REVIEWER TRAINING

2015-2016 Academic Program Assessment Reports
Review Outline

• Each reviewer will receive a Dropbox Folder invitation
  • Academic Reports to Review – 1st Phase
    • College Representative – typically 3 departments outside your college
    • Council Representative – typically 1 department outside your college
  • Rubric
    • Program
    • Certificate/Minor
  • Instructions and Guidelines for Reports
    • Links to Assessment Showcase Booklets and Reports
  • Instructions and Guidelines for Reviews
  • This Power Point
The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Page 6 of the Assessment Showcase Booklet outlines how the university defines Educational Programs.
3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas (Institutional Effectiveness):

*3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

The Off-site Reaffirmation Committee noted that institution provided samples of Detailed Assessment Reports for all degree levels (including certificates), teaching sites, and modes of delivery for a variety of academic programs in its six colleges. The reports included the identification of expected learning outcomes for the students, how those outcomes are assessed, targets for successful outcomes achievement, and discussion regarding how the collected data is used to make improvements.

Additionally, the institution described how the assessment cycle is directed, and by whom. Guidelines, policies, and administration were included in this description. Samples of the reviewers’ reviews of reports were included as well.
SACSCOC Reaffirmation Committee

• Following a review of the detailed assessment reports provided by the institution and conversations with University personnel, the On-site Reaffirmation Committee noted that it is clear that the institution identifies student learning outcomes, assesses the achievement of those outcomes and makes improvements based on those assessments. The institution deploys assessment for program-level student learning outcomes assessment; emphasis-level for plans of study that vary greatly; certificate programs and distance education, dual-site, and teaching sites. On-site interviews with the Director, Institutional Effectiveness and several present and past members of the University Assessment Committee demonstrated a culture of assessment that enables the university to achieve its educational mission. In summary, the Committee reviewed documents, conducted interviews in support of the institution’s case for compliance, and affirms the findings of the Off-site Review Committee.
Rubric Row 1

- 5 Strong Outcomes
  - 4 Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)
  - 1 Program Objective (O/O)
  - May find issues with labeling
  - A “Strong” Outcome or Measure could be defined as one that follows the guidelines set forth in Assessment Showcase Booklet. (See Expressing Learning Outcomes p. 12 & Expressing Measures p. 14)

- 2 Measures Minimum for each Student Learning Outcome
  - At least 1 Direct Measure for each Student Learning Outcome
    - Students demonstrate that they know or can do the specified learning outcomes. – Direct evaluation of student work
  - Indirect Measures can be used as the second (or third) measure.
    - Surveys or Interviews, ask students to reflect on their learning rather than to demonstrate it.
Rubric Row 1

• Program Objectives (O/O)
  • To ensure continued compliance with SACSCOC Federal Requirement 4.1, Student Achievement, all programs must have at least one Program Objective focused on student achievement.
  • Student achievement includes enrollment and retention rates, graduation rate, job placement rate, licensing, and certification.
  • Only 1 measure is required for a Program Objective
• Programs can use the same measure more than once, but unique targets are needed for each outcome.
• Course grades cannot be used as measures
  • This means OVERALL course grades. Graded components of a course can (and usually are) used as measures.
• Measures should address the outcome “Apple to Apple.”
  • If the outcome is Professional Development and the measure is the Annual Student Performance Evaluation, then the target should be only the score on the Professional Development section of the evaluation, not the overall score.
Rubric Row 1

• To ensure continued compliance with SACSCOC CS 3.6.1 Post-baccalaureate Program Rigor, Student Learning Outcomes must show progressive distinction between degree levels (BA, MA, PhD) in the same academic unit.

• English Example:
  
  • BA – Students will demonstrate the ability to articulate a clear thesis and fully developed argument
  
  • MA - Students will demonstrate the ability to articulate a clear thesis and fully developed argument that is informed by scholarly research and an appropriate methodology
  
  • PhD - Students will demonstrate the ability to articulate a clear and original thesis and nuanced argument that makes a unique contribution to the field and is informed by scholarly research and an appropriate methodology.
Rubric Row 2

- Findings data must be entered for each target.
- Findings must be separated by site or mode for dual-site/mode programs – indicated by ONE asterisk (*).
  - *Programs that fall in the multi-site and/or multi-mode category are marked with a single asterisk.
  - **Hybrid delivery programs, programs that are 50 percent to 100 percent online without a face-to-face equivalent, or programs that rest entirely at one of the teaching sites off the Hattiesburg campus are marked with a double asterisk.
- Findings are separated by semester, appropriated collected only once, or indication of combined semesters apparent.
  - Findings do not have to be separated. Findings can be combined into one AY. However, the reviewer has to be able to determine whether a full AY is represented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings (2011-2012) - Target: Partially Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81/85 (95.29%) passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64/66 (96.97%) passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145/150 (97.67%) passed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric Row 2

• Sample Sizes must be included
• Findings statements should mirror target
  • **Target:** 80% of students will achieve a mean composite score of 3.5 or greater on section 1 (Professional and Ethical Standards) of the Site Supervisor Final Practicum Evaluation form. This form is completed by the practicum site supervisor.
  • **Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
    • Fall 2012: 100% of students achieved a mean score of 3.5 or greater on section 1 (Professional and Ethical Standards) of the Site Supervisor Final Practicum Evaluation form (n=3/3).
    • Spring 2012: 100% of students achieved a mean score of 3.5 or greater on section 1 (Professional and Ethical Standards) of the Site Supervisor Final Practicum Evaluation form (n=3/3).
• **Target Level Achievement is correctly marked**
  
  • **Target**: 80% of students will score 80% or greater on the Family Science Policy Impact Paper Final Draft (Theoretical Connections Section only) Rubric.
  
  • **Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
    67% of students who completed the assignment scored 80% or greater on the FAM 475 Public Policy Theoretical Analysis rubric (n=8/12).

• Partially Met should only be used when there is a multi-part target and one part was not met but the others were met. Partially Met should not be used when the target was “almost” achieved.

• Using Partially Met incorrectly is not a reason to reduce the overall assessment of the report.
Rubric Row 3

• Action Plans should be developed to address any targets that are not met or partially met.

• Assessment plans are on a two year cycle. A program could make an argument that an action plan is not warranted due to the data collected over a two-year period.

• In this second year of the assessment cycle, at least one new action plan should be developed or the program should have recent action plans “in progress.”

• Action plans should be initiatives that will have a direct impact on the outcomes and/or measures in the assessment plan.

• Action Plans not related to a particular outcome/measure should be entered in the narrative section called Continuous Improvement Initiatives.
Rubric Row 4

- Previous Action Plans should be updated in WEAVE.
- Example:

  **professionalism and lifelong learning in EET 100**
  
The instructor should emphasize more topics related to professionalism and lifelong learning in EET 100 throughout the semester.

  **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
  **Implementation Status:** Planned
  **Priority:** High
  **Projected Completion Date:** 12/18/2013
  **Responsible Person/Group:** Randy Buchanan
Rubric Row 5

Analysis is the reflection of the program’s findings. The Analysis is a summary of strengths and areas in which improvement is needed.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
We are pleased with what our programmatic assessments show with regard to students’ performance in our program: all of the targets that we have established were met in the past year, although we clearly have more work to do (see below). While our assessment of students in our Writing Intensive course show that early in our program, students lack the writing and research skills they need, we are pleased to see that by the time they get to the final project in the capstone class (the source of our direct measures at this point), they have highly developed skills and an understanding of the nature of interdisciplinary writing and research. We are also pleased to see that students believe the program prepares them well as writers and researchers and paves the way for them to enter the workforce or a graduate and professional program.
Rubric Row 5

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Aspects of our master's program in Marine Science need further attention. We have struggled with the method of evaluation of the core courses and commit herein to find a solution. The core courses provide the basis for a broad, multidisciplinary knowledge of the ocean environment that we view as fundamental to ocean science. We need a satisfactory method for evaluating the learning outcomes of our students so we can improve the core courses as needed. By discussions with the core of instruction we will choose a path: 1) improve the Qualifying Exam and improve preparation for the exam so student pass on the first try, or 2) institute rubrics to evaluate learning outcomes directly from the core courses, or 3) perhaps institute another strategy that the core of instruction can suggest. Solving this issue will affect other perceived problems; it will help reduce time to an approved prospectus, completion of courses, and completion of a thesis.

We would like to find better ways to directly evaluate the field and laboratory experience of master's students. All students are getting this training, and their success in writing/presenting a thesis suggests that they have attained their learning objectives, but it would be useful to directly measure learning outcomes at the time they are doing the field and lab work and to do so in a consistent way, based on consensus among the thesis advisors.
Rubric Row 6

• Annual Reporting Fields
• **Program Summary**
  - Programs are asked to summarize highlights of the past year for this particular academic program. The summary field is needed to provide context to an outside reviewer. Program contributions, activities, and accomplishments should be included in this field. Any data collected outside of the student learning outcome measures could be showcased in this field as well.

• **Continuous Improvement Initiatives (Additional Action Plans)**
  - Any department-level or program-level action plans for improvement that are not necessarily tied to a specific student learning outcome or program objective should be described in this field. Efforts to improve enrollment and retention rates, graduation rate, job placement rate, licensing, and certification should be captured in this field.
Closing the Loop (Action Plan Tracking)

Programs are asked to summarize the results of previous action plan implementation. This is the opportunity for programs to close the assessment loop – to report on the success (or nonsuccess) of previously implemented action plans. It is very important for programs to respond to this section with thought and detail. This section is where programs provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results.

All Action Plans marked “Finished” in the report should be discussed in Closing the Loop.
Overall Assessment

(Please note rubric scores do not necessarily correlate with the following ratings.)

☐ Report does not support SACSCOC Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1

☐ Report inadequately supports SACSCOC Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1

☐ Report adequately supports SACSCOC Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1

☐ Report should be commended as one which demonstrates the spirit of SACSCOC Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1
Additional Comments

- Programs find the additional reviewer comments very useful. Please offer suggestions for improvement or praise for good work.

- Recommendations:
  - ☐ Improvements could be made next year
  - ☐ Good work, but see IE for assistance
  - ☐ Keep up the good work, it is appreciated
New Requirements

Comprehensive Standard 3.4.2: The institution's use of technology enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs. Students have access to and training in the use of technology.

- Programs are asked to read the SACSCOC Compliance Report response to this standard and provide evidence of how the program meets the standard in narrative form.

- The narrative may point to assessment outcomes/measures already in place in the WEAVE report. UAC members will review plans/reports in fall 2016 to ensure each graduate program meets this requirement. Results of this review will not influence the overall assessment of the assessment report in the fall 2016 review, but adherence to the requirement will be included in the overall assessment of 2016-2017 Reports.
New Requirements

• **Technology Use**

• In this narrative field, degree programs should articulate the methods by which they train students in and provide access to the technology necessary for up-to-date knowledge specific to their field. Programs should point to established Program Assessment Results (if applicable), examples of technology being used to enhance student learning, examples of technology being used to meet program objectives/outcomes, and examples of providing access to and training in the use of technology.
New Requirements

To ensure continued compliance with SACSCOC Comprehensive Standard 3.6.2, Graduate Curriculum, Graduate Program Student Learning Outcomes/Measures must demonstrate (1) knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (2) ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences. Graduate Programs are asked to read the SACSCOC Compliance Report response to this standard and review program outcomes and measures to ensure the plan/report supports this standard.

• Please review the following tables in the response:
  • Table 3. Example Academic Program Assessment Report Outcomes/Objectives, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings related to Knowledge of the Literature and Discipline
  • Table 4. Example Academic Program Assessment Report Outcomes/Objectives, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings related to Research
  • Table 5. Example Academic Program Assessment Report Outcomes/Objectives, Measures, Achievement Targets, and Findings related to Professional Practice and Training Experiences
New Requirements

- UAC members will review plans/reports in fall 2016 to ensure each graduate program meets this requirement. Results of this review will not influence the overall assessment of the assessment report in the fall 2016 review, but adherence to the requirement will be included in the overall assessment of 2016-2017 Reports.