BIENNIAL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT REPORT - GUIDANCE

The Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) is committed to a vision of assessment that focuses on improving student learning through program and other improvements and informs decision making and resource allocation in support of improved student learning and success. The biennial report provides the opportunity to highlight the student learning that is taking place within UAA’s programs, to note areas that might require additional attention, and to reflect on how well efforts to improve student learning are working. The report also enables the AAC to analyze assessment across the institution and to respond to UA System, Board of Regents, legislative, and Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) requests and requirements.

Revised form and new report cycle: In response to guidance from the NWCCU Mid-Cycle Evaluation, OAA produced summaries of the 2021 and 2022 Annual Academic Assessment Reports. While these summaries demonstrate that faculty are clearly engaging in ongoing, meaningful assessment and improvement processes, the summaries also highlight the sheer volume of effort, with more than 460 program student learning outcomes being assessed and reported in more than 100 reports each year. A subcommittee of the AAC reflected on these summaries, the assessment cycle, and the report itself. Based on feedback from the subcommittee, as well as administrator feedback, starting in Fall 2023, UAA is implementing a more focused report form, extending the due date, and moving to an every-other-year program student learning outcomes assessment reporting cycle, with approximately half of the reports due one year, and the other half due the following year.

• The two-year cycle is designed so that programs assess student learning one year, and implement improvements the next year.
• A program does not have to assess every program student learning outcome every year.
• However, a program must assess all its program student learning outcomes within a seven-year period, that is, by the time the program is scheduled for its next, regular Program Review.
• The assessment report and Program Review schedule is posted here.

Guidance on filling out the form: These reports are public documents and will be posted on the assessment website. Responses are to be narrative only, and must be ADA- and FERPA-compliant. Do not embed any links, including to webpages or other documents. To be FERPA-compliant, do not include the names of any current or former students. Rather, use statements such as, “In AY23 four program graduates were accepted to graduate programs in the field.” Programs with specialized accreditation or other external recognitions must comply with restrictions regarding what can be published, as per the accreditor or external organization. Please do not include appendices, as appendices to this form will not be posted.

The form uses narrative, text, and drop-down boxes. Narrative boxes have a character limit, which includes spaces. When using text and drop-down boxes, if you want to undo an answer, press “Control-Z” or “Command-Z.”

Use Microsoft Word: To ensure the fillable fields function correctly, the form must be completed in Microsoft Word. It will not function properly in Google Docs. Programs that wish to record collaborative discussion of the report might consider creating a separate document to take notes, before entering final responses in the official fillable form.

For technical assistance with the form, email Academic Affairs (uaa.oaa@alaska.edu).
The guidance above will be removed prior to posting the report.

REPORT ON AY2022-2023 ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT (Due to the dean on November 15)

Submission date: Select date.

Assessment Plan covered in the report: Select Plan.

College: Select College/School.

Campuses where the program(s) is delivered: ☐ Anchorage ☐ KOD ☐ KPC ☐ MSC ☐ PWSC

Submitted by: Enter assessment coordinator name, title, email address.

After responding to the questions below, the program should email this form to the dean, with a copy to the appropriate community campus director(s) if the program is delivered on a community campus.

1. Please list and number the Program Student Learning Outcomes your program assessed in AY23. For each outcome, indicate one of the following: Exceeded faculty expectations, Met faculty expectations, or Did not meet faculty expectations.

Example: 1. Communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and formats – Exceeded faculty expectations; 2. Adopt critical perspectives for understanding the forces of globalization and diversity – Met faculty expectations.

2. Describe your assessment process in AY23 for these Program Student Learning Outcomes, including the collection of data, analysis of data, and faculty (and other, e.g., advisory board) conversations around the findings. (1000 words or less)

3. What are the findings and what do they tell the faculty about student learning in your program? (1000 words or less)
4. Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for changes to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Select Yes or No.
   i. Please describe the recommended action(s), what improvements in student learning the program hopes to see, the proposed timeline, and how the program will know if the change(s) has worked. If no recommendations for changes were made, please explain that decision. *(1000 words or less)*

5. In the past academic year, how did your program use the results of previous assessment cycles to make changes intended to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Please check all that apply.
   - ☐ Course curriculum changes
   - ☐ Course prerequisite changes
   - ☐ Changes in teaching methods
   - ☐ Changes in advising
   - ☐ Degree requirement changes
   - ☐ Degree course sequencing
   - ☐ Course enrollment changes (e.g., course capacity, grading structure [pass/fail, A-F])
   - ☐ Changes in program policies/procedures
   - ☐ Changes to Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)
   - ☐ College-wide initiatives (e.g., High-Impact Practices)
   - ☐ Faculty, staff, student development
   - ☐ Other
   - ☐ No changes were implemented in AY23. *(If no options above were selected)*

   If you checked “Other” above, please describe. *(100 words or less)*

6. Do you have any information about how well these or other past improvements are working? Are they achieving their intended goals? Please include any data or assessment results that help you demonstrate this. *(1000 words or less)*

---

DEAN SECTION (Due to the program on January 15)

*After completing the Dean Section and signing it, the dean should email this form to the program, and copy uaa_oaa@alaska.edu for posting. If the program is delivered on one or more community campus, the*
dean should consult with the appropriate community campus director(s) on the response and copy the appropriate community campus director(s) when emailing the response to the program.

1. Based on the program’s responses above, what guidance and support do you have for the program moving forward? (200 words or less)

2. Discuss what the program is doing particularly well in terms of its processes for the assessment and improvement of student learning, for example, the use of a common rubric or prompt, a signature assignment, etc. (200 words or less)

Dean’s signature: ____________________________ Date: Select date.