Guidelines for Assessment of Academic Programs

Mission Statement and Goals

The goals of academic assessment at Angelo State University (ASU) ensure that all degree programs offered by the University *at least* meet the accreditation requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools – Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC). Specifically, the assessment process at ASU shall ensure that:

1) Program-level assessment outcomes are reasonable, actionable, clearly linked to student learning, and content valid;
2) Reliable and valid data are collected at regular intervals according to a logical, coherent schedule constructed by the academic departments and approved by the relevant oversight committees (described below);
3) These data are analyzed appropriately, clearly linked to program-level outcomes, and regularly utilized in documented program improvements;
4) Program-level assessment activities are reviewed periodically for methodological quality and data integrity through the use of program-level assessment reports completed by the managers of said programs.

Organizational Structure

The Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs (PVPAA) shall be the final authority governing University-wide assessment. The Director of Assessment, operating within the Office of Accountability, shall be responsible for the University-wide assessment process, while program-level managers (often Department Chairs or Program Coordinators) shall be responsible for their localized assessment activities. Assessment data and reports shall be communicated regularly and at request to the Office of Accountability, which has responsibility for external reporting to SACS-COC and other agencies.

The organizational structure for assessment is managed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and directed by the Office of Accountability. Below are definitions of the roles and responsibilities central to the assessment system.

Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs

The PVPAA has complete authority over the assessment process and shall work with the Office of Accountability and the Director of Assessment to ensure that the process works efficiently and effectively.

Office of Accountability

The Office of Accountability works with the Director of Assessment in a number of ways, such as administering the student evaluation system (IDEA), producing reports for external agencies, organizing indirect academic assessments such as the Proficiency Profile, and monitoring the University's QEP initiative. This office also manages the assessment of non-academic units and integrates the academic assessment process with University-level strategic planning.

Director of Assessment

The Director of Assessment is an active half-time faculty member. Any assessment initiative that is academic in nature, such as degree-level assessment and the assessment of the THECB Core Curriculum, is overseen by the Director who is part of the Office of Accountability. The Director works closely with all parties including faculty members and the Deans of the Colleges to ensure that the assessment process is faculty-driven, faculty-friendly, and methodologically sound.

College Deans

The Deans of the Colleges have responsibility for the assessment data that their departments generate. They also emphasize to their Department Chairs and faculty members the importance of ensuring that assessment is given a high priority at all times, and they communicate with the Director of Assessment and the Office of Accountability about potential problems and improvements that could be made in any and all assessment processes.

The Dean will accomplish the following primary tasks:

- Annual review and approval of all components of each program's assessment process, including student learning outcomes (SLOs), curriculum maps, assessment devices, and program-level assessment reports.
- Review of all changes to assessment components as requested by an academic program. Such changes may be requested on an annual basis.

University Academic Assessment Committee (UAAC)

The purpose of the UAAC is to provide regulatory oversight for the assessment efforts of the University at large.

- The UAAC is composed of one (1) tenured or tenure-track faculty member from each College, appointed by the appropriate College Dean to serve a 3-year term. The Director of Assessment, the Director of the Office of Accountability, the Dean of Research and Graduate

Studies, and the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs serve as ex-officio members.

- Appointment of new members to replace those whose terms are ending will be completed by the Deans by October 1.

The UAAC will accomplish the following primary tasks:

- Final review and approval of the decisions/recommendations of the College Deans regarding programmatic assessment components
- Assist the Director of Assessment in the management and oversight of the THECB Core Curriculum academic program.

Department Chairs/Program Coordinators

Department Chairs (undergraduate) and Program Coordinators (graduate) usually serve as the "Academic Program Managers" (APMs) for the degrees that their departments confer. The APMs will work with the College Deans and the Director of Assessment to manage academic assessment within their programs to ensure that the University's program-level assessment regulations are followed and that all faculty members understand their role in the process. Specific duties associated with these goals will vary to some degree across departments. It is allowable for a Department Chair to delegate assessment responsibilities to a faculty member after notifying the Director of Assessment.

Faculty Members

All faculty members teaching courses that are part of a degree program (including the THECB Core Curriculum) and that have been identified by the program(s) as an assessment point shall be expected to collect data in those courses as scheduled and according to the methods approved by their College Deans and the UAAC. Other faculty members in the departments that are not directly connected to assessment data collection may participate in assessment in other ways as requested by the program manager(s).

Essential Assessment Program Elements

Programs

An academic program is defined by a specific set of characteristics which differentiate it from other programs. An academic program contains:

- A set of student learning outcomes (SLOs) with at least one SLO that is unique to it.
- A set of curricular experiences that culminates in the receipt of an academic degree.

Most often, an academic program will be in a sole discipline, but multi-disciplinary programs are not excluded by these criteria.

These criteria will be used to determine whether a program should have its own data structure in the University's database.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

Student learning outcomes are statements that describe the content that is taught within a program as a function of the knowledge and skills that students are expected to have obtained at its completion. The following guidelines govern SLO creation:

- All programs must have at least three (3) but no more than seven (7) SLOs that have been approved for use by the College Dean and the UAAC.
- SLOs must be written so that they can be linked to the University's learning goals.
- SLOs must be written to cover the breadth and depth of the content of a particular academic program.
- SLOs must be written to invite objective measurement.

It is important to note that SLOs are achieved by mapping them through courses, and courses are used in assessment to provide opportunities for measurement of SLO attainment. Because courses are not explicitly linked to SLOs, curricular changes do not necessarily require adjustments to the assessment strategies within an academic program.

Curriculum Maps

A curriculum map is a matrix that links SLOs that define an academic program to courses. The intent of the matrix is to define points in the course of study at which assessment can occur.

- Courses that are linked to an SLO must be specified as a point where knowledge and skills are "introduced," "reinforced," or "completed."
- Assessment of an SLO may occur at any of these points, but assessment is required in any course where an SLO is expected to be "completed." This is known as a *summative* assessment.
- Any measurements earlier in the program are known as *formative* assessments. Formative assessments are recommended, but are not required.
- Academic programs that are subject to discipline-specific accreditation may already have constructed a curriculum map. If so, it can be submitted to the College Dean and the UAAC in lieu of the standard curriculum map template as long as it contains the required information as described above.

Assessment Devices

An assessment device is an assigned activity that is able to measure progress toward (*formative*) or completion of (*summative*) one or more SLOs in an academic program. The device can take a number of forms, but ultimately must produce quantifiable data.

- Academic programs must utilize assessment devices (and any associated rubrics) that have been reviewed and approved for use by the appropriate College Dean and the UAAC. Changes to assessment devices can only be implemented on an annual basis with these approvals. *Approval is only required for summative assessments – formative assessments are controlled entirely by the program generating them.* Assessment devices will be evaluated on the following criteria:
  - Is the assessment device reasonably constructed for the student sample and for the time allotted to it?
  - Is it reasonably clear that the assessment device is content valid with respect to the SLO it purports to measure?
  - Is the scoring method fair and clear?
- All assessment devices should usually be linked to a minimum performance score in raw scale units. The program manager may use a ratio-scaled minimum (i.e., a percentage) if the assessment device does not easily allow for raw score reporting.
- Because all assessment devices must be approved by the College Dean and the UAAC, it is strongly recommended that APMs maintain a collection of approved devices for summative assessment from which faculty members may choose.

Assessment Reporting Guidelines

Reporting Assessment Data to the University Database

ASU's assessment system utilizes two reporting cycles that are based on academic years (September-August):

1. For the THECB Common Core program, assessment data are reported to the University biennially.
2. For all other academic programs, assessment data are reported to the University annually.

All assessment data for a given academic year may be entered into the University's assessment database at any time during that academic year. However, the program's records for that year must be completed by **August 15** (beginning with the 2017-18 academic year).

If assessment occurs in a course with four (4) or fewer sections, a sample-weighted average of all sections should be reported. Otherwise, APMs will randomly select a maximum of four (4) sections to assess in each cycle and report the aggregate data from these sections only. (For an exception regarding Core assessment, see below).

For each assessment event, the following information must be reported:

- The obtained aggregate score for the event;
- The sample size for the event;
- Information about how the results of the event will be utilized for continuous improvement

If the sample size for the event is less than ten (10) students, it is recommended that the median score be used instead of the mean. This is most likely to occur in small-enrollment programs that utilize a capstone course as the assessment point.

Departments may choose who has responsibility for the entry of assessment data into the University's database. This individual will act as the APM for those programs; however, the Department Chair will maintain supervisory responsibility. The College Dean and the UAAC must be aware of who has been tasked with assessment data entry, and that person must undergo training on the University's assessment database before beginning those responsibilities.

Meta-Assessment Reporting Requirements

1. At the conclusion of each academic year designated as a reporting year, the program manager is responsible for completing a **Program Assessment Report (PAR)** and submitting it to the appropriate College Dean by the third Friday in September of the following academic year. The PAR must follow the general structure set forth in the official PAR template. The purpose of the PAR is to demonstrate University-level oversight of program-level assessment processes and to create a historical record of the University's assessment activities that is independent of any specific assessment software.
2. Once every four years, academic program managers will complete a **comprehensive audit of all assessment components** (mission statements, vision statements, SLOs, curriculum maps, and assessment devices) that will be submitted to the appropriate College Dean. The purpose of the audit is to provide an opportunity for programs to review their assessment processes at the program, College, and University levels. The Office of Accountability will maintain audit records and schedules. Notification to programs will be done by the fourth Wednesday of September of the fourth year, and audit reports will be submitted by the last Monday in April.
3. As needed, academic program managers will submit an **Assessment Change Request (ACR)** when a change in any assessment component is desired. The ACR will be submitted to the appropriate College Dean by **the second Friday in February** of the academic year *before the change will be implemented.*

Assessing the THECB Common Core

Because the Common Core is a multi-disciplinary program, it requires its own guidelines regarding data collection schedules, data entry, and program management.

- The Director of Assessment, in concert with the UAAC, will act as the program manager for the Common Core program in the University assessment database. Responsibilities will include setting the schedule for assessment events, communicating with relevant departments regarding their role in the process, and coordinating reporting.
- The Common Core will be assessed on a 2-year reporting schedule *at a minimum* beginning with Academic Year 2017-18. Approximately 50% of the Core courses in the curriculum will be assessed in the Fall semester; the remainder will be assessed in the Spring.
- All SLOs associated with a particular course will be assessed in each cycle. It is recommended that one assessment device is used to assess these SLOs. There are several strategies that can be used to achieve this goal, outlined in other assessment documentation.
- The Department containing a core course should report data using a sample-weighted statistic (usually the mean) across the sections of that course. If there are four (4) or fewer sections of the course, all sections should be measured. If there are five (5) or more sections, then four (4) sections may be selected by the APM and/or the Department Chair as the "assessment sample." The College Dean and the Director of Assessment can provide guidance on the sampling strategy utilized by a program.
- Exceptions to the previous bullet exist in Biology, English, and Arts/Music/Theater. For these disciplines, the maximum number of sections to be assessed (*for CORE only)* shall be three (3) per course.
- For the Dual Credit program (DCP) accommodations to these guidelines, see Appendix F.

Walkthrough of the Assessment Schedule

This section will provide a step-by-step walkthrough of the process by which the College Dean and the UAAC will provide review of assessment materials. This process shall be repeated every calendar year for academic programs other than the Common Core, which will be evaluated biennially unless significant content changes are made by the Coordinating Board, in which case an *ad hoc* review of the program may be necessary.

Please note that College/University assessment committees are not *discipline-level content* evaluators and will not reject SLOs, curriculum maps, and/or proposed measurement devices/rubrics on discipline-level, content-related grounds.

Summer
1. Dual-credit program (DCP) instructors trained by Assessment staff
2. All previous-year assessment data completed and documented in SPOL **by August 15**

Fall
1. *September*
   1.1. PARs due to College Deans by **third Friday**
   1.2. (if needed) Programs notified to begin assessment audit by **fourth Wednesday**
2. *October*
   2.1. College Deans evaluate program PARs

  2.2. College Deans finish review with approval of PARs by **fourth Monday**
    2.2.1. *Any requests for revisions must be completed by this date*
  2.3. Documentation and evaluations sent to UAAC
 3. *November*
  3.1. UAAC communicates final approval of PARs by **second Friday**
    3.1.1. *Any UAAC requests for revisions must be completed by this date*

<u>Spring</u>
 1. *February*
  1.1. Programs submit ACR documentation (if needed) to College Deans by **second Friday**
 2. *March*
  2.1. College Deans finish review with approval of ACRs by **fourth Monday**
    2.1.1. *Any requests for revisions must be completed by this date*
  2.2. UAAC receives documentation and evaluations from College Deans
 3. *April*
  3.1. UAAC communicates final approval of ACRs by **third Friday**
    3.1.1. *Any UAAC requests for revisions must be completed by this date*

Appendix A

Mission and Vision Statements

A program's <u>mission statement</u> is a brief but comprehensive text that describes:

- The "primary task" of the program in terms of both academic and career preparation;
- How the program aligns with the mission of the College and University, and;
- How the program benefits the student community it serves and the larger community within which the University exists.

There are two University requirements regarding these statements:

1. Every degree program must have a current mission statement approved by the UAAC.
2. Every program must review its mission statement once every four (4) years (or more frequently if needed) to ensure accuracy and alignment with the program's current direction.

The prose of the mission statement can be structured in a number of ways. Nonetheless, below is a standard template that writers may use as a starting point. Note that the alignment with the College/University mission is not explicitly stated, but should be clearly implied.

> "The mission of {*the academic program*} is to {*statement of academic/career primary task(s)*}. The program accomplishes these primary tasks by {*statements of key activities*}, thereby preparing students for further academic study and/or successful careers."

Below is an example that uses a variation on this structure but nevertheless includes all the major elements:

> The mission of the B.S in Social Work program is to prepare competent generalist social workers with the knowledge, values, and skills for engaging in individual, family, group, organization, and community planned change processes. Successful students will be able to obtain licensure as a social worker. The Social Work program educates students to serve diverse rural, vulnerable, disenfranchised, and underserved populations locally, regionally, and globally.

Mission Statement Checklist

Use the checklist below as a guide to the creation and review of your academic program's mission statement. Before submitting your statement for approval, please consider each item below.

- Is the statement brief, yet comprehensive?
- Does the statement show the distinctiveness of your academic program?
- Are the primary tasks explicitly stated?
- Is the language understandable by a non-academic audience?
- Are both students and the community explicitly or implicitly included?
- Does it align with the College and University mission statements?

Vision Statements

A "vision statement" is a brief paragraph that communicates the vision for the future of the academic program.

- The time horizon for the vision statement should be at least 5 years, and should reflect a general strategy to manage the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats that the academic program currently faces.
- A vision statement should also be linked to the program's student learning outcomes and to the strategic plan for the host department.
- It is important to emphasize that vision statements are NOT measurable – instead, they provide the foundation for planning and tasks, which ARE measurable.
- A vision statement should connect the mission of the academic program to the student learning outcomes that the program has adopted.

Note: Vision statements are NOT one of the required elements of ASU's academic assessment process. They also need not be approved through the College Dean and the UAAC. However, departments are encouraged to use them and to review them at least once every four (4) years.

Appendix B

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

Student Learning Outcomes

"Student learning outcomes" (SLOs) are statements that describe the learning (both cognitive and behavioral) that students should possess upon the completion of the academic program.

- All students in the program, regardless of specific emphases, should be reasonably able to achieve every SLO that the academic program has identified.
- SLOs must reflect the priorities established in the academic program's mission and vision statements.
- Every SLO must be addressed specifically in course content at least three (3) times in different courses, and this must conform to the plan depicted in the curriculum map.

Constructing SLOs

The necessity of measuring the SLO statement means that it cannot be written in just any manner. When the College Dean and the UAAC evaluates the SLO statements that the academic programs submit, they will be looking for particular earmarks of well-written, quantifiable, and focused SLOs. Following the recommendations in this section will not only lead to higher-quality assessment in the programs, but will also facilitate the institutional review process.

In simplest terms, an SLO must:

1. Identify the primary recipient of teaching behavior ("Undergraduate majors," "graduate students")
2. Use an active-voice verb that describes the general behavior expected from the student once the SLO is completed
3. Specify the knowledge and/or skills that will result from that behavior
4. Specify how the academic program will know that the SLO has been learned to a minimum standard, which will also imply what sort of measurement should be utilized

To explain further, below are some examples that meet the above requirements:

> "Undergraduate students will demonstrate the principles of engineering design, formulating requirements and constraints, following an open-ended decision process involving tradeoffs, and completing a design addressing an engineering need."

> "Undergraduate students will recognize and articulate the foundational assumptions, central ideas, and dominant criticisms of the psychoanalytic, Gestalt, behaviorist, humanistic, and cognitive approaches to psychology as assessed by a major field examination."

> "Graduate students will, in a written essay, analyze the relationship between the languages of satire to literary form by the close examination of a selected number of eighteenth-century texts."

Note that these statements tells us *who* will be learning, *what* they will do to show that, *what* information or skills they will display, and *how* the program will know that the performance meets minimum expectations.

To conclude this tutorial, consider the following questions as you write SLOs for your academic program:

1. Based on the required and elective courses in this program compared to similar programs at other schools, what knowledge and skills are our top priorities?
   a. For example, if a biology program has more invertebrate courses than its peers, then that subject matter should be reflected in the SLOs.
2. Based on the expertise among the faculty that we have, what knowledge and skills are areas of strength?
   a. For example, a political science department may have considerable expertise in East European political change since the 19th century, which would suggest that an SLO should reflect that.
3. Based on the resources we have available (financial and otherwise), what knowledge and skills can we realistically expect to teach our students?
   a. For example, a psychology department might believe that behavioral neuroscience is essential knowledge, but without expensive equipment, it may be difficult to design an SLO for that area that students can achieve.

Number of SLOs and Review Cycle

Academic programs should be able to construct at least three (3) SLOs that comprehensively describe the program content. Some programs may choose to build more – however, building more than seven (7) SLOs creates the risk of the statements being overly narrow. It is important to remember that SLOs are "first-order" factors and so must be sufficiently inclusive. The challenge is to strike a balance between the specificity of the SLO statement and the breadth of the curricular space that it covers.

Appendix C

Curriculum Mapping

<u>Concept and Definition</u>

A **curriculum map** graphically depicts the relationship between the courses taught in an academic program and the student learning outcomes (SLOs) that the program intends to achieve. The map shows when the students can expect to be exposed to the knowledge/skills relevant to a particular SLO. This exposure occurs in three phases:

- Phase 1 – Knowledge/skills are introduced to the students for the first time.
- Phase 2 – Knowledge/skills are reinforced through review and the addition of depth. This can occur in more than one course during the student's tenure in the program.
- Phase 3 – The presentation of knowledge/skills is completed. This can also occur in more than one course.

The map also shows when assessment will be done on each SLO. Assessment <u>must</u> occur during the course(s) in which the student should be completing the required study for a given SLO; however, an academic program may also choose to measure the SLO at the introduction and reinforcement phases to capture change over time. If so, the program manager is encouraged to work with the Director of Assessment to ensure that the proposed methodology will allow for meaningful statistical inference.

An Excel template is available from the Office of Accountability Blackboard site to facilitate the creation of curriculum maps. Program managers can enter the coursework for their program in the left-hand column, and the SLO information can be entered along the top rows. The individual cells are drop-down boxes where the user can identify the courses where SLOs are introduced, reinforced, and completed/assessed. As discussed in the previous paragraph, it is implied that assessment will take place in the courses identified as "completed" for each SLO. If the program elects to assess more frequently, this can be noted in the PAR submitted with the curriculum map.

IMPORTANT: Please note that if an academic program assesses an SLO in either of the first two phases, those data are <u>for program use only</u>. The program should NOT submit those data into the University's assessment database.

Curriculum Map Example

The example below, borrowed from a university in the Southeastern United States, shows how the SLOs and courses are linked visually so that the reader can clearly see how the student acquires the necessary knowledge/skills to meet minimum expectations when SLOs are assessed.

Note that the Seafaring degree may have other elective courses in it that are not listed here. This may occur if an elective is not connected to any of the SLOs adopted by the academic program, although if this happens frequently, the program manager should consider evaluating those elective courses to determine if faculty resources could be utilized more effectively in other courses.

Seafaring BS 2015
Courses and Activities Mapped to Seafaring BS SLOs

	Outcome		
	SLO 1 Comprehension	**SLO 2 Navigation Skills**	**SLO 3 Problem Solving Skills**
	Graduating students recognize and summarize key developments and eras in the history of human travel by sea	Graduating students accurately chart courses and travel times using traditional navigation techniques (e.g., paper charts).	Graduating students develop appropriate solutions to practical seafaring problems in a timely manner.
Core Courses and Learning Activities			
SEA 101 Introduction to Seafaring	I	I	
SEA 102 History of Seafaring	R		I
SEA 201 Vessels I	R	R	
SEA 202 Vessels II	R		
SEA 312 Navigation		M+A	R
SEA 330 Applied Seafaring I	M	A	R
SEA 331 Applied Seafaring II	M+A		M+A
SEA 490 Senior Internship	M+A	M+A	M+A
Electives			
SEA 381 Pirates: Fact and Fiction	R		
SEA 451 Seafaring in Literature	R		
SEA 453 Sailing Practicum		R	R

Legend: I = Introduced, R = Reinforced, M = Mastered, M+A = Mastered + Assessment Point, A = Assessment Point

Appendix D

Assessment Devices and Rubrics

<u>Concepts and Definitions</u>

<u>Rubrics</u> are defined as the individual assessment devices embedded into courses and administered by faculty members, which must include a standardized scoring metric. In order to be approved for use, a rubric:

1. Must have a standardized methodology and administration strategy;
2. Must be clearly linked to the SLO it is designed to measure, and;
3. Must include specific evaluation rules that link to a minimum expected score.

It is important to emphasize that the rubric does not need to be excessively elaborate, complex or intrusive. It may be included by the faculty member as part of the course grade, or it may be treated separately. It may be done in class or it may be a "take-home" assignment.

<u>Direct vs. Indirect Measures</u>

A rubric is considered "direct" if it measures behavior generated by the students directly. Almost all course-based assessment is characterized this way: tests, papers, presentations, etc. Academic assessment is reliant on these direct rubrics and they should be the type of rubric utilized in all academic programs. Other direct measures may include the Proficiency Profile test; however, these measures are not administered by programs but by the Office of Accountability.

In contrast, a rubric is considered "indirect" if it measures attitudes and perceptions *about* the education that the student received. The Office of Accountability is usually responsible for the administration of these kinds of rubrics. Other examples of indirect rubrics that programs could use would be student evaluations of courses (IDEA), alumni surveys, and exit interviews.

Appendix E

Program Assessment Report (PAR) and Assessment Change Request (ACR)

The purpose of the PAR is to facilitate institutional review of the assessment activities of all academic programs with the expressed intent of ensuring a standardized process across the University's academic units while allowing academic programs to have the ability to construct their mission, curriculum, and rubrics to include the knowledge/skills that are essential for their students. The form is available from the Office of Accountability Blackboard site, and if you have questions as you complete it, you can contact the Director of Assessment.

The purpose of the ACR is to document proposed changes to any of the essential assessment components identified in these guidelines (mission statements, SLOs, curriculum maps, and measures/rubrics) and allow the University to exercise regulatory oversight over those changes through the activities of the College Dean and the UAAC. This oversight is intended only to ensure minimum standards of assessment quality, not to dictate content.

Appendix F

Off-Site Campus Assessment Protocols

Angelo State has a robust collections of off-site locations in place that delivers course content to high school students around the state of Texas. Because of the unique characteristics of this initiative, assessment protocols must be adjusted to accommodate the special circumstances of the off-site locations, particularly the fact that these instructors do not have access to the University's assessment database (SPOL). For the remainder of this appendix, the abbreviation "OSL" will stand for "Off-Site Locations."

<u>General Statement of Purpose</u>

Per SACS-COC guidelines, all University courses taught at OSLs must be equivalent to the same course taught on the main campus. This equivalency must extend to the way in which these courses are assessed. Therefore, these courses will be subject to the same reporting schedules as on-campus courses.

<u>Assessment Strategy</u>

OSL assessment includes unique challenges with respect to training of faculty members and data reporting. To confront these challenges, the following procedures have been implemented:

1. Each summer, the University will train OSL instructors on assessment processes. During this time, the University will notify all OSL instructors that are scheduled to assess their courses in either the upcoming Fall or Spring terms, depending on the University's assessment schedule. Not all sections will be assessed at all schools; courses will be selected according to the following rules:
   a. One (1) course section will be assessed in each cycle on a "per course/per OSL" basis.
   b. More than one (1) course section may be assessed at a given OSL if there are less than four (4) OSLs offering that course, until a minimum of four (4) sections have been identified across all OSLs.
2. Instructors of courses that are selected for assessment will receive training online on the University's assessment process and expectations. Assignments utilized in SLO assessment must address the specific SLOs being taught in a course and be measured according to a standardized rubric in an equivalent manner to what is done on-campus.
3. When the assessment cycle is completed, OSL instructors will access a Web-based form on the University's Department of Accountability website and enter the required data. These data should be reported at the aggregated class level (not individual) and cannot under any circumstances be linked to any student's individual contributions. Additionally, OSL instructors must submit: the assignment used, the rubric used, and a summary of how they will use the data collected to improve instruction in the course going forward.
4. With respect to meta-assessment, courses taught at OSLs will be included in the PAR that describes the THECB Core program activities.