

## **A Summary of Assessment of Student Learning in Academic Programs at UW-La Crosse 1998-2005**

Compiled by

Bill Cerbin (Provost's Office), Karen Palmer McLean (SAH), Charles Martin-Stanley (CLS),  
George Arimond (EESHR), Bruce May (CBA)

July, 2005

In 1998, 2001, and 2003 each academic department at UW-La Crosse completed an assessment report describing its assessment practices (See Appendix A). In 2004 the associate deans conducted a review of these plans in their colleges. The following summary describes: 1) how each college conducted its reviews of assessment practices, 2) the "state" of assessment in academic programs, and 3) common gaps or weaknesses in program assessment.

## Summary of Assessment in Academic Programs 1998-2005

**I. The process of reviewing program assessment in the college.** Describe the process your college used to review and evaluate assessment of student outcomes in academic programs. Indicate which questionnaire your college used, who completed the questionnaires, who evaluated the results and what was done with the results (e.g., did programs receive feedback on their assessment practices).

**CLS:** The College of Liberal Studies has a college committee on assessment, with representatives from each department/program. This committee meets 2-3 times each semester. Associate Dean Martin-Stanley chairs the committee. The committee is charged with the following:

- To recommend assessment policies and guidelines
- To provide feedback to academic departments/programs on assessment issues
- To serve as a catalyst for assessment within the college and support assessment initiatives in departments/programs
- To stimulate discussion on assessment issues and promote the use of assessment results
- Serve as a resource to departments/programs on assessment issues
- Advise the Dean of the College on assessment issues
- To make referrals to appropriate assessment resources and faculty development opportunities
- Review requests for funding assessment initiatives
- Develop guidelines for the distribution of assessment funds
- Prepare an annual report on college assessment activities
- Inform departments of deadlines related to assessment issues

This academic year the CLS Assessment Committee evaluated the biennial assessment reports from 1996-1998, 1998-2001, and 2001-2004 for each department/program in the college. Using a checklist on assessment practices, the committee identified strengths, concerns, and made recommendations for each department/program (see attachment 1). Committee members were directed to share the committee's feedback with their department/program. The biennial assessment reports were also reviewed by the Associate Dean and feedback was given to departments/programs that had weaknesses in their assessment practices. Overall, the biennial assessment reports indicate a developing assessment culture in many departments/programs. The reports also document broader faculty participation in implementing assessment activities.

In order to gain a better understanding of the assessment culture in the college, the college assessment committee conducted a survey designed to measure CLS faculty perceptions of and experiences with assessment. The 15 item survey included a few items from an instrument developed by Bill Cerbin on Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in Academic Programs. Fifty-one members of the faculty in the college responded to the survey (see attachment 2). The data were analyzed by Associate Dean Martin-Stanley. The last committee meeting for the academic year was devoted to reviewing the results of the survey. Each committee member was encouraged to share the results with their department/program.

**SAH:** The SAH College Committee (9 SAH faculty members elected by their peers) received copies of all individual department/program assessment reports submitted since the last NCA on-site visit. Thus, there were three assessment reports for each program/department covering the following time period:

- 1996-1998
- 1998-2001
- 2001-2004

The College Committee reviewed the assessment reports using the 9/22/04 draft of the *Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in Academic Programs Questionnaire* developed by the University Assessment Work Group (chaired by Bill Cerbin). The College Committee then prepared letters to each program/department summarizing their feedback related to the submitted assessment plans and assessment results. These feedback letters were submitted to the NCA on-campus coordinator and are available on the campus-wide NCA website, as well as the individual program/department assessment reports. Several times the College Committee suggested that programs/departments that were still struggling with developing stronger assessment plans review the posted assessment reports prepared by other programs/departments in the College. In addition, the SAH College Committee provided feedback on the assessment rubric they used to review/critique the assessment plans.

**EESHR:** Each of the departments completed an Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Program Report on each of their undergraduate and graduate programs. The college collected these reports annually and they are housed in college files. These reports were reviewed by the Associate Dean, but were not critiqued as no college assessment criteria is currently available. The Associate Dean simply looked to see if the department made any curricular changes that originated from recommendations within the assessment outcomes report. In many, but not all cases, changes were made amongst the college's academic programs and departments.

In 2004-05 a questionnaire was distributed to and completed by Program Directors. This questionnaire titled, Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in Academic Programs Questionnaire, was collected by the Associate Dean. The Associate Dean reviewed the questionnaire responses from each program for obvious failures in the assessment process. There were no major failures. All program assessments met the basic requirements for performing an assessment. There are diversity of assessment methods and topics covered between departments. For the Associate Dean, this diversity of methods makes the process of reviewing the reliability and validity of these assessment methods difficult. Thus, only a cursory review of the methods was made. The Associate Dean acknowledge to the departments successful completion of their assessment, but did not provide feedback to the validity and reliability of their assessment methods.

**CBA:** There are three general categories of learning outcomes that are reviewed and evaluated within academic programs in the CBA. They are course learning goals, program learning goals and CBA learning goals. The course learning outcomes are reviewed and evaluated by the instructors, the overall CBA learning outcomes are reviewed and evaluated by either the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) or the Graduate Curriculum Committees (GCC), and the specific academic program outcomes are reviewed and evaluated by a combination of individuals, departmental and/or program committees depending on the program. Table 1 attached provides a summary of assessment activities from 1997-2004.

The CBA uses a variety of mechanisms to review the different assessment activities and learning outcomes within the College. For example, the MBA director and the CBA Graduate Curriculum Committee review the assessment results that are derived from the MBA one-credit assessment course. In addition, information is disseminated to faculty through different mechanisms including workshops convened to discuss the assessment procedures and results. The CBA UCC is charged with developing, implementing, and reviewing the assessment activities for the integrated knowledge of business learning outcomes. It also presents its findings at faculty meetings. The assessment activities for each undergraduate academic program are reviewed within the department through mechanisms such as departmental assessment committees and/or general department meetings. The Associate Dean also reviews the biennial assessment reports. College wide assessment results through mechanisms such as the EBI surveys are reviewed by each department and the dean's office and are available for individual faculty to review. Summary presentations of the results are presented at all faculty meetings. The faculty members and departments make adjustments mandated from issues identified in the various assessment activity results.

Two forms have been used to review assessment in the academic programs from 1998-2004. The Departments of Accountancy, Economics, and Management used the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in Academic Programs Questionnaire. The other departments used the Checklist to Evaluate Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in Academic Programs Based on Biennial Assessment Reports form. All forms were reviewed by the Associate Dean.

**II. The nature and quality of program assessment.** Use the results of the assessment questionnaire and departmental assessment reports (1996-1998, 1998-2001, and 2001-2004) to complete the table and answer the question below.

	Percentage of Programs			
	CLS	SAH	EESHR	CBA
Have someone responsible for program assessment	100%	93%	100%	100%
Use direct measures to evaluate student learning outcomes in the program	100%	81%	100%	100%
Use assessment results to try to improve the curriculum, teaching, and learning in the program	85%	69%	100%	100%

Summarize the "state" of assessment of student outcomes in academic programs in your college.

**CLS:** While the primary responsibility for assessment of student learning outcomes rests with faculty, administrators in the college play a crucial role in helping to sustain an assessment culture. Specifically, the Dean and Associate Deans have:

- Encouraged and supported outcomes assessment in departments/programs
- Encouraged departments/programs to use assessment data in programmatic decisions
- Demonstrated a commitment to assessment of student learning

- Provided resources for departments/programs and individual faculty to pursue assessment activities.

This year, three faculty members were supported by the Dean to attend an assessment workshop at UW-Parkside. Also this year, the college established criteria for allocating tenure-track faculty positions. One of these criteria requires the use of assessment tools and other evidence to justify a position request. At the beginning of the academic year, the Dean encouraged the college's core curriculum committee to utilize assessment data in its decision making. Each of the aforementioned examples provides evidence of the many ways the college's administrative leadership helps to sustain a culture of assessment within the college.

In general, most departments/programs in the college are doing a good job with assessment. However, there is variability across the college and room for improvement. It is apparent that there is a culture of assessment that is now imbedded in most of the departments/programs in the college. Since 1996 there has been considerably more assessment data collected. It is clear from the 2001-2004 biennial reports that more implementation has occurred and this has resulted in more useful assessment data. Most departments/programs in the college have developed measurable objectives for each of the program's student learning goals. In addition, most departments/programs have both direct and indirect methods to assess learning outcomes (see attachment 3).

**SAH:** The Health Science programs continue to be leading the way in terms of developing quality assessment plans that are being used to determine needed curricular changes. The College also has several departments that have made great progress over the last few years in terms of developing stronger assessment plans. For the past two years the College has supported individuals attending the national assessment conference held at IUPUI. These individuals from some of the basic science departments have then served as "assessment consultants" to their home departments as well as to other science departments that are trying to improve their assessment plans. Finally, the College has two departments that have made little progress in developing/improving their assessment plans over the past seven years. In one case, it appears that the department does not value the process of assessment while the other department has struggled due to many changes in leadership over the past five years.

**EESHR:** No summary

**CBA:** Assessment is generally the responsibility of the department in which the program is located. Departments report assessment activities in their annual reports which are reviewed by the Dean's office. The annual reports indicate that all departments engage in assessment activities. Each program, with the exception of International Business (I-B) and the MBA, is part of a department. The management department has three tracks, finance has two tracks, and the rest of the departments have one track. Assessment of the I-B program is the responsibility of the International Business Advisory Committee which is comprised of one member from each department. The IB program, which is relatively new, is scheduled for full review in 2006.

The MBA program is reviewed and evaluated by the GCC. In 2002 the MBA program was revised and a team teaching approach was implemented. In addition, a one credit assessment course was required of all students. Two different instructors have taught the course, each using a different assessment method for student learning outcomes. The evaluation the outcomes was reviewed by graduate faculty members but a single assessment method has not been implemented. The program is scheduled for a three year review starting in fall 2005. The review will include evaluation of student learning outcomes.

The CBA has processes for developing and reviewing CBA goals. They include creating and revising basic documents including the CBA undergraduate learning goals and the graduate learning outcomes. These criteria are reviewed periodically by CBA committees. Changes to either document must be approved by the CBA.

The CBA also collects college-wide data. Since 1999 the CBA has been using EBI (Educational Benchmarking Inc.) as part of its assessment strategy. EBI is an organization that provides high quality benchmarking assessment tools to educational institutions in support of their assessment and continuous improvement efforts. The full EBI results are located the CBA Dean's office. The CBA uses EBI to perform surveys of exiting seniors and graduates.

Significant milestones during the 1998-2004 timeframe were our AACSB International re-accreditation in 2002 and our Academic Program Review in 2004.

**III. Gaps in program assessment.** Describe the two or three most significant weaknesses or problems in program assessment in the college.

**CLS:** Some of the challenges we continue to face in sustaining an assessment culture are lack of adequate resources, failure to consistently use assessment data in decision making, and increasing faculty buy-in for the importance of assessment. In addition, not all departments/programs are demonstrating a commitment to the assessment process. Some departments/programs are not engaged in assessment practices that get at the core of measuring student learning outcomes. The college assessment committee has discussed each of these challenges and has identified strategies to address them.

**SAH:**

- Assessment is the responsibility of a single person as opposed to a broader group of faculty in the program/department. Assessment results are not discussed by the entire program/department faculty on a regular basis
- Those programs/departments that teach many gen ed students do not have a means to assess the learning outcomes of those gen ed courses. Instead, they only described assessment of their majors (and in some departments this is a small fraction of their workload relative to the gen ed workload).
- Programs/departments have not developed mechanisms to share assessment results with their students.

**EESHR**

- The departments are performing their assessment duties, but the higher levels of university (i.e. college level and higher) need to provide their input into the process. They also need to perform their own assessment within their offices and measure how their offices are impacting (positively or negatively) the curriculums within the respective academic programs and academic departments.
- There is still some confusion as to what types of evaluation measures are most appropriate. What are needed are inexpensive, time-efficient methods that provide acceptable levels of measurement accuracy. However, few Program Directors are sufficiently familiar enough with evaluation methodology to create inexpensive, time-efficient, accurate assessment methods. In addition, Program Directors change frequently and often newly appointed Program Directors have little or no knowledge on academic assessment methodology. To effectively solve this problem, the university has to offer training on annual basis, which is costly and places another time consuming task upon the newly appointed Program Directors. Some departments use a curriculum committee to coordinate these processes, but there seems to be a similar rapid change over in the leadership of the committee.

**CBA**

Gap 1: Culture and climate for assessment needs improvement. Although departmental and college wide data is collected there is no college wide, and in some cases, department wide comprehensive plans for full evaluation of the assessment cycle and full discussion among faculty. Even though all programs engage in assessment activities, the programs tend to be uneven within and across some departments and programs. Initiatives to improve assessment have been negatively impacted by dwindling resources and loss of faculty positions. Although assessment reports are completed and filed many faculty are not aware of what assessment is taking place beyond the courses they teach. Some of the lack of information is self-imposed while other aspects relate to instructor lack of assessment training, limited dissemination, and limited opportunities for discussion. There is no college wide committee or mechanism to focus on solely on assessment. Efforts to establish college wide mechanisms are under discussion but a strategy has not been fully developed. There is also a tendency to focus on “good news” in reporting assessment efforts. Some individuals seem to be uncertain about the commitment of the department, college, or university to assessment.

Gap 2: Assessment of student learning in the MBA and IB programs and college wide learning outcomes needs improvement. The International Business (IB) major and the MBA program are not housed in departments and their learning goals and assessment are accomplished by committees. Further, some of the overall CBA learning outcomes, such as the integrated knowledge of business, are assessed by a college-wide committee that is charged with overall undergraduate curriculum matters. The committees meet periodically and address assessment issues as part of their duties. Although members of the committees engage in valuable dialogue, the dialogue tends not to result in implementations of cohesive assessment plans and efforts and evaluation. Because assessment issues are only part of their duties the amount of time devoted to assessment varies depending on other issues for action. Further, committee membership and chairs of the committee often change from year to year and the committee work flow is broken by summer, fall and spring terms. This leads to incomplete assessment of the learning goals in those areas where the program is not housed in a department.

Gap 3: Completion of concluding steps of assessment cycle. Departments, colleges, and the university all require annual reports of assessment activities. Although assessment report are completed, reviewed, and evaluated, the full assessment cycle (test, evaluate, change, retest) is sometimes not fully evaluated. The test and evaluate processes of the assessment cycle are generally completed, the “change” and “retest” steps are not fully documented because they span a period that is greater than a year.

**Appendix A: Biennial Assessment Report Form completed by each Academic Program in 1998, 2001, and 2003.**

Biennial Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Program Report  
Due (*Date*) in the Dean’s Office

Academic Program: Undergraduate\_\_\_ Graduate \_\_\_

Department:

	January ( <i>Year</i> ) —June ( <i>Year</i> )
Who is responsible for conducting assessment in the department/program?	
Identify the occasions at which department/program faculty discuss assessment results.	
Identify the STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES you measured.	
Describe the DIRECT MEASURES used to evaluate student learning.	
Describe the INDIRECT MEASURES used to evaluate student learning.	

1. Summarize the major findings and results of assessment from January (*Year*) through June (*Year*).
2. Identify and explain specific actions intended to improve student learning and program quality undertaken by the department/program in response to the results of DIRECT MEASURES of student learning.
3. Identify and explain specific actions intended to improve student learning and program quality undertaken by the department/program in response to the results of INDIRECT MEASURES of student learning.

## Appendix B: Academic Program Assessment Questionnaires used by Colleges to Evaluate Assessment Practices in their Programs from 1998-2005

### Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Questionnaire for Academic Programs<sup>1</sup>

**Background and rationale for the assessment questionnaire.** In 1995 UWL instituted a requirement for assessment of student outcomes in all undergraduate and graduate programs, including general education. The impetus for assessment started with the North Central Association (NCA) which expects institutions to use assessment results to improve the quality of student learning, teaching, the curriculum, and overall program quality. Also, in 1995 the Faculty Senate approved a university Assessment Plan which set broad guidelines for assessment in academic departments. Since then, departments have completed brief biennial reports that describe how they conduct and use assessment.

Assessment as a tool for improvement of program quality continues to be an institutional priority. But, assessment also continues to pose challenges for departments and programs. This survey is intended to assess assessment practices at UWL. The questionnaire asks you about current assessment practices in your program or programs and how those practices have changed during the past eight years. To help you look back on your program's assessment we have enclosed copies of your biennial reports from 1998, 2001 and 2003.

The questionnaire results will be used in the following ways:

1. To help improve assessment practices at UWL. This information can help identify areas that need improvement as well as examples of assessment that work well.
2. To provide evidence about assessment of student learning outcomes for the UWL re-accreditation Self Study. The North Central Association (NCA) carefully examines how academic programs use assessment to make improvements in teaching, learning, curriculum and overall program quality. The results of the questionnaire will be used by the NCA Steering Committee as an exhibit about assessment practices at UWL.

---

<sup>1</sup> Instrument developed by the UWL Assessment Work Group. Used by SAH, EESHR, and some programs in CBA in 2004-2005 to evaluate assessment of student learning outcomes in academic programs.

## Glossary of Assessment Terms

A **Learning Outcome** is the knowledge, skills, abilities, values, or dispositions that students should attain as a result of educational experiences. Learning outcomes can be specified for individual class periods, courses and for entire programs and departments. Learning outcomes are defined in terms of student knowledge, skills and abilities. An example of a learning outcome for a department is, “Students will be able to write with clarity and precision using the stylistic conventions of the discipline.” Or, “Students will be able to analyze complex problems in terms of several theoretical perspectives in the discipline.”

**Departmental learning outcomes** refers to the department-wide or program-wide knowledge, skills, abilities, values, dispositions students should attain as a results of study in the department or program. These are outcomes that apply to all students in the program.

**Direct Measures of Student Learning** are first hand accounts of student performance with respect to departmental learning outcomes. A direct measure is one in which students demonstrate what they know and are able to do. Examples of direct measures include portfolio reviews, comprehensive examinations, work completed in a capstone experience, juried reviews of senior projects, systematic evaluations of students in internships, and any work students do that is evaluated by faculty collectively to judge students’ progress with respect to program outcomes (in contrast to outcomes of individual instructors). Direct Measures collect evidence of actual student learning toward the program’s learning outcomes.

**Indirect Measures of Student Learning** are proxies of student achievement such as job placement data, or opinions expressed at exit interviews, or on surveys of students, alumni, and/or employers. Think of indirect measures as second hand accounts of what students know or are able to do. For example, students’ opinions about what they have learned would be indirect measures, in contrast to an evaluation of senior projects which would be a direct measure of learning.

The key difference between a direct and indirect measure is whether the judgment is based on an actual observation of student performance related to the program learning outcome. For example, an internship supervisor or employer may conduct a performance evaluation of a student or former student. The measure is direct if the evaluation includes direct evidence of the person’s performance related to specific outcomes. In contrast, the measure is indirect if the evaluation is based on impressions, global opinion or second hand sources of information. This difference is more apparent if you consider assessing student performance in an academic program by using senior portfolios and senior focus groups. The portfolios contain multiple examples of student work related to program outcomes and several instructors evaluate these using a common rubric. The portfolio review is a direct measure. The senior focus groups involve discussions by students about what they have learned in the program. Rich as the information might be the focus group is an indirect measure.

**Non-Measures of Student Learning.** The North Central Association, which accredits UWL, considers some types of data to be NON-Measures of Student Learning. These include Grades, GPA, curriculum reviews and any other source of information that does not provide evidence of what students actually learn or acquire as a result of study in an academic programs. For example, Grades and GPA are not “adequate or reliable measures of student learning” across a program. Further, grades and GPA “tell us very little about what a student has actually learned in a course and very little about what a student actually knows or what that student’s competencies or talents really are.” Another reason is that grades are based upon judgments that include more than an evaluation of what a student learned (e.g., whether work was handed in on time, attendance, etc.). Curriculum reviews are non-measures of learning because they do not indicate what students learn as a result of completing a curriculum.

## Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in Academic Programs Questionnaire

DEPARTMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ PROGRAM NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

**DIRECTIONS.** This questionnaire is about assessment practices in your academic program(s). It should be completed by an individual who has been involved in assessment of student learning outcomes in the specified program. Completion of the questions could be a group effort but we want only one completed questionnaire from each program. Attached to the questionnaire is a glossary that defines assessment terminology used in the questionnaire.

Circle the best answer:

1. The department or program has clearly defined student learning outcomes for its majors.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
2. The department or program learning outcomes are linked explicitly to the university mission  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
3. The department or program communicates its learning outcomes to students.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
4. The department or program expects instructors to address learning outcomes in their courses.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
5. Instructors in the program discuss how to address departmental or program learning outcomes in their courses.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
6. Instructors address departmental learning outcomes explicitly in their courses.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
7. Students tend to be unaware of departmental learning outcomes.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
8. Students tend to understand how their courses address departmental learning outcomes.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
9. Students tend to understand departmental learning outcomes as complex competencies to work towards.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
10. The assessment instruments used by the program measure the departmental/program learning outcomes  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
11. The department or program uses indirect measures to evaluate learning  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
12. The department or program uses direct measures to evaluate departmental student learning outcomes  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
13. The department uses "non-measures" of student learning in its program assessment  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
14. The department or program distributes assessment results to its faculty.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
15. The department or program distributes assessment results to its students.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
16. The department or program distributes assessment results to its alumni.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment

17. The department or program schedules time for instructors to discuss assessment results collectively.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
18. Instructors analyze and discuss assessment results collectively.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
19. Departmental discussions focus on how to use assessment results to improve the quality of teaching, learning and the curriculum.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
20. The department or program has used assessment results on one or two occasions to make decisions intended to improve teaching, learning and the curriculum.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
21. The department or program incorporates assessment results regularly into decisions about how to improve teaching, learning and the curriculum.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
22. Instructors use assessment results to improve their teaching or courses.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
23. Students receive minimal feedback about their performance on departmental learning outcomes.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
24. Students receive substantive feedback about their performance on departmental learning outcomes.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
25. Students use feedback to monitor and assess their progress toward departmental learning outcomes.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
26. Students tend to view participation in assessment as a way to learn about their academic progress  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
27. Students tend to view participation in assessment as a way to help the department improve the quality of its programs.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
28. There is strong support among faculty for doing assessment  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
29. There is a procedure in the department to determine who is responsible for conducting assessment each year.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
30. Instructors delegate one or two individuals to handle assessment for the department.  
a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment

**Improvement of assessment since 1996.** In 1996 UWL was required by NCA to complete a special report indicating how each undergraduate and graduate academic program conducted assessment of student achievement and used the results to enhance teaching, learning and the curriculum. Since then UWL has used brief assessment reports to document assessment practices on a biennial basis. Copies of your reports are attached to the questionnaire. Based on the information in these reports, as well as other departmental records please answer the following questions about changes in assessment practices since 1996.

**Since 1996 the department or program has**

31. improved its assessment practices  
 a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
32. revised or refined its departmental/program learning outcomes  
 a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
33. measured all of its departmental/program learning outcomes  
 a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
34. improved the adequacy of its assessment instruments  
 a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
35. improved the way it uses assessment results  
 a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
36. learned something important about its students from assessment.  
 a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
37. made a significant improvement in some aspect or program quality (e.g., teaching, learning, curriculum) as a direct result of assessment.  
 a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment
38. adopted a procedure to inform and involve newly hired faculty members in assessment  
 a. strongly agree    b. agree    c. neutral    d. disagree    e. strongly disagree    f. no basis for judgment

Please include any comments about your evaluation.

Please provide feedback on the questionnaire. Recommend any changes that would make the questionnaire more complete, and easier to understand and use.

## Checklist to Evaluate Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in Academic Programs Based on Biennial Assessment Reports for 1996-1998, 1998-2001, and 2001-2004.<sup>2</sup>

Evaluation Team: \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ Program Evaluated \_\_\_\_\_

### Responsibility for Departmental Assessment

	1998	2001	2004
1. A faculty committee was responsible for departmental assessment	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__
2. A single individual was responsible for departmental assessment	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__
3. All members of the department were responsible for assessment	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__
4. It is not clear who was responsible for departmental assessment	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__

Comments:

### Departmental Learning Outcomes

1. The department identified student learning outcomes for the major Yes\_\_ No\_\_ Yes\_\_ No\_\_ Yes\_\_ No\_\_

Comments:

### Assessment Methods

The department used

- |   |            |            |            |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| 1. direct measures to evaluate departmental student learning outcomes   | Yes__ No__ | Yes__ No__ | Yes__ No__ |
| 2. indirect measures to evaluate departmental student learning outcomes | Yes__ No__ | Yes__ No__ | Yes__ No__ |
| 3. neither direct or indirect measures to evaluate learning outcomes    | Yes__ No__ | Yes__ No__ | Yes__ No__ |

Comments:

### Assessment Results

	1998	2001	2004
1. The department summarized results of their assessment	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__

Comments:

### Use of Assessment Results

- |   |            |            |            |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| 1. The department set aside time for faculty to discuss assessment results.   | Yes__ No__ | Yes__ No__ | Yes__ No__ |
| 2. The department used assessment results to make decisions intended to improve the quality of teaching, learning, and/or the curriculum. | Yes__ No__ | Yes__ No__ | Yes__ No__ |

Comments:

---

<sup>2</sup> Checklist developed by CLS and some CBA programs in 2004-2005 to evaluate assessment of student learning outcomes in academic programs.

**Improvement of Assessment**

Since 1996 the department has

- 1. revised or refined its departmental learning outcomes
- 2. not measured its departmental learning outcomes
- 3. measured some departmental learning outcomes
- 4. measured all of its departmental learning outcomes
- 5. documented student achievement with respect to the departmental learning outcomes
- 6. used assessment results each year to make changes to improve the quality of teaching, learning and/or the curriculum
- 7. used assessment results at least one time to make changes to improve the quality of teaching, learning, and/or the curriculum

Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__
Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__
Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__
Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__
Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__
Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__
Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__	Yes__ No__

**Recommendations:**