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Program Assessment Report Template

Submission Deadline: October 31, 2022

to Office of Academic Excellence

This is the template for program assessment of data collected during 2021-2022 academic year. The template ensures that programs are planning for, collecting and analyzing, and engaging with assessment data.

**1.D.4** The institution’s **processes** and methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity.

**1.C.7** The institution **uses** the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously **improve** student learning outcomes.

NWCCU Standards were updated in Jan. 2020 and include student learning outcomes, student success and achievement measures. Student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).

## What you Did – The Plan

**Section 1 – Program Mission and Educational Objectives**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions offer “programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission” (1.C.1.)

In this section, list the following:

* **Program Mission:** What is the purpose of the degree program? What professional and lifelong opportunities does it prepare students for? Where is it anticipated that graduates end up – both immediately after graduation and 5-10 years out?
* **Mission Alignment:** How is the program’s mission aligned with the university mission to offer “innovative, professionally-focused undergraduate and graduate degree programs,” providing a “hands-on, project based learning environment.”

**Section 2 – Program Student Learning Outcomes**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that programs must “culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes.” (1.C.1.)

In this section, list the following:

* **PSLOs:** What are the 5-10 program student learning outcomes – the key skills, supported and scaffolded across the program, which graduates will need to be able to demonstrate by graduation in order to successfully pursue the professional directions described the program’s mission statement?
* Must be measurable and actionable.
* Must be linked to external sources such as accreditation or ESLOs
* Resources on Bloom’s Taxonomy: <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/coursedev/models/id/taxonomy/#table>
* Resources on program student learning outcomes:
	+ <https://manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment/howto/outcomes.htm>
	+ <https://www.jmu.edu/assessment/_files/How%20to%20Write%20Clear%20Objectives.pdf>
	+ <https://www.jmu.edu/assessment/_files/Objectives%20Made%20Easy.pdf>

**Section 3 – Curriculum Map**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation requires that programs must demonstrate “an appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning” of student learning outcomes. (1.C.2)

* **Curriculum Map:** How are each of your program student learning outcomes (and institutional ISLO’s) supported and scaffolded throughout the program’s curriculum?

To address this, please complete this table with program’s curriculum map, with identification of how each PSLO and ISLO appears within the courses in the curriculum at the **Foundation** (Introduction), **Practice** (Reinforcement and Application) and **Capstone** (Synthesis) levels.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **University** | **ISLO****1 - Communication** | **ISLO****2 – Inquiry & Analysis** | **ISLO****3 – Ethical Reasoning** | **ISLO****4 – Quantitative Literacy** | **ISLO****5 - Teamwork** | **ISLO****6 – Diverse Perspectives** |  |  |
| **Program** | **PSLO 1** | **PSLO 2** |  | **PSLO3** |  |  | **PSLO4** | **PSLO5** |
| **COURSE** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MATH 111 |  |  | F |  |  | P |  |  |
| WRI 121 | F |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| SPE 111 | F |  |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| ENGR 101 | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CIV 100 |  | P |  |  | C |  |  | C |

**Section 4 – Assessment Cycle**

In this section, please complete this table to show which courses (and, where known, what assignments) are used to assess all PSLO and ISLO in a **three-year cycle**.

Although some programs may have compelling reasons to adopt a different cycle, assessment of program learning outcomes should follow a three-year cycle, with the intention that improvements prompted by one year’s assessment should be designed and implemented during the two years prior to the next scheduled assessment of that outcome. If an alternative cycle is adopted, a clear description of the activities occurring in each year of the cycle should be described.

This content should remain relatively static from year to year, although it should be extended by at least one year (and the old year dropped off) each time a new report is submitted.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ISLO** | **PSLO** | **2021-2022** | **2022-2023** | **2023-2024** |
| **Communication** | **PSLO 1** | Class 1Class 2 |  |  |
| **Ethics** | **PSLO 2** | Class 1Class 2 |  |  |
| **Teamwork** |  | Class 1Class 2 |  |  |
| **Diversity** |  |  | Class 1Class 2 |  |
| **Inquiry and Analysis** |  |  |  | Class 1Class 2 |
| **Quantitative Literacy** | **PSLO3** |  |  | Class 1Class 2 |
|  | **PSLO4** |  |  |  |
|  | **PSLO5** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Section 5 – Assessment Data Collection Processes**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions engage in “an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs” that “recognizes the central role of faculty in establishing quality, assessing student learning, and improving instructional programs.” (1.C.5.)

In this section, explain the rules for the sample collection process for student work that is to be evaluated this year. Include the following information:

* **Performance Target**: Specify the standard of success for number of students performing acceptably on the assignment that indicates that the course has met the outcome for the program. Example: 75% of students scoring 3 or higher
* **Activity**: For the courses indicated by the curriculum map for collection and analysis of student data this year, name the activity. May include a description of the assignment in the appendix for continuity.
* **Sample**: List the number of student artifacts (number or percentage of class) were assessed in each activity.
* **Reliability**: Describe briefly who was involved in the scoring, and how it was kept consistent across multiple locations or instructors if applicable.
* **Rubric**: Indicate the performance target for acceptable performance on the assignment for a single student. If not multiple choice assignment, include a rubric for the grading in the appendix for the activity.

# What you Found – The data

**Section 6 – Assessment Data**

In this section, fill in the data for **2021-2022** academic year with: Graduation, Retention, Persistence, DFWI, Post Grad Success, Equity Gaps, PSLO, ESLO and Indirect data from external sources and/or student exit survey.

*Note: Action targets for graduation, retention and DFWI are listed as previous year’s University average.*

(suggested formatting)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Criteria** | **Assessment Methods** | **Performance Target** | **Results** | **Met?** |
| PSLO1-Communication | Assignments in Classes assessed  | 75% of students scoring 3 or higher | 63% - Loc, Class, N | No |
| PSLO2-Ethics | Assignments in Classes assessed | 75% of students scoring 3 or higher | 100% -Loc, Class, N | Yes |
| Teamwork | Assignments in Classes assessed | 75% of students scoring 3 or higher | 100% - Loc, Class, N | Yes |
| Graduation Rate | University Dashboard | 6-year rate >50% | 92% | Yes |
| Retention | University Dashboard | 1-year rate >75% | 89% | Yes |
| Certification  | Accreditor’s report | 1-year >75% | 70% | No |
| DFWI | University Dashboard | All program <12% | 2% | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* **History of Results**: 3-years (or more) of data from previous reports on these outcomes should be looked at for trends.
	+ Discussion of Indirect data.

**Evidence of Improvement in Student Learning**

 Look back on the last time you assessed these outcomes. Were plans implemented then successful? Example table:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Criteria** | **Previous Action Plan** | **Previous Data** | **Current Data** | **Interpretation** |
| PSLO1-ESLO1 | None Indicated | **80%** | 63%  |  |
| PSLO2-ESLO2 | The assignment will be changed in the following ways. | 70% | 100% | Success |
| Graduation Rate | None Indicated | 87% | 92% |  |
| Retention | None Indicated | 76% | 89% |  |
| Certification  | Faculty deep dive evaluation of certification criteria. | 68% | 70% | More data needed |
| DFWI | None Indicated | 3% | 2% |  |

# How are you using the data? – Action

**Section 7 – Data-driven Action Plans:**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions “uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning support planning and practices.”(1.C.7.)

Describe actions that need to be taken in the coming year.

* Every program should, based on assessment data, identify at least one area to focus on for improvement during 2022-2023 academic year stemming from these assessment results. Criteria for evaluation of success of action plans is determined and listed with the action plan.
	+ Performance **below target** threshold should trigger action. Consider improvements both to PSLO and ISLO performance from student work product.
	+ Identify **gaps in equity** of student performance in course work or at the higher level outcomes of graduation, retention or post-graduation success.
* **Faculty Discussion:** Interpret trends in the program given all of the data from 2021-2022.
	+ Identify other actions that need to be taken by the program.
	+ Identify resources that need to be allocated to the action plans.

Look backwards: Discuss last year’s action plans.

1. Did you implement the changes you stated in previous years’ program assessment report?

2. What additional changes and improvements overall did you make in your program last year?

3. What changes in budget or resource allocations did you make in your program last year and why (i.e. new faculty, new equipment, etc.)?

4. What curriculum changes did you do in your program this last year and why?

5. What improvements do you plan this next year that will impact job success, curriculum improvements, even better alignment with industry needs and resource allocations? What data do you need to collect this next year to help support decisions for improvements you want for your program?

6. What are your greatest student success and achievement stories that you have had in the last year?

**Section 8 – Closing the Loop: Reflection on previous work**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions provide evidence of “continuous improvement of student learning.” (1.C.7.)

* **Improvements in Assessment Process:** What improvements will be made to the assessment process? What indicated that this change should be made? How will they yield better, more actionable information?
* **Faculty Discussion:** Summarize takeaways from all data in this report regarding program performance. How, when, to who were results presented discussed by program faculty? May include meeting minutes from when faculty evaluated assessment data and other meetings where assessment data were presented in the appendix.

|  |
| --- |
| Program Assessment Report Feedback |
| *2020-21 Assessment Report* |
| **Program:**  |
| **Department Chair:**  |
| **Program Assessment Report Author:** |  |
|  **Rubric Measure** | **Well Developed, Progressing or Not included.** |
| Program mission is aligned to University Mission |  |
| Educational Objectives Wording is Actionable |  |
| PSLO's are justified by Professional Standards |  |
| PSLO'S are aligned to ISLO |  |
| Curriculum Map: Scaffolding indicates Foundational, Practice, and Capstone Assessments by course |  |
| Assessment Cycle is three years to cover all PSLO and ISLO |  |
| Actions taken by programs on assessment during each year of the cycle are specified |  |
| During collection year, courses/assignments are specified that align to PSLO at FP&C levels |  |
| Rubric: Criteria for grading the assignment is described (appendix) |  |
| Sample: Number of samples reviewed is specified |  |
| Reliability: Reviewer and locations of the assignment are specified |  |
| Performance Targets of acceptability are indicated |  |
| Results include: Graduation, Retention, Persistence, DFWI, Post Grad Success, Equity Gaps, PSLO, ISLO |  |
| Interpretation: Current results are compared against performance targets |  |
| Interpretation: Current results are compared against previous 3 years of data |  |
| Interpretation: Current results are compared against University data |  |
| Action drivers: Items not meeting performance targets have actions planned |  |
| Action drivers: Additional action plans for overall department improvement are indicated |  |
| Action plans: Specifics of accountability and timelines are indicated |  |
| Action plans: Actions are linked to budgetary decisions |  |
| Faculty discuss trends in the data |  |
| Faculty discuss previous action plan success given new data |  |
| Faculty discuss the assessment process and make any improvements necessary |  |