constructive alignment matrix

Dr Rohaya Talib
School of Education
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (FSSH)
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
81310 Johor Bahru

Mapping of the Course Learning Outcomes (CLO) to the Programme Learning Outcomes (PLO), Teaching & Learning (T&L) methods and Assessment methods:

No.	CLO*	PLO (Code)	**Taxonomies and ***generic skills	T&L methods	****Assessment methods
CLO1	Evaluate the psychological test in terms of its psychometric properties, procedures in designing for research purpose, interpretation of the scores and/or the challenges, trends and issues related to psychological testing.	PLO1 (KW)	C5	Lecture Intermittent Discussion (ID): Think-Pair-Share Round Robin Mind Mapping	Final Exam: 40%
CLO2	Design Meta Content Analysis according to the principles of measurement to extract the conceptual and operational definition of a construct being measured.	PLO2 (CG)	C6	Case Study ID: Read & Examine Brainstorming	Meta-Analysis Report: 20% **Report Rubric*
CLO3	design a set of questionnaire based on clearly defined construct, collect the data, analyse and interpret the result using statistical software as a group work	PLO5 (CS) 10% PLO7 (NS) 20% PLO8 (LAR) 10%	P4 CS3 P4 CTPS3 A4 LS2	Project- Based Learning Reflection	Instrumentation Cycle Report (Set of Questionnaire, Validation Process and Data Analysis) 40%

Refer *Taxonomies of Learning and **UTM's Graduate Attributes, where applicable for measurement of outcomes achievement
***T – Test; Q – Quiz; HW – Homework; Asg – Assignment; PR – Project; Pr – Presentation; F – Final Exam etc.

Student learning time (SLT) details:

Distribution of student Learning Time (SLT) Course content outline	Teaching and Learning Activities						TOTAL SLT
	Guided Learning (Face to Face)				Guided Learning Non-Face to Face	Independent Learning Non-Face to face	
CLO	**L**	**T**	**P**	**O**			
CLO1 40%	17h				12h	13h	**45h** 120*0.4 = 48-3H(FE) =45H
CLO2 20%	8h				10h	4h	**24h** 120 * 0.2 =24H
CLO3 40%	17h				10h	13h	**48h** 120*0.4 = 48H
Total SLT	**42h**				**32h**	**30h**	**117h**

Continuous Assessment		PLO	Percentage	Total SLT
1	Meta-Analysis Report	CG	20	As in CLO2 (10H)
2	Instrumentation Cycle Report (Set of Questionnaire, Validation Process and Data Analysis)	CS NS LAR	10 20 10	As in CLO3 (14H)
Final Assessment			**Percentage**	**Total SLT**
1	Final Examination	KW	40	**3h** (CLO1)
Grand Total			**100**	**120h**

L: Lecture, T: Tutorial, P: Practical, O: Others

It is focused on complex learning (Reeves, 2000)
2. Engages higher-order thinking and problem solving skills,
3. Stimulates a wide range of active responses,
4. Involves challenging tasks that require multiple steps,
5. Requires significant commitments of student time and effort.

Simonson (2000)
1. Tend to simulate real-life contexts.
2. Learners have opportunity to practice the authentic activities that they might encounter in real life. These activities allow them to transfer their skills to various real world related settings.
3. Collaborative working is encouraged.
4. Alternative assessments assist lecturers to have a better understanding of student learning (Winking, 1997). Looking at the student outcomes / products rather than scores can allow instructor to get further insights regarding students' knowledge and skills (Niguidila, 1993).

COURSE ASSESSMENT STRUCTURE

FORMATIVE 60%

META ANALYSIS REPORT 20%
PLO2 (CG) C6 DESIGN
- REPORT RUBRIC

ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT

INSTRUMENTATION CYCLE REPORT
(SET OF QUESTIONNAIRE, VALIDATION PROCESS AND DATA ANALYSIS) 40%

HOTS, MEASURE GROWTH AND PERFORMANCE(LAW & ECKES, 1995)

USING VARIOUS INTELLIGENCES (BRUALDI, 1996)

PLO5 (CS) 10% -> P4 CS3
PLO7 (NS) 20%% -> P4 CTPS 3
PLO8 (LAR) 10% -> A3 LS2

SUMMATIVE 40%

FINAL EXAM
PLO1 (KW) C5 EVALUATE
- ANSWER SCHEME

TRADITIONAL ASSESSMENT

INDIRECT AND INAUTHENTIC (BAILEY, 1998)
NORM-REFERENCED, NO FEEDBACK, CANT TELL THE PROGRESSION (LAW & ECKES, 1995)
FOCUS ON MEMORIZATION (SMALDINO ET AL, 2000)

Literature Review

There has been a **movement from traditional assessment toward alternative assessments** (Dikli, S., 2003)

Alternative Assessment started being used as a means for **educational reform** due to the **increasing awareness of the influence of testing on curriculum and instruction** (Dietel, Herman, and Knuth, 1991).

Reeves (2000) stated that **traditional assessment**, which is generally called **testing**, is challenged by alternative assessment approaches.

Bailey (1998), **traditional assessments are indirect and inauthentic**. She also adds that traditional assessment is standardized and for that reason, they are one-shot, speed-based, and norm-referenced. There is no feedback provided to learners in this type of assessment.

Law and Eckes (1995) underline the same issue and state that **traditional assessments are single-occasion tests.** Only measure what learners can do at a particular time. However, test scores cannot tell about the progression of students. Similarly, they cannot tell what particular difficulties the students had during the test

Smaldino *et al*. (2000) state that **traditional assessment often focus on learner's ability of memorization and recall,** which are **lower level of cognition skills**. Additionally, traditional assessment tools require learners to display their knowledge in a predetermined way (Brualdi, 1996).

Alternative assessments, on the other hand, assess higher-order thinking skills. Students have the opportunity to demonstrate what they learned. This type of assessment tools focus on the growth and the performance of the student. That is, if a learner fails to perform a given task at a particular time, s/he still has the opportunity to demonstrate his/her ability at a different time and different situation. Since alternative assessment is developed in context and over time, the lecturer has a chance to measure the strengths and weaknesses of the student in a variety of areas and situations (Law and Eckes, 1995)

More authentic assessment tools, such as portfolios, independent projects, journals and so on, let learners express their knowledge on the material in their own ways using various intelligences (Brualdi,1996). According to Gardner, there are eight intelligences (Brualdi): “1.logical-mathematical intelligence, 2.linguistic intelligence, 3. spatial intelligence, 4.musical intelligence, 5.bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, 6.the personal intelligences: a. interpersonal intelligence, b.intrapersonal intelligence, 7. naturalistic intelligence” (1996, online document).

Reeves (2000) believes the emphasis on performance assessment is the ability of learner in applying his/her knowledge and skills to real life simulations. He further states that there are five main points in performance assessment (p. 108):

1. It is focused on **complex learning**,
2. Engages **higher-order thinking** and **problem solving skills**,
3. Stimulates a **wide range of active responses**,
4. Involves **challenging tasks that require multiple steps**,
5. Requires **significant commitments of student time and effort**.

Simonson (2000) discusses the several advantages of alternative assessment.

1. Tend to simulate **real-life contexts.**
2. Learners have **opportunity to practice the authentic activities** that they might encounter in real life. These activities allow them to **transfer their skills to various real world related settings.**
3. **Collaborative working** is encouraged.
4. Alternative assessments **assist lecturers to have a better understanding of student learning** (Winking, 1997). Looking at the student outcomes / products rather than scores can allow instructor to get further insights regarding students’ knowledge and skills (Niguidila, 1993).

References

Brualdi, A. (1998). Implementing performance assessment in the classroom. Practical Assessment, Research &Evaluation, 6(2). Available online: http://ericae.net/pare/getvn.asp?v=6&n=2

Dietel, R. J., Herman, J. L., & Knuth, R. A. (1991). What does research say about assessment? NCREL, Oak Brook. Available online: http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/stw_esys/4assess.htm

Elliott, S. N. (1995). Creating meaningful performance assessments. ERIC Digest E531. EDRS no: ED381985

Law, B. & Eckes, M. (1995). Assessment and ESL. Peguis publishers: Manitoba, Canada

Reeves, T. C. (2000). Alternative assessment approaches for online learning environments in higher education. Educational Computing Research, 3(1) pp. 101-111.

Simonson M., Smaldino, S, Albright, M. and Zvacek, S. (2000). Assessment for distance education (ch 11). *Teaching and Learning at a Distance: Foundations of Distance Education.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Wangsatorntanakhun, J. A. (1997). Designing performance assessments: challenges for three-story intellect [online document]. *Teaching with internet*. Available online: http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Parthenon/8658/

Winking, D. (1997). Critical issue: Ensuring equity with alternative assessments [online document]. NCREL (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory), Oak Brook: IL. Available online: http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/methods/assment/as800.htm

UTM grading system

Posted on October 5, 2016 ·

Marks	Grade	Point
90 - 100	A+	4.00
80 - 89	A	4.00
75 - 79	A-	3.67
70 - 74	B+	3.33
65 - 69	B	3.00
60 - 64	B-	2.67
55 - 59	C+	2.33
50 - 54	C	2.00
45 - 49	C-	1.67
40 - 44	D+	1.33
35 - 39	D	1.00
30 - 34	D-	0.67
00 - 29	E	0