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# **Executive Summary**

Over the last two semesters, LCC Programs of Study reported program-level learning outcomes, methods of assessment, and connections from program-level learning outcomes to a common set of institutional learning outcomes. This evidence was analyzed by the Center for Data Science (CDS) and Committee for Assessing Student Learning (CASL) to gain insight into:

* How we align program curriculums to a common set of institutional learning outcomes
* What we expect our students to learn and to what degree
* How we assess our students’ learning throughout a curriculum
* How well those assessment methods are aligned to our learning expectations
* How our students respond to our methods of assessment, and
* How well our students are performing with our student learning expectations

The results provide evidence for over three-quarters of Programs of Study reporting alignment between program curriculum and institutional learning outcomes. Of the possible four institutional-level learning outcomes, LCC places the greatest curriculum emphasis on the development of students’ intellectual and practical skills, followed by integrative and applied learning. LCC students are expected to apply and transfer these intellectual and practical skills inside and outside the classroom. Faculty use this teaching practice to allow students to continually apply the knowledge, skills, abilities, and values that were learned in the classroom to other contexts, such as at home or work. LCC faculty continue this authentic approach to teaching and learning by using primarily performance-based assessment methods that are aligned to program-level learning outcomes. Performance-based assessments give students opportunity to demonstrate their learning by solving problems, making decisions, using critical thinking, creating, and producing learning artifacts with real world application.

A summary of the assessment findings follows:

**Finding 1:** 78% of LCC Programs of Study report curriculum alignment to a common set of institutional learning outcomes

**Finding 2**: LCC Program of Study curriculums place the greatest emphasis on student development of intellectual and practical skills.

**Finding 3**: Most LCC Programs of Study report program-level learning outcomes for associate-level awards.

**Finding 4**: About half of A&S and HHS Program of Study learning outcomes require students to use moderate-level cognitive skills, with the greatest emphasis on applying or transferring learning from the classroom to other contexts.

**Finding 5**: Most LCC Programs of Study are assessing learning outcomes across the curriculum.

**Finding 6**: LCC faculty use performance-based assessments to assess students’ learning across the curriculums.

**Finding 7**: Over three-quarters of assessment methods selected by LCC faculty are aligned to the Program of Study learning outcome statement.

**Finding 8**: Students report frequent use of assessment practices by LCC faculty.

# **Assessment Scorecard**



*Legend:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Results are on or over the established target. |
|  | Results are under the established target, but within range. These results are monitored and improved. |
|  | Results are under the established target and require urgent attention. |

# **LCC Assessment Results**

## Institutional-Level Assessment Results

***Finding 1:*** *78% of LCC Programs of Study report curriculum alignment to a common set of institutional learning outcomes.*

LCC adopted the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) four essential learning outcomes (ELOs) as institutional outcomes. ELOs describe LCC’s shared outcomes of student learning with 78% of our Programs of Study identifying how they uniquely contribute to preparing students for twenty-first-century challenges. Our result is currently below a benchmark of 85% of AAC&U member institutions that report “a common set of intended learning outcomes for all undergraduate students” (AAC&U, 2016).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIVISION** | **AAC&U Member Institutions** | **LCC Programs of Study Reporting Links to ELOs** | **LCC Total** |
| Arts & Sciences  | $\geq $ 85% | 65% (43/66) | **78%** (83/106) |
| Technical Careers | $\geq $ 85% | 100% (32/32) |
| Health & Human Services | $\geq $ 85% | 100% (8/8) |

***Finding 2****: LCC Program of Study curriculums place the greatest emphasis on student development of intellectual and practical skills.*

LCC faculty prepare students for 21st century challenges by designing and teaching curriculums that align program level learning outcomes with institutional level learning outcomes. This approach allows students to progressively develop deeper learning of each institutional level outcome with the following percentage of curriculum aligned to each institutional learning outcome: 44% of learning outcomes aligned to ELO 1: Knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world; 59% of learning outcomes aligned to ELO 2: Intellectual and practical skills; 39% of learning outcomes aligned to ELO 3: Personal and social responsibility; and, 53% of learning outcomes aligned to ELO 4: Integrative and applied learning.

The following table shows the percentage of LCC curriculum aligned to each institutional learning outcome.

The following are examples of how LCC faculty integrates LCC’s institutional learning outcomes across Program of Study curriculums.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institutional Learning Outcome** | Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World | Intellectual and Practical Skills | Personal and Social Responsibility | Integrative and Applied Learning |
| **Curriculum Design Examples** | * Engaging students with big questions, both contemporary and enduring
 | * Provide opportunities to practice skills extensively across the Program of Study curriculum
* Provide progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance
 | * Provide real-world challenges
* Encourage and provide opportunities for active involvement with diverse communities
 | * Connect and synthesize learning across the curriculum
* Provide extensive opportunities for the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems
 |

*Adapted from LEAP Executive Summary, 2008*

## Program-Level Assessment Results

***Finding 3****: Most LCC Programs of Study report program-level learning outcomes for associate-level awards.*

Program-level learning outcomes define what we expect students to achieve in the Program of Study. In the Fall 2015 semester, **86%** of all LCC Programs of Study reported program-level learning outcomes that defined what LCC students can be expected to know or do when they complete the Program of Study. Our result is above a benchmark of 85% of AAC&U member institutions that report program-level learning outcomes.

Results reflect the number of Programs of Study that offer associate-level awards divided by the number of Programs of Study reporting program-level student learning outcomes.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIVISION** | **AAC&U Member Institutions** | **Programs of Study Reporting Learning Outcomes** | **LCC Total** |
| Arts & Sciences  | $\geq $ 85% | 77% (51/66) | **86%** (91/106) |
| Technical Careers | $\geq $ 85% | 100% (32/32) |
| Health & Human Services | $\geq $ 85% | 100% (8/8) |

***Finding 4****: About half of A&S and HHS Program of Study learning outcomes require students to use moderate-level cognitive skills, with the greatest emphasis on applying or transferring learning from the classroom to other contexts.*

Each reported learning outcome was analyzed to demonstrate the learning expectations of LCC students as defined by faculty. Bloom’s Taxonomy was used to classify the level of cognition identified for each outcome.

**Cognitive Skills Required of LCC Students**

Moderate Level Cognition = 53%

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Lower Cognitive Skill Levels** | **Higher Cognitive Skill Levels** |
| Knowledge | Comprehension | Application | Analysis | Synthesis | Evaluation |
| 12% | 12% | 45% | 8% | 14% | 9% |
| **69%** | **31%** |

***Finding 5****: Most LCC Programs of Study are assessing learning outcomes across the curriculum.*

LCC faculty is assessing **88%** of the program level and institutional level learning outcomes. Faculty use both formative and summative assessment to ensure progressive learning that helps students to meet program level and institutional level learning outcomes. Our result is higher than a benchmark of 87% of AAC&U member institutions that report assessing learning outcomes across the curriculum.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIVISION** | **AAC&U Member Institutions** | **% Assessment Methods Reported** | **LCC Total** |
| Arts & Sciences  | $\geq $ 87% | 84% (251/300) | **88%** (346/395) |
| Technical Careers | $\geq $ 87% | 100% (32/32) |
| Health & Human Services | $\geq $ 87% | 100% (63/63) |

***Finding 6****: LCC faculty primarily use performance-based assessments to assess students’ learning across the curriculums.*

Authentic, or performance-based assessments, require students to be active participants in their learning by demonstrating knowledge, skills, abilities, and learning processes. Some examples of how LCC faculty may use performance-based testing in the classroom include:

* Projects that enable the use of critical thinking, problem solving, and decision-making skills
* Capstones to assess the students’ achievement of program-level learning outcomes
* Portfolios that showcase collections of students’ work and demonstrate learning progression throughout the curriculum
* Demonstrations that give students the opportunity to show their mastery of the learning content

**Use of Performance-Based Assessment by Division**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIVISION** | **% Performance-Based Assessment** | **% Non-Performance-Based Assessment** | **LCC Total** |
| Arts & Sciences  | 81% | 19% | **83%** **Performance-Based Assessment** |
| Technical Careers | 100% | 0% |
| Health & Human Services | 96% | 4% |

The following table shows the methods of assessment that are used across the curriculums by LCC faculty and the percentage of use for each method of assessment.

**Types and Percentage of Use of LCC Assessment Methods**

\*Other assessment methods include: Presentations 3%; Clinical Evaluation 3%; Role Play/Group 2%; Case Study 2%; Jury 2%.

**Top Assessment Method(s) by Division**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Arts & Sciences**  | **Technical Careers** | **Health & Human Services** |
| Project **(29%)**  | Capstone **(100%)** | Demonstration **(40%)**  |
| Exam/Quiz/Test **(19%)**  |  | Clinical Evaluation **(19%)**  |
| Portfolio **(9%)** |  | Observation **(9%)** |

***Finding 7****: Over three-quarters of assessment methods selected by LCC faculty are aligned to the Program of Study learning outcome statement.*

Most of the assessment methods selected by faculty are aligned to the learning outcome statement. This may be interpreted as the selected type of assessment is matched to the learning expectations of students. Research demonstrates when there is an alignment between the learning outcome and the assessment method, students show evidence of deeper learning and an increase in skill development. Likewise, when students perceive this alignment, they perceive their learning to be more authentic (Gulikers, et al., 2006).

Each cognitive level and assessment type was analyzed to determine the match rate. The match rate is determined by analyzing the possible number of learning outcome statements divided by the number of aligned outcomes. The highest cognition level and highest assessment type was used in the analysis. The following table shows the percentage of match by Division and for LCC total.

**Percentage of Match Between Assessment Method and Learning Outcome**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIVISION** | **% Match** | **% Not Matched** | **LCC Total** |
| Arts & Sciences  | 69% (207/300) | 31% (93/300) | **76%** (299/395) |
| Technical Careers | 100% (32/32) | 0% (0/0) |
| Health & Human Services | 95% (60/63) | 5% (3/63) |

## Course-Level Assessment Results

***Finding 8****: LCC students report frequent use of assessment practices by LCC faculty.*

Student perceptions of assessment may act as learning motivators. For example, formative assessment used in the classroom gives students timely performance feedback allowing for en-route correction, deeper learning, and increased skill development. Further, research demonstrates a relationship between student perceptions of assessment authenticity and learning outcomes, as, for example, students who perceive connections between the learning task, the learning context, and the assessment method, achieve improved learning outcomes (Gulikers, et al., 2006).

The following chart displays means of student responses from a course questionnaire using a Likert scale of (5) Almost Always (4) Frequently (3) Sometimes (2) Occasionally (1) Hardly Ever.

## Pilot Studies Results

With evidence of what LCC students are expected to learn and the ways faculty go about assessing learning, the assessment plan moved into the next phase of understanding how well LCC students are meeting these learning expectations and how faculty go about using that understanding to improve student learning outcomes. Ten Programs of Study are participating in pilot studies that began in the Spring, 2016 semester with intent of planning, collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and using student learning evidence. The participating Programs of Study, the learning evidence that is being collected, the data collection strategy, and results are noted in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program of Study** | **Learning Evidence** | **Data Collection Strategy** | **Results** |
| **Biology**  | Biology program review follow-up meeting 4/1/16 w Director of Institutional Research & Director of Assessment  |  |  |
| **Center for Transitional Learning**  | Assessment study workshops starting 3/15/16 w Director of Assessment & Data Scientist  |  |  |
| **Community Health Service Education**  | Program Review, Spring, 2016 |  |  |
| **Fashion**  | The ability to sketch is a critical skill that is applied throughout the Fashion Studies curriculum. Fashion faculty note if a student struggles with this skill early in the program, the deficit compounds as the student progresses through the curriculum.  | A data collection worksheet was developed collaboratively with Fashion faculty to develop outcomes, units of measurement, data collection strategy, use of data, and management & communication. Faculty have set a schedule of submitting results at mid-term & finals week to one faculty member who is coordinating Fashion’s data collection efforts. | Course Level results will be submitted at the end of the Spring, 2016 semester by faculty data collection coordinator.  |
| **History**  | Faculty is creating opportunities to increase faculty participation in implementing discipline-specific teaching best practices in the classroom. Faculty host regular Best Practice Workshops & are measuring the effectiveness across course, program, & institutional levels.  | A data collection worksheet was developed collaboratively with History faculty to develop outcomes, units of measurement, data collection strategy, use of data, and management & communication. | Course Level results will be submitted at the end of the Spring, 2016 semester by Program Faculty ChairProgram Level: Fall, 2017Institutional Level: Spring, 2018 |
| **Rad Tech**  | While graduates of the Rad Tech program consistently pass certification exams, the faculty recognized trend data showing a decline in annual pass rates, and that may affect future 5-year pass rates. | A data collection worksheet was developed collaboratively with Rad Tech faculty to develop outcomes, units of measurement, data collection strategy, use of data, and management & communication. | Course Level results will be submitted at the end of the Spring, 2016 semester by a faculty data collection coordinator. Program Level: Fall, 2017Institutional Level: Spring, 2018 |
| **Real Estate** | BUSN/Real Estate program review follow-up meeting 3/11/16 w Director of Institutional Research & Director of Assessment |  |  |
| **Speech**  | Director of Assessment and Speech faculty member coordinated to derive context-specific assessment success case  | Interviews with Speech faculty member and data coordinator to learn data collection strategies, systems, and processes  | Course Level results will be submitted at the end of the Spring, 2016 semester by a faculty data collection coordinator. |
| **Surg Tech**  | The diversity of the program applicants is a concern of the Surg Tech faculty member. He requested support in outreach efforts to reach diverse student populations as potential candidates to the program of study.  | The Surg Tech faculty member assembled a support team to address outreach to diverse student populations  | Surg Tech faculty member will collaborate with CDS to develop measurement & data collection strategies, Spring-Fall, 2016 |
| **Writing/English**  | WRIT/ENGL faculty engaged in pilot studies to test assessment methods. The faculty are now working to identify the method most appropriate with taking these lessons learned and using a collaborative decision approach Data Ambassador Meetings: 3/2 & between 04/22-05/09; Assessment Workshops: 03/04; 03/18; 04/08; 04/22  |  |  |

*Examples of Good Practice – Speech Communication*

The Speech Communication program follows a student learning assessment practice of *every student, every outcome, every semester*. To address the time and effort needed for measuring all student learning, Speech Communication developed an efficient system for capturing, managing, analyzing, and using student learning data.

Faculty record formative and summative assessment results into a template housed in Dropbox. This allows for all faculty to submit data to a central location and for a key point data ambassador within the program to manage and analyze student learning data. Student learning data is analyzed at a minimum, at the end of every semester, with results shared and action plans negotiated with all faculty. To maintain their focus on using student learning results for improvement, the Speech Communication faculty keep student learning assessment as an ongoing agenda item for every department meeting.

# **Assessment Plan Development**

LCC revisions to the assessment plan began Fall, 2015 with the intent ofdesigning, implementing, and evaluating a systematic assessment plan that provides strategic direction for our efforts and resources aimed at continuous improvement of student learning. We use a continuous monitoring and evaluation approach to receive en-route, timely measurement of student learning outcomes and feedback about how LCC assessment contributes to our goal of student success.

CASL members built upon the existing LCC assessment plan (dated 2012) to design an updated plan. The plan was designed in collaboration with faculty members and administrators seeking a practical and integrated approach to student learning assessment. CASL members gathered feedback from faculty and administrators through 1:1 meetings, professional development activities, and the use of the SharePoint system that offered opportunities for a shared collaboration in the design, utility, and feasibility of the new assessment plan. CASL provided feedback using an Assessment Plan Feedback Rubric that assessed the completeness and quality of the LCC Assessment Plan. The rubric was designed in alignment with LCC’s strategic goals and criteria that corresponds to Criteria Four: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement. Feedback was then used to make modifications to the Assessment Plan design prior to Academic Senate review.

CASL members then submitted the updated plan to the Academic Senate for review, feedback, and approval in the Spring, 2016 semester. Feedback regarding the design is incorporated and the revised assessment plan is shared with the larger LCC community by posting LCC’s assessment plan to the CASL webpage on the lcc.edu public website and through presentations.

**Assessment Process**

Throughout the Fall, 2015 semester, all Programs of Study were requested to identify, document, and share Program of Study student learning outcomes statements, methods of assessment for student learning outcomes statements, and 2-year mastery levels. Supported by attendance to the HLC Assessment Workshop in St. Charles, IL during the summer of 2105, CASL developed a Program of Study Learning Outcomes Template to guide the process of mapping Program of Study learning outcomes with course and institutional learning outcomes. The template also provided space to identify the assessment method(s) for learning outcomes and the 2-year mastery level (i.e. introduce, reinforce, master). Programs of Study submitted completed templates to LCC’s SharePoint system. This provided a central location to report and maintain Program of Study learning outcomes. The templates were then divided up among CASL members for review. CASL feedback is then incorporated into the Program Review cycle.

To prepare for analysis of the completed templates, CASL developed a rubric to assess the completeness and quality of learning outcomes statements and selected assessment methods. Completeness is defined as all Programs of Study identify, document, and share all student learning outcomes statements and align those student learning outcome statements to LCC’s Essential Learning Outcomes. Quality is defined as all reported learning outcomes statements are specific, measurable, attainable, student-focused, and results-focused and that the selected assessment method is aligned to Bloom’s Taxonomy cognition levels.

With a new rubric to assess reported learning outcomes statements, CASL established the reliability (i.e. distinguishing levels, appropriate criteria, number of levels of achievement, clarity of the descriptions) and validity (i.e. time to complete, directions for use, recommended processes, ease of use, feasibility, utility) of the instrument through a series of inter-rater agreement studies in CASL meetings, small group activities, and professional development days. The final rubric will be published on the public lcc.edu website and also made available to faculty for self-reviews.

CASL and CDS also reviewed the Program Review processes and instruments, such as the Program Review questionnaire. The Program Review questionnaire is used to assist faculty with responding to the three overarching questions of Program Review. CASL reviewed the questionnaire in Fall, 2015 to assess alignment to the updated assessment plan. Questions related to student learning assessment were added to the questionnaire and submitted to Academic Senate for review and approval in Spring, 2016. The Academic Senate agreed to pilot the addition of student learning assessment questions during the Spring, 2016 semester and revisit a formal approval in the Fall, 2016 semester once we had data and feedback to support further changes to the Program Review questionnaire.

Feedback from faculty and administrators and a CASL self-review identified opportunities to streamline processes of capturing learning outcomes data by designing one template to gather both academic program and institutional learning outcomes in one form, rather than implementing steps a and b as separate tasks. Further, once a second form for ELOs was identified, previously captured Program of Study outcomes were prefilled onto the ELO template to reduce the duplication of work and speed up the process of gathering ELO alignment data from academic programs. During analysis, it was also determined a distinction between formative and summative assessment methods was necessary to clarify when and how often assessment takes place. The revised student learning outcome data form will capture and link course, academic program, and institutional learning outcomes and distinguish between formative and summative assessment.

**Assessment Communication and Education**

CASL planned for ongoing assessment communication and education with the intent of developing assessment capacity and to demonstrate a continuous assessment cycle. CASL supports the integration of the updated assessment plan by educating faculty on the revised standards of assessment performance and providing ongoing consultation and professional development. CDS and CASL actively seek opportunities to engage faculty and administration with the changes to the assessment plan by offering workshops, drop-in sessions for faculty to receive support in developing and/or revising student learning outcomes and identifying assessment methods, presentations at professional development days, participating in department meetings to assist with negotiating assessment types and learning outcomes, and 1:1 consultations with faculty to support integration and adoption of assessment expectations.

Ongoing communication about LCC’s assessment practices, policies, tools, and resources will be provided on an updated assessment webpage of lcc.edu/assessment. The updated assessment site is being designed in two phases. In the first phase (Fall, 2015), the assessment page was loaded with the CASL charter, information about ongoing projects of CASL, public announcements of meeting dates and times, copies of meeting minutes, and a listing of CASL members and contact information. In phase two (Fall, 2016), the assessment site will serve as a central site to locate and access assessment tools (e.g. rubrics, templates), assessment professional development education (e.g. assessment handbook, presentations, papers, announcements), and assessment results.

**Continuous Improvement of Assessment**

LCC approaches assessment as an ongoing, reflective learning process with plans for ongoing assessment improvements are described in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Area of Improvement** | **Assessment Tasks** | **Timeframes** |
| Continuous improvement of assessment data collection instruments | * Revise Program of Study learning outcomes template to distinguish between formative and summative assessments
* Re-review the addition of student learning evidence questions on the Program Review questionnaire
 | * CASL review and design Spring, 2016
* Resubmit Program Review questionnaire to Academic Senate early Fall, 2016
 |
| Add the correlation between assessment alignment and learning outcomes to future analysis | * Do more aligned assessment methods lead to improved learning outcomes for LCC students?
* Add analysis after larger sample size of student learning evidence results obtained
 | * Spring, 2017 – 2018
 |
| Gain insight into how faculty perceive the updated assessment plan in practice | * Design survey using criteria: utility, support, feasibility, satisfaction
* CASL review, approval
* Administer electronic survey to pilot participant faculty following the first round of data collection
 | * Survey design Spring, 2016
* CASL review early Fall, 2016
* Administer survey through SurveyMonkey Fall, 2016
 |
| Understand faculty time allocated to assessment activities. Is time allocated to assessment correlated to learning outcomes? How much time is and can be allocated to interpretation (where faculty can spend time devoted to using student learning evidence) | * Identify assessment activities
* Include time allocations to these activities in the faculty assessment survey
* Analyze for understanding how does time correlate to learning outcomes
* Analyze for time allocated to interpretation (where data becomes useful to faculty)
 | * Administer survey through SurveyMonkey Fall, 2016
* Analyze Spring, 2017
 |
| Continue collecting insight into how student learning evidence is used | * Conduct Program Reviews
* Continue soliciting additional programs to collaborate in student learning studies
 | * 10 Program Reviews, Fall, 2016
* Rolling 4-year Program Review calendar
* Ongoing assessment communication, education, consultation
 |
| Integrate assessment results with other LCC strategic initiatives  | * Share results with Guided Pathways, Curriculum Committee
 | * Ongoing – weekly meetings with Guided Pathways coordinator; Liaison assigned to CASL and CC
 |
| Improve reported alignment from A&S Programs of Study to LCC’s core institutional learning outcomes (Finding 1) | * Conduct targeted data sweep with A&S to collect reported Program of Study learning outcomes to essential learning outcomes. A&S current 65%, Goal $\geq $ 85%
 | * Fall, 2016
 |
| Improve match rate between learning outcome and selected assessment method in A&S (Finding 7) | * Conduct targeted data sweep with A&S to collect reported assessment methods. A&S current 69%, Goal ≥80%
 | * Fall, 2016
 |
| Improve student learning outcomes statements in TC (Finding 6) | * Most TC SLOs were program-focused rather than student-focused, therefore, unable to determine cognitive level requirements of TC students and graduates
* CASL to provide support for writing student-focused learning outcome statements
 | * Fall, 2016 – Spring, 2017
 |
| Improve assessment methods in TC (Finding 6)  | * One assessment method is used for all TC summative assessment. Recommend multiple measures and use of measures throughout the curriculum.
 | * Fall, 2016 – Spring, 2017
 |

# **Assessment Plan Measurement Strategy**

**CASL**: Committee for Assessing Student Learning **CDS**: Center for Data Science **CC**: Curriculum Committee  **CTE**: Center for Teaching Excellence

|  |
| --- |
| **BUSINESS OPERATIONS** |
| **Measures** | **Sources** | **Methods** | **Analysis** |
| % Programs of Study goals aligned to LCC goals | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration  | Program Review questionnaire  | # Program of Study/# Programs of Study aligned to LCC goals*Pilot started Spring, 2016* |
| % Reported links from Program of Study learning outcomes to LCC’s institutional learning outcomes | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration  | ELO Template  | # Programs of Study/# Programs of Study reporting links to ELOs; Analyzed at institutional & program-levels by ELO type |
| **STUDENT** |
| % Cognitive level of learning outcome | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration | Program of Study Learning Outcomes Rubric  | Bloom’s Cognitive level/# of learning outcomes; Aligned with Program Review cycles |
| % Match rate | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration | Program of Study Learning Outcomes Rubric  | Bloom’s cognitive level/# assessment method alignment matches; Aligned with Program Review cycles |
| Average student assessment satisfaction  | IT, CDS, Students  | IDEA Student Survey  | Select assessment questions analyzed by mean & standard deviation |
| **ASSESSMENT PROCESSES** |
| % Reported Program of Study learning outcomes  | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration | Program of Study Learning Outcomes Template | # Programs of Study/# Programs of Study reporting learning outcomes; Aligned with Program Review cycles |
| % Reported assessment methods  | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration | Program of Study Learning Outcomes Template | # Reported Programs of Study learning outcomes/# Programs of Study reporting learning assessment methods; Aligned with Program Review cycles; Analyzed by type  |
| % Program of Study plans for collecting student learning evidence | CDS, CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration  | Focus Groups; Data Collection Worksheet; Annual Improvement Plan Template | # Program of Study/# Programs of Study assessment plans; Aligned with Program Review cycles*Pilot started Spring, 2016* |
| **LEARNING & GROWTH** |
| % Faculty use of student learning evidence  | CASL, CDS, Administration, Finance, CC, Staff, Faculty | Annual Improvement Plan Template; Program Review Exit Meeting; Program Review Data Follow-Up Meeting | Pre/Post student learning results comparisons; Aligned with Program Review cycles |
| Average faculty assessment score | Faculty, CASL, CDS | Assessment Faculty Questionnaire (in development) | Average score (# ratings per question/ # questions x 100) Overall & by utility, support, feasibility, satisfaction*Data collection starts Fall, 2016* |

# **References**

Association of American Colleges & Universities (2008). College learning for the new global century. National Leadership Council for Liberal Education & America’s Promise: Washington, DC.

Association of American Colleges & Universities (2016). Trends in learning outcomes assessment: Hart Research Associates.

Gulikers, J. T. M., Bastiaens, Th. J., Kirschner, P. A., & Kester, L. (2006). Relations between student perceptions of assessment authenticity, study approaches and learning outcome. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 32* , 381-400