

Northern Illinois University
Office of Assessment Services

**University Annual Assessment Update Report:
The Health of Degree Program Assessment Systems
2014-2015**

Spring 2016
For Additional Information
Contact Office of Assessment Services
assess@niu.edu

Table of Contents

Purpose and Overview.....	3
University Participation	4
University Results and Interpretation.....	5
University Recommendations.....	8
College of Business.....	10
College of Education.....	12
College of Engineering and Engineering Technology.....	17
College of Health and Human Sciences.....	19
College of Law	23
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	25
College of Visual and Performing Arts	34
Office of the Provost.....	37
Appendix A: Annual Assessment Update Directions.....	39
Appendix B: Feedback Checklist/Rubric.....	42

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 2015 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 Update Reports are reviewed by the Office of Assessment Services (OAS) and feedback is provided to each degree program. Prior to 2013-2014, feedback had 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. Over the past two years, the focus of the feedback has 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 prior to 2014-2015 set at either present or absent. This year performance levels were changed to a three-point scale measuring the extent to which key criteria are demonstrated (not at all, somewhat, or to a great extent). The UAP set as a target of success that all criteria in each of the four areas be met (i.e., somewhat or to a great extent).

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

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
2014-2015	136	137	99
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

Historically the vast majority of degree programs complete annual assessment update reports, as noted above in Table 1. One degree program did not submit a report this year despite repeated requests, while two programs from the same department were very late in submitting their reports. The programs submitting late came from a department that had undergone leadership changes at the same time annual assessment update reports were due. Although degree program participation in the Annual Assessment Update process is essential, the quality of the assessment practices within degree programs is paramount for effective improvement practices. An analysis of each of the four areas (assessment methods, student learning outcomes, reporting of evidence, and use of results) indicates that, overall, Northern Illinois 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 to a great extent.

At the college level, the Colleges of Business, Engineering and Engineering Technology, Health and Human Sciences, and Law are performing exceptionally well, with degree programs demonstrating to a great extent key indicators between 97 and 100 percent of the time. The colleges of Education and Liberal Arts and Sciences are performing very well (with between 92 and 95 percent of all possible observations scored at the great extent level). The College of Visual and Performing Arts did see an improvement from the year before, with a gain from 79 to 93 percent. The Office of the Provost degree programs saw a decrease in performance with 81 percent of all possible observations at the great extent level.

A deeper analysis of results within each of the four areas of an assessment system reveals a number of strengths and a few areas in need of support. Within the area of assessment methods, degree programs sufficiently described their assessment methods (99 percent to a great extent), while 92 percent reported results using appropriate assessment methods. The most frequent inappropriate method was the use of grades (seven programs), followed by one program that used graduation rates and one program that used professional honors as measures of student learning outcomes. Four degree programs did not report one or more of the required two assessment methods.

Within the area of student learning outcomes, nearly all (99 percent) of degree programs reported outcomes that are student learning focused. Likewise, 98 percent of programs demonstrated student learning outcomes that imply higher levels of learning. Approximately 92 percent of degree programs demonstrated to a great extent outcomes that are observable and measurable. The most frequent concern was the use of phrases such as “students will *know*” or “students will *understand*” which are not directly observable nor measurable. The performance criterion with the lowest percent of degree programs performing well was “outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved.” Only 80 percent of degree programs demonstrated this criterion, which was also the lowest performing criterion overall. This criterion was introduced two years ago, and is somewhat difficult to conceptualize.

Performance within the area of reporting results was consistently high, with between 92 and 98 percent of degree programs demonstrating to a great extent the four criteria. Degree programs reported aggregated results in meaningful ways that stakeholders could interpret and use. They included essential features, such as sample size and the date data was collected. The lowest performing criterion was the inclusion of student and program level targets. This essential feature provides readers with a context to interpret the results (e.g., how well a single student should do on a single assessment, and how well the group of students should do overall to say the program is meeting its target). There were 11 degree programs that did not report student and/or program level targets.

Finally, within the area of decisions, actions, and use of results, degree programs again performed consistently well. Overall, performance ranged for 96 to 98 percent of degree programs demonstrating each of the three

criterion to a great extent. Programs supported their conclusions with data, identified program improvement actions, and planned to implement those improvement actions.

University Results and Interpretation

Table 2

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

Criterion	CBUS (10)	CEDU (27)	CEET (8)	CHHS (17)	CLAW (1)	CLAS (52)	CVPA (15)	Provost (4)	University (132)
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	100	100	100	100	100	98	100	75	99
Appropriate assessment methods	100	96	100	100	100	90	73	50	92
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	100	100	100	100	100	96	100	100	99
Outcomes observable and measurable	100	96	88	94	100	87	87	100	92
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	100	81	88	94	100	75	73	25	80
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	100	100	88	100	100	96	100	100	98
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	100	78	100	100	100	92	100	75	92
Sample size reported	100	100	100	100	100	90	93	75	95
Date data collected reported	100	100	100	100	100	98	93	75	98
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	100	100	100	100	100	88	93	75	95
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	100	96	100	100	100	90	100	100	96
Program improvement actions identified	100	93	100	100	100	98	100	100	98
Plans to implement improvement actions	100	93	100	100	100	98	100	100	98
Percent of all Possible Observations	100	95	97	99	100	92	93	81	95

Notes. Key indicators could be demonstrated from no extent, some extent, to a great extent. N University = 132, n CBUS = 10, n CEDU = 27, n CEET = 8, n CHHS = 17, n CLAW = 1, n CLAS = 52, n CVPA = 15, and n Provost = 4.

University Recommendations

Based on this year's analysis, several steps can be taken to improve compliance and the quality of assessment systems across the university. The first step is to reiterate to degree programs that submitting an annual assessment update report is not an option, but a requirement. While two degree programs had extenuating circumstances, including personnel turnover, increased communication with new program leadership should enhance compliance and the quality of submissions. Establishing consequences for historically problematic programs seems warranted.

A second recommendation is to continue efforts championing the use of appropriate, reliable, and valid assessment methods measuring program student learning outcomes. Nine percent of degree programs did not use appropriate assessment methods. There are still perceptions that using course grades as a means of measuring specific student learning outcomes is appropriate. Course grades typically include measures of more than student learning (e.g., attendance, participation, etc.). In many cases the remedy is a matter of shifting the focus from broad-based course grades, to student performance on specific course-based assessments that are aligned with specific student learning outcomes. As long as the course-based assessment data is aligned with particular program-level student learning outcomes, the data can be effectively and efficiently used as one element of student grades and as a program assessment.

A third major step is to communicate and highlight the usefulness and utility of well-written student learning outcomes. Two areas are still a concern university wide—namely, outcomes are observable/measurable and they imply a level of performance to be achieved; the latter indicator of quality was recently added as a criterion of quality program assessment. A specific recommendation is to work closely with degree programs that still have student learning outcomes that are not directly observable or measurable. The most frequent issue is the use of behaviors such as “students will know” and “students will understand.” An online tutorial is being developed by the Office of Assessment Services to guide programs in revising student learning outcomes.

Fourth, the Office of Assessment Services will explicitly emphasize how the quality of reported results can impact the ease with which internal and external stakeholders can grasp student performance and infer the quality of the degree program itself. Of note are the need to include student and program level targets, sample size, and the date when data was collected to put reported results in perspective. Likewise, results can be reported meaningfully by including longitudinal data to communicate progress over time, and disaggregating by important subgroups (e.g., native vs. transfer student, major vs. minor, major vs. general education, etc.). Increasing the quality of reported student learning outcome results on the annual assessment update report will enhance the ability of decision makers to identify areas of strength and areas in need of improvement—now and in the future (e.g., annually; and for mid-cycle status reports, program review, accreditation, and program prioritization efforts).

Fifth, the Office of Assessment Services will stress the usefulness of fully describing the decisions, actions, and use of results a program has made or plans to make. The annual assessment update report serves as a repository of specific improvement actions the program faculty have taken, which can be referenced in the future when asked to demonstrate program improvement efforts. This can be particularly useful in this era of accountability and personnel turnover.

And lastly, the Office of Assessment Services will continue to work very closely with the few degree programs that have consistently scored lower overall on the checklist/rubric. Follow up efforts this year 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.

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 (98 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 the Office of the Provost.

College of Business

Table 3

Demonstration to a great extent 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	CBUS
Assessment Methods											
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Student Learning Outcomes											
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Reporting Results											
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results											
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Percent of Possible Observations	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator to a great extent. 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 to a great extent 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	CEDU
Assessment Methods							
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Student Learning Outcomes							
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	2	3	96
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3	2	3	3	81
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Reporting Results							
Student and program level targets	3	3	2	3	3	3	78
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results							
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	93
Percent of Possible Observations	100	100	92	92	92	100	95

Note. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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 to a great extent 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	CEDU
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	81
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	1	78
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	93
Percent of Possible Observations	100	100	92	92	92	92	100	92	95

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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 ^a	FE MSED	IT MSED	CEDU
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	81
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	3	2	3	3	2		3	3	78
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	100
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	93
Percent of Possible Observations	100	92	100	100	92		100	100	95

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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.

^a M.S.Ed. in Elementary Education is not included in 2015 results. The program did not submit a report this year because they are no longer recruiting students into the program.

Criterion	Graduate (cont'd)						Percent in College
	IT EDD	KNPE MSED	LIT ED MSED	SBM MSED	SPEC ED MSED	SPORT MS	CEDU
Assessment Methods							
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	2	96
Student Learning Outcomes							
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3	2	3	2	81
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Reporting Results							
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	78
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results							
Conclusions supported by data	3	2	3	3	3	3	96
Program improvement actions identified	3	1	3	3	3	2	93
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	1	3	3	3	2	93
Percent of Possible Observations	100	77	100	92	100	69	95

Notes 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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 to a great extent 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	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	88
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	88
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	88
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Percent of Possible Observations	85	100	100	100	100	100	100	92	97

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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 to a great extent 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	FM	HED BSED	CHHS
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	100
Student Learning Outcomes						
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	94
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3	3	3	94
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	100
Reporting Results						
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	100
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	100
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	100
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	100
Percent of Possible Observations	100	100	100	100	100	99

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. COMD BS = B.S. in Communicative Disorders; ECS BS = B.S. in Early Childhood Studies; FCS BS = B.S. in Family and Child Studies; FM = B.S. in Fashion Merchandising; and HED BSED = B.S.Ed. in Health Education.

Criterion	Undergraduate (cont'd)					Percent in College
	HS	MLS	NURS	NDHA	PH	CHHS
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	100
Student Learning Outcomes						
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	94
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3	3	3	94
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	100
Reporting Results						
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	100
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	100
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	100
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	100
Percent of Possible Observations	100	100	100	100	100	99

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. HS = B.S. in Health Sciences; 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.

Table 8

Demonstration to a great extent 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	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	2		3	3	3	3	94
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	2		3	3	3	3	94
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Sample size reported	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Date data collected reported	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Percent of Possible Observations	100	100	85		100	100	100	100	99

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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 2015 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 to a great extent key indicators of a healthy assessment system.

Criterion	Graduate	Percent In College
	LAW	CLAW
Assessment Methods		
Assessment methods clearly described	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	100
Student Learning Outcomes		
Outcomes student learning focused	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	100
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	100
Reporting Results		
Student and program level targets	3	100
Sample size reported	3	100
Date data collected reported	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	100
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results		
Conclusions supported by data	3	100
Program improvement actions identified	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	100
Percent of Possible Observations	100	100

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. LAW = J.D. in Jurisprudence.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Grouped by the physical sciences, social sciences, and humanities

Table 10

Demonstration to a great extent 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 ^a	GEOG	GEOL	MATH	MET	PHYS	CLAS
Assessment Methods										
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	98
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	90
Student Learning Outcomes										
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	96
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3		2	3	3	2	2	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	3	3		3	3	2	3	2	75
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	96
Reporting Results										
Student and program level targets	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	92
Sample size reported	2	3	3		3	1	3	3	3	90
Date data collected reported	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	98
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	88
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results										
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	90
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	98
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	98
Percent of Possible Observations	85	100	100	0	92	92	92	92	85	92

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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.

^a B.A./B.S. in Environmental Studies is not included in 2015 results. The program did not submit a report despite multiple requests.

Table 11

Demonstration to a great extent 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	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	90
Student Learning Outcomes								
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	75
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Reporting Results								
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	92
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	90
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	88
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
Conclusions supported by data	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	90
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Percent of Possible Observations	77	77	100	100	85	100	100	92

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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	Graduate – Physical Sciences (cont'd)							Percent in College
	GEOL MS	GEOL PHD	MATH MS	MATH PHD	PHYS MS	PHYS PHD	STAT MS	CLAS
Assessment Methods								
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	90
Student Learning Outcomes								
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	75
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Reporting Results								
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	92
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	90
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	88
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	90
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Percent of Possible Observations	100	100	100	92	62	92	92	92

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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 to a great extent 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	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Appropriate assessment methods	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	90
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	75
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	92
Sample size reported	3	1	3	3	1	3	3	3	90
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	88
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	90
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	98
Percent of Possible Observations	100	85	92	100	85	92	100	100	92

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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 to a great extent 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	3	3	3	3	3	98
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	2	90
Student Learning Outcomes						
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	96
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3	3	3	75
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	96
Reporting Results						
Student and program level targets	3	3	2	2	3	92
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	90
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	98
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	88
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	90
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	98
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	98
Percent of Possible Observations	100	100	92	92	92	92

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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 ^a	SOCI MA	CLAS
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	98
Appropriate assessment methods	2	3	3	3	3	90
Student Learning Outcomes						
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3		3	96
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3		3	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3		3	75
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3		3	96
Reporting Results						
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	92
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	90
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	98
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	88
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	90
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	98
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	98
Percent of Possible Observations	92	100	100	69	100	92

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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.

^a M.P.A. in Public Administration student learning outcomes are not included in 2015 results. The program submitted a report, but did not include revised student learning outcomes.

Table 14

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

Criterion	Undergraduate – Humanities						Percent in College
	ENGL	FLFR ^a	FLGE	FLSP	HIST	PHIL	CLAS
Assessment Methods							
Assessment methods clearly described	3		3	3	3	3	98
Appropriate assessment methods	3		3	3	3	3	90
Student Learning Outcomes							
Outcomes student learning focused	3		3	3	3	3	96
Outcomes observable and measurable	3		3	3	3	3	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3		3	3	3	3	75
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3		3	3	3	3	96
Reporting Results							
Student and program level targets	3		3	3	3	3	92
Sample size reported	3		3	3	3	3	90
Date data collected reported	3		3	3	3	3	98
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3		3	3	3	3	88
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results							
Conclusions supported by data	3		3	3	3	3	90
Program improvement actions identified	3		3	3	3	3	98
Plans to implement improvement actions	3		3	3	3	3	98
Percent of Possible Observations	100		100	100	100	100	92

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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.

^a B.A. in French is not included in 2015 results. The program did not submit a report because there were no faculty in the program.

Table 15

Demonstration to a great extent 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 ^a	FLSP MA	HIST MA	HIST PHD	PHIL MA	CLAS
Assessment Methods								
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3		3	3	3	3	98
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3		3	3	3	3	90
Student Learning Outcomes								
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3		3	3	3	3	96
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3		3	3	3	3	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3		3	2	2	3	75
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3		3	3	3	3	96
Reporting Results								
Student and program level targets	3	3		3	3	3	3	92
Sample size reported	3	3		3	3	3	3	90
Date data collected reported	3	3		3	3	3	3	98
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3		3	3	3	3	88
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
Conclusions supported by data	3	3		3	3	3	3	90
Program improvement actions identified	3	3		3	3	3	3	98
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3		3	3	3	3	98
Percent of Possible Observations	100	100		100	92	92	100	92

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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.

^a M.A. in French is not included in 2015 results. The program did not submit a report because there were no faculty in the program.

College of Visual and Performing Arts

Table 16

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

Criterion	Undergraduate								Percent in College
	ART	ARTH	ART ED	ART BFA	MUSC BA	MUSC BM	THEA BFA	THEA BA	CVPA
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	73
Student Learning Outcomes									
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	73
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Reporting Results									
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Sample size reported	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	93
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	93
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	93
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Percent of Possible Observations	85	92	100	62	92	92	100	100	93

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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 to a great extent 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	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	73
Student Learning Outcomes								
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	87
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	73
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Reporting Results								
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	93
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	93
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	93
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Percent of Possible Observations	92	100	100	100	92	92	100	93

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent. 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 to a great extent 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	2	3	3	3	75
Appropriate assessment methods	2	2	3	3	50
Student Learning Outcomes					
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	2	3	2	25
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	100
Reporting Results					
Student and program level targets	1	3	3	3	75
Sample size reported	1	3	3	3	75
Date data collected reported	1	3	3	3	75
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	1	3	3	3	75
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results					
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	100
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	100
Percent of Possible Observations	46	85	100	92	81

Notes. 1 = no extent, 2 = some extent, and 3 = great extent. Percent in college demonstrating key indicator from somewhat to a great extent.

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 2015. Specialization data has been aggregated.

^b Teaching, M.S.T. did not submit an aggregate report in 2015. Specialization data has been aggregated.

Appendix A

Annual Assessment Update Report for Academic Programs AY 2014–2015 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 or revised assessment plan) that were collected during the spring, summer, and fall semesters of 2014, and/or spring semester of 2015. 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.

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: Friday, May 22, 2015

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
- Data from Summer 2014 through Spring 2015
- Due Date is **May 22, 2015**
- **Email** to Steve Wallace (swallace@niu.edu)

The template follows....

Degree Program: _____

Degree: _____

Report Completed by:

Name: _____

Department: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Due Date: May 22, 2015

Date Submitted: _____

Assessment Method #1	Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed with Assessment #1	Summary Assessment Results for Assessment #1	Use of Results for Assessment #1
<p>Insert a brief description of program assessment method #1 (from the current program assessment plan)</p>	<p>Insert a direct quote of the program student learning outcome(s) assessment #1 measures</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>And</u></p> <p>Desired target level of performance for each outcome at the program level.</p>	<p>Insert summary results for assessment method #1 here.</p> <p>Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the sample size, • date the data was collected, and • the desired performance level each student must demonstrate on the assessment. <p>Clearly link the data to the program student learning outcomes listed.</p>	<p>Insert conclusions and how the assessment results from assessment method #1 are being used for continuous improvement purposes.</p> <p>A recommendation is to document plans to implement improvement actions.</p> <p>Details here provide a record of continuous improvement efforts for future use by the program and others.</p>

Assessment Method #2	Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed with Assessment #2	Summary Assessment Results for Assessment #2	Use of Results for Assessment #2
<p>Insert a brief description of program assessment method #2 (from the current program assessment plan)</p>	<p>Insert a direct quote of the program student learning outcome(s) assessment #2 measures</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>And</u></p> <p>Desired target level of performance for each outcome at the program level.</p>	<p>Insert summary results for assessment method #2 here.</p> <p>Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the sample size, • date the data was collected, and • the desired performance level each student must demonstrate on the assessment. <p>Clearly link the data to the program student learning outcomes listed.</p>	<p>Insert conclusions and how the assessment results from assessment method #2 are being used for continuous improvement purposes.</p> <p>A recommendation is to document plans to implement improvement actions.</p> <p>Details here provide a record of continuous improvement efforts for future use by the program and others.</p>

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 22, 2015.

Appendix B

Annual Assessment Update Feedback (AY 2014-15)

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.

N = Not at all, S = Somewhat, and G = Great extent

N	S	G	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:

N	S	G	Student Learning Outcomes
			Related outcomes are student learning focused.
			Related outcomes are observable and measurable using verbs (e.g., explain, perform, collaborate)
			Related outcomes communicate what successful performance looks like (i.e., performance criteria are implied)
			Related outcomes imply higher levels of learning (e.g., analyzing, evaluating, creating)

Student Learning Outcomes assessed in this report:

N	S	G	Reporting Results
			Results include the desired target level of success at both the student and program level
			Results include sample size
			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:

N S G 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:
