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Institutional Effectiveness (IE)

Institutional Effectiveness is the **systematic** and **ongoing process** of collecting and analyzing data for implementing data-driven decisions as related to goals and outcomes in support of the University of North Texas Strategic Plan.

In general, UNT focuses on two major categories of expected outcomes:

- Academic Expected Outcomes (i.e. **Student Learning Outcomes**);
- Non-Academic Expected Outcomes (i.e. **Administrative Outcomes**).
UNT’s Institutional Effectiveness (IE) plans:

- All degree programs
- All graduate certificates
- Administrative offices
- Student service areas
- General education courses (The Core)*
- Centers & institutes*

430+ IE plans across campus
650+ Nuventive Improve users

*See next slide
The following guidelines are only for the IE plans concerning academic degree programs, graduate certificates, student services and administrative offices.

* Separate guidelines are available for faculty entering data for courses in The Core. Contact wendy.watson@unt.edu for more information.

* Separate guidelines are available for Centers & Institutes. Contact elizabeth.vogt@unt.edu for details.
Components of Effectiveness Plans

Five different components of Effectiveness Plans in Improve:

- Expected outcomes (SLOs/AOs)
- Assessment methods
- Criterion for success (target)
- Data results/analysis with evidence
- Recommendations & follow-up for seeking improvement

This is NOT our approach!
Developing program plans is a collaborative effort

- Academic Plans should be reflective of the collective goals of the program faculty for the degree
- Administrative Plans should reflect the collective goals of the administrators

*The collection, interpretation, and use of student learning evidence is a collective endeavor, and is not viewed as the sole responsibility of a single position. (SACSCOC.ORG)*

Maintenance of your plan is vitally important

- At least two faculty members (for academic plans) should be responsible for maintaining each plan
- At least two FT staff should be responsible for maintaining each administrative plan
- Continuity in assigned faculty/staff is vital for a successful plan.
- The plan & results should be regularly communicated with the whole department.
IE Cycle @ UNT

All Results, Evidence, Recommendations and Follow up information from the previous Academic Year must be entered by October 15th.

2018-19 completed IE plans are due October 15, 2019.

Any new outcomes and assessment methods for the current Academic Year must be entered by October 15th.

Plan Audits (for Quantity, not Quality) take place in October.

Peer Committees Review the IE reports (for Quality) beginning in November and continuing through April. Scores distributed by email.

Workshops and consultations continue as needed through July to improve scores.
Peer Review

1. UNT Peer Reviewers only review your four-column report and its attachments.

2. Your plan is scored against the UNT IE Rubric. Scores range from 0-100. **Plans must score 70 or above to be compliant.**

3. Peer Reviewers review the first 3 active outcomes listed in your 4-column report.

4. Plans that do not have results entered for the year are not scored.

5. The average of all 3 outcomes becomes the plan’s score.
## Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

### UNT Sample - Department/Division Academic Assessment Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 points</th>
<th>30 points</th>
<th>20 points</th>
<th>40 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment Methods</strong></td>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct research and disseminate the results - Departmental faculty will conduct research and disseminate the results.</td>
<td>Participation Rates - For the fiscal year July 1 to June 30, the number of papers submitted for publication in refereed publications by tenured and tenure track faculty members will be pulled from the annual faculty activity report and tabulated by the departmental office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Status</strong>: Active</td>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong>: An average of two papers will be accepted for publication each year per faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date</strong>: 09/01/2008</td>
<td><strong>Schedule</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Date</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Activities</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enrollment Data

On the institutional schedule for reporting retention data to departments and based on institutional definitions of retention, the Office of Institutional Research will provide retention data for the department.

**Criterion**: Department expects to increase the retention rate of its students by 2% over the previous year’s retention rate. 2015-16 rate was 69%.

**Change Status**: No Change

**Result Type**: Criterion Met

The data from TRAC show the retention rate for the department for 2007-2008 was 69%. The criterion was met.

(10/09/2017)

**Academic Cycle**: 2016 - 2017

### Change in Classroom Space

The Department’s scheduling will meet student needs while maximizing use of classroom space.
### Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

#### UNT Sample - Department/Division Academic Assessment Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct research and disseminate the results - Departmental faculty will conduct research and disseminate the results.</td>
<td>Participation Rates - For the fiscal year July 1 to June 30, the number of papers submitted to for publication in referred publications by tenured and tenure track faculty members will be pulled from the annual faculty activity report and tabulated by the departmental office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Status: Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date: 09/01/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention - Department will retain its students.</th>
<th>Enrollment Data - On the institutional schedule for reporting retention data to departments and based on institutional definitions of retention, the office of institutional research will provide retention data for the department.</th>
<th>Change Status: No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Status: Active</td>
<td></td>
<td>Result Type: Criterion Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Type: Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td>The data from IT show the retention rate for the department for 2007-2008 was 69%. The criterion was met. (10/03/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date: 09/01/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year: 2016 - 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheduling to maximize classroom space - The Department will meet student needs while maximizing use of classroom space.

07/10/2017

Generated by Tredit, a product of Nuventive
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Common Reasons for low scores (< 70):

• Assessment Method or example not attached

• Evidence of results not attached

• Outcome active for more than a year with no results

• Active Outcome with results entered and no recommendations

• Active Outcome with recommendations from the prior year that have no follow-up information

• Criterion statement is not quantitative
Here is a fully, completed plan:

**Assessment: Program Info Four Column**

**PROGRAM (CLASS) 1929 - CONVERGED BROADCAST MEDIA BA**

**Vision:** The vision of the Converged Broadcast Media major is the future. This major prepares the next generation of media professionals. Future media practitioners of tomorrow are exposed to multiple theories, technologies, and hands-on practice in media platforms including broadcast television, radio, the web, and long form narrative and documentary programming. The major encourages innovative thinking about career choices because media is expanding faster than most other professional arenas.

**Mission:** The mission of the Converged Broadcast Media major is to prepare students for careers in news, information, new media, management, and related media roles now and in the future regardless of the technological platform.

**Expected Outcomes**

| **Content Development for Digital Media** | **Course Assignment/Project** - Students will complete a foundational assignment that demonstrates their ability to gather information and execute the process of writing, shooting, editing, and producing. It will be demonstrated with two specific projects incorporating these concepts into a completed project. This content can be presented across multiple platforms. |
| **Outcome Status:** Active | **Assessment Tools/Project** - The number of students enrolled in 2017-2018 increased by about 17.9% (from 39 to 46 students) from the previous year. Based on the increased number of students the assessment methods and criterion remained stable. Of the 46 students, 93.3% scored 80% or better in the assignment. This was a slight decrease from 2016-2017 in which 94% of students scored 80% or better. (08/10/2018) |
| **Outcome Type:** Student Learning | **Schedule:** The section was raised from 50% to 80% for 2017-2018. |
| **Expected Outcomes** | **Related Documents:** 3525 Assess 2017-2018 Short form project - Frances P.docx, 3525 Asses 2017-2018 Long form.docx |

**Results**

| **Change Status:** No Change | **Recommendation:** With the continued success of students with the significant majority achieving 80% or better, the decision will be to close this course for assessment and focus on another academic area. |
| **Result Type:** Criterion Met | **Follow-Up:** With the continued success of students with the significant majority achieving 80% or better, the decision will be to close this assessment method after IE Plan is reviewed and will focus on another academic area. |

**Assessment artifacts attached**

**Evidence of results and analysis attached**
Outcomes statements are the foundation of institutional effectiveness plans.

“What gets tracked and measured, gets accomplished.”

JohnMaxwellTeam.com
Expected Outcomes

Consists of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
  • Describe the abilities, skills, knowledge that you want students in your program to acquire
  • Each SLO must be singular and measureable

Consists of Administrative Outcomes (AOs)
  • Describe the effectiveness of unit actions/activities
  • Each AO must be singular and measureable

Must have at least 3 SLO/AOs and should not have more than a total of 5 **active** SLO/AOs

Peer review teams review a maximum of 3 SLO/AOs
Writing Student Learning Outcomes

The key to Student Learning Outcomes is **MEASURABILITY**.

- Use active verbs that describe an observable behavior
- Behaviors that can be measured
- Use compound statements judiciously

**Words to avoid in an SLO**

**Students will:**

- "**understand**" – an internal process that can’t be easily measured
- "**value or appreciate**" – tricky to measure
- "**become familiar**" – how do you measure familiarity
- "**learn/think about…**" – not observable
- "**become aware of…**"
- "**have ability to…**" – Doesn’t measure achievement or demonstrate a skill (ability vs. achievement are different)
Other Verbs to Consider for SLOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remember</th>
<th>Understand</th>
<th>Apply</th>
<th>Analyze</th>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>Create</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Classify</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>Combine</td>
<td>Appraise</td>
<td>Arrange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define</td>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Argue</td>
<td>Assemble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate</td>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Find</td>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Compose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>Indicate</td>
<td>Illustrate</td>
<td>Sketch</td>
<td>Defend</td>
<td>Create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recite</td>
<td>Organize</td>
<td>Interpret</td>
<td>Solve</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Interpret</td>
<td>Appraise</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Devise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Illustrate</td>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Predict</td>
<td>Formulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>Reorganize</td>
<td>Criticize</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Qualify</td>
<td>Invent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>Translate</td>
<td>Diagnose</td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>Diagram</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summarize</td>
<td>Classify</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>Organize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Propose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: The Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence, Carnegie Mellon University
Things to Keep in Mind:

If your outcomes are assessed in classes that are offered in more than one mode (internet, off-site, face-to-face, etc.), disaggregate your data and compare attainment.

If a degree program can be completed online and face-to-face, attainment of student learning outcomes must be compared by mode.

In addition to outcomes, syllabi should be comparable. For example:

- a course should have the same outcomes/objectives regardless of mode
- assessment methods should be similar if not the same

- Administrative units should use comparison information if services are offered by more than one mode.
## Rubric: Expected Outcomes

**Expected Outcomes** — Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Administrative Outcomes (AOs) must be singular and measurable.

AOs at the department/division level should be designed to support the goals of both the department and the institution. This may be accomplished by the data-driven decision process which entails:

- What goals are to be accomplished by the department/division and how are they accomplished
- What type of assessment will best inform the department of the extent to which they are meeting their goals

SLOs are specific statements that describe the abilities, skills, knowledge, and/or values that you want students in your program to acquire. Action verbs are used to describe exactly what and how a student will demonstrate learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO does not address Student Learning or AO is not related to the Office/Dept.</th>
<th>AO/SLO is not measurable.</th>
<th>AO/SLO is too broad, or appears to be measuring more than one outcome.</th>
<th>AO/SLO describes expected outcome, but requires refinement or further information.</th>
<th>AO/SLO clearly describes a single measurable outcome.</th>
<th>Total Possible Points: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

A green light to greatness.®
SLOs must be assessed with at least one direct measure:

- How students show you what they have learned
- Assess the extent to which it achieves these outcomes
- Direct measures include: exams, portfolio assessments, capstone projects, case studies, etc.
- Indirect measures are based on attitudes or opinions
- Course grades are not acceptable measures of assessment for SLOs
- Documentation of the measure must be attached (available to review)
- Performing arts may be more comfortable with qualitative data
## Rubric: Method of Assessment

**AO/SLO #1 METHOD**

**Method of Assessment:** SLO’s must be assessed with at least one direct method. For best practice, select at least two separate methods for measuring AOs and SLOs. An important qualification to keep in mind when selecting measures for SLOs is that course grades are not acceptable for this purpose.

### Direct Measures
- Learning assessment tools. Academic units should use multiple direct measures of learning. Direct measurements are often derived from student course work.
  - Capstone courses/experiences
  - Case Studies
  - Portfolio Assessments
  - Assessment of Research Papers/Projects with a Standardized Rubric
  - Licensure Exams and certifications
  - Internship Evaluations
  - Written/oral comprehensive exams
  - Juried reviews of projects, exhibitions, performances
  - Standardized tests (Major Field Achievement Test, Critical Thinking Ability, Academic Profile, etc.)

### Indirect Measures (outputs)
- Provide useful information but DO NOT directly assess learning.

Indirect measurements are based on the opinions or attitudes toward what was learned that students, alumni, employers, and others may hold (e.g., graduating senior or alumni surveys) or are comprised of data that implies learning has taken place (e.g., job placement statistics and standardized surveys such as the National Survey of Student Engagement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO: No method of assessment clearly identified <strong>OR</strong> only one Indirect method AND No documents attached</th>
<th><strong>SLO Only:</strong> Method is described but is based only on one Indirect Measure. <strong>Documents attached.</strong></th>
<th>SLO/ AO: Method is described and is based on a Direct Measure. <strong>Documents not attached.</strong></th>
<th>SLO: Method is direct and clearly described. <strong>Document attached.</strong></th>
<th>AO/SLO: More than one measure listed. Each measure is clearly defined. At least one is Direct (if SLO). All Documents not attached.</th>
<th>AO/SLO: More than one method. Each method to assess is clearly described. For SLOs, at least one method is Direct. <strong>ALL Documents attached.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Possible Points:</strong> 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>SCORE:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_A green light to greatness._
Criterion (Performance target)

Indicates what performance level is acceptable for each method of measuring an SLO/AO

- Should be prepared to explain why the criterion is set at a particular level, especially if the level is less than 70%

The criterion should be stated as a:

- Specified percentage of students/clients attaining a given SLO/AO;
- Exam/Quiz/Knowledge and Skills Assessment scores; or
- Some other specific obtained value
AO and SLO criteria are stated in such a way that it is clear what performance level is to be considered successful. For each method of measuring the AO/SLO, a quantitative goal for the desired level of performance on the measurement must be stated. This target level or criterion may be a specified percentage of students attaining a given outcome, score on a test, or some other numeric value that reflects what you believe ought to be the ideal outcome. Be prepared to explain why the criterion is set at your chosen level.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No quantitative/measureable goals for the desired level of performance have been stated.</td>
<td>More than one active method, but not all specify a quantitative goal for the desired level of performance.</td>
<td>For each active method, a clearly stated quantitative goal for the desired level of performance has been specified.</td>
<td>Total Possible Points: 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SCORE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Findings from collected data:
- Indicate how the findings compare with the expectation established by the criterion
- Includes the percentage of students meeting the criterion **AND** the total number of students in the assessment. If a sample was used, explain the sampling methodology

Data must be collected and analyzed systematically:
- Results must be entered annually
- Evidence or documentation of analysis should be provided
- Artifacts of assessment
**AO/SLO #1 Results:**
- How do the results compare to your expectations?
- Have you provided evidence of your results?
- Did you provide total number of students completing the assessment along with % meeting your criterion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active outcome for more than one cycle, no results.</th>
<th>Results of assessment are stated. <strong>No comparison, no evidence attached.</strong></th>
<th>Results of assessment are stated. Results are <strong>compared to Plan expectations. No evidence of results is provided.</strong></th>
<th>Results of assessment are stated. Results are <strong>not compared to Assessment Plan expectations. Evidence of results is provided.</strong></th>
<th>Results of assessment are stated. Results are <strong>compared to Unit Assessment Plan expectations and evidence of results is provided.</strong></th>
<th><em>New outcome and/or assessment method.</em> There has not been sufficient time (1 academic year) for data collection since the AO/SLO or method was updated.</th>
<th><strong>Total Possible Points:</strong> 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>SCORE:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations & Follow-up

**Recommendations:** An action plan that indicates how results will be used to improve student learning and program quality:

- What changes will be made next cycle if students did not meet the criterion?
- If the criterion was met, what might be done to continue to foster improvement in the next cycle?
- If the criterion is consistently met, should the standards be adjusted or should new SLOs/AOs be introduced?
- Provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results

**Follow-up:** What happened with last year’s recommendations? Was improvement plan implemented?
# Rubric: Recommendations

**Recommendations and Follow-up**
- The final step in the assessment cycle is the most crucial – how are you going to use the results to continue to improve or enhance services/learning?
- What are you going to do to make improvements to address areas in which the criteria was not met? What is your plan of action?
- If goal was met, what can you do to continue to raise standards and/or improve? Remember this IE plan needs to demonstrate evidence of improvement.
- If the findings consistently suggest that no improvement is needed, then programs should consider examining a more useful AO/SLO, or setting more demanding target levels for existing methods of measurement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Not Met or Inconclusive- No recommendations.</th>
<th>Criterion Met. No recommendations to continue to raise standards/ improve.</th>
<th>Criterion Met, Not Met, or Inconclusive- Program has identified how they are using the results to continue to improve student learning.</th>
<th><em>New AO/SLO or Method</em>. Insufficient time for data collection and entry.</th>
<th>Total Possible Points: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior recommendations have not been followed up on.</th>
<th>Program repeats response from previous year. No action taken.</th>
<th>Prior recommendations are followed up on. Results are identified and used to measure continual improvement of AO/SLO.</th>
<th><em>New AO/SLO or Method</em>. Insufficient time for data collection and entry.</th>
<th>Total Possible Points: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using the results of the assessment, additional methods are identified and implemented to achieve success.</th>
<th>Having met the Unit’s goal, the program has developed new strategies and/or raised the criterion to continue to improve.</th>
<th>Since the findings consistently suggest that no improvement can be made in this area, the program has defined a new outcome to measure</th>
<th><em>New AO/SLO or Method</em>. Insufficient time for data collection and entry.</th>
<th>Total Possible Points: 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*A green light to greatness.*

UNT
Accessing Improve
https://unt.tracdat.com/tracdat/

For Username, enter your EUID

Enter your password (initially set to meangreen)

• Please note: Your Improve password does not automatically update when you change your password in the UNT system. You will need to separately change your password in the Improve system.
Improve Home Page

Administrative Unit Homepage

Assessment Unit Planning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effort Report Certification Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Provided by Office of Grants and Contracts Administration (OGCA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Routing System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to Change Your Password

Don’t forget to save your changes.
Improve Home page

1. Select the unit you want to work with

2. Click on the side tabs to navigate the system.
Helpful Hint: First and Last Step

• Run a 4-column report at the beginning and end of your work in your plan.
• The report reveals areas that need attention
• When your plan is complete for the year, save a copy on your desktop & in the Document Repository for your plan (in case anything is deleted unintentionally in Improve.)
Running a 4-Column Report

1. Select Reports from the side bar.
2. Click on Standard Reports.
3. Select “Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column”

Title for Academic units:
“Program Info Four Column”
Select *Open Report* from the top right of the page

You can filter out completed/inactive outcomes from your report to reduce page length. This helps you focus on only active outcomes.
### Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

#### UNT Sample - Degree Program Academic Assessment

**Vision:** The vision for the Sample Program in the Sample College of UNT is to achieve greater visibility in the region as a leader in our discipline and increase enrollment by 20% over the next three years.

**Mission:** The mission of the Sample Department in the Sample College at UNT is to establish and maintain a superior learning environment for the traditional and non-traditional student in the department discipline. Students will be actively engaged in research, coursework, and internships to prepare for a successful career in the community at home and abroad. The program offers mentorship, hands-on applications, and community involvement to guide and enable students as they enhance their skills in real-world applications. Students who graduate from this program will possess readily marketable if not superior quality skills as an entry-level employee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Outcome #1</strong> - The student will perform a regression analysis at proficiency level of 80% from a course assignment in Stats 201.</td>
<td>Course Assignment/Project - Students are evaluated from performance in 4 lab settings for regression analysis. Each lab is worth 25 points. Criterion: 80% of Students achieve a minimum of 80% of the points. Related Documents: [Sample Program Degree Grade Rubric.docx](mailto:Sample Program Degree Grade Rubric.docx) <a href="http://www.comindWARE.com">ComindWARE</a></td>
<td>Change Status: Change Made (Target Met, Not Met or Inconclusive) Result Type: Criterion Met 50 students completed the assessment. 100% scored 80 or above. (09/07/2011)</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong> Assess again in 2012. If results are repeated we will establish a different outcome. (09/27/2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is an active outcome with the method attached. There are several years of results. All results have evidence attached.

Look to see if results have been entered for the academic year. This plan has had no results since AY 2010-11.

Look for missing components. This plan is missing a follow-up statement.

Follow-Up: See 2011 results. Plan implemented and performance improved. (08/05/2011)

Follow-Up: Check exam grades and lab results after mid-term exams. Course instructors report...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment &amp; Criteria / Tasks</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Recommendation &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PROGRAM (CAS) 2590 - SOCIOLOGY BA**  
Outcome 3: Application - Apply theories and methodologies to substantive areas of human social life (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, family, health, demography, stratification, urbanization, organization, sexuality, disaster response, and religion)  
Outcome Types: Student Learning Outcome | Assessment Method:  
Graduating seniors take an exit interview exam during which they answer an open ended question asking them to identify three factors that contribute to poverty. (#15)  
Assessment Method Category: Exit Interview  
Criterion:  
75% of graduating seniors will be able to correctly explain at least two factors that contribute to poverty. | 11/04/2013 - 79.5% of 2012 graduating seniors were able to correctly explain at least two factors that contribute to poverty.  
Result Type: Criterion Met  
Change Status: Change Recommended (Target Met, Not Met or Inconclusive)  
Related Documents: FALL 2012 Sociology Exit Survey.xlsx | 11/04/2013 - The current plan's expected outcomes have been closed out because they were not singular and were difficult to measure. Going forward, the new SLOs will focus on more singular outcomes that better reflect student learning. |
| **Complete** | 10/24/2012 - 89.5% of graduating seniors were able to correctly explain at least two factors that contribute to poverty.  
Result Type: Criterion Met  
Change Status: Change Recommended (Target Met, Not Met or Inconclusive)  
Related Documents: Exam results 2010, 2011 | 10/24/2012 - In general, the exit interview items are indirect measures of learning outcomes, and should be replaced by direct measures. It is recommended that the department use relevant items from a revised version of the exit exam (included among the uploaded documents) to assess outcomes. |
| | 09/07/2011 - 76.8% of 2010-11 graduating seniors were able to correctly explain at least two factors that contribute to poverty.  
Result Type: Criterion Met  
Change Status: Change Made (Target Met, Not Met or Inconclusive)  
Related Documents: exam results 2010, 2011 | 09/22/2011 - A new assessment method (Capstone/ Senior level Exam) was developed to provide better data. |
| | 11/09/2010 - 89.9% of 2009-2010 graduating seniors were able to correctly name 2 factors that contribute to poverty (#15).  
Result Type: Criterion Met  
Change Status: Change Recommended (Target Met, Not Met or Inconclusive)  
Related Documents: exam results 2009-10 | 10/09/2010 - The data from this assessment is collected with graduation packets. It is our concern that students are not taking the assessment method seriously. New assessments are under development by faculty. |
| | 11/02/2009 - 74.7% of 2008-2009 graduating seniors correctly named at least two factors that contribute to | | |
How do I update information in my 4-column report?

1. Update columns 1 & 2 under the “Plan” option
2. Update columns 3 & 4 under the “Results” option

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column
How to update:

Column 1 – Outcomes
Adding or editing outcomes

1. Select Assessment Unit Planning
2. Click on Plan
3. Click on the arrow next to Expected outcomes to expand the selection
Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Outcome #1</strong> The student will perform an regression analysis at proficiency level of 80% from a course assignment in Stats 201. (Active)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome #2: Meta-Analysis</strong> Students will be able to conduct meta-analysis which involve regression tree analysis, bivariate analysis, T-test, and Analysis of Variance (ANNOVA). (Active)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytic skills</strong> The student will be able to apply a linear regression analysis for social statistics. (Active)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use the “+” sign to add new outcomes or select the pen/paper logo next to the outcome you wish to edit.
New Expected Outcomes

- Insert a short name for the Outcome
- Paste or write concise, singular outcome

For Outcome Status:
- **Active** indicates that the outcome is being actively monitored for the time period identified in the schedule. Usually no more than 5 outcomes per unit plan are active for a given year.
- **Inactive** indicates that the outcome is defined and waiting to be monitored in the future.
- **Complete** indicates that the outcome has been monitored and will not be monitored again.

- Make a selection for Outcome Type. Academic programs generally look at Student Learning Outcomes while Department and Administrative Units generally look at Administrative Outcomes.
- Enter a start date for assessment. Leave the end date blank until assessment of the outcome is complete and will not be assessed again.

Don’t forget to save your changes and return.
Editing Existing Outcomes

If you need to refine or further specify an existing outcome, Click on the (#1) plan tab, find the particular expected outcome, and select (#2) “Edit icon” for the outcome you want to edit.
Editing Existing Outcomes

From the Sidebar under Assessment Unit Planning, select Plan, then select “edit” next to the outcome you need to change.

(#1) Edit the text and (#2) Save Changes and return.
How to update:

Column 2 – Assessment/Criterion
Assessment methods

Select: 1. Assessment Unit Planning; 2. Plan; 3. Expected Outcomes; 4. Select your outcome; 5. All active assessment methods will populate.

Use the “+” to add a method.

Existing methods can be edited
Means of Assessment

1. Select a category for the method

2. Describe how the outcome will be assessed, including the title of assessment instrument if applicable.

3. State the Criterion- This is a brief statement that identifies the minimum percentage of students attaining a specific minimum performance level for success as measured on the assessment instrument for the SLO. (70% of students will score a minimum of 8 out of 10 points from the rubric) Do not use grades or means (averages). When setting your criterion, keep in mind things you could do to improve the results should you not meet it.

OPTIONAL: Enter the assessment schedule (will you assess annually, every long semester, etc.?)
Add documentation (grading rubric, instructions for the assignment, example test questions, etc.) to Means of Assessment Part One

Add documentation to methods

If the document has already been uploaded, it should appear in your repository. Locate the document and Select “Relate Document”

*** PDF is the preferred document type***
Add documentation to methods - Part Two

1. Select a folder. If General is the only option, select General
2. Browse for your documentation
3. Include a short description
4. Relate the document

You can now relate URLs
How to update Column 3 - Results & Evidence
Results Entry

Results for Programs and Departments

• Enter a description of the Results. For SLOs, include the number of students completing the assessment and the % that met your criterion for success. For AOs, include the total number of those assessed and the % that met your criterion for success.

• Select the Result Type based on the results—Was the Criterion** Met, Not Met, or Inconclusive?

Disaggregate Distance and Off-site data when possible
The Result Date is automatic. You can edit it if needed.

Select the Change Status based on the results.

Click on the Academic Cycle during which the results were collected.

Save Changes and Return.
Adding additional information to Results

Recommendations and documents are added once results have been entered. Use the appropriate green button to add recommendations or documentation of results.
Add documentation to Results

Add Results documentation from the Results side tab.

*** PDF is the preferred document type***

Redact confidential or student ID data
Add documentation to Results

If the document has already been uploaded, it should appear in your repository. Locate the document and Select “Relate Document”

If you have not uploaded the document before, use the "+" to add a new document.

*** PDF is the preferred document type***
How to update Column 4 – Recommendations & Follow-up
Closing the Loops

What can we modify to make positive gains for student attainment or administrative outcomes?

• What will actually improve student learning or administrative efficacy?
• Quality improvement actions
• Excellence beyond the minimum expectations
• How do you demonstrate continuous improvement?
Recommendations

• This is the most important area. You have collected your results...
• Now what? Or so what? Close the loops!
• If criterion is met or exceeded for more than one cycle, is it set too low? How are you demonstrating that program is seeking improvement? (SACSCOC requirement)
• If no improvement is needed after 2-3 cycles, choose a different objective to assess.
• Avoid “Continue to monitor results” as a recommendation
Possible Improvement Actions based on Analysis

- Curricular
- Pedagogical
- Academic support
- Professional development
- Improve assessment
- Raise criterion

**Administrative:** Raise criterion, new outcome, change procedures/process to improve efficiency or services
Possible Improvement Actions (academic)

• Create progressively more challenging projects, problems or standards of performance in your program
• Do you use the same level of validity, reliability and empirical research in deciding curricular changes?
• Can you improve future iterations of assessment?
• If you use a high stakes test in your program, is your means of assessment valid?
• Do you have interrater reliability in your assessment?
This text box must be used to explain what the unit plans on doing in light of the results.

“Continue to monitor” is not acceptable.

Click “Save” and “Return” after entry.
Differences between a Recommendation and a Follow-up Statement

- **2016-17 Plan**: Recommendations for 2017-18 improvement
- **2017-18 Plan**: Recommendations for 2018-19 improvement
- **2018-19 Plan**: Implement the change during 2018-19

**Follow-up** details how 2016-17 recommendations were implemented.
Follow Up on last cycle’s recommendations

Add a follow up to recommendations during the last cycle. If a recommendation was made for 2016-17, a follow up should be entered now for 2017-18 update.

Sample Outcome #1: The student will perform an regression analysis at proficiency level of 80% from a course assignment in Stats 201.

- **Course Assignment/Project:** Students are evaluated from performance in 4 lab settings for regression analysis.
  - Each lab is worth 25 points.
  - **Criterion:** 80% of students achieve a minimum of 80% of the points.

Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Made (Target Met, Not Met or Inconclusive)</th>
<th>Criterion Met</th>
<th>09/07/2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 students completed the assessment. 100% scored 80 or above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations:

- **Recommendation:** Assess again in 2012. If results are repeated we will establish a different outcome. (09/27/2011)
  - **Follow-Up**
  - **Assignment**
Adding a Follow-Up

Sample Outcome #1 The student will perform an regression analysis at proficiency level of 80% from a course assignment in Stats 201.

Course Assignment/Project Students are evaluated from performance in 4 lab settings for regression analysis.
- Each lab is worth 25 points.
- Criterion 80% of Students achieve a minimum of 80% of the points.

Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Made (Target Met, Not Met or Inconclusive)</th>
<th>Criterion Met</th>
<th>09/07/2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 students completed the assessment. 100% scored 80 or above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation Assess again in 2012. If results are repeated we will establish a different outcome. (09/27/2011)

Follow-Up Date 08/04/2016

Did the program/office implement the recommendation? Did it have any effect on the outcome? The only time you do not need to do this is if the recommendation was to close the outcome and assess a new outcome.
Things to remember:

• IE is about improving or enhancing - not reporting.
• IE is not about proving students can perform at a specific, minimal level year after year
• Always run a 4-Column Report after changes & save copy
• Never delete or overwrite existing outcomes, methods, or results (showing a mature, ongoing process is good)
• Always address your prior recommendations (Follow-up).
• It is ok to not meet your criterion - Just include your plans (actions to take or taken to meet the goal) in the recommendations section
• The new deadline for Academic and Administrative plans is October 15th.
So how does a 4-column report demonstrate IE?

**Institutional Effectiveness (IE)**

Institutional Effectiveness is the **systematic and ongoing process of collecting and analyzing data** for implementing **data-driven decisions** as related to **goals and outcomes** in support of the University of North Texas Strategic Plan.
Curriculum Mapping Tool
Map your program’s assessment

Benefits: curricular decisions, program review, program accreditation, IE improvement planning

What is it?
• Aligns goals and program outcomes
• Documents what is taught & sequence of curriculum
• Foundation for assessment planning and IE
• Visual tool to show relationship between courses and program learning outcomes
• Scaffolded view of learning (introduction, development and mastery of concepts)

Contact UA to provide resources and support
### Program Learning Outcomes

**Graduates will be able to...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses and Experiences</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop &amp; apply theoretical models that draw from multiple disciplines to solve security threats to sectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Required Courses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSCE 5550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCIS 5630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCE 5640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses and Experiences</td>
<td>Program Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates will be able to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop &amp; apply theoretical models that draw from multiple disciplines to solve security threats to sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Courses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCE 5550</td>
<td>I, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCIS 5630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCE 5640</td>
<td>M, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCE 5215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Courses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCE 5380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCE 5350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCE 5550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCE 5570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 5100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 5100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJUS 5120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: "I"=Introduced; "R"=Reinforced & developed; "M"=Mastered; "A"=Assessment evidence collected (formative or summative)
Questions and Wrap Up
Office of University Accreditation
University of North Texas

Hurley Administration Building Room 135
(Dr. Terri Day’s office suite for Academic Administration)

tracdat@unt.edu

Elizabeth Vogt
University Accreditation
Elizabeth.Vogt@UNT.edu
940-565-5288

Kim Faris
University Accreditation
Kimberly.Faris@UNT.edu
940-565-4584

Additional support:
Ronda Bewley, Barbara Ward & Megan Griffith