**University of Louisville Student Learning Outcomes**

**Annual Report Process**

**2022-23**

**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 2022-23 SLO Report for undergraduate programs.

**Important Information**

* **DEADLINE:** IEmust receive the 2022-23 SLO Reports by **Friday,**

 **November 10, 2023.**

* **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 is 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 2022-23 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.

**Template Has Revised Instructions**

In order to apply our philosophy of the cycle of assessment to our own work, IE has used faculty feedback to inform revisions made to the SLO reporting template for the AY 2022-23 cycle. The templates now have revised, condensed instructions for each required program goal and its relationship to the SLO, measure, target and finding. The typical three-part Action Plan has been separated piecemeal and instead of being placed at the very end of the report, an Action Plan/Step component follows each Finding. This allows for report writers to complete the document in a more linear fashion and avoid superfluous scrolling between pages. Though separated, the Action Plan provides authors the opportunity to close the loop and show program improvement where needed in three parts: (1) programs provide their previous action plan (from 2021-22), (2) include an update on improvements made in response to the plan (in 2022-23), and (3) create a new action plan (for 2023-24) based upon the assessment results (from the 2022-23 SLO Report). *Please submit your report to IE using the current 2022-23 SLO Report template for the undergraduate program.*

**Using the 2021-22 Feedback Reports**

All department chairs/heads received 2021-22 Feedback Reports. If you are a new chair and do not have a copy of the 2021-22 Feedback Report for your department, please contact Theo Barthes at 852-3950 or theo.barthes@louisville.edu. These reports were generated utilizing a rubric. The feedback report detailed suggestions for the next reporting cycle to demonstrate the alignment needed for each of the required program goals, its relationship to the SLOs and measures, and documenting improvement to the program based on the findings. The recommended changes identified in the 2021-22 SLO Feedback Report should be reflected in the 2022-23 SLO Report.

**New Requirement for AY 2022-23 Cycle**

Beginning with the 2022-23 reporting cycle, all programs that submit an annual SLO report will also include a copy of a curriculum map. The creation of your program’s curriculum map should be a one-time effort, unless your curriculum faces changes to core courses in future reporting cycles. To facilitate this new step for the annual reporting process, IE has created training materials (two brief videos) that walk faculty through the mapping process. IE staff are also available for one-on-one consultations as needed. If your program has its own specific accrediting body (e.g., ABET), you may instead submit copies of those maps to our office; however, you must ensure that your map addresses and aligns with SLOs that are reported in your annual report.

**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 2022-23 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.

**Certificate Programs**

For all **certificate programs**, department chairs/heads are asked to verify whether the certificate can be completed as a “stand alone” or in conjunction with another program. If the **certificate program** can be completed as a “standalone”, a separate SLO annual report is required identifying its specific program goals, SLOs, and measures. If the certificate program is offered in conjunction with another program, the certificate program can be incorporated into the SLO report for the other degree. The goals and SLOs for the certificate need to align with the existing degree program, but a separate SLO report is not needed.

**Update to Action Plan reporting component**

Beginning with this reporting cycle (addressing AY 2022-23), IE has split out and condensed the action plan component. Instead of its prior organization of being at the bottom of the template, there is now a small reporting component following each finding of the report. The aim for this adjustment is to make reporting more linear, and allow authors to address Findings and how their results will be used in sequential order rather than confining planning narratives for the end of the report.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

**Implementation of Previous Action Plan (addressing AY 2021-22)**

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.

**Impacts on Assessment of Student Learning (OPTIONAL)**

The **impact on assessment of student learning** is anOPTIONALcomponent, and 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 2022-23, and whether obstacles or other phenomena disrupted or affected the assessment cycle/process.

**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.