



5/5/2023

# University Assessment Team Report on Annual Program Assessment Reports

The 2022 -2023 University Assessment Team

## **COMMITTEE OFFICERS**

**College of Health Professions** - Kelli Frost (Chair)  
**Corktown Campus** - Alyssa Goike (Secretary)

## **COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**College of Liberal Arts and Education** - Varinder Kaur

**Riverfront Campus** - Paula Manning

**School of Architecture** - Kris Nelson

**College of Business Administration** - Mithu Bhattacharya

**College of Engineering and Science** - Mariam Faied

**Libraries** - Jill Turner

**Core Curriculum Committee** - Joe Weglarz

**MFA Representative** - Preston Foerder

## **Administrative Representatives**

Karen Lee, Associate VP of Academic Affairs  
Mike Verduco, Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning

## 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 2022-2023 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. Forty-three 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 (2.6), student learning outcomes (2.4), institutional outcomes (3.0), and results/planned actions/actions taken (2.7). These rubric dimension scores were equal to or higher than the scores from the previous year, indicating positive responses from program directors and department chairs to UAT 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.



### 2022-2023 Annual Program Assessment Reports Evaluated N=43



### Rubric Dimension Scores for Annual Program Assessment Reports 2021-2022 and 2022-2023



3-Point Rubric Scale: A=3, B=2, C=1



### 2022-2023 Assessment Overview N=43

- 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.



### 2022-2023 Student Learning Outcomes N=43

- 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.



### Institutional Outcomes N=43

- 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.



### Results, Planned Actions, Actions Taken N=43



- 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.