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Our Agenda

• Introductions
• Program Learning Outcomes assessment as part of the revamped Integrated Review of Academic Programs
• Our Framework
• Process & Forms Review
• Available Resources
• Contact and Program Verifications
### Why the revamp?

1. Create overall cohesive and coordinated process
2. Integrate with and enhance existing planning
3. Standardize data
4. Make PLO assessment stand on its own

Meet the requirements of SBOE and NWCCU
Why the revamp?

- Onerous self-study
- Narrow participation
- Variable focus on data and strategic planning
- Variable follow through
- Limited focus on program learning outcomes (PLO) assessment

Meet the requirements of SBOE and NWCCU

- Faculty are responsible for evaluating achievement of clearly identified LOs.
- The institution regularly reviews its assessment processes to ensure they appraise authentic achievements and yield meaningful results that lead to improvement.
- Uses the results of assessment of student learning to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices that lead to enhancement of student learning achievements.
- Results of student learning assessments are made available to appropriate constituencies in a timely manner.

KEY Concepts from NWCCU
**REQUIRED**

“[Depts/chairs/faculty] ensure that course expected learning outcomes are documented in each and every syllabus for every course taught by your faculty members.”

Meet the requirements of SBOE and NWCCU
BOISE STATE FRAMEWORK FOR PLO ASSESSMENT
Key Principles Guiding PLO Assessment

• **produces meaningful and actionable information** that programs can use to improve teaching and student learning.

• **lives closest to the programs** in which the learning occurs (i.e., it is a tool to be used by programs rather than an event/occurrence that happens to programs).

• favored by a **collaborative, collegial process** in which the community of educators **engages with evidence** of student learning.
Key Principles Guiding PLO Assessment

- efforts are **transparent and explicit** rather than known only to insiders of the program.

- reporting is **frequent enough** to ensure reasonable assurance of learning and continuous improvement yet **not so frequent so as to detract** from meaningful and action-oriented efforts.

- a **regular, ongoing effort** rather than an episodic event designed solely to satisfy reporting or external regulators.
PROCESS AND FORMS REVIEW
PAR Timeline (handout)

**August/September**
- Departments with reports due in the current year are notified in August.

**September - February**
- Prep meetings, consultations, and workshops held for department reps (chair, assessment committee, program director, etc.).
- Departments/programs review existing learning outcomes and assessment and decide upon a focus for updates or revisions.

**January - April**
- Departments/programs recursively work on outcomes, gathering and evaluating evidence, revising measures, etc. Facilitation and workshops continue.
- Departments with reports due during the next academic year are notified in January.

**February - April**
- Solicit, select, and train peer reviewers.

**May 1**
- Program Assessment Reports DUE; report template and curriculum map.

**May 1 - June 15**
- Peer review teams complete evaluations and provide feedback on PARS.

**June - August**
- Feedback is assembled and provided to departments.

**August - September**
- Departments/programs discuss feedback and next steps.

**October 1**
- Departments/programs submit Follow-up Report of the discussion and summary of actions to be taken.

**October 15**
- PARs and follow-up reports posted to the website; summary reports shared with dean, provost, and other administration/governance as appropriate.

Orange denotes items for which the departments/programs have responsibility and blue denotes administrative duties handled by the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Planning or Institutional Research.
Components of the Program Assessment Report (PAR)

• Narrative, Template Part 1
• Assessment Matrix, Template Part 2
• Curriculum Map
Template Part 1 – The Narrative

Mission

Overview

Reflection

Curriculum Map Discussion

Strengths in PLO Assessment

Improving PLO Assessment

CID and FF Assessment (UG only)

Program Assessment Report (PAR) Template Part 1

Date:
People completing this report:

1. **Mission:** What is the mission of your program? (i.e., What does the program do that is unique to other units? What is the larger impact of the program?) Who are its stakeholders? How does it fit with the mission of the college and university? (250 words)

2. **Overview:** Describe how the department discusses, uses, and shares information about student learning outcomes’ achievement (i.e., How does the assessment process work beyond individual courses? Who is involved? Is there a department committee? How does the department’s faculty interact around this topic? How often?). (750 words)

3. **Reflection:** Thinking back on the assessment actions from the last report, what specific changes or systematic shifts have been implemented based on what was learned? Refer to action items in prior assessment report, program review, or specialized accredit report, as appropriate. (750 words)

4. **Curriculum Map:** Attach or link the program curriculum map (see examples) and discuss how the map illustrates support for your mission and goals for student learning.

Questions to consider:

- Are students provided with multiple learning opportunities to develop the learning outcomes?
- Are courses in the major sequenced in the developmental pattern to facilitate achievement of the learning outcomes?
- Do individual courses provide students with opportunities to integrate multiple outcomes?
- How do learning experiences such as internships or service-learning contribute to development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified as PLO outcomes?
- Are students provided with feedback on their progress in mastering the learning outcomes?
- How well are the learning outcomes communicated to students in course descriptions?

5. **Strengths in PLO assessment:** Please describe what is going well in the program. What are the highlights or noteworthy accomplishments? (250 words max)

6. **Improving PLO assessment:** Please describe any challenges, gaps, or areas in need of improvement in this assessment of this program that you have already identified or identified in the past. (250 words max)

7. **CID and FF Assessment (Undergraduate Programs Only):** Please in this space, you are assessing CID and FF outcomes.
### PAR Template Part 2 – Assessment Matrix

#### Table 1 Program Assessment Report Template Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List the Intended Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Measures Used to Assess Outcomes</th>
<th>Interpretation of Key Findings</th>
<th>Actions Taken or Planned Based on Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(one per row, typically 6-8 per program)</td>
<td>What evidence is used by the department/program to determine whether the outcome has been achieved?</td>
<td>What have you discovered about student learning in each of the intended learning outcomes areas?</td>
<td>How have or will the findings be used by the faculty to make changes to the curriculum, specific courses, and/or to the pedagogy used in the program? Provide relevant examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner-centered statements that address: What should students know, be able to do, and value or appreciate as a result of completing the program?</td>
<td>Direct measure(s) such as portfolios, embedded assignments, lab reports, etc.</td>
<td>* NOTE: You will report on these action items in your next assessment report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect measure(s) such as surveys, focus groups, etc. of students, alumni, employers, supervisors, etc.</td>
<td>Informal method(s) such as faculty observations, informal reports, discussions, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLE:**
- Apply literary criticism in the traditions of the discipline.

**EXAMPLE:**
- Review sample of entry level assignments from XYZ 150 using a rubric – establishes baseline.
- Review of sample of final projects from XYZ 450 by program faculty to consider course and program revisions.

**EXAMPLE:**
- The sample of graduating projects did not show as much growth as expected. We expected to see more students achieving mastery on this PLO. Approximately 35% of the graduating seniors were mastering this outcome – we are targeting 60%

**EXAMPLE:**
- After reviewing the assessment results and our curriculum map, we noticed this topic was not being developed so we added PLO to XYZ 280 and XYZ 350. We expect to see a 60% of students mastering PLO by our next PAR reporting cycle.

1.  

2.  

Curriculum Map

- Illustrates alignment of the PLOs with what’s going on in our courses
- Allows you to facilitate discussion within and about your program
- Includes all CORE program components
- Electives or experiences are optional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIOL 191</th>
<th>BIOL 192</th>
<th>BIOL 301</th>
<th>BIOL 343</th>
<th>BIOL 323</th>
<th>BIOL 401</th>
<th>CHEM 111, 112</th>
<th>CHEM 317, 319</th>
<th>MATH 147</th>
<th>MATH 160</th>
<th>MATH 170</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Biology I</td>
<td>General Biology II</td>
<td>Cell Biology</td>
<td>Genetics</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Organic Evolution</td>
<td>College Chemistry</td>
<td>Organic Chemistry</td>
<td>Precalculus</td>
<td>Survey of Calculus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Goals/Outcomes**

- Learn and apply the scientific method of analysis.
- Gain strong knowledge base of biologically-related facts and theory.
- Develop strong oral and written communication skills and the ability to locate and make use of scientific information in the library.
- Develop strong problem solving skills, especially in a team situation.
- Develop strong quantitative and technical skills, including data analysis, graphing, use of instrumentation, field techniques, etc.
- Develop strong analytic skills so as to be able to critically assess data and ideas that are found, for example, in the scientific literature.
Report Submission

• Via Google Team Drive

• We will grant permission to those on our distribution list

• You can grant additional permissions as needed
Then What?

- Review teams of faculty and staff will read and evaluate reports using the PAR rubric
- Feedback and ratings from the peer reviews is compiled and returned to the dept. chair and report contributors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program Intended Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>No evidence presented of intended learning outcomes</td>
<td>- PLOs not functional (e.g. incomplete, overly detailed, disorganized, or not measurable).&lt;br&gt; - Describe a process or delivery of education (i.e., what the instructor does for students) rather than intended student learning (i.e., what the intended result is to be).&lt;br&gt; - Do not address the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the cumulative effect of the program.</td>
<td>- Written in a way that they can be measured.&lt;br&gt; - Most outcomes are clearly defined or the meaning is easily discernable.&lt;br&gt; - Most outcomes are written as learner-centered statements.&lt;br&gt; - Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline.&lt;br&gt; - Focus is too narrow to represent the cumulative effect of the program.</td>
<td>- Written in a way that they can be measured&lt;br&gt; - All outcomes are written as learner-centered statements with action verbs.&lt;br&gt; - Encompass program, college, and university mission and goals.&lt;br&gt; - Align with professional standards, as appropriate.&lt;br&gt; - Focus on the cumulative effect of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Measures (the evidence that is used to evaluate outcomes achievement)</td>
<td>No evidence presented of measures used</td>
<td>- Measures apply to too many outcomes at once.&lt;br&gt; - Few or no direct measures used.&lt;br&gt; - Methods are mismatched, inappropriate, or otherwise do not provide evidence linked to the</td>
<td>- At least one measure per outcome.&lt;br&gt; - A variety of direct and indirect measures used to assess outcomes.&lt;br&gt; - The evidence used is mostly linked to the intended outcomes.</td>
<td>- Multiple measures for at least some outcomes.&lt;br&gt; - Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct (i.e., data gathered is primarily focused on student learning activities).&lt;br&gt; - Purposeful; clear how results could be used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then What?

• Programs convene faculty to discuss the evaluation and recommendations

• Programs complete a brief PAR Follow-Up Report by Oct 1.

I. **Discussion of PAR Feedback.** Describe when and how the department/program discussed the PAR and the PAR feedback, including who was involved (the whole dept., a committee, other stakeholders, etc.) in the discussion.

II. **Given the discussion, do you have any comments on the feedback you received for the PAR?**

III. **Next steps.** As a result of the discussion and the department’s goals and plans for assessing and improving student learning in this program, and in light of the PAR feedback, do you have further thoughts on how you will move forward?

IV. **Comments and feedback on the process (optional).** As we work toward continuously improving student learning and assessment at Boise State, what suggestions do you have regarding the PAR process, resources (such as documents and templates), or other supports?
And finally. . . Summary Reports

• At the University level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Intended Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Findings</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions Taken or Planned</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And finally... Summary Reports

- By college (given to the Dean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Ag Sciences</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
<th># Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS Forestry</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Paper Science</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Forestry</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Paper Science</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Religion</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
<th># Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA Agnosticism</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA World Religion</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Theology</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Available Resources

• Assessment Website
  – assessment.boisestate.edu
  – Find the current PLOs on that site
• CTL Workshop Series
  – September 21: Program Learning Outcomes
  – October 5: Curriculum Mapping
  – October 26: Assessment Approaches
  – November 9: Developing an Assessment Strategy
• Facilitation and individual consultation
• Have a question?
  – Email: programassessment@boisestate.edu
QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND DISCUSSION
THANK YOU

Shari Ellertson, Director of Institutional Research
Teresa Focarile, Faculty Associate CTL
Martha Plascencia, Administrative Assistant II, Institutional Research