An Overview of Assessment Reporting

PAR Organizing Meetings
2021-22
Introductions - After your name is called, please

1. Tell us who are you and what you do

2. How are you involved with assessment in your department or program OR what is your interest in assessment?
Our Agenda

• Introductions
• What’s new in assessment?
• PAR Essentials
• Foundations of the Discipline Essentials
• Available Resources
• Questions, Comments, Discussion
WHAT’S NEW IN ASSESSMENT?
Spring 2019

Review feedback and recommend updates to PAR

Replace current question 7 on template 1 re: CID & FF

Require ULOs on PAR curriculum map and include evaluation criteria on rubric for this

**Purpose:** Review and improve the PAR. Enrich the understandings of the connections between programs and PLOs and ULOs

**Responsible:** Faculty/staff PAR Review Committee, General Education Committee (GEC)
### Spring 2019
- Review feedback and recommend updates to PAR
- Replace current question 7 on template 1 re: CID & FF
- Require ULOs on PAR curriculum map and include evaluation criteria on rubric for this

**Purpose:** Review and improve the PAR. Enrich the understandings of the connections between programs and PLOs and ULOs

**Responsible:** Faculty/staff PAR Review Committee, General Education Committee (GEC)

### Fall 2019 & Spring 2020
- Determine information to be collected, for what purpose, how it will be used
- Define frequency that will be needed to sustain ULO/UF assessment
- Evaluate alignment between the approach and PAR principles

**Purpose:** Define future-state UF/ULO assessment.

**Responsible:** General Education Committee, GEC Assessment Subcommittee, and Institutional Research (IR)
### Spring 2019
- **Purpose:** Review and improve the PAR. Enrich the understandings of the connections between programs and PLOs and ULOs.
- **Responsible:** Faculty/staff PAR Review Committee, General Education Committee (GEC)

### Fall 2019 & Spring 2020
- **Purpose:** Define future-state UF/ULO assessment.
- **Responsible:** General Education Committee, GEC Assessment Subcommittee, and Institutional Research (IR)

### Spring & Fall 2020
- **Purpose:** Define process details and requirements; implement revised processes; provide education and support.
- **Responsible:** General Education Committee, University Foundations, IR, and the Center for Teaching and Learning
University Assessment Principles at Boise State

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

- is a **reflective practice** that lives closest to the programs in which the learning occurs (i.e., it is a **tool** to be used by programs to understand student learning 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

- efforts are **transparent and explicit** rather than known only to insiders of the academic or general education 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
Core Questions

• What do we intend for students to KNOW, DO, and BECOME as a result of our program?

• How well are our students learning?

• How do we know?
Components of the Program Assessment Report (PAR)

- Narrative, Template I
- Assessment Matrix, Template II
- Curriculum Map Template

2022 PARs are due June 15
2023 PARs due date <pending>
Template Part 1 – Narrative

1. Mission
   – Who are you? What do you do?
   – Connection between your PLOs and mission

2. Assessment Process (current)
   – Engagement and Process within the department/program
   – Strengths and Challenges
   – National standards
3. Continuous Improvement (backwards looking)

- Assessment process + △
- Responses to last PAR if scores of No Evidence or Beginning
- Curricular/program changes
- Summary analysis
- 3 prompts for all programs PLUS 1 extra for UG programs

4. Curriculum Map Discussion

Template Part 1 – Narrative
## Template Part 2 – Assessment Matrix

### Program Assessment Report (PAR) Template Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List the Current Intended Program Learning Outcomes (one per row, typically 6-8 per program)</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>Learner-centered statements that address: What should students know, be able to do, and become as a result of completing the program?</td>
<td>What evidence is used by the department/program to determine whether the outcome has been achieved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct measure(s) such as portfolios, embedded assignments, lab reports, etc.</td>
<td>Indirect measure(s) such as surveys, focus groups, etc. of students, alumni, employers, supervisors, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal methods(s) such as faculty observations, informal reports, discussions, etc.</td>
<td>What have you discovered about student learning in each of the intended learning outcomes areas?</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 Template (NEW!)

Name of Program: **<insert here>**

## Program Learning Outcomes
(List program-specific learning outcomes, one per row below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO 1</th>
<th>PLO 2</th>
<th>PLO 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UO & PLO alignment:
- List the PLOs that align with each UO
- Identify which UOs align with each PLO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UO 1</th>
<th>UO 2</th>
<th>UO 3</th>
<th>PLO 1</th>
<th>PLO 2</th>
<th>PLO 3</th>
<th>PLO 4</th>
<th>PLO 5</th>
<th>PLO 6</th>
<th>PLO 7</th>
<th>PLO 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List all of the department's required courses for this degree program, one per column, and other learning experiences as applicable. In parentheses, include the associated credit hours for each course. (add columns as needed)

- UF 300 (3)
- English 101/102 (FW) (3)
- Foundations of Comm (FC) (3)

### Undergraduate Programs Only Complete the Following (see instructions #4 - 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Learning Outcomes (1 - 5)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Written Communication – Write effectively in multiple contexts, for a variety of audiences.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oral Communication – Communicate effectively in speech, both as a speaker and listener.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Critical Inquiry – Engage in effective critical inquiry by defining problems, gathering and evaluating evidence, and determining the adequacy of argumentative discourse.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ethics – Analyze ethical issues in personal, professional, and civic life and produce reasoned evaluations of competing value systems and ethical claims.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Diversity – Apply knowledge of diversity and systems of inequality to address social issues of local and global importance.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Modifications for 2021-22

1. Deferred the deadlines - June 15 for reports
2. Streamline / Focus PARs
   a. Template I: Programs not expected to have followed up on every item identified in their last PAR, but rather are asked to have taken action on at least 1 curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change identified and review each of the other items identified and whether they would continue to pursue, place the item on hold, or discontinue it.
   b. Template II: Programs may focus assessment on 1/3 of their PLOs (but no fewer than 2 PLOs). Each PLO should be listed in template II, but the assessment and reporting in the remaining columns can focus on the selected 1/3 of the PLOs.
3. Resources & Supports
Report Submission

- Via Google Team/Shared Drive
- We will grant permission to those on our distribution list
  - Let us know of others who need to be added

NOTE: This is where you will find previous PARs
Finding the Folders

- Look for “PAR<department name>”
Example

Google Drive

- PAR Biological Sciences
  - BS Biology
  - MA MS Biology
  - MS Raptor Biology
  - PhD Ecology, Evolution, & Behavior
  - UF Foundations of the Discipline REPORT
Peer Reviews

• Signature aspect of our assessment program

• Volunteer peer reviewers participate in training and norming exercises in late May / early June

• Review teams read and evaluate reports using the PAR rubric

• Feedback and ratings from the peer reviews are compiled and returned to the dept. chair and report contributors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No evidence or insufficient information was provided</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Process</td>
<td>- Program engages in little or no review of student performance on the PLOs.</td>
<td>- Program reviews student performance against outcomes but not on a regular or routinized basis.</td>
<td>- Program has a regular or established process for reviewing student performance against outcomes (i.e., routinized process).</td>
<td>- Program has implemented actions or next steps from its previous report and/or identified other improvements that were made (i.e., specific improvements are described and examples are provided).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Results of assessment are not discussed or are minimally discussed among faculty and stakeholder engagement is absent or limited.</td>
<td>- Results of assessment are discussed, among faculty with minimal engagement of other stakeholders (staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals of the field).</td>
<td>- Clear rationale is provided where action items identified in the last report were substituted with new items.</td>
<td>- The program has addressed matters related to any ratings of no evidence or beginning received in the last review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement</td>
<td>No evidence or insufficient information was provided</td>
<td>- No description or examples of how any action plan has had an impact on the program's development or performance.</td>
<td>- Some improvements are described and examples are provided without making specific connections to previous action plans or providing clear rationale of any new items.</td>
<td>- - Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed.</td>
<td>- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed.</td>
<td>- General responses to ratings of no evidence or beginning from the last review are provided.</td>
<td>- - Curriculum map demonstrates a pattern of courses that fosters student achievement of each PLO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Map</td>
<td>No curriculum map was provided</td>
<td>- A limited number of PLOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum.</td>
<td>- A majority of the PLOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum.</td>
<td>- Curriculum map identifies the degree of emphasis placed on PLOs in the relevant courses OR defines the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- UG Programs Only: Program has not mapped the connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum.</td>
<td>- Map does not identify degree of emphasis placed on PLOs in the relevant courses OR the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses.</td>
<td>- UG Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum through the narrative.</td>
<td>- Curriculum map identifies the degree of emphasis placed on PLOs in the relevant courses OR defines the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- All of the PLOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum.</td>
<td>- UG Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum through the narrative.</td>
<td>- Other learning experience (e.g., internships, service-learning, etc.) may be identified.</td>
<td>- Curriculum map identifies the degree of emphasis placed on PLOs in the relevant courses OR defines the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© 2012 Boise State University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 discernible.&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;- The outcomes are clearly defined.&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>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 intended learning outcomes.</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.&lt;br&gt;- Measures section lacks clear description and detail.</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 and clear how results could be used for program improvement.&lt;br&gt;- Measures section is described in sufficient detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Findings</td>
<td>No findings or analysis presented</td>
<td>- Results/findings lack specificity.&lt;br&gt;- Lack of connection between the outcomes, the data gathered, and the results reported.&lt;br&gt;- Degree of proficiency met is unclear.</td>
<td>- Some findings are reported that address outcomes and evaluate student achievement of them.&lt;br&gt;- Degree of proficiency met is included.</td>
<td>- Complete, concise, and well organized; provides statements summarizing the data finding(s); the meanings, and conclusions based on these finding(s).&lt;br&gt;- Aligned with proficiency targets as appropriate.&lt;br&gt;- Includes interpretation of the degree to which desired outcomes were met.&lt;br&gt;- Compares new findings with past results, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions Taken or Planned based on Findings</td>
<td>No evidence presented of actions taken or planned</td>
<td>- Limited evidence that findings from assessment have been used to improve the curriculum, individual courses, pedagogy, etc.&lt;br&gt;- No actions are documented; or there are too many plans to reasonably manage.</td>
<td>- Some evidence that findings from assessment have been used to improve the curriculum, individual courses, pedagogy, etc.&lt;br&gt;- At least one concrete action has been documented or planned with relevant details, timelines, etc.</td>
<td>- Actions or plans have been implemented and documented and/or detailed plans for implementation have been provided.&lt;br&gt;- Actions or plans clearly follow from assessment results and state directly which finding(s) motivated the action.&lt;br&gt;- Actions or plans define logical “next steps.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-Up Report

- After peer reviews are returned, programs convene faculty to discuss the feedback
- Programs complete a brief PAR Follow-Up Report

For 2022 PARs: due Dec 15
For 2023 PARs: due date <pending>

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?
How we use the information

- University Summary Report
  - accreditation, publicly shared
- College Summary Report
  - provided to Dean
- General Education Committee
  - summary information about the mappings between ULOs and PLOs from the responses in Template I and the curriculum map
- Example PARs
  - we will always ask before sharing your report with others
# University Summary Report (example)

## Boise State University Program Assessment Report Review Summary, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL Programs</th>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 54</td>
<td></td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Process</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Map</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Intended Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Findings</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions Taken or Planned</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## College Summary Report (example)

### College of XYZ Program Assessment Report Review Summary, 2016-17

<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></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>
ULO ASSESSMENT ESSENTIALS
## FACULTY-LED GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE PROCESS

### INCENTIVIZE PARTICIPATION
Evaluations/policies should recognize and incentivize participation in assessment
- Make assessment part of faculty workload, annual evaluation, and evaluation for P&T
- Add evaluation to the annual review of chairs & deans regarding ongoing assessment
- Have an annual meeting on PAR/ULO’s at Chairs/Leadership Council
- Provide financial support for faculty workshops
- Make assessment part of adjunct LOAs

### INTEGRATE
Departments should integrate ULO assessment into their regular meetings and program assessment
- Sync with existing PAR process to ensure Gen Ed is discussed within departments
- Assessment tools/guidelines should be flexible and allow department to align with ULO assessment with more specialized accreditation evidence and standards (avoiding bloat and redundancy)

### COMMUNICATE
Communication should be broad, clear, and frequent
- Info about assessment is part of onboarding new faculty
- Regular communication about ULO assessment to and front department chairs,
- Communicate with students about assessment process and goals
- Timely reporting of assessment results
- UF sends out clear communications about what other courses in FD category have been doing

### BROADEN PARTICIPATION
Seek broad participation of stakeholders
- Find a balance between group and individual self-assessment
- Dept. implementation plans should consider whether faculty across all course sections are able to participate in some way
- Faculty should be able to connect to a broader, interdisciplinary discussion of assessment results (FD-level)
- Process should ensure there is time for face-to-face meeting(s) carved out (Stand-down day?)
- Student voices should be included in assessment

### MODELS & EXAMPLES
Instructions, toolkit, and workshops should get specific
- Detailed handbook
- Case Studies and examples based on best practices included in toolkit
- Previously collected data included in toolkit
- CTL workshops specifically on assessment: Who has done assessment well? What does good assessment look like
- Bring national experts to campus

### IMPROVE DATA & REPORTING
Data gathering
- Encourage more process-based info gathering - less product-heavy, more qualitative.
- Encourage attainable scope; choose one or two outcome criteria as focus.
- Reporting
  - Return to course proposal as benchmark - what did you plan to do and how did it go (similar to question on PAR Template)
  - Ask for clear reporting of continuous improvement action steps and how action steps were arrived at
TWO STEPS FOR FD ASSESSMENT

FACULTY

JANUARY 24

FD SURVEYS COMPLETED BY FD FACULTY

DEPTS

JUNE 15

COURSE-LEVEL ULO REPORTS “FDRs”
## TWO-PART FD FACULTY SURVEY - PART ONE

### Example: Humanities Rubric scoring page from Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.1 Critical Reading Skills</th>
<th>10.2 Writing and/or Speaking</th>
<th>10.3 Reasoning</th>
<th>10.5 Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehending, interpreting, and analyzing texts; using appropriate disciplinary tools and vocabulary</td>
<td>Expressing ideas in language appropriate to the discipline; Use of grammar and style</td>
<td>Demonstrating logical reasoning in written and oral work; identifying assumptions, distinguishing fact from opinion; differentiating claims from reasons, and arranging evidence</td>
<td>Entertaining views that differ from one's own; exploring ambiguity and difference; appreciating the value of the discipline and exploring problems in earnest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate student work produced in your course on the 1-4 ULO rubric scale.
TWO-PART FD FACULTY SURVEY - PART TWO

1. Assessments: In the space below, please list and describe the assignment(s) you used to assess student achievement. How well did the assignment(s) help you gather evidence of student achievement?

To help us more fully understand how faculty across the university are assessing student work, please upload a sample assignment (one of the ones you described above).

Drop files or click here to upload

2. What conclusions did you draw about the strengths and weaknesses of your students by doing this assessment? If you had to focus on improving student achievement on just one of the subcriteria in the ULO rubric, which would you choose and why?
1. MISSION: In what ways are faculty able to explicitly articulate and emphasize the relevance of this course to the personal, professional, and civic lives of non-majors? Are there challenges, gaps, or areas for improvement in regards to helping non-majors understand the relevance of this course?

2. ENGAGEMENT PROCESS: Describe when and how the faculty who teach and supervise this course discuss, coordinate, and share information across sections about student achievement, course design elements, teaching methods, and learning outcomes. How and when do faculty interact? Are there any strengths or challenges in regards to engaging your faculty in ULO assessment and continuous improvement?

3. INTERPRETATION OF KEY FINDINGS: After examining the assessments instructors used to measure student achievement and the achievement levels they reported on each of the ULO subcriteria in their Fall 2020 surveys, do any areas of high or low student achievement stand out? What common themes do you see in student performance or across instructor comments?

4. ACTIONS TAKEN OR PLANNED: What course-level changes are you implementing or considering to continue improving student achievement? Please outline: (1) any actions already taken and (2) discussions, decisions, or actions planned and the associated timeline(s). (For example, describe changes to common assignments, teaching methods, course structure, faculty development, etc.).

5. FEEDBACK: Are there any potential changes to the assessment process itself you like to see the General Education Committee consider or discuss? What would make it more useful or meaningful?

FDR REPORT QUESTIONS FOR DEPTS

A HANDFUL OF QUALITATIVE QUESTIONS
RESOURCES & NEXT STEPS
Program Assessment Report (PAR) Help Guide

Note: This document is intended to supplement the template for program assessment reports (PARs) and serve as a tool for departments in preparing their PARs. A group of peer reviewers will be using a rubric to evaluate your PAR. For a copy of the latest version of the rubric, please see the Forms section on the assessment website (https://www.boisestate.edu/f-assessment/).

Programs should review previous PARs and look to build on them over time. New programs that have not yet submitted PARs are encouraged to review the program proposals that were submitted to the State Board as part of program development. These proposals contain information about the program’s learning outcomes as well as the draft plan for learning outcomes assessment. While the plan in the proposal may be different from what the program actually implements, it can serve as a reminder and a good starting point for dialogue among the faculty.

Instructions for Completing PAR Template I and Curriculum Map Template

1. **Mission:** What is the mission of your program? How does it align with the mission of the college and university? How do your program learning outcomes (PLOs) inform or reflect your mission?

   The program’s mission is the core statement of purpose. In some cases, the program may not have a specific mission, but rather is embedded in the department’s mission. Similarly, the program or department’s mission should connect to or flow from the college’s mission, which stems from the university’s mission. Mission statements might include vision (forward focus), values, and/or goals or the terminology appropriate to the discipline. While it is not the place of the PAR review to evaluate mission statements, the mission provides useful context of the program and helps your program or department’s faculty to examine your PLOs within that perspective.

   Points to ponder: What does the department prepare students to do? For example, is the program designed to produce graduates who are socially responsible citizens, pre-professionals, entry-level teachers, and/or graduate school applicants? How do your PLOs reflect your purpose?

2. **Assessment Process:** Responses to this item reflect the current state in the department/program. Provide a current “snapshot” of your PLO assessment process.

3. **Engagement & Process:** Describe how the department discusses, uses, and shares information about student learning outcomes assessment (i.e., How does the assessment process work beyond individual courses? Who is involved? How do the department’s faculty interact around this topic? How often? How are results shared and with whom?). [150 words max]

   Program-level assessment is different from course-level assessment in that the department or program faculty share the responsibility for the program’s assessment. Even though individual course-level assessments typically rest with the individual faculty member, assignments and student work may be extracted from courses and used at the program level.

   Some departments/programs use committees or coordinators to organize or facilitate program assessment while others rely on the entire department or existing structures like department retreats and meetings. However, the department/program goes about assessment, it is important to consider a process that involves the faculty as broadly as possible.

   Finally, consider how assessment results are shared. What does your feedback look like to ensure meaningful use of your findings? Are results distributed to whom? In what format? At a minimum, the department faculty should discuss the results. Does what you find match with students’ experiences of the program? Sharing results with students and inviting their reactions may be helpful to the program as well. It also may be useful to share results with employers, alumni, recruiters, prospective students, or others to demonstrate program quality.

   **Strengths & Challenges:** What is going well in the assessment of this program? Are there any challenges, gaps, or areas for improvement in the assessment of this program? [250 words max]

   PARs are submitted every three years, but the assessment of student learning should be ongoing. Describe what worked and what did not. For example, did your assessment measures give you the kind of information you need to assess each learning outcome? If not, you may want to look for different measures to use in the next assessment cycle. Do you need other kinds of involvement? Or do you need to create a schedule so that some PLOs can be evaluated each year? These examples do not encompass the entire range of areas on which a program might reflect about their strengths and challenges in the assessment of student learning.

   **Continuous Improvement:** Responses to this item are backwards looking in that you are reflecting on action items and next steps that were identified in
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Spring 2022 CTL Workshops

• Feb. 4- Aligning Course and Program Level Measures

• March 4 - Looking Back to Look Forward: Finishing Foundations Assessment

• April 1- PAR Work Session
Timeline – Key Dates for 2022 PARs

• January 24 – FD Faculty Surveys DUE
• Spring 2022 – workshops
• June 15 – PARs & FDRs DUE
• September – Programs receive peer review feedback & discuss
• December 15 – PAR Follow-up Reports DUE
Next Steps

- Check for Team Drive Access (Look for “PAR xyz dept”)
- Review your last PAR, the feedback from reviewers, and the Follow-Up Report
- Familiarize yourselves with the FD Faculty Survey and discuss with the instructors of those courses
- Make a game plan with your colleagues
- Participate in the workshops (if you have a report due this summer)
- Reach out if you have questions
QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND DISCUSSION
Contact us

Shari Ellertson, Director of Institutional Research
Martha Plascencia, Management Assistant, Institutional Research
programassessment@boisestate.edu

Teresa Focarile, Associate Director for Educational Development, Center for Teaching and Learning
teresafocarile@boisestate.edu
Jenn Mallette, Faculty Associate for Assessment, CTL
jennifermallette@boisestate.edu

Kay Wingert, Assistant Director, University Foundations
universityfoundations@boisestate.edu