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?

- 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 sunsetted
- GEC has created guidelines for PLO-ULO alignment
- Faculty coordinator for program assessment
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

List the Current Intended Program Learning Outcomes (one per row, typically 8-15 per program)
Lesser-centred statements that address: What should students know, be able to do, and become as a result of completing the program?

Measures Used to Assess Outcomes
What evidence is used by the department/program to determine whether the outcome has been achieved?
- Direct measures: such as tests, examinations, assignments, self-reports, etc.
- Indirect measures: such as surveys, focus groups, etc. of students, parents, employers, customers, etc.
- External measures: such as faculty observations, informed reports, discussions, etc.

Interpretation of Key Findings
What have you discovered about student learning in each of the intended learning outcomes areas?

Actions Taken or Planned Based on Findings
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 to the pedagogy used in the program? Please report (1) actions already taken, and/or (2) actions planned for the future. Provide relevant examples.

EXAMPLE:
Apply literary criticism in the traditions of the discipline.

EXAMPLE:
Review sample of entry-level assignments from XYZ 150 using a rubric—establishes baseline.
Review sample of final projects from XYZ 450 by program faculty to consider course and program revisions.

EXAMPLE:
The sample of graduating projects did not show as much growth as expected. We expected to see more students achieving mastery on this PLO. Approximately 50% of the graduating seniors were mastering this outcome—we are targeting 65%.

EXAMPLE:
After reviewing the assessment results and our curriculum map, we noticed this topic was not being developed so we added PLO to XYZ 230 and XYZ 250. We expect to see a 65% of students mastering this PLO by our next PAR reporting cycle.
## 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>Program engages in little or no review of student performance on the PLOs</td>
<td>Program reviews student performance against outcomes but not on a regular or standardized basis</td>
<td>Program has a regular or established process for reviewing student performance against outcomes (i.e., institutional or program-level)</td>
<td>Program has a regular or established process for reviewing student performance against outcomes (i.e., institutional or program-level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>No curricular, instructional, or programmatic changes were made to reflect or address any identified action items from the prior PAR</td>
<td>Improvements are described and examples are provided that draw general connections to previous action plans. The program made at least one substantive curricular, 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.</td>
<td>The program implemented 1-4 curricular, instructional, or programmatic actions or next steps from its previous report. Specific improvements are described and examples are provided. Actions from the prior reports that are still in progress, were not addressed, or were eliminated or replaced are briefly described. Where applicable, newly introduced actions (i.e., other improvements made based on assessment of student learning) were identified and clear rationale for their introduction was provided.</td>
<td>The program implemented 1-4 curricular, instructional, or programmatic actions or next steps from its previous report. Specific improvements are described and examples are provided. Actions from the prior reports that are still in progress, were not addressed, or were eliminated or replaced are briefly described. Where applicable, newly introduced actions (i.e., other improvements made based on assessment of student learning) were identified and clear rationale for their introduction was 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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Program has not mapped the connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum.</td>
<td>- Map does not identify degrees of emphasis placed on PLOs in the relevant courses. The level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses.</td>
<td>- US Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- US Programs Only: Program has identified connections between the five core University Learning Outcomes and its curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous Improvement</th>
<th>Curriculum Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No curriculum, instructional, or programmatic changes were made</strong></td>
<td><strong>No curriculum map was provided</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No reflection on action items from the prior PAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>A limited number of FLOs are mapped to multiple learning opportunities in the curriculum OR all of the FLOs are mapped to only one required course or experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Limited description or examples of how any action plan has had an impact on the program's development or performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>- A majority of the FLOs are mapped to multiple learning outcomes in the curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- The program did not make at least one substantive curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change</strong></td>
<td><strong>- The program has identified connections between the five core university learning outcomes and its curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed</strong></td>
<td><strong>- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review have not been addressed</strong></td>
<td><strong>- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Improvements are described and examples are provided that show general connections to previous action plans</strong></td>
<td><strong>- The program does not identify degree of emphasis placed on FLOs in the relevant courses OR the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- The program makes at least one substantive curriculum, instructional, or programmatic change</strong></td>
<td><strong>- The program has identified connections between the five core university learning outcomes and its curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Clear rationale is not provided for newly identified actions</strong></td>
<td><strong>- 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</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Gaps or challenges to the assessment process identified in the last report may not be fully addressed</strong></td>
<td><strong>- Actions from the prior report that are still in progress, were not addressed, or were eliminated/replaced are briefly described</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Ratings of No Evidence or Beginning from the last review were not specifically addressed (i.e., actions were taken to move the program forward)</strong></td>
<td><strong>- Where applicable, newly introduced actions (i.e., improvements made based on assessment of student learning) were identified and clear rationale for their introduction was provided</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Curriculum map demonstrates a pattern of courses that fosters student achievement of each FLO. Curriculum map identifies the degree of emphasis placed on FLOs in the relevant courses OR defines the level of competency students will achieve in mapped courses.*

*Other learning experiences (e.g., internships, service-learning, etc.) may be identified.*

*Curriculum in the map through the narrative description may not be complete.*

*UI Programs Only. Program has identified connections between the five core university learning outcomes and its curriculum.*
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

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, worked 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

University Summary Report
2022-23 PARs

<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
  - a. Make assessment part of faculty workload, annual evaluation, and evaluation for P&T
  - b. Add evaluation to the annual review of chairs & deans regarding ongoing assessment
  - c. Have an annual meeting on PAR/ULO’s at Chairs/Leadership Council
  - d. Provide financial support for faculty workshops
  - e. Make assessment part of adjunct LOAs

#### INTEGRATE
- Departments should integrate ULO assessment into their regular meetings and program assessment
  - a. Sync with existing PAR process to ensure Gen Ed is discussed within departments
  - b. 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
  - a. Info about assessment is part of onboarding new faculty
  - b. Regular communication about ULO assessment to and front department chairs,
  - c. Communicate with students about assessment process and goals
  - d. Timely reporting of assessment results
  - e. UF sends out clear communications about what other courses in FD category have been doing

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

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

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

FACULTY

JANUARY 25
FD SURVEYS COMPLETED BY FD FACULTY

DEPTS

May 1
COURSE-LEVEL ULO REPORTS “FDRs”

UPDATED FD FACULTY SURVEY (in progress via GEC)

Questions about outcomes focus, teaching methods, and faculty communication.

- 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
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
**Program Assessment Report (PAR) Help Guide**

*Note: This document is intended to supplement the templates—Template 1 and Curriculum Map Template—for the Program Assessment Report (PAR) and serve as a tool for departments in preparing their PARs. The forms department and program are used interchangeably to reflect the various administrative structures in place. A group of peer reviewers will be using rubrics to evaluate your PAR. For a copy of the latest version of the rubric, please see the Forms section on the assessment website.*

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

**Instructions for Completing PAR Template 1 and Curriculum Map Template**

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

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

   Points to ponder: What does the department propose students to do? For example, is the program designed to produce graduates who are socially responsible citizens, pre-professionals, or teachers? Is the program to be an undergraduate or graduate school? How do your PLOs reflect your purpose?

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

4. **Engagement & Outcome:** Describe how the department determines, assesses, and shares information about student learning outcomes achievement (i.e., how does the assessment process work beyond individual courses)? What is involved? How do the department’s faculty interact around this topic? More often? How are results shared and with whom? (30 words max)

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

Some departments/programs are committees or coordinators to organize or facilitate program assessment, while others rely on the entire department or existing structures that the department students and students. Whichever way the department/program go about assessment, it is important to consider a process that involves the faculty as broadly as possible and is equally as transparent to them and carried out. This is what is meant by the term “involved process.”

Where responsibilities for a program are shared between two or more departments, such as interdisciplinary programs and secondary education, please discuss the ways in which the two areas collaborate on an/or approach program assessment.

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

b. **Strengths & Challenges:** What is going well in the assessment of this program? Are there any challenges, gaps, or areas for improvement in the assessment of this program (200 words max)?

**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