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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 five years.

To increase efficiency and transparency in the Annual Assessment Update submission process, the Office of Assessment Services (OAS) now collects Annual Updates online using Blackboard Content Collection. Piloted in prior years in the colleges of Health and Human Sciences and Business, the fully online submission process was instituted by OAS in 2010-2011. Approval of the Annual Assessment Updates at both the college and departmental levels and all feedback provided by the OAS for review can now be accessed and stored using the Blackboard system.

Upon their submission, the Annual Updates are reviewed by the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Outcomes Assessment and other OAS staff. A standardized checklist for review is used to provide feedback to academic programs on their assessment efforts in relation to several criteria across the four key sections of the Annual Assessment Updates. (See page 3 for a list of the Annual Assessment Update sections and criteria).

OAS has developed and maintained a database 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 2007-2008 through 2010-2011

<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>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>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>90%</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 four years has generally increased. Results indicate that for 2010-2011, the only area that did not increase the percent of criteria met among graduate programs across the university was the Methods section, which remained the same. The sections that saw increases were the Student Learning Outcomes, Evidence, 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 three years. However, this year we saw a slight decline in the percentage of programs that overall met all criteria. Only about 40 programs are currently meeting the UAP’s target for success set at 100 percent. 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. 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 2007-2008 through 2010-2011

<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>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>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Percent met includes both “Met” and “Partially Met” for the 15 criteria on the Annual Update Checklist.*
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 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.
College of Education Graduate Programs - Methods Section
2007-2008 through 2010-2011

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: 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
### College of Liberal Arts & Sciences Graduate Programs - Methods Section
#### 2007-2008 through 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1</th>
<th>Criterion 2</th>
<th>Criterion 3</th>
<th>Criterion 4</th>
<th>Criterion 5</th>
<th>Criterion 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Unmet</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Unmet</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Unmet</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Unmet</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Unmet</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.