Summary
A workgroup from the campus Assessment Subcommittee reviewed aggregate data for program assessment reports aligned to UMD's undergraduate student learning outcomes and graduate goal category in Compliance Assist from AY2012-13 through AY2016-17. The workgroup considered the data (described below) and reviewed the data summaries (presented in Appendices A through F) to draw interpretations and related recommendations for assessment and for teaching and learning. The Assessment Subcommittee provided additional input and endorsed the document on February 22, 2018.

Overview
This report represents one element of annual campus assessment reporting processes established by the Assessment Subcommittee during AY2017-18. The reporting processes are intended to improve the use of assessment data to evaluate and inform decisions related to campus assessment practices and to teaching and learning.

This report is specific to program assessment data submitted by Program Assessment Liaisons (PALs) in the Compliance Assist assessment information system. Data presented in this document is based on the Assessment Subcommittee’s campus reporting schedule, which includes data collected on all UMD Undergraduate Student Learner Outcomes (SLOs 1 through 9) and Graduate Goal Category 2. As the first campus assessment report from the Assessment Subcommittee, this report includes review of data collected in Compliance Assist since 2013. Subsequent reports will presented annually and will not include historical data for all learning goals and outcomes.

The Subcommittee’s review and recommendations stemming from the Compliance Assist data were considered in the context of existing and evolving campus assessment practices as well as experiences of individuals who have recently led campus assessment activities. For instance, review of Compliance Assist data seems to reveal less data reported than expected. However, persons involved with campus assessment have examples of instances when program outcomes may not have been included in the Compliance Assist system though the outcomes were taught and measured. As campus assessment continues to evolve, campus assessment administrators and the Assessment Subcommittee will identify resolutions to address issues such as the limitations of reporting processes (e.g., challenges with the software) and the complexity of measuring student learning across programs at a large university with the purpose of informing instruction and curriculum.

Key Take-Away Items
1. Undergraduate academic programs’ participation in campus assessment increased from the first cycle of reporting to the second cycle of reporting based on the six SLOs that reported on two cycles since 2013 (recognizing that the second cycle included a full cycle of three years). For example, UMD SLO 1 2013 to 2016 showed increase in programs reporting from 15 to 31 and number of student work assessed from 2701 to 4796.
2. Based on identified program development recommendations and closing the loop reports, commonalities across curricular and co-curricular programs include:
   • Programs continue to identify development through refinement of assessment processes, though assessment processes seem to be improving overall.
   • Curricular programs recommended a variety of ways to improve courses to impact student learning.
   • In the second cycle of assessment reports for the same SLOs, recommendations carry more significance for program improvement beyond course modifications.

3. Now that data for all Undergraduate SLOs have been compiled, results are beginning to provide some guidance for determining student performance baselines. Of the seven SLOs assessed with direct measures across three-year periods, one fell in the 70% range of the percentage of students meeting satisfactory performance (SLO 1 in 2016 = 74%), three were in the 80% range (SLOs 2, 6, and 8), and three were 90% or greater (SLOs 3, 4, and 7).

4. Based on the annual undergraduate SLO and graduate goal category data, student learning at the campus level seems to be meeting expectations.

5. Overall, the assessment results indicate no concerns are present for student learning. However, as mentioned previously, the number of programs providing assessment reports for each of the campus SLOs are lower than expectations. Therefore, more data is needed to draw more definitive conclusions. Although campus assessment updates in progress during 2017-18 should help to address this issue, additional efforts could be identified to ensure that programs report assessment results so that data used to conduct campus analyses will be more reliable. The Campus Assessment Team and Assessment Subcommittee take ownership of this issue and will work to identify and address the causes beginning yet this semester.

6. A variety of recommendations are presented in this report for each aspect of the annual report summaries reviewed. Recommendations are directed toward campus assessment administrators, several shared governance committees, programs, and department, college/unit, and campus administrators. Recommendations are intended to improve assessment processes, gain additional insights regarding teaching and learning for the campus, and provide adequate resources and support as informed by assessment work. The Assessment Subcommittee will follow up on these items to track progress throughout the remainder of the current academic year and throughout next year.

2013-2017 Compliance Assist Program Assessment Report Data
UMD began using Compliance Assist in Fall 2013 for undergraduate curricular and co-curricular program assessment reports (previously, UMD employed a different system for which campus reports were generated through December 2012). Graduate programs began submitting assessment reports in Compliance Assist for AY2016-17.

Appendices in this document are based on the reporting schedule of campus student learning outcomes and goals, which was approved by the Assessment Subcommittee in Fall 2017:
- Undergraduate SLOs 1, 2, 3: Data for 2013 ........................................ Appendix A
  Data for 2014, 2015, 2016................. Appendix B
- Undergraduate SLOs 4, 7, 8: Data for 2013, 2014 ...................... Appendix C
  Data for 2015, 2016, 2017................. Appendix D
- Undergraduate SLOs 5, 6, 9: Data for 2013, 2014, 2015.............. Appendix E
- Graduate Goal Category 2: Data for 2017 ........................................ Appendix F
Undergraduate data files were downloaded from Compliance Assist by selecting each UMD SLO with the respective year(s) in the approved schedule. Each data file included the program assessment reports aligned to the UMD SLO1. Similarly, selecting Goal Category 2 and FY2017 downloaded the graduate data file from Compliance Assist, and the respective program assessment reports were included in the file. Data files were then reviewed and cleaned prior to aggregating information for curricular and co-curricular programs.

In general, data presented in the appendices are from the text fields within the program reporting templates in Compliance Assist. For curricular program assessment reports that did not include sample size and number meeting satisfactory performance but referenced an attached document, the attachment was reviewed to determine if data could be interpreted for inclusion in campus summary (note: this occurred primarily among a few undergraduate curricular programs). Program assessment reports missing quantitative assessment results were excluded from the curricular assessment data summaries. Therefore, data presented within those tables may be slightly less than the actual data reported.

In cases where multiple programs submitted duplicate assessment reports for the same UMD SLO, the assessment report was included in the data file only one time. Instances included the same reports provided for the BBA, BA&cc, and BA-Econ as well as IndE and MechE. In contrast, a program could have a learning outcome that aligned to multiple UMD SLOs in Compliance Assist. Although this was not prevalent, a few programs had the same learning outcome data included in more than one campus SLO report as a function of the software.

The percentage provided for “Total # Met Satisfactory Performance” is a general guide regarding student learning in curricular programs across campus. Because of the challenges with the data files from Compliance Assist described previously, campus-level results are interpreted with caution.

The initial Liberal Education Program assessment results were submitted in Fall 2016. Data from the Liberal Education category reports are not included in the curricular program assessment tables presented in the appendices due to the categories’ large sample sizes. Liberal Education Program assessment reports are available from the Liberal Education Subcommittee, and Appendices B and D include category reports submitted within the campus reporting schedule aligning with the years and UMD SLOs:

- 2016 – UMD SLO 2: Natural Sciences
- 2017 – UMD SLO 7: Global Perspectives and Cultural Diversity in the U.S.

Co-curricular program assessment data are summarized in more general terms compared to curricular programs because co-curricular programs use a combination of direct and indirect measures. The measures are identified within the summary tables along with general interpretations of the assessment results provided in the program assessment reports.

---

1 In Compliance Assist, program learning outcome alignment with UMD SLOs is entered manually using the “Related” function within each program report’s editing mode.
Assessment Subcommittee Review and Recommendations

1. Use of Compliance Assist for Reporting

REVIEW AND INTERPRETATIONS: In order to use campus assessment data most effectively, the Assessment Subcommittee recognizes that the data reported should be as complete as possible. However, in some instances, programs did not complete the established fields in the Compliance Assist report template, and the program assessment reports were not included in the campus summaries.

The Subcommittee is also aware of other issues within Compliance Assist that contribute to the challenge of having complete campus data. For example, if a program assessment report is not aligned to the campus SLO, then the program data is not pulled into the Compliance Assist data file for that SLO. The result is a misrepresentation of the extent to which programs are conducting student learning assessment on campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
- Campus Assessment Administrators:
  - Clarify language on the program report template to make content requested more transparent.
  - Remove fields from the program report template that are not used by programs and have shown limited or no utility for reporting (e.g., baseline).
  - Add “resource request” field to the graduate programs report template, since the field is not currently provided.
- Programs:
  - Enter information into all fields within the (revised) template in Compliance Assist so that interpretable information from all programs will be included in the subsequent reviews of campus assessment.

2. Program Assessment, Data, and Reports

REVIEW AND INTERPRETATIONS: Because some undergraduate programs aligned one program assessment report to multiple campus SLOs, results for the program SLO were counted multiple times in campus SLO summaries (this did not occur at the graduate level).

For several UMD SLOs, the number of programs reporting appears to be significantly lower than the number of programs that should be reporting – especially for undergraduate UMD SLO 1 (competence in major field) and SLO 4 (use of ethical reasoning). While the reporting on other primary curricular SLOs seems low, we recognize that the Liberal Education Program includes categories aligning with those SLOs that students must take as part of their degree programs: SLO 2 (all knowledge domain categories), SLO 3 (Logic and Quantitative Reasoning), SLO 6 (Writing and Information Literacy; Oral Communication and Languages), SLO 7 (Global Perspectives; Cultural Diversity in the U.S.), and SLO 8 (Sustainability). Undergraduate SLOs 5 and 9 are developmental in nature and are a primary focus of co-curricular programs. A co-curricular program such as Academic Advising that has connections to all students helps to ensure development-oriented outcomes are addressed within student learning experiences.

Across the UMD undergraduate SLOs and in the graduate goal category, the low end of the sample size range for curricular programs is extremely small, which limits the ability of those programs to draw meaningful interpretations of student learning from the assessment data. Considering the time in which
UMD has had assessment systems in place for undergraduate programs, the number of student work assessed for any category over a 3-year cycle is expected to be greater.

Within the Liberal Education Program assessment reports, we recognize the data represent partial reporting cycles and not all courses in the categories submitted assessment data (e.g., courses not offered during the time period in which the rubrics were available for doing the assessment work). Additionally, the course assessment reporting process was changed after the 2016 reporting year, such that the category results may be more easily interpreted beginning 2017.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

• Campus Assessment Administrators:
  o Track the updated undergraduate program assessment plans being submitted this spring to identify how many programs have learning outcomes that align with UMD SLOs 1 and 4. Share the data with the Assessment Subcommittee, who should address any evident concerns in how programs align to campus SLOs.

• Assessment Subcommittee:
  o Discuss the issue of the same program assessment report aligning with multiple UMD SLOs, and determine if programs should be allowed to use this practice (currently, the updated assessment plan process requires programs to identify only one UMD SLO per program learning outcome).
  o Review the undergraduate campus SLOs leaving the intent of the SLOs intact, but providing more clear and transparent language to help ensure that programs are assessing what the campus has intended. This may also help programs to align their learning outcomes more effectively across the range of campus learning outcomes.

• Teaching and Learning Committee:
  o Compare results of program assessment at the campus level with the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) survey results as applicable to determine if additional insights and related actions can be gained regarding teaching and learning across campus.

• Liberal Education Subcommittee:
  o Continue to monitor the course reporting process and make improvements as needed.
  o Implement actions to help ensure all courses are included in the assessment of the program.

• Programs:
  o Make sure that each program outcome is clearly aligned with ONE primary campus SLO
  o For programs with few students: Increase the sample size for program assessment reporting to improve the ability to draw more valid and reliable inferences from the data. One way to increase sample size is to collect assessment data every year within the 3-year assessment cycle and compile the data into the report filed in the 3rd year of the learning outcome assessment cycle. Another way to increase sample size is to collect multiple pieces of work from students within the same cohort; in which case, the sample size and number meeting satisfactory performance would be based on student work rather than the number of students.
  o Regularly review the percentage of students/student work meeting satisfactory performance, and “raise the bar” to enhance student learning where appropriate.
3. Potential Program Development

REVIEW AND INTERPRETATIONS: More evidence is available at the undergraduate program level compared to the graduate program level from which to identify generalizations and trends that include:

- Programs are continuing to identify development through refinement of assessment processes.
- Programs are identifying ways to improve their courses across multiple years of reporting on the same learning outcomes.
- A trend seems to be toward more in-depth recommendations about programs that carry more significance for program improvement compared to assessment processes (e.g., specific curricular changes).

Fall 2017 was the first year for graduate program assessment reporting and related campus-level review. Program recommendations were a combination of assessment practices and curriculum and delivery improvements.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Colleges and Programs:
  - Expand program discussions of assessment results and the involvement of faculty and program staff to the college/unit levels where appropriate to determine inter-departmental needs.

- Graduate Programs Committee:
  - Discuss program recommendations based on assessment results within the committee to determine needs that may exist among multiple programs. This process is consistent with the philosophy GPC has adopted regarding the review of new programs and courses. Reviewing assessment results provides another opportunity for the committee to identify possible overlaps between program development opportunities and to address the items from a campus and/or inter-program perspective.

- Liberal Education Subcommittee:
  - Document the manner in which Liberal Education category assessment reports are used to inform program development decisions. Since program development recommendations are not provided in the category reports, the Liberal Education Subcommittee should have alternative processes in place to demonstrate that the program conducts insightful reviews of student learning based on assessment results with the purpose of making substantive recommendations to increase student achievement.

4. Resource Requests

REVIEW AND INTERPRETATIONS: The information provided was from undergraduate reports only, as the graduate report template did not include this field. The intention of this field is for requests to be for program development that are informed by assessment of student learning processes and results. However, requests were not consistently supported by the data.

A handful of programs indicated they were paying for software for the collection of assessment data.

Over the past several years on campus, classroom spaces have been converted to active learning classrooms.
Curricular and co-curricular programs have requested resources and support related to conducting assessment work.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **Campus Assessment Administrators:**
  - Provide information to programs regarding the need to include resource requests tied to program development that are informed by student learning assessment.
  - Provide education to programs that requested additional support for conducting program assessment.
  - Provide training and support for PALs, especially those who are new to campus assessment.

- **Colleges:**
  - Discuss the use and need of software/technologies across departments to support assessment of student learning practices and streamline use of resources.

- **Programs:**
  - For programs that use the active learning classrooms and wish to have more active learning classrooms: Document the impact of such spaces on student learning to help inform future decisions to convert more space.
  - For all curricular and co-curricular programs: Tie resource requests back to assessment results and program development so that program, college/unit, and campus decisions may be informed by assessment of student learning.

- **Graduate Programs Committee:**
  - After discussing program recommendations presented in Appendix F: Determine whether resource requests informed by assessment results would be appropriate to forward to the Associate Vice Chancellor of Graduate Education and Research.

5. General Conclusions Regarding Student Learning at the Campus-Level

REVIEW AND INTERPRETATIONS: Curricular programs tend to focus on SLOs 1, 2, and 3 with some attention to SLO 6 and slightly less alignment with SLOs 4, 7, 8. Very few curricular programs have learning outcomes relating to SLOs 5 and 9. The highest number of co-curricular programs reported on SLOs 5 and 9 compared to the other campus SLOs. The percentage of co-curricular programs conducting assessment report on SLOs 5 and 9 is greater than the percentage of curricular programs reporting on these SLOs. Additionally, the differences between measures typically used by curricular programs (direct measures) and co-curricular programs (indirect measures), provide for different interpretations of the results.

Campus-wide, across undergraduate curricular programs for a full 3-year cycle, the range of percentages for student work meeting satisfactory performance was 74.06% (SLO 1 in 2016) to 94.93% (SLO 4 in 2014). Of the seven SLOs assessed with direct measures, one fell in the 70% range (SLO 1), three were in the 80% range (SLOs 2, 6, and 8), and three were 90% or greater (SLOs 3, 4, and 7).

Within the Liberal Education Program categories in the campus reporting schedule, the percentages for student work meeting satisfactory performance were generally consistent for one or more category SLOs compared with the curricular programs as a whole for the respective categories. A potential concern regarding student learning support could exist depending upon the extent of services provided in the Tutoring Center for online courses.
Recent assessment results suggest co-curricular programs positively contribute to student learning and rarely require significant program improvement. For example, in 2015, all program results led to positive interpretations for SLOs 5 and 9. However, the small sample sizes of reports from co-curricular programs limits the ability to draw meaningful campus-level conclusions at from the data.

The aggregate data for the first year of graduate program assessment reporting indicate student learning expectations were met at the campus level. Because Graduate Goal Category 2 is specific to research methods and skills and many graduate programs require research projects, the assessment finding is consistent with program curricula and requirements for degree completion (e.g., student learning associated with methods courses and/or successful completion of a thesis).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **Campus Assessment Administrators:**
  - Consider establishing a baseline for campus assessment results within the 75-90% range. While a few programs must ensure extremely high percentages of students meeting satisfactory performance levels (e.g., for specialized accreditation and/or pursuit of graduate education), in many cases programs might be able to raise their standards that could provide more challenging learning opportunities for students.
  - Identify which co-curricular programs should be conducting assessment of student learning and work with them to align their learning outcomes accordingly. Then, provide guidance to the Assessment Subcommittee regarding program reporting expectations so that appropriate interpretations may be made for campus assessment reports.

- **Department, College/Unit, and Campus Administrators:**
  - Utilize assessment data from the appropriate level(s) (program, college, campus) as informing decision-making processes. This practice is especially important when considering academic and student learning support priorities, allocating resources, and determining curricular changes.
  - Support a culture of assessment at the campus level through enhancing the culture of assessment at the program level, department level, and college level. For example, appropriately recognize faculty and staff who do the work of assessment, such as conducting the learning experience and related assessment and reporting on behalf of the program.
  - Review available student learning support to determine if student needs are being met (e.g., students in online courses use of the Tutoring Center).

- **Assessment Subcommittee:**
  - Identify meaningful ways to disseminate information regarding student learning assessment, including campus assessment reports, and to follow-up accordingly in order to close the loop on recommendations provided.
Information provided in Appendix A is comprised of program assessment reports submitted in Compliance Assist for AY2012-13 (reports filed Fall 2013).

UMD SLO 1: Demonstrate competence in a major field (Goal 1: Knowledge)
UMD SLO 2: Construct, integrate, and apply knowledge from instruction and experience (Goal 1: Knowledge)
UMD SLO 3: Think critically and creatively in seeking solutions to practical and theoretical problems (Goal 2: Thinking)

Curricular Program Assessment
The table below includes data based on program assessment reports using direct measures of student work completed in courses and other program requirements, such as portfolios and capstone projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMD SLO</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>SLO Report Data Sample Sizes</th>
<th>SLO Report # Met Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Total # of Student Work Assessed</th>
<th>Total # Met Satisfactory Performance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Range: 5-309</td>
<td>Range: 5-217</td>
<td>2701</td>
<td>2067 (76.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Range: 10-327</td>
<td>Range: 9-306</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1042 (85.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Range: 4-432</td>
<td>Range: 3-383</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td>1922 (93.48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Program Development
• SLO 1: Based on program-level assessment results, programs listed potential improvements to courses (increase coverage of certain topics, review textbook), assessment methods, student portfolio review process, and offering additional lab sections.
• SLO 2: Recommended improvements stated on reports include course items (e.g., teaching methods, coverage of content), modifications to assessment tools, and review of the inclusion of a specific SLO (one program).
• SLO 3: Programs noted the following improvements: modifications to assessment methods, changes to feedback provided to students, coverage of course content, skill reinforcement in other courses within the program, better communication of expectations to students, enforcement of course pre-req’s, different textbooks and/or required software, program curriculum changes.

Resource Requests
• SLO 1: Three programs listed needing resources, though data were not necessarily evident to justify additional resources at the program level. For example, one program stated the need for more faculty, lab, and equipment resources to maintain program quality when assessment results show that both of its program reports for the campus SLO met the program’s standards for meeting satisfactory performance.
• SLO 2: One program listed needing more faculty to lower class sizes, but also stated that SLO assessment results indicated students are learning the concept satisfactorily and did not specify any assessment-related improvements. A second program stated a financial resource need to pay for a grading machine they previously paid for.
• SLO 3: Regarding resource needs, one program listed the need to have a consistent program assessment liaison, and another program noted its decision to hire an assessment coordinator.
program specified the need for more faculty in order to lower class sizes, though the assessment results provided show students are meeting the SLO at 93% (this program is in the same department as one listing a need for increased faculty for SLO 1 and SLO 2 described previously).

**Co-Curricular Program Assessment**

Because co-curricular programs use a combination of direct and indirect measures to assess student learning outcomes, program assessment reports may include data from various measures. Therefore, instead of reporting aggregate data at the campus level, assessment methods and the overall interpretation of assessment results per SLO report are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMD SLO</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Interpretation of Assessment Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Survey, course grades</td>
<td># Positive: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Needs Improvement: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Course activities, surveys</td>
<td># Positive: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Needs Improvement: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td># Positive: n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Needs Improvement: n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential Program Development**

- SLO 1: Based on the program’s assessment results, identified improvements included the communication of the program’s services and identification of additional measures.
- SLO 2: Although programs were generally pleased with the results of their assessments, ways to improve upon program assessment methods were stated in the reports. One support program also noted the opportunity to increase students’ comfort level with technology within its curriculum.
- SLO 3: n/a.

**Resource Requests**

- SLO 1: No resource requests were stated.
- SLO 2: No resource requests were stated.
- SLO 3: One program filed an assessment report but did not submit data. The program is in the process of developing the assessment tool, and the report noted the need for assistance in developing the tool.
Appendix B
Undergraduate SLOs 1, 2, 3
Cycle Reporting Year 1: 2016

Information provided in Appendix B is comprised of program assessment reports submitted in Compliance Assist for AY2013-14, AY2014-15, and AY2015-16 (reports filed Fall 2014, Fall 2015, and Fall 2016).

UMD SLO 1: Demonstrate competence in a major field (Goal 1: Knowledge)
UMD SLO 2: Construct, integrate, and apply knowledge from instruction and experience (Goal 1: Knowledge)
UMD SLO 3: Think critically and creatively in seeking solutions to practical and theoretical problems (Goal 2: Thinking)

Curricular Program Assessment

The table below includes data based on program assessment reports using direct measures of student work completed in courses and other program requirements, such as portfolios and capstone projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMD SLO</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>SLO Report Data Sample Sizes</th>
<th>SLO Report # Met Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Total # of Student Work Assessed</th>
<th>Total # Met Satisfactory Performance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Range: 1-390</td>
<td>Range: 0-298</td>
<td>4796</td>
<td>3552 (74.06%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Range: 1-212</td>
<td>Range: 0-138</td>
<td>2196</td>
<td>1806 (82.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Range: 1-287</td>
<td>Range: 0-276</td>
<td>3061</td>
<td>2759 (90.13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Liberal Education Program assessment data not included.

2014-2016 Liberal Education Program Assessment (PAL Reports)
• SLO 2 – 2016 Natural Sciences: The percent of students meeting satisfactory across the three learning outcomes ranged from 75.7% to 90.9% (“beginner” plus “advanced” level).

Potential Program Development
• SLO 1: Most programs recommend no changes. A few programs specified modifications to the assessment methods and/or rubrics, additional emphasis of specific topics within courses, or alternative pedagogies. One program referenced changing its courses from 3-credits to 4-credits to better prepare students for the capstone course. One program identified the need for smaller, active learning classes. One program will review its curriculum.
• SLO 2: One program described coverage of course topics in the 3-credit course, which could warrant increasing the number of credits in the course. One program noted possible ways to enhance student learning (adding service learning as a degree requirement, changing portfolio requirements, providing additional workshops). Two programs described possible curricular and pedagogical changes. One program identified potential changes to assessment methods. One program noted modifications to the assessment rubric.
• SLO 3: One program noted changing the standard for student performance. Multiple programs indicated changing assessment methods. One program is changing its curriculum. Faculty in other programs are adjusting teaching materials and methods.
• Liberal Education Program: Faculty teaching the courses identified course-related teaching and learning improvements as well as assessment-related improvements that they could implement. Faculty suggested improvements to the course assessment reporting process.
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Resource Requests
• SLO 1: A few resource requests tied to assessment of student learning include pedagogical assistance and technology and equipment (especially lab courses). A couple of programs noted software used for tracking assessment data that is paid for from department funds.
• SLO 2: If service learning is pursued, information regarding possible opportunities. The programs considering curriculum changes may require additional faculty resources if a course is added as a degree requirement.
• SLO 3: In addition to requests noted for SLOs 1 and 2, needed resources included support from campus assessment personnel, the potential to collaborate with faculty from other institutions regarding their assessment practices, and collaboration with WRIT faculty to facilitate students’ writing ability. Liberal Education Program: Resources may be needed depending upon the most appropriate structure for conducting assessment work at the program level, once determined.

Co-Curricular Program Assessment
Because co-curricular programs use a combination of direct and indirect measures to assess student learning outcomes, program assessment reports may include data from various measures. Therefore, instead of reporting aggregate data at the campus level, assessment methods and the overall interpretation of assessment results per SLO report are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMD SLO</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Interpretation of Assessment Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td># Positive: n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Needs Improvement: n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>worksheets completed by students in specific courses; other program methods not identified</td>
<td># Positive: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Needs Improvement: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>surveys, portfolio</td>
<td># Positive: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Needs Improvement: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Program Development
• SLO 1: n/a.
• SLO 2: The program desiring improvement described having discussions with faculty to better incorporate teaching strategies into the student support services provided.
• SLO 3: The program noting needing improvement were still in discussions when the program assessment report was submitted.

Resource Requests
• SLO 1: n/a.
• SLO 2: None.
• SLO 3: None.
Information provided in Appendix C is comprised of program assessment reports submitted in Compliance Assist for AY2012-13 and AY2013-14 (reports filed Fall 2013 and Fall 2014).

UMD SLO 4: Use ethical reasoning to make informed and principled choices. (Goals 3 and 5: Self-realization and social responsibility)

UMD SLO 7: Apply understanding of cultural differences in diverse environments. (Goal 5: Social responsibility)

UMD SLO 8: Contribute to local, national, and global communities in which they live. (Goal 5: Social responsibility)

Curricular Program Assessment
The table below includes data based on program assessment reports using direct measures of student work completed in courses and other program requirements, such as portfolios and capstone projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMD SLO</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>SLO Report Data Sample Sizes</th>
<th>SLO Report # Met Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Total # of Student Work Assessed</th>
<th>Total # Met Satisfactory Performance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Range: 13-229</td>
<td>Range: 2-226</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>591 (88.74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Range: 14-41</td>
<td>Range: 12-38</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82 (94.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Range: 14-104</td>
<td>Range: 12-103</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>460 (98.71%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Program Development
• SLO 4: Changes included preparing a writing style guide for students, developing a rubric for assessment, and adding pre-performance review.
• SLO 7: One program noted developing a rubric to use in assessment and identifying additional courses in which the assessment of the program learning outcome could be conducted.
• SLO 8: In addition to items noted for SLO 7, a program identified the need for students to be guided more in the application of theory (creating a new course would be ideal).

Resource Requests
• SLO 4: No changes were tied to assessment results. One program listed needing more faculty resources, but its program assessment results were satisfactory (25/27 met satisfactory).
• SLO 7: None.
• SLO 8: No resources identified were tied back to assessment results. One program stating funds for students to attend conferences reported excellent assessment results (93/93 met satisfactory).

Co-Curricular Program Assessment
No co-curricular programs submitted assessment reports for UMD SLOs 4, 7, or 8 in Fall 2013 and Fall 2014.
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Information provided in Appendix D is comprised of program assessment reports submitted in Compliance Assist for AY2014-15, AY2015-16, and AY2016-17 (reports filed Fall 2015, Fall 2016, and Fall 2017).

UMD SLO 4: Use ethical reasoning to make informed and principled choices. (Goals 3 and 5: Self-realization and social responsibility)

UMD SLO 7: Apply understanding of cultural differences in diverse environments. (Goal 5: Social responsibility)

UMD SLO 8: Contribute to local, national, and global communities in which they live. (Goal 5: Social responsibility)

Curricular Program Assessment
The table below includes data based on program assessment reports using direct measures of student work completed in courses and other program requirements, such as portfolios and capstone projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMD SLO</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>SLO Report Data Sample Sizes</th>
<th>SLO Report # Met Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Total # of Student Work Assessed</th>
<th>Total # Met Satisfactory Performance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Range: 3-285</td>
<td>Range: 1-285</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>917 (94.93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Range: 14-288</td>
<td>Range: 9-275</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>880 (94.73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Range: 3-301</td>
<td>Range: 3-245</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>593 (84.59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Liberal Education Program assessment data not included.

2015–2017 Liberal Education Program Assessment (PAL Reports)
- SLO 7 – 2016 Global Perspectives: The percent of students meeting satisfactory across the four learning outcomes ranged from 81.8% to 89.7% (“beginner” plus “advanced” level).
- SLO 7 – 2017 Cultural Diversity in the U.S.: The percent of students meeting satisfactory across the three learning outcomes ranged from 90.8% to 94.0% for introductory courses, and the percent of students meeting satisfactory for all three learning outcomes in advanced courses was 94.1%.

Potential Program Development
- SLO 4: The major of programs did not indicate any changes are necessary. One program added a course to its requirements, two programs indicated revising assessment methods.
- SLO 7: Most programs did not indicated changes. One program will consider adding a course to their assessment methods for the program SLO, one program is creating Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) courses, and one program will consider pedagogical changes (teaching students how to critique a theory upfront).
- SLO 8: One program would like to increase student participation at conferences (all students met satisfactory on the outcome), one program will monitor students more closely to seem to not meet the outcome because the program requires interaction with the community, and one program noted strengthening the related content within the course where assessed.
- Liberal Education Program: Faculty teaching the courses identified course-related teaching and learning improvements as well as assessment-related improvements that could be implemented.
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Resource Requests
• SLO 4: One program identified training and support for faculty teaching online courses as well as student access to the Tutoring Center for online courses (note: the courses used in the program’s assessment are not included in the Tutoring Center’s courses).
• SLO 7: Programs listed assistance for students taking online courses (e.g., online student orientation), support from colleges and UMD for diversity and intercultural communication learning and activities, and financial and administrative support for COIL projects.
• SLO 8: Funds for student participation in conferences, faculty lines (though connection to student learning outcomes was not identified in the report), training for creating and taking online courses.
• Liberal Education Program: No resources were requested, however, the suggestion was made to review student access to the Tutoring Center if enrolled in online courses.

Co-Curricular Program Assessment
Because co-curricular programs use a combination of direct and indirect measures to assess student learning outcomes, program assessment reports may include data from various measures. Therefore, instead of reporting aggregate data at the campus level, assessment methods and the overall interpretation of assessment results per SLO report are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMD SLO</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Interpretation of Assessment Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td># Positive: n/a # Needs Improvement: n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>surveys, observation of student workers</td>
<td># Positive: 6 # Needs Improvement: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>reflection paper</td>
<td># Positive: 1 # Needs Improvement: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Program Development
• SLO 4: n/a.
• SLO 7: Programs noted the need to collect additional information and to review results over time.
• SLO 8: No response provided.

Resource Requests
• SLO 4: n/a.
• SLO 7: One program listed resources to provide additional training, though data indicate student learning outcomes are met at an acceptable level (89%).
• SLO 8: No response provided.
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Information provided in Appendix E is comprised of program assessment reports submitted in Compliance Assist for AY2012-13, AY2013-14, and AY2014-15 (reports filed Fall 2013, Fall 2014, and Fall 2015).

UMD SLO 5: Demonstrate self-knowledge across a range of developmental areas. (Goal 3: Self-realization)
UMD SLO 6: Communicate effectively through writing, speaking, and interpersonal group interactions. (Goal 4: Relationships)
UMD SLO 9: Apply life skills to succeed in college and beyond. (Goal 6: Life skills)

Curricular Program Assessment
The table below includes data for UMD SLO 6 based on program assessment reports using direct measures of student work completed in courses and other program requirements, such as portfolios and capstone projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMD SLO</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>SLO Report Data Sample Sizes</th>
<th>SLO Report # Met Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Total # of Student Work Assessed</th>
<th>Total # Met Satisfactory Performance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Range: 4-178</td>
<td>Range: 4-177</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>1310 (89.97%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Program Development
• SLO 6: Program development items include coverage/reinforcement of topics in courses (including more practice of the skills within courses), development of a rubric, and identifying appropriate assessment methods.

Resource Requests
• SLO 6: One program noted funding for tutoring as needed. Items listed that do not relate directly to the assessment results include time and support for those conducting the assessment.

UMD SLOs 5 and 9 are self-reflective developmental learning outcomes that may be assessed using indirect and direct measures as indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMD SLO</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Interpretation of Assessment Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>course assignments; surveys</td>
<td># Positive: 4 # Needs Improvement: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>reflections; surveys</td>
<td># Positive: 9 # Needs Improvement: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Program Development
• SLO 5: None included.
• SLO 9: One program noted reviewing its assessment methods for the outcome.

Resource Requests
• SLO 5: No requests made were tied to assessment data. One program noted the need for more faculty to lower class sizes, but the assessment results were excellent (39/39 met satisfactory).
• SLO 9: None.
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Co-Curricular Program Assessment
Because co-curricular programs use a combination of direct and indirect measures to assess student learning outcomes, program assessment reports may include data from various measures. Therefore, instead of reporting aggregate data at the campus level, assessment methods and the overall interpretation of assessment results per SLO report are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMD SLO</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Interpretation of Assessment Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>surveys; observer ratings</td>
<td># Positive: 4 # Needs Improvement: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>blog post; surveys; usage data</td>
<td># Positive: 5 # Needs Improvement: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>surveys; online personal assessment</td>
<td># Positive: 7 # Needs Improvement: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Program Development
• SLO 5: Advising: Each college analyzed data from its students to develop ideas for program development, such as moving toward Strengths-based advising, incorporating different advising strategies, and pre-advisement surveys. Student Conduct: Involvement of family earlier in the process.
• SLO 6: Career & Internship Services: Improved training on communication skills for student employees. Disabilities Services: Improved program communications to students and to faculty.
• SLO 9: One program noted redoing its program learning outcomes and revising methods accordingly. Other programs noted additional data collection and conversations with co-curricular partners to consider in program development.

Resource Requests
• SLO 5: Professional development funds for professional advising staff, additional advising staff, Strengths assessment funding. Program promotion resources.
• SLO 6: Training program staff on rubric development. Opportunities for programs to attend academic department meetings to share information.
• SLO 9: Assistance with data analysis. Time for staff to conduct training and students to attend training. Facility space was noted by RSOP that could also benefit Health Services.
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*Information provided in Appendix F is comprised of AY2016-17 program assessment reports entered in Compliance Assist (reports filed Fall 2017). All graduate programs report on the same Graduate Goal Category (or Categories) each year.*

Graduate Goal Category 2: Research and methodological skills relevant to the field.

The table below includes data from completed program assessment reports that used direct measures of student work from courses and other program requirements, such as theses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Goal Category</th>
<th># of Programs with Data Reported</th>
<th># of Program SLO Reports</th>
<th>SLO Report Data Sample Sizes</th>
<th>SLO Report # Met Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Total # of Student Work Assessed</th>
<th>Total # Met Satisfactory Performance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Range: 1-36</td>
<td>Range: 1-36</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>383 (92.96%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program Recommendations*

One or more programs identified the following recommendations to improve student learning and assessment practices:

- Review and modification of assignment or thesis requirements and/or assessment rubric on a regular basis.
- Inclusion of program assessment within courses where appropriate.
- Student orientation and/or student handbook/handout to present expectations of the program learning outcome(s) at the start of the program.
- Discussions with faculty teaching the courses to ensure program learning outcomes will be assessed appropriately; possible course changes or the timing in which students take research-oriented courses.
- Consideration of a course designated to research methods in the program.
- Clear inclusion of student learning outcomes and related content in course syllabi.
- Development of procedures to evaluate and save student work/artifacts.
- Monitor the timing of when certain research resources are available to students.
- Continue and increase faculty-student mentoring.
- Consideration of student research award within the program.