




5/5/2024

University Assessment Team Report on Annual Program Assessment Reports

The 2023 -2024 University Assessment Team

COMMITTEE OFFICERS

College of Health Professions - Kelli Frost (Co-Chair)

School of Architecture – Srida Scott (Co-Chair)

College of Engineering & Science – Mariam Faied (Secretary)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Corktown Campus: Joshua Scheys

College of Liberal Arts and Education - Varinder Kaur

Riverfront Campus - Paula Manning

College of Business Administration – Min Xu

College of Engineering and Science - Mariam Faied

Libraries - Jill Turner

Core Curriculum Committee - Open

MFA Representative - Preston Foerder

Administrative Representatives

Karen Lee, Associate VP of Academic Affairs

Noah Resnick, Associate Dean, SACD

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 2023-2024 academic year, the University Assessment Team (UAT) continued with the newly implemented electronic process for collecting Annual Program Assessment Reports for all academic and co-curricular programs. This process was preceded by the 2020-2021 initiative requiring all academic and co-curricular programs to file their assessment plans with the UAT. Team members used a rubric to assess each Annual Program Assessment Report and provided feedback to program directors and department chairs. Fifty Annual Program Assessment Reports were submitted and are posted on the [Assessment website](#). A three-point rubric scale was used (A=3, B=2, C=1) to evaluate four dimensions (assessment overview, student learning outcomes, institutional outcomes, and results/planned actions/actions taken). The mean rubric scores for each dimension were: assessment overview (2.4), student learning outcomes (2.3), institutional outcomes (3.0), and results/planned actions/actions taken (2.2). These rubric dimension scores were pretty consistent with the scores from previous years (some higher and some lower), indicating a more rigorous review from the UAT, with recommendations for more detailed reporting of the assessment overview, inclusion of corresponding assessment methods for student learning outcomes, and results/action plans. The figures that follow share additional detail about the Annual Program Assessment Reports.



Mean Rubric Trend 2021-2024



2023-2024 Assessment Overview N=50

- A) The assessment overview includes: the number of student learning outcomes, detailed assessment cycle, and examples of direct measures of assessment.
- B) The assessment overview is missing one of the following: the number of student learning outcomes, detailed assessment cycle, examples of direct measures of assessment.
- C) The assessment overview is missing two or more of the following: the number of student learning outcomes, detailed assessment cycle, examples of direct measures of assessment.

62%

16%

22%

2023-2024 Student Learning Outcomes N=50

- A) The SLO response includes a list of student learning outcomes assessed in the report and corresponding benchmarks.
- B) The SLO response is missing one of the following: the list of student learning outcomes assessed in the report or corresponding benchmarks.
- C) The SLO response is missing the list of student learning outcomes assessed in the report and corresponding benchmarks.


44%

46%

10%




2023-2024 Institutional Outcomes N=50



- A) The IO response includes alignment of reported student learning outcome(s) with at least one Institutional Outcome.
- C) The IO response is void of alignment of reported student learning outcome(s) with any of the institutional outcomes.

2023-2024 Results, Planned Actions, Actions Taken
N=50



- A) The Results and Actions summary is concise, includes details of assessment results, references benchmark(s), and describes how results led to actions to enhance student learning and/or improve program quality.
- B) The Results and Actions summary is missing one of the following: concise details of assessment results, references to benchmark(s), description of how results led to actions to enhance student learning and/or improve program quality.
- C) The Results and Actions summary is missing two or more of the following: concise details of assessment results, references to benchmark(s), description of how results led to actions to enhance student learning and/or improve program quality.