

**The Insight**

The methods used for assessment can shape the internalized learning educators desire students to achieve.

**Implications**

The use of multiple assessments for each course outcome requires educators to develop meaningful, valid assessment tools using differing methods that allow students to demonstrate their learning in various ways.

“Allowing students to demonstrate learning on a given outcome in multiple ways provides educators with several points of reference useful to validate the dimension of students’ internalized learning.”

**Will This Be On The Test?**

“Will this be on the test?” “Will the final exam cover the whole semester?” Sound familiar? One of the greatest challenges each educator faces is to motivate students to transition from memorizing information to pass the test or exam, to internalizing the information into useful, applicable knowledge.

The methods used for assessment can shape this internalized learning we desire students to achieve. Through use of multiple methods of assessment to measure an expected outcome, we provide students opportunity to express their knowledge in various contexts. Multiple assessment methods demonstrate how we, as educators, value the dimensionality of learning and the diverse ways different learners may best express their learning.

Researchers strive to triangulate findings to prove reliability and validity. Allowing students to demonstrate learning on a given outcome in multiple ways provides educators with several points of reference useful to validate the dimension of students’ internalized learning. Assessment methods include:

- Quantitative Assessment
- Qualitative Assessment
- Direct Assessment
- Indirect Assessment
- Formative Assessment
- Summative Assessment

Quantitative assessment may be through report of the number right and wrong on a quiz, while qualitative assessment may report translation of knowledge through student interaction or reaction to a given scenario, such as observing a student in a simulation setting, or participation in a debate. Direct assessment requires the student to produce a product, perhaps write a paper or build a model, while indirect assessment may be through student responses to an end-of-semester course evaluation.

Formative assessment allows determination of learning during a moment of time in a course, perhaps through in-class table discussions or reflective writing, while summative assessment prompts students to demonstrate cumulative course learning. Formative assessment results are invaluable in assisting educators to know when and where to adjust a method of delivery for a particular class section. These results will also help in identification of students who may require additional guidance to aid their chance for course success.

While the type(s) of assessment used should be designed to align with the objectives, the use of multiple methods of assessment for each course outcome allows several opportunities for a student to demonstrate his/her level of knowledge and understanding, and provides educators with valuable evidence to validate a student’s level of internalized learning.  
Source: Maki, Peggy, 2004, *Assessing for learning: building a sustainable commitment across the institution*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., AAHE