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The Annual Assessment Update process was implemented in academic year 2003-2004. The process requires each academic degree program in the university to submit an Annual Assessment Update Form at the end of the academic year reporting on two assessment activities that have been undertaken that year. The assessment activities are designed to measure student performance relative to degree program student learning outcomes. The Annual Assessment Update Form calls for: (1) an explanation of two assessment methods, (2) student learning outcomes that are addressed by the assessment methods, (3) evidence of findings and data from the assessment methods, and (4) how the assessment results were used as part of a continuous improvement process (see Appendix A for the form). In 2007, the University Assessment Panel (UAP) set as a target of success a 100% compliance rate in on-time submissions of the Annual Assessment Update Form.

Upon their submission, the Annual Assessment Update Forms are reviewed by the Associate Director of the Office of Assessment Services (OAS) and other OAS staff members. A standardized checklist for review is used to provide feedback to academic programs on their assessment efforts in the areas of assessment methods, student learning outcomes, evidence and data, and the use of results (see Appendix B for the feedback form). Each area has from three to six criteria, with performance levels at unmet, partially met, and met. The UAP set as a target of success that all criteria in each of the four areas be met.

To increase efficiency and transparency in the Annual Assessment Update process, the Office of Assessment Services now collects Annual Assessment Update Forms from degree programs using the Blackboard Content Collection feature. Piloted in prior years in the College of Health and Human Sciences and the College of Business, the online submission process was rolled out campus-wide in 2010-2011.

As shown in Table 1, compliance with the Annual Assessment Update process steadily increased over the first three years, reached and maintained the UAP’s target of 100% compliance through 2011-2012, then dropped slightly in 2012-2013. In 2012-2013, one degree program did not submit the Annual Assessment Update Form on time, resulting in a 99.2% compliance rate.

Table 1
Compliance of All Degree Programs with Annual Assessment Update Forms

<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>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While compliance is essential, so too is the quality of assessment practices. An analysis of each of the four areas (methods, student learning outcomes, evidence, and use of results) indicates progress is being made over time. The number of programs meeting or partially meeting all of the criteria within each area has increased substantially over the past year. As shown in Table 2, the number of programs demonstrating all criteria within a given area were met or partially met rose sharply from between 12 and 28%. Most significantly, the number of programs meeting or partially meeting all criteria in all areas rose 42%. This suggests individual programs university-wide are making solid progress in addressing all the criteria within a given area.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of All Degree Programs Meeting or Partially Meeting All Criteria within Each Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analyses demonstrate that, across the university, progress is being made in raising the quality of assessment programs. Table 3 shows the percent of criteria (that are met or partially met) within each area, with gains of between 8 and 11%. Learning outcomes showed the greatest gain with 97% of all observations being met or partially met. Nearly all of the use of results were met or partially met, suggesting degree programs are adequately using assessment data for program improvement purposes.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Criteria Meeting or Partially Meeting within Each Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Methods has 6 criteria; Learning Outcomes, Evidence, and Use of Results each have 3 criteria.

The remainder of this report presents graphs representing the percent of criteria in each area that are unmet, partially met, and met for the entire university and for each college.
NIU- Methods Section
2009-2010 through 2012-2013

Note. Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed from Spring/Fall 2012, or Spring 2013; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the degree program Student 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** 2009-2010 through 2012-2013

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

**NIU- Evidence Section** 2009-2010 through 2012-2013

*Note:* Criterion 1: 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** 2009-2010 through 2012-2013

*Note:* Criterion 1: Results used are based on the findings mentioned in "Evidence"; Criterion 2: Results from assessment are used in an effort to improve/maintain the program; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
College of Business - Methods Section
2009-2010 through 2012-2013

Criterion 1                      Criterion 2                     Criterion 3                      Criterion 4
Criterion 5                      Criterion 6

Note. Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed from Spring/Fall 2012, or Spring 2013; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the degree program Student 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: 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 based on the findings mentioned in "Evidence"; Criterion 2: Results from assessment are used in an effort to improve/maintain the program; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
Note. Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed from Spring/Fall 2012, or Spring 2013; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the degree program Student 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: 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 based on the findings mentioned in "Evidence"; Criterion 2: Results from assessment are used in an effort to improve/maintain the program; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
Note. Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed from Spring/Fall 2012, or Spring 2013; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the degree program Student 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: 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 based on the findings mentioned in "Evidence"; Criterion 2: Results from assessment are used in an effort to improve/maintain the program; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
Note. Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed from Spring/Fall 2012, or Spring 2013; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the degree program Student 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: 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 based on the findings mentioned in "Evidence"; Criterion 2: Results from assessment are used in an effort to improve/maintain the program; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences- Methods Section  
2009-2010 through 2012-2013

Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed from Spring/Fall 2012, or Spring 2013; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the degree program Student 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.
**College of Liberal Arts & Sciences- Student Learning Outcomes Section**  
2009-2010 through 2012-2013

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 Liberal Arts & Sciences- Evidence Section**  
2009-2010 through 2012-2013

Note: Criterion 1: 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 Liberal Arts & Sciences- Use of Results Section**  
2009-2010 through 2012-2013

Note: Criterion 1: Results used are based on the findings mentioned in "Evidence"; Criterion 2: Results from assessment are used in an effort to improve/maintain the program; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
Note. Criterion 1: Two distinct assessment methods are listed from Spring/Fall 2012, or Spring 2013; Criterion 2: All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"; Criterion 3: Methods are relevant to the degree program Student 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.

---

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

2009-2010 through 2012-2013

![Graph showing learning outcomes](image)

**Note.** Criterion 1: 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- Evidence Section**

2009-2010 through 2012-2013

![Graph showing evidence](image)

**Note.** Criterion 1: 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**

2009-2010 through 2012-2013

![Graph showing use of results](image)

**Note.** Criterion 1: Results used are based on the findings mentioned in "Evidence"; Criterion 2: Results from assessment are used in an effort to improve/maintain the program; Criterion 3: Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes.
Appendix A

2012-2013 Annual Assessment Update Submission Form
**Annual Assessment Update Form for Academic Programs 2012–2013**
Northern Illinois University

**Department:**

**Program:**

**Directions:**
1. List at least two assessment methods implemented during this academic year *(may be from Spring 2012, Fall 2012 or Spring 2013).*
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 05/24/2013.
6. Include copies of any surveys, rubrics or other assessment tools.

|------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|

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.

Completed by: ___________________________ Date: ____________

**Approvals:**

Chair: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Dean: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Date Received in Assessment Services: ____________

U:\assessment\Annual Update\2012-2013 Annual Updates\Annual_Assessment_Update_Form_2012-2013
Appendix B

2012-2013 Annual Assessment Update Feedback Form
Northern Illinois University
Assessment Services
2012-2013 Annual Assessment Update Feedback

Degree Program: ___________________________________________ Date: ____________

Degree: ___________________________________________

Methods
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet  Two distinct assessment methods are listed from Spring/Fall 2012, or Spring 2013
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet  All assessment methods discussed in "Evidence" are listed in "Methods"
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet  Methods are relevant to the degree program Student 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  Student Learning Outcomes are clearly stated
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet  Student Learning Outcomes are measurable
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet  Student 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:

Use of Results
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet  Results used are based on the findings mentioned in “Evidence”
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet  Results from assessment are used in an effort to improve/maintain the program
___ Met ___ PM ___ Unmet  Results used are relevant to student learning outcomes

Comments:

General Comments