Wayne State University’s efforts to support program assessment are guided by WSU Assessment’s mission, learning outcomes, and program goals. The success of those efforts is assessed annually and drive improvements in the following year.
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# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**The 2017-2018 academic year (AY17-18) was the fourth year in which an institutional assessment of the “state of assessment” was carried out. All action items from the AY16-17 assessment were successfully implemented and incorporated into this year’s assessment as appropriate. AY17-18 efforts and assessment results show a maturing culture of assessment with significant progress since AY14-15.**

**Specifically, new funding provided by Provost Whitfield and support from Associate Provost and Associate Vice President Ellis enabled the director of assessment and the** [University Assessment Council](https://wayne.edu/assessment/files/university_assessment_council_ay18-19.pdf) **to add to their repertoire of activities for building assessment knowledge, skill, and participation. New and ongoing efforts this year included:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **New** | **Ongoing** |
| * **publishing two WSU assessment handbooks**
 | * **offering professional development workshops**
 |
| * **organizing Assessment Week 2017**
 | * **meeting individually with programs**
 |
| * **establishing the General Education Oversight Committee’s Assessment Subcommittee**
 | * **updating WSU Assessment website’s tutorials, content, event listings, and good assessment examples**
 |
| * **workshops on General Education assessment by an assessment expert from the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)**
 | * **implementing strategies for recognizing programs’ and individuals’ assessment efforts**
 |
| * **establishing the WSU Program Assessment Grant program**
 | * **disseminating standardized monthly progress reports**
 |
| * **promoting the scholarship of assessment**
 | * **promoting the annual timeline**
 |
| * **carrying out a listening tour**
 | * **supporting assessment committee structures**
 |

**For the AY17-18 assessment, the director of assessment and the University Assessment Council implemented assessments for eight outcomes and four program goals. Target levels of improvement were met for four of the outcomes and goals, partially met for an additional four, and not met for one. Low response rates on the campus-wide assessment survey and the assessment committee reports limited the data available for the other three. Increasing response rates is a key action item for 2018-2019.**

**Data sources included:**

* **the review of 34 randomly selected assessment plans using the assessment plan feedback rubric**
* **an assessment committee annual activity report, and**
* **participation (on assessment committees, as assessment coordinators, in the assessment grant process, in the scholarship of assessment, at assessment workshops, meetings, events, or consultations, use of Compliance Assist, use of the WSU assessment website) by a total of 1128 attendees across 203 events and activities.**

**Comparing programs reviewed in AY16-17 to AY17-18, results from the rubric reviews revealed a similar or greater number of programs meeting quality standards in four of seven assessment plan sections this year, but assessment planning quality was lower in three other elements:**

**The annual assessment committee activity reports in AY17-18 described a variety of changes to improve learning outcomes, the assessment process, and assessment instruments,** to redesign curricula, and to improve communication with students**.**

**Recognition efforts continued and grew in 2017-2018:**

* **Email announcements and Today@Wayne story announcing the 2018 WSU Assessment Grant recipients**
* **2017 Assessment Recognition Luncheon hosted by President M. Roy Wilson and Provost Keith E. Whitfield**
* **Posters and table tents displayed at the luncheon and later across campus and online to recognize 24 programs for a well-designed and implemented assessment that led to a clear action to improve the program.**
* **Individualized recognition and thank-you letters from the Provost to members of the University Assessment Council and the WSU Program Assessment Grant reviewers.**
* **Campus-wide announcements of and congratulations to presenters at the IUPUI Assessment Institute.**

**For 2018-2019, the WSU director of assessment and the University Assessment Council will continue building Wayne State’s culture of assessment by providing individualized feedback and other professional development opportunities, expanding strategies to improve assessment data collection, providing more detailed information to supervisors to increase assessment plan completion rates, and collaborating with the Office for Teaching and Learning to offer workshops related to assessment.**

# **HISTORICAL CONTEXT:**

**Both nationally and internationally, continuous improvement of student learning outcomes has become an increasing focus over the last two decades. Program assessment, the data-driven process of setting clear goals for student learning, measuring the attainment of those goals, and improving programs based on the results is the cyclical process through which continuous improvement happens.**

**Concerted efforts to establish a culture of assessment at Wayne State grew in Fall 2012 with the appointment of Dr. Joe Rankin to the position of Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs. Under his leadership, the university licensed Compliance Assist, an online repository for program assessment documentation. He then populated the site with standard questions to guide programs’ assessment reporting. Beginning in Winter 2013, he and his staff offered 20 workshops across campus to train faculty, staff, and administrators in the use of the site and to introduce the campus to the role of the Higher Learning Commission in motivating more formalized attention to continuous improvement. Throughout the following months, Associate Provost Rankin gave presentations at meetings in most of Wayne State’s Schools and Colleges to further inform the campus of these efforts and individuals’ roles in them.**

**Despite these efforts, campus-wide progress in assessment was sporadic and slow. Unlike many other institutions of similar size with a more developed culture of assessment, Wayne State did not have an office dedicated specifically to supporting and enhancing program assessment processes. Associate Provost Rankin had recommended the creation of such a position to two previous provosts without success until then-Provost Margaret Winters agreed with his reasoning and approved a search for WSU Director of Assessment in summer 2014.**

**The hiring of the Director of Assessment in September 2014 enabled a number of new initiatives to enhance campus-wide assessment participation and practices:**

1. **Establishment of an institutional timeline for the program assessment cycle**
2. **Outreach to faculty, staff, and administrative groups at the university, college, and department levels**
3. **Creation of the** [University Assessment Council](https://wayne.edu/assessment/files/university_assessment_council_ay18-19.pdf)
4. **Delivery of structured faculty and staff workshops on program assessment to complement the work of the Office for Teaching and Learning**
5. **Development and launch of the WSU assessment website (**<http://wayne.edu/assessment>**)**
6. **Identification or creation of College/School/Division and department assessment committees and department-level program assessment coordinators**
7. **Creation, piloting, norming, and use of an assessment plan feedback rubric**
8. **Development and implementation of a plan for assessing the state of assessment at Wayne State**
9. **Standardized monthly reporting of assessment plan documentation to the Provost’s office, deans, and University Assessment Council, and presented as relevant to other groups**
10. **Planning of recognition events, including an annual luncheon for assessment practitioners and hosted by the president and the provost**
11. **Discussions with the provost’s office and the General Education Oversight Committee regarding the assessment of the General Education program**
12. **Better integration of program assessment efforts into Academic Program Review**
13. **Content analysis of campus-wide student learning outcomes to inform discussions in the General Education Reform Committee, and planning by the WSU Director of Assessment, the University Assessment Council, the Office for Teaching and Learning, the Academic Success Center, and within each college.**

**Several new efforts were undertaken in 2017-2018 to continue building the culture of assessment at Wayne State:**

1. **Assessment Week 2017, a series of events over four days to raise awareness and increase engagement in program assessment and to communicate its ongoing value and importance following the re-affirmation of WSU’s accreditation. Events included**
	1. **cookie decorating as a metaphor for the assessment process and its goals**
	2. **a competitive trivia game challenging college, school, and student services teams to show their assessment expertise for prizes**
	3. **a live performance of a mock trial in which an academic program uses assessment data to defend against a student’s suit against the program**
	4. **a town hall on assessment held by the provost**
	5. **the launch of assessment handbooks for** [academic](https://wayne.edu/assessment/files/academic_programs_assessment_handbook_wsu.pdf) **and** [student services](https://wayne.edu/assessment/files/student_services_assessment_handbook_wsu.pdf) **programs**
	6. **a workshop on assessing student learning**
	7. **the annual assessment recognition luncheon**
2. **WSU Assessment Grants 2018, a grant program for improving assessment practices. Seven programs received awards and will be carrying out their projects in 2018-2019.**
3. **Travel support for faculty and staff presenting at the 2017 IUPUI Assessment Institute**
4. **The General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) Assessment Subcommittee was established to develop a plan for direct measures of student learning outcomes in the newly approved, revised General Education program. The subcommittee started meeting in February 2018 and developed an assessment cycle and rotation for all Gen Ed focus areas.**
5. **NILOA Coach Visit, an award from the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) that brought a national assessment expert to campus to deliver workshops on adapting the VALUE rubrics to align with three areas of the new General Education program. These workshops and feedback from participants formed the basis for the GEOC Assessment Subcommittee’s work in developing rubrics for Diversity, Equity & Inclusion, Quantitative Experience, and Social Inquiry.**
6. **Publication of WSU assessment handbooks, one for academic programs, and the other for student services. The handbooks were collaboratively written by the director of assessment and Prof. Dian Walster, Information Science, and designed by Prof. Judith Moldenhauer, Graphic Design.**

**The remainder of this report summarizes the assessment plan for WSU assessment, its results, and action plan for AY17-18, indicating further growth of our culture of assessment over the last year.**

# **MISSION STATEMENT:**

The mission of WSU Assessment is to engage faculty, staff, administrators, and students from academic and co-curricular/student services programs in an effective, sustainable process of ***continuous program improvement that enhances student learning*** throughout their time at Wayne State. We encourage stakeholders’ engagement by:

* offering professional development opportunities in program assessment, such as workshops, group and individual consultations, training videos, presentations, peer forums, and written documentation
* disseminating information about program assessment through peer support structures (university, college/school /division, and departmental program assessment committees; program assessment coordinators) and online at <http://wayne.edu/assessment>
* recognizing individuals and programs for their exemplary progress and scholarly presentations or publications in assessment
* facilitating feedback processes to improve the quality of programs’ assessment plans

The University Assessment Council further supports and promotes program assessment and the WSU Assessment office’s efforts. Its charge and membership list are available [online](https://wayne.edu/assessment/contact/).

In 2017-2018, efforts at fulfilling WSU Assessment’s mission included the following activities:

## Professional development activities

* 16 university-level assessment events open to all campus members
* 51 in-person individual consultations
* 56 phone or email consultations
* 17 rubric report meetings
* 7 listening tour meetings
* 40 meetings of committees discussing assessment activities
* 759 visits by users to the dedicated professional development sections of the WSU Assessment website (media, examples)

Shifts in professional development activities responded to the changing needs of the campus and results of the 2015-2016 annual report. As such, university-level workshops were substantially reduced and rubric report meetings were introduced. More active outreach to invite individuals to discuss their assessment practices were undertaken, including individualized messages to program representatives with pending documentation, and a listening tour

## Director of Assessment’s participation in committee discussions

* Council of Undergraduate Administrators (CUA)
* General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC)
	+ GEOC Assessment Subcommittee
* Higher Learning Commission Steering Committee
* University Assessment Council (UAC)

The director’s role at committee meetings was to provide assessment expertise to support the committees’ charge. The director chairs the University Assessment Council.

## Dissemination of information

* 9 information meetings
* Monthly progress reports of assessment documentation submitted by each program to the provost, deans, other relevant supervisors , and University Assessment Council representatives
* Periodic communication with program assessment coordinators regarding available resources, professional development opportunities, and program-level progress in assessment plan documentation
* Monthly meetings of the University Assessment Council, whose representatives communicated information to their respective units
* Campus-wide emails and event postings announcing assessment-related professional development opportunities and deadlines
* School/college assessment committees made council information available at the departmental level.

## Recognition of individuals and programs

* A recognition luncheon for 60 faculty, staff, and administrators hosted by President M. Roy Wilson and Provost Keith Whitfield in October 2018
* Posters (12) describing good examples of programs’ assessment processes, presentations given at a national assessment conference, and recipients of the new WSU Assessment Grants were unveiled at the luncheon and subsequently displayed at multiple locations on campus.
* Faculty recognition section on the WSU assessment website for scholarly publication or presentation of assessment work (<http://wayne.edu/assessment/showcase/>)
* Video or written narrative versions of peer forum presentations and the assessment posters and table tents posted publicly on the WSU Assessment website (<http://wayne.edu/assessment/examples/>). There were 162 visits to this page in 2017-2018.

## Facilitating feedback processes

* University Assessment Council members conducted the fourth annual review of a 10% random sample of assessment plans from across campus to provide feedback to 34 programs regarding best practices in assessment. The corresponding reports were shared with program representatives in Fall 2018 to discuss the results of the review and provide support for improving assessment practices.

# **LEARNING OUTCOMES AND PROGRAM GOALS**

The success of the above efforts was assessed with respect to a set of specific learning outcomes and program goals, listed in Table 1 and described below. In AY16-17, all outcomes were assessed, but the data from the campus-wide survey were not usable due to an unacceptably low response rate. As such, LO1 and LO9 have no useable data for AY16-17, and other LOs have less available evidence than last year.

**Table 1. Learning Outcomes and Program Goals for Assessment at WSU**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEARNING OUTCOMES and PROGRAM GOALS:** | **ASSESSMENT METHODS** **(Details below)** |
| **WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs:** | **Participation data** | **Rubric scores** | **Campus-wide assessment survey****(Fall 2018)** |
| 1. identify the program assessment cycle’s stages, purposes, and benefits. |  |  | Data unavailable due to low response rate |
| 2. compose mission statements that reflect best practices | ✓ | ✓ |
| 3. compose learning outcomes that reflect best practices. | ✓ | ✓ |
| 4. accurately and clearly represent the development of student learning outcomes in a curriculum map | ✓ | ✓ |
| 5. select sustainable assessments that provide useful data for understanding whether their stakeholders are achieving their program’s learning outcomes. | ✓ | ✓ |
| 6. use their assessment data to make logical decisions about what to retain or change in their program. | ✓ | ✓ |
| 7. carry out their data-driven decisions to improve their program. | ✓ | ✓ |
| 8. close the loop by re-assessing whether their improvements efforts had the desired effect. | ✓ |  |
| 9. believe that program assessment efforts are valued.  |  |  |
| 10. meet annual assessment plan documentation requirements. | ✓ |  |
| 11. expand the number of individuals engaging in program assessment. | ✓ |  |
| 12. receive professional development opportunities. | ✓ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# **ASSESSMENT METHODS**

**The outcomes were assessed through four assessment methods:**

Feedback rubric scores:

**The WSU Director of Assessment selected 10% (34) of AY17-18 assessment plans from the list of programs in June 2018 using three approaches:**

1. **All academic programs at the mid-point of their Academic Program Review (APR) cycle were included.**
2. **Programs reviewed in 2016-2017 but that did not meet with a University Assessment Council representative to discuss that review and that made substantive changes to their assessment plan in 2017-2018 were re-reviewed to provide more current feedback.**
3. **Programs chosen randomly using a random number generator were added to reach a 10% sample.**

**Programs reviewed in 2015-2016 or 2016-2017 and their closely related counterparts were excluded from selection (with the exception noted in point 2 above) in order to broaden the range of faculty and departments involved in the process.**

**After an intensive training and norming process, UAC members applied a feedback rubric (**<http://wayne.edu/assessment/files/wsu_program_assessment_plan_feedback_rubric.docx>**) to each of the selected assessment plans to evaluate the quality of assessment planning across campus. All plans were scored by at least two Council members; some were scored by three.**

**Each section of the rubric corresponds to one element of the assessment plan, and thus to learning outcomes 2 through 7. Possible scores on each section included *Reflects best practices, Meets standards,* and *Needs development*. A summary score using the same scale reflects the quality of the overall assessment plan when all sections are considered together; it is not a mathematical average of the scores from other sections. The scores reflect only sections that were submitted by the review date; a submission rate is therefore also provided for context. Prior years’ reports included a “0” score for non-submissions. Those results are updated and presented alongside to this year’s scores to reflect the change in reporting format.**

**The target level of performance is** an annual 3% increase in the number of reviewed assessment plans ***meeting standards*** and ***reflecting best practices*** until all sections reach 85% of programs at those levels. See Table 2 for specific percentage targets

**Table 2. Target for UAC-reviewed assessment plans meeting standards or reflecting best practices**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AY14-15 (baseline)(n=40) | AY15-16 results:(n=37) | **AY16-17 results:****(n=33)** | AY17-18 targets: |
| Mission statement | 70% | 75% | **75%** | 78% |
| Learning outcomes | 57% | 62% | **73%** | 75% |
| Curriculum map | 58% | 63% | **59%** | 64% |
| Method | 33% | 38% | **54%** | 59% |
| Results | 39% | 44% | **38%** | 43% |
| Action plan | 32% | 37% | **91%** | 94% |
| Timeline | 40% | 45% | **85%** | 88% |
| Reporting to stakeholders\* | 27% | 32% | **70%** | 73% |
| Overall plan rating | 24% | 29% | **56%** | 59% |

\*Reviews after AY14-15 were conducted before the *Reporting to stakeholders’* deadline, so comparisons with that year will not be direct.

**CLOSING THE LOOP IN AY17-18: Several changes to the assessment plan review process were implemented in AY17-18 in response to data and feedback from the AY16-17 rubric reviews:**

* + **Norming activities and scoring were split over two days to minimize reviewer fatigue.**
	+ **Norming scores were entered by the director of assessment rather than by individual reviewers to avoid the confound in 2017 of reviewers seeing each other’s ratings and potentially modifying their own to match.**
	+ **Due to inconsistent follow-through in 2017 on holding post-review meetings with program representatives, the corresponding UAC representative, and the director of assessment, in 2018 an administrative assistant in the Office of the Provost took on the task of scheduling those meetings. All but one meeting was held by the end of October 2018; the last will be held in January 2019.**

Campus assessment survey:

**As in the previous four years, a random sample of graduate and undergraduate students plus all faculty, staff, and administrators** **affiliated with programs involved in program assessment received an invitation to respond to a campus-wide survey on program assessment. The survey included multiple choice and open-ended questions about the role of the respondent, the type of program with which they are affiliated, the usefulness of available assessment resources, their perceptions of the intended and actual purposes and uses of program assessment, benefits of program assessment, perceptions about who values their work in assessment, changes made based on assessment, barriers to assessment, and suggestions for improvements.** Of the 6,049 invitations sent, 228 (3.7%) surveys were started. Given this low response rate, the data were not cleaned, and therefore the actual useable number of responses is likely to be even lower.

Given the extremely low response rate, the University Assessment Council judged the data unreliable, and therefore they are not included as evidence of the corresponding learning outcomes in this report. The council identified a number of strategies to implement in 2019 to increase response rate; the strategies are presented in the action plan section of this report.

Given that the outcomes and program goals elicited on the survey cannot be reported this year, it is not possible to report whether the target levels of improvement have been met. They will be measured in the Fall 2019 survey.

**Targets**:

WSU Assessment has set a target of an annual 3% increase on the following measures in the survey:

* The self-reported level of engagement in assessment (AY15-16 sets the baseline for this measure) Q10)
* The recognition of the four main elements of the assessment cycle (Q12)
* Confidence in carrying out each program assessment activity (Q13)
* The identification of program-focused purposes of assessment (Q14)
* The reported experience of program-focused uses of assessment data (Q15)
* The perceived and experienced benefits of assessment (Q16, Q17)
* The use and usefulness of assessment resources (Q20)
* The number of individuals perceived to value participation in assessment (Q23)

WSU Assessment has set a target of an annual 5% reduction on the following measures in the survey:

* The identification in individual-focused purposes of assessment (Q14)
* The reported experience of individual-focused uses of assessment (Q15)
* The perceived and experienced barriers to participating in assessment (Q19)

(Note that for 2017-2018, these survey-based targets cannot be assessed due to the low response rate on the survey.)

Participation data:

* + **Interactions with WSU Director of Assessment: A count of the number of attendees at campus-wide, unit-level or committee workshops, meetings, and individual consultations with Dr. Cathy Barrette through AY17-18**
	+ **Assessment coordinators: A count of the number of individuals identified by their unit as the contact person for assessment communications**
	+ **Scholarship of Assessment: A count of presenters and scholarly presentations given at assessment conferences related to assessment efforts**
	+ **WSU Program Assessment Grants: A competitive grant program to improve assessment practices was established in 2017. The number of projects and participants and their focus serve as relevant data for participation as well as for LO5 (Assessment Methods).**
	+ **Compliance Assist users: A count of active users between Sept. 1, 2017 and Aug. 31, 2018**
	+ **WSU Assessment website traffic: Number of users and unique page views on the WSU Assessment website (per Google Analytics) between Sept. 1, 2017 and Aug. 31, 2018**
	+ **Assessment committee annual report: Beginning in June 2017, 84 units (college, school, division, department or non-departmental program) were invited to submit an annual assessment committee report identifying the committee members, their roles (e.g., faculty, staff, student), and describing the committee’s activities. Responses were received from 23 (27%) units; 17 (74%) of the 23 respondents reported having an active assessment committee in their unit.**
	+ **Assessment plan submission: Reports from Compliance Assist identifying the number of items of required documentation submitted in AY17-18 provided the final piece of participation data.**

WSU Assessment has set the following **targets** for participation measures for AY17-18:

* + **Interactions with WSU Director of Assessment: Increase the number of attendees at campus-wide and unit-level events, workshops, meetings, and individual consultations with Dr. Cathy Barrette through AY17-18 by 5%**
	+ **Assessment coordinators: 95% of programs will have at least one assigned contact person for assessment communications per department/unit**
	+ **WSU Program Assessment Grants: Elicit inquiries into, submissions for, and awards of assessment grants. AY17-18 is the inaugural baseline year for proposals.**
	+ **Compliance Assist users: Achieve an average of one active user per department/unit**
	+ **WSU Assessment website traffic: Increase the number of users and unique page views on the WSU Assessment website (per Google Analytics) by 3%**
	+ **Assessment committee report: Participation of 50% of units in responding to the report.**
	+ **Assessment plan submission**: 78% of programs will submit all Fall and Winter documentation.

# **ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

Table 3 provides a summary of results; details for each learning outcome and program goal follow.

#### Table 3. Summary of Results

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Learning outcomes and program goals:** *WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs…* | **Results** |
| 1. identify the program assessment cycle’s stages, purposes, and benefits. | **No data** |
| 2. compose mission statements that reflect best practices | **MET** |
| 3. compose learning outcomes that reflect best practices. | **PARTIAL** |
| 4. accurately and clearly represent the development of student learning outcomes in a curriculum map | **MET** |
| 5. select sustainable assessments that provide useful data for understanding whether their stakeholders are achieving their program’s learning outcomes. | **PARTIAL** |
| 6. use their assessment data to make logical decisions about what to retain or change in their program. | **PARTIAL** |
| 7. carry out their data-driven decisions to improve their program. | **PARTIAL** |
| 8. close the loop by re-assessing whether their improvements efforts had the desired effect. | **Insufficient data** |
| 9. believe that program assessment efforts are valued.  | **Insufficient data** |
| 10. meet annual assessment plan documentation requirements. | **NOT MET** |
| 11. expand the number of individuals engaging in program assessment. | **MET** |
| 12. receive professional development opportunities. | **MET** |

## RESULTS DETAILS

## LO1: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs identify the program assessment cycle’s stages, purposes, and benefits.

### DATA SOURCE: Survey

**LO1 relies entirely on assessment survey results. As such, no useable data for AY17-18 is available.**

## LO2: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs compose mission statements that reflect best practices

### DATA SOURCES: Rubric scores, Participation data

#### Submission rate and Rubric scores: Mission statement section (See Figure 1.)

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR L02:

Programs matched the quantity of mission statements submitted in AY16-17. No further progress is expected in future years because the remaining 1% corresponds to programs in transition, either newly added or in the process of moratorium or discontinuance.

A higher percentage of the randomly sampled programs met standards in their missions statements in AY17-18 compared to AY16-17. The 86% of programs that met quality standards exceeds the 78% target set for AY17-18.

**Target levels of improvement in quantity and quality were met for this outcome.**

## LO3: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs compose learning outcomes that reflect best practices

### DATA SOURCES: Rubric scores, Participation data

#### Submission rate and Rubric scores: Learning outcomes section (See Figure 2.)

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR L03:

Programs matched the quantity of learning outcomes submitted in AY16-17. No further progress is expected in future years because the remaining 1% corresponds to programs in transition, either newly added or in the process of moratorium or discontinuance.

A lower percentage of the randomly sampled programs met standards in their learning outcomes in AY17-18 compared to AY16-17. The 58% of programs that met quality standards falls considerably below the 75% target for AY17-18.

**Target levels of improvement were met for quantity for this outcome, but not for quality.**

## LO4: WSU faculty and staff from academic (and co-curricular) programs accurately and clearly represent the development of student learning outcomes in a curriculum map

### DATA SOURCES: Rubric scores, Participation data

#### Submission rate and Rubric scores: Curriculum maps (See Figure 3.)

Student Services programs are not required to submit curriculum maps. As such this graph only represents performance in academic programs.

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR L04:

Programs matched the quantity of curriculum maps submitted in AY16-17. No further progress is expected in future years because the remaining 1% corresponds to programs in transition, either newly added or in the process of moratorium or discontinuance.

The 71% of programs that met quality standards exceeds the 64% target set for AY17-18.

**Target levels of improvement in quantity and quality were met for this outcome.**

## LO5: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs select sustainable assessments that provide useful data for understanding whether their stakeholders are achieving their program’s learning outcomes.

### DATA SOURCES: Rubric scores, Participation data, WSU Program Assessment Grants

#### Submission rate and Rubric scores: Assessment method section (See Figure 4.)

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR L05:

Programs matched the quantity of assessment methods submitted in AY16-17. No further progress is expected in future years because the remaining 1% corresponds to programs in transition, either newly added or in the process of moratorium or discontinuance.

A lower percentage of the randomly sampled programs met standards in their assessment methods in AY17-18 compared to AY16-17. The 48% of programs that met quality standards falls considerably below the 59% target for AY17-18.

**Target levels of improvement in quantity were met for this outcome, but were met not for quality.**

## LO6: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs use their assessment data to make logical decisions about what to retain or change in their program.

### DATA SOURCES: Rubric scores, Participation data

#### Submission rate and Rubric scores: Results section (See Figure 5.)

#### Submission rate and Rubric scores: Action plan section (See Figure 6.)

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR L06:

On average, slightly fewer programs submitted results and action plans compared to last year.

A higher percentage of the randomly sampled programs met standards in their results in AY17-18 compared to AY16-17 (73% compared to 38%), but a lower percentage met standards in their action plans (79% compared to 91%).

**Target levels of improvement in quantity were not met for this outcome; target levels of improvement in quality were partially met.**

## LO7: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs carry out their data-driven decisions to improve their program.

### DATA SOURCES: Rubric scores, Participation data

#### Submission rates and Rubric scores: Timeline for implementation section (NB: Data for AY15-16 was downloaded three months earlier than in AY14-15, which affected the number of Timeline sections submitted.) (See Figure 7.)

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR L07:

A slightly lower percentage of programs submitted timelines in AY17-18 compared to the previous year, but more of the randomly sampled programs met standards in their timelines for implementing their action plans in AY17-18 compared to the previous year.

**Target levels of improvement in quantity (78%) and quality (88%) were not met for this outcome, although only fell short by one percentage point in each case.**

## LO8: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs close the loop by re-assessing the impact of action plan implementation on student learning outcomes.

### DATA SOURCE: Assessment Committee Annual Report

#### ****Assessment Committee Annual Report****

Eight of the fourteen active committees that described their accomplishments for 2017-2018 identified actions that involved closing the loop. They described changes to or development of the student learning outcomes, assessment process and instruments, and curriculum based on their assessment data. Three reported re-assessing following a change made in response to earlier assessment data. One described the impact of establishing collaborations across units and a communication plan to better support students.

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR L08:

**Committee reports suggest that unit-level discussions about closing the loop are taking place in about half of assessment committees. The limited number of committees that submitted this report (27%) limits the ability to generalize this result, however.**

## PG9: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs believe that program assessment efforts are valued.

***The academic literature on assessment indicates that a positive culture of assessment includes a perception that work on assessment is valued and rewarded (****Killian et al 2015; Kuh et al. 2014;* ***Suskie, 2009).***

### DATA SOURCES: Assessment Committee Annual Report

#### ****Assessment Committee Annual Report****

Fourteen of the 19 units that submitted this report identified at least one individual whose work on assessment was valued by the person submitting the committee report. The total number of individuals identified was 17.

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR PG9:

**Assessment committee reports provide some evidence that assessment efforts are valued at the unit level, whether the unit is the program, department, or school or college, but few committees submitted their report in AY17-18. Without this year’s survey data, no information is available about perceptions that assessment is valued institutionally.**

## PG10: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs meet annual assessment plan documentation requirements.

### DATA SOURCE: Participation data

#### Participation data: Compliance Assist assessment plan completion report

Reports downloaded from Compliance Assist provide evidence of the number of programs able to articulate their mission statements, learning outcomes, curriculum maps, assessment methods, and action plans, although the reports cannot indicate the quality of these items. Figure 8 compares completion rates since 2013-2014, the first year that programs had access to Compliance Assist.

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR PG10:

Completion rates increased each year through the Higher Learning Commission re-affirmation of accreditation process, but decreased in the two subsequent years following a positive outcome to the review. That decrease may also be due to the earlier cut-off date for the reports: The final report date for AY15-16 was in January 2017 in order to provide the most updated report possible to the HLC vs. in November 2017 for AY16-17 and in December 2018 for AY17-18.

**The target completion rate of 78% was not met.**

## PG11: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs expand the number of individuals engaging in program assessment.

### DATA SOURCES: Participation data

For the period of 9/1/2017 through 8/31/2018, participation in assessment is evidenced through a variety of counts, including the number of individuals participating in assessment events, scholarship, and the new WSU Program Assessment Grant program; individuals with assigned assessment roles and serving on assessment committees; and individuals using Compliance Assist or the WSU Assessment website.

#### ****Participation in Events**** (See Figure 9.)

**In this academic year, assessment events resulted in 1128 interactions with participants.** (Note that some individuals are represented in more than one count.) This represents an increase over previous years, primarily due to Assessment Week events, which account for 495 of those interactions, approximately 300 of them with students. A high percentage (46%) of those interactions involved new participants. **The goal of a 5% increase in total number of interactants was met.**

#### ****Assessment Coordinators**** (See Figure 10.)

**In addition, more individuals served as assessment coordinators in AY17-18 (150) than in AY16-17. They represent 95% of programs, leaving 5% of programs without an identified coordinator. The target of 95% of programs having a coordinator has been met.**

#### ****Scholarship of Assessment****

**Promoting opportunities for scholarly work based in assessment efforts is an ongoing strategy for engaging more individuals in assessment and for expanding professional development opportunities. Four colleagues presented their assessment efforts with the director of assessment at the 2017 IUPUI Assessment Institute, supported by travel funds from the Office of the Provost. In addition, fourteen colleagues (faculty and staff) submitted five group proposals to the 2018 IUPUI Assessment Institute, and all were accepted.**

**Given that AY17-18 was the first year of promoting the scholarship of assessment, no target for improvement was set.**

#### ****WSU Program Assessment Grants****

The Office of the Provost established a grant program in Winter 2017 to promote best practices in program-level assessment of student learning outcomes. In its augural year, twenty-two faculty and staff received funding for a total of seven collaborative projects selected from schools, colleges and units across campus. The projects will assist in the piloting, creation or significant revision of programs’ assessment processes.

Five additional proposals were received but not funded. Nineteen faculty and staff collaborated on those proposals. One additional individual made an inquiry about the program but decided not to submit a proposal.

Thirteen faculty and staff served as reviewers for the grant proposals.

In total, participation in the inaugural year of the assessment grant program included 41 faculty and staff submitting proposals, plus 13 faculty and staff reviewers. These results are a baseline for future comparison of participation.

**Given that AY17-18 was the first year of promoting the scholarship of assessment, no target for improvement was set for this year.**

#### ****Compliance Assist Use**** (See Figure 11.)

**While there was a slight increase in Compliance Assist users this year and some users were responsible for multiple programs, fewer programs overall used Compliance Assist to report their assessment efforts. This target was partially met.**

#### ****WSU Assessment Website Traffic**** (See Figure 12.)

**There were fewer total users of the website this year, but with a similar number of page views (98%) and a larger percentage were new users. The goal of a 5% increase in total users over last year was not met, but the increase in new users was.**

#### ****WSU Website Document Downloads****

**The ability to track document downloads on the website became available during the last five months of AY17-18. In those months, the most frequently accessed documents related to good assessment examples from WSU peers, professional development materials, and the rubric for the new assessment grant program.**

**Given that AY17-18 was the first year of promoting the scholarship of assessment, no target for improvement was set for this year.**

#### ****Assessment Committee Activity****

**59 individuals were members of the 23 programs or student services units that reported having a committee or group responsible for discussing assessment**

* **Average of 4.2 meetings in academic units in AY17-18 compared to 3.6 in AY16-17**
* **Average of 3.3 meetings in Student Services units in AY17-18 compared to 5.5 in AY16-17**

**Only 27% of committees completed the annual report, compared to AY16-17, when 55% of committees submitted a report. As such, the reported number of participants does not accurately reflect the actual number of participants. The target of 50% of units reporting was not met.**

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR PG11:

**The available data were limited in some areas for the program goal. However, much of the other data indicate substantial participation in assessment, although overall completion of assessment plans fell by two percentage points in AY17-18. However, initial documentation of participation in the scholarship of assessment and in improving assessment practice through the new grant program suggest potential growth in the quality of and expertise in assessment practices.**

## PG12: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs receive professional development opportunities.

### DATA SOURCES: Participation data, Materials provided

#### Participation data (See Figure 14.)

**Participants engaged in a variety of assessment activities through 203 formal and information professional development opportunities. The activities align with WSU Assessment’s goals of disseminating information, providing professional development, recognizing individuals’ and groups’ assessment efforts, and facilitating feedback to programs.**

#### ****WSU Assessment Handbooks****

 **Two faculty members (Dian Walster, Information Science; Judith Moldenhauer, Graphic Design) collaborated with the director of assessment for over a year to produce two assessment handbooks: *Academic Program Assessment: Easy Steps to Improving Student Learning* and *Student Services Program Assessment: Easy Steps to Improving Student Learning.* The handbooks were launched in October 2017 during Assessment Week 2017, hard copies distributed by request, and a pdf posted to the assessment website for free download. The handbooks explain each element of the assessment plan and provide examples from WSU programs in either academic or student services programs corresponding to the handbook version.**

**The handbooks thus serve as both professional development materials and recognition of programs whose assessment plan items were selected as examples to publish in the handbooks.**

#### ****Conversation Calendars****

**Conversation Calendars, a set of monthly discussion topics to guide assessment committees’ planning for and implementation of assessment plans in their programs and units, were promoted through email on multiple dates to faculty, chairs, directors, associate deans, and deans.**

#### ****Consultations****

**The WSU Director of Assessment and University Assessment Council members provided numerous individual and group consultations, informational meetings, and responses to email and phone questions throughout AY17-18. These interactions provide opportunities for just-in-time professional development related to all aspects of the assessment process.**

### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR PG12:

**A variety of professional development opportunities that rely on different modes of delivery, accommodate different group sizes, timing, and needs were provided in 2017-2018.**

# **ACTION PLAN and TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

**No specific actions were identified for LOs 1, 2, 4, 7 and 8, or for PGs 9, 11 and 12 (*identifying the assessment cycle, best practices in writing mission statements, curriculum maps; assessment valued*; *expand engagement; professional development*) because targets were met or exceeded for each, or data was not available due to low response rates.**

**For LOs 3, 5, and 6, and PG 10 (details below), Table 4 specifies the actions to be taken to improve the available quantity of assessment data, the quality of learning outcomes statements, assessment methods, and action plans, and the number of programs submitting complete assessment plans.**

**In addition, existing ongoing activities will be sustained, such as professional development events, recognition events, and promotion of the scholarship of assessment.**

**Table 4. WSU Assessment action plan, timeline, and responsibilities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ACTION PLAN ITEM** | **TIMELINE for IMPLEMENTATION and *RESPONSIBLE PARTIES*** |
| **For learning outcomes 1-7, program goals 8 and 9:****Implement strategies to increase response rate on the annual survey and the assessment committee reports in 2019, such as:**1. 2 weeks before the launch, send an announcement of the upcoming survey or report
2. Ask UAC members, advisors, and faculty to forward it and repeat the announcement at meetings – personal contact is key
3. Once the survey/report is launched, ask UAC members to forward the link with a request to complete it to members of their unit
4. Make it a competition across divisions - Check responses 1 week after launch and share the response rates/rankings, asking UAC members to use this information to encourage more participation.
5. Have some kind of incentive for participation, whether prizes for individual participation (especially for students) or an award for the group with the highest response rate
6. Investigate moving away from stratified random sample of students for the survey and toward targeted whole-class participation so that faculty can be asked to have students take 10 minutes out of class time to complete the survey.
7. Ask UAC members, deans, department chairs, and directors to put assessment on a meeting agenda and ask attendees to take 10 minutes to complete the survey/report during the meeting.
 | **Beginning in August 2019, continuing through end of October 2019*****WSU Director of Assessment and University Assessment Council*** |
| **LOs 3 (Learning outcomes), 5 (Methods), and 6 (Action plan) had lower quality ratings than last year** |  |
| 1. **Continue scheduling rubric report meetings with program representatives to provide individualized, concrete feedback on best practices in assessment.**
2. **Work with the Office for Teaching and Learning to offer workshops specifically related to writing outcomes and aligning assessment methods with them.**
3. **Organize an across-the-board review of program learning outcomes for all non-accredited programs.**
 | **Summer and early Fall 2018*****WSU Director of Assessment, University Assessment Council, OTL*****Winter 2019 – Fall 2019*****WSU Director of Assessment, University Assessment Council*** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PG10: WSU faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular programs meet annual assessment plan documentation requirements.** |  |
| **Schedule communication of deadlines/the assessment timeline at key points in the year.****Provide more detailed information in reports to deans, other supervisors, and UAC representatives regarding pending documentation to facilitate their communication with their faculty and staff.****Contact program coordinators directly with offers of assistance when documentation is pending or overdue.** | **All AY18-19*****WSU Director of Assessment, University Assessment Council*** |
|  |  |

# **REPORTING TO STAKEHOLDERS**

This report, will be publicly available online at <https://wayne.edu/assessment/>. It will also be sent to the provost, deans, program supervisors, and University Assessment Council members.

# **UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COUNCIL MEMBERS IN 2017-2018**

## Chairs:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Darin EllisAssociate VP/Associate Provostrdellis@wayne.edu(313)577-0167 | Cathy BarretteWSU Director of Assessmentc.barrette@wayne.edu(313)577-1615 |

## Business

Toni Somers

Bertie Greer

## Engineering

Jeff Potoff

Michelle McGrann

## Education

Bill Hill

Elizabeth Corah-Hopkins

## Fine, Performing, and Communication Arts

Judith Moldenhauer

## Graduate School

Sharon Lean

Karen Schramm

## Honors

Kevin Rashid

Alaa Al-Makhzoomy

## Information Science and University Libraries

Dian Walster

Bin Li

Paul Beavers

## Law

Susan Cancelosi

David Moss

## Liberal Arts and Sciences

Robert Aguirre

Heather Dillaway

## Medicine

Jason Booza

George Brush

Robert Reaves

Dan Walz

## Nursing

Ramona Benkert

Kate Zimnicki

## Office for Teaching and Learning

Sara Kacin

Tonya Whitehead

## Pharmacy and Health Sciences

Justine Gortney

Heather Sandlin

Mark Evely

## Social Work

Neva Nahan

Joy Swanson Ernst

## Student Senate

Ajanta Dutta

Mazen Zamzam

## Student Services

Amy Cooper

Stefanie Baier
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