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UW-LA CROSSE SNAPSHOT

- Midwestern Regional University located on the Mississippi River
- Fall 2016 Enrollment: 10,546 (9,728 UG, 818 Graduate)
- 100 UG Programs across 30 Disciplines, 21 Graduate Programs
- Comprised of 3 Colleges (Liberal Studies, Science & Health, Business Administration) and 2 Schools (Arts & Communication and Education)
- 19:1 Student to Faculty Ratio
- 588 Instructors (463 FT, 78% Tenured/Tenure Track)
A. 1996: Creation of Biennial assessment reports, response to HLC visit

B. Depts submit assessment reports to College/School Offices July, even years

C. Deans and School Directors summarize to provide college level report to Provost’s office

D. College/School level committee review reports to provide feedback to Depts

E. 2006: Academic Program Review adds assessment to reports for review, response to HLC visit. 7 yr cycle
CHARGE AND OUTCOMES OF AD HOC PROVOST’S TASKFORCE

- Provost created 6 person ad hoc taskforce to review 3 issues.
  - 1. Does the **timing** of review and feedback of assessment within the academic programs meet the needs of all parties involved?
  - 2. Does the current **structure** of review and feedback of assessment within the academic programs meet the needs of all parties involved?
  - 3. If these conditions (both or just one) are not met, what substantive changes could be taken to improve the process?
- Timeframe 3 weeks, report to Provost with Recommendations
CHARGE AND OUTCOMES OF AD HOC PROVOST'S TASKFORCE

Defining Assessment and Associated Expectations
- Understanding program assessment, unclear communication, expectations not articulated

Faculty Buy-in / ownership of assessment
- Faculty Resistance, Limited Time

Failure to close the loop
- Communication of results, Lack of use of results to make decisions
1. Improve Consistency of Feedback regarding program assessment

2. Encourage increased communication and knowledge of program assessment at all levels

3. Establish a reward and accountability structure

4. Identify strategies to increase faculty buy-in

Recommendations of Taskforce
FULFILLING RECOMMENDATIONS OF AD HOC TASKFORCE

- Creation of Univ. Program Assessment Committee, reporting & review structure
- Program Assessment Grants ($500-$1000)
- Annual Assessment Commons in January
- Increasing visibility of assessment activities in promotion materials
- Consistency of Feedback
- Increasing Knowledge
- Reward & Accountability Structure
- Increasing Faculty Buy-in
1. Assessment Plan for next 3 years entered in Taskstream, submitted to UPAC

2. UPAC members, in pairs review work, provide feedback

3. Programs digest feedback, Enact Plan

4. Programs complete plan and submit end of cycle report to UPAC

5. UPAC reviews end of cycle report, provides feedback.
1. Feedback given on:
   A. Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Maps
   B. Assessment Plan (Measures)
   C. Assessment Results
   D. Action Plan (Based on Results)
   E. Action Status Report

2. Types of Actions are coded across 12 types


4. Strong Emphasis on constructive comments

5. More info available at: https://www.uwlax.edu/taskstream/program-assessment/process-timeline/
LESSONS LEARNED, NEXT STEPS, QUESTIONS

- **Need for Administrative and Faculty Senate Support**
  - Strong Administrative Support - Provost and Deans
  - Prominent and Key Role of Faculty in Taskforce, soliciting feedback on needs, Faculty senate leadership in creation of committee

- **Focus on timely and constructive feedback**

- **Support for training on new systems for the programs and review committee**

- **Common format useful but unique needs remain**
  - College of Business maintained Internal Review
  - School of Education Annual Cycles
  - Accredited Program Exemptions

- **Next Steps: 2017-18 Second Cohort for review, seek user input on process and system, seek permanent status for UPAC**
### BIENNIAL REPORTS

#### 2012-2014 Biennial Assessment Report: Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in Academic Programs

**Date:** July 25, 2014

**Academic Program:**

**Department:**

The purpose of assessment is to promote high quality student learning through a process of continual attention to evidence for student learning outcomes. The biennial assessment form serves to summarize programmatic assessment processes/outcomes in a concise manner. Biennial assessment reports are submitted to the college (or unit), are uploaded to D2L, and are a component of API self-studies. In addition, biennial assessment reports are a component of quality assurance documentation provided to the Higher Learning Commission for university-wide reaccreditation. An information guide for this report can be found at [http://www.uwax.edu/assessment/pca.htm](http://www.uwax.edu/assessment/pca.htm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry or Request</th>
<th>Assessment Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible for conducting assessment in the department/program?</td>
<td>□ Department Chair / □ Program Director / □ Departmental or Program Assessment Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Department or Programmatic Assessment Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other (please describe):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List all of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) identified for the program / department.

(If multiple SLOs are elaborated under major categories, please share a hyperlink to a location where they may be found online.)

Identify the specific SLOs measured in the past biennium.

( must be a subset of the comprehensive listing of SLOs identified in the previous request)

---

**College/Library Report of Assessment of Student Learning in Academic Programs 2012-2014**

**Post to Biennial Assessment Reports D2L site by Friday, July 25, 2014.**

**College:** (CBA / CLS / SAH / Murphy Library / SOE)

I. **The process of reviewing program assessment in the college/library.**

Describe the process your college/library used to review and evaluate assessment of student learning outcomes in academic programs. Explain whether and how departments received feedback on their assessment work.

II. **The nature and quality of program assessment.**

   a) Based on departmental biennial assessment reports (2012-14), complete the table and answer the questions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of programs in your college/library that...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have someone responsible for program assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use direct measures to evaluate student learning outcomes in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use assessment results to try to improve the curriculum, teaching, and learning in the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b) Summarize the quality and depth of assessment of student learning outcomes in academic programs in your college.

III. **Gaps in program assessment.**

   a) Describe how the college addressed the weaknesses or problems in program learning outcome assessments identified in your 2012 assessment report.

   b) Describe the two or three most significant areas where your current program learning outcome assessments could improve in your college and describe how the college plans to address these issues.
SAH Assessment Planning and Implementation Checklists

Planning Form Checklist

1. Student Learning Outcomes

   A. The SLOs are clear and assessable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Curriculum Map

   A. Each required course is listed as a row in the curriculum map

   B. Each program SLO is listed as a column in the curriculum map

   C. Each column contains at least one “X”

   D. Each column contains at least one “A”

3. Timeline

   A. Each SLO is listed as a row in the timeline

   B. Each of the 2012-13, 2013-14 (the current biennium) has at least one G and/or one E.

Feedback from SAH Assess. Comm.:
CLARIFIED EXPECTATIONS FOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Basic Required Expectations:

The Program’s Assessment work at a foundational level is marked by:

1. Clearly Worded Statements of Student Learning Outcomes Appropriate to the Level of the Program.

2. Identification of How the Student Learning Outcomes are Aligned to the Program’s Curriculum through the Use of Curriculum Maps/Matrices

3. Clearly Identified Assessment Measures Aligned to Student Learning Outcomes which must include Direct Measures and Guided by Performance Targets/Benchmarks

4. A Well-Articulated and Utilized Process for Analysis and Review of Assessment Results by Faculty

5. Clearly Indicated Improvements to or Maintenance of the Curriculum that are Directly Tied to Assessment Results
Distinguishing Hallmarks of Advanced Assessment:

The Program’s Assessment work exceeds the foundation level by demonstrating:

- 6. Significant Resources (e.g. Faculty involvement, Class Time, Department Meetings) are Clearly Devoted to Assessment Process.
- 7. Substantial Roles for and Participation of All Program Faculty in the Assessment Process.
- 8. An Evaluation of the Assessment Process itself is Conducted to Identify and Correct any Obstacles to Assessment.
- 9. Clear Connections between each cycle of assessment with evidence that past assessment efforts guide future efforts.
- 10. Communication of learning outcomes, assessment process, and improvement actions to students.
PROCESS & TIMELINE

Program Assessment Cycle

The process of reporting on Program Assessment has shifted in two ways:

1. Use of the Taskstream-Tk20 assessment software to capture the information
2. Creation of the University Program Assessment Committee UPAC to provide useful and timely feedback on that work.

The overarching 3 year cycle (see graphic below) involves two submission points:

- Assessment Plan at the beginning of the cycle in spring of year 1 (Feb 15th).
- End of cycle report of the entire process (measures, results, analysis, and status of improvement action steps) fall of year 3 (Oct 15th).

Programs have been divided into two submission groups so that about half will submit in the