

## **SAMPLE Graduate Biennial Program Assessment Report**

<b>Program Information: (Modify table as needed)</b>	
Degree/s Assessed	PhD in NZ History
College or Administrative Division	College of Aotearoa
Department/School	
Report Submitted By	Craig Ogilvie
Date Submitted	29 June 2020
Assessment Period:	2019/20

Graduate assessment reports are to be submitted biennially. The report deadline is September 15<sup>th</sup>.

### **Biennial Graduate Assessment Process:**

Every graduate program assessment must have the following key components:

- 1. Program Description:** Depending on the program plan (A: Thesis; B: Professional, or C: Course Work) will define the nature of your PLO's. Ideally plans would include assessment that would cover all plans, but that would depend on the nature of your Master's program.
- 2. Program Learning Outcomes:** PLOs are the accumulated knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students develop during a course of study in the program. Essentially, PLOs tell us what students will learn in the program. PLOs should be written as specific, measureable statements describing *what students will be able to do* upon completion of the program. Each PLO should contain an **action verb** and a learning statement. (For help in developing learning outcomes see "Program Assessment Overview", under Resources on Provost Page: [https://www.montana.edu/provost/assessment/program\\_assessment.html](https://www.montana.edu/provost/assessment/program_assessment.html))
- 3. Threshold Values:** Along with program learning outcomes, program assessment reports should include threshold values to measure student achievement for learning outcomes.
- 4. Methods of Assessment:** Every assessment report needs evidence to demonstrate student learning at the program level. This evidence can be in the form of a direct measure of student learning or an indirect measure of student learning. Both direct and indirect assessment data must be associated with the program's learning outcomes, and collected within a timeframe determined by the program.
- 5. Timeframe for Collecting and Analyzing Data:** Please provide a multi-year assessment schedule that will show when all program learning outcomes will be assessed, and by what criteria (data). Ideally, assessment data should be collected throughout the year on an annual basis. At the minimum, program faculty should schedule an annual meeting to review these data and discuss student progress toward the SLOs.
- 6. Use of Assessment Data:** The assessment report should identify who received the analyzed assessment data, and how it was used by program faculty for program improvement (s).
- 7. Closing the Loop:** Assessment reports should also be reflective on previous assessment and program improvements. Based on assessment from previous years, please include program level changes that have led to outcome improvements.

## 1. Program Description:

This doctorate spans the comprehensive study New Zealand ranging from the first arrival of the indigenous people, the Maori, the establishment of Maori culture, the arrival of the Westerners, colonization, the Waitangi Treaty, to independence in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century

## 2. Program Learning Outcomes, Assessment Schedule, and Methods of Assessment

The learning outcomes adapt the European Qualification Framework of Knowledge, Skills, and Responsibility & Autonomy for Level 7: doctorate.<sup>1</sup>

ASSESSMENT PLANNING CHART					
	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	Data Source*
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES					
Knowledge: Demonstrate highly specialized knowledge of NZ history, at the forefront of the field, that is the basis for original research. Show critical awareness of the cultural and geographic contexts of NZ history and its connection with current and future directions of the country.		x		x	Department anonymously surveys each committee member after comprehensive exam and after the dissertation defense
Skills: Able to interpret original sources and artefacts in order to develop new knowledge of NZ history.	x		x		Department anonymously surveys each committee member after the comprehensive exam and after the dissertation defense.
Responsibility & Autonomy: Manage a wide range of sources and new approaches to interpret history; take responsibility for contributing to professional knowledge and practice of history.	x		x		Department anonymously surveys the committee chair after the comprehensive exam and after the completion of the degree.

## 3. Threshold values for program learning outcomes (please include assessment rubrics)

Threshold Values		
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME	Threshold Value	Data Source
Knowledge	At least 75% students will be at Likert scale 3 or 4 and at least 25% students will be at scale 4	Post-defense Likert scale question on this knowledge question. Likert scale ranges from 1 (low-level of knowledge) to 4 (very knowledgeable).

<sup>1</sup> <https://ec.europa.eu/ploteus/content/descriptors-page>

		Department averages are compiled separately for comps and defenses once at least 5 students have completed.
Skills	At least 75% students will be at Likert scale 3 or 4 and at least 25% students will be at scale 4	Post-defense Likert scale question on this skills question. Likert scale ranges from 1 (low-level of skills) to 4 (very skillful). Department averages are compiled separately for comps and defenses once at least 5 students have completed.
Responsibility & Autonomy:	At least 75% students will be at Likert scale 3 or 4 and at least 25% students will be at scale 4	Post-defense Likert scale question on this responsibility question. Likert scale ranges from 1 (low-level of autonomy) to 4 (very high-level of autonomy). Department averages are compiled separately for comps and defenses once at least 5 students have completed.

#### 4. What Was Done

a) Was the completed assessment consistent with the plan provided? YES   x   NO       

If no, please explain why the plan was altered.

b) Please provide a rubric that demonstrates how your data was evaluated.

Indicators	1: Low-level	2: Moderate-level	3: High-level	4: Very high-level
Knowledge				
Skills				
Responsibility & Autonomy:				

#### 5. What Was Learned: Results

Please include who received the analyzed assessment data, and how it was used by program faculty for program improvement (s).

a) Areas of strength

The average score for PhD completers for knowledge was 3.5 showing that students have a broad and deep knowledge of NZ history. The average score for skills is also 3.5. Both showed progression since the average scores after the comprehensive exams were 3.0

#### **b) Areas that need improvement**

The average score for PhD completers for responsibility and autonomy was however 2.5 showing that our mentoring of students needs to be improved. The average for this metric was only 2.0 at the comprehensive exam indicating that curriculum changes need to be made early in the program.

### **6. How We Responded**

**a) Based on the faculty responses, will there any curricular or assessment changes (such as plans for measurable improvements, or realignment of learning outcomes)?**

YES   x  

NO         

**If yes, when will these changes be implemented?**

2020/2021 Academic year

**Please include which outcome is targeted, and how changes will be measured for improvement. If other criteria is used to recommend program changes, please explain how the responses are driving department, or program decisions.**

Responsibility & Autonomy. We will add shorter projects into the curriculum earlier in the program so that the students can take increasing responsibility for new historical investigations. The method of assessing program outcomes will stay the same, but we will reset the departmental averages of the Likert surveys in order to evaluate the extent that the performance of students has changed.

**b) When will the changes be next assessed?**

2023/24

### **7. Closing the Loop**

**a. If there have been changes in program/curriculum to reflect concerns from previous assessments, what impact have the changes had (if any) on achieving the desired level of student learning outcomes?**

A previous assessment showed that students were not skilled at interpreting original sources. We included more projects that relied on original sources in our core courses. The average Likert score for this metric is 3.5

**NOTE: Student names must not be included in data collection. Dialog on successful completions, manner of assessment (publications, thesis/dissertation, or qualifying exam) may be presented in table format if they apply to learning outcomes. In programs where numbers are very small and individual identification can be made, focus should be on programmatic improvements rather than student success. Data should be collected through the year on an annual basis.**

Submit report to [programassessment@montana.edu](mailto:programassessment@montana.edu)