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

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[a]	97	125	78

Note. [a] 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 leaning 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.

Criterion	CBUS (10)	CEDU (28)	CEET (8)	CHHS (19)	CLAW (1)	CLAS (51)	CVPA (11)	Provost (3)	University (131)
Assessment Methods									
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
Student Learning Outcomes									
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
Reporting Results									
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
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
Percent of all Possible Observations	**93**	**89**	**95**	**93**	**92**	**82**	**52**	**50**	**81**

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).

	Undergraduate						Graduate				Percent In College
Criterion	**ACCY BS**	**BADM**	**FINA**	**MGMT**	**MKTG**	**OMIS BS**	**ACCY MAS**	**MBA**	**OMIS MS**	**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	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
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	**92**	**92**	**100**	**100**	**85**	**85**	**100**	**100**	**77**	**100**	**93**

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).

	Undergraduate						Percent in College
Criterion	**ATH TRAIN**	**EARLY CHILD** [a]	**ELEM ED**	**KINE**	**PHYS ED**	**SPEC ED**	**CEDU**
Assessment Methods							
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	89
Student Learning Outcomes							
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
Reporting Results							
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
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	96
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Percent of Possible Observations	**92**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**92**	**100**	**89**

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.

[a] 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).

	Graduate								Percent in College
Criterion	**ADULT ED MSED**	**ADULT ED EDD**	**COUN MSED**	**COUN PHD**	**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	96
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	89
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	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
Reporting Results									
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
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	96
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	96
Percent of Possible Observations	**92**	**92**	**85**	**85**	**92**	**92**	**100**	**100**	**89**

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.

	Graduate (cont'd)								Percent in College
Criterion	**EDAD EDS**	**EDAD EDD**	**ED PSYC**	**ED PSYC PHD**	**ED R&E MS**	**ELED MSED [a]**	**FE MSED**	**IT MSED**	**CEDU**
Assessment Methods									
Assessment methods clearly	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	2		3	3	89
Student Learning Outcomes									
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
Reporting Results									
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
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	96
Plans to implement improvement actions	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	96
Percent of Possible Observations	**100**	**92**	**92**	**85**	**92**		**92**	**92**	**89**

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.

[a] M.S.Ed. in Elementary Education is not included in 2016 results because the program is no longer active.

	Graduate (cont'd)						Percent in College
Criterion	**IT EDD**	**KNPE MSED**	**LIT ED MSED**	**SBM MSED**	**SPEC ED MSED**	**SPORT MS**	**CEDU**
Assessment Methods							
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	2	3	3	3	96
Appropriate assessment methods	3	2	2	3	3	3	89
Student Learning Outcomes							
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
Reporting Results							
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results							
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**100**	**85**	**0**	**77**	**100**	**92**	**89**

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).

	Undergraduate				Graduate				Percent In College
Criterion	**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	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
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**	**85**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**95**

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).

	Undergraduate					Percent in College
Criterion	**COMD BS**	**ECS BS** [a]	**FCS BS**	**FM**	**HED BSED**	**CHHS**
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	2	3	3	88
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	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
Reporting Results						
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**100**	**100**	**54**	**100**	**100**	**93**

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.

[a] 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.

	Undergraduate (cont'd)					Percent in College
Criterion	**HS**	**MLS**	**NURS**	**NDHA**	**PH**	**CHHS**
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	88
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	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
Reporting Results						
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**93**

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).

	Graduate									Percent in College
Criterion	**AFCS MS**	**AUD**	**COMR MS**	**COMS MS**	**FCS MS [a]**	**NURS MS**	**N&D MS**	**DPT**	**MPH**	**CHHS**
Assessment Methods										
Assessment methods clearly	3	3	3	2		3	3	3	3	88
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	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
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	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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results										
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**100**	**100**	**69**	**62**		**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**93**

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.

[a] 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

	Graduate	Percent In College
Criterion	**LAW**	**CLAW**
Assessment Methods		
Assessment methods clearly described	3	100
Appropriate assessment methods	2	0
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	**92**	**92**

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).

	Undergraduate – Physical Sciences									Percent in College
Criterion	**BIOS**	**CHEM**	**CSCI**	**ENVS** [a]	**GEOG**	**GEOL**	**MATH**	**MET**	**PHYS**	**CLAS**
Assessment Methods										
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
Student Learning Outcomes										
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
Reporting Results										
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results										
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**100**	**100**	**100**		**85**	**46**	**100**	**69**	**15**	**82**

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.

[a] 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).

	Graduate – Physical Sciences							Percent in College
Criterion	**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	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	84
Student Learning Outcomes								
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
Reporting Results								
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**54**	**62**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**82**

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**
Assessment Methods								
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	84
Student Learning Outcomes								
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
Reporting Results								
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**85**	**100**	**77**	**92**	**23**	**46**	**77**	**82**

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).

	Undergraduate – Social Sciences								Percent in College
Criterion	**ANTH**	**COMS**	**CLCE**	**ECON**	**JOUR**	**POLS**	**PSYC**	**SOCI**	**CLAS**
Assessment Methods									
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
Student Learning Outcomes									
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
Reporting Results									
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results									
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**100**	**100**	**85**	**100**	**77**	**62**	**38**	**100**	**82**

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).

	Graduate – Social Sciences					Percent in College
Criterion	**ANTH MA**	**COMS MA**	**ECON MA**	**ECON PHD**	**POLS MA**	**CLAS**
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	2	84
Student Learning Outcomes						
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
Reporting Results						
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**100**	**92**	**92**	**92**	**62**	**82**

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
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	88
Appropriate assessment methods	2	3	2	2	3	84
Student Learning Outcomes						
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
Reporting Results						
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**38**	**38**	**38**	**31**	**92**	**82**

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).

	Undergraduate – Humanities						Percent in College
Criterion	**ENGL**	**FLFR**	**FLGE**	**FLSP**	**HIST**	**PHIL**	**CLAS**
Assessment Methods							
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	2	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3	3	3	3	3	84
Student Learning Outcomes							
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
Reporting Results							
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results							
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**92**	**82**

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).

	Graduate – Humanities							Percent in College
Criterion	**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	2	88
Appropriate assessment methods	3	3		3	3	3	3	84
Student Learning Outcomes								
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
Reporting Results								
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results								
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**100**	**100**		**100**	**100**	**100**	**92**	**82**

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.

[a] 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).

	Undergraduate						Percent in College
Criterion	**ART**	**ARTH**	**ART ED**	**ART BFA**	**THEA BFA**	**THEA BA**	**CVPA**
Assessment Methods							
Assessment methods clearly described	1	3	3	1	2	2	64
Appropriate assessment methods	1	3	3	1	3	3	55
Student Learning Outcomes							
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
Reporting Results							
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results							
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**31**	**54**	**69**	**54**	**38**	**54**	**52**

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).

	Graduate					Percent in College
Criterion	**ART MA**	**ART MFA**	**ART MS**	**ARTED PHD**	**THEA MFA**	**CVPA**
Assessment Methods						
Assessment methods clearly described	3	3	3	3	3	64
Appropriate assessment methods	3	2	3	2	2	55
Student Learning Outcomes						
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
Reporting Results						
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results						
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
Percent of Possible Observations	**62**	**54**	**69**	**54**	**62**	**52**

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).

	Undergraduate		Graduate		Percent in Office
Criterion	**BSAM [a]**	**BGS [b]**	**MAT [c]**	**MST [c]**	**PROVOST**
Assessment Methods					
Assessment methods clearly described			3	2	50
Appropriate assessment methods			3	3	100
Student Learning Outcomes					
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
Reporting Results					
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
Decisions, Actions & Use of Results					
Conclusions supported by data			2.5	2	0
Program improvement actions identified			3	2	50
Plans to implement improvement actions			2.5	2	0
Percent of Possible Observations			**62**	**38**	**50**

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.

[a] B.S. in Applied Management is not included in 2016 results because the program did not submit a report.

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

[c] 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).

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.

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)

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

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 **And** Desired target level of performance for each outcome at the program level.	Insert summary results for assessment method #1 here. Include: • the **sample size**, • **date** the data was collected, and • the desired **performance level each student must demonstrate** on the assessment. 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 **And** Desired target level of performance for each outcome at the program level.	Insert summary results for assessment method #2 here. Include: • the **sample size**, • **date** the data was collected, and • the desired **performance level each student must demonstrate** on the assessment. 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 #
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 the Office of Assessment Services (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

N	P	C	**Assessment Methods**
			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:

N	P	C	**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:

Observations, comments, and suggestions:

N	P	C	**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)

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: