# Year 0 Planning Request: Graduate Programs

College:
Department:
Submitted by:

Which programs are requesting a planning year?
I**ndicate all majors, options and certificates that are included in this planning year**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Majors/Minors/Certificate** | **Options** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Year 0 request forms are September 15th.**

**Part 1: Review and approve program learning outcomes.**

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs): PLOs should be written as specific, measureable statements describing what students will be able to do upon completion of the program. The assessment of PLOs provide feedback on the accumulated knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students develop as they progress through their graduate program. Plans should include PLO’s that would cover all types of graduate programs, depending on the nature of your programs (i.e. Master’s Thesis, Professional, Course work, Doctoral Dissertation, or Certifications).

(For help in developing learning outcomes see “Program Assessment Overview”, under Resources on Provost Page: <https://www.montana.edu/provost/assessment/program_assessment.html>)

Are you keeping existing outcomes? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

If No: please identify all that apply:
Consolidating PLO’s \_\_\_\_
Rewriting PLO’s to be more assessable \_\_\_\_
Rewriting PLO’s to be more aligned with program objectives \_\_\_\_

Other:

**Part 2: Development of Assessment Plan**

**Each plan will require the following information:**Threshold Values:Along with PLOs, plans should include threshold values; minimums against which to assess student achievement for learning outcomes. Threshold values are defined as an established criteria for which outcome achievement is defined as met or not met.

Methods of Assessment & Data Source: Assessment plans require evidence to demonstrate student learning at the program level. This evidence can be in the form of a direct or indirect measure of student learning.Both direct and indirect assessment data must be associated with the program’s learning outcomes. An assessment rubric will also need to be included that demonstrates how evaluation of the data was used to assess student achievement.
Timeframe for Collecting and Analyzing Data: Develop a multi-year assessment schedule that will show when all program learning outcomes will be assessed. As graduate assessment reports are biennial, faculty review of assessment results may only occur every other year, however, annual faculty meeting to review these data and discuss student progress may be beneficial.

**Are any of your exiting thresholds, methods or data source rolling over to your new plan? Yes No**

**If you are developing new planning documents, please indicate what your committee will be developing (mark all that apply):**New threshold values \_\_\_\_
New Assessment Methods \_\_\_\_
New Data Source/s \_\_\_\_

Other:

**Developing a multi-year rotation and data collection. In reviewing your existing planning schedule, will be keeping the same rotation? Yes No**

**In the following fields, please indicate what will be completed, and by whom. It is recommended that during Year 0 Planning that assessment data is collected to determine whether it will be supportive of the learning outcomes.**

**Part 3: Program Assessment**
The assessment report should identify how assessment was conducted, who received the analyzed assessment data, and how it was used by program faculty for program improvement(s). Assessment reports should also reflect on previous assessment and program improvements by identifying previous program-level changes that have led to outcome improvements.

What is your current method? What has, and has not been effective? **Please include the current plan and schedule. Make a note of what will be updated and or reconsidered**
Process Strengths:

Process Improvements:

**Part 4: Program Assessment Plan
Program Description (from catalog) – If updated please include a brief statement as to what determined the need for the update. NOTE: all catalog descriptions should be updated in Courseleaf – curriculum management system** [**http://www.montana.edu/registrar/CourseleafHelp.html**](http://www.montana.edu/registrar/CourseleafHelp.html)**). If your graduate program in not in the CIM system, please contact the Provost’s office for assistance.**

All plans must include assessment rubrics (the methodology of how student artifacts are to be assessed, and a threshold for student success attainment). All outcomes should have some evaluative process to define “successful” completion. In reviewing your process, what areas of the assessment plan will be updated, check all that apply:
Outcome rubrics \_\_\_\_
How data (student artifacts) are collected
When data are collected \_\_\_\_
Who participates in the assessment process \_\_\_\_
 **Other:**

**B) Program Learning Outcomes, Assessment Schedule, Methods of Assessment, & Threshold Values**All program assessment plans will need to provide the following information, which will demonstrate the alignment between PLO’s, the data collected (student work/artifact), and threshold value. Below are examples the information planning tables and rubrics should provide.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ASSESSMENT PLANNING CHART |  |
| PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES  | 2016-2017  | 2017-2018  | 2018-2019  | 2019-2020  | Data Source | Threshold Value |
| **Example:** Demonstrate a substantive breadth of knowledge in the field of study. | x | x | x | x | Qualifying Exam | 80% of students will meet or exceed expectations on first qualifying exam attempt.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Example:** **Rubric Qualifying Exam for MS Thesis & PhD Students**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Expectations not met** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| Motivating the work | The reasons for the work are not covered or only minimally covered | Big picture presented. Reasons for research question laid out | Motivation is clear and documentation and/or data is used to show the importanceand need for the work |
| Defining the specific research question | Not clear what problem is going to be addressed | Clear what problemis being addressed | Clear what specific problem is being addressed |
| Experimental design and analysis | Experiments and analysis are not clear. Experiments are not tied to research question. Alternatives are not presented | Clear experiments and analysis with specific anticipated results and alternatives tied to research question | Rigorous design ofexperiments and analysis that not only include alternatives but are designed so that a negative finding is still very informative |
| Integration with core material | Core material is notunderstood well or not connected to proposal | Core material is referenced and relevant parts are used to strengthen proposal | Core material is used to gain new and potentially important insights into field |
| Writing | Writing is unclear, organization is poor | Writing is clear, organization islogical | Writing is at the level of a fundable grant |
| Presentation | Slides hard to read, organization poor. Speaker cannot be heard clearly | Slides are clearPresentation organizedSpeaker projects | Presentation equivalent to talk at national conferences |
| Questions | Does not understandquestions and/or not able to answer questions | Understands & answersquestions, with potentially someclarifications | Understands and responds to questions as well as givescontext to larger issues around questions |

**(Example provided should be deleted before submission – your rubric may be very different, it just needs to explain the criteria used for evaluating student achievement).**

**Part 5: Planning Goals
What is the goal for the end of Year 0, and who all will be involved in the process? Include information on how the need for change was determined, who will be involved in the planning process, and how will faculty be informed of the new process?**

## Submit report to programassessment@montana.edu