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Arizona State University’s Approach to Program Assessment

The Arizona State University (ASU) Charter is the university’s mission statement and drives all college, department, and programs level mission statements and program goals.

“ASU is a comprehensive public research university, measured not by whom it excludes, but by whom it includes and how they succeed; advancing research and discovery of public value, and assuming fundamental responsibility for the economic, social, cultural, and overall health of the communities it serves.”

At ASU, program assessment is dependent on faculty cultivating and maintaining a culture of continuous improvement. These activities include faculty writing and refining assessment plans, overseeing the collection of results data, and providing continuous improvement guidance to ensure students can demonstrate the development of skills and knowledge necessary for academic success in the program.

The University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness (UOEEE) consults with academic units as they develop and implement strategies to measure student learning at the program level. Strategies include the identification of learning outcomes, the means for measuring student learning on those outcomes, and follow-up activities to review and act on assessment data. The purpose of these efforts is to provide information that can improve student learning.

With the pace of information increasing rapidly, coupled with ASU’s innovative spirit, the demand is strong for instruction to be continuously reviewed and upgraded, impacting every program at the university. For any program to not be innovative and offer cutting edge education to students who have chosen ASU is unacceptable at the institution. Program assessment is the tool being used by most by colleges and universities across America and the format followed by ASU provides information to the Arizona Board of Regents, the Higher Learning Commission, and other accrediting and regulatory bodies.

It is helpful for faculty and other contributors to remember the information contained in the program assessment portal is public and accessed by university administration and accrediting bodies—and is available upon request to all stakeholders, journalists, and the general public. Therefore, it is crucial for the information contained in plans and reports to be as descriptive and robust as possible while remaining concise and being understandable to readers not in the program’s field.

This Handbook has a section for each element in a program assessment plan, containing instructions to help complete plans and information on academic program review’s (APR) use of assessment results and ABOR new and currently plan expectations. In addition, there are links to program assessment-related references and examples beginning on page ___. Furthermore, UOEEE can be contacted directly for program, department or college-level consultation and instruction assessment@asu.edu
Key Processes and Due Dates:

New degree program plans: The program assessment process at ASU begins with the submission of an assessment plan. When UOEEE has approved the plan, programs can begin the assessment process leading to an annual report based on the plan. New degrees, bachelor, master, and doctorates, will then go through the Arizona Board of Regents approval process. Undergraduate and graduate certificates do not go to ABOR for approval, yet must receive the same assessment attention as full degree programs to meet Higher Learning Commission and specialized accreditation standards.

Colleges will be notified by ASU’s provost office which programs submitted during each spring are approved to move on through internal and ABOR approval processes. This notification will usually happen in late spring. At this point, degree programs have until July 15th to submit assessment plans to UOEEE for eventual provisional approval. By August 31st, all new degree program plans going to ABOR need to have completed the UOEEE review process and have provisional approval to be able to complete all application descriptions.

Annual Assessment Reports: At the completion of the academic year, which coincides with the end of the spring semester, programs can begin the annual reporting process. It is best to collect assessment results prior to the beginning of the fall semester when findings can be developed while memories of the year’s assessment activities are relatively fresh and before fall teaching duties begin. Therefore, annual assessment reports are due from program leaders to their assessment delegates by July 15th to ensure delegates have time to process reports and clarify questions before the final submission date of September 30th.

Annual Plan Reviews: After annual assessment reports are finalized, programs can begin reflecting on necessary changes to the assessment plan. Plans need to be reviewed by December 2nd each year. When plans need changes or additions, these can be made during the fall semester when there is time to have UOEEE review and approve the changes. If a plan has made recent improvements and is implementing the changes, it is acceptable for plans to continue for up to three years as is. Plans that have not been updated in three years need to perform an extensive review to ensure the plan is as up-to-date and demonstrating innovation whenever possible.
Components of a Program Assessment Plan at ASU

The following is a list of components that are required to have a robust description in any assessment plans used at ASU, for full degrees and certificates. Graduate degree and certificates do not provide general education skills and habits in assessment plans, yet all other components are required for UOEEE provisional plan approval.

1. Mission Statement: There is one mission statement per program. Mission statements need to be program-level, if possible, or department or college-level, if program-level is not possible.

2. Program Goals: There is one set of program goals per program. Program goals are used to delineate instructional areas in the learning outcomes. Having at least one learning outcome per program goal is necessary to ensure all goals are being assessed.

3. Learning Outcomes: A minimum of three outcomes are required for each plan, yet there should also be an outcome for every element in program goals. Having an outcome for each element ensures goals are fully measured.

4. General Education-Undergraduate Only: All undergraduate programs must provide instruction in all nine areas of knowledge and identify the GE skills and intellectual habits addressed in the program’s curriculum. The UOEEE program assessment portal will help programs make choices as to which skills and habits to include in the plan.

5. Concepts: Plans need to identify the principles and theories students and graduates must be able to demonstrate to be successful during the program, in advanced studies, and professional careers.

6. Competencies: Students need to be able to demonstrate mastery of skills, tools, and knowledge sets specific to their program. Concepts are what is being applied and competencies are the tools necessary to make the application successfully, evaluative judgments, solve problems, and create solutions.

7. Assessment Methods: Readers need to know what type of research instruments are used, when in the program, if accreditation or regulatory bodies are involved, and how the data will be used for continuous improvement.

8. Measures: Information needed for an effective assessment of programs to determine if 1) learning outcome element is being addressed, 2) what the artifacts or other data sources are being used and, 3) when in the program the assessment will take place.

9. Performance Criteria: Most often described as the percentage of students reaching a level equal to mastery for a given measure, performance criteria need to be meaningful. If large proportions of students are successful based on a criterion, there is little useful information attained to make meaningful instructional improvements. Determining a challenging, yet accomplishable, a criterion for program success is vital to help drive instructional quality forward.

The following sections in this Handbook provide greater detail for each of these components and further questions can be directed to the UOEEE program assessment team at assessment@asu.edu
Mission Statement

Mission statements used by programs need to be related to mission statements created at the department and college levels and support the University's Charter (mission). The space in the UOEEE portal for a mission statement is intended to provide a reference point for program goals, as well as all other components contained in ASU program assessment plans. In essence, there needs to be a conceptual tie between the mission statement, program goals, and what is being assessed to report annually.

If a program has developed a mission statement, this is the preferred language to be included in the UOEEE portal. If a program-level mission statement has not been developed, the program needs to use department or college mission statements in the UOEEE portal.

1. The university mission/charter is the foundation upon which everything we do should be based. College mission statements, and in turn, departmental and program mission statements, should flow from and directly support the overall institutional mission. It should not be difficult to “connect the dots” and see the relationships among an institution and the academic and non-academic units that compose it.

2. Accreditors will evaluate how well an institution executes its mission through its academic programs and other endeavors.

3. Because it can be easy to forget the importance of university charter, or college/school and department missions in all that we do, assessment planning time provides an excellent opportunity to call our attention back to these statements of ‘who we are and what we are about.’ This may prompt some faculty to review school or department mission statements and consider whether it is time to update them. That, in turn, may prompt fresh thinking about curriculum planning or other activities. Although this is not the primary purpose of assessment planning, it is one example of the unexpected benefits that some faculty report as a result of this process.

4. Assessment outcomes must be directly related to the department mission (and, by extension, those of the university and college). You will be asked to evaluate these relationships as we prepare to develop learning outcomes.

The UOEEE assessment team does not evaluate the quality of the mission statements prepared by our academic or non-academic units. This information is only to help faculty focus on these directives as plans are developed and implemented.
Program Goals

What skills and knowledge must students be able to demonstrate to be academically successful in the program? What skills and knowledge must graduates have mastered upon graduation to be successful in their career and/or advanced academic endeavors?

Program goals provide more detail than the mission/charter on what is to be accomplished with the assessment plan outcomes, thereby helpful to operationalize mission/charter statements in a manner that allows outcomes and measures to be developed. Program goals often number between three and six per program, and identify the theoretical and technical areas students must master. These goals can be used to delineate the outcomes that need to be assessed in a program’s plan. As an example, a plan with four program goals can also have four programs outcome, with two measures each.

Programs need to have goals related to the academic development of the students (formative measures) and the eventual outcomes of the graduates (summative measures). As discussed earlier, program assessment at ASU measures student performance during the program to help faculty identify instructional areas for improvement (formative) and graduate skills and abilities (summative).
Outcomes

For all program assessment plans there must be three outcomes with two measures each. This produces just six data points from which to assess often complex degree and certificate programs. Therefore, programs are encouraged to not limit the number of outcomes to three, but develop as many learning outcomes as necessary to create accurate program findings and support a faculty-driven culture of continuous improvement. Ideally, there is a learning outcome for each program goal.

Outcomes and concepts are very closely related in they speak about what students will demonstrate using the related measures. Outcomes, however, are more detailed as to what is being learned. The items described in the outcomes can be related to measures and artifacts, while concepts relate to program goals and mission statements.

The language for outcomes needs to take on a positive tone and focus on students demonstrating accomplishments. It is vital to use the correct pedagogical level in describing what students are accomplishing. As an example, students in 100 and 200 level courses need to, at the least, be able to “remember” and “understand” key theories and ideas related to their field of study. Upper-level undergraduate students need to be able to “apply” and “analyze” key theories and ideas in their field. Finally, graduate-level students must be able to “evaluate” and be able to make judgments concerning key issues in their field, as well as “create” solutions that can be effective.

In addition, assessment plans should not limit students pedagogically; if sophomore-level courses teach students to apply and analyze in a program, this is a benefit to the students and can be considered higher quality instruction.

Conversely, upper-level undergraduate courses that only reach the pedagogical levels of remembering and understanding, or graduate courses that only analyze and apply, are considered pedagogically weak and of inadequate instructional quality. Such plans may not be eligible for UOEEE plan approval.

Please review the following diagram of Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy for a visual portrait of the varying level of pedagogical training. Two pages away is a wheel of action verbs and artifacts to help understand the terms and concepts behind each pedagogical level.
Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy Action Verbs

The following wheel, borrowed from Johns Hopkins University’s Whiting School of Engineering, begins with the same information in the pyramid above, then presents action verbs for each category, and finally gives example of student artifacts they qualify for each category.

General Education—Undergraduate Only

ABOR new application required description

To meet new ABOR general education skill and habit expectations, all new programs, those undergoing academic program review (APR), or those choosing to upgrade assessment plans to meet new standards must now provide the following information on how general education-specific activities are to be assessed.

Table One: Areas of Knowledge

- Plans must identify when in a program students will be exposed to each of the nine areas of knowledge; during their general studies courses, within the core curriculum, or during other periods.
- Programs need to indicate if an assessment “measure” will be used to report (most often a direct measure), a proxy indicator (most often an indirect measure), or in the case of general studies courses a narrative can be utilized. Narrative can be used for general studies only if collecting the information is not practical or even possible.
- It is expected that plans will develop to the point where most areas of knowledge are measured as part of the core curriculum; some are by proxy and few, if any, are narratives.

See next page

Table Two: General Education Skills and Intellectual Habits

- Plans must contain information related to the GE skills and intellectual habits supported by the program curriculum, a supporting activity such as an internship, or covered in a general studies area.
- Similarly, programs need to indicate if an assessment measure will be used, a proxy is the best indicator, or if a narrative is the only remaining option.
- It is expected that plans will develop to the point where all GE skills and intellectual habits are supported by a core curriculum or other measures.

See next page

In addition to the information that must be considered in Tables One and Two, the following instructions directly from ABOR Policy 2-210 must be kept in mind while developing undergraduate programs.

From ABOR Policy 2-210: https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/2-210%20General%20Education.pdf

- Evaluation of general education is also part and parcel of the review of the learning objectives of each degree program and those outcomes are reflected in the academic program reviews.
- Effective assessment depends fundamentally upon measurement and does not rely exclusively on a single project or capstone course. It …will inform curricular refinements and allow faculty & administrators to reconsider programs that do not meet expectations in terms of learned concepts and competencies.
- Each university will utilize rubrics, based on national standards or locally developed, to gauge whether students master the essential learning outcomes and intellectual qualities that are outlined in the policy.
### Areas of Knowledge: Where in the program are these areas addressed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Knowledge</th>
<th>General Studies Courses</th>
<th>Core Curriculum</th>
<th>Other: IA, Internships, Graduate School, Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Fine Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/ quantitative reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/ behavioral sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Institutions, Economics &amp; History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition, Communication &amp; Rhetoric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Ethical Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Discourse/ Civic Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Awareness, Diversity &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options: Measure, Narrative, Proxy

### Skills and Intellectual Habits: Where in the program are these areas addressed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills and Intellectual Habits</th>
<th>General Studies Courses</th>
<th>Core Curriculum</th>
<th>Other: IA, Internships, Graduate School, Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning &amp; Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas to Real-World Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options: Measure, Narrative, Proxy
Concepts

ABOR new application required description

Concepts cover the knowledge areas, theories, and principles students will draw upon in the successful execution of the outcome. This is a high-level description of the theories, ideas, paradigms, and understandings that comprise a given profession or field of study. Concepts can be viewed as the bridge between program goals and the skills and knowledge students must demonstrate mastery. Most academic fields and professions have a number of theories and principles that are mandatory for students to acquire during the program and afterward for graduates to demonstrate mastery. By identifying and grouping concepts as they relate to the program goals and outcomes, competencies and measures can then flow from the concept groupings.

As described earlier, it is important for assessment findings and continuous improvement efforts to relate directly to the program goals and mission statement. This linkage can only be accomplished when concepts in the assessment plan are related to the overall intention of the program and are measured by assessment results. Generally, the purpose of a nursing program is to produce registered nurses. Therefore, which theories and principles do students need to demonstrate, throughout the program and at/after graduation, to be successful in their careers and advanced educational endeavors.

Concepts differ from competencies in that competencies are specific skills and knowledge sets students will demonstrate during the program and have mastered at program completion. As an example, an accounting program can incorporate the concepts of business law, ethics, process analysis and design, principles of auditing, and monetary unit assumptions. The competencies are the tools necessary to operationalize and implement accounting concepts and can include database proficiency, report writing, project management, business statistics, and leadership.
Competencies

ABOR new application required description

Competencies cover the skills, tools, and operational knowledge students will draw upon in the successful execution of the outcome. These are the skills and knowledge sets that are unique to the program, as opposed to general education skills and habits that are transferable across disciplines.

Have nurse practitioner students and graduates demonstrated the ability to diagnose and prescribe treatment for the medical conditions they are trained? Can political science students specializing in polling able to effectively analyze survey results to predict election results? Can student pilots perform proper safety checks to ensure safe aircraft operations?

The number of competencies taught in a higher education program can be abundant, yet not all need to be included in an assessment plan. Programs need to identify the skills and operational knowledge that are summative in nature. In other words, which skills are built from knowing other skills.

Assessment Methods

ABOR new application required description

Assessment method descriptions need to detail the type of instruments to be used, when in the process they will be used, describe any professional certification or accreditation involvement (if any), and if findings will be used to drive a continuous improvement cycle. This “methods section” is needed for each outcome and needs to relate closely to the performance criteria listed in each measure.

This section is important for those currently involved in the program, as well as those who will be in the future, to understand when activities need to occur and what will be the result.

The methods section is used in the ABOR application for new programs. Therefore, it needs to be descriptive enough for “cold” readers to understand how the assessments are conducted and concise enough to be fit in the ABOR application.
Measures

ABOR new application required description

Measure and performance criteria work in tandem, with measures identifying the artifact, performance result, or other documentation used to make a judgment concerning demonstrable student and graduate abilities. Measures also detail when in the program the assessment will occur and, often, who will be collecting related data. There must be enough information contained in the measure concerning what the artifact or other source is involved, when in the assessment cycle the artifacts will be assessed and who is responsible for performing the assessment—usually course faculty. The information should be sufficient for those performing future assessment activities know what is done, when, and by whom.

Most often, the faculty will be responsible for collecting assessment data and, therefore, need to know what is expected and when. When a measure uses information not generated by faculty, as when professional certification, internships, or alumni surveys are involved, non-faculty staff can collect and process the information as long as faculty use these results when developing assessment findings.

Note: Programs are encouraged to use information already being collected for accreditors and regulators in their program assessment plan. It is recommended that accreditation standards are chosen that are more summative/cumulative in nature.

Direct and Indirect Measures

The must be a minimum of two measures for each outcome in an assessment plan and one must be a direct measure. A direct measure is based on a student-produced artifact or performance that is assessed for quality; most often using a rubric or similar approach. Indirect measures use information such as alumni survey results, internship assessments, employment, advanced degrees—items that are not single artifacts directly produced by students but are the result of the student being in the program.

Both direct and indirect are important for understanding program quality, as direct measures can often be used to help identify areas for instructional improvement (formative) and indirect measures can often be used for understanding program outcomes such as certification or employment (summative).

Formative and Summative Measures

Formative Measures: These assessments occur during the learning process to monitor student progress and help identify instructional areas where continuous improvements can be focused. At ASU, bachelor programs are expected to begin assessing students during the students’ 200 and 300 level courses. All students in the program are expected to be assessed or be eligible to be sampled if programs are large and reliability is tested to ensure accurate assessment results.

Summative Measures: These measures are also known as program outcomes. They provide insight into a program’s bottom-line—are students successful in the real world? Are nursing graduates qualified to be registered nurses? Are elementary and high school teachers still in the field three years after graduation?

ePortfolios and Digication

Arizona State University has a digital portfolio system with features that include artifact collection and rubric scoring that can be adapted to the course and program level. Programs are encouraged to utilize the digital portfolio system to help students build their academic repertoires as well as aid in program assessment and continuous improvement. Incorporating rubrics into digital portfolios makes course expectations transparent, allowing students to understand better how levels of performance are determined for a course or program. Furthermore, rubrics utilized within ASU’s digital portfolio system allow faculty, programs, departments, and colleges to create a history of assessment and continuous improvement efforts. See Digication.
Performance Criteria

Most often, performance criteria are based on the proportion of students attaining “mastery” of a subject, skill, or intellectual habit described in an accompanying measure. In the past, artifact grades had been acceptable for criteria, yet this is no longer the case. Rubrics, either faculty-developed or validity confirmed external rubrics, are now required to be used wherever circumstances allow, as with student artifacts and performances. Course grades or completion have never been acceptable at ASU based on UOEEE program assessment instructions.

Because ASU wants criteria to be effective and challenging, UOEEE does not track whether learning outcomes have met set criteria or not. Outcomes not met are viewed as opportunities for improvement and not a punitive issue. Therefore, plans are considered effective if they can provide valuable information for making continuous instructional improvements. Plans are considered challenging when criteria may or may not be met by students and graduates and require faculty to consider quality improvements continuously.

Challenging Criteria

Quite often criteria are met by students being assessed because performance levels have not been researched to determine which levels would be challenging to attain. Most often, 70% to 80% of students are expected to attain a set level of proficiency for a measure to be considered met during reporting. Yet, a large majority of reports submitted to UOEEE each year for review far exceed the 70% and 80% thresholds. For programs to “push the envelope” and increase the quality of instruction provided, performance criteria need to be based on past performance and faculty expertise as to what would challenge the program.

Rubric Use

Course grades, course completion, and any grade not generated using a grading rubric are not acceptable for program assessment purposes because they do not provide the level of detail necessary for making instructional improvement. Rubrics can cover general education requirements and apply across subjects, as seen in the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), or be an external rubric specific to a discipline and developed and tested for validity and reliability. Furthermore, many programs at ASU develop and use rubrics specific to an assignment. These faculty-developed rubrics are best when addressing an area with no standardized rubric is available, yet when an externally validated rubric is available, its use is strongly encouraged.
Program Assessment and New Program Applications to Arizona Board of Regents

To ensure new program assessment plans meet minimum qualifications for use by the ASU provost’s office in the application for new programs to the Arizona Board of Regents.

Language in UOEEE provisionally approved assessment plans is used to begin the new program application process for the Arizona Board of Regents, and for Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (CAPC) approval. Beginning in 2020, the UOEEE portal will have a process that helps programs translate the information from the UOEEE portal into language that fits the needs of the ABOR new program application process.

Because this new program information will go before ABOR and can be reviewed by accrediting bodies and stakeholders, when writing a new program assessment plan, programs need to remember these audiences and provide robust descriptions that leave readers with a strong understanding of what each element in the plan is intended to achieve. Plans that are written succinctly, demonstrating innovation, proactivity, thoroughness of thought and commitment to making the program as success will give decision-makers confidence to support the program. Program plans with limited information tend to be seen as weak, with less enthusiasm and faculty buy-in than plans that have robust descriptions.
Program Assessment and Academic Program Review

The information collected in the UOEEE program assessment portal is used to complete the program assessment sections of the Academic Program Review (APR) self-review. All program plans and reports are archived in the portal. Information entered by programs into the portal at the end of the assessment cycle can be accessed for the seven-year period required by the APR process. In addition, comments produced by UOEEE in the process of reviewing plans and reports are accessible for the APR process. Programs that have cultivated and maintained a culture of continuous improvement can point to the activities and developments that have occurred over the APR review period when completing the related sections in the APR submission form.

In addition, beginning in the 2020-21 APR cycle, UOEEE will be writing an assessment summary for inclusion in each academic unit’s APR report that relates to assessment activities evident in program assessment reports and plan developments. This summary will be independent of the program’s completion of other APR assessment related sections.

Programs are, therefore, strongly encouraged to be certain faculty participation and use of assessment findings are prominent in annual reports—and plan activities reflect continuous improvement efforts based on these findings.

Areas where assessment supports other APR instructions

7. How do you determine that the content of the degree program is rigorous? Are there disciplinary or professional standards? Do you review other curricula? Do you have an undergraduate capstone course and does it require some synthesis of knowledge from the undergraduate degree experience? Do you use a portfolio to assess students?

8. What innovations have been incorporated into the teaching activities in the department or school?

9. How is technology used to augment and enhance learning for students in face-to-face programs?

10. If online degree programs are offered, how is that program assessed and how do the graduates perform compared to those in the face-to-face program?

Page #4, APR self-report template

Excerpts from Arizona Board of Regents Directives (2-208 2-225):
Periodic program reviews provide a mechanism for faculty to evaluate the effectiveness, progress, and status of their academic programs continuously.

The program review process is intended to provide a comprehensive assessment of the current status of an academic unit based on its programs, activities and achievements since its last program review. This also provides the unit the opportunity to think strategically regarding its curricular offerings and its future direction. (ASU/APR Website https://provost.asu.edu/academic-program-review).

Program Self-Determination:
Faculty’s opportunity to guide program development, control destiny of programs, increase overall instructional quality, and improve graduate success.

VI. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (Undergraduate and Graduate)
The unit’s self-study should reference the following:

- The unit’s program-level learning goals/outcomes;
- How those goals/outcomes map to the curriculum;
- The unit’s assessment plan (purpose, questions, and evidence gathering methods);
- The reports of assessment efforts already undertaken since the last review;
APR Guiding Principles

• The process should be broadly participatory, involving faculty, students, staff administrators, and relevant community constituents.

• The APR should provide a framework for excellence, an opportunity to explore, enhance, and integrate student learning and faculty teaching, service, and scholarly efforts into the unit’s mission and goals.

• The process should facilitate short-term and long-term strategic planning in areas such as curricular development, resource allocation (e.g., financial, physical), faculty/staff hiring/workload, and research foci.

• The APR provides an opportunity for the university to account for its use of public resources and facilitate support among its various constituencies.
Program Assessment Reporting

Every established program\(^1\) at ASU is expected to report annually on 1) faculty participation in assessment and, 2) how faculty are guiding continuous improvement efforts based on assessment findings. These reports are based on the assessment plan last updated in the UOEPE program assessment portal.

Reporting on assessment activities is an opportunity for program faculty to reflect on their level of participation and whether assessment findings are providing information detailed enough for faculty to provide continuous improvement guidance. Currently, whether program outcomes are meeting expectations is not tracked by UOEPE for analysis purposes. This information is collected in the portal to keep faculty and administrators informed and is designed to help target areas where instruction can be continuously improved.

As described early in this Handbook, it is preferred that programs make performance criteria challenging to attain. This drives programs to be innovative as opposed to settling for the status quo for the program and the students who have chosen to attend.

Administrative Support
Faculty can use administrative assistance to enter information into the portal and collect assessment results data. Yet, it must be faculty that review assessment results, develop findings, and provide continuous improvement guidance that is described in the reports.

---

\(^1\) Established programs are those old enough to begin reporting, usually two years after the initial semester for bachelor and doctoral degrees, and one year after approval for master degrees and certificates. Programs must be formally disestablished before they are not expected to report annually.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Components</th>
<th>0-Unacceptable</th>
<th>One pt.-Developing</th>
<th>Two pts-Innovative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>College/ Dept Level</td>
<td>Program Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Goal</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Dept Level</td>
<td>Program Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>None to two</td>
<td>Three, minimum</td>
<td>Four or More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest Two</td>
<td>Middle Two</td>
<td>Top Pedagogical Levels, Bloom Taxonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical Levels, Bloom Taxonomy</td>
<td>Pedagogical Levels, Bloom Taxonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Edu- Undergrad Only</td>
<td>None to 49%</td>
<td>Majority Incorporated</td>
<td>All Skills Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>None or not focused on theories, principles</td>
<td>Focused on theories, principles, relates to outcomes</td>
<td>Focused on theories, principles, and drives to outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>Not focused on skills or habits</td>
<td>Focused on skills and habits related to outcomes</td>
<td>Focused on skills and habits, drives to outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Methods</td>
<td>Two or fewer components (what, how, when)</td>
<td>What is being measured, how, and when?</td>
<td>Plus, how will findings be applied?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>None to One</td>
<td>Two, minimum</td>
<td>Three or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Only</td>
<td>Direct Only</td>
<td>Direct and Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summative Only</td>
<td>Formative Only</td>
<td>Formative and Summative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Criteria</td>
<td>All measures expected to be met easily, based on past performance</td>
<td>Challenging; most measures may not be met</td>
<td>Challenging, all measures may or may not be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Level</td>
<td>Any button means the plan is not acceptable in current form</td>
<td>Twelve undergrad/eleven grad to seventeen points</td>
<td>Eighteen to 24 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource Links

ASU Assessment Links
UOEEE Home Page: https://uoeee.asu.edu/
UOEEE Assessment Portal: https://uoeee.asu.edu/assessment-portal
UOEEE Survey Reporting Portal: https://uoeee.asu.edu/survey-reporting
ASU Academic Program Review Portal: https://provost.asu.edu/academic-program-review

Assessment in General
References:
AAC&U VALUE Rubrics: https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics
UC Berkeley: https://teaching.berkeley.edu/resources/improve/evaluate-course-level-learning/rubrics
Higher Learning Commission: Guiding Values
https://www.hlcommission.org/Publications/guiding-values.html

Assessment References from ASU Library Resources:

- Assessment in arts education / Philip Taylor ISBN: 9780325007953
- Assessment in Mathematics Education: Large-Scale Assessment and Classroom Assessment (online text)
- Research Assessment in the Humanities: Towards Criteria and Procedures / Hans - Dieter Daniel; Sven E. Hug; Michael Ochsner. Springer 2016 (online text)
- Assessment in the Science Curriculum / Marlow. Ediger. S.l : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 2001
- Assessment in social work practice Carol H. Meyer 1924-New York: Columbia University Press c1993
- Assessment: a sourcebook for social work practice Julia B Rauch; Families International (Milwaukee, Wis.) - Milwaukee, Wis. : Families International c1993
- Assessment in Student Affairs, Second Edition John H. Schuh, J. Patrick Biddix, Laura A. Dean, and Jillian Kinzie (online text)
- Assessment in Mathematics Education: Large-Scale Assessment and Classroom Assessment Suurtamm, Christine; Thompson, Denisse R.; Kim, Rae Young; Moreno, Leonora Diaz; Sayac, Nathalie; Schukajlow, Stanislaw; Silver, Edward; Ufer, Stefan; Voc, Pauline: Springer International Publishing, Cham 2016 (online text)
- Assessment in mathematics Kate Bennie :ISBN: 9780636035157
• **Measuring up: educational assessment challenges and practices for psychology** Dana Dunn; Chandra Mehrotra; Jane S Halonen: Washington, DC: American Psychological Association c2004 (online text)
• **Assessment for Learning in Law** John O. Mudd: S.l.: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 1986
• **Assessing public journalism** Edmund B Lambeth; Philip Meyer; Esther Thorson: Columbia: University of Missouri Press c1998
• **Assessment in Mass Communication** Susan Tyler. Eastman: S.l.: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 1993
• **Assessment in arts education: a necessary discipline or a loss of happiness?** Malcolm Ross 1932- 1st ed. Oxford; New York: Pergamon 1986
• **The problem of assessment in art and design** Trevor Rayment Bristol: Intellect 2007
• **Student Assessment in Architecture Schools** Sarah M. Dinham: S.l.: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 1988
• **Assessment in Management, Nursing, and Teaching at Alverno College** Georgine. Loacker: S.l.: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 1986
• **Assessment in business education** Jim D Rucker; Ramona J Schoenrock; National Business Education Association: Reston, Va.: National Business Education Association 2000
• **Assessment in education** D. G. Lewis: New York, Wiley c1975
• **Assessment in the History Curriculum** Marlow. Ediger : S.l.: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 2000
• **Assessment Clear and simple: a practical guide for institutions, departments, and general education** Barbara Walvoord: 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass c2004

---

**Articles / studies / reports::**

• **Down and In Assessment Practices at the Program Level (2011) NILOA**

---

**From Other sources:**

• **Assessment of student learning in business schools: best practices each step of the way / Kathryn Denise Martell; Thomas G Calderon**