

COMMITTEE REPORT

AY 20-21

1. Committee name

Committee on the Assessment of Student Learning (CASL)

2. Your name

Tracey Frey and Nune Hovhannisyan, co-chairs

3. How often did your committee meet?

CASL met monthly, with exceptions in December, January, and May, when it undertook extensive offline work for the completion of the 2018-2021 institutional assessment plan and the development of the next one.

4. How many hours were required to attend meetings and for the work outside of the meetings?

On average, CASL met 1.5 hours and completed 3 hours of work outside the meetings monthly.

5. What did your committee accomplish this year? Or, what were your primary topics of concern?

CASL's primary topics this year were the Middle States self-study and site visit, the transition of all academic degree programs to the use of the Watermark system for student learning assessment reports, and the preparation for developing the next three-year university-wide assessment plan.

In fall 2020, CASL reviewed and contributed feedback for the three academically-related chapters of the Middle States self-study report. The committee met with the Middle States evaluation team during the site visit in March.

In the fall, a co-chair met with the three divisions of Loyola College to introduce and provide templates for the transition to the Watermark system. (Please see attachment 1 for the templates in the assessment packet.) Subsequently, throughout the spring, the co-chair met with each program individually to provide an orientation to the Watermark system. Transitions to Watermark will be completed in June by Loyola College. SOE and Sellinger will complete the transition in July. Full adoption of the Watermark reporting system across all three schools/college this summer completes the *2018-21 University-wide Assessment Plan*.

The major achievements of the 2018-2021 assessment plan are:

- establishment of Loyola's Assessable Learning Outcomes that serve as a bridge between observable student achievements and the aspirational Undergraduate Learning Aims;
- early stages of drafting general university rubrics to operationalize Assessable Learning Outcomes;
- establishment of a university-wide rubric and divisional report used by Associate/Assistant Deans to evaluate assessment practices used by each academic program;

- early stages of leveraging program-level student learning assessment for institutional-level findings about student learning achievement (as reported to the Academic Senate); and
- the pending university-wide adoption of the Watermark software reporting platform for regular and systematic reporting on student learning assessment.

In December and January, CASL began strategic thinking exercises by engaging with literature, assessment conference resources, and reflections on alignment with University mission, core values, and goals. (Please see attachment 2 for strategic thinking pre-read materials and instructions.) In the spring, CASL considered the feedback from the Middle States evaluators during the site visit and oral exit report, met with UCC representatives to discuss ways in which the committees might collaborate in the future, and drafted updates to the *Principles and Practices of Student Learning Assessment*, originally developed by CASL's predecessor, the Student Learning Assessment Committee. All of the above has informed the current drafting of the next university-wide assessment plan.

6. What issues or ideas should your committee pursue next year?

CASL has several tasks to pursue in AY21-22, including:

1. Produce a university-wide summary report on student learning assessment after full adoption of the Watermark reporting system. Disseminate report through governance bodies.
2. Collaborate with other faculty groups to gather feedback on the draft *2021-24 University-wide Assessment Plan* so that it serves university needs for understanding student achievement. Propose the plan and the revised *Principles and Practices of Student Learning Assessment* to the Academic Senate in fall 2021.
3. Incorporate Middle States feedback on student learning assessment into future practice, by:
 - a. creating a timeline for the assessment cycle of the *Assessable Learning Outcomes*;
 - b. developing and implementing a student learning assessment plan for Core courses;
 - c. ensuring all degree programs engage in regular, organized, and systematic assessments of student learning and other outcomes that are relevant to the programs.
4. Collaborate with the UCC subcommittee on the Diversity Course Requirement to complete a direct assessment of diversity learning aims.

7. Other thoughts

In AY20-21, CASL began to include student voice through regular attendance at meetings. This occurred, initially, after reading a 2019 report from the SGA to the UCC that indicated interest in engaging with CASL, and it has benefitted the committee's work. Whether this will be formalized in the future or not, we would recommend that CASL continue to find ways to engage with students.

In AY20-21, CASL faculty representation included, as a proxy for a faculty member on sabbatical, a teaching/clinical faculty member who brought expertise and enthusiasm to the role. There may be a desire to expand faculty membership, through subcommittees or *ad hoc* work, to increase CASL's capacity to enhance the culture of assessment at Loyola and simultaneously to create more spots for faculty engagement, including teaching/clinical spots and expansion beyond one member per academic division.

The role of equitable and inclusive practices in the field of assessment has grown in the last decade. This permeates the literature and conference sessions. CASL's draft strategic plan for assessment incorporates this knowledge base and the ideals of assessment for inclusive academic excellence.

The overarching enthusiasm and high levels of engagement members bring to this committee's work highlight the growing value of assessment at Loyola. The committee will continue to explore ways in which it can broaden collaboration with faculty and other Senate committees in service to the institution and in deepening assessment practice. CASL would like to express its sincere gratitude to the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning Committee and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for making connections to CASL and for fostering the emerging culture of assessment at Loyola.

Loyola College of Arts and Sciences
Program Assessment Packet for AY20-21

Table of Contents

Loyola College – Assessment Plans for Two-Year Reports (2019-2021)

2019-2021 Assessment Report Plan for Artifact Collection and Evaluation (template) – to be completed by departments by December 1, 2020

AY 2020-21 Program Assessment Tips from CASL for Loyola College

ASSESSMENT REPORT (template) –
for use in preparing to transition to the Watermark system by end of June 2021

Associate/Assistant Deans' Rubric for the Evaluation of Program Assessment Reports

Loyola College – Assessment Plans for Two-Year Reports (2019-2021)

Context: Last May, several Loyola College programs elected to defer their annual program assessment reports in favor of the dean’s offer to submit a 2-year report on program learning assessment at the end of spring 2021. This extension was offered due to the emergency transition to remote teaching and learning in spring 2020, during the arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic in Maryland.

Purposes: The written assessment plan will help you organize your program’s artifact collection and reporting this year. It will inform your associate dean of your plans to complete the two-year report. Finally, it will allow you to gain efficient support for the transition to the assessment reporting software that goes into effect this year.

Instructions: Obtain the annual program assessment report template from your associate dean to remind yourself what goes into the report you will complete by end of June 2021 (a new organization of the template will help you make the transition into the new reporting software we will use this year). Answer the questions on the next page by replacing the blue font with your responses, and submit the plan to your associate dean by **December 1, 2020**. Complete a plan for each degree program in your department.

-
- share the plan with the department and the associate dean by December 1, 2020, so that all are informed
 - at the same time, share the plan with Tracey Frey (tdfrey@loyola.edu) so that she can prepare the reporting software for you
 - schedule a meeting with Tracey after you share the plan with her so that she can provide support and guidance for your transition to reporting in the software system. Individual support and group training will be available.
-

2019-2021 Assessment Report Plan for Artifact Collection and Evaluation

Department Name: _____

Department Chair: _____

Program Name: _____

1. Identify which program learning outcome(s) will be evaluated from the 2 academic years (2019-20 & 2020-21):

2. Identify when/ how student artifacts will be collected and stored:

example:

2019-20 – Final papers from Course #s were submitted in Moodle in SP19. The papers will be saved to a OneDrive folder in October for the department’s assessment committee to access.

2020-21 – A group project oral presentation will be recorded in Zoom at the end of the fall semester in Course #. The recordings will be saved by [faculty member name] to share with the department’s assessment committee in SP21 for evaluation.

3. Make a basic timeline of when faculty who are responsible for program assessment will review and evaluate the student work:

example: See above for timing of collection. The assessment committee will review the artifacts during its meetings each semester, typically in October and March. The members of the assessment committee this year are [list faculty names].

- Decide what rubric(s) will be used for the evaluation (CASL can help, if necessary) *example: The department assessment committee will use the Writing/Critical Thinking rubric the department developed and an Oral Communication rubric based on the AAC&U VALUES rubrics.*

4. Decide how/when to share findings with department colleagues and discuss them through the lens of continuous improvement so that there is consensus around actions the department will take to improve student learning in the future *example: Their findings will be compiled and shared with the department after Commencement. We will discuss the results and the actions we will take for continuous improvement together during our late May departmental meeting. We will review the proposed actions for improvement when we return pre-fall 2021.*

- Determine who will write the report and when it will be completed (deadline: June 2021) *example: The primary author(s) for the report will be [faculty name(s)]. They will complete the report, based on a consensus of the program faculty, in the Watermark reporting system with support from OAA, in early June 2021. The department chair will review the report and submit it to the associate dean by the end of June 2021.*

AY 2020-21 Program Assessment Tips from CASL for Loyola College

During the spring 2020 transition to emergency remote teaching, Dean Fowl provided an option for Loyola College programs to delay the normal assessment reporting deadline in favor of completing a two-year report by June 2021. At the request of an associate dean, CASL offers the following tips for programs as faculty work toward completing this 2-year report.

First, let us begin with a reminder about the purpose of student learning assessment at Loyola.

Academic Program Learning Assessment is¹

- a reflective ongoing process used for the improvement of student learning
- used for decision making in curricular and pedagogical change, improvements to processes or student supports, improvements to the assessment practices themselves
- conducted by faculty
- meant to be simple, specific, and realistic: able to be fully implemented given the constraints of faculty time and departmental resources

Academic Program Learning Assessment *is not*

- an evaluation of individual faculty or used to make comparisons across faculty, programs, departments, divisions, or schools

Planning for your Program Learning Assessment Report in June 2021

1. Discuss with your department:

- a 2-year report (AY 2019-20 + AY 2020-21) is due in June 2021 for those programs that took the extension offered by the Dean
- identify the student work/artifacts that can be or have been captured from 2019-20
- review your original assessment plan for AY 2020-21—does it make sense for this year? Is it doable? Does it need to be revised? Could it be pared down or streamlined?

TIPS:

- Focus on the learning that is essential for the Program Learning Outcome(s) you plan to assess this year.
- Identify where that learning will be demonstrated most clearly (i.e., which courses/which assignments?)
- Plan ahead and ensure those faculty know they are responsible for capturing the student work/artifacts.
- Consider the advantages that digital learning provides in terms of collecting student work or artifacts.
- Consider whether THIS is the year to focus on *Eloquentia Perfecta*—specifically oral communication skills because Zoom provides an opportunity to easily record oral presentations. (completely optional tip to take or leave)

¹ Principles and Practices of Student Learning Assessment at Loyola University Maryland

2. Create a plan:

- obtain the report template from your associate dean to remind yourself what goes into the report you will complete
 - (a new organization of the template will help you make the transition into the new reporting software we will use this year)
- identify which program learning outcomes will be evaluated from the 2 academic years
- identify when/ how student artifacts will be collected and stored
- make a basic timeline of when faculty who are responsible for program assessment will review and evaluate the student work
- decide what rubric(s) will be used for the evaluation (CASL can help, if necessary)
- decide how/when to share findings with department colleagues and discuss them through the lens of continuous improvement so that there is consensus around actions the department will take to improve student learning in the future
- determine who will write the report and when it will be completed (deadline: June 2021)
- share the plan with the department and the associate dean by December 1, 2020, so that all are informed
- share the plan with Tracey Frey (tdfrey@loyola.edu) so that she can prepare the reporting software for you
- schedule a meeting with Tracey after you share the plan with her so that she can provide support and guidance for your transition to reporting in the software system. Individual support and group training will be available.

3. Bring your students into the process:

- create a shared understanding of what they gain/can do by achieving the program learning outcome and how far their study and work for that particular assignment or course will get them toward it
- create clarity around the learning outcome with your students
- create clarity of the assignment's alignment with the learning outcome for your students
- provide transparency of expectations by sharing the assessment rubric for the assignment along with the prompt and by letting them know their learning or performance will be assessed
 - if you are choosing to offer flexibility and multiple ways for a student to fulfill the assignment, use a consistent assessment rubric across them—as long as the rubric and the assignment are both closely and clearly aligned with the essential skills of the learning outcome, this should work while providing equitable assessment
- share their individual results with them afterwards if you use the rubric as part of your course-based grading

ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR DEPARTMENT OF

An assessment report should be completed for each degree program.

(Academic Department Name)

(Instructional Program)

(Degree Level)

(Assessment Period Covered)

(Date Submitted)

Submitted By: _____

(Departmental Chair or Faculty Assessment Representative)

Based on Nichols, J. and Nichols, K. (2001). *General education assessment for improvement of student academic achievement: Guidance for academic departments and committees*. Bronx, NY: Agathon Press.

Adapted for transition to the Watermark Planning & Self-Study assessment software.

Please note a change in terminology:¹

As the university's assessment practices continue to mature, we are adapting part of the terminology to gain clarity in our discussions about assessment and assessment findings. Specifically, this means that the term this form used at the program level simply as Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) will now be called Program Learning Outcomes (PLO). Similarly, the broad term used to encapsulate Undergraduate Learning Aims and Graduate Learning Goals, Loyola's institution-level student learning outcomes, will be called Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO).

The PLO-to-ILO alignment allows the university to design its programs in keeping with the university mission and goals AND it allows assessment at the program level to provide indications of student learning achievement of the Undergraduate Learning Aims or Graduate Learning Goals, as relevant to the program level.

¹ You may delete this note on a change in terminology once you have completed the report. Similarly, all red font can be deleted and replaced with responses.

Assessment of Program-level Learning Outcomes in 2019-20 and 2020-21

Which program learning outcomes (PLO) did you assess over these two academic years?

1. Enter text of a PLO that was the focus of this year's (or last year's)* assessment.

*Note: Some programs elected to complete a two-year report for AY 19-20 and AY 20-21.

Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:

1.a. Means of Program Assessment (artifacts):

Describe the method of assessment (e.g. final paper, Major Field test, internship supervisor's report etc.). If the data source or artifact of student work is embedded coursework, then a scoring guide should be developed and attached to this assessment report. **Direct evidence of student learning (e.g., essays, exams, etc.) should be the main sources; indirect evidence (e.g., survey's, interviews) are supplemental.**

Identify the Course #(s): If the assessment data has been collected from a particular course, please identify the course number.

Identify the Element of the ILO that corresponds to the assessment (see [UG Learning Aims](#) or [GR Learning Goals](#)): When the assessment data also represent evidence of student learning related to an institutional learning outcome (ILO), **please make clear which element of the ILO** can be considered aligned to the assessment. (For instance, if the program learning outcome aligns with Critical Understanding, and the assessment artifacts provide evidence of students' quantitative literacy skills, an element of Critical Understanding, please indicate so. **This is a necessary step in making assessment practices and findings more precise for the program and the university.**)

1.b. Target (Criteria for Success):

Provide a criterion for success. In other words, if your program is functioning the way you think it 'ought' to function, what will be the outcome/score on this assessment? For example, what percentage of students would you expect to achieve at what level? If you have a rubric, scoring sheet, or other document that you use for assessment, please attach.

1.c. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

Provide a brief summary of the artifacts/data you collected. How many artifacts? What proportion of students in the program is represented in the data? To analyze direct evidence of student work, was the program able to use random selections of the artifacts and to remove personal identifying information from the work for the analysis? Details such as these are important for understanding the results to those outside of your program.

1.d. Results of the Assessment:

Briefly describe the results of the assessment. Was the target met? Please make explicit statements of whether students met expectations for the artifact/data and whether students met achievement of the PLO overall. This information is especially important in cases where multiple types of evidence are used in the analysis. If the target was not met, describe the ways in which it was not met. What percentage of students met or exceeded the standards? Please note: The Watermark Planning & Self-Study assessment software provides a simple 4-point rating report template with categories of "Exceeded," "Met," "Approached," and "Not Met." Other rating scales (e.g., 3-point: "Exceeded," "Met," "Did Not Meet"; 2-point "Met"/ "Did Not Meet") can translate into the Watermark rating system.

1.e. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:

Describe how the faculty have/will use information obtained from this assessment activity for continuous improvement of the program and student learning. What actions have/will the faculty take to assure that the intended outcome is met in the future. How are these decisions made—by committee, by individual faculty member, by a particular group of faculty members, etc.?

Repeat questions 1.a.-1.e. for each PLO that is assessed for these years. Continue to Question 2 on the next page.

example

Program Assessment Cycle:

What is the multi-year assessment plan for the degree program or core courses in your program?

2. Assessment Cycle of Program Learning Outcomes (PLO):

What academic years are covered by your program assessment cycle? Please describe the progression of PLO assessments across the years. For instance, if the program has a total of 5 PLO, when will they be assessed over the course of the cycle? Some programs cycle through each program learning outcome once in a cycle while others cycle through each twice in a cycle, for comparisons. Some programs analyze one PLO per year, while others analyze multiple PLO in a year.

If your department teaches core courses, when will core courses be assessed in the cycle? Please describe the relationship between the core courses and the major—are they connected?

Order of Assessments during the Cycle:

2.a. Annual Assessment Activities for the Cycle:

Describe the collection, analysis, and action cycle for each program learning outcome. A sample table follows:

Year	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Collecting data/artifacts for Course # or range (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)
Analysis of data for Course # or range (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)
Closing the loop action impacting Course # or range (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)	Course # (PLO#)
Core Course Assessment (Course #)	Course #	Course #	Course #	Course #	Course #	Course #

2.b. Alignment with ILO:

Provide a table that shows which elements of Undergraduate Learning Aims (for undergraduate programs) or Graduate Learning Goals (for graduate programs) will reasonably be demonstrated by the evidence of student work that is part of the planned assessment cycle. A sample table follows:

Year	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Conducting Analysis of PLO#	<i>list the PLO #</i>	<i>list the PLO #</i>	<i>list the PLO #</i>	<i>list the PLO #</i>	<i>list the PLO #</i>	<i>list the PLO #</i>
Reasonable alignment between artifact and element of ILO (see UG Learning Aims or GR Learning Goals)	<i>list the ILO element</i>	<i>list the ILO element</i>	<i>list the ILO element</i>	<i>list the ILO element</i>	<i>list the ILO element</i>	<i>list the ILO element</i>

2.c. Assessment Process:

Provide a brief summary of the process and organization used to assess your program. For instance, does your assessment process allow faculty members to assess their own students' work, or is this done by a committee that looks at randomly selected assessment artifacts/data that have personally identified information removed? The former is less ideal than the latter, but sometimes the size of a program dictates the assessment process.

ATTACHMENT 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Note: PLOs have already been captured in the Watermark System from the 2018-19 report. Your program only needs to complete Attachments 1 & 2 if your PLOs changed or you have a new program.

Intended Program Learning Outcomes:

Learning outcomes include knowledge, skills, and attitudes/values.

1. Enter one of the intended program learning outcomes (PLO) for this degree program. It is recommended that there be at least three and no more than five PLOs. If there are more than 5, then just continue to add and number them at the bottom. Identify which ILO it supports, and please specify the precise element(s) of the ILO are supported. (see [UG Learning Aims](#) or [GR Learning Goals](#))

2. Enter one of the intended program learning outcomes (PLO) for this degree program. It is recommended that there be at least three and no more than five PLOs. If there are more than 5, then just continue to add and number them at the bottom. Identify which ILO it supports, and please specify the precise element(s) of the ILO are supported. (see [UG Learning Aims](#) or [GR Learning Goals](#))

3. Enter one of the intended program learning outcomes (PLO) for this degree program. It is recommended that there be at least three and no more than five PLOs. If there are more than 5, then just continue to add and number them at the bottom. Identify which ILO it supports, and please specify the precise element(s) of the ILO are supported. (see [UG Learning Aims](#) or [GR Learning Goals](#))

4. Enter one of the intended program learning outcomes (PLO) for this degree program. It is recommended that there be at least three and no more than five PLOs. If there are more than 5, then just continue to add and number them at the bottom. Identify which ILO it supports, and please specify the precise element(s) of the ILO are supported. (see [UG Learning Aims](#) or [GR Learning Goals](#))

5. Enter one of the intended program learning outcomes (PLO) for this degree program. It is recommended that there be at least three and no more than five PLOs. If there are more than 5, then just continue to add and number them at the bottom. Identify which ILO it supports, and please specify the precise element(s) of the ILO are supported. (see [UG Learning Aims](#) or [GR Learning Goals](#))

ATTACHMENT 2: Curricular Map**Curricular Map (next page) and Cohesion:**

1. List all course numbers (or range of courses, e.g., HS 300-level) in the column “Courses.”
Add additional rows for courses (or range of courses) as needed.

2. For each learning outcome/objective identified previously, indicate in which course(s) the objective is introduced, reinforced (or practiced), and demonstrated at the mastery level expected of the degree by copying the appropriate letter in from the key into each cell.

Note, not all cells will be filled; if the program has more than 5 outcomes, add the necessary column(s). Expectations of “mastery” are relative to the degree level—faculty would expect a higher degree of mastery of a doctoral candidate than of a master’s student, and of a master’s student than a bachelor’s degree student. “Mastery” is determined by the faculty of the program in their articulation of the program learning outcomes, their consensus on student achievement targets (or criteria for success), and potentially by external expectations of disciplinary accrediting bodies or professional organization standards, etc.

3. Please provide a summary of your impressions based on the curricular map.

Are all outcomes being introduced and given adequate opportunity for practice?

Are there opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of all of the outcomes?

Are all courses touching upon at least one of the program’s desired outcomes?

Curricular Map

Courses	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5

KEY

- I = Introduced
- R = Reinforced (or Practiced)
- M = Demonstrated at the mastery level expected for this program degree

Informational Item – COVER SHEET

Associate/Assistant Deans' Rubric for the Evaluation of Program Assessment Reports

As associate/assistant deans evaluate program assessment reports each year, they report to the Committee on the Assessment of Student Learning on evidence of student learning achievement and on the practice of assessment within their divisions. They use the following rubric to evaluate assessment practice across all five divisions so that there is alignment with the goals for improved practice set by the *Three-year University Wide Assessment Plan* and so that the university develops a shared understanding of best practices in assessment.

The rubric will help you understand the university's goals for our maturing assessment processes and procedures. It is shared with you as an informational item; you do not need to fill it out or submit it to anyone. However, if you wish to use it for self-assessment purposes, you are welcome to do so.

	Main Criteria*	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	Criterion 5	Notes, if necessary	
Assessment Plan	1 Each program has a feasible three-to-five-year learning outcomes assessment plan	The program identifies an assessment cycle of its program learning outcomes. __Yes or __No						
	2 Program outcomes are written in a way that facilitates direct assessment and identifies where they align with Loyola Undergraduate Educational Aims/Graduate Learning Goals.	Program learning outcomes clearly identify what students will learn by completing the degree program. __Yes or __No	The program identifies with which UG Aims or GR Goals the program learning outcomes align. __Yes or __No	The program identifies direct evidence of student work that aligns with the learning outcome(s) assessed and uses that direct evidence for the purposes of student learning assessment. __Yes or __No				
	3 Each program has a current curricular map that indicates the course(s) in which outcomes are addressed, the extent to which they are practiced and/or mastered, and whether students produce work that might be used for university-wide assessment purposes.	The program's curricular map is up-to-date and current. __Yes or __No	The curricular map identifies courses where program learning outcomes are addressed. __Yes or __No	The curricular map identifies the extent to which the program learning outcomes are practiced in the courses (e.g., "Introduced", "Reinforced", "Mastered"). __Yes or __No	The curricular map identifies student work (e.g., course assignments) that, by virtue of program-level outcome alignment with an institution-level outcome, can be used for university-wide assessment purposes. __Yes or __No			
	4 The methods outlined in the plan reflect best assessment practices.	Each assessed program learning outcome uses evidence of student learning from student work (a.k.a., direct evidence). __Yes or __No	The program employs a shared understanding for the criteria by which to assess the student work (e.g., a rubric). __Yes or __No	The program identifies the target for student achievement of the program learning outcome and uses it as a benchmark for comparison to actual student achievement levels. (For example, 75% of students will master the skill; 85% of students will apply the concept correctly; etc.) __Yes or __No	The program uses random selections of student work for the assessment, ensures that individual identifying information is removed from the work for assessment, and ensures that faculty members do not assess their own class's work. __Yes or __No	Where/when appropriate, the program uses indirect evidence (e.g., survey data, focus groups) to gain additional information about student learning. __Yes or __No		
Results	5 Assessment results are analyzed and discussed by the program/department and used to inform evidence based action to facilitate the continuous improvement of student learning outcomes.	The program has collected, analyzed, and discussed the direct evidence of student learning. __Yes or __No	There is a process in place for faculty to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning. __Yes or __No	There is at least one example of attempts to improve the program based on assessment results. __Yes or __No				

*Note: Assessment Criteria follow the criteria of the Three-Year University-Wide Assessment Plan, received by Academic Senate in SP18.

CASL Strategic Thinking Pre-read Materials

In Spring 2021, CASL will enter its strategic planning phase for the years 2021-2024. The planning phase will follow and overlap with the successful implementation of the 2018-2021 plan for university-wide assessment, culminating with the universal adoption of the Watermark Planning & Self-Study assessment software platform for annual reporting on student learning assessment. The 2021-2024 plan should capitalize on the foundation laid by the previous plan and ground itself in the mission, vision, goals, and core values of Loyola University Maryland and current literature on assessment practices.

Context

University Mission - Loyola University Maryland is a Jesuit, Catholic university committed to the educational and spiritual traditions of the Society of Jesus and to the ideals of liberal education and the development of the whole person. Accordingly, the University will inspire students to learn, lead, and serve in a diverse and changing world.


University Vision - Loyola University Maryland, anchored in Baltimore, will be a leading national liberal arts university in the Jesuit, Catholic tradition.


University Core Values - *Academic Excellence, Focus on the Whole Person, Integrity and Honesty, Diversity, Community, Justice, Service, Leadership, Discernment, Constant Challenge to Improve*


University Strategic Plan - Loyola University Maryland holds forth 7 strategic priorities under 4 pillars in its current [strategic plan](#), as follows:


<i>Pillars of the Ignatian Compass Strategic Plan</i>	<i>7 Areas of Focus for the Strategic Plan</i>
Ignatian Educational Innovation Ignatian Citizenship Ignatian Engagement Ignatian Vitality and Sustainability	Cultivating Innovation and Entrepreneurship Fostering Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Engaging Faculty and Staff Ensuring Institutional Vitality and Fiscal Integrity Improving Yield and Retention Creating a Culture of Philanthropy Enhancing Brand

Academic Goals - In support of the university's Areas of Focus, the academic division guides its work with four goals:

 **Increase Student Academic Engagement** through High-Impact Practices that support inclusive academic excellence and by embracing the digital future that will support program vitality.

 **Enhance Equity and Inclusion** for faculty and students and embrace diversity, equity, and inclusion as pillars of academic excellence that focuses on the whole person and justice. (Substantive work on Internationalization is on hold, due to pandemic and related travel restrictions.)

 **Program Vitality and Fiscal Sustainability** through new academic programs, increased for-credit and non-credit offerings, market exploration, and stewardship

 **Broaden the Impact of Innovation** to educate leaders for a diverse and changing world.

CASL strategic plan - The major achievements of the 2018-2021 assessment plan are:

- establishment of Loyola's Assessable Learning Outcomes that serve as a bridge between observable student achievements and the aspirational Undergraduate Learning Aims;
- early stages of drafting general university rubrics to operationalize Assessable Learning Outcomes;
- establishment of a university-wide rubric and divisional report used by Associate/Assistant Deans to evaluate assessment practices used by each academic program;
- early stages of leveraging program-level student learning assessment for institutional-level findings about student learning achievement (as reported to the Academic Senate); and
- pending university-wide adoption of the Watermark software reporting platform for regular and systematic reporting on student learning assessment.

Considerations for the Next Plan

Some areas that remain ongoing goals for CASL can inform our planning:

- leveraging program-level assessments for institution-level findings about student learning achievement;
- attentiveness to graduate level assessment and the Graduate Learning Goals;
- continued collaboration/relationship-building with the Committee on the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning

Some new areas exist for exploration in planning:

- attentiveness to inclusive academic excellence and equitable/inclusive assessment practices;
- attentiveness to a new Core Curriculum at the undergraduate level and creating an assessment reporting cycle that helps inform colleagues on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee;
- attentiveness to academic goals for broader use of HIPs;
- continuing collaboration and support of faculty and administrators and promoting a positive culture of assessment;
- using the experience of online Spring and Fall 2020 semesters to innovate or improve future assessment practices;
- other ideas from committee members, student representatives, and colleagues across campus

Items to Review for Strategic Thinking by the end of January

1. University mission, vision, values, and strategic goals (see page 1)
2. Academic Goals (see page 1)
3. Re-examine Loyola's Principles and Practices for Student Learning Assessment ([see Teams Site](#))
4. Re-read Loyola's Assessable Learning Outcomes ([see Teams Site](#))
5. Re-read Loyola's [Undergraduate Learning Aims](#) and [Graduate Learning Goals](#)
6. Literature (see file folder on the [Teams Site](#))
7. Resources from 2020 Assessment Conferences (see file folder on the [Teams Site](#))

Outcomes

By reviewing the materials provided, CASL members will be able to:

- articulate how some current trends in the assessment field align with Loyola's mission, values, goals;
- affirm or recommend updates to the Principles and Practices for Student Learning Assessment;
- identify necessary priorities to continue implementing in the next few years; and
- identify up to 3 new priorities for the next few years.