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The Institutional Effectiveness website hosts a page for each program that displays assessment reports and information. All available biennial assessment and program review reports are located at the bottom of the program’s page on our site. As a part of the biennial report process, we ask that you please review your page for completeness and accuracy, and indicate below the changes that need to be made in sections A-E.

**Program page link:**

# Mission Statement

**Information is current; no changes required: Yes No \_\_**

Update if not current:

# Student Learning Outcomes

(Please include certificate and associate credential learning outcomes)

**Information is current; no changes required: Yes No \_\_**

Update if not current:

# Curriculum Grid

**(**Please review your current curriculum grid and verify that at least one course has been identified for each outcome in which you expect your students to demonstrate the desired competency of a graduating student. This could be shown in a variety of ways: classroom work, clinical or internship work, a field test, an ePortfolio, etc. You may request access to the Google Sheet on our site if that is easiest, or we can make the updates. Please reach out to [oie@weber.edu](mailto:oie@weber.edu) if you wish to have access)

**Information is current; no changes required: Yes No \_\_**

Update if not current

# Program and Contact Information

**Information is current; no changes required: Yes No \_\_**

Update if not current:

# Assessment Plan

We have traditionally asked programs to report on outcome achievement by students at the course level. We are encouraging programs to consider alternative assessment approaches and plans that are outcome-based as opposed to course-based, though course-based assessment can continue to be used. A complete assessment plan should include:

* a timeline (which courses or which outcomes will be assessed each year),
* an overall assessment strategy (course-based, outcome-based, reviewed juries, ePortfolio, field tests, etc.)
* information about how you will collect and review data
* information about how the department/program faculty are engaged in the assessment review.

**Information is current; no changes required: Yes No \_\_**

Update if not current:

# Student Achievement

Please come back to this section later. The dashboard is being updated and is not yet on Site Manager. OIE will send out an email when it is ready.

Percent and number of students completing degrees within 2 years of achieving 90+ credit hours (or just time to graduation for graduate programs) and a reflection on that metric.

Here are instructions on how to access this information:

* + 1. Log into the eWeber portal
    2. Search for, and select the app, "Report Gallery"
    3. Agree to the FERPA warning
    4. In the Report Gallery search for Program Review Undergraduate - you can enter that text into the search bar or you can scroll down the list of dashboards until you find it.
    5. Select the tab at the top labeled "Time to Grad" at the top of the page.
    6. Select your Program Unit and Program Level on the right side
    7. Select Priority 1 under Priority

You should now be in the right settings for understanding your program’s time to graduation. Please reflect on what you are seeing, discuss any highlights or concerns, and outline what initiatives the program is doing to address the numbers shown. If you require assistance or have questions, please email [oie@weber.edu.](mailto:oie@weber.edu) You may use a screenshot of the information shown in the dashboard as a part of your report.

# Evidence of Learning

There are a variety of ways in which you can choose to show evidence of learning, including the traditional Evidence of Learning Rubric, the updated Evidence of Learning worksheet, a narrative describing your assessments and evidence of student learning, or other tools such as ePortfolios, Signature Assignments, juried reviews, and so on, or a combination of any of these.

Whichever method you choose, please include:

1. Each learning outcome addressed in the course, and an interpretation of the outcomes as necessary to help outside reviewers understand the learning goals
2. The methods used to assess learning for each outcome – ideally, each outcome will be measured with at least two different methods, e.g., multiple quiz questions and a signature assignment, multiple exam questions and lab reports, course discussions and homework assignments, etc.
3. The threshold of acceptable performance – preferably a multi-stepped threshold, such as “80% of students will score 80% or better on the set of quiz questions” – and brief explanation for why that target was selected
4. The results of the assessment for each outcome. If possible, include specifics such as the number of students who meet, exceed, or fall short of the threshold.
5. A reflection on, or interpretation of, the findings. For example, if 100% of students correctly answer all quiz questions, might they need to be too easy?
6. A plan of action to address the findings, even if the threshold was met, and/or reflection on changes made as a result of (or in the interim since) the last biennial report.
7. How you plan to monitor and assess the success of changes you will make/have made (“close the loop”).

If individual faculty who provide data or participate in the assessment of these courses would like feedback or support from GEIAC or the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, provide their names and contact information here:

**Types of Assessment**

1. Course-based assessment
   1. This is the format we have traditionally suggested programs use for assessment. The familiar ‘evidence of learning worksheets’ are included in the template and can also be accessed from the IE website.
2. Outcome-based assessment
   1. Moving from course-based to outcome-based assessment has the potential for programs to gather and reflect upon data that are more meaningful, and to connect assessment findings from throughout the program. The approach may be much easier for associates and certificate programs where only select students in classes are earning the credential. For more information email ([oie@weber.edu](mailto:oie@weber.edu))
   2. Reporting options include:
      1. A traditional evidence-of-learning [worksheet](https://apps.weber.edu/wsuimages/ie/Assessment%20Tools/Assessment%20Templates/EOL_Outcome_Based_Worksheet.docx?_ga=2.143093813.1812623437.1631024899-784579081.1557782423) with an outcome (across multiple courses) as the focus (instead of a course with multiple outcomes).
      2. A report that is more [narrative-based.](https://apps.weber.edu/wsuimages/ie/Assessment%20Tools/Assessment%20Templates/Outcome_Based_Assessment%20Report.docx?_ga=2.210213141.1812623437.1631024899-784579081.1557782423)
      3. Other tools such as an ePortfolio in which key or signature assignments have been identified by the faculty, and uploaded by the student with their reflection. The key or signature assignments are aligned to student learning outcomes. (ePortfolio is an excellent assessment tool for certificates and associate degrees.)
      4. There are other approaches such as juried reviews, physical portfolios, field tests, etc.
3. General Education course assessment needs to continue to be reported at the course level using either the [traditional template](https://www.weber.edu/wsuimages/ie/Assessment%20Tools/Assessment%20Templates/EOL_CourseWithinMajor_Worksheet.docx) or a more [narrative-based format.](https://www.weber.edu/wsuimages/ie/Assessment%20Tools/Assessment%20Templates/EOL_CourseWithinMajor_Narrative.docx) See the [Checklist and Template](https://www.weber.edu/ie/Review_and_Assessment/Checklists_and_Templates.html) page for area-specific worksheets as well.

**Note: if you cannot download templates directly from this document, please visit our** [**template page**](https://www.weber.edu/ie/Review_and_Assessment/Checklists_and_Templates.html) **for downloads.**

# Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major

(**This is a sample page for purpose of illustration only**; a blank template can be found on the next page or at [this site](https://www.weber.edu/ie/Review_and_Assessment/Checklists_and_Templates.html))

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sample only -** Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major – **Sample only** | | | | | |  |
| Measurable Learning  Outcome: Students will… | Method of Measurement\* | [Target](#_bookmark12) [Performance](#_bookmark12) | [Actual Performance](#_bookmark13) | Interpretation of Findings | Action Plan/Use of Results | “[Closing the Loop](#_bookmark14)” |
| Learning Outcome 1: | Measure 1: A set of 10 multiple choice questions from Exam 1 | Measure 1: 85% of students will score 80% or better on 10 questions | Measure 1: 93% of  students scored 80% or better on 10 questions | Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated interpretation skills | Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time | Analyze the performance on the lower-scoring criterion and determine if clarity of instruction improved student performance. |
| Measure 2: Student presentations | Measure 2: Using a rubric to assess the presentation, 90% of students will achieve a score of  75% or above. | Measure 2: the threshold was met, but students performed poorly (avg. = 1.8) on one  criterion. | Measure 2: unclear where the issue is | Measure 2: provide better explanation of the expectations for this criterion and re- assess. |
| Learning Outcome 2: | Measure 1: Results of standardized test | Measure 1: 85% of students will score at or above the national average. | Measure 1: 90% of students scored above national average | Measure 1: Students successfully demonstrated competence; lowest average score was in transfer of knowledge, where only 69% of questions were answered correctly. | Measure 1: Faculty agree to include review of transfer in all related courses; this outcome will be reassessed during next review |  |
| Measure 2: Students are surveyed about their perceived competence of the outcome | Measure 2: On a 5 point Likert scale, 90% of students will indicate 4 or 5 | Measure 2: Less than half of students felt competence with this outcome. | Measure 2: Students tested well, but their perceived competence was lower than expected. | Measure 2: Students will be given more opportunity to practice this skill with immediate feedback. |

\*Can be a mix of [direct](#_bookmark15) and [indirect](#_bookmark7) measures, but at least one measure must be direct

# Evidence of Learning Worksheet: Courses within the Major – Copy as needed (see appendix for alternative format) Course: Semester taught: Sections included:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major | | | | | | |
| Measurable Learning Outcome | Method of Measurement\* | Target Performance | Actual Performance | Interpretation of Findings | Action Plan/Use of Results | “Closing the Loop” |
| Learning Outcome 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: |  |  |
| Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: |  |  |
| Learning Outcome 2: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: |  |  |
| Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: |  |  |

\*Direct and indirect: at least one measure per objective must be a direct measure.

Additional narrative (optional – use as much space as needed):

# Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses

(Area-specific EOL grids can be found at <https://www.weber.edu/ie/Review_and_Assessment/Checklists_and_Templates.html>; they can replace this page.)

Course: Semester taught: Sections included:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evidence of Learning: General Education | | | | | | |
| Measurable Learning Outcome  Students will… | Method of Measurement | Target Performance | Actual Performance | Interpretation of Findings | Action Plan/Use of Results | “Close the Loop” |
| Learning Outcome 1: | Measure 1 | Measure 1 | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: |  |
| Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: |  |
| Learning Outcome 2: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: |  |
| Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: |  |
| Learning Outcome 3: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: | Measure 1: |  |
| Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: | Measure 2: |  |

\*At least one measure per objective must be a direct measure; indirect measures may be used to supplement direct measure(s).

It is proposed that these assessment results will be reviewed by the General Education Improvement & Assessment Committee, who will provide feedback on evidence of continuous improvement.

# Alternative Evidence of Learning Grid

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Course Name & Number: | Outcome: | |
| Measure 1 | Measure 2 |
| Method of Measurement |  |  |
| Target Performance |  |  |
| Actual Performance |  |  |
| Reflection/Interpretation |  |  |
| Action Plan |  |  |
| Assessment of Changes/Closing the Loop |  |  |

Additional narrative (optional – use as much space as needed):

# Appendix A

Most departments or programs receive a number of recommendations from their Five/Seven-Year Program Review processes. This page provides a means of updating progress towards the recommendations the department/program is enacting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date of Program Review: #### | Recommendation | Progress Description |
| Recommendation 1 | Text of recommendation | #### +1 progress |
|  |  | #### +2 progress |
|  |  | #### +3 progress |
|  |  | #### +4 progress |
| Recommendation 2 | Text of recommendation | #### +1 progress |
|  |  | #### +2 progress |
|  |  | #### +3 progress |
|  |  | #### +4 progress |
| Recommendation 3 | Text of recommendation | #### +1 progress |
|  |  | #### +2 progress |
|  |  | #### +3 progress |
|  |  | #### +4 progress |
| (add as needed) |  |  |

Additional narrative:

# Appendix B

Please provide the following information about the full-time *and adjunct faculty* contracted by your department during the last academic year (summer through spring). Gathering this information each year will help with the headcount reporting that must be done for the final Five-Year Program Review document that is shared with the State Board of Regents.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Faculty Headcount** | **2019-20** | **2020-21** | **2021-22** | **2022-23** |
| **With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by**  **the institution)** |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time Tenured |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track) |  |  |  |  |
| Part-time and adjunct |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **With Master’s Degrees** |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time Tenured |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time Non-Tenured |  |  |  |  |
| Part-time and adjunct |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **With Bachelor’s Degrees** |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time Tenured |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time Non-tenured |  |  |  |  |
| Part-time and adjunct |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Other** |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time Tenured |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time Non-tenured |  |  |  |  |
| Part-time |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Headcount Faculty** |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time Tenured |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time Non-tenured |  |  |  |  |
| Part-time |  |  |  |  |

# Appendix C

**Please respond to the following questions.**

* + 1. Looking back at your previous biennial report where you identified strategies for improvement, what progress has been made in implementing improvements?
    2. Please take a few minutes to review the new DFWI dashboard in the Report Gallery. This dashboard allows you to see the percentage of students in each course who earn a D+, D, D-, E, W, UW, or NC grade. The data can be filtered by several parameters. Reflect on the DFWI rates overall and of your underserved minority students versus your Caucasian students:
       1. What are you seeing?
       2. What concerns you?
       3. What additional data could be beneficial?
    3. We have invited you to re-think your program assessment. What strategies are you considering? What support or help would you like?

# Glossary

Student Learning Outcomes/Measurable Learning Outcomes

The terms ‘learning outcome’, ‘learning objective’, ‘learning competency’, and ‘learning goal’ are often used interchangeably. Broadly, these terms reference what we want students to be able to do AFTER they pass a course or graduate from a program. For this document, we will use the word ‘outcomes’. Good learning outcomes are specific (but not too specific), are observable, and are clear. Good learning outcomes focus on skills: knowledge and understanding; transferrable skills; habits of mind; career skills; attitudes and values.

* Should be developed using action words (if you can see it, you can assess it).
* Use compound statements judiciously.
* Use complex statements judiciously.

Curriculum Grid

A chart identifying the key learning outcomes addressed in each of the curriculum’s key elements or learning experiences (Suskie, 2019). A good curriculum:

* Gives students ample, diverse opportunities to achieve core learning outcomes.
* Has appropriate, progressive rigor.
* Concludes with an integrative, synthesizing capstone experience.
* Is focused and simple.
* Uses research-informed strategies to help students learn and succeed.
* Is consistent across venues and modalities.
* Is greater than the sum of its parts.

Target Performance (previously referred to as ‘Threshold’)

The level of performance at which students are doing well enough to succeed in later studies (e.g., next course in sequence or next level of course) or career.

Actual Performance

How students performed on the specific assessment. An average score is less meaningful than a distribution of scores (for example, 72% of students met or exceeded the target performance, 5% of students failed the assessment).

Closing the Loop

The process of following up on changes made to curriculum, pedagogy, materials, etc., to determine if the changes had the desired impact.

Continuous Improvement

An idea with roots in manufacturing, that promotes the ongoing effort to improve. Continuous improvement uses data and evidence to improve student learning and drive student success.

Direct evidence

Evidence based upon actual student work; performance on a test, a presentation, or a research paper, for example. Direct evidence is tangible, visible, and measurable.

Indirect evidence

Evidence that serves as a proxy for student learning. May include student opinion/perception of learning, course grades, measures of satisfaction, participation. Works well as a complement to direct evidence.

HIEE – High Impact Educational Experiences

Promote student learning through curricular and co-curricular activities that are intentionally designed to foster active and integrative student engagement by utilizing multiple impact strategies. Please see <https://weber.edu/weberthrives/HIEE.html>