2016-2017 Program Assessment Summary.

Number of submissions

In 2016-2017, 20 reports were evaluated using the rubric, vs. 17 reports in 2015-2016, an increase of 18%. As there is some inconsistency in what aspects of the program external accrediting bodies ask for in reports submitted to them (facilities, funding, qualifications of faculty, etc. are often part of these reports but are not assessment of learning) the rubric was not used on accredited programs.

Recommendations:

a) Develop a rubric for accredited programs (may not be possible given the diversity of accrediting bodies).
b) Require accredited programs to report on student learning - This would require a policy change as currently they are only required to submit a report to the UAC in years that they submit a report to their accrediting body (and only the same report that they use for that body, which may or may not address student learning) and to submit a cover sheet only in non-reporting years.

Non-submissions

As has previously been the case, there were a large number of programs for which a report was not received: Economics, English, Geoscience, Nursing/Health Administration, History, Spanish, Teaching English as a Second Language, Women and Gender Studies, East Asian Studies, Music, Sustainability, and Theater Arts.

For many of these programs, there has been a history of not completing assessment.

Recommendations:

a) The UAC will schedule meetings with departments during spring semester, 2018, to discuss the new 3 year assessment cycle and revision of program assessment plans in light of U-WSLOS, UAC feedback, and curriculum mapping. Particularly when a department has a history of not participating in program assessment, one or more administrators (specifically the dean associated with that department) should also be present.

Results:

Summary results of non-accredited programs:

	2015-2016	2016-2017
Number of SLOs Evaluated	29% E, 12% A, 53% D, 6% B	50% E, 25% A, 5% D, 20% B
Assessment Measures	41% E, 18% A, 35% D, 6% B	55% E, 20% A, 5% D, 20% B
Analysis	35% E, 24% A, 29% D, 12% B	50% E, 20% A, 5% D, 25% B
Action Plan	24% E, 29% A, 29% D, 18% B	40% E, 25% A, 15% D, 20% B

E = exemplary, A = accomplished, D = developing and B = beginning.

Over the past 2 years, the analysis and action plans continue to be the place where the most programs are struggling; unfortunately, it is also that part of the assessment that is the most crucial – how do you change praxis in light of the data you have collected and hopefully analyzed?

The trend from 2015-2016 to 2016-2017 is interesting. There was a marked increase in both the percent of programs achieving at the *Exemplary* level and in programs at the *Beginning* level.

The increase in *Beginning* level might be an outlier caused by a single department. Computer Science, Computer Information Systems, and Computer Information Technology made up 3 of the 20 reports and were all very low this year. As this was 15% of the sample, this easily explain most of the observed increase at the low end. Otherwise, the programs receiving Exemplary + Accomplished moved from 41-59% in 2015-2016 to 65%-75% in 2016-2017. Having an explicit rubric was likely part of the increase, because it increased the clarity of what was required.