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I. Introduction

Assessment of student learning and institutional improvement is a core value and ongoing activity at Grantham University. The comprehensive assessment and evaluation of student-learning outcomes is the foundation of effective planning and revision, necessary to ensure that Grantham University continues to provide quality professional education for success within a changing global society. These assessment initiatives are guided by assessment and evaluation standards from the Distance Education Accrediting Commission (DEAC), various programmatic accreditors, a variety of professional organizations, and a synthesis of best assessment practices from colleges and universities across the country.

Outcomes assessment requirements and methodologies in higher education have evolved considerably over the past decade. An established consensus (reflected in the work of assessment theorists and practitioners, and in the standards of accrediting organizations) suggests colleges and universities should be actively engaged in assessing learning at all levels of the institution, focusing on graduate as well as undergraduate education, on the course- and programmatic-level of degrees. Although interpretation of nationally normed tests together with institutional data remains a common assessment practice in higher education, many colleges and universities have reduced their dependence on these techniques in favor of a comprehensive analysis of work students actually do in classes within the context of the institutional mission.

II. Assessment at Grantham University: Definition and Principles

Learning outcomes assessment at Grantham University is coordinated by the Assistant Chief Academic Officer (ACAO) and the Assessment Committee (see Appendix A). The University defines the purpose and philosophy of assessment as follows:

The primary purpose of assessment is to create an environment that promotes educational excellence through evidence-based dialogue about academic programs and services. Successful assessment accomplishes this by: continuing a process aimed at understanding and improving student learning; using reliable data upon which to measure student achievement against outcomes while maintaining a stimulating and quality learning environment.

Secondarily, assessment also enables the University to communicate the effectiveness of efforts to a variety of stakeholders and to use resources more wisely in carrying out the mission and goals of the University. Assessment facilitates these functions by: providing a basis for communicating our achievements to our constituents in an objective and accountable fashion; and providing a basis for making resource allocation decisions.

III. Process for Assessing Student Learning Outcomes at the Degree (Programmatic) Level

Student learning goals have been established at various levels: The University has established University Learning Outcomes (ULOIs), which are intended for all students regardless of their majors. The colleges and schools have established broad-based student learning goals and a set of operational goals that apply to every student earning a degree in a given college or school. The academic programs each have discrete student learning outcomes for the majors and each course offered at the University is built around a set of course objectives. Every objective intended for students to master must be assessed as students
move through their programs. The curriculum is designed to reflect the mission, vision and core values of Grantham University within a continuous improvement process that enables a student to progress logically through his/her program, mastering the skills necessary in a sequential and purposeful manner.

Programmatic Outcomes Assessment (Annual)

Beginning in fall 2014, an outcomes assessment plan (OAP) was designed for every degree program, intended to capture programmatic-level outcomes. The OAP identifies the broad-based student learning goals (SLO) and the supporting operational goals for the college or school in which the program is offered. It also reiterates the student learning goals and the supporting operational goals for the specific degree program, and identifies a direct and indirect measure that will be used (generally within a capstone course) to assess each SLO and operational goal together with expected benchmarks for achievement just prior to graduation. Additionally, each program has mapped the required courses to the SLOs to assure students were introduced to a skill, had the opportunity to have that skill reinforced, and then demonstrated mastery just prior to graduation. This process was designed to provide a structured method for (1) assuring the programs meet the expectations of industry, (2) enabling the deans and the faculty to determine whether students as a whole are meeting the required criteria of the programs (and if not, what the deficiency is) for purposes of making changes, and (3) meeting the requirements of DEAC as well as a number of programmatic accrediting bodies with respect to programmatic outcomes assessment.

Formal Program Review (Every Three Years)

Every three years, each degree program is evaluated for purposes of assuring that the program is meeting the needs and expectations of industry, that there remains demand for the degree, and that it is offering the necessary courses on a schedule and in a sequence that makes sense. It is the program review process that often drives changes that are made to learning objectives or to courses (revisions or newly developed) to reflect what is happening within the industry the degree is intended to support.

IV. Process for Assessing Student Learning Objectives at the Course Level

Course-level assessment is overwhelmingly the responsibility of the faculty and is an ongoing process that can result in corrections made to directions provided students, or can be as extreme as wholesale replacement of entire assignments. It is intended that faculty members within a discipline work collaboratively to assess student success within courses and make recommendations for change. This process depends heavily on faculty experience, the integrity of the data they are using to assess student success, and above all, active and ongoing engagement in the assessment process.

Grantham University uses the following ground rules for developing and implementing assessment plans across the degree programs:

1. Work collaboratively to identify the mission statement, goals and learning outcomes for each program in the school or department, including graduate and undergraduate degrees. Schools will need to ensure that their learning outcomes align properly with accreditation standards that govern those professions.

2. Faculty are the core of any assessment process. Their involvement should include selection of measures, establishing benchmarks, selection of artifacts that demonstrate student learning, and collection and evaluation of data. If student learning is not demonstrated at the level desired, faculty should also be involved in development of action plans for improvement.
3. Identify method(s) of assessing one or more outcomes; each outcome is to be assessed using one direct and one indirect measure. The assessment method should be clearly linked to the specific learning outcome and be well suited for assessing the intended learning outcome(s).

4. Conduct assessments, gather data, interpret results and use these results to improve teaching and learning.

5. Document discussions and recommended actions.

V. General Guidelines for Selecting Assessment Tools

Assessment of student learning, regardless of whether it is being done at the program- or the course-level can either be direct, focusing on actual student work (essays, exams) to look for evidence that learning has been achieved (exams or rubrics that translate skills for use with artifacts), or indirect, looking for signs that learning has taken place through proxies or such “performance indicators” as surveys, focus groups, retention or transfer rates. Both methods of assessment are valuable and should be used together to provide a multidimensional picture of learning for each objective.

Direct Assessment Methods

While there are a number of effective methods that can be employed as direct measures to assess achievement of SLOs in courses or programs, there are only three tools available to capture the data. These tools are (1) exams where correct answers are already established, (2) simulation software which captures the necessary data, and (3) rubrics which have been designed to enable evaluators to translate a particular artifact into usable data in a consistent manner. Rubrics can be developed for use with any number of activities, a sampling of which are listed below.

- **Assigned papers or presentations** that are designed to enable students to demonstrate knowledge of a skill;
- **Portfolios**, which require students (or instructors) to assemble a group of projects from a single class or group of classes as a way of demonstrating achievement of learning outcomes has taken place;
- **Projects** (either individual or group-based) that require students to integrate knowledge and skills associated with a specific sequence of knowledge (or courses).

Indirect Assessment Methods

Indirect assessment methods are those that validate learning “one step removed” from student demonstration. These are opinions of learning (e.g., end-of-course surveys or supervisory evaluations of an intern's job performance) that are filtered through perceptions of other people including, perhaps, the students themselves. While these methods do not validate what a student can actually do or what a graduate actually knows, they do validate ability or knowledge based on opinions of participants or observations of performance by interested parties. An understanding of quantitative and qualitative research methods is required for using these methods, as the tools include surveys, focus groups, and open discussions, such as advisory board meetings.

Data on student retention, grade distributions, persistence, job placement information, rates of acceptance into graduate programs, or student demographics may also be strong assessment tools, if analyzed and mapped to specific learning outcomes.
VI. Assessment in General Education

“General education serves a dual purpose at Grantham University. While it assists students in gaining foundational skills for learning, general education also allows students to develop a sense of intellectual inquiry, culminating in a solid intellectual framework with which students make informed decisions and contributions to their communities as active citizens” (2015-2016 University Catalog, p. 47).

Assessment of general education focuses on the University Learning Outcomes and consists of course-embedded assessments, standardized instruments, and student surveys/reflections to introduce and reinforce the five ULOs. The assessment occurs at two points, the first of which is GU299, General Education Capstone, intended to be taken in the tenth term (conclusion of sophomore year for baccalaureate students and end-of-program for associate degree students). The assessment is rubric-based and covers all five learning outcomes:

- Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Respect for Diversity
- Professional, Ethical and Social Responsibility
- Lifelong Learning

Students are reassessed within their major-program capstone courses just prior to graduation, a longitudinal process that will also show the value added by the respective majors with respect to these five learning outcomes.

The assessments are conducted by an assessment team composed of GU299 faculty members.

VII. Assessment FAQs

1. What is Assessment at Grantham University?

Assessment is any systematic inquiry in which the goal is to document learning and to improve the teaching/learning process. It can be understood more precisely as a three-step process of:

1. Defining what students should be able to do, think, or know at the end of a unit of instruction (defining, that is, the student learning outcomes).
2. Designing the curriculum and students’ learning experiences to address these outcomes.
3. Determining whether, and to what extent, students can do, think, or know it.
4. Using this information to make improvements in teaching and learning.

Outcomes assessment specifically refers to program-level objectives and is supported and directed by outcomes assessment plans (OAPs) developed for each degree program offered at the University.

2. Who Should Do Assessment?

Until fairly recently, outcomes assessment data were mostly gathered by institutional research offices, focusing on key performance indicators like retention, success, persistence, and transfer rates. Results of national student engagement surveys or tests of core competencies like writing ability and critical thinking have also been compiled and used primarily for accountability purposes. Increasingly, however,
the locus of outcomes assessment work has shifted from the institution as a whole (though that is still important) to the various programs that exist within the institution. Assessment is the business of each program and school at the University — and by extension, each instructor.

Faculty engagement in the past has been limited to serving on the assessment committee and no formal assessment activities were conducted within that governing body. In 2014, a course on assessment was available to instructors and full-time faculty and was used to present the basic principles of using embedded assessment, student artifacts the faculty are already familiar with to gather data for assessment. During 2015, an ongoing and weekly professional development program was designed to help faculty and staff tie the concepts together within the context of the academics division.

The curriculum development and revision process now depends heavily on ongoing faculty engagement with respect to assessment at both the course-level and programmatic-level.

3. Is Assessment the Same Thing as Grading?

No, at least not the way grading students on papers and exams, and in courses overall, is usually done. Grading and assessing usually have distinctly different purposes. Traditional grading is primarily evaluative, a method for classifying students, assigning grades and making immediate adjustments to teaching. Outcomes assessment is primarily summative, designed to improve teaching and learning, and to measure progress towards program outcomes. Grades are also often based on a number of factors (e.g., substantive interaction, late work) that may be unrelated to achievement of learning outcomes for the course, which are assessed as individual skills.

4. Why Should We Do Assessment?

The best reason for systematically assessing student learning is the intrinsic value of doing so. Effective teaching doesn't exist in the absence of student learning. Assessment is part of the broad shift in higher education today toward focusing on student learning, and on developing better ways of measuring and improving it. Assessment results implicitly ask us to fit our teaching, as much as we can, not to some set of timeless pedagogical absolutes but to the messy reality of specific classrooms, where actual students in one section of a class may require a substantially different kind of teaching than their counterparts in another section. Done well, learning outcomes assessment makes us happier teachers because it makes us better teachers.

VIII. Glossary

Achievement Target: This is the overall level for satisfactory or desirable performance on a student learning outcome. It also outlines what percentage of students is expected to achieve this level of performance. Rubrics can help to clarify these items.

Action Plan: This is an activity sequence designed to help accomplish intended outcomes/student learning outcomes and/or improvement of academic assessment plan. Action plans might include revising organizational structure, reallocating resources, revising administrative policies/procedures, revising curriculum, individual course revision, sequencing of courses, inclusion and/or modification of educational experiences and strategies (e.g., undergraduate research, internships, practicum, study abroad, service learning).

Assessment: Outcomes assessment is any systematic inquiry whose goal is to improve the teaching/learning process. It can be understood more precisely as a four-step process of 1) defining what students should be able to do, think, or know at the end of a unit of instruction (defining, that is, the student
learning outcomes), 2) designing the curriculum and students' learning experiences to address these outcomes, 3) determining whether, and to what extent, students can do, think, or know it, and 4) using this information to make improvements in teaching and learning.

**Benchmark:** Similar to an achievement target, this is a point in time (e.g., the sophomore year) or a performance standard (e.g., 80% of the students in a particular group will score at a particular level) which measures student progress.

**Bloom's Taxonomy:** Beginning in 1948, a group of educators undertook the task of classifying education goals and objectives. The intent was to develop a classification system for three domains: the cognitive, the affective and the psychomotor. Work on the cognitive domain was completed in 1956 and is commonly referred to as *Bloom's Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain* (Bloom et al., 1956).

**Direct/Indirect Assessment:** *Direct assessment* requires students to display their knowledge and skills in response to the measurement instrument itself, as in tests or exams, essays, portfolios, presentations, etc. *Indirect assessment* usually asks students to reflect on their learning rather than demonstrate it (as in interviews, surveys, or focus groups). Indirect assessment may also ask employers or other interested parties to evaluate student learning as they have had occasion to observe it. Both forms of assessment are valuable, particularly when used in tandem.

**Embedded Assessment:** Using existing coursework (e.g., common questions asked of all students on a final exam in every section of a course) as a means of assessing student learning in aggregate. Collecting assessment information from within the classroom provides an opportunity to use already in-place assignments and coursework for assessment purposes. This involves taking a second look at materials generated in the classroom.

**Findings:** These are the assessment results used for comparison of actual versus expected achievement level. It is important to include specific numbers/percentages when possible that are connected to the learning outcomes and achievement targets.

**Formative/Summative Assessment:** Formative assessment is any evaluation taking place during the course of instruction; summative assessment is an evaluation that takes place at the end of a unit of instruction. Formative assessment enables assessors to modify instructional practices in time to improve learning for the particular students being assessed. Summative assessment results inform changes in pedagogy or curriculum for future students. Both forms of assessment are essential to an overarching institutional assessment process.

**Goal:** This is a broad statement about desired ends for the students. The goals should be linked to the academic degree program mission and reflect long range outcomes.

**Learning Outcome:** What students can be expected to do, think, or know as a result of a particular course of study. Outcomes are performance oriented, focusing less on what instructors will cover in a course or what their instructional goals are (these are often designated as "objectives") and more on what students can produce, perform, or achieve as a marker of success in the course or program. Learning outcomes should be SMART: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant/Results Oriented, and Time bound.

**Mission Statement:** The mission statement outlines the highest aims, intentions, and activities of the entity. For degree programs, the mission statement should connect to the departmental, college/school, and university mission statements.

**Measurement:** This is the method to gauge achievement of expected results. Examples include using a rubric for essays, quizzes, tests, journals, group projects, class discussion, portfolios, etc.
Portfolio: Any purposeful collection of work done by a particular student. Students themselves are usually encouraged to gather the materials for their portfolios themselves, often using a selection process specifying various criteria. Portfolios are then usually evaluated against a rubric. Aggregating the data as one evaluates a number of portfolios in a single class or program (or even across an entire institution) leads to potentially rich outcomes assessment data. Increasingly, portfolios are being digitalized in what are called electronic portfolios or e-portfolios. Besides their value for assessment purposes, portfolios potentially enable students to demonstrate their achievement to prospective employers, graduate schools, etc.

Qualitative/Quantitative Assessment: Quantitative assessment results can be expressed in numerical terms; qualitative assessments are usually expressed in narrative form. In many cases, qualitative assessment can be converted to quantitative through the use of rubrics. Both forms of assessment can be valuable.

Reliability: The measure of consistency for an assessment instrument. The instrument should yield similar results over time with similar populations in similar circumstances. (Contrast with validity.)

Rubric (Analytic vs. Holistic): A rating scale with explicit criteria, used to evaluate any performance, including essays, speeches, presentations, etc. Essays may group various performance criteria under each numerical category (a holistic rubric), or break out each criterion separately and allow for different ratings for each distinct criterion (an analytic rubric). Holistic rubrics are useful for grading purposes, but analytic rubrics are more effective for doing outcomes assessment, since they capture very specific performance characteristics.

Validity: The extent to which the assessment measures the desired performance and allows appropriate inferences to be drawn from the results. A valid assessment accurately measures the learning it claims to measure.

IX. Appendices

A. University Assessment Committee Charter

As outlined in the University Assessment Plan, the Committee is charged with encouraging, supporting and guiding the growth of effective student learning outcomes assessment practices at Grantham University. The Committee is responsible for guiding the development and integration of student learning outcomes assessment into a University-wide assessment and evaluation system that is effectively linked with planning and budgeting processes. The Committee reviews program level assessment plans for all academic programs and provide recommendations for plan improvements to department chairs, program directors and departmental assessment coordinators. The Committee assists in developing, monitoring and revising the University plan for assessing the General Education learning outcomes.

B. Grantham University Assessment Structure and Timeline

C. Outcomes Assessment Plan Template

The assessment plan allows a department to gather information about assessment being conducted in its courses and to map that information against its broader, degree-level goals.
Appendix A: Assessment Committee Charter

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE CHARTER

Group: Academic Assessment Committee
2015-2016

Chair: Director, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness

Members(s):
- Chief Academic Officer
- Assistant Chief Academic Officer
- Dean of Mark Skousen School of Business
- Faculty Representative, MSSB
- Dean of Nursing and Allied Health
- Faculty Representative, Nursing and Allied Health
- Dean of Arts and Sciences
- Faculty Representative, Arts and Sciences
- Dean of Engineering & Computer Science
- Faculty Representative, Engineering & Computer Science
- Dean of Foundations Faculty
- Dean of Curriculum
- Associate Director of Evaluations & Student Records
- Manager of Student Academic Progress
- Chair Curriculum Committee
- Chair Academic Council
- IT Representative
- Marketing Representative

Committee Charter

I. University Definition of Assessment

The primary purpose of assessment is to create an environment that promotes educational excellence through evidence-based dialogue about academic programs and services. Successful assessment accomplishes this by continuing a process aimed at understanding and improving student learning, using reliable data upon which to measure student achievement against outcomes while maintaining a stimulating and quality learning environment.

Secondarily, assessment also enables the University to communicate the effectiveness of efforts to a variety of stakeholders and to use resources more wisely in carrying out the mission and goals of the University. Assessment facilitates these functions by: providing a basis for communicating our achievements to our constituents in an objective and accountable fashion; and providing a basis for making resource allocation decisions.
II. Organization

The Assessment Committee (the “Committee”) shall consist of the deans and/or chairs, representatives from IT and Marketing and the chair of the Academic Council or others as designated by the Chief Academic Officer. As a minimum, membership within the committee must consist of representation from across the Academics unit. The majority of regular membership shall consist of department deans and faculty. Each dean is responsible to bring to the Assessment Committee all recommendations, plans and unit-specific needs from their respective colleges through subcommittees or teams within those units.

Regular meetings of the Committee shall be called by the Chair, or by any two Committee members. The Committee is advisory in nature, and its recommendations are intended to be followed. Should any Committee member (Regular, Chair, or Ex-Officio) express concern regarding any recommendation, such shall be reconsidered by the Committee, and if any concern should remain, the matter will be presented to the Chief Academic Officer for a final decision. The determination of a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting shall be the presence of two-thirds of the voting membership, and all matters shall be determined by consensus among the voting members present. The Committee may delegate any of its responsibilities to a subcommittee comprised of two or more members of the Committee.
III. Purpose of the Committee

The purpose of the Committee shall be to advise the individual schools within the University concerning issues related to the development and use of tools devised to measure academic outcomes. The Committee will work to develop and present to the Academic Council annual results of assessment activities conducted in programs/departments.

IV. Responsibilities and Duties

In furtherance of the Committee's purpose, and in addition to any other responsibilities that may be assigned to it from time to time by the Chief Academic Officer, the Committee shall have the following responsibilities and duties as they relate to Academics:

- Facilitate strategic planning process and evaluate plans for purposes of coordinating the assessment activities across the academic division.
- Define the standards for how GU will measure University-level learning outcomes at the course and program levels.
- Evaluate and monitor programmatic assessment plans for purposes of compliance with external accreditors.
- Request and facilitate University-level metrics for efficiency of data distribution and analysis.
- Monitor progress of the assessment process and program reviews within each college, and collect and store individual school/program/department reports
- Maintain programmatic mapping documentation that shows how our course milestones align with our course objectives, program objectives and University standards.
- Serve as advisory resource to units regarding assessment.
- Manage reporting and formal communications flows as necessary.

The Committee shall report its activities to the Academic Council on a regular and timely basis so that University administrators are kept informed of its activities. The Committee will also work with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to ensure reporting of assessment results, actions and plans.

V. Performance Evaluation

The Committee shall evaluate its performance on a regular basis. The Committee is also subject to evaluation by the Chief Academic Officer.

VI. Charter Review

The Committee shall review and reassess the adequacy of this charter as part of the performance review process.
## ASSESSMENT STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>Mark Skousen School of Business</th>
<th>College of Nursing &amp; Allied Health</th>
<th>College of Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Levels of Assessment and Reporting Schedule

#### Unit-Level Assessment (Quarterly Reporting)
- Assessment Committee
- Deans

#### Programmatic Assessment (Quarterly Reporting)
- Dean
- Faculty Curriculum Specialist
- Faculty
- Dean, Curriculum

#### Course-Level Assessment (On-going and College-Specific)
- Discipline Specialists (Faculty)
- Faculty
- Curriculum Specialist

**Programmatic Assessments compared against Strategic Plans**

**Programmatic Outcomes Assessment Plans evaluated using assessment results**

**Courses assessed against course-level learning goals**
Assessment Committee

Membership (up to 15 members)—may need smaller steering committee

- Assessment Committee Chair
- CAO
- ACAO
- Deans (or designates)
- Faculty members
- IR (or representative from IT)
- Chair, Curriculum Committee
- Chair, Academic Council
- Marketing representative

Annual Assessment Cycle

DataPulled
Ongoing

Run Course
Ongoing

Data Evaluated
Monthly with March 31 cutoff

Implement Changes
September 1

Changes Determined
June 30
Duties

• View and coordinate assessment activities from perspective of units as well as division
• Share information
• Evaluate unit-level strategic plans to help determine assessment-related resources
• Clarify required data and reports necessary to enable units to assess student learning and operations
• Serve as advisory resource to units regarding assessment
• Review plans as per respective accreditation requirements
• Manage reporting and formal communication flows

Timeline/Assessment Cycle

• January — updates from academic deans regarding progress on data collection as per OAPs
• February — updates from every dean regarding progress on data collection as per strategic plans, which begins to lay the groundwork for budget 2016
• March — review of Quarterly reports (Q4) and current IEP
• April — examine programmatic accreditation compliance related to programmatic outcomes assessment
• May — discuss results against strategic plans and examining institutional-level metrics to identify gaps not addressed by units
• June — review of Quarterly reports (Q1); touch base on strategic plans
• July — review final reports to be submitted to Grantham boards in August
• August — programmatic outcomes assessment reports completed by Deans and submitted to Assessment Committee; comprehensive report (for prior calendar year) submitted by Assessment Committee for presentation at Academic- and Board-level meetings
• September — review of Quarterly reports (Q2); review proposed strategic plans for purposes of coordinating metrics and reports
• October — academic deans will review changes implemented based on documented assessment data
• November — receive final strategic plans from units and assure institutional-level reports have been requested and/or distributed; receive all programmatic outcomes assessment plans
• December — review institutional-level metrics; review of Quarterly reports (Q3)
## PROGRAMMATIC OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN

### Degree Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Direct Measure</th>
<th>Assessment Cycle</th>
<th>Indirect Measure</th>
<th>Assessment Cycle</th>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Grantham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>Date Data Pulled</td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>Date Data Pulled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Directions

In accordance with the revised Charter of the Grantham University Assessment Committee, there must be a programmatic outcomes assessment plan developed for every academic degree program offered by Grantham University. The template offered above is to be used if the respective programmatic accreditors do not dictate form. Regardless of the template used, the following information is required:

1. Determine and list the student learning outcomes (SLOs) for each program AT THE END OF THE PROGRAM.

2. Keeping in mind that every SLO must be assessed using at least one direct and one indirect tool, selecting a tool as well as a target expected of the students (e.g., 80% of the students will be expected to score 75% or higher on each dimension of the standardized exam).

3. Set specific dates for pulling data.

4. Indicate whether the SLO supports a student goal as listed in the respective college’s strategic plan.

5. Indicate whether the SLO supports a student goal as listed in the Grantham University catalog.

6. Develop Assessment Cycle. (See chart on next page.)
Assessment Cycle

DataPulled

Run Course

Data Evaluated

Implement Changes

Changes Determined

1. Provide specific information for each step: When will data be pulled (e.g., every capstone course)?
2. Describe how data will be evaluated and who will be involved (e.g., faculty? advisory boards?).
3. Determine changes that need to be made and document via minutes.
4. Create ticket and follow change.
5. Document when the revised courses are ready.
6. Pull new data following the changes and reassess.
7. Post assessment results.