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## PART ONE

# Introduction to the Assessment Measures

| Name | Description | Scale | Sample/Response Rate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Graduating Senior Survey (GSS) | The GSS is a self-report survey completed online by seniors in their last semester. Students rate how much their experience as a psych major helped them to meet each of the department learning goals. | Items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (None) to 4 (A lot) | Out of a possible 146 graduating seniors from Summer 2015 through Spring 2016, 76 (52%) completed the Senior Survey. |
| Psychology Comprehensive Exam (PCE) | The PCE is administered in D2L to graduating seniors during their last semester on campus; it became a graduation requirement with the 2007 catalog. It is a 28-item multiple choice test that covers the major domains of psychology. There are also 2 integrative learning essay questions. [Direct measure] | N/A | Out of a possible 146 graduating seniors from Summer 2015 through Spring 2016, 136 (93%) completed the PCE. |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation | Posters developed by students enrolled in Research Methods (PSY3805) classes are rated independently by faculty judges (excluding Research Methods instructors), using our Poster Evaluation form during each semester’s Research Methods Forum in the last week of class.  [Direct measure] | Eleven items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (Poor) to 4 (Excellent) | Typically, 4-6 faculty volunteers are assigned to rate different subsets of posters so that all posters are rated by at least two faculty. A total of 85 poster ratings were completed this year. |
| Research Methods Poster Oral Evaluation | Students who created posters for their Research Methods class (PSY3805) present their research orally to faculty members in the hallway during the research methods forum in the last week of class. [Direct measure] | Three items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (Poor) to 4 (Excellent) | Typically, 4-6 faculty volunteers evaluate several students each semester, resulting in 73 evaluations this year. |
| Intern Self-Evaluation | Students enrolled in undergraduate internship (PSY 4275) complete an online survey with questions about their internship experience at the end of each semester. | Questions related to the department learning goals are on a 5-point scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) | A total of 15 students out of 17 (88%) in Fall/Spring completed the internship self-evaluation |
| Supervisor Evaluation of Intern | Off-site supervisors of students enrolled in undergraduate Internship rate the performance of their students at the end of each semester. [Direct measure] | Questions related to the department learning goals are on a 4-point scale from 1 (Poor) to 4 (Excellent) | A total of 15 supervisors out of 17 (88%) in Fall/Spring completed the internship evaluation |
| Student Researcher Survey | Students who conduct research (PSY3805, PSY3900, PSY4100, PSY4444 and PSY4644) are asked to complete this survey at the end of each semester, which asks how much their research experience met the department learning goals. | Items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (None) to 4 (A lot) | Of the 172 student research experiences (including research methods), there were 79 (46%) responses. |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers | Faculty advisors of students enrolled in undergraduate research (PSY3900, PSY 4100, or Honors Thesis) complete an evaluation of their students at the end of each semester with questions similar to the Student Researcher Survey. [Direct measure] | Items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (None) to 4 (A lot) | Of the 64 undergraduate research experiences, 53 were rated by faculty (83%). |
| Capstone Course Ratings | Students enrolled in a capstone course as a senior (required for graduation) are rated by faculty on their engagement in original research, critical thinking, writing, and oral communication skills. [Direct measure] | Items are rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (Not at all competent) to 4 (Highly competent). | 108 of 115 students (94%) were rated by faculty in the Fall/Spring semesters. |
| Watson-Glaser Test | This standardized test measures students’ critical thinking skills.  [Direct measure] | Overall scores are reported in comparison to all other EIU students who took the test. |  |

**2015-2016 Results**

# 1. Scientific Inquiry, Critical Thinking, & Quantitative Reasoning

| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations?\* | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.1 Apply innovative, integrative, and critical thinking skills to interpret psychological phenomena | GSS |  | M = 3.57, 97% Some/A lot | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | M = 3.13, 76% Good/Excellent |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | 80% Agree/SA |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.45, 94% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.70, 98% Some/A lot |
| Capstone Course Ratings |  | M = 3.24, 90% Competent/Highly Comp. |
| 1.2 Apply innovative, integrative, and critical thinking skills to design and conduct research, analyze data, and interpret results. | GSS |  | M = 3.53, 93% Some/A lot |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | * Appropriate Design, M = 3.34 (84% Good/Excellent) * Accurate Analysis, M = 3.43 (83% Good/Excellent) * Effective Interpretation, M = 3.14 (78% Good/Excellent) |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.58, 95% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.55, 89% Some/A lot |
| 1.3 Apply information literacy skills to find and evaluate research studies in psychology. | GSS |  | M = 3.51, 93% Some/A lot |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | M = 3.30, 86% Good/Excellent |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.58, 96% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.67, 94% Some/A lot |
| 1.4 Produce, analyze, interpret, and evaluate quantitative materials. | GSS |  | M = 3.34, 91% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.56, 92% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.54, 94% Some/A lot |
|  | Watson-Glaser Test | Psychology students will meet or exceed the average score of all EIU students taking this exam. | Expectations were **not** met. In the Fall 2015 semester, the average composite score of the 36 Psychology majors taking the test was 23.44, which was slightly below the average of all 518 students taking the test (24.69). | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| General Research Skills | The number of **students conducting Independent Study** (PSY3900), **Undergraduate Research** (PSY4100),and **Honors Theses** (PSY4444 and PSY4644) projects is monitored. | 15% of undergraduates will be enrolled in Undergraduate Research or related courses. | Expectations were **not** met. In Fall 2015, out of our total number of 424 majors, 12 were enrolled in PSY 3900, 8 in PSY 4100, and 7 in PSY 4444 for a total of 27 students (6%). Out of 381 majors in Spring 2016, 6 were enrolled in PSY 3900, 25 in PSY 4100, and 7 in PSY 4644 for a total of 38 students (10%). | Results will be shared by **Assessment Committee Chair** withundergraduate research advisors to encourage students to engage in undergraduate research, apply for awards, and present their research at undergraduate and professional conferences. |
|  | The number of **students disseminating research** (students in PSY4100 or PSY4644) presenting at psychological research conferences or publishing articles is monitored. | At least 50% of students completing Undergraduate Research or Honors Theses will present and/or publish their results. | Expectations were met. Of the 32 students enrolled in these courses in Spring 2015, 18 (56%) made one or more conference presentations. |
|  | The number of **research awards and grants** obtained by undergraduate students is monitored. | Psychology students should receive a representative number of awards based on the number given. Normally, this would be 1 URSCA award (~35 awards among ~35 departments) and 1 SURE award (12 awards given among 11 programs in COS) | 1 student received a SURE Award.  1 student received an URSCA Award.  1 student received a COS Travel grant. |

# 2. Communication

| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations?\* | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Writing and Critical Reading** | | | | |
| 2.1 Write critically and effectively in the discipline of psychology by developing a cogent scientific argument and evaluating evidence, issues, ideas, and problems from multiple perspectives. | GSS |  | M = 3.58, 96% Some/A lot | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | APA Style, M = 3.52 (89%)  Scientific Argument, M = 3.18 (77%)  Clear Grammar, M = 3.31 (85%) |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.51, 90% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.41, 90% Some/A lot |
| Capstone Course Ratings |  | M = 3.16, 87% Competent/Highly Comp. |
| 2.2 Evaluate primary sources in psychology, collect and employ source materials ethically, and understand the strengths and limitations of different types of sources. | GSS |  | M = 3.62, 97% Some/A lot |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.52, 91% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.64, 94% Some/A lot |
| Capstone Course Ratings |  | M = 3.28, 96% Competent/Highly Comp. |
| **Speaking and Listening** | | | | |
| 2.3 Demonstrate competence in oral communication skills by presenting information using a scientific approach, engaging in discussion of psychological concepts, explaining the ideas of others, and expressing their own ideas with clarity. | Research Methods Poster Oral Evaluation |  | Present Information, M = 3.52 (93% Good/Excellent)  Engage Discussion, M = 3.59 (93% Good/Excellent) | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| Supervisor Evaluation of Intern |  | M = 3.50, 93% Good/Excellent |
| Capstone Course Ratings |  | M = 3.32, 95% Competent/Highly Comp. |
| 2.4 Exhibit flexible interpersonal approaches that optimize information exchange and relationship development. | Research Methods Poster Oral Evaluation |  | Effectively exchange information, M = 3.64 (94% Good/Excellent) |
| Supervisor Evaluation of Intern |  | M = 3.64, 93% Good/Excellent |

# 3. Content Knowledge

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations?\* | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared? |
| 3. Comprehend fundamental knowledge, major concepts, theoretical perspectives, historical trends, and empirical findings in the primary content areas of psychology. | GSS |  | M = 3.53, 96% Some/A lot | Results will be shared by the **Assessment Committee Chair** with all psychology faculty and outcomes in specific domains discussed. |
| GSS ratings of confidence in presenting on different topics | 70% of graduating seniors will indicate being somewhat confident in their ability to give a presentation based on information learned from courses in the major domains, and overall mean scores will be above 2.8 (i.e., mean rating on a 4-point scale). | Expectations were met **for five out of six domains assessed.** The following are percentages of graduating seniors who indicated having at least “some” confidence: 80% in abnormal (M = 3.14), 80% in social (M = 3.07), 83% in personality (M = 3.08), 43**%** in biopsychology (M = 2.51), 63% in cognitive (M = 2.80), 77% in learning (M = 3.05), and 78% in developmental (M = 3.13). |
| PCE | At least half of the students will score at least 50% on the PCE. | The overall mean score was 70%. A total of 87% of students exceeded a score of 50% on the PCE. Performance on individual domains were: Stats/Research Methods (58%), Social (73%), Learning/Memory (73%), Abnormal (65%), Developmental (74%), Biological (71%) |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | Knowledge of Psychology, M = 3.34 (85% Good/Excellent) |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.48, 87% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.62, 98% Some/A lot |

# 4. Ethical and Social Responsibility

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations?\* | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared? |
| 4.1 Evaluate formal regulations that govern professional ethics in psychology. | GSS |  | M = 3.37, 91% Some/A lot | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | 80% Agree/SA |
| Supervisor Evaluation of Intern |  | M = 3.70, 100% Good/Excellent |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.23, 76% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 2.90, 67% Some/A lot |
| 4.2 Interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with people from diverse backgrounds and demonstrate understanding of the sociocultural contexts that influence individual differences. | GSS |  | M = 3.57, 96% Some/A lot |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | Issues of diversity addressed, M = 2.58 (49% Good/Excellent) |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | Interact Effectively (93% Agree/SA)  Understand sociocultural contexts (80% Agree/SA) |
| Supervisor Evaluation of Intern |  | M = 3.77, 92% Good/Excellent |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.22, 80% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 2.57, 50% Some/A lot |
| 4.3 Implement values that will lead to positive outcomes in work settings and a society responsive to multicultural and global concerns. | GSS |  | M = 3.55, 95% Some/A lot |
| Research Methods Poster Evaluation |  | Positive Outcomes, M = 2.90 (60% Good/Excellent) |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | 93% Agree/SA |
| Supervisor Evaluation of Intern |  | M = 4.0, 100% Excellent |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.52, 87% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.05, 79% Some/A lot |

# 5. Professional Development

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations?\* | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible?  How are results shared? |
| 5.1 Apply psychology-specific content | GSS |  | M = 3.67, 96% Some/A lot | The **Assessment Committee Chair** will share the results with Psychology faculty. |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | 87% Agree/SA |
| Supervisor Evaluation of Intern |  | M = 3.50, 92% Good/Excellent |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.59, 92% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.81, 100% Some/A lot |
| 5.2 Work effectively as part of a team | GSS |  | M = 3.51, 92% Some/A lot |
| Research Methods Poster Oral Evaluation |  | M = 3.72, 97% Good/Excellent |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | 93% Agree/SA |
| Supervisor Evaluation of Intern |  | M = 3.71, 93% Good/Excellent |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.33, 77% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.17, 66% Some/A lot |
| 5.3 Self-reflect in preparation for employment, graduate school, or professional school | GSS |  | M = 3.63, 96% Some/A lot |
| Intern Self-Evaluation |  | 93% Agree/SA |
| Supervisor Evaluation of Intern |  | M = 3.77, 92% Good/Excellent |
| Student Researcher Survey |  | M = 3.49, 86% Some/A lot |
| Faculty Evaluation of Student Researchers |  | M = 3.58, 100% Some/A lot |

# General Results

Figure 1: Comparison of Faculty and Student Ratings of Learning Goals

The figure above shows the ratings of our department’s 15 learning goals by three different groups:

1. Undergraduate Research Advisors (Faculty) who rate their student researchers’ effectiveness in meeting each learning goal
2. Students enrolled in undergraduate research experiences who rate their own effectiveness in meeting each learning goal
3. Seniors who complete the Graduating Senior Survey (GSS) who rate their own effectiveness in meeting each learning goal.

Ratings by faculty (1) and students (2) of students’ undergraduate research experiences are highly correlated with each other (r = .87). This finding suggests that undergraduate researchers and their faculty advisors are largely in agreement of how well undergraduate research experiences meet our department learning goals. However, there is some discrepancy between these two groups of raters, particularly within the fourth learning goal (Ethical and Social Responsibility). Students perceive their own research experience to be better at meeting these learning goals than their faculty counterparts. In addition, this learning goal is rated lower overall than the other learning goals (see Future Plans below).

It’s also obvious that we failed to ask about learning goals 2.3 and 2.4 (Speaking and Listening) on the three surveys shown in Figure 1, but they are measured with the capstone assessment ratings and the oral presentation ratings at the research methods poster forum (in which case students are rated highly).

## PART TWO

Describe what your program’s assessment accomplished since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

### Previous Plans Addressed

1. We successfully integrated the new APA learning goals with EIU’s revised University Learning Goals and have modified significantly our assessment surveys, as needed, to accurately capture the success of our program in preparing EIU Psychology graduates for the future.
2. Because we significantly revised all of our assessment measures for Fall 2015 (except the PCE), some of our prior plans are now no longer relevant. However, we have (as planned):
   1. Added instructions on the PCE itself to make sure that the students are aware that the top 10% of the PCE scorers will receive a letter of accomplishment. Although this incentive was already in place, the increased visibility should encourage further motivation to do well. Indeed, average scores have improved over the last few years by about 8-10%.
   2. We posted our last assessment report on our department web site and distributed the report to all department faculty.
   3. To better assess integrative learning experiences, we have added a question to the Student Internship Survey (started Fall 2015) that asks students to generate examples of how course content has been applied in their internship experience. Students provided numerous examples such as, “Through this internship, I have learned so much about different psychological disorders. I had learned about these disorders in my abnormal psychology courses, but it was so different being able to see them first hand. You learn about many of the common symptoms, but what you don't learn is how different one disorder can be displayed in different people. A few of the clients are getting older, and are beginning to have problems that I learned about in my Maturity and Old Age class - the biggest one being memory issues. I have also learned about psychological assessments that the facility uses to assess new clients before they begin receiving services. Many of these assessments and the importance of using them correctly were touched on in my psychological measurements class.”
   4. To better assess ethics, we have added two questions to the student researcher survey.
   5. We have further refined the PCE using data from individual item analyses to eliminate questions on which students appear to be randomly guessing (i.e., they have a very low or negative correlation with the total score.) We have also reduced the number of integrative learning questions from two to one (students scored similarly on both items so we now randomize which question each student receives). However, starting Fall of 2016, we will be piloting a new PCE that is built from questions that tap into the main pillars (domains) of the suggested common core for introductory psychology. We have also added two questions from the St. Joseph’s critical thinking exam.
3. We did not have extensive discussion of prior years’ assessment reports at our department meetings because we were focusing on revising our psychology major learning goals.

### Specific Responses to CASA Director’s Report

On our previous submitted report (AY 2013-2014), Karla Sanders, CASA Director, suggested the following:

1. “My assumption is that quantitative reasoning is embedded in objective 2 given the kind of research conducted in your discipline, but you may want to consider making that more explicit.”
   * *We have done so in our revised department learning goals.*
2. “You might talk to the new Study Abroad coordinator about ways to receive information from your majors engaging in this experience. With the changes in the subgoals for responsible citizenship, you might find it useful to look at your research methods class since ethics is part of that goal. How research is conducted could be part of the assessment for professional ethics and might increase the data and the number of majors for responsible citizenship.”
   * *We have added two ethics questions to the survey completed by student researchers (and graduating seniors). In addition, students enrolled in the Research Methods course must complete the CITI “Basic Course - Human Subjects Research” that provides tutorial instruction and verification of knowledge of ethical issues associated with conducting human research.*

## PART THREE

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

### How have you used the data? What have we learned?

1. We continue to fall short of the number of undergraduates that we want to be enrolled in undergraduate research (15%). However, this is unlikely given the number of majors (~400) and the number of Unit A faculty. To have 15% enrolled would require every faculty member to supervise about 4 students every semester, which is unrealistic. To better match our goal for undergraduates to participate in research with the number of available Unit A faculty, we are changing our expectation to be an average of 2 students per Unit A Faculty member per semester, which would be 28 students next academic year. In addition, faculty could engage students in small group projects rather than individual projects, which would give more students the opportunity to be involved at some level of the research experience.
2. For some years we have noted that our graduating seniors are not equally confident about their knowledge levels across the various domains of Psychology (LG 3: Content Area Knowledge). Consistently, students have less confidence in their ability to give a presentation on *Biological* and *Cognitive* topics. However, on the PCE, performance on these subdomains is comparable to others, suggesting that it is primarily a problem with confidence and not ability. We expect confidence in these domains to somewhat lower than others for several reasons: Most students will not enter a profession that directly deals with these areas of psychology and there is likely to be more interest (and repetition) of the other topics across the curriculum.
3. Overall performance on the PCE has improved. It appears that we are developing a culture of expectations to do well on the PCE and the incentive of a letter of accomplishment may be furthering motivation. This year, 87% scored higher than a 50% on the PCE, compared to 77% in 2014.
4. Although students in our department score very close to the mean for the university on the Watson-Glaser test, that’s not much to get excited about, considering the overall mean is below the national average. However, we continue to see an incongruity between the critical thinking ability of our students as measured by the Watson-Glaser, and the direct measures of assessment for critical thinking that we have developed in the Department.
   1. Our first direct measure of critical thinking is based on an assessment made by faculty members teaching our Capstone courses. Faculty assessment of critical thinking in the Capstone classes indicated a somewhat incredible 90% of students who were rated at least “competent” (3 or higher on a 4 point scale) by faculty in Critical Thinking (Goal 1.1), with a mean rating of 3.24 out of 4 (a ratio of .81).
   2. Second, faculty assessing critical thinking on the research methods posters rated the students at a mean of 3.13 on a 4-point scale (a ratio of .78). Thus, our faculty rate our students’ critical thinking skills as good, whereas they are mediocre at best according to the Watson-Glaser scores. One explanation may be that there is a discrepancy between “domain-general” and “domain-specific” critical thinking skills. Given that most reasoning and critical thinking occurs in the context of a profession in the real world, it may be the case that the institution has a whole has put too much emphasis on the Watson-Glaser scores as the defining measure of critical thinking skills.
5. The Department Assessment Committee realized that we often collected data that didn’t directly relate to our learning goals. As such, we have streamlined our assessment surveys to focus on the learning goals.

## Plans for the Future

1. In Summer 2016, we will be rolling out the revised Psychology Comprehensive Examination. The new exam is built on the common core domains for introductory psychology (APA, 2014) and include Biological, Cognitive, Developmental, Social and Personality, Mental and Physical health, and Research Methods. Over the course of the year, we will evaluate the adequacy of each quiz item using the reports available in D2L. Questions will be rewritten or removed from the pool of questions if they fail to adequately test the concepts.
2. Now that we have all new assessment measures, this year will be our “baseline” measure of performance in comparison with future data. From this year’s data, it appears that an “A/B” grade cutoff on our assessments is a reasonable expectation. Thus, average scores of 3.5 or higher on a 4-point scale, and having 90% of respondents mark the upper half of the 4 point scale seems achievable. With this somewhat arbitrary cutoff for the first year, we see that the learning goals consistently rated below this cutoff are:

* 4.1 Evaluate formal regulations that govern professional ethics in psychology.
* 4.2 Interact effectively, sensitively, and ethically with people from diverse backgrounds and demonstrate understanding of the sociocultural contexts that influence individual differences.
* 4.3 Implement values that will lead to positive outcomes in work settings and a society responsive to multicultural and global concerns.

Part of the reason for lower ratings on these items is that they come from the research methods posters, which don’t necessarily require diversity issues to be part of their studies. In contrast, graduating seniors rate themselves highly on these learning goals. This issue will be raised with research methods faculty and those who supervise undergraduate research projects.

1. Since 2012, our department has not offered a study abroad course. However, Dr. Daniele Nardi is taking students in the 4-week session of Summer 2016 to Italy, which will allow us to resume assessment of our study abroad experience, including its effects on learning goal #4. Ethical and Social Responsibility.
2. It’s also obvious that we failed to ask about learning goals 2.3 and 2.4 (Speaking and Listening) on several of our revised surveys. This has been corrected already for the next round of assessments.
3. We will also standardize, where possible, the rating scales of our assessments to allow more accurate comparisons between groups of raters who are using different surveys to measure the same learning goals.