2009-2010 Annual Assessment Update 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 Programs</th>
<th>Percent Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</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 measurement of student learning outcomes (see page 3 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.
As indicated in Table 2, across the university, the percent of criteria that were met or partially met for each of the four sections saw a substantial increase this year. Of the four sections, Learning Outcomes and Use of Results saw the most dramatic increases, each garnering 8% more than the previous year. These increases can be attributed, in part, to the Office of Assessment Services’ increased emphasis on the reporting of clearly stated student learning outcomes and effective use of results. Furthermore, the overall percent of criteria met increased by 5%, indicating that as a university, we are seeing growth in the positive culture of assessment at NIU.

While the percent of criteria that were met in each of the four sections seems to indicate that a majority of programs across the university are performing at a satisfactory level, the results below in Table 3 indicate that there is still progress 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, most notably the 27% jump in programs meeting the overall standard as a university. However, review of the Annual Update Checklists indicated that there is still progress to be made in several areas as only 22% (up from 5% last year) of programs are currently meeting the UAP’s target for success set at 100%. In addition, several academic 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. The review of the Annual Update Checklists also revealed that there is a need for greater continuity across each of the assessment components. This report also provides specific results regarding the percent of individual criteria that received ratings of met, partially met, and unmet in each of the four areas for the total university and the Colleges of Business, Education, Engineering and Engineering Technology, Health and Human Sciences, Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Visual and Performing Arts.

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.
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
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: 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.
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