

Curriculum Mapping at the UNR School of Social Work



- “It is unlikely that you will get the curriculum map right the first time (Harden, 2001).”



History of CM at UNR SW

Addressed two main issues:

- 1) Pressures for outcome evaluation for re-accreditation and UNR Assessment Office. Prior assessment tools emphasized process evaluation.
- 2) Need for systematic assessment of curriculum to determine where students were provided breadth & depth of material and where there was redundancy—or particular concern for LOAs and new faculty.



History continued

- Initially faculty members feared CM would be another time-consuming mechanical assessment tool.
- CM became more attractive as faculty perceived it as a tool that could achieve multiple purposes.



Goals of CM

- 1) Outcome assessment that would fulfill requirements of **Program Evaluation**.
- 2) Systematic information for **Instructors** about what material was taught in each class, and at what level of depth.
- 3) This information can be shared with **Community Stakeholders** (future employers)
- 4) and with **Students**.



Inductive Approach to CM

- In contrast to HDFS, SW began by assessing what was currently taught in each class in relation to the SLO established by our accrediting body.
- This approach fit the needs of the faculty.
“Start where the faculty is at.”



CM Instrument

- Learning objectives on the left-hand side of the CM. All student learning objectives were listed for each course.
- Bloom's taxonomy across the top to measure depth of processing



Student Input in CM

Recall the 3 perspectives of CM assessment:

- 1) Written (“fictional”) curriculum
- 2) Taught (teacher experience of what was taught)
- 3) Received (student experience of what was taught)



Administration of CM

- Instructors completed CM for each course they taught in the required CM curriculum.
- Students completed the same CM instrument for each applicable course.
- CM tools for both students and instructors were included with end of semester STE.
- The CM tools for students and instructors were identical.



Lessons Learned

- 1) CM is a process as well as an assessment tool.
 - CM is used to collect quantitative data but the communication that it elicits among faculty and students is equally beneficial.
 - CM highlights the conceptual underpinnings of a program. Reaching agreement and understanding of these goals and priorities is a lengthy and dynamic process.



Lessons Learned continued

2) Unanticipated value judgments were made about Bloom's taxonomy

- Students gave high ratings on Bloom's taxonomy if they liked the instructor
- Instructors wanted to be given high ratings on Bloom's taxonomy



Lessons Learned continued

- 3) Methodological problems call into question the validity of our CM data.
- Time administration of the CM tool so that students do not have assessment fatigue
 - Identify one individual to administer CM
 - Need clearer operationalization of Bloom's taxonomy
 - Limit learning objectives listed on each CM instrument to those we have empirically found addressed in each course.

