; Mendez, 2014). In this context, the University of Ottawa uses two different tools: 1- An online survey template tool to provide a snapshot of the underlying structure of a program and its function; 2- A syllabus mining tool to provide an evolving view of curricular changes. While developing and improving the curriculum analysis tools at the University of Ottawa, it has become ever more evident that the main goal of the program evaluation and development support services involves more than gathering and presenting curriculum data, it also involves fostering meaningful discussions among instructors about teaching and learning that are essential to concrete changes and the development of a culture of continuous program enhancement (Cardoso et al., 2016; Kleijnen et al., 2015). In this session, we will situate and present two curriculum analysis tools and share sample outputs. Via small-group activities, participants will discuss data interpretation and the implications for program review support and share strategies that foster participation and reciprocity in the curriculum analysis and enhancement process.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Describe the characteristics and choices behind two curriculum analysis tools; (ii) Analyze and evaluate the output of curriculum mapping software via different case studies. Discuss how these can be interpreted and the implications for program review support; and (iii) Discuss, exchange and explain strategies that will foster greater participation and reciprocity in the curriculum analysis and enhancement process.

**WORKSHOP E****TOKYO*****Course-Level Assessment of Learning Outcomes:  
Variety, Transparency, Alignment***

**SPEAKERS:** CATHY BRUCE and ROBYNE HANLEY-DAFOE, Centre for Teaching and Learning, Trent University

**CHAIR:** PIERRE ZUNDEL, Laurentian University

**LEVEL:** Intermediate

This session will support faculty, instructors, and course designers in developing practical and effective methods for analysing course design in order to increase the alignment of assessment practices with course-based learning outcomes. The session will introduce case samples from Trent University to illustrate different assessment approaches that are transparent, student-centered and practical for instructors, and that align with the course learning outcomes. Garrestson and Golson (2005) reported that curriculum-embedded assessment tools improved the teaching and learning experiences for both students and instructors. Rhodes (2012) furthered the discussion by reporting

---

that student motivation and performance also increased when assessment was integrated into existing course activities. An identified challenge to authentic assessment practices is time, both for the evaluation itself and for instructors to provide meaningful feedback. Common challenges and potential solutions will be explored collaboratively in this session. Participants are encouraged to bring a syllabus or other course assessment samples to the session as artefacts.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Explain the importance of curriculum embedded assessment and provide examples how to incorporate these assessment practices into course design; (ii) Align and map learning outcomes to assessment practices while developing a deeper understanding of the importance of variety and transparency in course-based assessments; and (iii) Communicate how the assessment practices align with the course learning outcomes.

**WORKSHOP F****DENVER**

***Revitalizing Graduate Attribute Initiatives Across the Faculty:  
A Panel Discussion***

**SPEAKERS:** RANIA AL-HAMMOUD, MICHELE BRISTOW, JASON GROVE, ANDREW MILNE, MEHRDAD PIRNIA and DEREK WRIGHT, Faculty of Engineering, University of Waterloo

**CHAIR:** SOFIE LACHAPELLE, University of Guelph

**LEVEL:** All

The Faculty of Engineering at the University of Waterloo has hired six full-time Graduate Attributes Lecturers (GALs) and four Accreditation Assistants to respond to the challenge of Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board graduate attributes assessment and continual improvement criteria. Over the last year, the attributes team worked in a distributed as well as coordinated manner to find effective and efficient strategies to scaffold outcomes assessment into curriculum development processes. In this panel discussion, we will provide an overview of the varied approaches used in our departments. Specifically, we will shed light on the complexities of incorporating learning outcomes into our current programs as we navigate through the terrains of existing program structures, departmental cultures, and the partially developed graduate attribute systems we inherited. We will also present examples of assessment mechanisms that have been created and piloted to measure program-level outcomes. It is our goal that this session will help spark timely conversations pertaining to learning outcomes and graduate attribute measurement initiatives. As such, the presentation component of the session will intentionally be kept short to maximize time for questions, brainstorming, and feedback from the audience.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Articulate the challenges in applying the theory of outcomes-based assessment to practice in an undergraduate engineering context (13 programs, each with cohorts of 60-200 students); and (ii) Generate ideas for how to overcome the difficulties in building a program assessment mechanism within a large, existing institution (6 departments, each with 30-90 faculty complements).

**WORKSHOP G****SEATTLE**

***Curriculum Revolution or Evolution:  
A Case for Ongoing Curriculum Improvement Processes***

**SPEAKERS:** JOANNE HEWSON and KERRY LISSEMORE, Ontario Veterinary College, and DALE LACKEYRAM, Centre for Open Learning and Educational Support, University of Guelph

**CHAIR:** MICHEL LAURIER, University of Ottawa

**LEVEL:** Intermediate

In this presentation we make a case for ongoing curriculum assessment and improvement versus stop-start standardized curricular review processes. Effective curriculum improvement requires each course to have clearly defined intended learning outcomes and closely aligned assessments that are relatable at both the course-level and program-level. In order to improve the alignment of the curriculum numerous questions/gaps are examined, such as: Where and how often in the curriculum is an outcome delivered? How is the outcome evaluated? How does student performance compare with what was intended? Etc. For ongoing curriculum improvement processes we demonstrate how a continuous assessment paradigm using program outcomes can be used to evaluate students formatively and summatively and simultaneously provide information about overall program alignment. Key Findings and Implications: Developing outcomes and program assessment approaches that link performance at the student-level and course-level to proficiency at the program-level is critical to effective ongoing curriculum improvement and alignment.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Identify strategies for adapting and aligning curriculum; (ii) Identify key stakeholders involved in ongoing curriculum improvement processes; and (iii) Analyse and discuss outcomes data and the implications for ongoing curricular improvement.

**WORKSHOP H****SAN FRANCISCO**

***Building Inquiry and Research Skills: Librarians as Partners in Developing Outcomes and Formative Assessment Strategies***

**SPEAKERS:** JACKIE DRUERY, Humanities & Social Sciences Library, CORINNE LAVERTY, Centre for Teaching and Learning, and VICTORIA REMENDA, Faculty of Arts & Science, Queen's University

**CHAIR:** KIM MCPHEE, Western University

**LEVEL:** All

The session will provide a short introduction to inquiry-based learning as a high impact educational experience, how we define it at Queen's, and how teaching librarians work to support development of inquiry skills in assignments, courses, and across programs. Librarians analyse research assignments to identify intended learning outcomes based on standards for the program. They identify opportunities for feedback on discrete pieces of the research process in a course and/or across a program so that inquiry skills can be built gradually. Using two existing inquiry-based assignments, participants will identify the inquiry skills that would be needed to successfully meet the intended assignment outcomes. A Researcher Skill Development Framework (Willison, 2016) will be used as a model for the research process. Having identified specific skills, participants will discuss the anticipated research process and its component parts where feedback on inquiry skills can be given sequentially as students complete the assignment. Examples of how librarians might scaffold

this feedback will be compared. A discussion of the role of teaching librarians and how librarians can work with faculty and educational developers to provide support for building inquiry skills developmentally will close the session.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Deconstruct inquiry-related assignments to determine specific research skill learning outcomes; (ii) Map the process stages of an inquiry assignment to identify opportunities for formative feedback; and (iii) Describe how librarians support university learning outcomes related to inquiry-based learning.

## COFFEE BREAK

3:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

ALL CONFERENCE ROOMS

### KEYNOTE 1

MANDARIN BALLROOM

4:00 p.m. – 5:15 p.m.

#### *Between the Rock and the Hard Place: Lessons Learned from Working Between External Demands and Internal Resistance to Improve Student Learning*

**KEYNOTE SPEAKERS:** CHARLES BLAICH, Director, Center of Inquiry at Wabash College and the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS) and KATHY WISE, Associate Director, Center of Inquiry at Wabash College and the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS)

**CHAIR:** PAUL GOOCH, Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

Driven by regional and specialized accreditors, state and federal government, foundations, and other external stakeholders, assessment has become a fact of life for colleges and universities in the United States. While the quality and usefulness of assessment efforts varies, the external demands for quality assurance continue to push institutions, and their constituent departments, schools, and programs, to assess their impact. Yet, even as institutions are led, or pushed, into assessment by outside forces, there are faculty, staff, and administrators at these institutions who choose to lead assessment efforts not to keep their institutions in good standing with outsiders, but because they see it as an opportunity to improve student learning. These assessment leaders work to leverage assessment mandates to motivate and resource campus efforts to improve student learning. In this session, we will review the obstacles these assessment leaders encounter and the strategies they use to try and make assessment matter as much for their students as it does for meeting the requirements of external stakeholders.

## WINE & CHEESE RECEPTION

5:15 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.

OTTAWA ROOM

Sponsored by:

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON  
**GRADUATE STUDIES**

An affiliate of the  ONTARIO  
UNIVERSITIES

# Tuesday, October 18, 2016

**REGISTRATION AND BREAKFAST****MANDARIN BALLROOM****7:30 a.m. – 8:00 a.m.****WORKSHOPS – DAY 2, SESSION 1****8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.****WORKSHOP A****VICTORIA A&B*****Leveraging Your Learning Management System to Inform Curriculum Improvement***

**SPEAKERS:** JOHN DONALD and RICHARD ZYTNER, School of Engineering, RICHARD GORRIE and JASON THOMPSON, Centre for Open Learning and Educational Support, University of Guelph

**CHAIR:** ERIN ASPENLIEDER, McMaster University

**LEVEL:** Intermediate

The effective use of a learning management system (LMS) can be helpful in the successful delivery of a course. Being successful has many meanings, including content delivery, communicating with the class, tracking/measuring student learning and maintaining grades. In addition, an LMS such as D2L-Brightspace has features that enable the capture and reporting of learning outcomes for course and program level improvement. Using these learning outcome features can be very challenging and requires an approach that is planned as well as integrated with the full program curriculum improvement cycle. The proposed session will share, as a case study, experience using D2L-Brightspace in the delivery of the Capstone Design Course in the School of Engineering (SOE) at the University of Guelph. The discussion will then be expanded from the case study to explain how the SOE captures, compiles and utilizes outcomes based assessment data (e.g., exams, reports, presentation results) within its overall outcomes based curriculum improvement process. To make the process work there are also forms and custom software tools and spreadsheets developed and implemented for both faculty and administration. These operational issues will also be discussed.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Identify opportunities to support the program level curriculum improvement process, leveraging a Learning Management System (LMS) to track learning outcomes; (ii) Identify methods for faculty to use the LMS to provide learning outcome assessment data; and (iii) Identify strengths and limitations of available technologies to support program learning outcome assessment.

**WORKSHOP B****TORONTO BALLROOM*****Called to Action: Creating Learning Outcomes Based on the Recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission***

**SPEAKERS:** KAHENTE HORN-MILLER, School of Indigenous and Canadian Studies and ANDREA THOMPSON, Office of the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic), Carleton University

**CHAIR:** RICHARD MCCUTCHEON, Algoma University

**LEVEL:** Intermediate

---

With the release of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action last year, Canadian Universities have been grappling with ways to make Indigenous Studies (IS) part of every students' educational experience. While some institutions have created stand-alone courses in IS that students must take to graduate, others have looked for ways to integrate IS within students' current programs of study. At Carleton we are currently exploring this latter approach through the development of learning outcomes rooted in the 7 Grandfathers' Teachings (Wisdom, Love, Respect, Bravery, Honesty, Humility, and Truth) that can be adopted and adapted by any program, regardless of academic discipline. This workshop will familiarize attendees with the TRC recommendations related to education, and outline our highly consultative approach to translating the TRC Calls to Action into observable abilities students will be able to demonstrate upon graduation. Attendees will learn techniques for integrating IS and Indigenous ways of knowing into their own learning goals and assessment techniques and will be invited to discuss similar initiatives taking place at their institutions.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Recognize the TRC Calls to Action relevant to post-secondary education. An overview of the TRC Calls to Action will be discussed during the presentation; (ii) Compare different approaches to implementing the TRC Calls to Action within post-secondary education; and (iii) Recognize how learning outcomes can be used to further the objectives of the TRC commission.

**WORKSHOP C****HONG KONG*****Rhapsody on Graduate Program Diversity: Linking Music Program Learning Outcomes With Graduate Degree Level Expectations***

**SPEAKER:** CATHERINE NOLAN, Don Wright Faculty of Music, Western University

**CHAIR:** JENNIFER MACTAVISH, Ryerson University

**LEVEL:** Advanced

Like themes in a musical rhapsody, our graduate program in Music at Western embraces a range of intersecting, yet distinctive fields that demonstrate individual identities while functioning in a larger cohesive whole. The fields of musicology, music theory, and music education share goals, aspirations, and understandings of knowledge associated with the humanities and social sciences, while the fields of composition and performance share goals, aspirations, and understandings of knowledge with the fine and performing arts. Music education, music theory, and musicology in particular encourage interdisciplinary engagement; composition and performance hold a dual view of music as both non-temporal text (musical scores) and temporal event (recitals, concerts, and productions). Knowledge of musical repertoire is essential to all five fields alongside divergent understandings of musical objects and cultural contexts. In short, our graduate program is characterized by diversity in the ways its fields relate to each other and to larger disciplinary alignments. The expression of learning outcomes facilitates the balance of goals in academic and artistic excellence and allows for nuances specific to each of the five fields to emerge. Similarly, linking nuanced program learning outcomes with Graduate Degree Level Expectations facilitates the expression of distinctive program supports and aspirations.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Understand the challenge of balancing goals in academic and artistic excellence in graduate program learning outcomes in Music; (ii) Understand program diversity in Music both internally and externally through the complex affiliations of Music with other disciplines in the arts, humanities, and social sciences; and (iii) Understand how linking program learning outcomes with Graduate Degree Level Expectations can facilitate the communication of program diversity in other disciplines.

---

**WORKSHOP D****SHANGHAI*****Measuring Student Learning Outcomes in Higher Education: HEIghten Approach*****SPEAKER:** **JAVARRO RUSSELL**, College Programs Unit, Global Education Division at Educational Testing Service (ETS)**CHAIR:** **JAMES BROWN**, Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board**LEVEL:** Intermediate

Increasingly so, institutions are interested in the extent to which students are attaining the specified learning outcomes that are inextricably connected to student success. Doing so allows those institutions to highlight the effectiveness of their educational activities, programs, and support systems in improving student learning, and ultimately increase student success. During this session, we will discuss how institutions are using next generation learning outcomes assessments and large scale assessment processes to gather evidence of student learning for demonstrating accountability, but more importantly improving student learning.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Identify attributes of assessments that produce evidence of student learning for the purpose of learning improvement at the program or institution level; and (ii) Identify the attributes of assessment processes that lend themselves to the production of evidence of student learning for the purpose of learning improvement at the program or institution level.

**WORKSHOP E****DENVER****Informal Discussion*****Inclusive Assessment Aligned to Outcomes*****SPEAKERS:** **SANDRA CARDINAL** and **THERESA STEGER**, Program Planning, Development and Renewal, Humber College (Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning – ITAL)**LEVEL:** Beginner

In this guided informal discussion, participants will be asked to examine learning outcome statements aligned across the Ontario Qualifications Framework to uncover and address covert barriers to inclusive assessment practices. Participants will discuss and critically analyze multiple assessment pathways that enable all students to demonstrate the achievement of essential learning outcomes by minimizing barriers and maximizing accessibility, without sacrificing rigour and validity.

**WORKSHOP F****SEATTLE****Informal Networking**

**WORKSHOP G****SAN FRANCISCO****Informal Discussion*****Assessing Outcomes of Faculty Development Programming*****DISCUSSION LEADER:** NATASHA HANNON, Centre for Academic Excellence, Niagara College

The Western Region College Educator Development Program has recently undergone significant review and revision and this 2 year, inter-institutional undertaking is now an outcomes-driven program of professional instructional development for all new, full-time faculty hires at Conestoga, Fanshawe, Lambton, Mohawk, Niagara, and St. Clair colleges. Participants will be led in informal discussion regarding assessment of learning outcomes for instructional development programming.

**KEYNOTE 2****MANDARIN BALLROOM****8:45 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.*****Aligning Goals, Assessment, and Pedagogy:  
Assignment Design as a Key Faculty Activity*****KEYNOTE SPEAKER:** PETER EWELL, President Emeritus, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS)**CHAIR:** ALICE PITT, Chair, Conference Planning Committee

Effective collegiate learning experiences are not easy to create because they demand intentional alignment among three things: a) clear goals for student attainment stated in outcomes terms, b) carefully designed curricula and pedagogical strategies structured to yield these goals and, c) reliable ways to assess student attainment of these goals that can be aggregated for purposes of both improvement and accountability. Based on a range of projects in the U.S. funded by the Lumina Foundation, this session argues that carefully designed assignments, created by faculty and “embedded” in regular classroom settings, represent the best approach to useful assessment consistent with these ideals. Doing this well, though, requires systematic attention to constructing sound assignments that are capable of generating consistent and comparable student responses that can be scored to yield generalizable information.

**COFFEE BREAK****9:45 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.****ALL CONFERENCE ROOMS**

## WORKSHOPS – DAY 2, SESSION 2

10:15 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.

### WORKSHOP A

VICTORIA A&B

#### *From College to Graduate School — Experiences from the Trenches*

**PANEL:** AMANDA BOYD, Conestoga College, SARAH HORSFORD, St. Lawrence College, NICHOLAS JOHNSTON, Sheridan College, STEPHANIE LAMANNA, Seneca College, ANDY PRINCE, Fanshawe College

**MODERATOR:** JOAN CONDIE, Sheridan College

**LEVEL:** All

A panel of Ontario college degree graduates who went on to graduate school discuss their experiences. Coming from a wide variety of disciplines, these panelists will discuss why they chose to do their undergraduate degree at a college, the preparation they felt they received for tackling graduate work, and any comparisons they observed with colleagues from a university undergraduate degree background. Given that their "applied" degree learning outcomes focused both on theory and professional application, they will discuss how that combination served them well to succeed in the demanding context of graduate work.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Articulate the specific benefits expressed by college degree graduates regarding their college experience preparing them for graduate degree work; (ii) Describe the challenges experienced by college degree graduates who went on to university graduate work; and (iii) Consider the implications of the expressed benefits and challenges for both college degree preparation and for the receiving university graduate schools.

### WORKSHOP B

TORONTO BALLROOM

#### *Including Diverse Perspectives: Analyzing Curriculum Mapping Data for Gaps and Opportunities*

**SPEAKERS:** PATTI DYJUR and FRANCES KALU, Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning, University of Calgary

**CHAIR:** LORRAINE DAVIES, Western University

**LEVEL:** Intermediate

In this hands-on session we will approach learning outcomes within the context of curriculum review. Using a scenario in which National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data reveal a weakness in "discussions with diverse others" within a fictitious program, we will show how curriculum review could be used as a process for further inquiry into the issue. Mapping learning outcomes relating to diverse perspectives could provide further insight and identify gaps in the program. Three different charts and graphs will be used in the session as examples of how learning outcomes relating to diverse perspectives might be presented. Participants will analyze them individually and in small groups to discuss possible strategies that would strengthen the program in terms of student learning experiences and assessment. Since participants in the session will be well versed in learning outcomes and curriculum review, our intention is to keep presentation time to a minimum, allowing ample time for people to share their perspectives and experiences.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Interpret data from three curriculum maps to identify gaps in the area of 'diverse perspectives'; and (ii) Gain strategies for mapping and presenting curriculum data to inform specific questions about a curriculum.

**WORKSHOP C****HONG KONG**

***Evolutions in Curriculum Mapping: Changing Practices to Support Program Learning Outcomes Assessment***

**SPEAKERS:** ERIN ASPENLIEDER, McMaster Institute for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning, McMaster University, LORI GOFF, McMaster Institute for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning, McMaster University, JOVAN GROEN, Centre for University Teaching, University of Ottawa, CLARKE MATHANY, Open Learning and Educational Support, University of Guelph, GAVAN WATSON, Teaching Support Centre, Western University

**CHAIR:** MARY WILSON, Niagara College

**LEVEL:** Intermediate / Advanced

In this panel discussion, educational developers from four different Ontario universities describe the evolution of institutional curriculum mapping tools between 2011-2016. The initial curriculum mapping tool developed at the University of Guelph influenced the development of the tools at Western University and the University of Ottawa, which subsequently influenced the tool used at McMaster University. The panel will discuss both the institutional choices that influenced the implemented tool and the ways the tool has evolved in response to user needs with respect to learning outcomes assessment. Attendees at this session can expect to engage in discussion on the role of curriculum mapping in influencing and documenting program learning outcomes assessment for a variety of audiences, including accreditation and IQAP processes, as well as for internal and public stakeholders.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Compare the evolution of curriculum mapping tools used at four different Ontario universities; and (ii) Describe the way curriculum mapping tools can be used to influence program learning outcomes assessment.

**WORKSHOP D****SHANGHAI**

***Mapping the Terrain of Learning Outcomes***

**SPEAKERS:** MARY CATHARINE LENNON, Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB)

**CHAIR:** SARAH FUCHS, Council of Ontario Universities

**LEVEL:** Beginner

New to the area of learning outcomes? Trying to understanding the basic ideas of what they are, how they're used and for what purposes? Or maybe you 'get' what you're doing, but you've had conversations about learning outcomes and felt the other person was speaking a different language? Or that their project was so different from yours it was difficult to recognise the relationship to your own work? This workshop will demystify learning outcomes by mapping the landscape of initiatives. It will unpack ideas of how learning outcomes initiatives can be of different types, focus and level, and how policy choices serve distinct goals, stakeholders, target audiences and purposes, and can be enacted through a variety of activities. Participants will be provided with a framework to work though these ideas, and will engage with examples of learning outcomes initiatives from Ontario and around the world in order to explore the concepts. Participants will then apply the framework to their own institutional/agency activities in order to situate their work in the broader context. The workshop is not

about semantics. It's about understanding the broad concepts that underpin learning outcomes initiatives so that its easier to translate local, national and international conversations and recognise types of activities.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Recognise and map a range of learning outcomes initiatives; (ii) Articulate where their institution/agency learning outcomes initiatives are situated in the landscape; and (iii) Reflect on the policy goals and choices of their initiatives.

**WORKSHOP E****TOKYO*****Learning Outcomes Assessment of Master and PhD Theses***

**SPEAKER:** **KAMRAN SIDDIQUI**, Mechanical and Materials Engineering, Western University

**CHAIR:** **BRIAN TIMNEY**, Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

**LEVEL:** Intermediate

Master and PhD theses comprise a major portion of graduate curriculum and hence their assessment is a key parameter in the overall assessment of the graduate degree outcomes. The thesis work covers all six graduate attributes unlike graduate courses that individually cover few of these attributes. Hence, the assessment of these attributes in the thesis work is a strong indicator of the fulfilment of degree level expectations by individual students. This session will focus on the development and implementation of tools to assess the learning outcomes of six graduate attributes in Master and PhD theses. In this session, details of the work that has been conducted at Western University in developing, implementing and evaluating theses learning outcomes will be presented and discussed. The challenges and future directions will also be discussed.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Thesis assessment rubric for graduate attributes; and (ii) Utilization of the learning outcomes data.

**WORKSHOP F****DENVER*****Integrating Game-Based Elements in Assessing Learning Outcomes***

**SPEAKERS:** **ROBERT BAJKO**, School of Professional Communication, **DAVID CHANDROSS** and **LEONORA ZEFI**, the G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education, Ryerson University

**CHAIR:** **JOHN MITCHELL**, Brescia University College, Western University

**LEVEL:** Beginner / Intermediate

Designing meaningful assessments and integrating engaging tools in the assessment process can help motivate students and accomplish learning outcomes. The affordances of social media and other technological tools allow for technology-based assessments that can measure student learning beyond physical and temporal confines of the classroom. In education, gamification is the application of game concepts such as narratives, quests, levels, leaderboards, and avatars to educational material and classes (Detering et al., 2011). When correctly implemented, gamification can inspire the target demographic to carry out tasks they would previously have found uninteresting or undesirable (King et al., 2013) In this interactive session, participants will learn about recent and ongoing research work and findings in the field of gamification as it applies to use of social media at the university undergraduate level. Design concepts, creation of narrative and testing of the narrative/gameplay interfaces will be reviewed and discussed, alongside with some proven strategies on how to select and integrate different gamified elements for effective assessment of learning outcomes. A demonstration of how a given LMS was used to implement those strategies and integrate them with

grading and communication systems will be provided along with a discussion on how some institutional challenges were mitigated by the instructors.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Demonstrate creative approaches to assessing learning outcomes using technology-based assessments; (ii) Identify some gamified elements that can be used in assessments in own setting; and (iii) Understand the design concepts and creation of narrative in gamified courses.

**WORKSHOP G****SEATTLE*****A Flexible Framework: Developing Institutional-Focused Information Literacy Learning Outcomes***

**SPEAKERS:** **HEATHER BUCHANSKY**, Faculty and Student Engagement, Chief Librarian's Office, **EVELINE HOUTMAN**, Robarts Reference Library, and **COURTNEY LUNDRIGAN**, John W. Graham Library, University of Toronto

**CHAIR:** **HEATHER CAMPBELL**, Brescia University College, Western University

**LEVEL:** All

Many post-secondary institutions recognize information literacy, the ability to find and use information critically and ethically, as one of the core competencies for an undergraduate degree. Until recently, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) promoted a standards-based approach to information literacy that included a set of prescribed learning outcomes. In 2016, ACRL adopted a new Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education based on threshold concepts, ideas that shape how students view and work with information. The Framework focuses on developing knowledge practices and dispositions in students, and instructors develop relevant learning outcomes locally. Inspired by an institutional priority to transform undergraduate education, a working group of librarians created a set of learning outcomes aligned with the Framework. The outcomes promote a flexible approach to implementing the Framework, while leaving room for disciplinary information literacy strategies and instructors' teaching goals. This interactive workshop will introduce participants to the Framework and associated learning outcomes, as well as explore opportunities for Framework implementation.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Familiarize themselves with the new information literacy Framework; (ii) Identify intersections between the Framework and course materials/learning outcomes; and (iii) Articulate opportunities and collaborations to incorporate the Framework into course and/or departmental curriculum planning.

**WORKSHOP H****SAN FRANCISCO*****Facilitating the Creation of Optimal Transfer Pathways: Using NVivo for Qualitative Analysis of Learning Outcomes in Curriculum Documents***

**SPEAKERS:** **NANCY NOLDY-MACLEAN** and **HEATHER RAIKOU**, Academic Quality, Georgian College

**CHAIR:** **NICOLE FALLON**, Ontario Council on Articulation and Transfer

**LEVEL:** Beginner / Intermediate

The process of determining credit transfer between credential levels is complex. Institutions struggle with the process of determining which learning outcomes have been met by another program, where the gaps in learning are and which courses should be credited. At an operational level, the process of comparing learning outcomes to give credit for prior learning and optimize transfer pathways includes: identifying similarities, extracting themes, highlighting differences and acknowledging relationships. Similarly, Qualitative Data Analysis programs, like NVivo, allow the user to manage

---

data from numerous sources, explore themes, find patterns, and create meaningful reports. However, to our knowledge, NVivo has never been used for this application. Supported by ONCAT research funding, we are looking at NVivo as a potential tool for facilitating these processes to determine credit transfer between credential levels. Participants in this workshop will be engaged in a manual process of comparing learning outcomes to determine if a potential student would get credit for a degree course based on learning from a high affinity diploma program, and then participate as a group in a demonstration of a pilot protocol for using an NVivo process to determine the same transfer pathway. A discussion comparing these processes will conclude the workshop.

**By the end of this session participants will be able to:** (i) Apply a manual protocol for determining credit transfer between diploma and degree courses; (ii) Discuss an NVivo protocol for determining credit transfer between diploma and degree courses; and (iii) Compare and appraise a manual and NVivo protocol for determining credit transfer between diploma and degree courses.

## PLENARY PANEL 2

MANDARIN BALLROOM

11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

### *State of the Union*

**PANEL:** EILEEN DE COURCY, Associate Vice-President for Teaching and Learning, Humber College, JOHN DOERKSEN, Vice Provost (Academic Programs and Students), Western University, ROSS FINNIE, Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa, LINDA MILLER, Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, Western University

**MODERATOR:** ALICE PITT, Vice Provost (Academic), York University

Panelists representing aspects of the Ontario post-secondary sector are invited to reflect on achievements, challenges and emerging questions in relation to the development of the assessment of learning outcomes as these contribute to a shared commitment to producing and documenting quality in post-secondary education. As institutions have moved towards greater emphasis on articulating and assessing learning outcomes at the level of the credential and programs leading to credentials, can we now identify gaps within and between institutions that may challenge other priorities, such as access and student mobility? What can we learn from labour market outcomes that might direct our research, policy and institutional development efforts over the next few years? To what extent do labour market outcomes reflect the skills and knowledge identified by our educational learning frameworks, particularly as these relate to transferable skills? Are there developments in other jurisdictions that might inform our context?

## CLOSING REMARKS

MANDARIN BALLROOM

1:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.

ALICE PITT, Chair, Conference Planning Committee

## LUNCH

1:15 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

MANDARIN BALLROOM

**Boxes will be available for those needing to depart right away**