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Guiding Principle and History

- The Board of Governors recognizes that high-quality teaching, learning, and assessment require a clear understanding of expected core student learning outcomes by both faculty and students.

- **Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs)** were established in 2004
  - to convey expected core student learning outcomes for each baccalaureate program in the State University System and
  - to identify, by academic program, what students will have learned by the time they graduate, and
  - to identify how content knowledge, and communication and critical thinking skills will be measured.

- In 2007, Board of Governors adopted Regulation 8.016 Academic Learning Compacts.
November 2011 - Board of Governors is considering notice to amend Regulation 8.016

- Academic Learning Compacts Work Group (members from 6 universities and the Board office) developed revisions

- Amendments clarify processes for student learning outcomes assessment

- Title change from “Academic Learning Compacts” to “Student Learning Outcomes Assessment”
Content and Products

• Each university must develop processes for the following areas
  • Academic Learning Compacts (ALC)
  • Related assessment mechanisms
  • Program evaluation
  • Continuous improvement

• Each ALC must take into consideration perspectives of appropriate constituencies (including potential employers and graduate programs) regarding the knowledge and skills graduates need.

• Each ALC must be posted using student-friendly, jargon-free language on the university Web site.

• Each university must submit periodic status reports to the Board Office.
Current Status of SLO Assessment

• Summary of data from 2010 ALC status report
  • **Identify core student learning outcomes** - 99% are completed and in continuous improvement mode
  • **Posted core student learning outcomes on Web Site** - 98% are posted and in continuous improvement mode
  • **Identify assessment types** - 92% have been identified and are in continuous improvement mode
    • Capstone projects
    • Portfolios
    • Common embedded exam questions
Sample ALC: USF B.S. Chemistry

• **Discipline-Specific Knowledge and Skills**

  • **Outcome 1:** Demonstrated knowledge of chemistry topics
    • **Assessment:** Standardized test of general subject knowledge (ACS subject test) at end of each course

  • **Outcome 2:** Demonstrated knowledge of scientific research methods and use of research instruments
    • **Assessment:** Final exam in capstone course reviewed by at least 2 faculty and evaluated at 4 levels of performance

  • **Outcome 3:** Effective use of scientific method in well-written, logically correct and concise lab reports
    • **Assessment:** Lab reports in capstone course scored using a detailed scoring rubric
Sample ALC:USF B.S. Chemistry (cont.)

- **Critical thinking skills**
  - **Outcome 1**: Demonstrate critical thinking and analytical abilities, including ability to draw appropriate conclusions from research data
    - **Assessment**: Faculty teams analyze 2 oral presentations (posters and student research conference) using rubrics

- **Communication skills**
  - **Outcome 1**: Demonstrate effective written communication skills
    - **Assessment**: Faculty team analyzes final written research project in capstone course
  - **Outcome 2**: Exhibit effective oral communication skills
    - **Assessment**: Faculty member evaluates oral presentation on final research project in capstone course
Best Practices

Contain the following elements for each program:

– Program Mission
– Program Goals
– Specific student learning outcomes
– Valid and reliable measures
– Performance targets (program and student level)
– Data-driven results (program and student level)
– Use of results for continuous improvement
# 2008-2009 Academic Assessment Status Report

**Date:** December, 2009

In light of the 5th Year SACS Interim Report, the Office of Assessment recommends clearly defined program-level assessment procedures in accordance with requirements of the regional accrediting body (i.e., the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools [SACS]) and in alignment with national accreditors of specific schools or colleges, e.g., Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Furthermore, the Florida State Board of Governors has mandated the Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) for all undergraduate programs since 2004. This overview of undergraduate programs is based on the requirements as specified by SACS and ALCs.

## 1. MISSION - Development: Faculty have developed a concise mission statement.

## 2. GOALS - Continuous Improvement: Evidence that goals are informing continuous programmatic improvement.

## 3. OUTCOMES - Development: Faculty have identified clear outcomes based on the goals.

## 4. MEASURES - Continuous Improvement: Faculty have identified programmatic processes and goals.

## 5. ASSESSMENT RESULTS - Development: Faculty have identified clearly documented assessment results.

## 6. USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS - Continuous Improvement: Evidence that assessment results are being used to improve goals, objectives, and processes.

## 7 ANNUAL REPORTING: The department or program is providing consistent annual reports based on the Annual Reporting Guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM TITLE (Major/Degree)</th>
<th>1. MISSION</th>
<th>2. GOALS</th>
<th>3. OUTCOMES</th>
<th>4. MEASURES</th>
<th>5. ASSESSMENT RESULTS</th>
<th>6. USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS</th>
<th>7. ANNUAL REPORTING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africana Studies, B.A.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>ID, ISE</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>Provide a statement on inter-rater reliability, Submit program rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology, B.A.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>Provide a statement on inter-rater reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Biology, Microbiology &amp; Molecular Biology</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Biology, Microbiology &amp; Molecular Biology, B.S.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology, B.S.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>Submit program rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry, B.S.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>Submit program rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry, B.A.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>Submit program rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry, B.S.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>Submit program rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Natural Sciences, B.S.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GO** = Reliance on grades as outcomes; **BP** = Good practice, worthy of emulation; **IDM** = overly reliant on indirect measures; **ME** = missing element; **IR** = no evidence of inter-rater reliability; **AC** = Acceptable; **IDF** = incomplete data feedback loop; **ISE** = incomplete source of evidence; **MOD** = measure(s) disconnected from outcomes; **NSO** = non-specific outcomes; **RV** = insufficient or no evidence of reliability or validity.

**Legend:**
- **NCR** = Not Currently Relevant
- **AC** = Compliance
- **IR** = Needs Work
- **ME** = Non-Compliance
**2009-2010 Academic Assessment Status Report**

**College of Arts and Sciences [Undergraduate Programs]**

**Date: November, 2010**

Prepared By: Felix Wao

In light of the 5th Year SACS Interim Report, the Office of Assessment recommends clearly defined program-level assessment procedures in accordance with requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and (if applicable), in alignment with national accreditors of specific schools or colleges, e.g., Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), etc. Furthermore, the Florida State Board of Governors has mandated the Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) for all undergraduate programs since 2004. This overview of undergraduate programs is based on the requirements as specified by SACS and ALC mandate.

1. **MISSION** - Development: Faculty have developed a concise mission statement.
2. **GOALS** - Continuous Improvement: Evidence that goals are informing continuous programmatic improvement.
3. **OUTCOMES** - Development: Faculty have identified clear outcomes based on the goals.
4. **MEASURES** - Continuous Improvement: Faculty have identified programmatic processes and goals.
5. **ASSESSMENT RESULTS** - Development: Faculty have identified clearly documented assessment results.
6. **USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS** - Continuous Improvement: Evidence that assessment results are being used to improve goals, objectives, and processes.
7. **ANNUAL REPORTING**: The department or program is providing consistent annual reports based on the Annual Reporting Guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM TITLE (Major/Degree)</th>
<th>1. MISSION</th>
<th>2. GOALS</th>
<th>3. OUTCOMES</th>
<th>4. MEASURES</th>
<th>5. ASSESSMENT RESULTS</th>
<th>6. USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS</th>
<th>7. ANNUAL REPORTING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africana Studies, B.A.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>ISE</td>
<td>IDF</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology, B.A.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Biology, Microbiology &amp; Molecular Biology, B.S.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Biology, Microbiology &amp; Molecular Biology, B.S.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology, B.S.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry, B.S.</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry, B.A.</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry, B.S.</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td>BP, AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Natural Sciences, B.S.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technology, B.S.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT NOTE**

In 2010-2011 cycle, programs will not only be required to provide a statement of Inter-rater reliability (IR) or reliability/validity (RV) but also show evidence of IR value (e.g., in terms of Cronbach’s Alpha) or RV (in terms of reliability estimates, face validity, etc) in the Assessment Results sections. Furthermore, the Use of Assessment Results section should include decisions or recommendations regarding reliability and/or validity information.

GO = Reliance on grades as outcomes; BP = Good practice, worthy of emulation; IDM = overly reliant on indirect measures; ME = missing element;
IR = no evidence of inter-rater reliability; AC = Acceptable; IDF = Incomplete data feedback loop; ISE = Incomplete source of evidence; MOD = measure(s) disconnected from outcomes; NSO = non-specific outcomes; RV = Insufficient or no evidence of reliability and/or validity

NCR = Not Currently Relevant: While inclusion of goals as part of program assessment and development of program-level annual reporting is not currently required, they will form part of program assessment and evaluation in future cycles.

- Green = Compliant
- Yellow = Needs Work
- Red = Missing Element