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This is the template for program assessment of data collected during 2022-2023 academic year. The template ensures that programs are planning for, collecting and analyzing, and engaging with assessment data.

**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 the institutions’ graduate programs differ from undergraduate programs by requiring “ greater depth of study, greater 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.” (1.C.9.)

The following resources are provided for reference in development of mission or objectives at the level of rigor required for Graduate level programs:

* <https://www.luminafoundation.org/files/resources/dqp.pdf>
* <https://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/dqp/>

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.” It is recommended that graduate programs reference and follow any standards that are relevant to their particular field.
* **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.

**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 professional standards.
* 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
* Narrative of the **changes** made in the past year to the PSLOs and the reasons for those changes.

**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 supported and scaffolded throughout the program’s curriculum?

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **PSLO 1** | **PSLO 2** | **PSLO3** | **PSLO4** | **PSLO5** |
| **COURSE** |  |  |  |  |  |
| MATH 111 |  | C |  |  |  |
| WRI 121 | F |  | F |  |  |
| SPE 111 | F |  |  | P |  |
| ENGR 101 | P |  |  |  |  |
| CIV 100 |  | P |  |  | 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 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 current year planned for data collection.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Act** | **Collect** | **Plan** |
| **PSLO** | **2021-2022** | **2022-2023** | **2023-2024** |
| **PSLO 1** | Class 1  Class 2 |  |  |
| **PSLO 2** | Class 1  Class 2 |  |  |
| **PSLO3** |  |  | Class 1  Class 2 |
| **PSLO4** |  |  | Class 1  Class 2 |
| **PSLO5** |  | Class 1  Class 2 |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**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. Include the following information:

* **Performance Target**: 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
* **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

**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 **2022-2023** 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 achievement for trends and gaps in relation to external and internal comparators. Those indicators are defined as: Graduation, Retention, Persistence, DFWI, Post Graduation Success.
* All Programs have assessed student performance on established program student learning outcomes 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.
* 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.

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** | **Equity Gap?** |
| 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 | No  No  Yes | No |
| PSLO2-Ethics | 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 | Yes  No  Yes | No |
| 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 | Yes  No  Yes | No |
| Graduation Rate | University Dashboard | 6-year rate >50% | 92% | Yes | Yes – Native American Graduation 40% |
| Retention | University Dashboard | 1-year rate >75% | 89% | Yes | Yes- Stop out of Black students 60% |
| Certification | Accreditor’s report | 1-year >75% | 70% | No | No |
| DFWI | Average Oregon College Rating for Math Departments | All program <12% | 2% | Yes | Yes – Course A identified as gate keeper course. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

* 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. Questions to consider: 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 can be presented either in narrative or tabular format. It should include the following items:

* **History of Results**: Data from previous reports on this years' measured outcomes should be looked at for trends. If student performance 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. External sources of data can be useful in these types of interpretations. Or perhaps an outcome continues to have low performance due to an unmet resource need or an unimplemented action plan.
* **Evaluation of Past Actions:**  Look back on the last time you assessed these outcomes in the cycle. Were there action plans implemented? How has this data changed because of programmatic changes made? Did your program implement something really successful? This is a place to highlight how you know it was successful. Did your program implement something that did not go well? This is how you show that it did not go well and may need to be re-evaluated. Does your program continue to lack a requested resource? This is a place where you can demonstrate the continued need.

Below is an example of table format:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Criteria** | **Previous Action Plan** | **Previous Data** | **Current Data** | **Interpretation** |
| PSLO1 | None Indicated | **80%** | 63% | **New gap identified** |
| PSLO2 | 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% |  |
| Certification | Faculty deep dive evaluation of certification criteria. | 68% | 70% | More data needed |
| DFWI | None Indicated | 3% | 2% |  |

# 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 actions that need to be taken in the coming year.

* Every program should, based on assessment data collected in 2022-23, identify at least one area to focus on for improvement during 2023-2024 academic year stemming from these assessment results. **Action plans** should be generated when:
  + Student Performance on an outcome is **below target**.
  + 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.
  + 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 | 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?
* **Discuss programmatic 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Graduate Program Assessment Report Feedback Rubric | |
| *2022-23 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 Graduate level Professional Standards |  |
| Curriculum Map: Scaffolding indicates Foundational, Practice, and Capstone Assessments |  |
| Assessment Cycle is three years or less to cover all PSLO |  |
| Actions taken by programs on assessment during each year of the cycle are specified |  |
| During collection year, courses/assignments are specified that align to PSLO at FP&C levels |  |
| Rubric: Criteria for grading the assignment is described (may include as an appendix) |  |
| Sample: Number of samples reviewed is specified |  |
| Accountability: Reviewer of the assignment are specified |  |
| Assessment data is collected across all locations and modalities |  |
| Performance Targets of acceptability are indicated |  |
| Results include: Graduation, Retention, Persistence, DFWI, Post Grad Success, Equity Gaps, PSLO |  |
| Interpretation: Current results are compared against performance targets |  |
| Interpretation: Current results are compared against previous years of data |  |
| Interpretation: Current results are compared against some external Graduate level comparator |  |
| 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 |  |
| Faculty discuss trends in the data |  |
| 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.