



The Course Progress Hub Reveals an Assessment Pattern

A notable portion of students are flagged on a specific assessment or within a specific course section - at rates that suggest a pattern beyond individual student difficulty:

- Average is below 60%
- Fail rate is over 20%



STEP ONE
Finding the Pattern

Changes cannot be made in silos, therefore, if an assessment needs revisiting, faculty should work with the program coordinator and the program team during the course editing process. Faculty who observe high signal rates on an assessment should communicate this to the program coordinator.

Reflect on the following:

Varied Assessments Were different types of evaluations provided; was choice offered to students.	Expectations Were there clear assessment instructions; were rubrics provided; clear submission requirements	Language Was there clear structure and wording for quiz/exam; were CLOS aligned; direct and concise.
Alignment Was assessment aligned to course content; reflects level of cognitive thinking appropriate for semester.	Practice Were there opportunities to practice skills and knowledge via low stakes learning activities.	Scaffold Was knowledge scaffolded and had actionable and meaningful feedback, allowing students to adapt.
Classroom Environment Ways learners are building confidence in safe classroom spaces; learning through actions.	Workload Were challenges appearing with cumulative workload across multiple courses.	Weight Does percentage weight match time asked of students to commit to evaluation.
Active Learning What active learning strategies were used; was engagement scaffolded to build confidence.	Authenticity Was the assessment authentic to industry.	



STEP TWO
Program Team Review (Recommended)

Faculty who observe high signal rates on an assessment may find it helpful to connect with their program coordinator and program team, as the assessment flag may reflect a broader concern across sections or within the program.

Some ways in which the program team can collaboratively assess the signaled assessment can include:

- Cumulative workload
- Historical Patterns
- Assessment alignment



STEP THREE
Action

This may include:

- Change assessment(s) or rubric(s)
- Redistribute workload across the semester
- Introduce scaffolding or formative checkpoints
- Adjust prerequisites



STEP FOUR
Connect with the CTL

If curricular design is warranted, program teams and faculty are encouraged to connect with the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) for consultation on assessment design, pedagogy, and alignment with evidence-based practice.

PATTERN PERSISTS AFTER INTERVENTION?

NO

YES

RESOLVED
Pattern Addressed

Continue monitoring via Course Progress Hub.

UNRESOLVED
Escalate

During APR/PAC/CPR. Persistent patterns should become a formal systemic review item.

Tips

WHY PROGRAM-LEVEL, NOT INDIVIDUAL?

Curricular challenges are frequently cumulative rather than independent. A student struggling in one course may be experiencing compounding difficulty across several. Program team review solutions account for the student's full program experience and draw on the expertise of the full teaching team - not left to individual faculty to resolve in isolation.

STANDING AGENDA ITEM

Widget data should be shared routinely at program team meetings - not only when individual faculty escalate.

CTL AS PARTNER

When redesign is needed, CTL can provide evidence-based consultation on assessment, pedagogy, and curriculum alignment.

