

Feedback on Program Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Example

Full Program Name	Master of X
Program Level	Graduate / Professional
Campus	Mequon or Ann Arbor
Academic School	XY
Program Director's / Department Chair's Concordia Email	Name
Assessment Report Year	2022-2023
Report Submission Date	Jul 07, 2023
Assessment Report Documents	[what was submitted would be attached]

[Each of the Eight Criteria can be evaluated as Exemplary, Meets Expectations, or Needs Improvement. Overall reports of the all feedback for a given school are provided to the Dean]

Criterion 1) Program Learning Outcomes

Are the PLOs measurable, meaningful and descriptive of exit-level learning?

Program Learning Outcomes

Meets Expectations (2)

Feedback

Program Learning Outcomes Comments

PLOs are aligned with X accreditation standards, and have multiple competencies.

Criterion 2) Global Learning Outcomes

Are the PLOs aligned with the GLOs, at least one PLO for each of the six GLOs, and is the PLO for GLO #1 Christian Faith explicit about Christian Faith?

Global Learning Outcome Feedback

Meets Expectations (2)

Global Learning Outcomes Comments

The department has identified a way to link competencies to the GLOs, and because there are so many competencies, they are focusing here on those that align with identified GLOs. There is no specific PLO that aligns with Christian Faith, but there the department has identified what they want students to learn about Christian Faith and provided a strategy to measure that learning.

Criterion 3) Curriculum Map provided with the report

Is there a curriculum map listing all PLOs, where they are developed, and entry-level (optional) and exit-level assessment points?

Curriculum Map Feedback

Meets Expectations (2)

Curriculum Map Comments

Department has several levels of curriculum maps and these cover all the aspects of the program to indicate where learning occurs related to the PLOs identified as linked to GLOs.

Criterion 4) Collaborative Work demonstrated in the report

Is there evidence that faculty/staff are working together?

Collaborative Work Feedback

Exemplary (3)

Collaborative Work Comments

The faculty department reports working together with assessment coordinator for School of XY on updated goals from X accreditation which will be implemented next year.

Criterion 5) Tools described and used by the department

Are the tools of X Program Products/Faculty Evaluation effective?

Tool Feedback

Meets Expectations (2)

Tool Comments

The tool to measure the PLO aligned with GLO 6 is a paper/written assignment which requires students to analyze meaningful patterns in quantitative data in course XYZ. There is also application of this area of learning in course XXY which is closer to the end of the program, and thus, more connected to exit level learning than course XYZ. Would there be a way to measure this PLO in XXY? At that point it may not be the analyzing of data itself, if might be the highest level of understanding involving applying learning gleaned from research to practice.

Criterion 6) Data presented and evaluated in the report

Is direct measurement of student learning collected, evaluated, reported?

Data Feedback

Exemplary (3)

Data Comments

Criterion 7) Recommendations made for improvement in the report

Are recommendations for changes made and implemented?

Recommendation Feedback

Meets Expectations (2)

Recommendation Comments While the data from this analysis did not lead to changes or re-evaluation, the entire assessment process is being reevaluated due to changing accreditation learning goals. This will require review of all courses, updates to teaching materials and strategies, and new identification of measurement points.

Criterion 8) Overall Goal

Is the assessment process used to improve student learning?

Overall Goal Feedback

Meets Expectations (2)

Overall Goal Comments

This accredited department uses assessment for improvement on a number of levels.

Reviewer's Name

AB

Reviewer's Email

AB@cuw.edu

Additional Feedback