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2008-2009 Annual Update Checklist 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 three 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>
</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 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 hopes to include more colleges in the years to come. It is anticipated that the online submission process will allow for a more timely, systematic, and transparent assessment process, which will eventually be expanded across the university.

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 methods and measurement of student learning outcomes (see Appendix A for a list of the Annual Assessment Update criteria). These changes are reflected in the results reported below.

A 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 for each Annual Assessment Update Area for Academic Years 2003-2004 through 2008-2009

<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>2003-2004</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>97% (89%)</td>
<td>96% (73%)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91% (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>97% (90%)</td>
<td>97% (84%)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90% (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>94% (88%)</td>
<td>91% (81%)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90% (87%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percent met includes both “Met” and “Partially Met” for original 13 criteria on Annual Update Checklist. Percent met in parentheses includes both “Met” and “Partially Met” for the 15 criteria on the revised Annual Update Checklist.

As indicated in Table 2, across the university, the percent of criteria that were met or partially met for each of the four sections over the past five years declined in the Methods and Student Learning Outcomes section, but grew in the Evidence and Use of Results section. The percent of criteria that were met or partially met in the Methods and Student Learning Outcomes sections decreased in academic year 2006-2007 due to two new criteria that were added to the checklist. One of the criterions was added to the Methods section, requesting programs to include any surveys, rubrics, and/or other assessment tools that were used. The other criterion was added to the Student Learning Outcomes section, requesting programs to set specific targets to measure success relevant to their student learning outcomes.

Results indicate that for academic year 2008-2009, the greatest improvement in assessment practices across the university was the presentation of evidence related to student learning outcomes. While both the Methods and Learning Outcomes section declined, this decrease can be attributed to the call for a more detailed description of the methods and learning outcomes to help create a more defined link between the two. These results represent excellent progress on the reporting of assessment practices across campus.

Table 3: Percent of Academic Programs Meeting the Criteria for each Annual Assessment Update Area for Academic Years 2003-2004 through 2008-2009

<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>2003-2004</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>92% (51%)</td>
<td>96% (27%)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>63% (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>91% (49%)</td>
<td>95% (59%)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>63% (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>85% (57%)</td>
<td>88% (64%)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>61% (35%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percent met includes both “Met” and “Partially Met” for original 13 criteria on Annual Update Checklist. Percent met in parentheses includes both “Met” and “Partially Met” for the 15 criteria on the revised Annual Update Checklist.

While the percent of criteria that were met in each of the four sections seem to indicate that a majority of programs across the university are performing at a satisfactory level, the results 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 indicated that there is still progress to be made in several areas as only six (up from five last year) programs are currently meeting the UAP’s target for success set at 100%. In addition, although 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, more progress needs to be made. 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 met, partially met, and unmet ratings 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.
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
NIU - Student Learning Outcomes Section

Note. Criterion 1: Learning Outcomes are clearly stated; Criterion 2: Learning Outcomes are measurable; Criterion 3: Learning Outcomes include a numeric target for success

NIU - Evidence Section

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”

NIU - Use of Results Section

Note. Criterion 1: Results used are relevant to 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 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.
College of Education - Student Learning Outcomes Section  

Note. Criterion 1: Learning Outcomes are clearly stated; Criterion 2: Learning Outcomes are measurable; Criterion 3: Learning Outcomes include a numeric target for success

College of Education - Evidence Section  

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”

College of Education - Use of Results Section  

Note. Criterion 1: Results used are relevant to 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 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 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.
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences - Methods Section

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 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.
College of Visual & Performing Arts - Student Learning Outcomes Section

Note. Criterion 1: Learning Outcomes are clearly stated; Criterion 2: Learning Outcomes are measurable; Criterion 3: Learning Outcomes include a numeric target for success.

College of Visual & Performing Arts - Evidence Section

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”.

College of Visual & Performing Arts - Use of Results Section

Note. Criterion 1: Results used are relevant to 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

Note. * = Criterion added in academic year 2006-2007