

**Institutional Effectiveness  
&  
Assessment Manual**



**KENTUCKY  
WESLEYAN  
COLLEGE**  
—1858—

**Office of Institutional Effectiveness and  
Research**

**Revised 2022**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

What is Institutional Effectiveness? .....	3
Institutional Assessment Plan .....	4
Institutional Assessment Committee .....	6
Assessment Plans.....	6
Mission Statement.....	6
Outcome/Objectives.....	6
Measures .....	7
Achievement Targets .....	8
Assessment Reports.....	8
Academic Assessment Plans and Reports .....	9
Direct Assessment Methods .....	10
Indirect Assessment Methods.....	10
Appendix A: Academic Program Learning Outcomes Planning Template .....	14
Appendix B: Administrative/Student Services Unit Outcomes Planning Template .....	18
Appendix C: Rubric for Evaluation of an Academic Program Assessment Plan.....	19
Appendix D: Rubric for Evaluating Non-Academic Unit Assessment Plans .....	20
Appendix E: Academic Program Assessment Report .....	21
Appendix F: General Education Assessment Report .....	24
Appendix G: Administrative Unit Assessment Report.....	27
Appendix H: How to Write Student Learning Outcomes.....	32
Appendix I: Academic Program Assessment Cycles .....	33
Appendix J: Indirect Assessment Index .....	34
Industry Influencers .....	34
Educational Collaboration.....	34
External Review.....	34
Student Engagement .....	35
Alumni Engagement .....	35
Program Operations .....	36
Standards and Practices.....	36
Institutional Planning .....	36
Other Assessments .....	36

## What is Institutional Effectiveness?

Institutional Effectiveness is the process in which Kentucky Wesleyan demonstrates how well it succeeds in accomplishing its mission. The United States Department of Education has “required regional accrediting agencies to measure the effectiveness” of institutions since 1987. Items that must be evaluated include:

- Existence of an institutional purpose appropriate for higher education
- Determining that the institution has educational objectives consistent with its mission or purpose
- Documentation of the achievement of students in relation to the intended educational outcomes identified
- Determination of the extent to which institutions regularly evaluate student academic achievement and use its results for improvement of educational programs

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) 2018 edition of the *Principles of Accreditation: Foundation for Quality Enhancement* includes the following core requirement:

“The institution engages in ongoing, comprehensive, and integrated research-based planning and evaluation processes that (a) focus on institutional quality and effectiveness and (b) incorporate a systematic review of institutional goals and outcomes consistent with its mission.”

It is noted in the 2020 edition of the *SACSCOC Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundation for Quality Enhancement*, that

“Institutional effectiveness is the systematic, explicit, and documented process of measuring performance against mission in all aspects of an institution.... Even though the concept of institutional effectiveness may not be explicitly referenced in all of the standards, the accreditation process assumes that all programs and services, wherever offered within the context of the institution’s mission and activity, are reviewed as part of the institutional effectiveness process.”

Therefore, the process of Institutional Effectiveness involves planning, assessment, and using the assessment results for continuous improvement and links these processes to resource management and decision-making. Student Achievement data are collected and examined regardless of location or course delivery modality

The purpose of this manual is to provide guidance for faculty, staff, and administrators to develop and evaluate Institutional Operational Plans, Student Learning Outcomes, and Program Outcomes, and to use the assessment results to continuously improve their programs and services that benefit the students KWC serves.

## Institutional Assessment Plan

Kentucky Wesleyan's assessment plan meets the accreditation standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on College (SACSCOC). To comply with SACSCOC core requirements (C.R.), comprehensive standards (C.S.), and federal requirements (F.R.), as defined in the *Principles of Accreditation*, a systematic and ongoing evaluation process for all academic and non-academic (administrative and student services) programs/units must be present to demonstrate institutional effectiveness. These standards set the following expectations that must be followed to be effective and ensure compliance.

Kentucky Wesleyan operates with a mission that fosters teaching and learning and supports research and public service in the context of its teaching mission. Kentucky Wesleyan's mission is a living document, which is reviewed regularly and amended as appropriate to ensure continuous improvement in institutional quality and achievement of its mission.

“The institution has a clearly defined, comprehensive, and published mission specific to the institution and appropriate for higher education. The mission addresses teaching and learning and, where applicable, research and public service.” (C.R. 2.1. Mission)

Kentucky Wesleyan's outcomes assessments include the evaluation of student learning outcomes, administrative and academic and student support services, research, and community and public service as applicable to its mission.

“The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results in the areas below:

- a. Student learning outcomes for each of its educational programs.  
(Student outcomes: educational programs) (C.S. 8.2.a)
- b. Student learning outcomes for collegiate-level general education competencies of its undergraduate degree programs.  
(Student outcomes: general education) (C.S. 8.2.b)
- c. Academic and student services that support student success.  
(Student outcomes: academic and student services)” (C.S. 8.2.c)

Kentucky Wesleyan has a plan to include continuous improvement in the quality of the education it offers.

“The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is an integral component of the reaffirmation of accreditation process and is derived from an institution's ongoing comprehensive planning and evaluation processes. It reflects and affirms a commitment to enhance overall institutional quality and effectiveness by focusing on an issue the institution considers important to improving student learning outcomes and/or student success.” (C.S. 7.1. Institutional Planning and Effectiveness)

Kentucky Wesleyan's academic programs are approved by the faculty and administration,

evaluated internally and externally, and assessed to document student learning. Kentucky Wesleyan's faculty have the primary responsibility for ensuring that the curriculum is effective.

“The institution (a) publishes and implements policies on the authority of faculty in academic and governance matters, (b) demonstrates that educational programs for which academic credit is awarded are approved consistent with institutional policy, and(c) places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty. (C.S.10.4. Academic Governance)

Kentucky Wesleyan uses both direct and indirect measures in evaluating its institutional effectiveness. The assessment process elaborates on the gathering and interpreting of information with the intent of discovering whether a program is meeting established goals, and using that information to improve the program. Assessment is concerned principally with student learning both inside and outside the classroom.

# **Institutional Assessment Committee**

The Institutional Assessment Committee helps ensure that all College-wide assessment functions are implemented according to well-defined and communicated processes. The committee systematically reviews the college-wide assessment plan to determine the extent to which the College's mission is achieved, and monitors the overall performance of the institution and its various units.

## **Assessment Plans**

Faculty, staff and administrators develop mission statements for each academic program and non-academic (administrative or student services) unit, which are aligned with the College's mission statement. Planning templates are available to assist academic programs (Appendix A) and non-academic units (Appendix B) with this process. Once plans have been completed they will be reviewed and evaluated by a committee using a standard rubric appropriate for either academic programs (Appendix C) or non-academic units (Appendix D). Once plans have been approved, the units will use them to collect meaningful data that will be used to assess the success of the program or unit in achieving its outcomes (goals).

## **Mission Statement**

A mission statement is a clear, concise statement that gives the purpose of the program or unit. It guides the work of the program or unit, indicates who it serves, in what ways and with what results.

## **Outcome/Objectives**

Outcomes are specific statements that clearly identify the knowledge, skills, and abilities students should gain or improve through engagement in the academic program or learning experience; for administrative units, outcomes describe the desired quality of key services.

There is a broad range of important outcomes that assessment efforts can address. They may be divided into two general categories: Institution-Centered Outcomes, and Student-Centered Outcomes.

Institution-centered outcomes include those outcomes that have more direct benefit to the College than to students, and are specific, programmatic, operational, and administrative objectives that academic programs and non-academic units intend to accomplish. They are not directly related to student learning. Some examples of these types of outcomes include:

- program-generated revenue,
- program efficiency,
- cost-effectiveness,
- desired quality of key services,
- program impact on promoting professional/public partnerships,
- numbers of students that enter graduate or professional schools and/or careers, and
- campus-community among faculty, staff, and administrators.

Student-centered outcomes encompass those outcomes that pertain more directly to student

learning and development that students are expected to have or exhibit when they complete an academic program, such as:

- knowledge,
- skills,
- behaviors,
- attitudes, or
- values

They can be assessed collectively or individually; and examined at the institutional, program, and course levels.

## Measures

In order to determine whether outcomes are achieved, some kind of evaluation is in order. There are a variety of measures used to evaluate each outcome. The evidence you gather should be credible, applicable to decision making, and relevant.

**Direct measures:** are designed to directly measure what a stakeholder (faculty, staff, students, etc.) knows or is able to do and/or the benefit of programming or intervention.

- Pre- and post-tests
- Holistic assessments of student learning
- Course-embedded assessment (e.g., homework assignment; essays, locally developed tests)
- Comprehensive exams
- National Major Field Achievement Tests
- GRE subject exams
- Certification exams, licensure exams
- Senior thesis or major project
- Portfolio evaluation
- Case studies
- Reflective journals
- Capstone projects
- Internal/external juried review of performances and exhibitions
- Internship and clinical evaluation
- External examiners/peer review
- Grading with criteria or rubrics
- Ratings of student skills by supervisors
- Employer ratings of student skills

**Indirect measures:** focus on stakeholders' (faculty, staff, students, etc.) perception and satisfaction with the program or service.<sup>1</sup>

- Program survey
- Exit interviews
- Alumni survey
- Employer survey
- Focus groups
- Job placement statistics
- Graduate and professional school placements

---

<sup>1</sup> A more complete list of indirect assessments, including descriptions, is found in Appendix K.

- Graduation and retention rates
- Percentage of students who participation (e.g., study abroad, internships)
- Honors, awards, scholarships

## Achievement Targets

A target or benchmark is a specific indicator that represents success at achieving a given outcome. For example, 50% of Kentucky Wesleyan students will participate in an internship or 90% of the education students will pass the Praxis II exam.

## Assessment Reports

Once plans have been approved, data is gathered yearly, analyzed, and used as the basis for making changes for continuous improvements. For academic programs, assessment reporting follows a two-year, two-tiered process with half of all programs providing a final report at the conclusion of each academic year. (Appendix J) This allows programs to collect data for two consecutive academic years and for a thorough review of those reports at the end of each two-year report cycle.

Assessment cycles for academic programs follows an academic year schedule. At the beginning of the academic year, faculty gather for the fall Academic Assessment Day, a workshop where faculty present results from the previous year and are provided time to work as groups on planning for the upcoming year's assessment needs. A second mid-year workshop takes place in January before the beginning of the spring semester. At this workshop, faculty can begin the process of analyzing fall data and discuss any mid-year changes. Academic assessment results are reported to the Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at the end of the spring semester.

General education assessment follows a similar reporting schedule, all general education areas are assessed on a two-year cycle. In year one, assessment activity is administered and data is collected. At the end of the year, the findings are analyzed and recommendations are made to improvement student learning. In year two, those improvements are implemented. At the end of year two, a final general assessment narrative report is compiled discussing the impact of those results.

Non-academic assessment results are reported to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research at the end of the Spring semester or after the fiscal year audit has been approved. Assessments must be reported using the approved reporting template for academic programs (Appendix E), General Education courses (Appendix F) or non-academic units (Appendix G). The assessment data is reviewed and evaluated by a committee using a standard rubric appropriate for either academic programs/courses (Appendix H) or non-academic units (Appendix I). The Committee reports back its findings each cycle during an annual assessment day that will occur before the beginning of the fall semester (Academic assessments).

### Results

A concise summary of the results gathered from a given assessment measure.

### Impact of Previously Implemented Changes

A short summary of how action plans from the previous year (or in cases of outcomes measured on a greater than annual cycle) have led to improvements



### Action Plans

Actions to be taken to improve the program or assessment process based on analysis of results.

## Academic Assessment Plans and Reports

The responsibility for developing academic assessment plans and collecting and analyzing assessment data and making course specific decisions about improvements resides with the faculty teaching in the academic program. The responsibility for submitting the annual assessment report to the Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) resides with the Program Coordinator, who also must coordinate with faculty to ensure individual course decisions are leading to the continual improvement in the entire academic program.

Programs should use the planning template (Appendix A) to develop their plans. This template is based on using course embedded assessments. The rubric (Appendix C) for evaluating these plans also will be useful. Appendix J provides some examples of how to write meaningful and measurable student learning outcomes. Completed plans should be submitted to the VPAA for review and approval.

The table below provides an outline of the components included in academic program assessment plans and reports. The academic assessment form and rubric for the annual evaluation of the report may be found in Appendices E and G.

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COMPONENTS
<b>MISSION:</b> the plan provides a clear, concise, descriptive statement of purpose for the program and is aligned with the College mission.
<b>PROGRAM EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES OR GOALS:</b> The plan identifies at least three achievements or accomplishments that graduates generally attain
<b>OUTCOMES:</b> The plan identifies at least three meaningful student learning outcomes that are measurable, describe what students should be able to do or demonstrate as a result of their studies, and align with and support the programs goals.
<b>METHODS (ASSESSMENTS):</b> Each outcome lists methods to measure the achievement of the outcome. There is at least one direct measure for each outcome that will be able to determine if the target (minimum performance) level has been met.
<b>RESULTS AND ANALYSIS:</b> Each method provides results and analysis, including: qualitative or quantitative data in a narrative summary or table a well-reasoned description of conclusions, significance, and impact
<b>IMPACT:</b> Assessment results from the current year are discussed in terms of the previous cycles action plans to improve outcomes.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Each method describes relationship among results, decisions, and next steps and explains how results are used to inform curricular changes

**Direct Assessment Methods** used by academic programs include most of the items listed in the section above titled Measures. Additionally, course embedded assessments are direct assessment methods. Some examples are:

- Essays/Written Assignments\*
- Locally Developed Examinations
- Blind-scored Assignments\*
- Oral Assignments\*
- Teamwork
- Pencil/Paper Tests
- Problem Sets
- Problems on Tests
- Case Studies
- Technical Reports & Proposals
- Pre-test/Post-test Evaluations
- External Examiner Review
- Student Reflections\*

\*indicates use of rubric

Grades are not an appropriate measure of student performance, as they are awarded based on overall satisfaction of course requirements rather than specific performance on a single program-level outcome. Those course requirements typically include several course-level outcomes (which may or may not be directly related to a program outcome), attendance, and extra credit. Course grades alone do not provide specific information about the concepts mastered by students or those concepts that proved challenging – important information for faculty to consider if they want to improve student learning over time.

**Indirect Assessment Methods** used by academic programs:

- Student Perception of Learning Surveys (e.g. NSSE)
- Alumni Surveys
- Analysis of Course Syllabi
- Focus Groups
- Employer Surveys
- Exiting Senior Survey
- Consultation with Internship Supervisors
- Consultation with Advisory Board/Counsel
- Student Evaluation of Faculty
- Advisory Perception Survey
- Graduation rates
- Time to degree
- Retention rates
- Persistence/Return rates
- Exit Interviews
- General Faculty Survey
- Job Placement Rates
- Graduate School Placement Rates

- Tracking Complaints
- Recruiting Results
- Website Interests/Hits
- Establishing Timelines & Budgets
- Faculty Performance Appraisals
- Advisory Council Survey
- Juried Performance
- Service Learning Evaluation
- Internship Evaluation
- A guide to indirect assessment types is included in Appendix F

## 1. Non-Academic (Administrative and Student Services) Assessment Plans and Reports)

Units should use the planning template (Appendix B) to develop their plans. The rubric (Appendix D) for evaluating these plans also will be useful. Completed plans should be submitted to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research for review and approval.

The table below provides an outline of the components included in academic program assessment plans and reports. The academic assessment form and rubric for the annual evaluation of the report may be found in Appendices F and H.

NON-ACADEMIC UNIT ASSESSMENT COMPONENTS
<b>UNIT MISSION:</b> The Plan has a clear concise and specific statement of the unit purpose and function that is aligned with the college mission
<b>RESPONSIBILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION:</b> The plan identifies, by title, who: crafts outcomes and methods; collects and analyzes data; reports results to unit staff; makes decisions based on data; ensures that decisions are implemented
<b>OUTCOMES:</b> The plan identifies at least three outcomes (goals) stating what the unit will achieve and are measurable, realistic and achievable
<b>METHODS:</b> Each outcome has at least one direct measure that that provides data that will determine if the target (minimum performance) level has been met
<b>RESULT AND ANALYSIS:</b> Each method provides results and analysis, including: qualitative or quantitative data in a narrative summary or table a well-reasoned description of conclusions, significance, and impact
<b>IMPACT:</b> Assessment results from the current year are discussed in terms of the previous cycles action plans to improve outcomes.
<b>ACTION TAKEN:</b> Each method describes relationship among results, decisions, and next steps and explains how results are used to inform unit changes

The evidence you gather should be credible, applicable to decision making, and relevant. The

majority should employ direct measurement. Indirect measures do not reflect actual student learning, but focus, instead, on their perceptions or opinions.

The following are examples of the methods that can be used to assess the expected outcomes of non-academic units.

- Satisfaction surveys
- Graduation rates
- Retention rates
- Benchmarks set by national, state, or peer institutions/organizations
- Establishing timelines and budgets
- Tracking the Use of a Service (e.g. hits on a website, use of computer technology)
- Recruiting results
- Tracking program participation
- Student Opinion Survey
- Athletic Exit Surveys
- Tracking complaints and how they are resolved
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- External measures of performance or quality
- Usage of a program or service
- Focus groups
- Participation data
- Observation of behavior
- Volume of activity
- Level of efficiency (average response time)
- Measure of quality

### Assessment Schedule

Time	Action/Occurrence	Who Is Responsible
TBA	Non-Academic Unit Assessment Day – Report Back of Previous Years Assessment Findings and Unit Planning for the Upcoming Cycle	Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Research and all Staff
August 15-25	Academic Assessment Day— faculty present results from the previous year and are provided time to work as groups on planning for the upcoming year's assessment needs	VPAA
Sept.	Assessment Committee reviews goals and outcomes for the upcoming year and provides feedback for revisions (if needed) by Sept 30	Institutional Assessment Committee
Sept- May	Collect Assessment Data	Faculty and Staff
Jan. 3-10	Assessment/Operational Plans are re- visited and assessed formally by all functional units in a mid-year planning meeting	Director IE & IR, Faculty, Program Directors, Non- Academic Unit staff, Unit Heads

May 1-29	Analysis of Assessment data and Completion of the Annual Assessment Report	Faculty, Program Directors, Unit Heads
May 30	Most Assessment Reports due to the appropriate Office	Program Directors & Unit Heads
June 30	Advancement Assessment Report due (at end of FY )	Unit Head
June – July	Assessment Subcommittees Review of Reports	Academic Assessment Committee; Non-academic Unit Assessment Committee
July 31	All Assessment Reports and Reviews Completed and Stored on SACS drive;	Director Institutional Effectiveness
Aug 1-5	Reports sent back to person responsible	Director Institutional Effectiveness
Aug. 15	Publication (online) of Annual Institutional Assessment document detailing prior year's goals, outcomes, use of results, and current action plans	Director Institutional Effectiveness
Oct. 15	Finance and Admissions Assessment report due (at end of FY Audit and entrance of class)	Unit Heads

# Appendix A: Academic Program Learning Outcomes Planning Template

**Degree Program:** \_\_\_\_\_

## College Mission

Kentucky Wesleyan College, in partnership with the United Methodist Church, fosters a liberal arts education that nourishes and prepares students intellectually, spiritually and physically to achieve success in life.

## Division Mission

## Program Mission

**1. Program Learning Outcomes** - Overall, what knowledge, skills, or abilities should a graduate of your program possess?

Program Learning Outcome #1

Program Learning Outcome #2

Program Learning Outcome #3

**1A. Course(s) where each Program Learning Outcome is/are taught:**

Program Learning Outcome #1 Course(s)

Program Learning Outcome #2 Course(s)

Program Learning Outcome #3 Course(s)

**2. Course Learning Outcomes** - What are the major learning goals of the courses listed in 1A? (Usually found on the syllabus)

**Course #1**

Course Learning Outcome #1

Course Learning Outcome #2

**Course #2**

Course Learning Outcome #1

Course Learning Outcome #2

**3. Individual Assignments/Assessments** - Individual events in each class related to a Course Learning Outcome where a grade is assigned.

*Be sure to indicate the type of assignment (i.e. Homework, Exam, Quiz, Research Paper, Paper, In-Class Activity, Presentation, etc.)*

**Course #1 → Course Learning Outcome #1 →**

**Assignment #1**

**Assignment #2**

**Course #2 → Course Learning Outcome #1 →**

**Assignment #1**

**Assignment #2**

**4. Measurement of Success** – How will each assignment/assessment listed in #3 be used to evaluate success?

*For example: Assessment Goal: 65% or more of students will correctly score 70% or more on the ACC 2312 post test exam which covers theories underlying AICPA conceptual; framework.*

**Course #1 → Course Learning Outcome #1 → Assignment #1**

**Assessment Goal:**

**Course #1 → Course Learning Outcome #1 → Assignment #2**

**Assessment Goal:**

**5. Connection to General Education** – List any Course Learning Outcomes (#2) that could be categorized by the College's ten General Education Core Competencies.

*For example: Communicate Effectively in a) Writing and b) Speech*

*Course: BIO 2114*

*Course Learning Outcome(s): 1(Learning and practicing effective communication in science: (a) written), 2 (Learning and practicing effective communication in science: (b) oral)*

**LO 1 Exhibit Critical and Logical Thinking**

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

**LO 2 Demonstrate Problem Solving Ability**

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

**LO 3 Identify and Analyze Ethical Issues**

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

**LO 4 Communicate Effectively**

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

**LO 5 Demonstrate an Aesthetic Awareness**

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

**LO 6 Explore the Human Experience**

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

**LO 7 Comprehend the Natural World**

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

**LO 8 Utilize Knowledge to Sustain Physical Well-being**

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):

Course:

Course Learning Outcome(s):



**6. Other Assessments** – List any other assessments the program uses to gauge student learning. Include a description of the assessment method(s) and goal(s); e.g., placements in graduate and professional schools, national disciplinary exams, internships, externships, licensure pass rates, etc.

# Appendix B: Administrative/Student Services Unit Outcomes Planning Template

Unit: \_\_\_\_\_

**College Mission**

Kentucky Wesleyan College, in partnership with the United Methodist Church, fosters a liberal arts education that nourishes and prepares students intellectually, spiritually and physically to achieve success in life.

**Unit Mission**

**Unit Goals (optional if stated goals are broad non-measureable statements)**

**Unit Outcomes, Methods to Determine if the Outcomes are Met (Assessments), Measurement of Success (Target or benchmark), and Rationale for Choosing the Target** – Each unit should articulate 3-5 **outcomes** aligned with the unit and the College mission. Institution-centered outcomes, such as increase in efficiency, increase revenue, have an impact on the College while Student-centered outcomes pertain to student learning or personal development, such as an increased awareness of what constitutes sexual harassment, changes in attitudes concerning diversity, increased usage of counseling services. Multiple **methods** are best to use to document success. You must have at least one direct measurement (assessment) for each outcome, such as increased usage of service, increased revenues, etc. **Target or Benchmark of Success** indicates how the assessment method will be used to evaluate success? The **rationale** indicates why/how you picked the benchmark you indicated.

Outcome	Method	Target	Rationale

## Appendix C: Rubric for Evaluation of an Academic Program Assessment Plan

Program: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Needs Improvement	Comments
Mission Statement of the Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mission statement is a clear, <b>concise, discipline specific</b> statement of the aspects covered within the major</li> <li>Relationship to the College's mission is apparent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mission statement is <b>not entirely clear, discipline specific, or concise</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mission statement <b>lacks clarity</b>, and is <b>not discipline specific</b>, or <b>concise</b></li> </ul>	
Program Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goals clearly identify discipline specific knowledge, skills, and competencies students will acquire</li> <li>Goals are aligned with the program mission</li> <li>Goals are stated in terms of students' knowledge, skills, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goals identify knowledge, skills, and competencies that are vague <b>and/or not</b> discipline specific</li> <li>Goals are <b>not</b> clearly aligned with the program mission</li> <li>Goals are <b>not</b> consistently stated in terms of students' knowledge skills, and competencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goals do <b>not</b> identify knowledge, skills, and competencies students will acquire</li> <li>Goals are <b>not</b> aligned with the program mission</li> <li>Goals are <b>not</b> stated in terms of student knowledge, skills, and competencies</li> </ul>	
Expected Learning Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outcomes are aligned with the mission and goals</li> <li>Learning outcomes are realistic, achievable, and measurable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outcomes are <b>not</b> clearly aligned with mission and goals</li> <li>Less than 3 learning outcomes are identified</li> <li>Learning outcomes are <b>not</b> realistic and/or achievable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outcomes are <b>not</b> aligned with mission and goals or are missing;</li> <li>No learning outcomes are identified</li> <li>Learning outcomes are <b>not</b> measurable</li> </ul>	
Method of Assessment (measures)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures correspond to and validly assess learning outcomes</li> <li>Target performance level for the program is stated</li> <li>There is at least one direct measure for each learning outcome</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures do <b>not</b> consistently correspond to or validly assess learning outcomes</li> <li>Target performance level for the program is unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures do <b>not</b> directly correspond to stated learning outcomes</li> <li>Measures do <b>not</b> appropriately assess intended learning outcomes or are missing</li> <li>Target performance level for the program is <b>not</b> stated</li> </ul>	

## Appendix D: Rubric for Evaluating Non-Academic Unit Assessment Plans

Unit: \_\_\_\_\_

Assessment Cycle Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Needs Improvement	Comments
Mission Statement (Purpose) of the Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mission statement is a clear, <b>concise, specific</b> statement of the unit's purpose and function in a manner that is clear to an outsider</li> <li>• Relationship to the College's mission is clear</li> <li>• Encompasses all activities of the unit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mission statement is <b>not clear to an outsider.</b></li> <li>• The units mission is <b>not totally aligned</b> or with the College's mission (part of the functions match those of the College)</li> <li>• Refers to some but not all activities of the unit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mission statement is <b>missing, not concise, or does not specifically</b> refer to the function of the unit</li> <li>• The <b>connection</b> of the unit to the College <b>is not</b> apparent</li> <li>• Does not refer to activities of the unit or refers only in general terms</li> </ul>	
Expected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes are aligned with the units mission</li> <li>• Outcomes are realistic</li> <li>• Outcomes are measurable</li> <li>• Outcome is appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes <b>are not clearly aligned</b> with mission</li> <li>• <b>Less than 3 outcomes</b> are identified</li> <li>• Outcomes are <b>not realistic</b></li> <li>• Outcome is appropriate but cannot be completed in the time frame</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes <b>do not give guidance</b> as to what is to be achieved</li> <li>• Outcomes <b>are missing</b></li> <li>• Outcomes are <b>not</b> measurable</li> <li>• Outcome is not timely</li> </ul>	
Method of Assessment (Measures)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures correspond to and validly assess outcomes</li> <li>• Target performance level for the outcome is stated</li> <li>• Multiple measures are available for some or all outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures do <b>not</b> consistently correspond to or validly assess outcomes</li> <li>• Target performance level for the outcome <b>is unclear</b></li> <li>• There is at least <b>one direct measure</b> for each outcome</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures do <b>not</b> directly correspond to stated outcomes</li> <li>• Measures do <b>not</b> appropriately assess intended outcomes or <b>are missing</b></li> <li>• Target performance level for the outcome is <b>not</b> stated</li> <li>• <b>No direct measures</b> are used</li> </ul>	

## Appendix E: Academic Program Assessment Report

### [Insert Program Name] Assessment Report 20[??]-20[??] Assessment Cycle



**Program Coordinator:** [Insert Name]

#### **College Mission**

Kentucky Wesleyan College, in partnership with the United Methodist Church, fosters a liberal arts education that nourishes and prepares students intellectually, spiritually and physically to achieve success in life.

#### **Program Mission**

[Insert Program Mission]

#### **Program Purpose & Goals**

[Insert Program Purpose and Goals]

#### **Student Learning Outcomes**

Student learning outcomes (SLOs) are built and refined in a collaborative process where the Program Coordinator and program faculty work with the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), the Assessment Committee, and the Director of Institutional Research. Each SLO is rated by faculty members after reviewing available evidence. SLOs are reviewed regularly, as part of the program's regular assessment cycle and as part of regular program review.

#### **SLOs Assessed this Cycle**

- [Insert a Bulleted List of Program SLOs, and Place a Check ☒ beside the SLOs Assessed this Cycle]

## Direct Assessment(s)

[Insert Name/Title of Assessment Instrument]. [(Which SLOs Are Assessed? E.g. 1 and 3)]

- *Description:* [Insert Description of the Assessed Assignment and Course Syllabi, Instructions, and Rubrics (if necessary)]
- *Target:* [Insert Target Score. E.g. “At least 70% of students expected to meet or exceed each standard”.]

[Include tables, charts, or other representations of data used to demonstrate

[Insert Name/Title of Assessment Instrument]. [(Which SLOs Are Assessed? E.g. 1 and 3)]

- *Description:* [Insert Description of the Assessed Assignment and Course Syllabi, Instructions, and Rubrics (if necessary)]
- *Target:* [Insert Target Score. E.g. “At least 70% of students expected to meet or exceed each standard”.]

[Include tables, charts, or other representations of data used to demonstrate

[Insert Name/Title of Assessment Instrument]. [(Which SLOs Are Assessed? E.g. 1 and 3)]

- *Description:* [Insert Description of the Assessed Assignment and Course Syllabi, Instructions, and Rubrics (if necessary)]
- *Target:* [Insert Target Score. E.g. “At least 70% of students expected to meet or exceed each standard”.]

[Include tables, charts, or other representations of data used to demonstrate

## Indirect Assessments

[Include Any Indirect Assessments Used along with summaries of data ]

## Programmatic Improvements:

[Discuss any general changes made in response to assessment activities: changes to SLOs, new/deleted courses, pre-requisites, etc.]

## Improvements, by SLO:

### SLO1:

[Discuss assessment-driven improvements to student learning made in this area. New assignments, resources, etc. Will include evidence of seeking improvement, recording action items—trainings, new assignments, ways of approaching classes—that will effect change]

### SLO2:

Focus on student learning. New assignments, resources, etc. Will include evidence of seeking improvement, recording action items—trainings, new assignments, ways of approaching classes—that will effect change]

### SLO3:

Focus on student learning. New assignments, resources, etc. Will include evidence of seeking improvement, recording action items—trainings, new assignments, ways of approaching classes—that will effect change]

**SLO4:**

Focus on student learning. New assignments, resources, etc. Will include evidence of seeking improvement, recording action items—trainings, new assignments, ways of approaching classes—that will effect change]

**SLO5:**

Focus on student learning. New assignments, resources, etc. Will include evidence of seeking improvement, recording action items—trainings, new assignments, ways of approaching classes—that will effect change]

**Goals for Next Assessment Cycle**

[Provide a bulleted list of action items that will help direct your efforts for the next assessment cycle.]

# Appendix F: General Education Assessment Report

Academic Program:   Program Director:   Date:

## College Mission

Kentucky Wesleyan College, in partnership with the United Methodist Church, fosters a liberal arts education that nourishes and prepares students intellectually, spiritually and physically to achieve success in life.

## General Education Learning Outcomes

Check each outcome assessed during the previous year.

- ☐ LO 1. Exhibit critical and logical thinking
- ☐ LO 2. Demonstrate problem solving ability
- ☐ LO 3. Identify and analyze ethical issues
- ☐ LO 4. Communicate effectively
- ☐ LO 5. Demonstrate an aesthetic awareness
- ☐ LO 6. Explore the human experience
- ☐ LO 7. Comprehend the natural world
- ☐ LO 8. Utilize knowledge critically to sustain physical well-being

## General Education Courses Offered

<u>Last Years’ Recorded Action Plan for Each LO Assessed</u>	<u>IMPACT OF LAST YEARS’ ACTION PLAN for Each LO Assessed</u>



Outcome	Course	Methods and Targets	Results <i>(append detailed results to end of document)</i>	Action Plan for Next Year
		Method:  Target:	out of students met standard %  <input type="checkbox"/> Target met	<i>Describe specific actions planned to improve student outcomes.</i>
		Method:  Target:	out of students met standard %  <input type="checkbox"/> Target met	
		Method:  Target:	out of students met standard %  <input type="checkbox"/> Target met	

**If Appropriate - Record ANY CHANGES in Measures and Rationales for next year below.**

Outcome	Method and Target	Rationale
	Method:  Target:	
	Method:  Target:	
	Method:  Target:	

**Record any changes to the program mission, purpose, or goals here:**

**Attach detailed assessment results here:**

# Appendix G: Administrative Unit Assessment Report

Unit:    Unit Leader:    Date:

**College Mission**

Kentucky Wesleyan College, in partnership with the United Methodist Church, fosters a liberal arts education that nourishes and prepares students intellectually, spiritually and physically to achieve success in life.

**Program Mission**

**Program Purpose & Goals**

<u>Last Years’ Recorded Action Plan for Each Outcome Assessed</u>	<u>IMPACT OF LAST YEARS’ ACTION PLAN for Each Outcome Assessed</u>

**INDIRECT ASSESSMENTS of OUTCOMES**

If applicable.

Outcome	Methods and Targets	Results <i>(append detailed results to end of document)</i>	Action Plan for Next Year
	Method:  Target: What is the performance target to be met?	Results  <input type="checkbox"/> Target met	<i>Describe specific actions planned to improve outcomes.</i>
	Method:  Target: What is the performance target to be met?	Results  <input type="checkbox"/> Target met	
	Method:  Target: What is the performance target to be met?	Results  <input type="checkbox"/> Target met	

If Appropriate - Record ANY CHANGES in Outcomes, Measures, Targets, and Rationales for next year below.

Outcome	Method and Target	Rationale
	Method:  Target: What is the performance target to be met?	
	Method:  Target: What is the performance target to be met?	
	Method:  Target: What is the performance target to be met?	

Record any changes to the program mission, purpose, or goals here:

Attach detailed assessment results here:

	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Needs Attention	Comments
Method of Assessment (measures)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures correspond to and validly assess learning outcomes</li> <li>Target performance level for the program is stated</li> <li>There is at least one direct measure for each learning outcome</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures do <b>not</b> consistently correspond to or validly assess learning outcomes</li> <li>Target performance level for the program is unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures do <b>not</b> directly correspond to stated learning outcomes</li> <li>Measures do <b>not</b> appropriately assess intended learning outcomes or are missing</li> <li>Target performance level for the program is <b>not</b> stated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Assessment Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results are related to the specific measures of learning outcomes</li> <li>Data are analyzed appropriately and provide evidence of target achievement level</li> <li>Results yield meaningful information for improvement(s)</li> <li>Results are shared and can lead to an action plan for improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results are <b>not</b> clearly related to the intended learning outcomes</li> <li>Data are <b>not</b> analyzed appropriately and/or does <b>not</b> consistently provide evidence of target achievement level</li> <li>Results may <b>not</b> be consistent or yield meaningful information for improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results are <b>not</b> clearly related to the intended learning outcomes or are missing</li> <li>Data are <b>not</b> analyzed appropriately and do <b>not</b> provide evidence of target achievement level</li> <li>Results are <b>not</b> consistent or do not yield meaningful information for improvement</li> <li>Results are either not shared, or not used to facilitate discussions, and/or do not lead to an action plan for improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Results Related to Previously Reported Modifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate</li> <li>Provides evidence that previous modifications led to improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results of previous modifications are present but do not indicate improvements in outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence that previous modifications cited in Action Plans from previous review cycles were implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Action Plan/Use of Results for Continued Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action plan is developed directly from, and is aligned with, the results</li> <li>Actions are intended to improve program, teaching methods, or curriculum</li> <li>Actions may also modify learning outcomes or assessment strategies as necessary</li> <li>Actions are shared with others</li> <li>Actions are reviewed/ evaluated and terminated as necessary</li> <li>Contains completion dates.</li> <li>Identifies a responsible person/group.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action plan is not <b>clearly</b> developed from, or aligned with, the results</li> <li>Actions are <b>not clear concerning</b> improvements in the program, teaching methods, or curriculum, and/or modify learning outcomes, or assessment strategies</li> <li>Actions are not <b>consistently</b> shared</li> <li>Actions are not <b>consistently</b> reviewed/evaluated or terminated as necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action plan is <b>not</b> directly developed from, or aligned with, the results or is missing</li> <li>Actions do <b>not</b> lead to improvements in the program, teaching methods, or curriculum, and/or modify learning outcomes, or assessment strategies</li> <li>Actions are <b>not</b> shared</li> <li>Actions are <b>not</b> reviewed/evaluated or terminated as necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

Unit:

Date:

	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Needs Attention	Comments
Method of Assessment (Measures/ Targets)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures correspond to and validly assess administrative unit goals</li> <li>Target performance level for the unit is stated</li> <li>There is at least one direct measure for each unit goal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures do <b>not</b> consistently correspond to or validly assess administrative unit goals</li> <li>Target performance level for the unit is unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures do <b>not</b> directly correspond to stated administrative unit goals</li> <li>Measures do <b>not</b> appropriately assess intended administrative unit goals or are missing</li> <li>Target performance level for the unit is <b>not</b> stated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Assessment Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results are related to the specific measures of administrative unit goals</li> <li>Data are analyzed appropriately and provide evidence of target achievement level</li> <li>Results yield meaningful information for improvement(s)</li> <li>Results are shared and can lead to an action plan for improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results are <b>not</b> clearly related to the intended administrative unit goals</li> <li>Data are <b>not</b> analyzed appropriately and/or do <b>not</b> consistently provide evidence of target achievement level</li> <li>Results may <b>not</b> be consistent or yield meaningful information for improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results are <b>not</b> clearly related to the intended administrative unit goals or are missing</li> <li>Data are <b>not</b> analyzed appropriately and do <b>not</b> provide evidence of target achievement level</li> <li>Results are <b>not</b> consistent or do not yield meaningful information for improvement</li> <li>Results are either not shared, or not used to facilitate discussions, and/or do not lead to an action plan for improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Results Related to Previously Reported Modifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate</li> <li>Provides evidence that previous modifications led to improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results of previous modifications are present but do not indicate improvements in outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence that previous modifications cited in Action Plans from previous review cycles were implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Action Plan/Use of Results for Continued Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action plan is developed directly from, and is aligned with, the results</li> <li>Actions are intended to improve unit, administrative processes, and unit support of college mission</li> <li>Actions may also modify administrative unit goals or assessment strategies as necessary</li> <li>Actions are shared with others</li> <li>Actions are reviewed/evaluated and terminated as necessary</li> <li>Contains completion dates.</li> <li>Identifies a responsible person/group.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action plan is not <b>clearly</b> developed from, or aligned with, the results</li> <li>Actions are <b>not clear concerning</b> improvements in the unit, administrative processes, or unit support of college mission, and/or modification of administrative unit goals or assessment strategies</li> <li>Actions are not <b>consistently</b> shared</li> <li>Actions are not <b>consistently</b> reviewed/evaluated or terminated as necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action plan is <b>not</b> directly developed from, or aligned with, the results or is missing</li> <li>Actions do <b>not</b> lead to improvements in the unit, administrative processes, or unit support of college mission, or modification of administrative unit goals or assessment strategies</li> <li>Actions are <b>not</b> shared</li> <li>Actions are <b>not</b> reviewed/evaluated or terminated as necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

## Appendix H: How to Write Student Learning Outcomes

From: Kansas state University Office of Assessment (<http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/slo/action.htm>)

### Action Verb List – Suggested Verbs to Use in Each Level of Thinking Skills

Below are terms (verbs) that can be used when creating student learning outcomes for a course or degree program.

Knowledge	Comprehension	Application	Analysis	Synthesis	Evaluation
Count	Associate	Add	Analyze	Categorize	Appraise
Define	Compute	Apply	Arrange	Combine	Assess
Describe	Convert	Calculate	Breakdown	Compile	Compare
Draw	Defend	Change	Combine	Compose	Conclude
Identify	Discuss	Classify	Design	Create	Contrast
Labels	Distinguish	Complete	Detect	Drive	Criticize
List	Estimate	Compute	Develop	Design	Critique
Match	Explain	Demonstrate	Diagram	Devise	Determine
Name	Extend	Discover	Differentiate	Explain	Grade
Outlines	Extrapolate	Divide	Discriminate	Generate	Interpret
Point	Generalize	Examine	Illustrate	Group	Judge
Quote	Give examples	Graph	Infer Outline	Integrate	Justify
Read	Infer	Interpolate	Point out	Modify	Measure
Recall	Paraphrase	Manipulate	Relate Select	Order	Rank
Recite	Predict	Modify	Separate	Organize	Rate
Recognize	Rewrite	Operate	Subdivide	Plan	Support
Record	Summarize	Prepare	Utilize	Prescribe	Test
Repeat		Produce		Propose	
Reproduces		Show		Rearrange	
Selects		Solve		Reconstruct	
State		Subtract		Related	
Write		Translate		Reorganize	
		Use		Revise	
				Rewrite	
				Summarize	
				Transform	
				Specify	

*Source/Reference:* These steps were derived from information collected at various conferences by Dr. Cia Verschelden, the original source is unknown. This information was original posted on the Office of Assessment web site ( [www.k-state.edu/assessment](http://www.k-state.edu/assessment) ) in the summer of 2003.



## Appendix I: Academic Program Assessment Cycles

For academic programs, assessment reporting follows a two-year, two-tiered process. While all programs collect assessment data on an ongoing basis, only half providing a final report at the conclusion of each academic year. This allows each program to collect two-years' worth of assessment data. The following chart outlines the academic program assessment schedule representing report schedules for Academic Years 2021-2028.

	SP 23	FA 23	SP 24	FA 24	SP 25	FA 25	SP 26	FA 26	SP 27	FA 27	SP 28
Art	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
Biology	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R
Chemistry	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
CART	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
CJC	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
English	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R
Exercise Science	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R
FSM	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
General Studies	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
Graphic Design	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
Health Science	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R
History	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
Legal Studies	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
Math	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R
Music	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R
Physics	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R
Political Science	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
Psychology	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R
Religion	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
Theatre Arts	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C
Zoology	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R	C	C	C	C/R

C= Collection of Data

R= Reporting

## Appendix J: Indirect Assessment Index

### Indirect Assessment Index

The benefits of a more inclusive approach to assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are many. Indirect assessments represented here allow for inputs from a diverse set of activities that help identify a broader range of barriers to student success. This index also gives greater dynamism to our assessment practices, allowing for faster responses to emergent student needs. It also invites greater involvement from key stakeholders and, through its emphasis on layered review and information sharing, promotes greater campus-wide awareness of productive assessment practices.

#### Industry Influencers

- 1.1 *Job Market Analysis*: The Program carefully monitors sources such as the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) and online job postings to identify additions or alterations to professional requirements. The demand for specific technical skills (e.g. proficiencies in certain software) and other desired qualifications help shape learning outcomes and program improvement.
- 1.2 *Industry Partnerships*: The Program leverages relationships with local and regional industries to identify emerging trends within the job market and evolving skills and technological abilities required of recent graduates.
- 1.3 *Industry Advisory Board*: Professionals in fields related to the discipline take part in regular conversations with faculty regarding new or revised curriculum. In this way, program improvement becomes a collaborative venture where industry experts become stakeholders in the Program's success and new or revised programs rest on firm, evidence-based suppositions.

#### Educational Collaboration

- 2.1 *Engagement with Pre-college Learners*: Contact with K-12 educators and students is initiated through activities related to the Program's education programs. This contact gives faculty insight into secondary curriculum and changes to learning environments in general (emerging classroom technology, pedagogy, and related state policies).
- 2.2 *Articulation Agreements*. The Program has built and maintained durable relationships with area community colleges. Sustained faculty and administrative interactions with counterparts from these institutions influences curriculum development and guides improvement.
- 2.3 *Academic Trends*. The review of other related programs, conducted through web-based searches or conversations with colleagues from other institutions, allows faculty to baseline offerings while providing new and innovative approaches to student learning outcomes and curricular design.

#### External Review

- 3.1 Academic Program Review:* Academic Program Review and Planning (APR&P) conducted over the course of the 2014-15 Academic Year, gave the Program an opportunity to enhance its programs, grow enrollment, reduce time to degree, and otherwise enhance current offerings.
- 3.2 External Reviewers Invited to KWC:* External review teams, brought to campus at the instigation of Program or university administration, conduct comprehensive investigations of Program programs and policies. Reviewers compile data into objective summaries and offer recommendations based on these observations.
- 3.3 External Review of Other Programs:* KWC faculty are frequently invited to perform external reviews at other institutions. During their visits, KWC faculty conduct individual interviews, hold group meetings, and perform relevant background research to create reports and recommendations. In conducting these reviews, KWC faculty gain perspective on their home Programs; this perspective often helps shape the student learning environment at KWC.

## **Student Engagement**

- 4.1 Informal Feedback:* Undergraduate student feedback occurs as a natural part of the classroom environment. Undergraduates communicate directly with faculty in and outside of class (e.g. emails, phone conversations, office hours). Through these interactions, faculty are able to evaluate curriculum and improve learning.
- 4.2 Student Surveys:* Regular or periodic surveys of undergraduate students, delivered electronically or in paper form, give insight into factors influencing student success.
- 4.3 New Student Intake:* Each new major and minor is put through a comprehensive intake protocol which, in addition to introducing students to the various curricular features and opportunities within the Program, helps faculty gather anecdotal evidence on evolving student needs, identify emerging barriers to graduation, and improve student learning.
- 4.4 Advising within the Program:* In this Program, student advising is both a shared faculty responsibility and a point of focused concern. Individual student appointments not only benefit the student's overall learning experience, information received through these interactions helps uncover obstacles, identify curricular gaps and areas of need, and inform the Program's approach to course and program improvement.
- 4.5 Student Focus Groups:* Faculty led meetings and informal group conversations with undergraduate students allows the Program to gauge the level of student satisfaction, measure the results of program improvements, and otherwise improve approaches to student learning.

## **Alumni Engagement**

- 6.1 Faculty Interaction:* Faculty initiated contact with graduates occurs evenly throughout the year. Through these interactions, faculty are able to stay informed of professional concerns and evaluate the unit's programs against job-market realities.

- 6.2 *Alumni Advisory Board*: Board members, drawn from recent and established alumni, provide faculty and staff with information relevant to the Program's planned and potential activities. Their feedback is essential to the long-term success.

## **Program Operations**

- 7.1 *Program Faculty Meetings*: Faculty meetings make room for robust conversations regarding student learning and the relationship of student learning outcomes to individual courses or programs. Discussion may focus on individual curricular concerns or proposals or may generally relate to the health of individual programs. These free-flowing exchanges allow the Program to explore multiple channels of evidence and investigate new pathways of improvement. Instructional methods, faculty interest, anecdotal reports and developments from within and without the Program, are some but do not sum the total of the topics used to enhance or otherwise improve programs.
- 7.2 *Program Strategic Plan*: The Program's updated mission and vision statements, as well as connected objectives and strategies.
- 7.3 *Program Resource Assessment*: Budgetary constraints, changes to faculty workload, and a host of other issues influencing the allocation of programmatic instructional resources, are assessed frequently and in the normal course of program revision.

## **Standards and Practices**

- 8.1 *Professional Standards*: The Program's professional organization outlines disciplinary goals and expectations for post-secondary learning environments. These goals are articulated in the organization's mission and vision statements but through established learning outcomes. The professional organization also publishes the results of undergraduate and graduate surveys to better inform Programs of immediate and long-term career success. Frequent interaction with this information, either through their website or at the annual meeting, allows the Program to keep pace with evolving trends and adjust curricular expectations.
- 8.2 *Changes within the Discipline*: Disciplines are, themselves, in a constant state of change. The Program keeps pace by adjusting expectations for student learning, modifying course content, adjusting course and program offerings, and updating nomenclature.
- 8.3 *Secondary Education Accreditation*: Included in this category are materials required for teacher educator recertification. This includes, but is not limited to, PRAXIS results; assignments, rubrics, and assessments of candidate performance in secondary methods courses; intern teaching evaluations, and Impact on Student Learning (ISL) data.

## **Institutional Planning**

- 9.1 *External Planning Conversations*: Discussions related to institutional planning sometimes consider programs as part of larger conversations.

## **Other Assessments**

- 8.4 *Institutional Research Reporting*: Institutional Research reports allow assessment-driven improvement. Careful and consistent attention to rates of retention, time-to-degree, student success (expressed as a percentage of course grades), and other common reports have informed the Program's approach to student learning and program improvement.
- 8.5 *Measurements of Curricular Complexity*: The University of New Mexico's Innovation Academy maintains a web-based program used to model the structural and instructional complexity of academic programs. These curricular maps can be used to inform curricular redesign. <https://curricula.academicdashboards.org/>
- 8.6 *Rubrics*: Qualitative rubrics with descriptive scores establish relationships between numerical values and categorical definitions and allow us to track year-over-year improvement. Categories of analysis are drawn from required, level-specific learning outcomes and established programmatic benchmarks.
- 8.7 *Curricular Change Forms*: Evidence of data-driven course and curricular change is included as part of the curricular change process.