**University of Louisville Student Learning Outcomes**

**Annual Report Process**

**2023-24**

**Instructions for Undergraduate Programs**

The Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Annual Report process is a key component of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) reaffirmation. The university needs to identify student learning outcomes in its educational programs, assess the extent to which those outcomes are achieved, and provide evidence of developing improvement based on analysis of the results (SACSCOC Comprehensive Standard 8.1 and 8.2.a). **CS 8.1 and 8.2.a are two of the most cited standards for non-compliance by SACSCOC.** New guidelines continue to be developed by SACSCOC, increasing expectations on student learning outcomes reporting. Therefore, in each reporting cycle changes are made to the process to more clearly and accurately define and align outcomes, measurements and findings and provide evidence of continuous quality improvements. The SLO process continues to evolve as additional refinements are needed in order for UofL to be in full compliance with SACSCOC requirements.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is charged with the collection and review ofStudent Learning Outcomes (SLO) Annual Reports submitted by the department chairs/heads of the academic programs. Below are the instructions for the completing the 2023-24 SLO Report for undergraduate programs.

**Important Information**

* **DEADLINE:** IEmust receive the 2023-24 SLO Reports by **Friday,**

 **November 15, 2024.**

* **100% submission of reports is required for compliance with SACSCOC core requirements and comprehensive standards.** These reports are critical to the university's ability to demonstrate institutional effectiveness. Your dean will receive periodic status reports detailing delinquent reports until full compliance is achieved.
* Staff from IE are available to assist you and ensure timely submission of the reports. Please contact Theo Barthes at 852-3950 or theo.barthes@louisville.edu if you need assistance.
* Please submit the 2023-24 SLO Report template for undergraduate programs via email to theo.barthes@louisville.edu

**SACSCOC Accreditation**

As part of the SACSCOC accreditation for undergraduate programs, UofL needs to document the integrated relationship of our General Education program and a culminating undergraduate experience (CUE) within our undergraduate programs. Although the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) Ideas to Action (i2a) has been institutionalized, we need to continue to provide evidence of our ongoing efforts to assess students’ critical thinking. Through our SLO process, the department chairs/heads provide the evidence for these outcomes.

**Revised Template**

In order to apply our philosophy of the cycle of assessment to our own work, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has used faculty feedback to inform revisions made to the SLO reporting template for the AY 2023-24 reporting cycle. We’ve elected to use a minimalist approach to significantly reduce the clutter on each page. Additionally, to mitigate extraneous scrolling back and forth on the template, we have embedded a series of hyperlinks which allow authors to jump from a table of contents to specific reporting components or to instructions.

**Using the 2022-23 Feedback Reports**

All chairs/department leaders will receive their 2022-23 Feedback Report(s) by August 2024. These reports were generated utilizing a rubric. The recommended changes identified in the 2022-23 SLO Feedback Report(s) need to be reflected in the 2023-24 SLO Report. IE staff are available to assist you with determining how to appropriately implement feedback.

**Online (distance) Academic Programs and Off-Site Academic Programs**

Current guidelines developed by SACSCOC are expanding expectations on student learning outcomes reporting. Programs marketed as online through the Delphi Center and programs where 50% or more of the program are available offsite will need to be more specific in their SLO reports about the assessment of outcomes for the students enrolled in programs offered either online or at offsite locations. SLO reports will need to show that the learning taking place online or offsite is comparable to the face-to-face components of the program. *If your program offers multiple modalities (face-to-face/on-site, off-site/distanced, and/or online), you must delineate the findings for all SLO targets. This includes identifying the total number and percentage of students who met or did not meet targets based on what programmatic mode of delivery they fall under.*

In the 2023-24 SLO Report, department chairs/heads will need to identify the online (distance) and/or off-site degree program in addition to the traditional on campus program. Department chairs/heads will need to verify whether program goals, SLOs and measures for online academic programs and /or off-site are similar in scope and content to the traditionally delivered counterpart. **Authors are now required to distinguish in the report between on campus, distance, and off-site students and document for each group of students their direct attainment of the outcomes. If separated findings are unavailable for this reporting cycle, please make note, and identify a plan moving forward that will allow you to capture these important data.** If the online (distance) or off-site program is a stand-alone program, a separate report will need to be submitted reflecting the unique program goals and related SLOs and measures.

**A Note Based on Embedded Certificates:**

In an effort to meet evolving SACSCOC accreditation standards, Institutional Effectiveness staff are currently reviewing requirements for how certificate programs are integrated into the SLO process. By November 2025, certificate programs must be reported separately by curriculum and level of credential. We encourage authors to begin thinking about how they would like to separate certificate programs out from the degree-level programs that they are embedded within. IE staff are available to assist authors with integrating these changes into their writing/reporting process.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

**Implementation of Previous Action Plan (addressing AY 2022-23)**

The **previous action plan’s implementation** should reflect on your action plan from the previous SLO reporting cycle, to address what, if any, improvements were made. Essentially, this component ought to indicate whether programs had the ability or opportunity to do what they said they would.

**Open Response on Annual Assessment Cycle (OPTIONAL)**

This component is derived from the previously-titled ‘COVID-19 Continued Impacts on Assessment of Student Learning’. This component should include any relevant information and/or modifications made to the annual SLO reporting process that are atypical to a usual reporting cycle. This component can be used to frame how the academic program operated in AY 2023-24, and whether obstacles or other phenomena disrupted or affected the assessment cycle/process. You may also use this space as a catch-all to discuss any kind of updates you think we need to know about, such as enrollment, retention, recruitment, staffing, etc.

**Program Mission**

The **program** **mission** is a broad statement of the purpose of the academic unit/program which is linked to UofL’s institutional mission. The mission statement outlines the purpose of the academic unit/program within the context of who it serves and in what ways. Each academic unit/program should have its own mission statement that reflects its contribution to UofL’s institutional mission: <http://louisville.edu/about/>

**#1 Competency Related to Major**

**Program Goal #1**

A statement (clearly aligned to the program’s mission) that addresses the distinct body of knowledge students will possess upon completing this program of study.

**Student Learning Outcome #1**

SLO clearly aligns to Program Goal 1 (above), and describes specific **measurable** knowledge, skills or perceptions to be gained or improved upon completing the program of study.

*NOTE: Though you may have multiple outcomes related to this program goal, it is suggested that you limit the number of SLOs. If possible, please only report ONE SLO for which you have the necessary measure, target, and finding. If more than one SLO is needed try to limit to two or maximum three. Again, make sure you have the necessary measure, target, and finding for each of the SLOs.*

**Measure #1**

Clearly aligns to SLO 1 (above) and describes a **direct** assessment measuring how students’ work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency.

* Acceptable: paper, exam, essay, presentation, thesis/dissertation, portfolio, supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation, performance
* NOT acceptable: course grade or course completion. Does not provide the level of granularity needed to assess students’ performance for the specific competency related to the SLO.

Be sure to **describe** the criteria used to evaluate the student work and **provide copies of the evaluation materials,** if applicable.

* Acceptable: rubric (with explanation of scale), specific exam questions related to SLO, specific questions from supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation form. **Please include a copy of rubric, evaluation form, etc.**

*NOTE: Where appropriate, the same measure may be used for more than one SLO.*

An **indirect** measure can be used **in addition** to a direct measure (student opinion survey, satisfaction survey, exit survey, etc.)

**Target #1**

Clearly aligns to Measure 1 (above) and indicates a specific and appropriate threshold for students’ collective performance related to the measure of SLO 1. Be sure to include:

* sampling methodology (e.g. representative sample, whole population) with justification for your choice,
* the total number of students being evaluated (ex. n = 25), and
* the percentage (not mean/average) of students expected to achieve a particular threshold (e.g. 90% of students must earn a rating of “adequate” or higher on the designated rubric).

**Finding #1**

Provide results specified in Measure 1 (above) and indicate whether the intended target/threshold was met. (e.g. 75% of students earned a rating of “adequate” or higher on the designated rubric. Target was not met.)

**Action Plan #1**

“Close the loop” by utilizing the assessment results collected for SLO 1 and indicate strategies for continuous program improvement to enhance student learning and the student’s academic experience for the competency related to the major.

**#2 Competency which builds upon the Cardinal Core Curriculum**

**Program Goal #2**

This goal clearly aligns to the program mission statement and addresses how upper-level courses (generally 400-level and above) in your program continue to strengthen either effective communication or cultural diversity (one of the competencies initially gained through the general education curriculum). This is **NOT** to address any 100- or 200-level gen ed courses taught through your department.

*Note: Critical thinking will be addressed in section 4: Competency related to Critical Thinking*

**Student Learning Outcome #2**

SLO clearly aligns to Program Goal 2 (above) and describes specific **measurable** knowledge, skills or perceptions related to effective communication or cultural diversity to be strengthened by completing this program of study.

*NOTE: Though you may have multiple outcomes related to this program goal, it is suggested that you limit the number of SLOs. If possible, please only report ONE SLO for which you have the necessary measure, target, and finding. If more than one SLO is needed try to limit to two or maximum three. Again, make sure you have the necessary measure, target, and finding for each of the SLOs.*

**Measure #2**

Clearly aligns to SLO 2 (above) and describes a **direct** assessment measuring how students’ work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency.

* Acceptable: paper, exam, essay, presentation, thesis/dissertation, portfolio, supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation
* NOT acceptable: course grade or course completion. Does not provide the level of granularity needed to assess students’ performance for the specific competency related to the SLO.

Be sure to **describe** the criteria used to evaluate the student work and **provide copies of the evaluation materials,** if applicable.

* Acceptable: rubric (with explanation of scale), specific exam questions related to SLO, specific questions from supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation form. **Please include a copy of rubric, evaluation form, etc.**

*NOTE: Where appropriate, the same measure may be used for more than one SLO.*

An **indirect** measure can be used **in addition** to a direct measure (student opinion survey, satisfaction survey, exit survey, etc.)

**Target #2**

Clearly aligns to Measure 2 (above), and indicates a specific and appropriate threshold for students’ collective performance related to the measure of SLO 2. Be sure to include:

* sampling methodology (e.g. representative sample, whole population) with justification for your choice,
* the total number of students being evaluated (ex. n = 25), and
* the percentage (not mean/average) of students expected to achieve a particular threshold (e.g. 90%of students must earn a rating of “adequate” or higher on the designated rubric).

**Finding #2**

Provide results specified in Measure 2 (above) and indicate whether the intended target/threshold was met. (e.g. 75% of students earned a rating of “adequate” or higher on the designated rubric. Target was not met.)

**Action Plan #2**

“Close the loop” by utilizing the assessment results collected for SLO 2 and indicate strategies for continuous program improvement to enhance student learning and the student’s academic experience for the competency related to the Cardinal Core curriculum.

**#3 Competency Related to the Culminating Undergraduate Experience**

**Program Goal #3**

This goal clearly aligns to the program mission statement, describes senior-level applied-learning, addresses the defining features of a culminating undergraduate experience, (CUE) <http://louisville.edu/ideastoaction/about/cue/curriculartoolkit/definingfeatures> and identifies the specific CUE course(s). This should describe an opportunity for students to build upon discipline-specific knowledge and/or critical thinking skills and to apply their emerging skills to solve practical (i.e. real world) problems of increasing complexity.

**Student Learning Outcome #3**

SLO clearly aligns to Program Goal 3 (above), and describes specific measurable discipline-specific knowledge and/or critical thinking and application of their emerging skills to solve practical (i.e. real world) problems of increasing complexity.

*NOTE: Though you may have multiple outcomes related to this program goal, it is suggested that you limit the number of SLOs. If possible, please only report ONE SLO for which you have the necessary measure, target, and finding. If more than one SLO is needed try to limit to two or maximum three. Again, make sure you have the necessary measure, target, and finding for each of the SLOs.*

**Measure #3**

Clearly aligns to SLO 3 (above) and describes a **direct** assessment measuring how students’ work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency.

* Acceptable: paper, exam, essay, presentation, thesis/dissertation, portfolio, supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation
* NOT acceptable: course grade or course completion. Does not provide the level of granularity needed to assess students’ performance for the specific competency related to the SLO.

Be sure to **describe** the criteria used to evaluate the student work and **provide copies of the evaluation materials,** if applicable.

• Acceptable: rubric (with explanation of scale), specific exam questions related to SLO, specific questions from supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation form. **Please include a copy of rubric, evaluation form, etc.**

*NOTE: Where appropriate, the same measure may be used for more than one SLO.*

An **indirec**t measure can be used **in addition** to a direct measure (student opinion survey, satisfaction survey, exit survey, etc.)

**Target #3**

Clearly aligns to Measure 3 (above), and indicates a specific and appropriate threshold for students’ collective performance related to the measure of SLO 3. Be sure to include:

* sampling methodology (e.g. representative sample, whole population) with justification for your choice,
* the total number of students being evaluated (ex. n = 25), and
* the percentage (not mean/average) of students expected to achieve a particular threshold (e.g. 90%of students must earn a rating of “adequate” or higher on the designated rubric).

**Finding #3**

Provide results specified in Measure 3 (above) and indicate whether the intended target/threshold was met. (e.g. 75% of students earned a rating of “adequate” or higher on the designated rubric.

Target was not met.)

**Action Plan #3**

“Close the loop” by utilizing the assessment results collected for SLO 3 and indicate strategies for continuous program improvement to enhance student learning and the student’s academic experience for the competency related to the CUE.

**#4 Competency Related to Critical Thinking**

**Program Goal #4**

This goal clearly aligns to the program mission statement and addresses the opportunities provided to students for refinement of their critical thinking skills (e.g. problem solving and higher-order thinking) acquired through the program.

**Student Learning Outcome #4**

SLO clearly aligns to Program Goal 4 (above), and describes specific **measurable** critical thinking skills acquired through the program.

*NOTE: Though you may have multiple outcomes related to this program goal, it is suggested that you limit the number of SLOs. If possible, please only report ONE SLO for which you have the necessary measure, target, and finding. If more than one SLO is needed try to limit to two or maximum three. Again, make sure you have the necessary measure, target, and finding for each of the SLOs.*

**Measure #4**

Clearly aligns to SLO 4 (above) and describes a **direct** assessment measuring how students’ work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency.

* Acceptable: paper, exam, essay, presentation, thesis/dissertation, portfolio, supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation
* NOT acceptable: course grade or course completion. Does not provide the level of granularity needed to assess students’ performance for the specific competency related to the SLO.

Be sure to **describe** the criteria used to evaluate the student work and **provide copies of the evaluation materials**, if applicable.

• Acceptable: rubric (with explanation of scale), specific exam questions related to SLO, specific questions from supervisor/internship/co-op evaluation form. **Please include a copy of rubric, evaluation form, etc.**

*NOTE: Where appropriate, the same measure may be used for more than one SLO.*

An **indirect** measure can be used **in addition** to a direct measure (student opinion survey, satisfaction survey, exit survey, etc.)

**Target #4**

Clearly aligns to Measure 4 (above) and indicates a specific and appropriate threshold for students’ collective performance related to the measure of SLO 4. Be sure to include:

* sampling methodology (e.g. representative sample, whole population) with justification for your choice,
* the total number of students being evaluated (ex. n = 25), and
* the percentage (not mean/average) of students expected to achieve a particular threshold (e.g. 90%of students must earn a rating of “adequate” or higher on the designated rubric).

**Finding #4**

Provide results specified in Measure 4 (above) and indicate whether the intended target/threshold was met. (e.g. 75% of students earned a rating of “adequate” or higher on the designated rubric. Target was not met.)

**Action Plan #4**

“Close the loop” by utilizing the assessment results collected for SLO 4 and indicate strategies for continuous program improvement to enhance student learning and the student’s academic experience for the competency related to critical thinking.