The model of Assessment and Annual Program Review followed by Cornish College of the Arts focuses on assessment of meaningful program learning outcomes and the development of actionable conclusions and recommendations for continuous program improvement.

Annual Program Review provides an opportunity for a department to think holistically about their program, connecting issues pertaining to student demographics, student progression, and graduation/destination data, with course-level assessment data and make recommendations for possible curriculum change, approaches to teaching and learning, additional student support activities and so forth. Each department must use the process in a way that supports understanding and advancement of student learning and achievement. Annual Program Reviews support more in-depth multi-year Program Reviews. APRs will be reviewed by the cross-College Assessment Committee.

| Department: |  |
| Degrees offered: |  |
| Date: |  |

1. **Program Description**

   Provide a description of the program(s), inclusive of such things as:

   - Degree offerings
   - Explanation of foundational and upper-division coursework and instruction (e.g. content, teaching methods)
   - Explanation of degree/program requirements

   This narrative might be similar to information appearing on the College website.

2. **Program-Level Learning Outcomes (past year) and Rubrics**

   Note all program-level learning outcomes (narrative or table form). Beginning summer 2020 all PLOs will be reviewed and approved by the Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Please note alignment with the College Level Learning Outcomes and provide copies of all PLO rubrics in the report Appendix.

3. **Curriculum – Learning Outcomes Mapping**

   Include one or more tables or visuals noting alignment of program-level outcomes with all courses within each degree program. These tables should provide clarity about opportunities for progression of skills development as students move through each degree/program. Responses to question 3 and 4 can be combined. A department housing multiple majors should ensure that information about each major is clearly delineated.
4. **Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes**

Provide direct data related to all PLOs assessed during the prior academic year; a narrative analysis of the data as it relates to student learning and success; and brief plans for improvement to be implemented for the next semester or Academic Year (see the Annual Assessment Plan below). Departments are encouraged to collect and review data each semester to support this annual process and should archive anonymous student work samples.

The narrative should briefly address the following:

- What Program Learning Outcomes did the department examine this year?
- Describe the methods used (e.g. the assignment/assessment tool used to assess student learning).
- What were the results (tracking of all students in a class, set of classes, or program - anonymized data)? Results should be provided in the aggregate and can be presented in tables (e.g. percentages), bar charts, pie charts, n narrative form, etc. (Please remember that this is not letter grade data. Student levels of achievement should be measured via a scaled rubric). If PLOs were tracked in two consecutive semesters please disaggregate that data and address any changes in results.
- How were the results disseminated?
- How were the results interpreted by the department? For example, what might be the cause of variations in results or lack of student achievement and what might lead to improved learning (e.g. curricular changes, new teaching and learning methods, need for a revised assessment tool, faculty professional development).
- What impact will these results have on the future of the department?

5. **Other Data Student Success Data Collected by the Program**

Please discuss other data collected by the program to monitor student progress, achievement of learning outcomes and program success (e.g. exit interviews, forums, focus groups, in-class surveys, Student Satisfaction Inventory Data, other institutional research data) and how it is used to inform program improvements (e.g. discussed at departmental meetings and initiatives planned). Institutional research will be disseminated to departments throughout the year to support annual program analysis.

6. **Closing Equity Gaps**

Provide a narrative explanation indicating how the program focused on closing barriers to academic achievement and success (e.g. curriculum revisions, faculty professional development, workshops with the Chief Equity Officer, revision of rubrics, discussions with Student Life and Student Success Coaches, implementation of initiatives) in the past year. Please see the NWCCU 2020 Standards: https://www.nwccu.org/accreditation/standards-policies/standards/
7. **Continuous Program Improvement Documentation**

All programs are responsible for archiving relevant data related to continuous program improvement (e.g. Curriculum Change Forms, samples of departmental meeting minutes). Please include pertinent documents in the APR Appendix.

8. **Use of Review Results / Implementing Improvements—Next Steps**

Annual Program Review provides an opportunity for a department to think holistically about their programs and to connect issues pertaining to student demographics, student progression, and graduation/destination data, with course-level assessment data and make recommendations for possible curriculum change, approaches to teaching and learning, additional student support activities and so forth.

Referencing the responses to the prior questions in this report, provide a narrative explanation or bullet points outlining next steps in order to implement changes to support student learning (e.g. curriculum revisions, faculty professional development, revisions to rubric or assignments/assessment tools, needed institutional initiatives).

In other words, what are the actionable items to be implemented in the year ahead - or multi-year period - as a result of this review and analysis of student learning (direct and indirect) and institutional research data?
Plan for Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes 2019-20 – Direct and Indirect Evidence

Assessment plans need to be reviewed and updated by each program at the end of each academic year (e.g. revision of PLOs, new rubrics/courses/assessment tools, new degrees). Please place a new draft Academic Year Assessment Plan below this one and review/update in August each year to ensure accuracy.

Provide a table noting how and when each Program Learning Outcome is assessed (direct and indirect evidence) and tracked. For example, assessment of PLOs on an annual rotation should be noted in the table. All assessment tools and rubrics should be included in an appendix.

SAMPLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO</th>
<th>In which course(s) is it assessed?</th>
<th>How is the PLO assessed? What is the assessment tool/assignment?</th>
<th>When is this PLO assessed (e.g. term) and who is responsible for assessment and data collection (all data is due on the same day that FA/SP grades are due).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>