Chapter Five Appendix

Enclosure 5.06
2011 Annual Assessment Memo

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC DEAN AND PROVOST
UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY
121 BLAKE ROAD
ANNAPOLIS MARYLAND 21402-1300

March 31, 2011

From: Academic Dean and Provost

Subj: AY2011 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS – FACULTY SENATE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Ref: (a) ACDEANINST 5400.1 of 6 Jan 05

Encl: (1) AY2011 Department Assessment Report Template
(2) AY2011 Division Assessment Report Template

1. Background

As stated in ACDEANINST 5400.1 of 6 Jan 05, the fundamental purpose of Naval Academy academic assessment programs is to support continuous improvement of midshipman learning and development.

2. AY2011 Department Assessment Reports

Each department and/or program is required to submit an annual assessment report. These reports come in one of two forms: a retrospective report or an annual status update. A retrospective report is only required when the program is preparing for a periodic program-specific external review (such as a USNA visiting committee, ABET, or ACS review), or when the Naval Academy itself is preparing for a Middle States Periodic Review Report (PRR) or decennial review. In all other cases, only an annual update on the current status of assessment is required. Recognizing that all departments participate in periodic program-specific external reviews, departments are encouraged to leverage the assessment instruments, data, and analysis utilized for these reviews and not to duplicate their efforts unnecessarily. Nevertheless, departments and divisions are expected to include in all retrospective reports the matrices that map course outcomes to department outcomes, department outcomes to division outcomes, and department outcomes to USNA attributes.

Because the Naval Academy is now finalizing its Middle States PRR submission, the AY2010 reports were all retrospective reports. They recapped the development and implementation of assessment plans over the last several years, drew some lessons from the past, and pointed the direction for the future. With the exception of any program that is preparing for a program-specific external review in AY2011, all reports this year should be annual updates. Hence, the annual update report should focus on the current status of assessment as described in Encl (1).

3. AY2011 Division Assessment Reports

Division AY2010 reports described assessment plans as they have been developed over the last several years. The **AY2011 Division Core Assessment Report** should describe the **Division Core Assessment Status** regarding the implementation of those plans. A template is provided in Encl (2).

ABET, ACS, or visiting committee/program reviews reports should be written so as to be understandable by members of the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee, in particular those outside the area being reported. Supplementary materials such as assessment instruments, and graphs and tables of results should be included as appendices.

4. Action

In keeping with the ACDEANINST 5400.1 dated 6 January 2005 (attached) those responsible for assessment at the Division and Department levels including those responsible for interdisciplinary programs will prepare reports summarizing their assessment activities for AY2010 and submit them to the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee through the ex-officio chair, Dr. Peter Gray, Director of Academic Assessment, at the end of the 2010 spring semester, but no later than 19 June 2010.

A. T. PHILLIPS

Distribution:
Chair, Faculty Senate Assessment Committee
Division Directors
Department Chairs
Program Coordinators
Senior Professors

AY2011 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS – FACULTY SENATE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

AY2011 Department Assessment Report Template

The **AY2011 Department Assessment Report** should include the following:

I. An overview of the department assessment plan (1-2 pages of narrative).

1. It is expected that this overview will remain largely the same from year to year, and revisions will be made as needed to reflect changes in the department assessment plan.
2. This overview should:
   - i. List the department outcomes (to be achieved by graduation). For departments participating in the ABET accreditation process, provide a mapping of the department outcomes to ABET outcomes (a)-(k).
   - ii. Describe the overall structure and operation of the assessment plan to assess all outcomes over a reasonable period (3-4 years).
   - iii. Include a description of the assessment sources and methods used by the department to collect data and the process for organizing and analyzing the assessment data. For example, is assessment performed using a "bottom-up" approach where courses are assessed and the data is used to evaluate how well learning goals (outcomes) are being achieved, or it is structured using a "top-down" approach where each learning goal (outcome) is assessed using applicable data from the program?
   - iv. Include an update of the Department Assessment Time Cycle Matrix from the AY2010 report and describe the current status with regard to the time cycles.
   - v. Include an update of the Department Matrix of USNA Attributes and Department Learning Goals from the AY2010 report.

II. Actions taken based on last year's (AY2010) assessment activities (2 – 3 pages of narrative). Include all relevant supporting data as an appendix.

III. Lessons learned and recommendations for action based on this year's (AY2011) assessment activities (3 – 5 pages of narrative) including:

1. Assessment(s) implemented this academic year,
2. Results obtained, and
3. Perceived implications and planned curricular and/or assessment changes

Include all relevant supporting data as an appendix. Note that core-related assessment results should be submitted for inclusion in the Division report.

Reports should be written so as to be understandable by members of the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee, in particular those outside the area being reported. Supplementary materials such as assessment instruments, and graphs and tables of results should be included as appendices.

AY2011 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS

AY2011 Division Assessment Report Template

The **AY2011 Division Assessment Report** should include the following:

I. A description of the plan to assess division learning outcomes across departments within the division and across divisions, as appropriate, and a discussion of sources of assessment data.

   1. It is expected that this overview will remain largely the same from year to year, and revisions will be made as needed to reflect changes in the division assessment plan.
   2. This overview should describe the overall structure and operation of the assessment plan to assess all outcomes (to be achieved by graduation) over a reasonable period (3-4 years).
      - i. Identify the sources of assessment evidence. Sources should include those that build on the departmental assessments and those that are independent of the departments, that is, that are specific to an individual division or a combination of divisions. (1-2 pages of narrative)
      - ii. Include a description of the methods used by the division to collect data, the process for organizing and analyzing the assessment data, and the process for generating curricular change proposals based on assessment results.
      - iii. Include an update of the Division Assessment Time Cycle Matrix from the AY2010 report and describe the current status with regard to the time cycles.
      - iv. Include an update of the Division Matrix of USNA Attributes and Division Learning Goals from the AY2010 report.

II. Actions taken based on last year's (AY2010) assessment activities. Include the analysis in 2-3 pages of narrative and attach all relevant supporting data as an appendix.

III. Lessons learned and recommendations for action based on this year's (AY2011) assessment activities including:

   1. Assessment(s) implemented this academic year,
   2. Results obtained, and
   3. Perceived implications and planned curricular and/or assessment changes

Include the analysis in 3-5 pages of narrative and attach all relevant supporting data as and appendix.

Reports should be written so as to be understandable by members of the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee, in particular those outside the area being reported. Supplementary materials such assessment instruments, and graphs and tables of results should be included as appendices.