Northern Illinois University
Office of Assessment Services

University Annual Assessment Update Report:
The Health of Degree Program Assessment Systems
2013-2014

Spring 2015
For Additional Information
Contact Office of Assessment Services
assess@niu.edu

Table of Contents

Purpose and Overview

The Annual Assessment Update process supports NIU's Program Review process. Its purpose is to establish an on-going process by which degree programs can demonstrate the achievement of student learning outcomes and foster continual program improvement. The Annual Assessment Update process was implemented voluntarily in academic year 2002-2003 and mandated since 2004-2005. Every academic degree program is required to submit an Annual Assessment Update Report at the end of the academic year summarizing the results of two assessment activities that have been undertaken that year. Degree programs are encouraged to assess each student learning outcome every few years during the program review cycle and thereby build a database that documents the achievement of all their student learning outcomes.

Directions for completing the Annual Assessment Update Report, along with a template and sample report, were forwarded to all degree programs at the beginning of the Spring 2014 semester. The Annual Assessment Update Report required: (1) a description of two program assessments (from the program's current/revised assessment plan), (2) the student learning outcome(s) each assessment measured, (3) the desired student and program level performance targets, (4) results for each assessment, and (5) a brief discussion of how the results are/were used for program improvement purposes (see Appendix A for the report form).

Upon their submission, the Annual Assessment Updates are reviewed by the Office of Assessment Services (OAS) and feedback is provided to each degree program. In previous years, feedback has been focused primarily on documenting compliance with the process and, to a lesser extent, to providing suggestions that could improve the quality of the program's assessment system. This past year, the focus of the feedback shifted toward a greater emphasis on program quality improvement. A standardized checklist is used for review and to provide tailored feedback to academic programs in the areas of assessment methods, student learning outcomes, reporting of results, and the use of results (see Appendix B for the revised feedback form). Each area has two to four criteria, with performance levels set at either present or absent. The UAP set as a target of success that all criteria in each of the four areas be present.

To maintain transparency in the Annual Assessment Update process, a summary is posted online by the Office of Assessment Services (http://www.niu.edu/assessment/annualupdate/index.shtml). In addition, all Annual Assessment Updates and feedback from all degree programs are stored online using the Blackboard Content Collection feature.

University Participation

As shown in Table 1, there continues to be a high level of degree program participation in the Annual Assessment Update process. Since its establishment in 2002-2003, participation increased steadily over the first three years, reached and maintained the University Assessment Panel's (UAP) target of 100% participation through 2011-2012, then dropped slightly in 2012-2013 with a rebound to 100% in 2013-2014.

Table 1

Percentage of degree programs completing the annual assessment update process in each academic year.

Academic Year	Number of Submissions	Total Number of Programs	Percent Participation
2013-2014	136	136	100
2012-2013	132	133	99
2011-2012	130	130	100
2010-2011	130	130	100
2009-2010	130	130	100
2008-2009	130	130	100
2007-2008	128	128	100
2006-2007	128	128	100
2005-2006	121	124	98
2004-2005	118	126	94
2003-2004[a]	97	125	78

Note. [a] Annual assessment update reporting was voluntary in 2003-2004, and required from 2004-2005 to the present.

University Results and Interpretation

Although degree program participation in the Annual Assessment Update process is essential, it is the quality of the assessment practices within degree programs that is most important. An analysis of each of the four areas (assessment methods, student learning outcomes, reporting of evidence, and use of results) indicates that, overall, the university has high quality assessment systems. Table 2 shows the percent of degree programs within each college and across the entire university that demonstrate key quality indicators of a healthy assessment system.

At the university level, the assessment methods area is healthy with approximately 95 percent of all programs clearly describing appropriate assessment methods. All degree programs in the Colleges of Business; Engineering and Engineering Technology; Health and Human Sciences; Law; and the Office of the Provost met all criteria. Ninety-six percent of all degree programs in the College of Education met all criteria. There is variability, however, with 27 percent of the College of Visual and Performing Arts programs and 11 percent of College of Liberal Arts and Sciences degree programs lacking appropriate assessment methods. Most problematic was the use of course grades as a measure of student learning outcomes. This is not recommended as course grades often measure more than academic achievement and a single student learning outcome.

Likewise the quality of student learning outcomes for the university as a whole are high, with between 93-100 percent of degree programs demonstrating the quality criteria. All degree programs reported student learning outcomes that imply higher levels of learning and 98 percent were student learning focused. The lowest criterion within student learning outcomes (and overall among all criteria) is, "outcomes implying a level of performance to be achieved." Only 79 percent of degree programs provided student learning outcomes that included reference to what the desired student behavior might look like when a student meets a student learning outcome. This is a new, piloted expectation consistent with program assessment best practices and one that is seen in more advanced assessment systems; it is also challenging to put into practice.

The reporting of results area is fairly consistent with 88-96 percent of all degree programs university-wide demonstrating each of the four criteria. Aggregating and reporting results in meaningful ways was the highest criterion and reporting student and program level targets was the lowest. All programs in the Colleges of Business and Law, and the Office of the Provost met all of the reporting results criteria. The College of Visual and Performing Arts had the greatest opportunity for improvement in this area with 60-67 percent of programs meeting each criteria.

The area of decisions, actions, and use of results ranged from 85-98 percent of all degree programs university-wide meeting each criterion. More than 96 percent of degree programs reported results supported by data and identified program improvement actions they could take. Eight-five percent indicated they had plans to implement program improvement actions. All programs in the Colleges of Business; Engineering and Engineering Technology; and Law met all of the "decision, actions, and use of results" criteria.

Table 2

Percent of degree programs within each college and across the entire university demonstrating key indicators of a healthy assessment system.

Criterion	COB	COE	CEET	CHHS	COL	CLAS	CVPA	Provost	University
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	100	96	100	100	100	100	87	100	98
Appropriate assessment methods	100	96	100	100	100	89	73	100	92
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	100	100	100	100	100	94	100	100	98
Outcomes observable and measurable	100	100	100	94	100	87	93	100	93
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	90	68	88	82	100	87	73	25	79
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	100	89	100	100	100	85	67	100	88
Sample size reported	100	93	88	100	100	96	60	100	92
Date data collected reported	100	86	100	94	100	100	60	100	92
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	100	96	100	100	100	100	67	100	96
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	100	100	100	100	100	100	80	100	98
Program improvement actions identified	100	100	100	100	100	93	100	100	97
Plans to implement improvement actions	100	96	100	88	100	80	67	50	85
Percent Overall	**99**	**94**	**98**	**97**	**100**	**93**	**79**	**90**	**93**

University Recommendations

Based on this year's analysis, several steps can be taken to improve the quality of assessment systems across the university. The first major step entails clarifying the directions and expectations for the Annual Assessment Update Report itself. In particular, the Office of Assessment Services will explicitly remind degree programs to include both student level targets and program level targets (as appropriate) when reporting results. Providing targets allows stakeholders who are using the results to put student performance in perspective with desired program outcomes. Feedback has already been provided to specific programs that did not include targets. The second clarification to the directions and expectations will be to emphasize the need to not only identify program improvement actions, but to take the next step and describe program plans to implement the improvement actions. Doing so will foster a more proactive quality improvement process within degree programs.

The second major step the Office of Assessment Services will take is to elaborate more fully on what is meant by "Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved." This is a newly piloted criteria for a healthy assessment system and one that is seen in more advanced assessment systems. There is some subjectivity to what is meant by an implied performance level; and it is challenging striking a balance between a concise, succinct student learning outcome and one that excessively communicates a desired performance level. An example of a concise student learning outcome from this year's annual assessment update is, "Solve practical business problems." While this is a clear outcome, it doesn't imply a performance expectation. A slight modification, such as "Solve practical business problems that meet the needs of stakeholders," implies a level of expectation—in this case that the solution meets stakeholders needs. This will enable program faculty, students, and others, to get an idea of what is meant by "solve practical business problems." Often, existing assessment rubrics and grading schemes can provide ideas on implied performance levels. The Office of Assessment Services will disseminate resources to programs that describes what implied performance levels look like and how a program can modify existing student learning outcomes to include implied performance levels.

The third major step OAS will take will be to work very closely with the few degree programs that have consistently scored lower on the checklist/rubric. Follow up efforts indicated that some programs scored lower because of a lack of understanding of reporting requirements, faculty turnover and retirements, and developing knowledge and experience with program assessment systems in general. Tailored written feedback has been sent to all degree programs, with the Office of Assessment Services staff offering extended outreach and support. These efforts will continue with a focus on high quality assessment systems and submitting a well-written annual assessment update report this coming year.

In summary, Northern Illinois University overall has proactive and engaged program assessment, with high quality assessment systems providing degree programs with useful, actionable information. There is a strong commitment to continuous program improvement as evidenced by the high percentage of programs (97 percent) that have identified program improvement actions based on student performance data. Those identified and planned program improvement actions, when implemented, will ultimately further and advance student success.

The following tables provide a detailed look at the health of assessments for all degree programs within each College and Office of the Provost.

College of Business

Table 3

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by degree program within the College of Business).

Criterion	Undergraduate						Graduate				Percent In College
	ACCY	BADM	FINA	MGMT	MKTG	OMIS	ACCY	MBA	OMIS	TAX	COB
Assessment Methods											
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Student Learning Outcomes											
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	90
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results											
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results											
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Percent Overall	100	92	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	99

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. Undergraduate: ACCY = B.S. in Accountancy; BADM = B.S. in Business Administration; FINA = B.S. in Finance; MGMT = B.S. in Management; MKTG = B.S. in Marketing; OMIS = B.S. in Operations and Information Management. Graduate: ACCY = M.A.S. in Accounting Science; MBA = M.B.A. in Business Administration; OMIS = M.S. in Management Information Systems; and TAX = M.S. in Taxation.

College of Education

Table 4

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by undergraduate degree program within the College of Education).

Criterion	Undergraduate						Percent in College
	ATH TRAIN	EARLY CHILD	ELEM ED	KINE	PHYS ED	SPEC ED	COE
Assessment Methods							
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Student Learning Outcomes				✓			
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	68
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results							
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	89
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	86
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results							
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Percent Overall	**92**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**100**	**100**	**94**

Note. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. Undergraduate: ATH TRAIN = B.S. in Athletic Training; EARLY CHILD = B.S. in Early Childhood Studies; ELEM ED = B.S.Ed. in Elementary Education; KINE = B.S. in Kinesiology; PHYS ED = B.S.Ed. in Physical Education; SPEC ED = B.S.Ed. in Special Education.

Table 5

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by graduate degree program within the College of Education).

Criterion	Graduate								Percent in College
	ADULT ED MSED	ADULT ED EDD	COUN MSED	COUN EDD	C&I MSED	C&I EDD	ECE MSED	EDAD MSED	COE
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	68
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		89
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		86
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Percent Overall	**100**	**100**	**92**	**92**	**92**	**100**	**100**	**85**	**94**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. ADULT ED MSED = M.S.Ed. in Adult and Higher Education; ADULT ED EDD = Ed.D. in Adult & Higher Education; COUN MSED = M.S.Ed. in Counseling; COUN EDD = Ed.D. in Counselor Education and Supervision; C&I MSED = M.S.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction; C&I EDD = Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction; ECE MSED= M.S.Ed. in Early Childhood Education; EDAD MSED = M.S.Ed. in Educational Administration.

Criterion	Graduate (cont'd)								Percent in College
	EDAD EDS	EDAD EDD	ED PSYC MSED	ED PSYC PHD	ED R&E MS	ELED MSED	FE MSED	IT MSED	COE
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Appropriate assessment methods		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	✓			✓			68
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	89
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	93
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	86
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Percent Overall	92	100	100	92	100	100	77	92	94

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. EDAD EDS = Ed.S. in Educational Administration; EDAD EDD = Ed.D. in Educational Administration; ED PSYC MSED = M.S.Ed. in Educational Psychology; ED PSYC PHD = Ph.D. in Educational Psychology; ED R&E MS = M.S. in Educational Research and Evaluation; ELED MSED = M.S.Ed. in Elementary Education; FE MSED = M.S.Ed. in Foundations of Education; IT MSED = M.S.Ed. in Instructional Technology.

Criterion	Graduate (cont'd)						Percent in College
	IT EDD	KNPE MSED	LIT ED MSED	SBM MSED	SPEC ED MSED	SPORT MS	COE
Assessment Methods							
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	96
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Student Learning Outcomes							
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓			✓	✓	68
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results							
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	89
Sample size reported	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Date data collected reported	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	86
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	96
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results							
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	96
Percent Overall	**100**	**85**	**92**	**62**	**100**	**92**	**94**

Notes ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. IT EDD = Ed.D. in Instructional Technology; KNPE MSED = M.S.Ed. in Kinesiology and Physical Education, LIT ED MSED = M.S.Ed. in Literacy Education; SBM MSED = M.S.Ed. in School Business Management; SPEC ED MSED = M.S.Ed. in Special Education; SPORT MS = M.S. in Sport Management.

College of Engineering and Engineering Technology

Table 6

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by degree program within the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology).

Criterion	Undergraduate				Graduate				Percent In College
	ELE	ISYE	MEE	TECH	ELE MS	ISYE MS	IND MS	MEE MS	CEET
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	88
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	88
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Percent Overall	**100**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**100**	**98**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. ELE = B.S. in Electrical Engineering; ISYE = B.S. in Industrial and Systems Engineering; MEE = B.S. in Mechanical Engineering; TECH = B.S. in Technology; ELE MS = M.S. in Electrical Engineering; ISYE MS = M.S. in Industrial and Systems Engineering; IND MS = M.S. in Industrial Management; MEE MS = M.S. in Mechanical Engineering.

College of Health and Human Sciences

Table 7

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by undergraduate degree program within the College of Health and Human Sciences).

Criterion	Undergraduate					Percent in College
	COMD BS	ECS BS	FCS BS	HED BSED	HS	CHHS
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Student Learning Outcomes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable		✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved		✓	✓	✓	✓	82
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	88
Percent Overall	**85**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**97**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. COMD BS = B.S. in Communicative Disorders; ECS BS = B.S. in Early Childhood Studies; FCS BS = B.S. in Family and Child Studies; HED BSED = B.S.Ed. in Health Education; HS = B.S. in Health Sciences.

	Undergraduate (cont'd)					Percent in College
Criterion	**MLS**	**NURS**	**NDHA**	**PH**	**TAM**	**CHHS**
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Student Learning Outcomes						
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	82
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results						
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓	✓		88
Percent Overall	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**97**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. MLS = B.S. in Medical Laboratory Sciences; NURS = B.S. in Nursing; NDHA = B.S. in Nutrition, Dietetics, and Hospitality Administration; PH = B.S. in Public Health; and TAM = B.S. in Textiles, Apparel, and Merchandising.

Table 8

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by graduate degree program within the College of Health and Human Sciences).

| Criterion | Graduate | | | | | | | | Percent in College |
	AFCS MS	AUD	COMD MA	FCS MS[a]	NURS MS	N&D MS	DPT	MPH	CHHS
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	▦	▦	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	82
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Date data collected reported	▦	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	▦	✓	✓	▦	✓	✓	✓	✓	88
Percent Overall	85	92	92	▦	100	100	100	100	97

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. AFCS MS = M.S. in Applied, Family and Child Studies; AUD = Au.D. in Audiology; COMD MA = M.S. in Communicative Disorders; FCS MS = M.S. in Family and Consumer Sciences; NURS MS = M.S. in Nursing; N&D MS = M.S. in Nutrition and Dietetics; DPT = D.P.T. in Physical Therapy; MPH = M.P.H. in Public Health.

[a] M.S. in Family and Consumer Sciences is not included in 2014 results. The program submitted a report, but there are no students in the program.

College of Law

Table 9

Evidence by degree program within the College of Law demonstrating key indicators of a healthy assessment system.

	Graduate	Percent In College
Criterion	**LAW**	**COL**
Assessment Methods		
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	100
Student Learning Outcomes		
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	100
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	100
Reporting Results		
Student and program level targets	✓	100
Sample size reported	✓	100
Date data collected reported	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results		
Conclusions supported by data	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	100
Percent Overall	**100**	**100**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. LAW = J.D. in Jurisprudence.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Grouped by the physical sciences, social sciences, and humanities

Table 10

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by undergraduate degree program in the physical sciences within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences).

Criterion	Undergraduate – Physical Sciences									Percent in College
	BIOS	CHEM	CSCI	ENVS	GEOG	GEOL	MATH	MET	PHYS	CLAS
Assessment Methods										
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	89
Student Learning Outcomes										
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results										
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	85
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results										
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	80
Percent Overall	**100**	**100**	**92**	**92**	**92**	**92**	**92**	**92**	**92**	**93**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. BIOS = B.S. in Biological Sciences; CHEM = B.S. in Chemistry; CSCI = B.S. in Computer Sciences; ENVS = B.A./B.S. in Environmental Studies; GEOG = B.S. in Geography; GEOL = B.S. in Geology and Environmental Geosciences; MATH = B.S. in Mathematical Sciences; MET = B.S. in Meteorology; PHYS = B.S. in Physics.

Table 11

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by graduate degree program in the physical sciences within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences).

Criterion	Graduate – Physical Sciences							Percent in College
	BIOS MS	BIOS PHD	CHEM MS	CHEM PHD	CSCI MS	GEOG MS	GEOG PHD	CLAS
Assessment Methods								
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	89
Student Learning Outcomes								
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	▨	✓	✓	✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results								
Student and program level targets	▨	▨	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	85
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	▨	▨	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	▨	▨	✓	✓	▨	✓	✓	80
Percent Overall	**77**	**77**	**92**	**100**	**92**	**100**	**100**	**93**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. BIOS MS = M.S. in Biological Sciences; BIOS PHD = Ph.D. in Biological Sciences; CHEM MS = M.S. in Chemistry; CHEM PHD = Ph.D. in Chemistry; CSCI MS = M.S. in Computer Sciences; GEOG MS = M.S. in Geography; GEOG PHD = Ph.D. in Geography.

Criterion	GEOL MS	GEOL PHD	MATH MS	MATH PHD	PHYS MS	PHYS PHD	STAT MS	Percent in College CLAS
Assessment Methods								
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	89
Student Learning Outcomes								
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓				87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		87
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results								
Student and program level targets					✓	✓	✓	85
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	80
Percent Overall	92	92	92	85	85	85	85	**93**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. GEOL MS = M.S. in Geology; GEOL PHD = Ph.D. in Geology; MATH MS = M.S. in Mathematics; MATH PHD = Ph.D. in Mathematical Sciences; PHYS MS = M.S. in Physics; PHYS PHD = Ph.D. in Physics; STAT MS = M.S. in Applied Probability and Statistics.

Table 12

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by undergraduate degree program in the social sciences within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences).

Criterion	Undergraduate – Social Sciences								Percent in College
	ANTH	COMS	CLCE	ECON	JOUR	POLS	PSYC	SOCI	CLAS
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	89
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	85
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	96
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	80
Percent Overall	100	92	100	100	85	100	85	100	93

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. ANTH = B.A./B.S. in Anthropology; COMS = B.A./B.S. in Communication Studies; CLCE = B.A./B.S. in Community Leadership and Civic Engagement; ECON = B.A./B.S. in Economics; JOUR = B.A./B.S. in Journalism; POLS = B.A./B.S. in Political Science; PSYC = B.A./B.S. in Psychology; SOCI = B.A./B.S. in Sociology.

Table 13

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by graduate degree program in the social sciences within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences).

Criterion	Graduate – Social Sciences					Percent in College
	ANTH MA	COMS MA	ECON MA	ECON PHD	POLS MA	CLAS
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓		89
Student Learning Outcomes						
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results						
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓		✓	85
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Plans to implement improvement actions		✓	✓	✓	✓	80
Percent Overall	**92**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**92**	**93**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. ANTH MA = M.A. in Anthropology; COMS MA = M.A. in Communication Studies; ECON MA = M.A. in Economics; ECON PHD = Ph.D. in Economics; POLS MA = M.A. in Political Science.

Criterion	Graduate – Social Sciences (cont'd)					Percent in College
	POLS PHD	**PSYC MA**	**PSYC PHD**	**PSPA MPA**	**SOCI MA**	**CLAS**
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓			✓	✓	89
Student Learning Outcomes						
Outcomes student learning focused				✓	✓	94
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓		✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	✓		✓	87
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results						
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	85
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓		✓	96
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓			✓	✓	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓			✓	✓	80
Percent Overall	**92**	**69**	**62**	**85**	**100**	**93**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. POLS PHD = Ph.D. in Political Science; PSYC MA = M.A. in Psychology; PSYC PHD = Ph.D. in Psychology; PSPA MPA = M.P.A. in Public Administration; SOCI MA = M.A. in Sociology.

Table 14

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by undergraduate degree program in the humanities within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences).

	Undergraduate – Humanities						Percent in College
Criterion	ENGL	FLFR	FLGE	FLSP	HIST	PHIL	CLAS
Assessment Methods							
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	89
Student Learning Outcomes							
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	87
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results							
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	85
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results							
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	80
Percent Overall	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**100**	**93**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. ENGL = B.A. in English; FLFR = B.A. in French; FLGE = B.A. in German; FLSP = B.A. in Spanish; HIST = B.A./B.S. in History; PHIL = B.A./B.S. in Philosophy.

Table 15

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by graduate degree program in the humanities within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences).

Criterion	Graduate – Humanities							Percent in College
	ENGL MA	ENGL PHD	FLFR MA	FLSP MA	HIST MA	HIST PHD	PHIL MA	CLAS
Assessment Methods								
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	89
Student Learning Outcomes								
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	94
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	87
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results								
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	85
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	96
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	80
Percent Overall	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**100**	**100**	**93**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. ENGL MA = M.A. in English; ENGL PHD = Ph.D. in English; FLFR MA = M.A. in French; FLSP MA = M.A. in Spanish; HIST MA = M.A. in History; HIST PHD = Ph.D. in History; PHIL MA = M.A. in Philosophy.

College of Visual and Performing Arts

Table 16

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by undergraduate degree program within the College of Visual and Performing Arts).

Criterion	ART	ARTH	ART ED	ART BFA	MUSC BA	MUSC BM	THEA BFA	THEA BA	CVPA
	Undergraduate								Percent in College
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	87
Appropriate assessment methods		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	73
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	93
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	73
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	67
Sample size reported		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	60
Date data collected reported		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	60
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	67
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	80
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	67
Percent Overall	69	85	100	100	54	54	100	100	79

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. ART = B.A. in Art; ARTH = B.A. in Art History; ART ED = B.S.Ed. in Art Education; ART BFA = B.F.A. in Studio Art; MUSC BA = B.A. in Music; MUSC BM = B.M. in Music; THEA BFA = B.F.A. in Theatre Arts; and THEA BA = B.A. in Theatre Studies.

Table 17

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by graduate degree program within the College of Visual and Performing Arts).

| Criterion | Graduate | | | | | | | Percent in College |
	ART MA	ART MFA	ART MS	ARTED PHD	MUSC PC	MUSC MM	THEA MFA	CVPA
Assessment Methods								
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	87
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	73
Student Learning Outcomes								
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	93
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	73
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results								
Student and program level targets	✓						✓	67
Sample size reported	✓		✓	✓			✓	60
Date data collected reported	✓		✓	✓			✓	60
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓		✓	✓			✓	67
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	80
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	67
Percent Overall	92	62	92	92	38	46	100	79

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. ART MA = M.A. in Art; ART MFA = M.F.A. in Art; ART MS = M.S. in Art; ARTED PHD = Ph.D. in Art Education; MUSC PC = P.C. in Music; MUSC MM = M.M. in Music; THEA MFA = M.F.A. in Theatre Arts.

Office of the Provost

Table 18

Demonstration of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by degree program within the Office of the Provost).

Criterion	Undergraduate		Graduate		Percent in Office
	BSAM	**BGS**	**MAT** [a]	**MST** [b]	**PROVOST**
Assessment Methods					
Assessment methods clearly described	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Appropriate assessment methods	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Student Learning Outcomes					
Outcomes student learning focused	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved			✓		25
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Reporting Results					
Student and program level targets	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Sample size reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Date data collected reported	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results					
Conclusions supported by data	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Program improvement actions identified	✓	✓	✓	✓	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	✓	✓			50
Percent Overall	**92**	**92**	**92**	**85**	**90**

Notes. ✓ indicates criterion was demonstrated. BSAM = B.S. in Applied Management; BGS = B.G.S. in General Studies; MAT = M.A.T. in Teaching; MST = M.S.T. in Teaching.
[a] Teaching, M.A.T. did not submit an aggregate report in 2014. Specialization data has been aggregated.
[b] Teaching, M.S.T. did not submit an aggregate report in 2014. Specialization data has been aggregated.

Annual Assessment Update Report for Academic Programs 2013–2014
Northern Illinois University

Introduction and Directions

The annual assessment update report is part of NIU's program review process. Its purpose is to ensure degree programs have sufficient student learning outcomes data. The annual data is to be used to build a database to support the effectiveness of the program and ensure students are meeting student learning outcomes. A degree program that assesses each outcome every few years will have data to respond to. The key is to regularly connect assessment results with specific student learning outcomes.

This year's annual assessment update report asks you to report the results of two program assessments (from the program's current/revised assessment plan). Results are reported for each assessment, along with the student learning outcome(s) each measures, the desired performance targets, and a brief discussion of how the results are/were used for program improvement purposes. The template to use begins on the next page.

In an effort to streamline and improve the submission process, the Blackboard Workflow feature will no longer be used. Please complete the template below and email it, along with copies of each assessment reported on, to Steve Wallace (swallace@niu.edu), associate director of the office of assessment services.

Due Date: Monday, May 19, 2014

For those in need of assistance or unfamiliar with the annual assessment update report or its relationship to program review, please feel free to contact me (Steve Wallace) at 753-0816 or swallace@niu.edu.

Essentials:

- Complete the template
- Due Date is **May 19, 2014**
- **Email** to Steve Wallace (swallace@niu.edu)

The template follows….

Degree Program: _____ Due Date: __**May 19, 2014**__

Degree: _____ Date Submitted: _____

Report Completed by:

    Name: _____

    Department: _____

    Email: _____

    Phone: _____

Assessment Method #1	Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed with Assessment #1	Summary Assessment Results for Assessment #1	Use of Results for Assessment #1
Insert a brief description of assessment method #1.	Insert a direct quote of the outcome(s) assessment #1 measures and the desired target level of performance for each outcome.	Insert summary results for assessment method #1 here. Include the sample size, date the data was collected, and the desired performance level each student must demonstrate. Clearly link the data to the student learning outcomes listed.	Insert conclusions and how assessment results from assessment method #1 are being used for continuous improvement purposes.

Assessment Method #2	Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed with Assessment #2	Summary Assessment Results for Assessment #2	Use of Results for Assessment #2
Insert a brief description of assessment method #2.	Insert a direct quote of the outcome(s) assessment #2 measures and the desired target level of performance for each outcome.	Insert summary results for assessment method #2 here. Include the sample size, date the data was collected, and the desired performance level each student must demonstrate. Clearly link the data to individual student learning outcomes.	Insert conclusions and how assessment results from assessment method #2 are being used for continuous improvement purposes.

Assessment Method #	Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed with Assessment #	Summary Assessment Results for Assessment #	Use of Results for Assessment #
Repeat with additional assessment methods as needed (only two are required)			

Submit the completed annual assessment update report (and **copies of each assessment method**) to Steve Wallace, associate director of the office of assessment services (swallace@niu.edu) by May 19, 2014.

Appendix B

Annual Assessment Update Feedback (AY 2013-14)

Degree Program: _____   Date: _____

Degree: _____   Reviewer: _____

Annual assessment update reports serve multiple purposes. The first is to provide a body of data and a record of continual program improvement efforts. Annual assessment update activities should feed into mid-cycle status reports and program review. A second purpose is to gauge the health of a program's assessment system. Below is a subset of indicators of a quality program assessment system (that can be observed through the annual assessment update report). Note that status reports and program review provide an opportunity to observe the entirety of an assessment system; annual assessment update reports are a snapshot. Please use the feedback provided to guide program improvement efforts.

	Assessment Methods
_____	All assessment methods are clearly described
	All assessment methods are appropriate to measure the intended program-level student learning outcome

Assessment methods included in this report:

  1.
  2.

Observations, comments, and suggestions:

_____

	Student Learning Outcomes
_____	Related outcomes are student learning focused.
	Related outcomes are observable and measurable using verbs (e.g., explain, perform, collaborate)
_____	Related outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved
_____	Related outcomes imply higher levels of learning (e.g., analyzing, evaluating, creating)

Observations, comments, and suggestions:

_____

	Reporting Results
_____	Results include the desired target level of success at both the student and program level
_____	Results include sample size

Reporting Results

	Results include the date when the data were collected
	Results are aggregated and presented in meaningful ways (e.g., tables, graphs, narrative themes)

Observations, comments, and suggestions:

Decisions, Actions, and the Use of Results

	Conclusions relative to program student learning outcomes are clearly supported by the data
	Program improvement actions are identified
	Plans to implement program improvement actions are specified

Observations, comments, and suggestions:

General Comments, Suggestions, and Recommendations:

Thank you for taking the time and putting in the effort to document (1) student achievement of your program student learning outcomes and (2) your program assessment system. Please use the formative feedback on the health of your program assessment system as part of your overall program improvement efforts. Take the next step. Office of Assessment Services staff are more than happy to provide tailored support in your efforts. A healthy assessment system supports good data-driven decision making.