

2018-19 Assessment: University Report

What is Assessed: All undergraduate programs (which include “stand-alone” minors) are assessed annually, all graduate programs and certificates are assessed biennially.

268 programs, certificates and minors have been identified as active.

Of the 268 programs, two are new and are developing assessment processes (Ranching Systems and Cybersecurity/Information Assurance) 107 are graduate programs or certificates.

53 graduate programs were not due in the fall of 2019 (graduate programs are on an “every other year” cycle). The graduate programs not submitting this year will be required to submit their assessment for the years 2018-2020 in the Fall of 2020.

Assessment Activity: There were 213 programs, minors and certificates that were due to submit their assessment in the Fall of 2020.

37 programs did not submit their assessment for the academic year of 2018-19. Of these, eight were minors, and 6 were certificates. Minors and certificates have not been specifically identified for assessment in previous years (as many of these are interdisciplinary in nature). The Assessment and Outcomes Committee (AOC) will be assisting these programs to develop assessment plans that can provide information on student success, and documentation of quality assurance for their program.

Breakdown by College:

College/School	# of Active Programs *	# of Programs w/no assessment *	% Participation
Agriculture	34	4	88%
Arts and Architecture	17	4	76%
Education, Health & Human Service	40	0	100%
Norm Asbjornson College of Engineering	45	9	80%
Gallatin College	14	4	71%
Graduate School **	0	0	0
Honors College	2	2	0
Jake Jabs College of Business & Entrepreneurship	5	0	100%
Letters and Science	51	13	75%
Nursing	5	0	100%
Total	214	37	83%

* This does not include graduate programs or new programs that were not participating in this assessment cycle.

** Programs under the Graduate School were not due in this assessment cycle.

Total University Assessment = Although 83% is not acceptable, it is understandable as mentioned above, 14 of the 40 include minors and certificates, and three are interdisciplinary programs. As assessment of minors and certificates are relatively new requirements, programs may not be aware that they needed to be assessed, and many are interdisciplinary in nature. AOC will continue to work with programs to develop plans to assess these minors and certificates, with the goal of 100% participation in assessment and planning development by the fall of 2020. The interdisciplinary programs were Sustainable Food and Bioenergy (Livestock Production – Animal &

Range Sciences; Agroecology – Land Resources and Environmental Science; and Crop Production – Plant Sciences/Plan Pathology). The Department of Health and Human Development, which also has an option in this degree, is working with the other three departments to develop an assessment plan.

Assessment Process: In the fall semester, departments are required to submit their program assessments to the Assessment and Outcomes Committee (AOC) for review. The assessment report is a standardized template that emphasizes program's activities and the documentation of student success. Programs are required to include their program learning outcomes, the courses that map into the outcomes, the type of assessment artifacts used, the means of assessment (rubric), and desired threshold values. Each report then explains how the results were analyzed by the department faculty, and the discussions that would lead to program or curricular improvements. Lastly, the report includes analysis of previous program improvements (closing the loop). The AOC then reviews each report and submits a survey response so that data can be collected to determine how university colleges and departments are successfully meeting assessment requirements. Lastly, a report is developed for each department head, college dean and the university.

Assessment Results: There were two types of program reports submitted. The standard program assessment report, and for the first year, a Year 0 assessment planning request. The Year 0 planning document was a result of last year's assessment analysis by the AOC. It was determined that several programs/departments were missing the goal of assessment, and needed to redesign assessable learning outcomes, develop a program map, identify assessment artifacts, rubrics and/or thresholds. Because this is a process we take seriously, we allotted programs a year to work with faculty and develop a strategic assessment plan.

Program Assessment Results:

1) Population or unbiased samples of collected assignments are scored by at least two faculty members using scoring rubrics to assure inter-rater reliability:

We still have a ways to go on getting programs to buy into the use of inter-rater reliability.

49% either did not report or indicated they did not use at least two faculty to assess student work.

2) Programs identify areas where performance thresholds were not met

50% Not reported

8% Did not meet threshold

42% Met threshold

3) Program assessment results are shared at program/unit faculty meetings

31% reported total faculty involvement in reviewing assessments, analyzing results, developing strategies.

7% indicated that faculty were minimally, or not involved at all in assessment activities.

62% fell somewhere in between. The most consistent response was that faculty were informed of the assessment results at a meeting. However, there is little information on faculty response to reports or if any recommendations were produced from these meetings. We think that this is occurring, but we need to inform departments that this information should be documented.

4) Evidence that faculty reviewed assessment results, and have developed specific strategies

40% identified areas for assessment improvement: changing assessment assignments to better assess outcomes, identifying potential curriculum changes to identify concerns, reevaluate assessment rubrics, strengthen learning outcomes to be more assessable, and reassess outcome thresholds. A few programs noted the need to help faculty learn how to assess, and the standardization of capstone courses (faculty development).

32% identified no concerns and were satisfied with the assessment results, 28% did not respond at all.

5) Demonstration of changes made from previous assessment activities (Closing the Loop)

37% identified specific areas of changes made from previous assessments, and how those changes affected student success. Although we hope to see this number improve, it is a new area of reporting. We can consider this a benchmark number to identify continued improvement in this area.

6) Program areas of strength: How programs reflect on the consistency between their identified Program Learning Outcomes (PLO's) and the results presented:

8% Strengths are consistent with Program Learning Outcomes (but not consistent with data)

22% Strengths are consistent with Data Presented (but not consistent with PLO's)

41 % Strengths consistent with both PLO's and Data

24% Lack or no connection between identified strengths, and PLO's or data.

5% Not reported

7) Areas that need improvement based on the analysis of data. Probably the most common concern on improvement of data was around sample size (too small) or assessment results based on minimal assessment activity and data.

Although this is a program assessment, the assessment of learning outcomes are reflected in course curriculum. We encourage programs to include “non-majors” in their assessment (especially if their program is small), as the curriculum reflects the outcome of the programs.

Other common areas for improvement include:

Identification of outcome achievement, without supporting information

Lack of reporting on program strengths

Some of these issues are due to using the incorrect assessment form. The template specifically asks programs to identify their program strengths and areas they hope to improve upon. Without the prompt, programs do not report on these areas.

8) Identification of program level changes that have led to outcome improvements. This is an area that we have found difficult to get consistent reporting. The goal is for programs to look holistically at their assessments, not in year-by-year snippets. We're starting to see improvements, but this is also a benchmark we will continue to improve.

72% Closing the Loop assessment not identified

28% Assessment of previously identified program/curricular improvements

Most common areas identified for recommended improvements:

#1 recommendation was to use the correct assessment form. Programs are probably meeting many more of our outcomes but are simply not reporting them. Our goal is to have 100% use of the assessment form so that we can accurately benchmark program activity.

#2 Programs that do not provide any information for program improvement or even evaluation of curriculum alignment to program outcomes. For programs that are not actively engaged in program assessment, we will recommend a Year 0 full evaluation of assessment process, including the department reviewing program learning outcomes, mapping required curriculum and establishing criteria for assessment artifacts, rubrics and the means of assessment.

#3 More inclusive faculty involvement (assessment, review, and analysis). We have seen great improvement in this area, but there are still programs that have minimal faculty involved.

#4 Use of assessment data, alignment of program learning outcomes with curriculum and defined rubrics, and thresholds for student achievement. We also found that several programs rely on student grades rather than the evaluation of specific assessment activities/or artifacts. As grades can not be used to assess specific outcomes, programs are encouraged to identify targeted assessment material to evaluate the attainment of student learning.

Year 0 Planning

Programs choosing a Year 0 planning submitted a form with the elements they wish to address over the course of the academic year. The request included the nature of faculty involvement, what specific assessment criteria will be addressed, the assessment cycle, and the thresholds for outcomes. Most programs requesting a Year 0 planning year indicated that they will be building from the Learning Outcomes up, which will include rewriting outcomes, new program mapping, assessment criteria (artifacts), rubrics, and thresholds.

We had a total of 14 programs, which included multiple options and minors. Both undergraduate and graduate programs submitted Year 0 requests.

In Fall of 2020, these programs will submit their full assessment plan, and begin assessment. 100% of the submitted forms included a carefully documented set of goals and outcomes, and only 1 program did not specifically indicate how faculty will be involved in the process, which was noted in the departmental report so that it can be corrected.

Self-Reported Data Summary:

Annual Assessment Process (Check off list)	Data Not Reported	No	Yes	N/A
Data are collected as defined by assessment plan	6%	14%	80%	
Population or unbiased samples of collected assignments are scored by at least two faculty members using scoring rubrics to assure inter-rater reliability	17%	34%	49%	
Areas where the acceptable performance threshold has not been met are highlighted.	30%	7%	41%	22%
Assessment scores were presented at a program/unit faculty meeting.	26%	13%	61%	
Closing the Loop	18%	45%	37%	
The faculty reviewed the assessment results, and responded accordingly	41%	9%*	49%	1%**

* No = No changes were made based on the results of the program assessment

**NA = Faculty had not yet met when report was submitted

This is the first time this data has been collected specifically for these outcomes. We plan to use this information as baseline data, and monitor improvements.

This report is respectfully submitted on behalf of the Assessment and Outcomes Committee.

Committee Chair: Rachel Anderson - Assistant Provost Assessment & Curriculum Management

Members:

Tracy Dougher: Associate Dean - College of Agriculture

Ann Ewbank: Director of Accreditation & Operations - Department of Education

Ruhul Amin: Professor, Mechanical Engineering Program Coordinator – Norm Asbjornson College of Engineering

Craig Ogilvie: Dean of Graduate School & Associate VP of Research

Donna Negaard: Director of Graduate Student Affairs - Graduate School

Sarah Maki: Associate Dean - Gallatin College

Logan Schultz: Assistant Dean - Honors College

Susan Raph: Associate Dean for Academic Programs – College of Nursing

David Eitle: Associate Dean – College of Letters & Science

Vaughan Judge: Professor, Director of the School of Art – College of Art and Architecture

Margaret Thorsen: Assistant Professor, Sociology – College of Letters & Science

Tia Brown – Director of Operations – Jake Jabs College of Business & Entrepreneurship

Keely Holmes – Program Manager – Office of the Provost/Academic Affairs