An Overview of Assessment Reporting
PAR Organizing Meetings
2023 – 2024

Our Agenda

• What’s new in assessment?
• Essentials of PAR
• Foundations of the Discipline essentials
• Available resources
• Questions, comments, and discussion
WHAT’S NEW IN ASSESSMENT?

What’s new in assessment?

- In the current cycle (started in 2022-23)
  - Online programs required to report separately from campus-based
  - Each PAR should demonstrate the distinctiveness of the given program – i.e., departments cannot submit the exact same report for two different programs
- The pandemic-related adjustments have been sunsettled
- GEC has created guidelines for PLO-ULO alignment
- Faculty coordinator for program assessment
PAR ESSENTIALS

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

**Use the delivered versions of the templates – do not reuse old reports or templates

PARs are due May 1

Template Part 1 – Narrative

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

2. Assessment Process (current)
   a. Engagement and Process within the department/program
   b. Strengths and Challenges
   c. National standards
Template Part 1 – Narrative

3. Continuous Improvement (backwards looking)
   a. Curr/instr/program changes
   b. Assessment process + / –
   c. Responses to last PAR if scores of No Evidence or Beginning

4. Curriculum Map Discussion
   ○ Summary analysis
   ○ 3 prompts for all programs PLUS 1 extra for UG programs

Template Part 2 – Assessment Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List the Current Intended Program Learning Outcomes (one per row, labeled “Learner”)</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? Direct measures: such as tests, examinations, assignments, rubrics, etc. Indirect measures: such as surveys, focus groups, etc. Observations, feedback, surveys, etc. Observational methods: such as faculty observations, interview reports, discussions, etc.</td>
<td>What have you discovered about student learning in each of the intended learning outcomes areas?</td>
<td>Based on the assessments and results reported in this table, how have or will the findings be used by the faculty to make changes to the curriculum, specific courses, and/or the pedagogy used in the program? Please report (1) actions already taken and (2) actions planned for the future. Provide relevant examples.</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 to establish a baseline.
Review 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 the number of students achieving mastery on this PLC. Approximately 94% of the graduating seniors were mastering this outcome – we are targeting 65%.

**EXAMPLE:**
After reviewing the assessment results and our curriculum map, we noticed the topic was not covered in detail, so we added PLO 1, 2, and 3 to the course.

1.

2.
What does it mean for a PLO to be aligned with a ULO?

- When a PLO addresses at least two of the ULO’s achievement criteria, it should be marked as aligned.
Report Submission

- Via Google 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
Peer Reviews

- Signature aspect of our assessment program
- Volunteer peer reviewers participate in training and norming exercises in spring
- 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</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Process</td>
<td>No evidence or insufficient information was provided</td>
<td>Program engages 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., evaluated process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>No curriculum, instructional, or programmatic changes were made no reflection on action items from the prior PAR</td>
<td>Limited description or examples of how any action plan has had an impact on the program's development or performance</td>
<td>Improvements are described and examples are provided that draw general connections to previous action plans</td>
<td>The program implemented 2-4 curricular, instructional or programmatic actions or next steps from its previous report. Specific improvements are described and examples are provided</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>All of the PLOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Map demonstrates a pattern of courses that fosters student achievement of each PLO, and the level of competency students will achieve in the mapped courses.

- Other learning experiences (e.g., internships, service-learning, etc.) may be identified.
Some updates to this section of the rubric clarifying the criteria – it is a blend of elements from the pre-pandemic and pandemic-adjusted rubrics

| Continuous Improvement |-No curriculum, instructional, or programmatic changes were made-
|---|---|
| No reflection on action items from the prior PAR-
| Limited description or examples of how any action plan has had an impact on the program’s development or performance-
| The program did not make at least one substantive curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change-
| Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last review report may not be fully addressed-
| Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review have not been addressed-
| Improvements are described and examples are provided that show general connections to previous action plans-
| The program made at least one substantive curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change-
| Clear rationale is not provided for newly identified actions-
| Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed-
| Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review were at least partially addressed-
| The program implemented 2-4 curricular, instructional, or programmatic actions or next steps from its previous report, specific improvements are described and examples are provided-
| Actions from the prior report that are still in progress, were not addressed, or were eliminated/replaced are briefly described-
| Where applicable, newly introduced actions (i.e., other improvement models based on assessment of student learning) were identified and clear rationale for their introduction was provided-
| Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report or self-identified improvements were addressed-
| Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review were specifically addressed (i.e., actions were taken to move the program forward)-

Curriculum Map

| No curriculum map was provided-
| A limited number of POOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum OR all of the POOs are mapped to only one required course or experience-
| US Programs Only: Program has not mapped the connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum-
| A majority of the POOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum-
| Map does not identify degree of emphasis placed on POOs in the relevant courses OR the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses-
| US Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum-
| All of the POOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum-
| Curriculum map demonstrates a pattern of courses that fosters student achievement of each POO-
| Curriculum map identifies the degree of emphasis placed on POOs in the relevant curriculum OR defines the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses-
| US Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum-
| Other learning experience (e.g., internships, service-learning, etc.) may be identified-

Other stakeholders (staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals of the field) as appropriate.

- The program may have an especially distinctive, creative, or innovative way of approaching assessment.

---

Some updates to this section of the rubric clarifying the criteria – it is a blend of elements from the pre-pandemic and pandemic-adjusted rubrics

| Continuous Improvement |---|---|
|---|---|
| No curriculum, instructional, or programmatic changes were made-
| No reflection on action items from the prior PAR-
| Limited description or examples of how any action plan has had an impact on the program’s development or performance-
| The program did not make at least one substantive curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change-
| Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last review report may not be fully addressed-
| Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review have not been addressed-
| Improvements are described and examples are provided that show general connections to previous action plans-
| The program made at least one substantive curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change-
| Clear rationale is not provided for newly identified actions-
| Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed-
| Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review were at least partially addressed-
| The program implemented 2-4 curricular, instructional, or programmatic actions or next steps from its previous report, specific improvements are described and examples are provided-
| Actions from the prior report that are still in progress, were not addressed, or were eliminated/replaced are briefly described-
| Where applicable, newly introduced actions (i.e., other improvement models based on assessment of student learning) were identified and clear rationale for their introduction was provided-
| Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report or self-identified improvements were addressed-
| Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review were specifically addressed (i.e., actions were taken to move the program forward)-

Curriculum Map

| No curriculum map was provided-
| A limited number of POOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum OR all of the POOs are mapped to only one required course or experience-
| US Programs Only: Program has not mapped the connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum-
| A majority of the POOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum-
| Map does not identify degree of emphasis placed on POOs in the relevant courses OR the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses-
| US Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum-
| All of the POOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum-
| Curriculum map demonstrates a pattern of courses that fosters student achievement of each POO-
| Curriculum map identifies the degree of emphasis placed on POOs in the relevant curriculum OR defines the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses-
| US Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum-
| Other learning experience (e.g., internships, service-learning, etc.) may be identified-

Other stakeholders (staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals of the field) as appropriate.

- The program may have an especially distinctive, creative, or innovative way of approaching assessment.

---

Some updates to this section of the rubric clarifying the criteria – it is a blend of elements from the pre-pandemic and pandemic-adjusted rubrics

| Continuous Improvement |---|---|
|---|---|
| No curriculum, instructional, or programmatic changes were made-
| No reflection on action items from the prior PAR-
| Limited description or examples of how any action plan has had an impact on the program’s development or performance-
| The program did not make at least one substantive curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change-
| Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last review report may not be fully addressed-
| Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review have not been addressed-
| Improvements are described and examples are provided that show general connections to previous action plans-
| The program made at least one substantive curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change-
| Clear rationale is not provided for newly identified actions-
| Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed-
| Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review were at least partially addressed-
| The program implemented 2-4 curricular, instructional, or programmatic actions or next steps from its previous report, specific improvements are described and examples are provided-
| Actions from the prior report that are still in progress, were not addressed, or were eliminated/replaced are briefly described-
| Where applicable, newly introduced actions (i.e., other improvement models based on assessment of student learning) were identified and clear rationale for their introduction was provided-
| Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report or self-identified improvements were addressed-
| Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review were specifically addressed (i.e., actions were taken to move the program forward)-

Curriculum Map

| No curriculum map was provided-
| A limited number of POOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum OR all of the POOs are mapped to only one required course or experience-
| US Programs Only: Program has not mapped the connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum-
| A majority of the POOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum-
| Map does not identify degree of emphasis placed on POOs in the relevant courses OR the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses-
| US Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum-
| All of the POOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum-
| Curriculum map demonstrates a pattern of courses that fosters student achievement of each POO-
| Curriculum map identifies the degree of emphasis placed on POOs in the relevant curriculum OR defines the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses-
| US Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum-
| Other learning experience (e.g., internships, service-learning, etc.) may be identified-

Other stakeholders (staff, students, alumni, and/or outside professionals of the field) as appropriate.

- The program may have an especially distinctive, creative, or innovative way of approaching assessment.
### Follow-Up Report

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

**Due November 1st**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program Intended Learning Outcomes | No evidence of intended learning outcomes | - PUDs not functional (e.g., incomplete, overly detailed, disorganized, or not measurable) | - Written in a way that they can be measured <br> - All outcomes are written as learner-centered statements with action verbs <br> - The outcomes are clearly defined <br> - Emphasize program, college, and university mission and goals <br> - Align with professional standards, as appropriate. <br> - Focus on the cumulative effect of the program | - Lacks rigor in the intended learning outcomes |}

| Measures (the evidence that is used to evaluate outcomes achievement) | No evidence of measures used | - Measures apply to too many outcomes at once <br> - Few or no direct measures used <br> - Methods are mismatched, inappropriate, or otherwise do not provide evidence linked to the intended learning outcomes | - At least one measure per outcome <br> - A variety of direct and indirect measures used to assess outcomes <br> - The evidence used is mostly linked to the intended outcomes <br> - Measures section lacks clear description and detail | - Multiple measures for at least some outcomes <br> - Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct (i.e., data gathered is primarily focused on student learning activities) <br> - Purposeful and clear how results could be used for program improvement |}

| Key Findings | No findings or analysis presented | - Results/findings lack specificity <br> - Lack of connection between the outcome, the data gathered, and the results reported <br> - Degree of proficiency met is unclear | - Some findings are reported that address outcomes and evaluate student achievement of them <br> - Degree of proficiency met is included | - Compare, concise, and well organized; provides statements summarizing the data finding(s), the meanings, and conclusions based on those finding(s) <br> - Align with proficiency targets as appropriate <br> - Includes interpretation of the degree to which desired outcomes were met <br> - Compares new findings with past results, where appropriate |}

| Actions Taken or Planned based on Findings | No evidence of actions taken or planned | - Limited evidence that findings from assessment have been used to improve the curriculum, individual courses, etc. <br> - No actions are documented, or there are too many plans to reasonably manage | - Some evidence that findings from assessment have been used to improve the curriculum, individual courses, pedagogy, etc. <br> - At least one concrete action has been documented or planned with relevant details, timelines, etc. | - Actions or plans have been implemented and documented and/or detailed plans for implementation have been provided |}

---

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. **Feedback about PAR (optional).** As part of our regular review cycle, we appreciate your feedback on the PAR process, resources, and support. What, if anything, works best or is most helpful about the PAR process? If you could change one thing about the PAR process, what would it be?
How we use the information

- University Summary Report: accreditation, publicly shared
- College Summary Report: provided to Dean/Assoc 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 you for permission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No evidence</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Process</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Map</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Intended Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Findings</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions Taken or Planned</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>63%</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**

**DEPTS**

**JANUARY 25**
FD SURVEYS COMPLETED BY FD FACULTY

**May 1**
COURSE-LEVEL ULO REPORTS “FDRs”

**UPDATED FD FACULTY SURVEY (in progress via GEC)**

- Students listening to or observing an instructor, TA or other non-student lecturing, performing a demonstration, recorded content, etc.
- The instructor/TA asking the entire class questions or students asking the instructor/TA questions
- Student participating in group discussion
- Students, either individually or in groups, solving problems, engaging in experiential learning, performing or producing work (e.g. writing, field work, lab experiments, simulations, studio time, worksheets, etc.)
- Students presenting their own work or leading class instruction
- Students reviewing each other’s work
- Students completing assessments (e.g. quizzes, tests, exams)
- Other

Questions about outcomes focus, teaching methods, and faculty communication.
FDR REPORT QUESTIONS FOR DEPTS

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?

RESOURCES & NEXT STEPS
Fall 2023 CTL Support

Workshops

- September 29, 9-10 am - How We Make Assessment Meaningful
- October 27, 9-10 am - Fueling Program Assessment with Existing Course-level Data
- November 10, 9-10 am - Making Visible the Connections between PLOs and ULOs

Other Support

- Schedule a consultation: programassessment@boisestate.edu
- Assessment resources: https://www.boisestate.edu/ie-assessment/
- Coming soon: Student Learning Institute!
Timeline – Key Dates for 2024 PARs

- January 25 – FD Faculty Surveys DUE
- May 1 – PARs & FDRs DUE
- August – Programs receive peer review feedback
- Sept-Oct – Program faculty discuss feedback
- November 1 – 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
- If applicable, 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
- Reach out if you have questions
QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND DISCUSSION

Contact us

programassessment@boisestate.edu
universityfoundations@boisestate.edu

Shari Ellertson, Senior Executive Director, Institutional Effectiveness
Martha Plascencia, Management Assistant, Institutional Effectiveness
Teresa Focarile, Associate Director for Educ Dev, Center for Teaching and Learning
Nicole Cundiff, Faculty Coordinator for Assessment
Kay Wingert, Associate Director, University Foundations