

TWU Academic Institutional Improvement 2013 Report – AIIR-CP: Findings and Use of Results Deadline: March 17, 2014

Certificate Program Name: Post-Master's Certificate in Academic Assessment

Academic Unit/College: Institutional Improvement/Academic Affairs

Coordinator: Dr. Terry A. Senne

Department Chair: Dr. Michael Stankey **Date Submitted:** 03/1/2014

Campus(es): Denton Dallas Houston

If classified as an "online" certificate program, check here:
Certificate Type: Undergraduate Post-Bacc **Post-Master's**

NOTE: If no students were enrolled in the certificate program or if no students were assessed in 2013 due to timing of the assessment cycle and/or course offerings for course-embedded certificate program assessments check here: Next, insert SLO, Assessment Measures, and indicate ($N = 0$) in the Summary Data column of Table 1 to complete the AIIR-CP form.

Table 1 – SLOs, Assessment Measures, 2013 Summary Data, and Target Indicators Table

List the academic degree program student learning outcome(s), assessment measures, and target indicators (criterion for success, *realistic* target goal, and *stretch* target goal – refer to current AIAP-CP). Report the *summary data* (aggregate) results/findings for each SLO assessed during 2013 [**Summary data = the percentage of students assessed that achieved the set criterion for success**], and record the total number of students assessed per measure ($N = _$). [Disaggregated category/sub-category data for assessments, if applicable, may be reported in Table 2.]

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Measures (2 per SLO)	2013 Summary Data	Target Indicators		
			Criterion for Success	Realistic Target Goal	Stretch Target Goal
SLO 1: Effectively design an assessment plan for an academic degree program or certificate program.	1. Assessment Plan – assessed by faculty rubric	($N = 22$) 85%	Score of 4 out of 5 <u>on each</u> component	85%	90%
	2. Self-Assessment of Assessment Planning Competency - rubric	($N = 20$) 80%	Score of 4 out of 5 <u>on each</u> component	85%	90%

Table 2 – Disaggregated Assessment Category/Sub-Category Data Table

Use this table, **when appropriate**, to report **additional category/sub-category data** (disaggregated data) for applicable assessments reported in Table 1. **Table 2 only applies to certificate program assessments for which category/sub-category data are available to report.**

SLO/Assessment	Assessment Categories/Sub-Categories	2013 Categorical Data	Realistic Target Goal <small>[if applicable]</small>
1.1	Outcome 1/Assessment 1 – Assessment Plan/Faculty Rubric	85%	85%
	A. Alignment to University & Program Missions	87%	85%
	B. Student Learning Outcomes	88%	85%
	C. Alignment of Program SLOs to the Curriculum	92%	85%
	D. Assessment of Program SLOs	78%	85%
	E. Assessment Plan Implementation Coordination	80%	85%
	F.		
	G.		
	H.		
1.2	Outcome 1/Assessment 2 – Self-Assessment/Assessment Planning Competency	80%	85%
	A. Alignment to University & Program Missions	83%	85%
	B. Student Learning Outcomes	85%	85%
	C. Alignment of Program SLOs to the Curriculum	84%	85%
	D. Assessment of Program SLOs	72%	85%
	E. Assessment Plan Implementation Coordination	78%	85%
	F.		
	G.		
	H.		

Table 3 – Analysis & Interpretation of Results*

Provide a detailed analysis and interpretation of student performance data for each student learning outcome assessed during the 2013 reporting period using Tables 1 and 2 results/findings. Also, use the TWU Summary Analyses & Actions for Improvement – Trend Analysis of AllRs table (separate document) to reflect trend analysis (where appropriate).

Student Learning Outcome	Analysis & Interpretation
<p>SLO 1:</p> <p>Effectively design an assessment plan for an academic degree program or certificate program.</p>	<p>We achieved our realistic target goal on Assessment 1 (faculty assessment of assessment plan); however, when analyzing the disaggregated data, we found some deficiencies in student learning: Assessment of Program SLOs and Assessment Plan Implementation Coordination. In contrast, students exceeded the realistic target goal in the following assessment plan components: Alignment to University & Program Missions, Student Learning Outcomes, & Alignment of Program SLOs to the Curriculum. The Alignment of Program SLOs to the Curriculum also exceeded our stretch target goal, demonstrating that students are very competent in this aspect of assessment planning.</p> <p>Relative to the student self-assessment of assessment planning competency (Assessment 2), overall, students performed below the realistic target goal by 5%. The only category in which students achieved the realistic target goal was in Student Learning Outcomes. Similar to Assessment 1, students assessed themselves as performing less well in the same two components as assessed by faculty in Assessment 1 - Assessment of Program SLOs and Assessment Plan Implementation Coordination.</p> <p>Therefore, we need to address Assessment of Program SLOs and Implementation Coordination as we work to improve student learning.</p>

***Note:** Certificate program faculty will not be expected to analyze data, interpret results, and implement at least 1 programmatic action for improvement in student learning until *sufficient data (may be cumulative over time) are available for a minimum of 20* certificate program students. This will ensure that data upon which changes will be implemented are reliable.

Table 4 - Next Steps – Actions for Improvement *

Using the data analysis and interpretation provided in Table 3, describe in detail one targeted action that will be implemented *to improve student learning* for each SLO assessed during the 2013 reporting period. Use the Improvement Code Table (next page) to “code” the type of action that will be taken.

Student Learning Outcomes (List each SLO statement)	Action(s) for Improvement	Improvement Codes
<p>SLO 1:</p> <p>Effectively design an assessment plan for an academic degree program or certificate program.</p>	<p>We will add additional opportunities both in-class and through outside assignments that allow for the application of appropriate assessment methodology and effective implementation coordination in order to provide more formative feedback to students in AAll 6453. AAll 6453 is taken prior to the capstone course (AAll 6553), where students design an assessment plan for a degree or certificate program.</p>	<p>Ped-C</p>

Recommend no more than 1 action for improvement per SLO so that changes in performance data may be more likely attributed to the action taken.

***Note:** Certificate program faculty will not be expected to analyze data, interpret results, and implement at least 1 programmatic action for improvement in student learning until *sufficient data (may be cumulative over time) are available for a minimum of 20* certificate program students. This will ensure that data upon which changes will be implemented are reliable.

Actions for Improvement Codes

Code	Action	Description
Curr-C	Curricular Change	Curricular change to degree program (adding a course or other requirement, changed course sequence, etc.)
Ped-C	Pedagogical Change	Revised instructional methodology of delivering course material (less lecture, more student engagement; integrated technology; more formative assessment & feedback, etc.)
CR	Course Revision	Revised existing course(s), added or modified assignments or projects, modified content of course, changed textbooks; etc.)
C-Pre	Change in Course Prerequisite(s)	Adding or deleting course prerequisites; enforcing prerequisites
SS	Student Support	Improving tutoring services, self-study materials, developing specialized support by library or writing center staff, improved advising to ensure students follow established course sequencing, faculty mentoring, etc.
RP	Revised Process	Changed entrance/admission requirements, hired new faculty, changed environment, other process revisions, etc.
RA	Revised Assessment	Modified assessment tools, changed data analyses strategy, etc.
D/T	Development/Training	Providing faculty or TA development or further training workshops
ESS	Equipment, Supplies, Space	Change in instructional equipment, supplies, and/or space (new/updated computers or software, improvements or expansions of labs or studios, expanded space or equipment for student projects)
Crit-C	Criteria Change	Increased or modified set criteria for success or standards change/implementation
Fac-C	Faculty Change	Additional or change in roles or responsibilities of faculty
SLO-C	SLO Change	Revisions or changes to SLOs
Accr-C	Accreditation Change	Revisions due to disciplinary accreditation standards, etc.
OTH	Other Change	Changes made that are not reflected in any of the above categories