Program Assessment Annual Report Template

**Part I: Program Assessment Information**

Assessment Period (Academic Year): *2017-2018* [ ]

*2018-2019* [ ]

*2019-2020* [ ]

College:

Department:

Program(s) / Outcomes assessed:

 Program A:

 PLO #1:

 PLO# 2:

 Program B:

 PLO #1:

Submitted By Chair: Name, title Date Submitted:

Reviewed By: Reviewer Name, title Date Reviewed:

Reviewed By: Reviewer Name, title Date Reviewed:

**Part II: PLO Assessment Report**

Please fill out for each PLO assessed during the assessment period. If no PLO is assessed, please skip to Part III.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program:  |  |
| PLO # 1 | *Ex) Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and respond to …...* |
| Assessment Measure(s):  | Information to include: Direct or Indirect, Measure types, Source, Date/SemesterEx) Direct #1, Written assignment, ECON 401, Fall 2017,  Direct #2, Subfield score on ETS Exam, External, exam date - 10/27/2017 |
| Targets, Standards, or Benchmarks: | Ex) At least 70% of the students score 80 or higher on the direct measure #1.The target average subfield score of the ETS exam is 165.  |
| Summary Data Results:  | Total Number of Students assessed:#, % of students met Target, Standards, or Benchmark: |
| Review / Analysis: |  |
| Recommendation for Improvement: |  |
| Action Plan for next assessment period: |  |
| Review, Analysis, and Plan by: | Name(s), title(s)Date:  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program: |  |
| PLO # 2 | *Ex) Students will be able to* *explain …* |
| Assessment Measure(s):  | Information to include: Direct or Indirect, Measure types, Source, Date/SemesterEx) Direct #1, Written assignment, ECON 401, Fall 2017,  Direct #2, Subfield score on ETS Exam, External, exam date - 10/27/2017 |
| Target, Standards, or Benchmark: | Ex) At least 70% of the students score 80 or higher on the direct measure #1.The target average subfield score of the ETS exam is 165.  |
| Summary Data Results:  | Total Number of Students assessed:#, % of students met Target, Standards, or Benchmark: |
| Review / Analysis: |  |
| Recommendation for Improvement: |  |
| Action Plan for next assessment period: |  |
| Review, Analysis, and Plan by: | Name(s), title(s)Date:  |

**Part III: Closing the Loop**

1. Please describe of the improvement(s) in the Program Learning Outcome results within the past 2 years, comparing the results from prior assessment periods. Please include actions taken during the reporting period.
2. Please describe the issues, concerns, and other barriers from prior or current assessment periods and how they were resolved to advance the assessment of the program learning outcomes.

**Glossary**

For the purposes of this process, we use the following common definitions for assessment terminology:

1. Institutional Learner Outcome (ILO) – FHSU will establish the general education learner outcomes as its institutional learner outcomes. These outcomes will be measurable, have a direct assessment associated with it, and be measured on a periodic basis systematically in a manner proposed by the General Education Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate.
2. Program Learner Outcome (PLO) – a measurable outcome associated with a particular approved degree program, it’s associated major, and possibly, concentration.
3. Course Learner Outcome (CLO) – a measurable outcome associated with a particular course offered in the curriculum within a degree program.
4. Degree Program – one of the officially approved degree programs at FHSU found on the Kansas Board of Regents program inventory. For example, BBA in Accounting. Note that a major is not the same thing as a degree program and multiple majors may exist for the same degree program. For example, the Bachelor of Science degree has multiple majors throughout the university.
5. Concentration – also known as a minor. Technically, comprises a minimum of 21 hours at the bachelor’s level and 12 hours at the master’s level. A degree program and major may have multiple concentrations.
6. Learning Goals/Objectives – goals and objectives are often used on syllabi. In general, they do not include a measurable component and are not associated with an assessment. Learner outcomes are preferable for assessment.
7. Curriculum Mapping - a process to address a set of learning outcomes with a curriculum. The process helps to identify and to address academic gaps, redundancies, and misalignments for purposes of improving the overall coherence and its effectiveness of a course of study. It can also be used to identify where a learning outcome assessment can be planted in the series of courses.

A curricular mapping example is provided below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Courses\PLO | PLO1 | PLO2 | PLO3 | PLO4 | PLO5 |
| Course 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Course 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Course 3 | 2 |  | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Course 4 | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Course 5 |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |

1=introducing, 2= developing, 3=fulfilling

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Courses\PLO | PLO1 | PLO2 | PLO3 | PLO4 | PLO5 |
| Course 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| CLO1 | x |  | x |  | x |
| CLO2 |  | x |  |  |  |
| CLO3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLO1 | x |  | x |  |  |
| CLO2 |  | x | x |  |  |
| CLO3 |  | x |  | x |  |
| Course 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLO1 | x |  | x |  |  |
| CLO2 |  |  | x | x | x |
| CLO3 | x |  | x | x |  |
| Course 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLO1 | x |  |  |  |  |
| CLO2 | x |  |  | x |  |
| CLO3 |  | x |  | x |  |
| Course 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLO1 |  | x |  |  | x |
| CLO2 |  | x |  |  | x |
| CLO3 |  | x |  |  | x |

CLO: Course Learning Outcomes.

1. Assessment Planning – a process of identifying the course, learning activities, tools and methods, and standards that will enable measurement of the individual student achievement of each outcome. An example is provided below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Assessment Measure(s) | Targets, Standards, or Benchmarks | Source of Assessment:Embedded (courses) or External | Time line |
| PLO1 | Presentation | 85/100 | Course 2 | Fall 2018 |
| PLO2 | Mid Term part A | 45/50 | Course 3 | Fall 2018 |
| PLO3 | Final Exam part B (Question 7 -12) | 45/50 | Course 3 | Spring 2019 |
| PLO4 | A presentation | 85/100 | Course 4 | Fall 2019 |
| PLO5 | A term paper | 80/100 | Course 5 | Spring 2020 |

**Annual Process Timelines**

* Beginning of Spring semester: The routine cycle of yearly assessment of PLOs begins with the close-the-loop process where faculty review and analyze the assessment data from the previous assessment period (Spring, Summer, Fall semesters). Faculty identify the program learning outcomes to assess for the year and conduct or adjust the assessment planning.
* Annual Program Assessment Report Due the week before Spring Break.
* During Spring, Summer, Fall semesters: The course-embedded or external assessments are implemented according to the assessment planning worksheets. Faculty submits the assessment data from either Blackboard or Tk20 to program assessment coordinators to prepare and collect program learning outcome assessment report.

**Best Practice Tips**

1. Clearly communicate the necessity of identifying and systematically collecting program learning outcome data as an HLC AQIP institution. AQIP is based on the principle of continuous quality improvement. Institutions must show processes that are embedded throughout the institution, data collection on these processes, and then the interpretation of these data to make improvements. Communicate that the process we have chosen to use for this process is good practice across many AQIP institutions and is independent of an executive leadership change at the institution. It is unlikely that executive change will force units and faculty to divert to a different assessment process.

2. Departments should identify 5-12 learner outcomes per degree program. Fewer program learner outcomes chosen is better in order to control the amount of assessment work required. In degree programs and majors with multiple concentrations, departments should make decisions about whether or not to measure the concentration or not. However, concentration related program learner outcomes should be restricted to no more than 2 or 3 of the total program learner outcomes chosen for assessment.

3. Avoid the temptation to “over measure.” The breadth across all programs rather than the depth of our assessment process in the institutions is of greater concern to inform improvement. Minimize the number of assessments chosen to inform an outcome. Keep things simple. A single direct measurement is all that is required to measure a program learning outcome. Departments may want to focus upon courses identified as level 3 (“fulfilling”) for purposes of assessment planning.

4. Consider a 2-year cycle for program learning outcomes that will align with the institution’s 6-year program review process. In theory, programs will then have 3 cycles of data to reflect upon for continuous quality improvement in between each program review.

5. Constructing appropriate and measurable program learning outcomes is a critical step as departments begin this work. Be sure to use some form of Bloom’s Taxonomy for guidance.

6. Blackboard and TK20 have been identified as the primary systems we will use to document and archive program learning outcome results. All learning outcomes, curriculum mapping, assessment plans, and program learning outcome data will be loaded to TK20.

If you have any question, please contact Sangki Min at IEQI office, x4540, s\_min2@fhsu.edu.