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*{The following is provided as a sample and not meant to dictate content, measures, or reporting framework.*

*It includes a variety of assessment measures and reporting styles}*

1. **Program Information**

Department: [DEPARTMENT NAME]

Program: [PROGRAM NAME] B.S. B.A.

Contact Name: Jane and John Doe

Contact Email: janedoe@ksu.edu, johndoe@ksu.edu

Program assessment website: [www.ksu.edu/assessment](http://www.ksu.edu/assessment)

### Outcome Reporting

**Example of text-based reporting**

**Student Learning Outcome 1: Knowledge.**

Students will demonstrate a depth of knowledge and apply the methods of inquiry in a discipline of their choosing, and they will demonstrate a breadth of knowledge across their choice of varied disciplines.

**Assessment Method(s)**

**(Direct Measure) –** Students are assessed with a 50-question multiple choice exam in ASSESS 595, Senior Capstone in assessment. Questions pertain to the breadth of knowledge students should attain by the end of the assessment studies program with categories of knowledge dis-aggregated to identify the quality of learning in specific areas. Minimum expected level of achievement is 80% of questions correct for each sub-category, proficient is 90%. As a program, we want 90% of our students to reach the minimum level for all sub-categories, with at least 80% of our students to reach the targeted proficiency level for all sub-categories.

**Data Summary**

42 seniors were assessed in fall 2011

74 seniors were assessed in spring 2012

2 students scored below the minimum acceptable level.

18 student scored above the minimum acceptable of 80% but below the targeted proficiency level of 90%.

96 students scored at or above 90%, our program’s designated level of proficiency.

**Reflection**

Scores illustrate that 83% of the students assessed have achieved at the level of Proficient or above meeting the expectation of our program. This is nearly the same percentage as the previous year. The program goal of students achieving a minimum level was met with 98%.

**(Indirect Measure) –** As part of an e-portfolios, students describe their mastery of the knowledge associated with this outcome and the extent to which their knowledge attained can be applied in an authentic situation.

**Data Summary**

In responding to the five-point Likert question (with 1 being the highest score), student response scores indicated a high level of agreement (M=17), indicating that students feel that our overall curriculum is strong in offering knowledge content.

**Example of vertical-table reporting**

**Student Learning Outcome 2: Critical Thinking.**

Students will demonstrate the ability to access and interpret information, respond and adapt to changing situations, make complex decisions, solve problems, and evaluate actions.

**Assessment Method(s)**

**(Direct Measure) –** The assessment committee decided to assess the Critical Thinking via ASSESS 500: Critical Choices in Assessment. The professor tried a novel teaching approach that combined goals for student mastery of both critical thinking and assessment techniques. Specifically, the professor encouraged students to “think critically about student learning, values and norms” by discussing what is meant by learning associated with a variety of content areas. Students selected education, technology, social identity, and performing arts as areas of consideration. After exploring theories and concepts of learning, within each area, the students developed assessment measures and rationalized their choices supporting consideration of multiple learning perspectives.Student work was assessed using an adapted version of the [AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE rubric](http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/toolkit/measurement/CriticalThinking.doc). Minimum expected achievement is a score of 2 out of the 4 possible on all levels of the rubric, but the targeted level of achievement is a score of 3 on all levels of the rubric. Aggregate scores from each category are reported to identify specific areas for improvement. As a program, we expect 90% of our students to reach the minimum level and 80% of our students to reach the targeted level of proficiency.

**Data Summary**

35 students were assessed. The results are as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Total # at Level | % at Level |
| High Proficiency (=4) | 1 | 3% |
| Proficiency (>3) | 25 | 71% |
| Minimum Competency (>2) | 35 | 100% |

**Reflection**

Following faculty discussion, the assessment task and measuring tool appears to effectively demonstrate student achievement in critical thinking as expected by our program. The program met the minimum expected achievement, but did not meet the goal of 80% of the students reaching the targeted proficiency level. The area in which students scored lowest on the rubric were: ‘Influence of context and assumptions’ and ‘Explanations of the issues’. Faculty plans to adjust instruction too increase focus on these areas and integrate an additional set of formative measures to identify the development of these foundational skills.

**(Indirect Measure) –** All SLOs are also assessed through senior survey through which students are asked to anonymously complete a self-assessment of their mastery of the knowledge/skills associated with each outcome.

**Data summary and reflection**

In the exit survey, 30 students were asked to respond to questions relating to SLO 2. For the question: “Which of the following statements best describes your ability to access and interpret usefulness and accuracy of information?” 27 students responded “I can readily access information needed for projects and distinguish usefulness and accuracy for scholarly work” and 3 students acknowledged that they “have some difficulty distinguishing distinguish usefulness and accuracy.”  A similar result occurred with the question concerning their ability to make complex decisions to solve problems. These findings identify that a portion of students are not aware of the need for improvement in these areas, as found in the direct assessment, supporting the importance of enhancing instruction and student awareness of expectations.

**Example of horizontal-table reporting**

**Student Learning Outcome 3: Communication.**

Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate clearly and effectively.

**Assessment Method(s)**

**(Direct Measures)**

**Oral Communication**, student presentations of their capstone projects are assessed by both the faculty and two external industry professionals using a modified version of the [AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric](http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/toolkit/measurement/OralCommunication.doc). Minimum expected achievement is a mean score of >2 (average of the three reviewers’ score) on all levels of the rubric. Targeted proficiency is a score of >3 (average of the three reviewers’ scores) on all levels of the rubric. Aggregate cores are broken down by each rubric category to identify specific areas for student learning improvement. As a program, we expect 90% of our students to reach the minimum level and 80% of our students to reach the proficiency level.

**Written Communication**, student capstone research papers are scored with a modified [AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric](http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/toolkit/measurement/WrittenCommunication.doc). Minimum expected achievement is a mean score of >2 (average of the three reviewers’ score) on all levels of the rubric. Targeted proficiency is a score of >3 (average of the three reviewers’ scores) on all levels of the rubric. Aggregate cores are broken down by each rubric category to identify specific areas for student learning improvement. As a program, we expect 90% of our students to reach the minimum level and 80% of our students to reach the proficiency level.

**Graphic Communication**, the program requires all students to display a portfolio of work (10 pieces) for review. The work displayed is to show their achievements in designated foundational skills. The faculty individually score each skill using the rubric attached. The criteria is based on visual appeal, appropriate and varied use of digital tools, communication of designated intent, and integration of multiple representation. The students are rated as Below Average, Average, and Above Average. Additional comments are written on each student's form.

**(Indirect Measure) –** All SLOs are also assessed through senior survey through which students are asked to anonymously complete a self-assessment of their mastery of the knowledge/skills associated with each outcome.

**Data Summary**

**Direct: (as described above)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Communication Outcome** | **Total assessed** | **Did not meet minimum****<80%** | **% of total** | **Met minimum >80%** | **% of total** | **Proficient >90%** | **% of total** |
| **Oral Communication** | 83 | 12 | 14% | 71 | 86% | 62 | 75% |
| **Written Communication** | 83 | 3 | 4% | 80 | 96% | 73 | 88% |
| **Graphic Communication** | 83 | 10 | 12% | 73 | 88% | 61 | 74% |

**Indirect:** Student responses to the senior exit survey on “How well has the program prepared you for your career in each of the following areas?”

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Communication Outcome** | **Total assessed** | **Not Well** | **Somewhat** | **Very Well** |
| **Oral Communication** | 75 | 16 | 8 | 51 |
| **Written Communication** | 71 | 0 | 2 | 69 |
| **Graphic Communication** | 69 | 1 | 0 | 68 |

**Reflection**

The program has met the intended target for written communication signifying that in all component categories scored on the rubric, students are achieved at or above expected levels. Four percent of our students are performing below the minimum acceptable level in regard to written communication. While this number is down from the 7 percent reported last year it is still distressing. The separation of a content and mechanics sections within this rubric has proved useful in determining where the weaknesses lie. Only one student was considered to be below minimum in regard to the mechanics of written communication, yet within the content component 10 students scored below the minimum level. There is also a rather large percentage of students that fall within the "met minimum but below proficient" range for both mechanics (36 percent) and content (31 percent). While such a ranking illustrates that many of our students are meeting criteria, the fact that most are not exceeding expectations is noteworthy.

Program targets were not met for Oral Communication, nor for Graphic Communication.

In reference to Oral Communication, students appeared to score well in the rubric categories of ‘Central message’ and “Supporting Materials’, demonstrating effective knowledge and understanding, but rubric categories discovered that lowered student achievement scores were in the areas of ‘Delivery’ and ‘Organization’. This finding guided faculty to explore where in the curriculum prior to the senior capstone course the students experienced preparing for and orally demonstrating their learning. It was discovered that this was not present in the current curriculum, so additional learning experiences will be added into prerequisite courses.

In the outcome of Graphic Communication, the category in which a deficiency was discovered is in the area of appropriate and varied use of digital tools. The faculty will meet in the summer to discover if there is a between skills and application in the project.

There survey data suggests there is an awareness of the need for additional experience that develops oral communication skills with only 68% feeling fully prepared. This supports the findings from direct assessment. But there appears a discrepancy between student perceptions of their use of technological tools and how well they did on the final project, which indicates that students may need additional instruction in the curriculum.

**Example of multi-year reporting**

**Student Learning Outcome 4: Diversity.**

Students will demonstrate awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to live and work in a diverse world.

**Assessment Method(s)**

**(Direct Measure) –** Two essay assignments at the mid- and end-points of the semester in Assess 595: Senior Capstone were used to assess this SLO. For the essay exams, students were asked respond to a case study involving several diversity issues related to this discipline and draw heavily on course materials and empirical data to explain how inequalities of gender, race, and ethnicity are (re)produced through the current work environment of this discipline. Students compose a paper, which is scored with a modified VALUE Rubric (uses elements of the [Intercultural Knowledge](http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/toolkit/measurement/InterculturalKnowledge.doc) and [Global Learning](http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/toolkit/measurement/globallearning.doc) rubrics). Minimum expected achievement is a mean score of >2 (average of the three reviewers’ score) on all levels of the rubric. Targeted proficiency is a score of >3 (average of the three reviewers’ scores) on all levels of the rubric. Aggregate cores are broken down by each rubric category to identify specific areas for student learning improvement. As a program, we expect 90% of our students to reach the minimum level and 80% of our students to reach the proficiency level.

**(Indirect Measure) –** Surveys were used numerous times throughout the semester using the K-State Survey System (Qualtrics). Questions asked students to self-report their understanding and comprehension of the core issues of diversity explored in readings and in class. Since these are not quantitative assessments, no expected level or performance can be measured.

**Data Summary**

Forty-three students submitted work for both assignments and completed the course. Their scores across the two sets of essay assignments reflect improvement over time. Although 42 of 43 students (over 97 percent) demonstrated minimum competency or beyond at both points in the semester, more students demonstrated high proficiency at the end of the semester than at the mid-point (10 versus 6 students). At both points, nearly 80 percent of the students demonstrated proficiency or beyond.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of Students** | **Academic****Year** | Unsatisfactory | Developing | Acceptable | Exemplary |
| 32 | 2011-2012 | 1 or 4% | 1 or 4% | 24 or 74% | 6 or 18% |
| 29 | 2012-2013 | 0% | 0% | 18 or 63% | 11 or 37% |
| 21 | 2013-2014 | 2 or 9% | 1 or 5% | 8 or 38% | 10 or 48% |
| 43 | 2014-2015 | 1 or 2% | 8 or 19% | 24 or 56% | 10 or 23% |

**Reflection**

Current scores illustrate that 79% of the students have achieved at the targeted level of Proficient or above. This is slightly lower than the previous years. The assessment is indicating that students are achieving at an acceptable level for the program, the faculty might analyze more deeply into the drop in score to identify if there was a misunderstanding in the assessment task, or if there is any area associated with diversity that may not have been sufficiently addressed for this cohort of students.

60 percent of our majors surveyed believe their experiences as has improved their understanding of diversity issues and 40 percent contend that they have had many opportunities to experience authentic situation. Overall these numbers are down from the previous reporting period (82 percent surveyed). Some of this could be explained in the relatively low return we received on the surveys.

**Example of horizontal-table reporting**

**Student Learning Outcome 5: Academic and Professional Integrity.**

Students will demonstrate awareness and understanding of the ethical standards of their academic discipline and/or profession.

**Assessment Method(s)**

**(Direct Measure) –**Students compose a paper in Assess 595, Senior Capstone, which tasks them with responding to a case study involving several ethical issues related to this discipline. Students are then scored on a modified [AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric](http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/toolkit/measurement/EthicalReasoning.doc). Aggregate cores are broken down by each rubric category to identify specific areas for student learning improvement. As a program, we expect 90% of our students to reach the minimum level and 80% of our students to reach the proficiency level.

**Data Summary**

Thirty-five students were assessed. The results are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Instrument* | *# Stu-dents* | *High End**Performance at 90% or better* | *Mid-Range performance at 80% or better**(Cumulative; Includes high end)* | *Low End performance at 70% or better**(Cumulative; Includes high end)* | *Failing**< 70%* | *Observations and Corrective Action* |
| Assess 595 (F14) | Final Exam, paper submission | 18 | 1583.3%Outcome Met | 1794.4%Outcome Met | 1794.4%Outcome Met | 15.6% | Outcome met. |
| Assess 595 (F15) | Final Exam, paper submission | 7 | 342.7%Outcome Met | 571.4%Outcome Met | 685.7%Outcome Met | 114.3% | Outcome met. |
|  | *Criteria:* | *10% or greater* | *50% or greater* | *80% or greater* |  |  |

**Reflection**

Program goals are not met. The program faculty will meet to discuss if the measure is properly addressing actual learning and/or if curriculum needs to be addressed.

**Example of multi-year, multi-outcome reporting for indirect outcomes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome Measures** | **Achievement** |
| **2014-2015** | **2015-2016** | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** |
| **n Average** | **n Average** | **n Average** | **n Average** | **n Average** |
| Diversity | On average, seniors will rate their diversity awareness, understanding, and skills as a 3.0 or better on a 5.0 scale. | 34 | 3.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communication | On average seniors will rate their ability to communicate effectively as 3.0 or better on a 5.0 scale. | 34 | 3.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CriticalThinking | On average, seniors will rate their ability to think critically as 3.0 or better on a 5.0 scale. | 34 | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional | On average, seniors will rate their professional development as 3.0 or better on a 5.0 scale. | 34 | 3.82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

bThe stem “Please rate your knowledge or ability of the following items on a 5-point scale from (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree” was used.

Development

***Program’s statement reflecting on what the results may mean to the program student achievement and programmatic expectation:*** Within the indirect measures of student learning outcomes, results indicate that all students believe they are achieving the goals established.

### Program Self Review

**Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data**

The committee met to discuss results and presented its findings to the larger faculty meeting. Additional meetings on how to address oral communication earlier in the curriculum are scheduled.

**Program Improvements**

Faculty teaching Assess 595 will adjust the diversity assignment in response to student feedback. Preliminary discussions are underway to include components of oral communication in earlier required coursework in order to improve this outcome. Over the last year, extensive work has been done to revise the current SLOs and the review and assessment is still on-going. Because several of the SLOs did not meet identified standards, discussion is currently taking place in regards to the standards set by the faculty during the spring 2014 revision and if the standards are appropriate or if teaching methods and program requirements need to be adjusted to meet the identified standards. Because this is the first report since the revisions have taken effect, faculty may elect to wait for one more reporting cycle to be completed to determine the best course of action to take.

**Future Plans**

We will keep a close eye on diversity outcomes scores next year to see whether the low results stemmed from the measure used or from ill-preparation. We also plan to explore whether a currently optional oral communication course for our majors should be made a requirement. In addition, we are also looking at increasing our rigor in the knowledge and critical thinking outcomes, as those have consistently shown high achievement for several years.

**Summary of this Report (to be inserted in the Program Review Report for Board of Regents Program Review)**

Our assessment process has developed to the point where it is helping us expose areas of concern in student learning. Our students are exceeding our expected levels in three of our five outcomes, and are close to meeting the program expectation in the other two outcomes. In those two outcomes where some additional students didn’t quite meet our expectations (oral communication and diversity), the assessment process has helped us to identify ways to address the issues. Our assessment committee regularly meets to discuss concerns and potential improvements, and also reports regularly to the wider faculty.