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This is the template for program assessment of data collected during 2023-2024 academic year. The template ensures that programs are planning for, collecting and analyzing, and engaging with assessment data. If a different format is required by your accreditor, that may be used so long as the required information for University assessment is also included. **This report will be published on your department’s external facing Assessment Website viewable by the general public.**

Note: If in a self-study year, the self-study may be submitted in lieu of this report.

**1.D.4** The institution’s **processes** and methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity.

**1.C.7** The institution **uses** the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously **improve** student learning outcomes.

NWCCU Standards were updated in Jan. 2020 and include student learning outcomes, student success and achievement measures. Student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).

## What you Did – The Plan

**Section 1 – Program Mission**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions offer “programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission” (1.C.1.)

In this section, list the following:

* **Program Mission:** In two to three sentences describe the following. What is the purpose of the degree program? What professional and lifelong opportunities does it prepare students for? Where is it anticipated that graduates end up – both immediately after graduation and 5-10 years out? This information is fairly static from year to year.
* **Mission Alignment:** In narrative format answer the following. How is the program’s mission aligned with the university mission to offer “innovative, professionally-focused undergraduate and graduate degree programs,” providing a “hands-on, project based learning environment.” Identify external accrediting or certifying bodies that may have impacted the program's mission.

**Changes to the Mission:** In narrative format, describe what if any changes were made to the program's mission and the justification (external or internal) for those changes.

Things to think about:

* Date Mission Wording Discussed with Faculty
* Is your Mission Wording accurate on the Program Assessment Website?

**Section 2 – Program Student Learning Outcomes**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that programs must “culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes.” (1.C.1.)

In this section, record the following:

* **PSLOs:** List the exact wording for 5-10 program student learning outcomes – the key skills, supported and scaffolded across the program, which graduates will need to be able to demonstrate by graduation in order to successfully pursue the professional directions described the program’s mission statement.
* Must be measurable and actionable.
* Must be linked to external sources such as accreditation or ISLOs
* Resources on Bloom’s Taxonomy: <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/coursedev/models/id/taxonomy/#table>
* Resources on program student learning outcomes:
  + <https://manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment/howto/outcomes.htm>
  + <https://www.jmu.edu/assessment/_files/How%20to%20Write%20Clear%20Objectives.pdf>
  + <https://www.jmu.edu/assessment/_files/Objectives%20Made%20Easy.pdf>
* Narrative **Justification** of PSLOs based on external certification or accreditation sources or ISLOs.
* Narrative of the **changes** made in the past year to the PSLOs and the reasons for those changes.

Things to think about: Program Learning Outcomes Approving Entity, When they were approved, when changes were made last, if the wording is correct on the external facing website, if the wording is correct on your program’s exit survey.

**Section 3 – Curriculum Map**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation requires that programs must demonstrate “an appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning” of student learning outcomes. (1.C.2)

**Curriculum Map:** How are each of your program student learning outcomes (and institutional ISLO’s) supported and scaffolded throughout the program’s curriculum? About how long is completing the curriculum expected to take?

To address this, please complete this table with program’s curriculum map, with identification of how each PSLO and ISLO appears within the courses in the curriculum at the **Foundation** (Introduction), **Practice** (Reinforcement and Application) and **Capstone** (Synthesis) levels.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **University** | **ISLO**  **1 - Communication** | **ISLO**  **2 – Inquiry & Analysis** | **ISLO**  **3 – Ethical Reasoning** | **ISLO**  **4 – Quantitative Literacy** | **ISLO**  **5 - Teamwork** | **ISLO**  **6 – Diverse Perspectives** |  |  |
| **Program** | **PSLO 1** | **PSLO 2** |  | **PSLO3** |  |  | **PSLO4** | **PSLO5** |
| **COURSE** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Freshman** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MATH 111 |  |  | F |  |  | P |  |  |
| WRI 121 | F |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| SPE 111 | F |  |  |  |  |  | P |  |
| **Sophomore** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ENGR 101 | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CIV 100 |  | P |  |  | C |  |  | C |
| **Junior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **XXX300** |  | **P** | **C** |  | **C** |  | **C** |  |
| **Senior** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **YYY450** |  | **C** |  | **C** |  |  |  | **C** |

**Section 4 – Assessment Cycle**

In this section, please complete this table to show which courses (and, where known, what assignments) are used to assess all PSLO and ISLO in a cycle that is completed in a minimum of **three-years**.

Although some programs may have compelling reasons to adopt a different cycle, assessment of program learning outcomes should follow a three-year cycle, with the intention that improvements prompted by one year’s assessment should be designed and implemented during the two years prior to the next scheduled assessment of that outcome. If an alternative cycle is adopted, a clear description of the activities occurring in each year of the cycle should be described. The years listed in the report should include the year **actions** were carried out, the year data presented in the report was **collected** from, and the year **planned** for data collection.

Indicate during each year which program courses provided **Capstone Learning Outcomes Assessment** documentation of the learning outcomes listed*. Please note: it is recommended that for all sections and modalities of the course indicated all students in the course be assessed on outcomes, not just students declared in majors.* (Foundational and Practice level assessments may be done if more data needed to inform actions taken.)

*Note: The next time this report is written, courses in the Act year should move to the Plan year.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Act** | **Collect** | **Plan** |
| **ISLO** | **PSLO** | **2023-2024** | **2024-2025** | **2025-2026** |
| **Communication** | **PSLO 1** |  | Class 1  Class 2 |  |
| **Ethics** | **PSLO 2** |  |  | Class 1  Class 2 |
| **Teamwork** |  |  | Class 1  Class 2 |  |
| **Diversity** |  |  |  | Class 1  Class 2 |
| **Inquiry and Analysis** |  | Class 1  Class 2 |  |  |
| **Quantitative Literacy** | **PSLO3** | Class 1  Class 2 |  |  |
|  | **PSLO4** |  | Class 1 |  |
|  | **PSLO5** |  | Class 1 |  |

**Section 5 – Assessment Data Collection Processes**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions engage in “an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs” that “recognizes the central role of faculty in establishing quality, assessing student learning, and improving instructional programs.” (1.C.5.)

In this section, explain the rules for the sample collection process for student work that is to be evaluated this academic year. This report is a snap-shot in time of the assessment processes currently used in your department. Include the following information:

* **Performance Target for Learning Outcomes**: Specify the standard of success for number of students performing acceptably on the assignment that indicates that the course has met the outcome for the program. Example: 75% of students scoring 3 or higher
* **Performance Target for Student Success Indicators:** External sources of data may be used to set performance targets for graduation rate, retention and post graduation success that are realistic for the program such as compared to a college-wide average or comparison to similar programs from external universities or past program performance.
* **Activity**: For the courses indicated by the curriculum map for collection and analysis of student data this year, name the activity. May include a description of the assignment in the appendix for continuity.
* **Sample**: List the number of student artifacts (number or percentage of class) were assessed in each activity.
* **Accountability:** Describe briefly who was involved in the scoring and how standards remained consistent across all graders.
* **Representation**: Ensure that samples are represented across multiple locations, modalities, or instructors if applicable.
* **Rubric**: Indicate the performance target for acceptable performance on the assignment for a single student. If not multiple choice assignment, include a rubric for the grading in the appendix for the activity.

# What you Found – The data collected

**Section 6 – Assessment Data and Interpretations**

1.C.6 Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and bachelor level programs or within a General Education curriculum, institutional learning outcomes and/or core competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are not limited to, effective communication skills, global awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information literacy.

1.D.2 Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of indicators for student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).

1.C.1 The institution offers programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission, culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes that lead to collegiate-level degrees, certificates, or credentials and include designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

1.C.9 The institution’s graduate programs are consistent with its mission, are in keeping with the expectations of its respective disciplines and professions and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. The graduate programs differ from undergraduate programs by requiring, among other things, greater: depth of study; demands on student intellectual or creative capacities; knowledge of the literature of the field; and ongoing student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression, and/or relevant professional practice.

In this section, present the data for **2024-2025** academic year specific to the program. Items included provide information that programs are meeting the above listed accreditation standards.

* All Programs have looked at their indicators of student success for trends and gaps in relation to external and internal comparators. Those indicators are defined as: Graduation, Retention, Persistence, Post Graduation Success.
* All Programs have assessed student performance on established program student learning outcomes (PSLO) both directly, indirectly and to ensure that all modalities and locations offer consistent programming. Data presented should be disaggregated by modality and location offered and be compared to established targets of success.
* Bachelor's and Associates Programs have assessed student performance on established institutional learning outcomes (ISLO) according to the institutional assessment cycle. These Programs should list the student data collected directly and indirectly that demonstrates student performance on Communications and Teamwork for the year 2024-25.
* Graduate level programs should present data that establishes student performance different than Bachelor's level programs such as the number of students engaged in research, scholarship, creative expression or relevant professional practice.
* Report annual data required by programmatic accreditation (example: graduation rate, placement, certification, retention).

Note: Below is an example of how this data could be presented efficiently. Performance targets listed are examples not requirements. Each program should establish performance targets that are meaningful for programmatic improvement and based either on external comparators, internally provided data or some established mission specific programmatic goal. Assessment methods should include both direct and indirect methods. Results should specify location or modality depending on programmatic offering.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Criteria** | **Assessment Methods** | **Performance Target** | **Results** | **Interpretation** |
| **Learning Outcomes** | | | | |
| PSLO1-Communication | Direct: Assignments in Classes assessed  Indirect: Course Evals | 75% of students scoring 3 or higher  80% of students rated contribution 2 or better | 63% - LocA, Class, N  72% - LocB, Class, N  90% student rating | Un Met  Met  Met |
| PSLO2 | Direct: Assignments in Classes assessed  Indirect: Employer Evals | 75% of students scoring 3 or higher  100% employers rated acceptable | 100% -LocA, Class, N  60% -LocB, Class, N  100% employer rating | Met  Un Met  Met |
| Teamwork | Direct: Assignments in Classes assessed  Indirect: Peer Review | 75% of students scoring 3 or higher  80% Peer review rating of 5 | 100% -LocA, Class, N  69% - LocB, Class, N  100% peer review | Met  Un Met  Met |
| **Student Success Indicators** | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | University Dashboard | 6-year rate >50% | 92% | Met |
| Retention | University Dashboard | 1-year rate >75% | 89% | Met |
| Post Graduation Success | Employment survey | 6 months post-graduation employment >75% | 70% | Un Met |
| Program Certification % (If needed for accreditation) | National Board Exam | >75 % | 90% | Met |

**Interpretation of Results:** A narrative discussion may be included here of faculty impressions overall regarding what the data presented indicates about the quality of education and services in the program from the academic year presented.

* **Things to think about:** Are all locations and **modalities** delivering the same level of quality? Are all types of students able to perform at expected levels? Does student performance on outcomes show growth as they progress through the curriculum? What is the **student perspective** of their own learning of the curriculum? How are students from your program perceived to perform in the **workforce**? Are there gaps in graduation or retention that can be linked to student outcomes performance within the curriculum?

**Evidence of Improvement in Student Learning**

The evidence of improvement in Student Learning over time can be presented either in narrative or tabular format. It should include a discussion or presentation of the **historical trends** for the data presented (both learning outcomes and student success indicators) and any **actions taken** on the outcomes previously.

* **Things to think about**: If student performance on learning outcomes has met targets this year, has it always met targets or did something change to make it better? If student performance did not meet targets, is this an expected result because of a trend, or something new that needs to be monitored over time? This section can be an explanation of the interpretations of the data using historical context. Perhaps an outcome has low performance because of an environmental factor unrelated to the program. Or perhaps an outcome continues to have low performance due to an unmet **resource** need or an unimplemented **action plan**.
* Below is an example of table format.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Criteria** | **Previous Action Plan** | **Previous Data** | **Current Data** | **Interpretation** |
| PSLO1-ISLO1 | None Indicated | **80%** | 63% | **New gap identified** |
| PSLO2-ISLO2 | The assignment will be changed in the following ways. | 70% | 100% | Successful action plan implemented |
| Graduation Rate | None Indicated | 87% | 92% |  |
| Retention | None Indicated | 76% | 89% |  |
| Post-Graduation Success | Faculty deep dive evaluation of certification criteria. | 68% | 70% | More data needed |

# How are you using the data? – Action

**Section 7 – Data-driven Action Plans:**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions “uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning support planning and practices.”(1.C.7.)

Describe all **curricular actions** that will be taken in the coming year 2025-26.

* Every program should, based on assessment data collected in 2024-25, identify at least one area to focus on for improvement during 2025-2026 academic year stemming from these assessment results. **Action plans** should be generated when:
  + Student Performance on an outcome is **below target**. Consider improvements both to PSLO and ISLO performance from student work product.
  + Equity Gaps of student success in the program are identified for a particular student group. Consider supports for specific student groups that may benefit progress through the program.
  + A need is identified through student perspective data or external evaluators such as advisory boards.
  + Faculty want to explore something innovative in the program.
* **Action plan specifics** should be listed to ensure accountability within the process. Specifics include: timeline, accountable party, which outcome will be measured to determine success, resources needed for successful implementation.

Action plans should be presented in the format that will be best utilized in future by the program to evaluate the success of the actions planned. Example of how this may appear in the table below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action Driver | Action Taken /# students impacted | Accountable Person | Resources Needed | Outcome Measure |
| Equity Gap for English as Second Language Learners | New peer review assignment in WRXXX implemented 2023-24 Fall | Instructor of WRXXX | Peer student lab grammar check | 2025 Certification Scores |
| PSLO2 Low Performance | Interprofessional survey course made mandatory for attendance for 2023-24 academic year | Program Director at Orientation makes the announcement | Collaboration with allied health majors | 2026 PSLO Re-measure |

**Section 8 – Closing the Loop: Reflection on previous work**

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions provide evidence of “continuous improvement of student learning.” (1.C.7.)

* **Discuss last year’s Action Plans:** as listed in last year's Program Assessment Report. This may be a good point to report some new data on last year's outcomes if improvements are already apparent. Did you implement the changes you stated in previous years’ program assessment report, why or why not? What were the barriers or successes?
* **List programmatic/curriculum Improvements** that were not Assessment Driven: What changed in your program over the last year, how do you expect that to impact student outcomes performance? Were there external pressures that drove these changes?  What data do you need to collect to help support decisions for improvements that you want for your program?
* **Improvements in Assessment Process:** What improvements will be made to the assessment process? What indicated that this change should be made? How will they yield better, more actionable information?
* **Faculty Discussion:** Summarize takeaways from all data in this report regarding program performance. How, when, to who were results presented discussed by program faculty? May include meeting minutes from when faculty evaluated assessment data and other meetings where assessment data were presented in the appendix.
* **Student Success stories from the year:** This is an excellent place to highlight academic achievements from this year.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program Assessment Report Feedback Rubric | |
| *2024-25 Assessment Report* | |
| **Program:** | |
| **Department Chair:** | |
| **Program Assessment Report Author:** |  |
| **Rubric Measure** | **Well Developed, Progressing or Not included.** |
| Program mission is aligned to University Mission |  |
| Educational Objectives Wording is Actionable |  |
| PSLO's are justified by Professional Standards |  |
| PSLO'S are aligned to ISLO |  |
| Curriculum Map: Scaffolding indicates Foundational, Practice, and Capstone Assessments by course |  |
| Assessment Cycle is three years or less to cover all PSLO and ISLO |  |
|  |  |
| During collection year, courses/assignments are specified that align to PSLO and ISLO |  |
| Rubric: Criteria for grading the assignment is described (may include as an appendix) |  |
| Sample: Number of samples reviewed is specified |  |
| Accountability: Reviewer(s) of the assessments are specified |  |
| Assessment data is collected across all locations and modalities |  |
| Performance Targets of acceptability are indicated |  |
| Reported data include: Graduation, Retention, Post Grad Success, PSLO, ISLO |  |
| Interpretation: Current results are compared against performance targets |  |
| Interpretation: Current results are compared against previous assessment |  |
| Reports include actions planned for the next academic year. |  |
| Action drivers: Items not meeting performance targets have actions planned |  |
| Action drivers: Additional action plans for overall department improvement are indicated |  |
| Action plans: Specifics of accountability and timelines are indicated |  |
| Action plans: Actions are linked to identification of resources needed |  |
|  |  |
| Close the Loop: Faculty discuss previous action plan success given new data |  |
| Faculty discuss the assessment process and make any improvements necessary |  |

 Directions: Please provide comments on any item that is not graded as well developed.