

Northern Illinois University  
Accreditation, Assessment,  
and Evaluation  
(formerly Office of  
Assessment Services)

**University Annual Assessment Update Report:  
The Health of Degree Program Assessment Systems  
2015-2016**

Spring 2018  
For Additional Information  
Contact Accreditation, Assessment, and Evaluation  
[assess@niu.edu](mailto: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 at least 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 2016 semester. The Annual Assessment Update Report required: (1) a description of at least 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 were reviewed by the former Office of Assessment Services (OAS). This office merged with the academic accreditation function in Fall 2016 and is now the Accreditation, Assessment, and Evaluation (AAE) function under Institutional Effectiveness (IE) at NIU. During this transition, a different rater than the one who had rated programs for the past several years rated some of the programs. For this reason, the approach to rating programs may differ this year, relative to prior years.

Feedback was provided to each degree program during the 2015-2016 academic year. 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 three 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. In 2014-2015, performance levels were changed to a three-point scale measuring the extent to which key criteria are demonstrated (not at all, partially, or completely). The UAP set as a target of success that all criteria in each of the four areas be met (i.e., completely).

To maintain transparency in the Annual Assessment Update process, a summary is posted online on Institutional Effectiveness's website (<http://www.niu.edu/effectiveness/assessment/reports.shtml>). In addition, all Annual Assessment Updates and feedback to the programs 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
2015-2016	131	138	95
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 <sup>a</sup>	97	125	78

*Note.* <sup>a</sup> Annual

## University Results and Interpretation

Historically, the vast majority of degree programs complete annual assessment update reports, as noted above in Table 1.

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 completely or to a great extent.

At the college level, the colleges of Business; Education; Engineering and Engineering Technology; Health and Human Sciences; and Law are performing exceptionally well, with degree programs demonstrating key indicators “completely” more than 85 percent of the time. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is performing well (with most indicators scored at the “completely” level more than 70 percent of the time). The programs for the colleges of Visual and Performing Arts and the Office of the Provost saw a decrease in performance from the year before, (for CVPA, from 93 percent to 52 percent and for Provost, from 81 percent to 50 percent), but this is likely due to the new rater’s difference in rating style, compared to the previous rater. In fact, all colleges tended to see a decrease in performance from last year to this year, possibly for this same reason.

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, most programs do well at describing their methods, but may require additional discretion in choosing better methods that are appropriate for assessment. However, overall, most programs are performing well in terms of understanding how to use assessment methods.

Within the area of student learning outcomes, programs perform well at creating student learning outcomes that convey appropriate goals, in terms of what the program wants students to learn (i.e., they are “student learning-focused” and “imply higher levels of learning”). However, programs may need to focus slightly more attention on iterating goals that translate well into their assessment methods (i.e., they are “observable and measurable” and they “imply a level of performance to be observed”).

Within the area of reporting results, programs consistently performed very well. This was especially true for indicators that involved programs providing enough context to make their results interpretable (i.e., providing “student and program level targets”, reporting “sample size”, and reporting the “date data collected”). Upon providing all of this background context, many programs tended to also disaggregate their data in meaningful ways; however, performance in the indicator involving disaggregation was still slightly weaker than in other indicators.

Finally, within the area of decisions, actions, and use of results, degree programs tended to perform well. One notable issue was that some programs identified future improvement actions (as informed by their reported results), but the connection between those actions and their reported results was not clear, or programs did not convey specific plans to implement improvement actions. However, these were not frequent problems among programs.

## University Results and Interpretation

Table 2

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

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>CBUS</b> (10)	<b>CEDU</b> (28)	<b>CEET</b> (8)	<b>CHHS</b> (19)	<b>CLAW</b> (1)	<b>CLAS</b> (51)	<b>CVPA</b> (11)	<b>Provost</b> (3)	<b>University</b> (131)
<b>Assessment Methods</b>									
Assessment methods clearly described	100	96	100	88	100	88	64	50	86
Appropriate assessment methods	100	89	100	100	0	84	55	100	79
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>									
Outcomes student learning focused	100	96	100	100	100	88	91	100	97
Outcomes observable and measurable	70	93	75	82	100	75	9	50	74
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	50	50	63	82	100	65	9	0	52
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	90	79	100	100	100	86	73	0	79
<b>Reporting Results</b>									
Student and program level targets	100	93	100	100	100	90	55	100	92
Sample size reported	100	96	100	94	100	86	64	100	93
Date data collected reported	100	96	100	88	100	80	100	100	96
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	100	82	100	88	100	76	9	0	69
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>									
Conclusions supported by data	100	96	100	94	100	92	45	0	78
Program improvement actions identified	100	96	100	100	100	84	73	50	88
Plans to implement improvement actions	100	96	100	94	100	75	36	0	75
<b>Percent of all Possible Observations</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>81</b>

*Notes.* Key indicators could be demonstrated as Not At All, Partially, or Completely. N University = 131, n CBUS = 10, n CEDU = 28, n CEET = 8, n CHHS = 19, n CLAW = 1, n CLAS = 51, n CVPA = 11, and n Provost = 3.

## 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. Many recommendations are similar to those posed in prior years, which highlights the need to communicate assessment-related advice clearly to programs.

One recommendation is to reiterate to degree programs that submitting an annual assessment update report is not an option, but a requirement. One potential source of miscommunication regarding the requirement of turning in a report is that NIU has experienced a lot of transition during the past couple of years. Therefore, programs may be more subject to extenuating circumstances and have less time to enact quality assessment practices. Emphasizing the mandatory nature of annual assessment update reports and effectively communicating with programs' offices should enhance compliance and the quality of submissions.

A second recommendation is to continue efforts championing the use of appropriate, reliable, and valid assessment methods measuring program student learning outcomes. An issue that remains from the prior year is that there are still perceptions that it is appropriate to use course grades (or enrollment in specific courses) as a means of measuring specific student learning outcomes. 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 recommendation is to communicate and highlight the usefulness and utility of well-written student learning outcomes. An area that remains a university-wide concern is lack of a clear connection between outcomes and methods, because outcomes are worded in ways that make them observable/measurable and they imply a level of performance to be achieved. These points are being emphasized in feedback to programs, and an increase in individual assessment consultations with programs may also help to remedy this.

A fourth recommendation is for Accreditation, Assessment and Evaluation to 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 is the need to disaggregate results meaningfully. For example, this could be achieved by including longitudinal data to communicate progress over time, and by disaggregating according to 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 for improvement— now and in the future (e.g., annually; and for mid-cycle status reports, program review, and accreditation).

A fifth recommendation is for Accreditation, Assessment and Evaluation to 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.

Lastly, Accreditation, Assessment and Evaluation will continue to work closely with programs that reach out to them for assistance with assessment. This should especially benefit programs that consistently score lower overall on the checklist/rubric. Based on individual communication with programs, it seems that lower scores may be due to a lack of understanding of specific reporting requirements, of assessment in general, or with establishing faculty buy-in within one's program (or from other programs, for cross-disciplinary programs). 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. 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 or completely of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by degree program within the College of Business).*

Criterion	Undergraduate						Graduate				Percent In College
	ACCY BS	BADM	FINA	MGMT	MKTG	OMIS BS	ACCY MAS	MBA	OMIS MS	TAX	CBUS
<b>Assessment Methods</b>											
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
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>											
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	70
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	50
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	90
<b>Reporting Results</b>											
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
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>											
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
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>93</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. Undergraduate: ACCY BS = 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 BS = B.S. in Operations and Information Management. Graduate: ACCY MAS = M.A.S. in Accounting Science; MBA = M.B.A. in Business Administration; OMIS MS = M.S. in Management Information Systems; and TAX = M.S. in Taxation.

College of Education

Table 4

*Demonstration to a great extent or completely 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 <sup>a</sup>	ELEM ED	KINE	PHYS ED	SPEC ED	CEDU
<b>Assessment Methods</b>							
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	89
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>							
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	2	3	93
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	3	3	2	3	3	50
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning		3	3	3	3	3	79
<b>Reporting Results</b>							
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	93
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	3	82
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>							
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>89</b>

*Note.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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.

<sup>a</sup> B.S. in Early Childhood Studies is cross-listed with CHHS. The program submitted one report, but the same ratings are listed in both this table and in a table for CHHS.

Table 5

*Demonstration to a great extent or completely 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 PHD	C&I MSED	C&I EDD	ECE MSED	EDAD MSED	CEDU
<b>Assessment Methods</b>									
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	89
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>									
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	93
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	50
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	79
<b>Reporting Results</b>									
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	93
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	82
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>									
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	96
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>89</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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 = Ph.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	ED PSYC PHD	ED R&E MS	ELED MSED <sup>a</sup>	FE MSED	IT MSED	CEDU
<b>Assessment Methods</b>									
Assessment methods clearly	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	2		3	3	89
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>									
Outcomes student learning	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Outcomes observable and	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	93
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	2	2	3		2	2	50
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	2	3		3	3	79
<b>Reporting Results</b>									
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	93
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	2	3	3	3		3	3	82
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>									
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>92</b>		<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>89</b>

Notes. 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator "Completely". 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.

<sup>a</sup> M.S.Ed. in Elementary Education is not included in 2016 results because the program is no longer active.

Criterion	Graduate (cont'd)						Percent in College
	IT EDD	KNPE MSED	LIT ED MSED	SBM MSED	SPEC ED MSED	SPORT MS	CEDU
<b>Assessment Methods</b>							
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	2	3	3	3	96
Appropriate assessment methods	3	2	2	3	3	3	89
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>							
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	2	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	2	3	3	3	96
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	2	2	2	3	2	50
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	2	2	3	3	79
<b>Reporting Results</b>							
Student and program level targets	3	3	2	1	3	3	93
Sample size reported	3	3	2	3	3	3	96
Date data collected reported	3	3	2	3	3	3	96
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	2	3	3	3	82
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>							
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	2	3	3	3	96
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	2	3	3	3	96
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	2	3	3	3	96
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>89</b>

Notes 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator "Completely".  
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 or completely 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
<b>Assessment Methods</b>									
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
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>									
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	75
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	63
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	100
<b>Reporting Results</b>									
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
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>									
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
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>95</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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 or completely 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 <sup>a</sup>	FCS BS	FM	HED BSED	CHHS
<b>Assessment Methods</b>						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	2	3	3	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	100
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>						
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	2	3	3	82
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	2	3	3	82
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	100
<b>Reporting Results</b>						
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	100
Sample size reported	3	3	2	3	3	94
Date data collected reported	3	3	2	3	3	88
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	88
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>						
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	94
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	2	3	3	94
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>93</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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.

<sup>a</sup> B.S. in Early Childhood Studies is cross-listed with CEDU. The program submitted one report, but the same ratings are listed in both this table and in a table for CEDU.

Criterion	Undergraduate (cont'd)					Percent in College
	HS	MLS	NURS	NDHA	PH	CHHS
<b>Assessment Methods</b>						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	100
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>						
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	82
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3	3	3	82
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	100
<b>Reporting Results</b>						
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	100
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	94
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	88
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	88
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>						
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	94
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	94
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>93</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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 Management; PH = B.S. in Public Health.

Table 8

*Demonstration to a great extent or completely 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	COMR MS	COMS MS	FCS MS <sup>a</sup>	NURS MS	N&D MS	DPT	MPH	CHHS
<b>Assessment Methods</b>										
Assessment methods clearly	3	3	3	2		3	3	3	3	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>										
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
Outcomes observable and	3	3	2	2		3	3	3	3	82
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	2	2		3	3	3	3	82
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	100
<b>Reporting Results</b>										
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	94
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	2		3	3	3	3	88
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	1	2		3	3	3	3	88
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>										
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	2	3		3	3	3	3	94
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	94
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>62</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>93</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. AFCS MS = M.S. in Applied, Family and Child Studies; AUD = Au.D. in Audiology; COMR MS = M.S. in Communicative Disorders, Rehabilitation Counseling; COMS MS = M.S. in Communicative Disorders, Speech Pathology; 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.

<sup>a</sup> M.S. in Family and Consumer Sciences is not included in 2016 results because the program is no longer active.

College of Law

Table 9

*Evidence by degree program within the College of Law demonstrating to a great extent or completely key indicators of a healthy assessment*

Criterion	Graduate	Percent In College
	LAW	CLAW
<b>Assessment Methods</b>		
Assessment methods clearly described	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	2	0
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>		
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
<b>Reporting Results</b>		
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
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>		
Conclusions supported by data	3	100
Program improvement actions identified	3	100
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	100
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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 or completely 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 <sup>a</sup>	GEOG	GEOL	MATH	MET	PHYS	CLAS
<b>Assessment Methods</b>										
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3		3	1	3	2	3	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3		3	2	3	2	2	84
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>										
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	2	88
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3		2	3	3	3	2	75
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3		2	3	3	3	2	65
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	1	86
<b>Reporting Results</b>										
Student and program level targets	3	3	3		3	2	3	3	1	90
Sample size reported	3	3	3		3	1	3	3	2	86
Date data collected reported	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	1	80
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3		3	1	3	3	3	76
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>										
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3		3	1	3	3	2	92
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3		3	3	3	2	2	84
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3		3	2	3	2	2	75
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>85</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>82</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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.

<sup>a</sup> B.A./B.S. in Environmental Studies is not included in 2016 results because the program did not submit a report.

Table 11

*Demonstration to a great extent or completely 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
<b>Assessment Methods</b>								
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	84
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>								
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	88
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	75
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	65
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	86
<b>Reporting Results</b>								
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	90
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	86
Date data collected reported	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	80
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	76
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>								
Conclusions supported by data	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	92
Program improvement actions identified	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	84
Plans to implement improvement actions	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	75
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>82</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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.

Graduate – Physical Sciences (cont'd)								Percent in College
Criterion	GEOL MS	GEOL PHD	MATH MS	MATH PHD	PHYS MS	PHYS PHD	STAT MS	CLAS
<b>Assessment Methods</b>								
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	84
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>								
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	88
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	75
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	65
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	86
<b>Reporting Results</b>								
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	90
Sample size reported	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	86
Date data collected reported	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	80
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	1	3	3	1	1	3	76
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>								
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	92
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	84
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	75
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>82</b>

Notes. 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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 or completely 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
<b>Assessment Methods</b>									
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	84
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>									
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	88
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	75
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	65
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	86
<b>Reporting Results</b>									
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	90
Sample size reported	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	86
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	80
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	76
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>									
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	92
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	84
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	75
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>82</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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 or completely 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
<b>Assessment Methods</b>						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	2	84
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>						
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	2	88
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	2	75
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	2	3	3	2	65
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	86
<b>Reporting Results</b>						
Student and program level targets	3	3	2	2	3	90
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	86
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	80
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	76
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>						
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	92
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	84
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	2	75
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>82</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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
<b>Assessment Methods</b>						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	88
Appropriate assessment methods	2	3	2	2	3	84
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>						
Outcomes student learning focused	2	2	3	2	3	88
Outcomes observable and measurable	1	2	1	1	3	75
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	1	2	1	1	3	65
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	2	2	1	3	3	86
<b>Reporting Results</b>						
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	90
Sample size reported	3	3	3	2	3	86
Date data collected reported	2	2	2	2	3	80
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	1	1	1	2	2	76
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>						
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	92
Program improvement actions identified	3	2	2	2	3	84
Plans to implement improvement actions	2	1	2	1	3	75
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>82</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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 to a great extent or completely 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	FLGE	FLSP	HIST	PHIL	CLAS
<b>Assessment Methods</b>							
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	2	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	84
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>							
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	3	88
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3	3	3	2	3	75
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3	3	3	3	3	65
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	3	86
<b>Reporting Results</b>							
Student and program level targets	3	3	3	3	3	3	90
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	86
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	80
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3	3	3	3	3	76
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>							
Conclusions supported by data	3	3	3	3	3	3	92
Program improvement actions identified	3	3	3	3	3	3	84
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	75
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>82</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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 to a great extent or completely 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 <sup>a</sup>	FLSP MA	HIST MA	HIST PHD	PHIL MA	CLAS
<b>Assessment Methods</b>								
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3		3	3	3	2	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3		3	3	3	3	84
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>								
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3		3	3	3	3	88
Outcomes observable and measurable	3	3		3	3	3	3	75
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	3	3		3	3	3	3	65
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3		3	3	3	3	86
<b>Reporting Results</b>								
Student and program level targets	3	3		3	3	3	3	90
Sample size reported	3	3		3	3	3	3	86
Date data collected reported	3	3		3	3	3	3	80
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	3	3		3	3	3	3	76
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>								
Conclusions supported by data	3	3		3	3	3	3	92
Program improvement actions identified	3	3		3	3	3	3	84
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3		3	3	3	3	75
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>82</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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.

<sup>a</sup> M.A. in French is not included in 2016 results because the program is no longer active.



College of Visual and Performing Arts

Table 16

*Demonstration to a great extent or completely 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	THEA BFA	THEA BA	CVPA
<b>Assessment Methods</b>							
Assessment methods clearly described	1	3	3	1	2	2	64
Appropriate assessment methods	1	3	3	1	3	3	55
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>							
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	2	3	91
Outcomes observable and measurable	2	2	2	2	2	3	9
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	2	2	2	2	3	9
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	2	3	2	3	2	3	73
<b>Reporting Results</b>							
Student and program level targets	1	3	3	2	3	2	55
Sample size reported	2	3	3	3	1	2	64
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	3	10
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	1	1	3	1	1	1	9
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>							
Conclusions supported by data	3	2	3	3	1	2	45
Program improvement actions identified	3	2	3	3	3	3	73
Plans to implement improvement actions	2	1	2	3	3	2	36
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>52</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator "Completely". 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; THEA BFA = B.F.A. in Theatre Arts; and THEA BA = B.A. in Theatre Studies.

Table 17

*Demonstration to a great extent or completely 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	THEA MFA	CVPA
<b>Assessment Methods</b>						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	64
Appropriate assessment methods	3	2	3	2	2	55
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>						
Outcomes student learning focused	3	3	3	3	3	91
Outcomes observable and measurable	2	2	2	2	2	9
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved	2	2	2	2	2	9
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning	3	3	3	3	3	73
<b>Reporting Results</b>						
Student and program level targets	3	2	3	3	2	55
Sample size reported	3	3	3	3	2	64
Date data collected reported	3	3	3	3	3	10
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways	1	1	1	1	1	9
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>						
Conclusions supported by data	3	2	2	3	2	45
Program improvement actions identified	2	3	3	2	3	73
Plans to implement improvement actions	2	3	3	1	2	36
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>52</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”. 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; THEA MFA = M.F.A. in Theatre Arts.

Office of the Provost

Table 18

*Demonstration to a great extent or completely of key indicators of a healthy assessment system (by degree program within the Office of the Provost).*

Criterion	Undergraduate		Graduate		Percent in Office
	BSAM <sup>a</sup>	BGS <sup>b</sup>	MAT <sup>c</sup>	MST <sup>c</sup>	PROVOST
<b>Assessment Methods</b>					
Assessment methods clearly described			3	2	50
Appropriate assessment methods			3	3	100
<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>					
Outcomes student learning focused			3	3	100
Outcomes observable and measurable			3	2	50
Outcomes imply a level of performance to be achieved			2.5	2	0
Outcomes imply higher levels of learning			2	2	0
<b>Reporting Results</b>					
Student and program level targets			3	3	100
Sample size reported			3	3	100
Date data collected reported			3	3	100
Aggregated and reported in meaningful ways			2	1	0
<b>Decisions, Actions &amp; Use of Results</b>					
Conclusions supported by data			2.5	2	0
Program improvement actions identified			3	2	50
Plans to implement improvement actions			2.5	2	0
<b>Percent of Possible Observations</b>			<b>62</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>50</b>

*Notes.* 1 = Not at all, 2 = Partially, and 3 = Completely. Percent in college is percent of programs demonstrating key indicator “Completely”.

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.

<sup>a</sup> B.S. in Applied Management is not included in 2016 results because the program did not submit a report.

<sup>b</sup> B.G.S. in General Studies notified Accreditation, Assessment, and Evaluation that it is currently undergoing a reorganization that makes assessment efforts unfeasible.

<sup>c</sup> Teaching M.A.T. and Teaching, M.S.T. did not submit an aggregate report in 2015. Specialization data for the average of Health Education and Elementary Education (M.A.T.) and Health Education only (M.S.T.) is presented.

Annual Assessment Update Report for Academic Programs AY 2015–2016  
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.

As in previous years, 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 2015, and/or spring semester of 2016. 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.

*Double-check <http://www.niu.edu/assessment/plans/academic-programs.shtml> to verify the posted assessment plan is up-to-date. If not, please send the current assessment plan with your annual assessment update report.*

Please complete the template below and email it, along with copies of each assessment reported on, to the Office of Assessment Services ([assess@niu.edu](mailto:assess@niu.edu)).

### Due Date: Friday, May 20, 2016

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 the Office of Assessment Services at 815-753-8659 or [assess@niu.edu](mailto:assess@niu.edu).

### Essentials:

- Double-check current assessment plan is posted online
- Complete the template
- Data from Summer 2015 through Spring 2016
- Due Date is **May 20, 2015**
- **Email** to Office of Assessment Services ([assess@niu.edu](mailto:assess@niu.edu))

The template follows....

Degree Program: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Degree: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Report Completed by:  
 Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Due Date: May 20, 2015  
 Date Submitted: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email to: [assess@niu.edu](mailto:assess@niu.edu)

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 program assessment method #1 (from the current program assessment plan)	Insert a direct quote of the program student learning outcome(s) assessment #1 measures  <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>And</u></b></p> Desired target level of performance for each outcome at the program level.	Insert summary results for assessment method #1 here.  Include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the <b>sample size</b>,</li> <li>• <b>date</b> the data was collected, and</li> <li>• the desired <b>performance level each student must demonstrate</b> on the assessment.</li> </ul> Clearly link the data to each program student learning outcomes listed.	Details here provide a record of continuous improvement efforts for future use by the program and others.  A recommendation is to document plans to implement improvement actions.  Insert conclusions and how the 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 program assessment method #2 (from the current program assessment plan)	Insert a direct quote of the program student learning outcome(s) assessment #2 measures  <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>And</u></b></p> Desired target level of performance for each outcome at the program level.	Insert summary results for assessment method #2 here.  Include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the <b>sample size</b>,</li> <li>• <b>date</b> the data was collected, and</li> <li>• the desired <b>performance level each student must demonstrate</b> on the assessment.</li> </ul> Clearly link the data to each program student learning outcomes listed.	Details here provide a record of continuous improvement efforts for future use by the program and others.  A recommendation is to document plans to implement improvement actions.  Insert conclusions and how the 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 #
<b>Repeat with additional assessment methods as needed (only two are required)</b>			

Submit the completed annual assessment update report (and **copies of each assessment method**) to the Office of Assessment Services ([assess@niu.edu](mailto:assess@niu.edu)) by May 20, 2016.



Appendix B

**Annual Assessment Update Feedback (AY 2015-16)**

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.

The degree to which criterion is met:  
 N = Not at all, P = Partially, and C = Completely

<b>N</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Assessment Methods</b>
			Assessment methods are clearly described
			Assessment methods are appropriate to measure the intended program-level student learning outcome

Assessment methods included in this report:

Observations, comments, and suggestions:

---

<b>N</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>
			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:

Observations, comments, and suggestions:

---

<b>N</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Reporting Results</b>
			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)

**N P C Reporting Results**

---

Observations, comments, and suggestions:

---

**N P C 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 (as appropriate)
			Plans to implement program improvement actions are specified (as appropriate)

Observations, comments, and suggestions:

---