Institutional Assessment Council Proposal:
Two-Year Program Assessment Reporting Cycle

Assessment: “The human will to learn from what we are trying to achieve” (Angelo, 2003)

**What:** A department-driven process for identifying a salient question, problem or issue related to student learning, determining strategies for gathering data, analyzing data, and using findings to refine program curricula and students’ learning experiences.

**How:** Two-year reporting cycle, with the following process:

- **Year one:** Identify question/problem/method; Begin data collection;

- **Year two:** Continue data collection (could be phase 2); Review results; Implement changes (or plan for changes in following cycle).

The two-year cycle should be

**Relevant:** Grounded in department activity and concerns;
**Efficient:** Connected to ongoing, already occurring activity;
**Value-added:** Useful to department initiatives and students’ needs.
• Year two summary
  • Report results
    • Strategy for connection with program review

(4) Use results

(1) Identify question(s) and methods

(3) Data Collection/Review Results
  • Engage assessment resources
  • Design improvement strategies

(2) Data Collection
  • Identify dept. contacts
  • Engage assessment resources/communicate plan and timeline

• Year one interim summary
**Rationale:** Established, cyclical assessment activity and reporting can promote consistent activity across programs, engagement with assessment resources, additional preparation for external reporting requirements (e.g., program review) and opportunities to clarify the relationship between data associated with specialized accreditation requirements and regional accreditation requirements.

Regular reporting cycles give all programs the opportunity for

- Creating a record of assessment activity that can be used for program improvement and to “tell the story” of programs and their contribution to student success;

- Creating and maintaining and updated repository of information that can be easily shared with the campus, and when needed, for purposes of program review and external reporting requirements;

- Clarifying and “bridging the languages” between specialized accreditation and regional requirements;

- Keeping the assessment process relevant and localized to department concerns and initiatives; creating situated, achievable plans with just-in-time resources.