

Assessment Reporting Guidelines

Educational Programs

All educational programs are required to have assessment plans (student learning outcomes, means of assessment and criterion for success) and report the components below annually in Nuventive Improve.

Annual Assessment Reports Due:
May 15 for 9-month faculty
June 15 for 12-month faculty

Report Components

1. Report Component: Actions Taken

Actions Taken are a summary of the curricular and pedagogical actions faculty took to improve student learning that are related to the outcome.

Questions to consider: *What curricular/pedagogical changes were made? Was the curriculum delivered differently? Was the last action plan implemented?*

2. Report Component: Results

Results are a summary of the data collected from the Means of Assessment (MoA) and should be stated in terms of the Criterion for Success.

Questions to consider: *What results were generated from the MoA? Were multiple MoAs used? Was the Criterion for Success met?*

3. Report Component: Analysis of Results

The Analysis of Results is a summary of the relationship between Actions Taken by faculty to improve student learning and the Results. It includes faculty's interpretation of the Results and the identification of an area for improvement or reinforcement.

Questions to consider: *In faculty's professional judgment, does it appear that the Actions Taken had an impact on your Results? Were there other variables that could have impacted the Results? If so, what were they? What types of circumstances remained constant so that faculty could see the impact of the Actions Taken (i.e., delivery method, instructor, class schedule, etc.)? Based on the interpretation of the results, what area(s) could be improved or reinforced?*

4. Report Component: Actions Planned

Actions Planned summarize the curricular or pedagogical steps faculty will take to improve or reinforce student learning for the area identified in the analysis.

Questions to consider: *Based on the analysis, where in the program could you take curricular or pedagogical actions to contribute to the learning outcome? For a more robust action plan consider implementing actions that impact the outcome outside of the course where it is assessed (i.e., series of courses, out of class experiences, internship, clinical rotation).*

Supporting Documentation (optional)

Attach documents to support any report component if appropriate (e.g., meeting minutes, reports, data tables, etc.).

Undergraduate and graduate programs report on a minimum of 3 outcomes as defined in the 5-year cycle section of the workbook.

Certificates and Stand-Alone Minors report on a minimum 2 outcomes.

Report Example: One Means of Assessment

Outcome: Upon completion of the program, students will develop and implement criteria to analyze written materials.

MOA: Portfolio review with a rubric in the capstone EXPL 4000

CFS: 80% of students score a 4 (competent) or better on the rubric.

Notice the Action Taken outside of course in which assessed

1. Actions Taken: Faculty reviewed the curriculum map to determine where a new assignment could be integrated to improve student learning. Therefore, one new assignment in EXPL 3000 and EXPL 3100 included assessment, reflection, and revision (such as peer review, or editing work of another person) required students to develop and implement criteria for evaluating written materials developed by peers. Additional activities that required students to develop criteria and evaluate materials (e.g., examples of intercultural communication or visual displays of information) were added to classes.

Results stated in terms of Criteria for Success

2. Results: Six of eight students, or 75% of the students evaluated, achieved a score of 4 or better on this outcome. Thus the criterion of 80% was not met.

Comparison to last year's results and judgment on whether actions had an impact

3. Analysis of Results: Assessment of the students' work, as well as discussion among faculty, indicate that students improved in applying existing criteria or standards with additional practice. While the criterion was not met this year, there was a slight improvement over the previous year, when 70% of students scored 4 or better. Students continue to have difficulty developing evaluative criteria and understanding the purpose of criteria. Based on the faculty's interpretation and analysis of the results, faculty have identified students' ability to independently develop evaluative criteria as an area of focus.

Area for improvement or reinforcement

4. Actions Planned:

Assignments in the core courses EXPL 3000 and EXPL 3100 will continue to include at least one assignment with explicit instructions that ask students to develop and apply criteria for evaluating at least one type of technical or professional communication. Self-assessment accompanying the assignments in each of the classes will ask students to explicitly explain how they developed and applied criteria in the context of the assignment and how they would go about developing criteria to evaluate other projects. Faculty will discuss differences in lecture content to ensure consistency across instructors.

Actions specifically targeting area for improvement

Report Example: Multiple Means of Assessment

Outcome: Students will recognize, apply, and explain the use of rhetorical techniques in a wide range of texts.

MOAs: Portfolio review with rubric and exit survey

CfS: 80% of students score satisfactory or better on the portfolio rubric. On the exit survey, 80% of students agree or strongly agree that program coursework has improved my ability to recognize, apply, and explain the use of rhetorical devices in a wide range of texts.

Actions developed collaboratively and implemented in multiple classes

1. Actions Taken: In the discipline-specific area meetings faculty shared innovative teaching practices from Writing Intensive classes, successful and unsuccessful model essays, and types of reflective writing in which students identify rhetorical techniques. This resulted in a bank of materials that was shared on the departmental SharePoint for faculty to use particularly in their Writing Intensive classes for majors. All instructors incorporated at least one strategy from the bank into their class.

2. Results: Out of 34 portfolios, 88% scored satisfactory or higher. Our CfS (80%) was met. 100% of students who responded (N=7) to the survey indicated that they "agree" or "strongly agree" with the statement that their coursework has improved their ability to apply and explain the use and effects of various rhetorical techniques in a wide range of texts. Our CfS (80%) was met.

3. Analysis of Results: Results from the two means of assessment suggest that all seniors responding to the survey feel confident about using rhetorical techniques, while 88% of student portfolios (30 out of 34) indicate the same. The results were similar to last year where 89% of the portfolios met the criterion. The actions implemented during the year helped to maintain student learning for this outcome. Of the student portfolios that were rated "unsatisfactory" in the current year, they all failed to explain the use and effects of form, style, structure, and themes of rhetorical techniques. Faculty acknowledged there was a significant decrease in the survey response rate from last year to this year. The limited results suggest that student perceptions and performance on this outcome are closely matched.

Combined analysis

4. Actions Planned: For the upcoming academic year, faculty will share previous student work samples that showcase successful and unsuccessful portfolio explanations of the use and effects of form, style, structure, and themes of rhetorical techniques. To increase the survey response rate, faculty will promote the survey even earlier in the semester (both fall and spring) next year.

Actions targeted at area for improvement

This additional action provides better data but does not directly improve student

Comparison to last year's results and judgment on whether actions had an impact