

株主総会も社員株主を前の方に座らせてやらせの質問をさせていることもわかり、日本人はまだあまり変わっていないのではないかという気になりました。

永見先生の本日のお話は宗教学的、歴史的、文献的な講演であり大変興味を持ってお聞きすることができ大変ありがとうございました。

Guest Speech 2 (2008年6月)

講師：Cheryl E. Drout

ニューヨーク州立大学フレドニア校教授
(フルブライト招聘講師 愛知教育大学)

**Trend in American Higher Education Administration: Assessment,
Student Centered Learning and Accountability***

Prof. Hoshino:

I'm very glad today to have a special lecture by Professor Cheryl Drout. She now teaches at Aichi University of Education as Fulbright visiting lecturer/researcher. This lecture is sponsored by Fulbright Alumni Association, Chubu Chapter, and Japanese Association of Administrative Science, Chubu Chapter and Nanzan University.

I'd like to introduce you briefly about Professor Drout. She is Professor and Interim Chair of the Department of Psychology, State University of New York at Fredonia.

I wondered where Fredonia is, and checked the road map this morning and I found out it's south west sixty miles from Buffalo. There is a city named Fredonia, facing the Lake Erie. I know the State University Buffalo, because some Japanese economist there, but I didn't know Fredonia. Now I know.

She got her doctor's degree on the topic of "Attitudes toward battered women" and her Master's on the topic of "Sex differences in attributional mediators of depression" in Social Psychology at University of Delaware, Newark, and she published many papers. There are some paper which has close correlation with Japanese society and Japanese education system, such as she published "Noh Thyself: Psychological principles of Japanese training in the Theater Arts." in Japan Studies Association Journal, 2003,

* This lecture was organized by Fulbright Alumni Association, Chubu Chapter, Japanese Association of Administrative Science, Chubu Chapter and Nanzan University on June 21, 2008.

and also, 1998, she published "Japanese education reinterpreted: Reexamining Japanese and American educational philosophy in light of western social and educational psychology." also published in same journal. And other paper like "Using assessment results to improve teaching and learning".

We are very glad to have her here today. Thank you very much. Please start your lecture.

Prof. Drout:

Welcome. *Konnichiwa*. And thank you for inviting me this evening.

I would like to say a little bit more about my placement for Fulbright at Aichi University of Education and my background, before starting on a topic for tonight.

At Aichi University of Education, I'm teaching Intercultural Communication /Cross-cultural Psychology and I'm also teaching English courses. I'm involved in team-teaching, so I want to mention my team teachers for some of you who know the faculty at Aichi University (of Education). I'm working with Professor Kitano in the Communications Department, and also Professor Robins in the English Department, and my research work is with Professor Nakano, in Educational Psychology. We're taking a look at teacher's attitudes towards some of the educational reforms that have taken place since 2002. I'm working with several different faculty and it's been a wonderful experience. I very much appreciate this opportunity from Fulbright and the opportunity to share with you tonight and to learn from your experiences.

Just let me say a little more about my home institution, the State University of New York at Fredonia. I want to mention that there I have been involved in teaching Cross-cultural Psychology, Industrial-Organizational Psychology, and Psychology of Ethnicity. Also, we have a Psychology Lab, that is part of our introduction to Psychology course, which I've been involved in teaching there. On the administrative side, I've worked as Director of General Education, as Co-Director of Assessment, and most recently I am taking on chairing the Psychology Department. So, I feel the influences on my topic today are both faculty and administrative influences.

My topic is "Trends in American Higher Education Administration". We'll be

talking a bit about assessment, student centered learning, and the Voluntary System of Accountability, and I will define each of those as we approach each topic.

I began this work with the Student Learning Initiative at Alverno College in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Alverno college is very well known for its work in assessment and its faculty have had many grants for working in the area of assessment and bringing faculty to the campus to develop their own abilities in assessment.

They received a Pew Grant between 2000 and 2005, to undertake investigation of the status of assessment in America, looking at the status of assessment specifically in higher education. Before I continue, I need to define a few of these terms, because they are used in different ways across the academy, so that we have a common definition of terms.

When we talk about "assessment", we're talking about measuring the impact of what we do, that is measuring the impact of our teaching, measuring educational outcomes. Then there are many more specific terms that we use. "Student learning outcomes," for example, refers to measuring the direct impact of teaching and learning and carefully gauging the effectiveness of our methods.

So when we use "student learning outcomes", we're usually talking about direct measures of performance, such as standardized tests, local faculty designed tests, evaluations of skills by objective parties, and demonstrations of competencies. At Fredonia, we tend to emphasize local faculty designed tests. This is what our faculty tend to prefer and so we have developed a lot of this type of measure. At Alverno College, they use a lot of evaluations of skills by objective parties. For example, in measuring their students' public speaking skills, Alverno actually brings in employers in the area, and has those employers observe their students giving public talks and speeches. This also involves rating the students and providing feedback. So they are evaluating their students' skills by using objective parties actually from outside of the university itself. So these are the kinds of direct measures that are used when assessing student learning outcomes. When we use the phrase "program assessment", we're talking about

typically measuring outcomes in a major, this may involve student learning outcomes, but often may be limited to just indirect outcome measures. These might be reports of satisfaction by students. Students complete a survey and indicate that they liked the program or they are unhappy with the major. This might indicate strengths and weaknesses of the major. Also, indirect measures include the comparison of program characteristics to sets of standards. So for example, in the psychology program at Fredonia, we compare our program to standards set by the American Psychological Association. They relatively recently came out with guidelines for undergraduate psychology majors. So we compare our course offerings to the guidelines and also our student learning outcome measures are compared to the kinds of measures they recommend.

Another 'indirect measure' would be access to jobs and graduate schools or what percentage of students are able to get into graduate schools and how quickly students are able to get jobs after they graduate. These are fairly common measures of program assessment.

The phrase "assessment as learning" means that when data is collected from students for assessing teaching and learning, it's also shared with students, so that they receive feedback on their performance and they learn from the assessment itself. When we use "assessment as learning", it really has two purposes, for assessing a program but for also sharing that performance with the students so they learn from that performance as well. However, Assessment often does not involve assessment as learning.

"Portfolios" are multiple measures of performance that are collected longitudinally from the same students. So these are multiple measures taken over time from the same group of students so that we can evaluate their developmental progress.

"Institutional assessment" goes beyond student learning outcomes and outcomes in major and it looks at evaluating the institution as a whole. So institutional assessment evaluates the institutional use of resources and the management of the institution. It examines the administrative level, and how the administrative level affects teaching and learning.

I'd like to share my experience with the Alverno Student Learning Initiative

and the work that we did at that time and some of the changes that have occurred since.

We did a survey involving 700 institutions nationwide. This included both colleges and universities. 140 out of 700 responded to our surveys, so we had about a 20% response rate. We wanted to find out about the status of assessment in those colleges and universities. We found that most of the assessment that had been done (around 2000 and 2001) reflected compliance with mandates designed by faculty assessment committees, looking at program assessment. Most of this assessment involved measures of outcomes in majors, but not necessarily student learning outcomes; not many of these measures at that time involved direct measures of student learning. When student learning outcomes were measured, they were not tied to graduation and they were not used for assessment as learning, so there were some student learning outcomes in use but typically they did not have dramatic impact, not being tied to graduation and not used for assessment as learning. Portfolios that were in use typically were used to measure aggregate student performance only, and not to examine individual performance, but instead just to look at aggregate student performance.

So we came up with selected recommendations as to how assessment might be improved from the current situation at that time. One of the things we recommended was creating opportunities for institutional collaboration. It is helpful for the institutions to share with each other how they are carrying out assessment, and what they are learning from the assessment process. One of the things that was done with the student learning initiative was a follow-up in which 26 colleges and universities continued to work together, so that provided a model of this idea of collaboration.

We also recommended that student learning outcomes be tied to graduation, in that way students take measures seriously. If they performed poorly, they would have to continue their learning before leaving these institutions.

It was recommended that there be exploration of transfer evaluation of student learning outcomes, that student learning outcomes might be used to identify course equivalencies to facilitate the transfer process for one

institution to another.

It was also recommended that there would be faculty development for teaching and assessment, which needs to begin in graduate school. This is something at least APA (the American Psychological Association) has responded to, adopting this kind of change. At least in Psychology graduate programs, schools are doing more in terms of teacher training and also in terms of instructing about assessment before going out and doing teaching. So for example, when we hired a new clinical psychologist at Fredonia he came to us basically ready to assess his courses, as this was natural to him and something he does on regular basis. He came prepared to use both formative and summative assessment. With formative assessment mid-semester he gets feedback from his students and then he can make adjustment for his current students for the remainder of the semester. With summative assessment the evaluations are done at the end of the course and the adjustments are made for the future offerings. Most importantly, he basically needed no training from graduate school; he already had that kind of experience.

The Student Learning Initiative became a focus group, and we continued a collaboration of 26 institutions, both public and private, colleges and universities. If you look at the status of the use of student learning outcomes in this smaller subset, they are further along than the 140 institutions that had responded to our survey. We found for example that all of these institutions had measures of student learning outcomes in general education, that all were directly measuring student learning outcomes related to general education requirements.

87% had student learning outcomes that have been identified with respect to the majors. 81% had assessment committees in place. 75% were doing program level assessment. 75% were using assessment as learning. So even getting students feedback is only underway. 68% were using student learning outcomes that were tied to graduation requirements. 68% had support structures for outcomes assessment. That is, going beyond the faculty committee, the institution had created either an office of assessment, an office of institutional research, or a director of assessment, but the important thing was that the institution provided support that was built in, so infrastructure for assessment was in use.

We'll begin to talk about what comes to be called "student centered learning". We were interested in how can we improve the assessment; how can we make our institutions more student centered; how can we use student centered learning to be effective? What is "student centered learning"? To define that term further, "student centered learning" is first of all not teaching to the tests. Some of the initial reactions you hear are that faculty may assume student centered must mean giving students what they want, "making it easy, giving them the answers to the test in advance, making the classroom fun". But that really is not what the idea is about, it's really teaching to your audience, being audience centered, knowing your audience, taking into account learning styles, trying to adapt your teaching to the students' learning styles. We use assessment to get feedback from our learners to find out who is in our classroom and what learning methods are effective for them and adjusting our teaching to that. Giving feedback to learners in a timely manner, they can learn from your feedback. We try to facilitate their self-reflection and their change process. All of this goes hand in hand with assessment. In order to teach in this way, you have to be assessing and evaluating where your students are at and how they are doing and how they are responding to you. So that's really what this group's use of student centered learning is about.

The assessment oriented institutions with a focus on student centered learning all have well-developed goals. These are four of the goals that all of these institutions were able to agree on, that is, that all 26 felt were very important.

Achieving clarity about learning outcomes: that is, the more specific the learning measures you can identify, the more useful and informative the data would be.

Coordinating teaching and assessment to promote student learning: that is, you really need coordination between the teaching that is taking place and assessment that has been done. So for example, in the area of general education, very often people doing the assessments may not be those who are teaching the courses. They are not always assessing their own courses. So you need careful coordination so that the teachers are getting the feedback that enables them to use the information that's gathered, and often that coordination breaks down.

Aligning structures and resources to serve student learning: again, as we conduct assessment, we learn about weaknesses in our courses and program, and we identify the ways they can be improved but then there has to be resource support to bring about that improvement.

Working continuously to improve the learning environment: the emphasis here is on the idea that the assessment is never really finished, that it is a continuous process that has to be revisited on a regular basis.

These are the four goals, the four main principles that the group identified.

As an update on the status of assessment, currently there has been a lot of change since this group began its work. We can see at this point there is a great deal of assessment in both program assessment and general education, that most colleges and universities are carrying out assessments in both of these areas. Portfolio measures at this point are usually being used both for aggregate reporting and individual feedback. Faculty assessment committees quickly came to realize that if you are going to gather these measures over time from students repeatedly from their freshman to senior year, just getting aggregate data from that didn't make sense. Following student performance and getting individual feedback from which they could learn really was a much more efficient use of this time and effort. Learning outcomes are more likely to be tied to graduation at this point, however, typically that's in certification areas, that's really primarily where learning outcomes are tied to graduation, partly because of the requirements by certification bodies. Responsibility for assessment now is typically shared between faculty committees and administrative offices. So faculty are still very involved but there is often also a primary administrative office.

I think now we are open to question something that is debated: whether assessment now is primarily a matter of compliance, of accountability, or of real commitment to a genuine interest in improving teaching and learning. I think that's an open question and one that is frequently debated: Are the faculty involved in this genuinely trying to improve teaching and learning and address student needs? Or has it become a centrally directed recording process that's really just about accountability? I think we need to keep asking ourselves that question, as we look at some of the new approaches

that have been used.

Finally, the Voluntary System of Accountability is one of the new approaches. Universities across the United States are sharing the results of standardized measures of assessment. This represents a voluntary accountability to the public and a way of assisting prospective students in choosing between institutions of higher education. My home university is participating. You can go to the university home page and see the VSA profile for Fredonia. It is representative of participating schools.