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Assessment Plan and Status Report Format
for Academic Programs

Departments are required to submit a current copy of their assessment program(s) and status report(s) to the University Assessment Panel through the appropriate college committee to the University Assessment Panel prior to program review by the Academic Planning Council. A report on each degree program undergoing program review should be submitted according to the schedule provided below. The University Assessment Panel will review the report and, if necessary, make recommendations for changes in the department’s reported set of assessment activities to insure that sufficient evidence of student outcomes are included. The department may request funding for continuing authentic assessment initiatives or new assessment activities to address identified gaps or problem areas. The department may consult with the panel and revise the schedule of activities, as needed. An example of an assessment report for a hypothetical degree program is included.

The assessment program report should have the following components:

1. **Student Learning Objectives.** A list of specific objectives unique to each degree program.

2. **Methods.** An explanation of how evidence/information/data are gathered to determine if the outcomes are being met, including systematic methods for gathering quantitative and/or qualitative data as well as anecdotal information, with a clear indication of which outcome or outcomes each method addresses. All outcomes should be assessed by at least one direct method. **Numeric targets** are set for the achievement levels that demonstrate program quality. All assessments methods should include copies of relevant surveys, rubrics or other assessment tools as appropriate.

3. **Evidence.** The information/data gathered through the department’s assessment activities that show the extent to which learning outcomes are being met. Please report data by outcome.

4. **Use of Results.** A description of how the evidence that has been gathered is used systematically to make a determination that the students are achieving the learning outcomes at an appropriate level and/or to make programmatic improvements.

5. **Further Information Needed.** An analysis of results to uncover gaps in current information/data or problematic findings that indicate a need for further study.

6. **Timeline.** A timeline for collecting additional information.

Departments may request resources to support ongoing authentic (direct) assessment initiatives or new assessment activities. The request should include

- justification for the requested funding, making clear what the activities will add to the department’s information about program outcomes
- a budget
- a timeline for completing activity and submitting a final report on the funded initiative

**Submit to** Associate Vice Provost for Academic Outcomes Assessment. Please also forward an electronic version (Microsoft Word is the preferred format) to assess@niu.edu.

Northern Illinois University
Office of the Provost
The Relationships between Assessment Activities and Program Review

Northern Illinois University is accountable for demonstrating the quality of its academic program outcomes to internal and external constituencies. The two major initiatives that enable the university to demonstrate its accountability are program review and program assessment. The Academic Planning Council (APC), which is responsible for conducting the program reviews, and the University Assessment Panel (UAP), which reviews assessment programs and status reports and recommends funding for assessment initiatives, has developed a coordinated review cycle to ensure that programs can consistently demonstrate their quality, identify ways to improve programs, and establish a record of successful improvements. Funding is available to programs in year four of the program review cycle (see schedule below) for the implementation of authentic (direct) assessment methods.

The assessment program and status report/funding request will become part of the record reviewed by the APC in conducting the program review, and the documentation by the UAP that the University Assessment Program is being fully implemented in accordance with the university’s accreditation standards. The annual assessment updates will also be used in the program review process and provide the university with evidence of systematic, continuous program improvement in its reporting to external entities.
## Coordinated Cycle for Program Review and Program Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years 1 and 2 (following program review)</td>
<td>Continue to implement assessment program and review the information/data from assessment activities. Make evidence-based decisions concerning students’ attainment of the learning outcomes. <strong>Submit Annual Assessment Update to associate dean and Assessment Services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 (five years prior to program review)</td>
<td>Continue to gather evidence on how students are attaining learning outcomes and conduct a thorough review of each assessment program using the <em>Assessment Program Evaluation Rubric</em> as a guide. Modify assessment program if needed. Begin drafting status report to the UAP. <strong>Submit Annual Assessment Update to associate dean and Assessment Services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 (four years prior to program review*)</td>
<td><strong>Status Report.</strong> Submit current assessment program and status report on the findings from assessment activities and how the results from assessment activities were used for decision making. The UAP will provide feedback to the program. The UAP may request an <em>Interim Report</em> in year 6 of the review cycle. <strong>Submit Status Report to associate dean and Assessment Services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5 (three years prior to program review)</td>
<td>Continue to gather evidence on students’ attainment of learning outcomes, and review the information/data from assessment activities. Make evidence-based decisions concerning student’s attainment of the learning outcomes. <strong>Submit Annual Assessment Update to associate dean and Assessment Services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 (two years prior to program review)</td>
<td>Submit <em>Interim Report</em> on the implementation of the assessment program to the UAP, if needed. Continue to gather evidence on how it is meeting its objectives and to make comparisons of the findings from the evidence collected since the program review. Make evidence-based decisions concerning students’ attainment of the learning outcomes. <strong>Submit Annual Assessment Update to associate dean and Assessment Services.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7 (preparation of program review document)</td>
<td>Submit a copy of the assessment program, status report, and Annual Assessment Updates to the provost’s office with program review(s). <strong>Submit Annual Assessment Update to associate dean and Assessment Services.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Year 8 (review of the program by the APC) | *Program Review.* The program review is distributed for discussion with the APC. The final report on the program is prepared and outcomes and recommendations from the review are reported to the NIU Board of Trustees and the Illinois Board of Higher Education. **Submit Annual Assessment Update to associate dean and Assessment Services.**
Examples of Assessment Activities and Use of Results

Assessment Activities. Assessment programs use multiple sources of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, for each learning outcome because any single type of evidence reflects only a part of students’ achievement. Departments should select methods of gathering evidence most suited to their disciplines. The methods that best reflect student learning may be implemented on a periodic basis. Each learning outcome must be assessed by multiple methods, including at least one direct method.

Direct evidence of student learning: the results of

- locally developed and standardized objective/essay test items administered to all students
- capstone experience (e.g., course, thesis, field project)
- portfolios of student work
- comprehensive examinations
- thesis and dissertation defenses
- essay questions blind scored by faculty across the department, division, school, or college
- standardized and nationally normed tests
- performance on national/state licensure, certification or professional examinations
- qualitative internal and external juried review of comprehensive senior projects
- externally reviewed exhibitions and performances
- external evaluation of performance during internships based on stated program objectives
- course-embedded measures other than tests used for course grades

Indirect evidence of student learning: information from

- alumni and employer surveys
- student satisfaction questionnaires
- exit interviews with graduates
- focus groups
- graduate follow-up studies
- retention and transfer studies
- length of time to degree
- graduation rates and transfer rates
- job placement data
- information from advisory boards

The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) consultant-evaluators note that indirect sources of data are inadequate evidence of student outcomes if used alone. However, when used to supplement direct evidence, the indirect evidence provides information that may illuminate aspects of what the direct evidence tells us about students’ academic achievement. HLC staff has also provided examples of information that does not provide evidence of learning.

Non-measures of student learning include

- questionnaires asking students if their personal goals for the course or major or program have been met
• data on the quality of the curriculum and other aspects of a program
• faculty publications and recognition
• the kinds of courses or majors students select, including course enrollments and course profiles
• faculty/student ratios
• the percentage of students who study abroad
• enrollment trends
• the percentage of students who graduate with the baccalaureate in five years
• the diversity of the student body
• grades and GPAs

HLC evaluators regularly stress that neither grades nor GPAs are adequate or reliable evidence of student learning across an undergraduate major or graduate/professional program of study. Alexander Astin, in his 1991 work *Assessment for Excellence*, states that course grades and GPAs "tell us little of what the student has actually learned in the course" and "very little about what a student actually knows or what that student's competencies or talents really are" (p. 11).

**Use of Results.** A department should develop a variety of indicators, both quantitative and qualitative, of how well students’ are attaining learning outcomes. The kinds of information that may emerge from assessment activities include

• how well students score on an objective test compared to a national norm group
• how well students score on an objective test when they exit the program as compared to when they entered the program
• how much growth occurs as a result of program specific initiatives that may be reflected in locally developed evaluations
• what students and alumni think of the degree program as they enter the institution, as they leave the program, and years after graduation
• the degree to which students can synthesize information from a number of courses to complete capstone projects or develop portfolios
• the degree to which outside reviewers believe that the program is meeting its objectives and that these objectives are appropriate for this discipline
• the degree to which employers feel that the program prepares students for experiences in work settings
• the degree to which the program prepares students for graduate education
• the degree to which the graduate education prepares students for professional positions

A degree program should implement multiple methods for gathering evidence in order to provide a balanced portrayal of the program. A program should be sure that it collects evidence that could be used to improve teaching and learning processes and curricula; identifies departmental mechanisms and processes for using results to maintain or to improve program quality; has feedback loops to related university processes (for example, planning, curriculum review, program review); and creates mechanisms to communicate results to faculty and to explain processes to students.
Assessment Plan and Status Report

Program: B.S. in General Business Studies

1. Learning Objectives

Graduates of the program will be prepared for successful professional careers in business by:

1. demonstrating their ability to analyze data in XX, DD, and ZZ
2. applying leadership skills in groups and on team projects
3. evaluating ethical business practices in simulated and real-world experiences
4. creating computer applications for basic business problems
5. communicating effectively orally and in writing
6. demonstrating effective quantitative reasoning skills
7. applying the principles of XX in business settings

2. Explanation of Methods

The following chart lists the methods to be used, as well as a description of each method, a timeline for implementation, the person responsible, and the objectives each method addresses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description/Target</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Objectives Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Course</td>
<td>Evaluation of projects by faculty outside the course and from internship supervisors will be used to evaluate students’ overall preparation in the program. Target: 85 percent of students will meet all project standards</td>
<td>Spring semester, even years</td>
<td>Director of undergraduate studies</td>
<td>1,2,4,5,6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Testing</td>
<td>A sample group of students beginning the program and near the end of the program will be tested with the Major Fields Examination in XX. Students’ scores will be compared to national norms and cross validated against courses, projects, etc., completed locally. Target: TBD in 20XX</td>
<td>Annually, review data in fall of odd years</td>
<td>Department chair</td>
<td>1,3,6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey</td>
<td>In addition to the university alumni survey, students in the program will be asked more specific questions about their experiences at NIU and their perception of how well the program prepared them for their careers.</td>
<td>One-, five-, and nine-years after graduation</td>
<td>Department chairs</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship Performance</td>
<td>Evaluations from instructor and site supervisor and student self-evaluation will be analyzed.</td>
<td>Fall semester, senior year</td>
<td>Internship coordinator</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board (Employer Feedback)</td>
<td>Alumni, employers, and other professionals in the region will discuss how well the program prepares graduates and meets changing professional needs, and make suggestions for curricular improvements.</td>
<td>Fall and spring</td>
<td>Chair and director of undergraduate studies</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes-by-Methods

Table demonstrating which outcomes are addressed by each method of assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Standardized Testing</th>
<th>Alumni Survey</th>
<th>Internship</th>
<th>Advisory Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ethics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Computer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quantitative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Principles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Available Data

Findings from the latest round of assessment activities:

Capstone Course

Last year’s activities. The capstone course has been taught for five years. A sample of the major project for the course (n = 53; 25 percent sample) was evaluated online by three faculty using established criteria. Findings. The results showed that 20 percent of the students attained all project goals at a level that exceeded the standards, 40 percent met all standards, 30 percent met all but one standard, and 10 percent did not meet two or more standards. There was no particular pattern of standards that were not met; each standard had at least one student who did not meet it.

Standardized Testing

Last year’s activities. This method was added to the plan to replace the XYZ test we discontinued because it did not evaluate the breadth of skills we expect our students to achieve. The sophomores (n = 107) were tested using the Major Fields Examination in XX. Findings. Preliminary results indicate that our students did not perform as well on accounting tasks as did the national norm group (76 percent versus 79 percent), but that they exceeded the norm (75 percent versus 68 percent) in marketing strategies. Since this is the first use of the Major Fields Examination, the faculty will review the results from next year’s group to see if a trend in performance begins to emerge and then decide if course adjustments need to be made.

Alumni Survey

Activities over the last three years. A supplemental survey was developed specific to the program objectives and was mailed to one-, five-, and nine-year-out alumni along with the university survey. Findings. Findings indicate that the recent graduates are satisfied with the program, that more than 90 percent feel the degree prepared them well for their current position, and that specific skill areas (accounting, marketing, and management) were adequately addressed by the curriculum. Five year-out graduates reported similar levels of satisfaction (89 percent) in both areas. The nine year-out graduates reported lower levels of satisfaction (82 percent) with preparation for their current job and skill areas (75 percent to 83 percent). It should be noted that the nine-year-out graduates completed their program prior to a major curriculum revision seven years ago.
Internship Performance

Last five years’ activities. The creation of a database for instructors’, site supervisors’, and students’ evaluations of internship experiences permits us to look at the trends in how well students perform in a variety of settings. Findings. More than 90 percent of site supervisors and the students annually rated students’ skills in all areas as meeting/exceeding expectations, while instructors’ ratings were lower overall (81 percent to 86 percent). All groups agreed that oral communication skills were at an acceptable level (96 percent to 98 percent across groups), but that greater proficiency is needed with writing skills (80 percent to 94 percent across groups). Students placed in small organizations (25 or fewer employees) had more difficulty in meeting performance expectations in all areas and rated the overall quality of their experiences lower than students in larger organizations.

Advisory Board - Employer Feedback

Last year’s activities. Due to the lack of success in eliciting responses from employers via survey, the program created an advisory committee to provide feedback on alumni skills and knowledge. Last year faculty developed a list of alumni, employers and other professionals who might be invited to participate in an advisory capacity to the program. During spring semester, individuals were contacted until we had an agreed upon number of 12 affirmative responses. Due to scheduling problems, the group did not convene in the spring semester, but will meet in mid-October. Findings. None at this time.

4. Use of Results

Over the last several years, actions have been taken based on the results from the evaluations of the capstone projects and internships. Based on the findings from the capstone course, faculty reviewed the alignment of course content and objectives with the project standards. Two minor changes in course objectives were recommended to the curriculum committee and approved by the faculty. In addition, faculty included a selection of readings on ethics to course requirements and restructured an assignment on data management. Comments from students enrolled in the course since these changes were made indicate that they recognize the importance of the increased emphasis on ethics and have found it helpful. The majority of students also found the revised data management assignment useful, but several offered similar suggestions for further revisions of this requirement that the faculty will consider in the fall. Faculty set a target of 85 percent of the students meeting all project standards by 20XX.

The findings from the internship students, supervisors, and faculty were generally good. The faculty set a target of 90 percent agreement in all three groups that students meet all internship requirements by 20XX. Faculty addressed the need to improve writing skills by replacing an oral presentation in GBS 304 with a writing assignment and by adding a short writing assignment in GBS 361 and GBS 416. All of these courses are prerequisites to the internship. Students are now routinely referred to the writing center in all major courses, as needed. Because of the number of internship placements needed each fall, the use of small organizations as placement sites has remained relatively constant. In the last year three new larger sites that can accommodate more than one student placement were added to the placement roster. The evaluation of all internship placement sites is ongoing.

Faculty are generally satisfied with the results of the alumni surveys. Alumni who have graduated since our major curricular revision are satisfied with the program overall, and with the specific knowledge and skills they gain in the program. Information from the alumni survey indicates that recent graduates feel the degree prepared them well for their current position, and given that 94 percent of the respondents
are currently employed in business positions within Illinois, our assumption is that this degree helps sustain economic growth in the state. Further, 12 percent of last year’s program graduates were African-American, 9 percent were Hispanic, and 10 percent were Asian-Americans, indicating that the program attracts a diverse student body.

The advisory committee will meet in October and the chair, internship coordinator, and director of undergraduate studies are preparing a set of questions for discussion about alumni performance. Advisory committee feedback will be reported at the November faculty meeting.

5. Gaps in Current Data

In preparation for program review, faculty would like to conduct a special round of assessments on capstone projects, and to increase the percentage of the projects reviewed from 25 to 35 percent. We will concentrate on the projects completed within the last two years, and add those completed this year. This project will help to confirm or refute the assessments completed on a smaller number of projects, and give us preliminary data from one group of students who completed the course since the objectives were revised and the assignments were changed. It will also provide useful information for the focused curricular review that faculty conduct every three years. This review will occur next fall.

Response rates to the department’s supplemental alumni survey are quite low. It appears that many of our graduates complete the university’s alumni survey online, and therefore graduates do not complete the paper version of the supplemental survey. The Office of Assessment Services has agreed to work with us in developing an online version of the supplemental survey that can be made available to alumni who are contacted next spring.

6. Timeline for Collecting Additional Data – Capstone Course

We plan to conduct the special capstone assessments at the conclusion of the spring semester. If this project is funded we will implement the following timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-April 20XX</td>
<td>Identify the sample of capstone projects for review</td>
<td>Director of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First and second weeks of May</td>
<td>Copy selected sample of projects to the department’s review website test to see that project files and rating sheet files open properly</td>
<td>Director of undergraduate studies and college tech support services staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third week of May</td>
<td>Conduct project assessments</td>
<td>Three faculty and the director of undergraduate studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First week of June</td>
<td>Run descriptive analyses of project ratings</td>
<td>Director of undergraduate studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-June</td>
<td>Prepare preliminary draft of findings</td>
<td>Director of undergraduate studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-August</td>
<td>Discuss findings with assessment/curriculum committee</td>
<td>Director of undergraduate studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-September</td>
<td>Present results to faculty</td>
<td>Chair and director of undergraduate studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining fall semester</td>
<td>Conduct ongoing discussion as needed</td>
<td>Chair and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring-Summer 20XX</td>
<td>Prepare report to UAP on the project</td>
<td>Director of undergraduate studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Resources Needed

The department requests support for faculty stipends (four faculty x $150/day x 5 days) to review approximately 220 projects, stipend for director of undergraduate studies (10-mnth contract) to review projects, run analyses, draft findings, and prepare report to UAP ($150/day x 7 days). Departmental support for the project is reflected in its ongoing support of the computers and software/site licenses used in the project, copy/distribution of draft reports to faculty, etc. College tech support is available to the department without charge. The total amount requested to fund this project is $4,050.00.
The Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) requires that universities provide evidence of feedback from employers in reports of the results from program review. Self-reported data from alumni are necessary and acceptable measures of their success after graduation are helpful, but they do not meet the criterion of soliciting information from employers. Surveys of employers are often not feasible and historically have generated a low response rate. While surveys remain an acceptable indicator of employer feedback, NIU has identified other measures that can be used to meet the criterion of eliciting feedback from employers. The following methods are recommended to meet the criterion:

• Departmental/program advisory group input/feedback
• Articles/research published in refereed/professional journals
• Funded grants
• Juried exhibitions and performances
• Evaluations from internship/cooperative education supervisors
• Evaluations from supervising teachers or preceptors
• External review of dissertations
• Leadership roles in profession or discipline
• Acceptance into graduate studies

All assessment programs are expected to include at least one means of soliciting employer feedback.

Northern Illinois University
Office of the Provost
## Evaluation Rubric for Academic Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Overall Program</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>All objectives are clearly stated in measurable terms; all are student learning focused and objectives oriented; the number of objectives is appropriate and all objectives reflect higher levels of achievement (See Bloom)</td>
<td>All methods are clearly stated and appropriate to assess outcomes; all outcomes are assessed using multiple methods and authentic assessment, all methods have relevant numeric targets related to outcomes they are measuring; rubrics and evaluation tools are developed (samples included)</td>
<td>All methods, procedures, timelines, and responsible parties are in place and clearly stated; the program has been fully implemented for more than one year</td>
<td>Data are reported on all outcomes; all outcomes are assessed using multiple measures that include authentic assessment</td>
<td>Clearly developed and well thought out analyses are reported; findings are reported on all outcomes comparing/contrasting findings from multiple measures that include authentic assessment</td>
<td>A thorough program to maintain or change all outcomes is reported; plan reflects the thoughtful use of the analyses of student outcome achievements and includes an evaluation of its feasibility; the status report provides evidence that assessment findings have influenced academic program decision making; performance standards are identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Majority of objectives are clearly stated in measurable terms; student learning focused and/or objectives-oriented; the number of objectives is appropriate; the majority reflect higher levels of achievement (See Bloom)</td>
<td>Majority of methods are clearly stated and appropriate to assess outcomes; most outcomes are assessed using multiple measures and/or using authentic assessment, some rubrics and evaluation tools are developed (samples included)</td>
<td>Majority of methods, procedures, timelines, and responsible parties are in place and clearly stated; the majority of the program has been implemented</td>
<td>Data are reported on each outcome; the majority of outcomes are assessed using multiple measures</td>
<td>Analysis of findings related to the majority of outcomes is provided; majority of analyses compare/contrast findings from multiple measures</td>
<td>A program to maintain or change the majority of outcomes is reported; plan is connected to the analyses of student outcome achievements and/or addresses aspects of feasibility; the status report provides evidence that assessment findings have influenced academic program decision making; performance standards are identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Some objectives are clearly stated in measurable terms; some are student learning focused and/or objectives-oriented; number of objectives may be inappropriate and/or are at lower levels of achievement (See Bloom)</td>
<td>Some methods are clearly stated and are related to outcomes; some are appropriate to assess outcomes; some are authentic; some outcomes are measured using multiple methods</td>
<td>Methods, procedures, timelines, and responsible parties are partially developed; some elements of the program have been implemented</td>
<td>Data are reported for some outcomes; some outcomes are assessed using multiple measures</td>
<td>Incomplete analysis of findings related to outcomes is provided; some analyses compare/contrast findings from multiple measures</td>
<td>A partially developed program to change or maintain outcomes is reported; program is not clearly connected to the analyses of student outcome achievements and/or evaluated for feasibility and/or assessed for the likelihood of program improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>No or unclear objectives; none are student learning focused and/or objectives-oriented</td>
<td>Methods are not clearly stated; not related to outcomes; inappropriate for outcomes; no use of multiple measures</td>
<td>Program lacks information on methods, procedures, timelines, and responsible parties; the program has not been implemented</td>
<td>No data for any outcomes are reported</td>
<td>No analysis of findings related to outcomes is provided</td>
<td>No plan either to change or maintain program outcomes is reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Reviewer ________________________________ Program ________________________________
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Assessment Plan/Status Report Checklist
Academic Programs

Program:

Structure of the Plan

___ Met ___ PM* ___ Unmet The objectives are stated.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet All assessment methods are listed.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet All assessment methods are briefly described and copies of relevant surveys, rubrics or other assessment tools are included as appropriate.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet A timeline for implementation of each of the assessment methods is stated.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet The individual(s) responsible for each of the assessment methods is identified.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet The plan shows which of the assessment methods are used to assess each outcome.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet The plan contains an outcomes-by-methods matrix.

Content of the Plan

___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Each of the objectives is stated in measurable terms and includes numeric targets related to specific methods of assessment.

Objective(s) not meeting this criterion:

___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Each of the objectives is stated as a student learning outcome.

Objective(s) not meeting this criterion:

___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet All of the methods reported are accepted assessment methods.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet The plan includes both direct and indirect assessment methods.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Each outcome is assessed by at least one direct and one indirect method.

Outcome(s) not meeting this criterion:

___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet The plan includes at least one method for soliciting employer feedback.

Content of the Status Report

___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet The report provides a summary of the data from each assessment method.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet The report demonstrates that assessment methods were implemented as described.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet The plan includes a report of how the findings were used to improve the program.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet The plan is fully implemented.

*PM=Partially Met
Annual Assessment Update Form for Academic Programs 2011–2012
Northern Illinois University

Department: 
Program: 

Directions:
1. List at least two assessment methods implemented during this academic year (*may be from Spring 2011, Fall 2011 or Spring 2012*).
2. List the student learning outcome(s) assessed by these methods. Include a numeric target for success (e.g., 80% of students will . . .).
3. Report the direct evidence/data/findings obtained from the assessment methods.
4. Indicate specifically how this evidence was used in program decision making.
5. Submit a *completed* form for each degree program to the Office of Assessment Services by 05/31/2012.
6. Please include copies of any surveys, rubrics or other assessment tools as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This completed form, the departmental assessment plan, and the departmental assessment program data and results are to be kept on file and available for review in the college office.

Approvals:
Chair: ____________________________  Date: _____________

Dean: ____________________________  Date: _____________

Date Received in Assessment Services

SAMPLE Completed Form

Due Date: 05/31/2012

Due Date: 05/31/2012
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Northern Illinois University

**Department:** Political and Economic Sciences  
**Program:** International Studies

Directions:
1. List at least two assessment methods implemented during this academic year *may be from Spring 2011, Fall 2011 or Spring 2012*.
2. List the student learning outcome(s) assessed by these methods. Include a numeric target for success (e.g., 80% of students will . . .).
3. Report the direct evidence/data/findings obtained from the assessment methods.
4. Indicate specifically how this evidence was used in program decision making.
5. Submit a completed form for each degree program to the Office of Assessment Services by 05/31/2012.
6. Please include copies of any surveys, rubrics or other assessment tools as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: Each student will write a research paper (required in the capstone course), which will be evaluated by the designated coordinator and two faculty members. The papers will be graded using four criteria as reflected in the departmental assessment plan. See attached rubric. A written essay in International Studies 238 and 394 will test the degree to which students have met this objective. Essays will be evaluated independently by two faculty members using the attached rubric.</td>
<td>Example: Program graduates will have the ability to write an effective research paper demonstrating their understanding of the underlying principles of an international situation, issue, or policy. 100% of the students will meet minimum criteria as scored on the attached rubric. 25% of the students will exceed the minimum criteria. Program graduates will demonstrate the ability to use models of international behavior to make predictions about the specific behavior of individual countries in order to understand the decision-making process. 85% of the students will meet minimum criteria as scored on the attached rubric.</td>
<td>Example: An analysis of the scores obtained from this assessment indicate that there is a great deal of room for improvement in research and writing skills, especially in regard to the ability to research a topic and to develop a thesis in a logical, coherent manner (less than 80% met the established criteria). A random sample of 40 exams from four courses was evaluated. 87% of the students met the stated criteria as assessed independently by two faculty member. Criterion-specific results were; criterion 1 = 88%, criterion 2 = 87%, criterion 3 = 92%.</td>
<td>Example: The evidence obtained from a variety of sources suggests that the students’ writing and research skills need to be improved. The department has had numerous discussions on this issue and has implemented additional writing/research projects throughout the undergraduate program. See attached assignments from three courses. Given the difficulty of the question that were evaluated, the results suggest that the students have demonstrated reasonably good proficiency in these skills. No further action is required at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This completed form, the departmental assessment plan, and the departmental assessment program data and results are to be kept on file and available for review in the college office.

**Approvals:**

**Chair:** _____________________________  
**Date:** ______________

**Dean:** _____________________________  
**Date:** ______________
Annual Assessment Update Checklist for Academic Programs 2011–2012

Program: ___________________________

Methods

___ Met ___ PM* ___ Unmet Two distinct assessment methods are listed from Spring 2011, Fall 2011, or Spring 2012.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet All assessment methods discussed in “Evidence” are listed in “Methods.”
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Methods are relevant to the Learning Outcomes.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Methods are clearly defined.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Methods listed are appropriate means of assessment.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Surveys, rubrics, and/or other assessment tools are included as appropriate.

Comments:

Student Learning Outcomes

___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Learning Outcomes are clearly stated.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Learning Outcomes are measurable.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Learning Outcomes include a numeric target for success.

Comments:

Evidence

___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet A summary of the data from each assessment method is provided.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Data provided are relevant to the assessment method.
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet Data provided are stated in measurable terms as defined by “Learning Outcomes.”

Comments:

*PM = Partially Met
### Use of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Unmet</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results used are relevant to findings mentioned in "evidence."

Results used are in an effort to improve/maintain the program as indicated by assessment.

Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.

### Comments:

**General Comments**
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