2009-2010 Annual Assessment Update Graduate Results

The Annual Assessment Update was implemented in academic year 2003-2004. This assessment requires that each academic program in the university submit an Annual Update Form at the end of the academic year reporting on two assessment activities that have been undertaken that year. The format of the Annual Update Form calls for 1) an explanation of the assessment methods, 2) the student learning outcomes addressed by the methods, 3) evidence of findings, and 4) use of assessment results. In 2007, the University Assessment Panel (UAP) set the target for success as a 100% compliance rate in regards to submitting the Annual Update Forms. Likewise, the UAP set the target for success in each of the four sections of the Annual Update Forms at 100%. As shown in Table 1, compliance with the Annual Assessment Update steadily increased over the first three years and reached the UAP’s target of 100 % the past four years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of Submissions</th>
<th>Total Number of Graduate Programs</th>
<th>Percent Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an attempt to simplify the Annual Assessment Update submission process, the Office of Assessment Services (OAS) partnered with the College of Health and Human Sciences and the College of Business to collect Annual Update Forms online using Blackboard Content Collection. Approval of the Annual Assessment Updates at both the college and departmental levels, and all feedback provided by the OAS for review, can be accessed and stored using the Blackboard website. OAS plans to incorporate the remaining four colleges into the online submission process next year as the online submission process has allowed for a more timely, systematic, and transparent assessment process.

Upon their submission, the Annual Update Forms are reviewed by the Director of Assessment Services and other OAS staff. A standardized checklist for review is used to provide feedback to academic programs on their assessment efforts. Two additional criteria were added to the checklist in academic year 2006-2007 in order to encourage greater specificity in the description of the methods and the measurement of student learning outcomes (see Appendix A for a list of the Annual Assessment Update criteria).

A tracking database has been developed and maintained that includes tracking and feedback for the Annual Assessment Updates. This database allows for the reporting of summary assessment data, including the percent of criteria that were met as well as the percent of programs that met the criteria in each of the four sections. These data are presented in Tables 2 and 3, respectively.
Table 2: Percent of Criteria Met by Graduate Programs for each Annual Assessment Update Area for Academic Years 2006-2007 through 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Use of Results</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent met includes both “Met” and “Partially Met” for the 15 criteria on the Annual Update Checklist.

As indicated in Table 2, for graduate programs across the university, the percent of criteria that were met or partially met for each of the four sections over the past five years has generally increased. Results indicate that for 2009-2010, the only decline in assessment practices among graduate programs across the university was a minor decrease (1%) in the presentation of data (Evidence). The sections that saw increases were the Methods, Student Learning Outcomes, and Use of Results sections. These increases can be attributed, in part, to the Office of Assessment Services’ increased support of assessment practices and an increased culture of assessment across the university.

While the percent of criteria that were met in each of the four sections seems to indicate that a majority of graduate programs are performing at a satisfactory level, the results below in Table 3 indicate that more progress needs to be made within each of the individual programs. The percent of academic programs that have met the criteria in each of the four areas has generally increased over the past five years. However, review of the Annual Update Checklists indicates that there is still room for improvement in several areas. Only 19 programs are currently meeting the UAP’s target for success set at 100 percent (up from one last year). Several graduate programs should be commended for the vast improvement they have made in meeting the criteria for each Annual Assessment Update area over the past year (up from 38 percent in 2006-2007 to 77 percent in 2007-2008). Review of the Annual Update Checklists further revealed that there is a need for greater continuity across each of the assessment components. This report includes specific results regarding individual criteria that received ratings of met, partially met, and unmet in each of the four areas for graduate programs across the total university, as well as aggregate ratings by college.

Table 3: Percent of Graduate Programs Meeting the Criteria for each Annual Assessment Update Area for Academic Years 2006-2007 through 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Use of Results</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percent met includes both “Met” and “Partially Met” for the 15 criteria on the Annual Update Checklist.

The Office of Assessment Services is always looking for input on how to improve the Annual Update report and submission process. Recently, we have incorporated changes to the submission form itself in response to university input and next year we plan to do 100% of the submissions online via Blackboard. This year OAS is interested in using the compiled results to help determine how we can duplicate this year’s dramatic increase in overall scores and any input regarding this area of interest would be welcomed.
Note. Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the Learning Outcomes; Criterion 4: Methods are clearly defined; Criterion 5: Methods listed are appropriate means of assessment; Criterion 6: Surveys, rubrics, and/or other assessment tools are included as appropriate.
Note. Criterion 1: Learning Outcomes are clearly stated; Criterion 2: Learning Outcomes are measurable; Criterion 3: Learning Outcomes include a numeric target for success.

Note. Criterion 1: A summary of the data from each assessment method is provided; Criterion 2: Data provided are relevant to the assessment method; Criterion 3: Data provided are stated in measurable terms as defined by “Learning Outcomes”.

Note. Criterion 1: Results used are relevant to the findings mentioned in “Evidence”; Criterion 2: Results used are in an effort to improve/maintain the program as indicated by assessment; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
Note: Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the Learning Outcomes; Criterion 4: Methods are clearly defined; Criterion 5: Methods listed are appropriate means of assessment; Criterion 6: Surveys, rubrics, and/or other assessment tools are included as appropriate.
Note. Criterion 1: Learning Outcomes are clearly stated; Criterion 2: Learning Outcomes are measurable; Criterion 3: Learning Outcomes include a numeric target for success

Note. Criterion 1: A summary of the data from each assessment method is provided; Criterion 2: Data provided are relevant to the assessment method; Criterion 3: Data provided are stated in measurable terms as defined by “Learning Outcomes”

Note. Criterion 1: Results used are relevant to the findings mentioned in “Evidence”; Criterion 2: Results used are in an effort to improve/maintain the program as indicated by assessment; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes
Note. Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the Learning Outcomes; Criterion 4: Methods are clearly defined; Criterion 5: Methods listed are appropriate means of assessment; Criterion 6: Surveys, rubrics, and/or other assessment tools are included as appropriate.
Note. Criterion 1: Learning Outcomes are clearly stated; Criterion 2: Learning Outcomes are measurable; Criterion 3: Learning Outcomes include a numeric target for success.

Note. Criterion 1: A summary of the data from each assessment method is provided; Criterion 2: Data provided are relevant to the assessment method; Criterion 3: Data provided are stated in measurable terms as defined by “Learning Outcomes.”

Note. Criterion 1: Results used are relevant to the findings mentioned in “Evidence”; Criterion 2: Results used are in an effort to improve/maintain the program as indicated by assessment; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
Note. Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the Learning Outcomes; Criterion 4: Methods are clearly defined; Criterion 5: Methods listed are appropriate means of assessment; Criterion 6: Surveys, rubrics, and/or other assessment tools are included as appropriate.
Note. Criterion 1: Learning Outcomes are clearly stated; Criterion 2: Learning Outcomes are measurable; Criterion 3: Learning Outcomes include a numeric target for success

Note. Criterion 1: A summary of the data from each assessment method is provided; Criterion 2: Data provided are relevant to the assessment method; Criterion 3: Data provided are stated in measurable terms as defined by “Learning Outcomes”

Note. Criterion 1: Results used are relevant to the findings mentioned in “Evidence”; Criterion 2: Results used are in an effort to improve/maintain the program as indicated by assessment; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes
Note. Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the Learning Outcomes; Criterion 4: Methods are clearly defined; Criterion 5: Methods listed are appropriate means of assessment; Criterion 6: Surveys, rubrics, and/or other assessment tools are included as appropriate.
Note. Criterion 1: Learning Outcomes are clearly stated; Criterion 2: Learning Outcomes are measurable; Criterion 3: Learning Outcomes include a numeric target for success.

Note. Criterion 1: A summary of the data from each assessment method is provided; Criterion 2: Data provided are relevant to the assessment method; Criterion 3: Data provided are stated in measurable terms as defined by “Learning Outcomes.”

Note. Criterion 1: Results used are relevant to the findings mentioned in “Evidence”; Criterion 2: Results used are in an effort to improve/maintain the program as indicated by assessment; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
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Note. Criterion 1: A summary of the data from each assessment method is provided; Criterion 2: Data provided are relevant to the assessment method; Criterion 3: Data provided are stated in measurable terms as defined by “Learning Outcomes”.

Note. Criterion 1: Results used are relevant to the findings mentioned in “Evidence”; Criterion 2: Results used are in an effort to improve/maintain the program as indicated by assessment; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
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Note. Criterion 1: A summary of the data from each assessment method is provided; Criterion 2: Data provided are relevant to the assessment method; Criterion 3: Data provided are stated in measurable terms as defined by “Learning Outcomes”.

Note. Criterion 1: Results used are relevant to the findings mentioned in “Evidence”; Criterion 2: Results used are in an effort to improve/maintain the program as indicated by assessment; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
Appendix A

Annual Assessment Update Criteria

Methods

1) Two distinct assessment methods are listed
2) All assessment methods discussed in “Evidence” are listed in “Methods”
3) Methods are relevant to the Learning Outcomes
4) Methods are clearly defined
5) Methods listed are appropriate means of assessment
6) Surveys, rubrics, and/or other assessment tools are included as appropriate

Student Learning Outcomes

1) Learning Outcomes are clearly stated
2) Learning Outcomes are measurable
3) Learning Outcomes include a numeric target for success

Evidence

1) A summary of the data from each assessment method is provided
2) Data provided are relevant to the assessment method
3) Data provided are stated in measurable terms as defined by “Learning Outcomes”

Use of Results

1) Results used are relevant to findings mentioned in “Evidence”
2) Results used are in an effort to improve/maintain the program as indicated by assessment
3) Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes