**Instructions for Program Assessment Report Template**

Assessment Reports due Oct. 15, 2024

Annual Undergraduate reporting: 2023-2024

Biennial Graduate reporting: 2022-2023 and 2023-2024

Your Program Assessment Report should contain the following elements. The reporting template follows this instruction page. Please delete instruction pages before submitting your Program Assessment Report. The reporting template is for both Annual (Undergraduate) and Biennial (Graduate) reporting. You distinguish whether you are using it for Annual or Biennial reporting based on the academic years you are assessing.

**Programs Table**: Please fill in the table with the majors, minors, options, certificates, etc. in as full a manner as it can be. This eliminates guesswork and supports records management.

1. **Past Assessment Summary:** Briefly summarize the findings from the last assessment report conducted related to the PLOs being assessed this year. Include any findings that influenced this cycle’s assessment approach. Alternatively, reflect on the program assessment conducted last year, and explain how that impacted or informed any changes made to this cycle’s assessment plan.
2. **Action Research Question:** What question(s) are you seeking to answer in this cycle’s assessment? Research questions should be meaningful (focus on an area you need to know the answer to), relatable (tied to program goals), and measurable. Focus on: What will we be able to improve on if we answer this question? The question should be tied to the PLOs. Formulate the question so it is specific to an observable action – not on something that is difficult to measure. E.g., If you have a PLO related to students developing problem-solving skills. An actionable research question could be: Can students apply problem-solving steps?
3. **Assessment Plan, Schedule, and Data Sources:**
	* 1. Provide a multi-year assessment schedule that will show when all program learning outcomes will be assessed, and by what criteria (data). This schedule can be adjusted as needed. Attempt to assess all PLOs every three years. You may use the table provided, or you may delete and use a different format.
			1. **Data sources**.
				1. Examples of **direct evidence** of student learning: specifically designed exam questions, written work, performances, presentations, projects (using a program-specific rubric – not a course grading rubric); scores and pass rates on licensure exams that assess key learning goals; observations of student skill or behavior; summaries classroom response systems; student reflections.
				2. **Indirect evidence** of student learning includes course grades, grade distributions, assignment grades, retention and graduation rates, alumni perceptions, and questions on end-of-course evaluations forms related to the course rather than the instructor. These may provide information for identifying areas of learning that need more direct assessment but should NOT be used as primary sources for direct evidence of student learning.
4. What are the threshold values for which your program demonstrates student achievement? Delete the example provided in the table before submission and create your own table.
5. **What was Done**: Fill in the subcategories as requested and include your program assessment specific rubric. These are program-specific NOT course grading rubrics. Example provided should be deleted before submission.
	1. Self-reporting metric. This is used for accreditation purposes.
	2. This section allows you to explain your methodology for data collection and analysis; as well as to acknowledge who took part in assessment.
	3. **About Rubrics.** Your rubric may be very different than the example and have a different set of criteria or levels of evaluation; it just needs to explain the criteria used for evaluating student achievement.

Rubrics can be designed to address any or all levels of assessment (the evaluation score and threshold percentage may vary according to the course level). Some rubrics/assessments may be more tailored for specific levels of courses (e.g., a rubric designed to assess outcomes in either or both upper division and lower division courses simultaneously – it depends on how the assessment has been designed). Or, if you are assessing more basic learning outcomes, you might expect outcomes to be established earlier in the academic career and are using lower division coursework.

Student names must NOT be included in data collection. Reporting on successful completions, or 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 throughout the year on an annual basis – this is especially helpful for biennial/graduate program reporting. Proprietary program information (e.g., exam questions and examples) does not need to be included in the report. Departments are responsible for uploading their reports to their websites and need to determine what information is appropriate for any public-facing documents*.*

1. **What was Learned.** Fill in subcategories. Assessment is focused on looking at both meeting threshold’s successful and finding ways to improve. Unless you have met all thresholds at 100%, there is room to reflect and consider what can be improved or looked at more deeply. If programs are consistently meeting thresholds on PLOs, reviewing rigor and/or assessment rubrics may be a deeper step in assessment endeavors.
2. **How we Responded**. Explain how what was learned was communicated with faculty and how results of assessment will be used for future curricular or assessment endeavors.
3. **Closing the loop(s).** This is a key section of the report. It is an opportunity to think about how assessing specific PLOs have happened in the past and how the current assessment will inform the program going forward. [NOTE: Program assessment is directly tied to departmental 7-year program review cycles; they are a resource that can be used for budgetary considerations, future program planning, and evidence of ways that programs/departments are engaging in supporting institutional effectiveness. They are a historical record for the department to use in the future.]

See [Assessment Report Templates webpages](https://www.montana.edu/provost/assessment/assessment_report_templates.html) for additional instructions and information.

Sample reports and guidance can be found at: <https://www.montana.edu/provost/assessment/program_assessment.html>

Same template used for either (Annual/UG) 2023-2024 or (Biennial/GR) 2022-2023 & 2023-2024. Please indicate appropriate year(s) assessed.

# Program Assessment Report

Academic Year(s) Assessed:

College:
Department:

Department Head:
Submitted by:

**Program(s) Assessed**
*List all majors (including each option), minors, and certificates that are included in this assessment – add or subtract rows as needed – please use official titles:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Majors** | **Minors, Options, etc.** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. **Past Assessment Summary.**

Response:

1. **Action Research Question.**

Response:

1. **Assessment Plan, Schedule, and Data Sources.**
2. Please provide a multi-year assessment schedule that will show when all program learning outcomes will be assessed, and by what criteria (data).

|  |
| --- |
| ASSESSMENT PLANNING SCHEDULE CHART |
| PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME | 2021-2022 | 2022-2023 | 2023-2024 | 2024-2025 | ***Data Source\**** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

b) What are the threshold values for which your program demonstrates student achievement?

|  |
| --- |
| **Threshold Values** |
| **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME** | **Threshold Value** | **Data Source** |
| ***Example:*** *6) Communicate in written form about fundamental and modern microbiological concepts* | *The threshold value for this outcome is for 75% of assessed students to score above 2 on a 1-4 scoring rubric.* | *Randomly selected student essays* |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. **What Was Done.**
2. Self-reporting Metric (required answer): Was the completed assessment consistent with the program’s assessment plan? If not, please explain the adjustments that were made.

 Yes No





## How were data collected and analyzed and by whom? Please include method of collection and sample size.

1. Please provide a rubric that demonstrates how your data were evaluated. (Delete example below and replace with program’s assessment-specific rubric.)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicators** | **Beginning - 1** | **Developing- 2** | **Competent- 3** | **Accomplished- 4** |
| Analysis of Information, Ideas, or Concepts | Identifies problem types | Focuses on difficult problems with persistence | Understands complexity of a problem | Provides logical interpretations of data |
| Application of Information, Ideas, or Concepts | Uses standard solution methods | Provides a logical interpretation of the data | Employs creativity in search of a solution | Achieves clear, unambiguous conclusions from the data |
| Synthesis | Identifies intermediate steps required that connects previous material | Recognizes and values alternative problem solving methods | Connects ideas or develops solutions in a clear coherent order | Develops multiple solutions, positions, or perspectives |
| Evaluation | Check the solutions against the issue | Identifies what the final solution should determine | Recognizes hidden assumptions and implied premises | Evaluates premises, relevance to a conclusion and adequacy of support for conclusion. |

1. **What Was Learned.**
2. Based on the analysis of the data, and compared to the threshold values established, what was learned from the assessment?
3. What areas of strength in the program were identified from this assessment process?
4. What areas were identified that either need improvement or could be improved in a different way from this assessment process?
5. **How We Responded.**
6. Describe how “What Was Learned” was communicated to the department, or programfaculty. How did faculty discussions re-imagine new ways program assessment might contribute to program growth/improvement/innovation beyond the bare minimum of achieving program learning objectives through assessment activities conducted at the course level?
7. How are the results of this assessment informing changes to enhance student learning in the program?
8. If information outside of this assessment is informing programmatic change, please describe that.
9. What support and resources (e.g. workshops, training, etc.) might you need to make these adjustments?

## 7. Closing the Loop(s). Reflect on the program learning outcomes, how they were assessed in the previous cycle (refer to #1 of the report), and what was learned in this cycle. What action will be taken to improve student learning objectives going forward?

## Self-Reporting Metric (required answer): Based on the findings and/or faculty input, will there any curricular or assessment changes (such as plans for measurable improvements, or realignment of learning outcomes)?

No

Yes





## In reviewing the last report that assessed the PLO(s) in this assessment cycle, what changes proposed were implemented and will be measured in future assessment reports?

## Have you seen a change in student learning based on other program adjustments made in the past? Please describe the adjustments made and subsequent changes in student learning.

## Submit report to programassessment@montana.edu

Update Department program assessment report website.

Update PLO language in CIM if needed ([Map PLOs to Course LOs](https://www.montana.edu/provost/curriculum-development/mapping_program_learning_outcomes_to_course_learning_outcomes.html))

##