<h1 style="text-align:center">Program Assessment Annual Report Template</h1>

Instructions:

1. Please submit a separate annual assessment report for each program in your department.
2. All program learning outcomes in each program are assessed following a one or two-year cycle.
3. An annual assessment period each year is an Academic year, Fall - Spring – Summer.
4. The annual program assessment report is due the Fall semester *(November 15th)* reporting on results from the previous Academic Year.

Part I: Program Assessment Information

Assessment Period (Academic Year): *2022*

College:

Department:

Program:

Program Learning Outcomes assessed: Please list all program learning outcomes assessed during the last assessment period. If no assessment was conducted, please proceed to Part III.2.

PLO #1:

PLO# 2:

PLO #3:

Curriculum Map:
Please provide a curriculum map addressing where in your program the above learning outcomes are addressed as well as assessed in the curriculum.

Courses\PLO	PLO1	PLO2	PLO3	PLO4	PLO5
Course 1	1	1/2	1		1
Course 2	1	3	2	1	
Course 3	2		3**A**	2	2
Course 4	3**A**			3**A**	
Course 5		3**A**			3**A**

1=introducing, 2= developing, 3=fulfilling

Mark with the letter "**A**" where the PLO will be assessed

Submitted By: Name, title   Date Submitted: _____
Reviewed By: Reviewer name, title   Date Reviewed: _____

Part II: PLO Assessment Report

Please fill out one table for each PLO assessed during the assessment period. If no PLO is assessed, please skip to Part III.2.

Title of the 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/Semester Ex) 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.
Data Results:	Total Number of Students assessed: #, % of students met Target, Standards, or Benchmark:
Review / Analysis:	
Changes needed for Improvement:	
Action Plan for next assessment period:	
Review, Analysis, and Plan by:	Name(s), title(s) Date:

Title of the Program:	
PLO # 2	*Ex) Students will be able to explain …*
Assessment Measure(s):	Information to include: Direct or Indirect, Measure types, Source, Date/Semester Ex) 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:	
Changes needed 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 the improvement(s) in the Program Learning Outcome results 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. These outcomes are currently refered to as the FHSU Core and can be reviewed at the following website: https://www.fhsu.edu/liberaleducation/core
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.

8. <u>Assessment Planning</u> – 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 the Fall 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 academic year (Fall, Spring, Summer semesters). Faculty identify the program learning outcomes to assess for the upcoming academic year and conduct or adjust their assessment plan.
- Annual Program Assessment Report Due Mid-November, reporting on the previous Academic Year's results.
- During Fall, Spring, Summer semesters: The course-embedded or external assessments are implemented according to the assessment planning worksheets. Faculty submits the assessment data from either Blackboard or AEFIS 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 accredited institution. HLC Criterion 4 of Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement states: "The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement." More specificially, HLC Criterion 4.B outlines "The institution engages in ongoing assessment of student learning as part of its commitment to the educational outcomes of its students." 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 a good practice across many 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 current 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 AEFIS have been identified as the primary systems we will use to collect, document, and archive program learning outcome results. All learning outcomes, curriculum mapping, assessment plans, and program learning outcome data can be loaded into AEFIS to ease the collection and reporting expectations of your assessment process.

If you have any questions, please reach-out to Andrew Cutright, the Interium Director of University Assessment, at x4540, Sheridan Hall 214, or abcutright@fhsu.edu

Finally, as part of the University's initiative to enhance student success and embrace a culture of student learning assessment, the University has established two awards stemming from program's efforts and participation in their assessment process: *1) The advancing assessment award; 2) The Cloosing-of-the-Loop award*. Each of these awards are presented annually at Spring Convocation and come with both recognition received as well as a monetary award to your program's department. In order to be eligible for the award your program must submit your annual program assessment report to the Department of Assessment *(abcutright@fhsu.edu)* prior to the submission deadline of November 15th. To help you better understand how these award winners are determined, the University Assessment Committee would like to make available the Program Assessment Report Rubric to better help faculty connect to the items their reports will be assessed on. You can find the Program Assessment Report Rubric on the following page.

Assessment Award Rubric

Name

Description Description here.

Rubric Detail

Levels of Achievement

Criteria	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Number of PLOs measured	**0 Points** None measured	**2 Points** 1 or 2 pilot stage	**4 Points** Multiple PLOs measured beyond pilot stage.	**6 Points** At least half of the PLOs are measured and scheduled to be assessed 1 or 2 year cycle.
Assessment Measures	**0 Points** Missing contents.	**2 Points** Measures are generally not appropriate or not well suited to assess the specified outcome.	**4 Points** Majority of measures are likely to generate valid and relevant data for the specified outcome.	**6 Points** All measures are likely to generate valid and relevant data.
Targets and Benchmarks	**0 Points** Missing contents.	**2 Points** Targets and benchmarks frequently do not reflect the appropriate level of student learning	**4 Points** Majority of targets and benchmarks effectively reflect the appropriate level of student learning.	**6 Points** All targets and benchmarks that are rigorous and leave rooms for improvement in student learning
Result Data	**0 Points** Missing contents.	**2 Points** Data frequently seems to lack validity or may not be useful as the basis of curriculum decisions.	**4 Points** Majority of data appears to be valid and useful.	**6 Points** All data appears to be valid and useful for making appropriate decisions with confidence.
Review and Analysis	**0 Points** Missing contents.	**2 Points** Review and analysis is cursory or misapplied.	**4 Points** Review and analysis is detailed and meaningful.	**6 Points** Review and analysis is done collaboratively and shared internally and/or with appropriate constituents.
Area of Improvement	**0 Points** Missing contents.	**2 Points** Areas of improvement lack significant relation to the assessment results.	**4 Points** Assessment results used to identify areas of improvement, but proposed curriculum change lacks detail.	**6 Points** Decisions for curriculum change are detailed and based on the assessment data and analysis.
Action Plan for next year	**0 Points** Missing contents.	**2 Points** Action plan lacks specificity.	**4 Points** Action plan is clearly specified.	**6 Points** Action plan is detailed and likely to be successful.
Closing the Loop Part I and II	**0 Points** Missing contents.	**2 Points** Review of process lacks insightful or detailed examination of assessment process and results.	**4 Points** Summarizes overall assessment results and process in detail.	**6 Points** Overall assessment results and processes have been reviewed, compared to previous assessment results, and reflected to improve their effectiveness and/or efficiency with sufficient engagement from faculty, as appropriate.