Table A. Summary of changes to assessment practices identified in the PLO Assessment Reports of 23 undergraduate and graduate programs.

Types of Assessment Actions	Number of Programs Reporting Action	Percentage of Programs (n=23)
Stream line assessment	8	35%
Revise or refine rubric	6	26
Develop new forms of evidence	6	26
Increase number of faculty involved in assessment	6	26
Increase number of lines of evidence	5	22
Develop indirect evidence	5	22
Revise PLO(s)	4	17
Improve alignment of PLO, assessment evidence, and/or rubric	4	17
Develop rubrics to better calibrate faculty scoring across courses	3	13
Refine faculty calibration	3	13
Develop value added approach to assessment	3	13
Increase student participation in indirect assessment	3	13
Improve assessment-related communication in program	2	9
Refine assessment prompt or tools	2	9
Calculate inter-rater reliability regularly	1	4
Formalize process by which indirect evidence collected	1	4
Further investigate curricular support for aspect of PLO	1	4
Implement direct assessment	1	4
No assessment actions identified	2	9

Table B. Summary of changes to programmatic curriculum identified in the PLO reports of 23 undergraduate and graduate programs.

Types of Curricular Actions	Number of Programs Reporting Action	Percentage of Programs (n=23)
Curricular Actions Agreed Upon by Faculty		
Integrate skills or knowledge more completely through program curriculum	6	26%
Add a course to curriculum	6	26
Communicate the PLOs and associated criteria more explicitly to students	5	22
Introduce skill(s) earlier in curriculum	5	22
Revise pedagogy	4	17
Revise PLO(s)	4	17
Increase communication among instructors	3	13
Add existing courses as pre or co-requisites	2	9
Revise key required course(s)	2	9
Adopt common rubric across program	2	9
Revise syllabi	2	9
Eliminate a pre-requisite	1	4
Convert thesis into a capstone project	1	4
Develop file of student work to share with future students	1	4
Connect program more directly to graduate program	1	4
Eliminate capstone due to anticipated scaling issues	1	4
Potential Curricular Actions		
Add course as possible	2	9
Consider alter program prerequisites	1	4
Consider revising PLO	3	13
Consider implementing assignment rubric in foundational course	1	4
Consider implementing peer review in foundational course	1	4
Add a language lab	1	4
No Curricular Actions Identified	2	9

Table C. Summary of co-curricular actions identified in the PLO reports of 23 undergraduate and graduate programs.

Types of Co-Curricular Actions	Number of Programs Reporting Action	Percentage of Programs (n=23)
Direct students to supplemental writing support (SALC, MWP)	1	4%
Improve student advising by staff and faculty	1	4
Support improvements to undergraduate advising	1	4

Table D. Summary of the types of direct evidence programs used to assess student learning as identified in the PLO reports of 23 undergraduate and graduate programs.

Forms of Direct Evidence	Number of Programs Reporting Action	Percentage of Programs (n=23)
Homework or lab assignment	6	26%
Embedded exam questions	12	52
Final paper/report/mock proposal	6	26
Presentation	1	4
Senior thesis/project	2	9
Course portfolio	2	9
Capstone project	1	4
National standardized knowledge test	1	4

Table E. Summary of the types of indirect evidence programs used to assess student learning as identified in the PLO reports of 23 undergraduate and graduate programs.

Forms of Indirect Evidence	Number of Programs Reporting Action	Percentage of Programs (n=23)
Focus group	4	17%
Exit interview	2	9
Survey	2	9
Course evaluations with PLO directed self-assessment	1	4
Interviews with students and/or instructors	1	4
Student reflective essay	3	13
Assessment of time spent in course on learning outcome	1	4
None	13	57

Table F. Approximate percentage of program faculty (Senate and non-Senate lecturers) involved in PLO assessment in 23 undergraduate and graduate programs.

Approximate Percentage of Faculty	Number of Programs Reporting Action	Percentage of Programs (n=23)
Single individual	1	4%
0-20%	2	9
21-40%	5	22
41-60%	2	9
61-80%	1	4
81-100%	9	39
Unknown	2	9
Not applicable (ex. externally scored standardized test)	2	9

Table G. Percentage of programs reporting to calibrate faculty for review of student work when review involved more than one faculty member.

	Number of Programs Reporting Action	Percentage of Programs (n=13)
Yes	9	69%
No	4	31

Table H. Percentage of programs reporting inter-rater reliability when more than one faculty member reviewed student work.

	Number of Programs Reporting Action	Percentage of Programs (n=13)
Yes	9	69%
No	4	31

Table I. Level of student assessed as reported in the PLO reports of 23 undergraduate and graduate programs.

Level	Number of Programs Reporting Action	Percentage of Programs (n=23)
Lower division	1	4%
Upper division	12	52
Seniors	4	17
Various	6	22
Graduate	1	4