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University Assessment Team

The Assessment Team is the primary oversight body for the student outcomes assessment programs of the University. The Assessment Team reports to the vice president for Academic Affairs and is comprised of
- One representative from each of the colleges or schools.
- One representative from the library.
- One faculty member from the McNichols Faculty Assembly.
- Two administrative representatives.

The Assessment Team is responsible for
- Developing a mechanism for sharing best practices around the University regarding assessment.
- Reviewing the assessment methodologies being used by each school and identifying those schools in which assessment activities require improvement.
- Providing ongoing reports to and consultation with the academic vice president and provost.
- Keeping the University community informed of team activities

Report Summary

During the 2020-2021 academic year, the University Assessment Team facilitated a newly implemented process for collecting program assessment plans for all academic and co-curricular programs. Team members used a rubric to assess each plan and provide feedback to program directors and department chairs. Fifty assessment plans were submitted and their submission is noted on the Assessment website. A three-point rubric scale was used (A=3, B=2, C=1) to evaluate four dimensions (learning outcomes, measures, benchmarks, and assessment cycle). The mean rubric scores for each dimension were: learning outcomes (2.9), measures (2.6), benchmarks (2.5), and assessment cycle (2.7). These rubric dimension scores show the greatest strengths in learning outcomes and assessment cycle, followed by measures. Most of the feedback provided to program directors and department chairs were for benchmarks. Revised plans can be submitted before annual assessment reports are due in December of 2021. The figures that follow share additional detail about the assessment plans.
LEARNING OUTCOMES
MEASURES BENCHMARKS CYCLE

2.9 2.6 2.5 2.7

MEAN DIMENSION SCORE

3-POINT RUBRIC SCALE: A=3, B=2, C=1

RUBRIC DIMENSION SCORES FOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLANS - 2020-2021

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLANS EVALUATED N=50

- Co-Curricular
- College of Business Administration
- College of Engineering & Science
- College of Health Professions
- College of Liberal Arts & Education
- School of Dentistry
- School of Architecture
- School of Law

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES N=50

- A) All learning outcomes are stated at the program level, measurable, and specific to the expected knowledge, skills, attitudes, competencies, and habits of mind that students are expected to acquire.

- B) Learning outcomes are not stated at the program level, or not measurable, or not specific to the expected knowledge, skills, attitudes, competencies, and habits of mind that students are expected to acquire.

- C) Learning outcomes are not stated at the program level, not measurable, and not specific to the expected knowledge, skills, attitudes, competencies, and habits of mind that students are expected to acquire.

90% 8% 2%
OUTCOME MEASURES N=50

- A) Outcome measures are clearly related to and appropriate for each learning outcome and include more direct methods of assessment than indirect methods of assessment.
- B) Outcome measures are clearly related to and appropriate for each learning outcome and include more indirect methods of assessment than direct methods of assessment.
- C) Outcome measures are not clearly related to or appropriate for each learning outcome.

BENCHMARKS N=50

- A) Benchmarks for the “group” are explicitly stated and include minimum performance levels for student success appropriate for the program level.
- B) Benchmarks for the “group” are not explicitly stated but include minimum performance levels for student success appropriate for the program level or vice versa.
- C) Benchmarks for the “group” are not explicitly stated and void of minimum performance levels for student success appropriate for the program level.

ASSESSMENT CYCLE N=50

- A) The assessment cycle describes the total number of learning outcomes for the program and the number of outcomes assessed each year.
- B) The assessment cycle does not describe the total number of learning outcomes for the program but describes the number of outcomes assessed each year or vice versa.
- C) The assessment cycle does not describe the total number of learning outcomes for the program and nor the number of outcomes assessed each year.