



**Example Policy and Procedures for Systematic Review of Program Level Assessment Data**

**Policy/Procedure Name:** Program Level Assessment Reporting & Review by College Curriculum and Assessment Committee

**Approved:** 05/03/2016 (PEP Coordinating Council)

**Purpose:** To promote meaningful, consistent collection and use of assessment data for program evaluation, continual improvement efforts, and to support and celebrate student learning strengths.

Accredited Programs (CAEP/SPA-nationally recognized programs, CACREP-accredited Counseling programs, NASM- accredited Music Education, and ADE-program review for Art Education programs are included in this category):

1. CAEP Accredited Programs: During the fall semester of even years, CAEP programs will complete a Biennial Curriculum & Assessment Report, including a section regarding the Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program (Section 5) and a section for developing a Multi-Year Curriculum & Assessment Action Plan (Section 6).
  - a. Sections 5 and 6 of the Biennial Curriculum & Assessment Report will be submitted to and reviewed by the appropriate college curriculum and assessment committee.
  - b. During the spring semester of odd years, the college curriculum and assessment committee representatives will review Sections 5 and 6 to ensure consistent progress is made toward curriculum and assessment requirements.
  
2. Other Accredited Programs: During the fall semester of even years, other accredited programs will complete a Biennial Curriculum & Assessment Report, including a section regarding the Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program and a section for developing a Multi-Year Curriculum & Assessment Action Plan.
  - a. Biennial Curriculum & Assessment Report sections regarding the Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program and the Multi-Year Curriculum & Assessment Action Plan will be submitted to and reviewed by the appropriate college curriculum and assessment committee.
  - b. During the spring semester of odd years, the college curriculum and assessment committee representatives will review the Biennial Curriculum & Assessment Report sections regarding the Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program and the Multi-Year Curriculum & Assessment Action Plan to ensure consistent progress is made toward curriculum and assessment requirements.
  
3. Accredited programs referenced above are not required to submit the Annual Curriculum and Assessment Status Reports.

COE Non-Accredited Programs (e.g., MEd Human Relations, MEd Community College Higher Education, MEd Education Foundations):

1. Following their periodic review through the ABOR/NAU Academic Program Review process and as part of their mid-point review, programs will complete a Multi-Year Curriculum & Assessment Action Plan.
  - a. The Multi-Year Curriculum & Assessment Action Plan will be submitted to and reviewed by the COE Curriculum and Assessment Committee.
2. Annually, programs will revise their Multi-Year Curriculum & Assessment Action Plan and complete an Annual Curriculum & Assessment Status Report.
  - a. The Annual Curriculum & Assessment Status Report will be submitted to and reviewed by the COE Curriculum and Assessment Committee to ensure consistent progress is made toward curriculum and assessment requirements.

Addendum – Approved 12/11/2017

Systematic Review of Signature Assignments:

1. Program level signature assignments should be reviewed at a minimum every two years. For CAEP accredited programs, department leadership should establish review processes during the fall semester of odd years. For accredited programs and programs without specialized accreditation, department leadership should establish review processes for signature assignments during the semester/year when other significant reports are not required. Programs should complete these reviews and revisions at least three years in advance of the formal report submission to national accreditation agencies or professional associations to ensure a minimum of two cycles of data for program reports and three cycles of data for unit level reports.

Steps for the initial review should include analysis of data including usefulness of results and confidence in data. Additionally, a high level review of the instrument and scoring guide should be conducted by reviewing the master copy of the instrument and consulting with or gathering feedback from faculty members, including part-time instructors, who have implemented the signature assignment in the past one to two years. Based on the findings of these two initial steps for all signature assignments, the department and/or program leadership should determine if deeper examination of the instrument and/or if work on reliability such as calibration training or checks for inter-rater agreement are needed.

If any signature assignments are identified as needing to be examined at a deeper level, the Validity Inquiry Process (VIP) Model can be used. The VIP Model provides reflective practice instruments for facilitating the review of instruments. Checks for reliability, including the examination of the data collection and reporting procedures, scoring guides in relation to actual student artifacts, training of evaluators, and analysis of data results from student artifacts as well as inter-rater agreement results from evaluators. VIP Model resources are available on the following website:  
<https://nau.edu/Provost/PEP/Quality-Assurance-System/>

This policy is not intended to limit the review of signature assignments. If issues arise with a signature assignment or national accreditation/state regulations change, prompting the need for more frequent review of one or more signature assignments, program faculty should engage in the necessary process to revise signature assignments accordingly to meet new expectations.

The review of signature assignments, any documentation completed related to the review, findings, and revisions made should be maintained on the NAU PEP SharePoint website (see <https://nau.edu/Provost/PEP/Quality-Assurance-System--Assessment-Data/>) and submitted or referenced in the Biennial or Annual Report submitted to NAU's Office of Curriculum, Learning Design, and Academic Assessment.