

**Office of Institutional Effectiveness
November 2021**

2019-2020 Academic Program Assessment Summary

The academic program assessment process at Siena College is intended to involve continuous collaboration and goal-setting, leading to the improvement of student learning. Specifically, this annual process includes the establishment of student learning outcomes; changes made to assignments, instructional techniques, and the curriculum; as well as measures and metrics of student learning. Student learning is also facilitated by the completion of yearly reports, which provide a means for reflection and planning with respect to the multiple aspects of assessment. These reports also provide accountability to internal stakeholders, such as students, other programs, and administrators, and external stakeholders, such as accrediting bodies.

For the 2019-20 year, each academic major, minor, and certificate program was advised to submit the first four sections of their assessment report (i.e., program SLOs, phases, procedures and criteria, and results) by July 1. Each program then had the opportunity to submit the last two sections (i.e., use of results and determining impact) by October 15. OIE met individually with programs in May, June, and November (School of Business) to assist them in developing their reports.

This Academic Program Assessment Summary report provides the status of the 2019-20 academic program assessment cycle, including:

- Report submission compliance statistics
- Assessment phase (e.g., use of results) statistics
- Qualitative observations of areas of strength and areas for improvement
- Recognition of programs doing commendable assessment work

Report Submission Compliance

A culture of continuous improvement implies the active engagement of all major, minor, and certificate programs in reporting. Program faculty, school assessment coordinators, members of the Student Learning Assessment Committee (SLAC), and Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) administrators continue to meet, to form connections, and to hold one another accountable as they pursue this goal. In the 2019-2020 year:

- 92% ($n = 34$) of majors submitted
- 67% ($n = 34$) of minors submitted
- 58% ($n = 7$) of cert. submitted

For the 2019-2020 year, minors that are in the same field as the major ($n = 27$) were not required to submit assessment. This decision was made based on conversations with Middle States Commission on Higher Education Vice President Liaison on the requirements of standards for accreditation. . However, some of those minors still submitted their assessment report and that made the 2019-2020 compliance remain the same as last year's. The compliance increased 3% for majors and remained the same for certificates, if compared to the data of 2018-2019 year.

Did Not Submit	Majors	Minors & Certificates
2011-2012	7	27
2012-2013	2	9

2013-2014	2	16
2014-2015	0	0
2015-2016	2	11
2016-2017	3	11
2017-2018	1	7
2018-2019	4	22
2019-2020	3	22

Assessment Phases

Continuous improvement also involves using results to make changes to programs and to improve student learning. Among those programs that submitted reports, half of majors reported the use of results in making improvements (i.e., “closing the loop”), with a relatively small number of majors reported in the planning stage only, as they were either new programs or revamped their assessment process. For minors, the proportion of programs that reported the use of results was slightly lower, but still higher than that of programs, which were in the planning or result-reporting stages.

- 20.6% ($n = 7$) majors were still in planning phase as they were relatively new programs or revamped their assessment process
- 29.4% ($n = 10$) majors reported assessment results
- 50.0% ($n = 17$) majors reported use of results
- 39.0% ($n = 16$) minors and certificates were still in planning phase
- 19.5% ($n = 8$) minors and certificates reported assessment results
- 41.5% ($n = 17$) minors and certificates reported use of results

Areas of Strength

Looking at the content of academic program assessment reports, reports demonstrated the following areas of strength, which were testaments to the professional development of faculty:

- Learning outcomes statements
 - Reflected multiple levels of cognitive complexity of Bloom’s taxonomy
 - Used measurable action words that represented the level of learning
- Methodology and criteria
 - Used specific tasks or assignments that were aligned with learning outcomes
 - Criteria were well-developed over time.
 - Some programs began to use more than one methods to assess each learning outcome.
 - Many programs uploaded supporting documents to provide description of assignments or exams.
- Use of Results
 - Many programs made changes to curriculum, instructional approaches, and learning activities and content to promote engagement and learning based on assessment results.
 - Some programs started to track student performance over years by comparing and contrasting results of multiple years.

Areas for Improvement

On the other hand, reports also showed the following areas for improvement:

- Learning outcomes of some programs could be more descriptive by adding disciplinary or contextual information
- Some programs needed to develop rubrics to ensure consistent assessment results.
- Some programs could use curriculum mapping to visualize the alignment between learning outcomes, courses, levels of learning complexity, and measurement tools.

Commendable Assessment Work

The following programs were recognized for commendable assessment work:

- Actuarial Science (School of Business)
 - Well-articulated learning outcomes, criteria, assignments, assessment methods and results.
 - Curriculum and instructional approaches (e.g., teaching time on specific topics) were changed for continuous improvement based on thoughtful and critical reflection of assessment results.
- Physics (School of Science)
 - Strong presentation of outcomes capturing multiple levels of Bloom's taxonomy.
 - A robust set of assessment methods was provided and results were clearly documented and thoughtfully used to make changes.
 - Rubrics were developed.
- Social Work (School of Liberal Arts)
 - Clear and measurable learning outcomes. A new outcome of program of diversity was added.
 - A secondary assessment method (course and fieldwork) was implemented for the purpose of data triangulation.
 - A thorough discussion of results and well-articulated plan to promote learning (e.g., providing preparedness workshop to seniors).
- Creative Arts (School of Liberal Arts)
 - Strong presentation of outcomes, criteria, assignments, and results. A new outcome of diversity was added to appeal a more diverse group of students.
 - Results and impacts of changes on student learning were thoroughly discussed.
 - The program also reflected on the impact of COVID (remote-learning) and explored approaches to address the challenge.
 - Changes were made to curriculum in order to better prepare students for advanced courses (e.g., providing capstone prep class)
 - Changes were made to instructional pedagogy in order to engagement students in different disciplines (e.g., co-teaching)
 - Well-developed rubrics that were aligned with the learning outcomes.

Summary

Faculty, staff, and administrators are making progress toward adopting a culture of continuous improvement. The majority of programs are compliant in submitting academic assessment reports. Half of programs that submitted reports reported using results to improve learning, and a relatively smaller number reported being only in the planning phase. Furthermore, faculty have made marked

improvements to their student learning outcomes, methodology, criteria, and use of results, with some room for improvement regarding development of clear learning outcomes and rubrics.

2020-2021 Report Submission Dates:

- July 1, 2021 – first four sections: program SLOs, phase, procedures and criteria, results
- October 15, 2021 – last two sections: use of results, determining impact

Student Learning Assessment Committee

- Mohua Bose – Associate VPAA, Institutional Effectiveness, SLAC Chairperson
- Lisa Yu – Associate Director of Institutional Effectiveness
- **Joseph McCollum – Associate Professor of Business Analytics, School of Business Assessment Coordinator**
- **Tim Reno – Associate Dean of Liberal Arts – School of Liberal Arts Assessment Coordinator**
- **Tom Giarla – Assistant Professor of Biology, School of Science Assessment Coordinator**
- Angela McKeever – Assistant Dean, School of Science
- Britt Haas – Teaching Assistant Professor, First Year Seminar
- Catherine Crohan – Librarian, Core Information Literacy
- Mark Rosenberry – Associate Professor of Physics, Core Advisory Committee Chairperson
- Kathleen Renaud – Assistant Dean of Administration, School of Liberal Arts
- Diane Hannahs – Assistant Dean, School of Business
- Michelle Liptak – Teaching Assistant Professor, First Year Seminar

*Note your school assessment coordinator (bold).