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National University

- Founded 1971
- Private non-profit California
- 2nd largest private non-profit in the state
National University

- 27 campus locations
- 23,000 FTE
- 30,000 headcount
- Format: 1 month per class
Student Demographics

• Serving Adult Students
• Average age 33
• Undergraduate students – median 21-30
• Graduate students – median 26-35
• Master’s Degree rankings
  – Hispanic 1 in California; 6 in Nation
  – African American – 1: California; 33 in Nation
  – Military friendly school - 17% of admission
• Student load default rate - 4.40%
Top Programs by Admissions

• BS Public Health
• Associate of Arts – General Education
• Bachelor’s of Business Administration
• BS Criminal Justice
• BA Psychology
• Master’s of Business Administration
Accreditation

• WASC Senior, Western Association of Schools and Colleges
• Accredited since 1979;
• Recent recertification 2011 through 2021
The Mission

Making **lifelong learning opportunities** accessible, challenging, and relevant to a diverse student population.

Promote **continuous learning** by:
– offering a **diversity of instructional approaches**,  
– encouraging **scholarship**,  
– engaging in **collaborative community service**, and  
– empowering its constituents to become **responsible citizens in an interdependent, pluralistic, global community**.
Institutional Learning Outcomes 2010

Mission

ILOs

PLOs
Institutional Learning Outcomes

• Apply information literacy skills necessary to support continuous, *lifelong learning*.

• Communicate effectively orally and in writing, and through other appropriate modes of expression.

• Display mastery of knowledge and skills in a discipline.
Institutional Learning Outcomes

• Demonstrate cultural and global awareness to be responsible citizens in a diverse society.
• Demonstrate professional ethics and practice academic integrity.
• Utilize research and critical thinking to solve problems.
• Use collaboration and group processes to achieve a common goal.
Engage University Community

- Lead Fac.
- Fellow
- Univ. Comm.
- School
- IR
- Grad
- Under grad
University Community

• Councils set guidelines
• Program Lead Faculty
  – Learning Outcomes
  – Curriculum Map
  – Assessment Plan
• Institutional Research
  – Provides Support
  – Manages Taskstream
Peer to Peer Mentors Confidential

• School Assessment Committee
  – Mentors

• Faculty Assessment Fellows
  – Two Faculty
  – Provide confidential mentoring
  – One to One Support
University Community

- University Academic Assessment Committee
  - Chairs of the School Assessment Committee
  - Institutional Research
  - Assessment Fellows
  - Associate Provost
  - Recommend to Councils
  - Share best practices across schools
Assessment Planning

Student Learning Outcome Assessment Based

Institutional Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes

Course Learning Outcomes
Assessment Planning

Program Annual Report (PAR)
Program Learning Outcomes
How do we know what are students know?

Five Year Program Review (6th year)
Broader view
Inquiry focused
Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

- Data for decision making
- Assessment support
- Manages TaskStream
- Survey support
Program Annual Reports

- Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)
- PLO mapping
- Curriculum map
- Multi-Year Assessment Plan
- Annual Assessment Plan
- Assessment finding
- Assessment Reflection
- Recommendation to improve student learning
Program Annual Reports

Assess Program Learning Outcomes

Recommendations are used for:
- program improvement
- resource allocation
Five Year Program Review

INQUIRY BASED REVIEW

• Engages dialog
• Frames the issues
• Defines the scope of investigation
• Defines the scope of assessment
• Directs evidence collection
Five Year Program Review

- Examines achievement of student learning outcomes
- Reviews trend data and program vitality
- Uses external reviewer
- Results in Memorandum of Agreement with action plan
### Program Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td>NU Institutional Learning Outcomes: 1, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analyze the effectiveness of oral communication messages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>NU Institutional Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establish appropriate communication goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>NU Institutional Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Create content that fulfills communication objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4</td>
<td>NU Institutional Learning Outcomes: 1, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apply critical analysis of mediated messages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 5</td>
<td>NU Institutional Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deliver an effective presentation using digital technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6</td>
<td>NU Institutional Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effectively deliver a clear and well-researched argument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum Map

### MS Special Education Curriculum Map
Courses and Activities Mapped to Required Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses and Learning Activities</th>
<th>Required Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXC602A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 5</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 7</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 8</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 9</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 10</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **I**: Introduced
- **D**: Developed
- **M**: Mastered
- **3**: Introduced & Mastered
- **2**: Developed & Mastered
- **1**: Introduced & Developed
Closing the Loop

The community has sustainable plans for knowing what the students learn and processes in place for continuous improvement and “closing the loop.”
Student Learning and Sustainability

Closing the Loop

a. Using Assessment results for program improvement

b. Using Assessment results for resource allocation
Student Learning and Sustainability

Faculty Reflect on Student Learning

• What have we learned at the program level?

• What have we learned in the assessment process at the institutional level?

• What do we do with what we learned?
Assessment Summit
For Faculty By Faculty

Five Year Review Lessons Learned
Heutagogy
Statistics that capture what you are already doing
Assessment Using Student Portfolio
Models of Collaboration
Inter-School Assessment
Making Meaning: Assessing Critical Discourse
### Five-Year Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of PARs Assessed</th>
<th>Five-Year Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Level</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td># of PLOs Assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Avg Score</td>
<td>% of Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing Research &amp; Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate Professional Ethics</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate Effectively</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Mastery of Knowledge</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Collaborative and Group Process</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply Information Literacy</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate Cultural &amp; Global Awareness</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)

• DQP is an educational framework developed by the Lumina Foundation.
• Determines the learning outcomes at three degree levels.
• Learning community created a plan to engage faculty by referencing the existing assessment system and experimenting.
Lumina Foundation
Degree Qualification Profile

• Institution specific
• Supports Student Learning
• Assists with academic planning
• Facilitates transfer
National University Exploration

How can we continue to showcase what our students learn and what they know?

2011 National University recognized for NU Assessment process by WASC

Processes for student learning assessment “closing the loop”
WHY DOES IT MATTER

Engage in Dialog
Nine Faculty Members;
One administrator
Learn explore discuss
Considers ILOs and DQP
Learning Community
Community of Practice

Reads Lumina DQP
Considers ILOs and DQP
Discusses Learning
Considers Practice
Tries Mapping with OIRA assistance
Speaks with Faculty
Attends WASC meetings
Timeline

- **Fall 2011 - DQP Learning Community**
- **Attends WASC Presentation**
- **Explores Spider web options**
- **Winter 2012 – Informal conversation**
- **Spring 2012 - Engage WASC ARC**
- **Summer 2012 - Planning Assembly**
- **Fall 2012 - Academic Assembly**
- **2013 Further Conversation**
DQP

• Develop a transparent view of the University’s areas of emphasis;
• Define learning expectations at the associate’s, bachelor’s and master’s degree levels
• Develop common vocabulary for sharing best practices between institutions and among faculty.
Why the DQP?

Public Good
- External Lens
- Transparency for students
- Pathway through degrees
- Improved transferability
- Value of a degree

WASC Regional Accreditation
- Peer evaluation process
- Faculty developed curriculum
National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment

• Communicate relevant student and institutional performance data to policy makers, prospective students, and other stakeholders.

• Document what is being accomplished by and learned from universities experimenting with the DQP

• Piloting the DQP
  26 Institutions in California
  226 Institutions nationally Reviewing the DQP
  39 states
Areas of Knowledge

• Specialized Knowledge
• Broad, Integrative Knowledge
• Intellectual Skills
• Applied Learning
• Civic Learning
Areas of Learning

Specialized Knowledge
• Knowledge in a field of study
  – Terms; theories; practice

Broad Integrative Knowledge
• Knowledge acquired in gen ed field
  – Examines perspectives; Independent investigation
  – Social / global context
 Areas of Learning

Intellectual Skills

- Analytical Inquiry
- Information Resources
- Diverse Perspectives
- Communication Fluency
- Quantitative Fluency
Areas of Learning

Applied Learning
  – Locating evidence, writing a case, formulating questions, creative presentation

Civic Learning
  – Community; historical positions; significant policy
DQP for National University

• Develop a transparent view of the University’s areas of emphasis;
• Define learning expectations at the associate’s, bachelor’s and master’s degree levels
• Develop common vocabulary for sharing best practices between institutions and among faculty.
WASC Framing Questions

• What areas of the DQP do you find immediately useful?

• Are there specific parts of the DQP that would be difficult to understand at your institution?

• What strategies or modifications would you suggest to make it more usable as a tool?

• How relevant are the six areas of learning?
NU Faculty Community

• Individual Perception
• Areas of Knowledge
  – PLO Matching
  – Discussion
• Group Rendition
  – Spider Web
  – Discussion
• Individual Refinements
• Discussion
Outcomes

Learn

Discuss

Reflect

Apply
Introduction

Given:

• The Areas of Knowledge
• The Degrees

What do you think the NU Spider Web would look like?
Areas of Learning
NU EXPORATIONS

Communication Fluency

Adapted and Revised

– Error free prose in argumentative and narrative form
– Organizes and Leads groups
– Concisely frames and disseminates information
Areas of Learning
NU EXPORATIONS

Transformative Learning

– Identifies how principles of how people change
– Explores a value and assesses through reflection and dialog
– Provides evidence of impact of transformative learning on their own practice
Individual Reflection

- Applied Learning
- Civic Learning
- Intellectual Skills
- Broad, Integrative Knowledge
- Specialized Knowledge
GROUP RENDITION

Draw a National University Spider Web
Individual Refinement
Draw Your Program Spider Web
PLO Matching

Map the Areas of Knowledge to the INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES
Learning Outcomes

• Apply information literacy skills necessary to support continuous, lifelong learning.
• Communicate effectively orally and in writing, and through other appropriate modes of expression.
• Display mastery of knowledge and skills in a discipline.
• Demonstrate cultural and global awareness to be responsible citizens in a diverse society.
• Demonstrate professional ethics and practice academic integrity.
• Utilize research and critical thinking to solve problems.
• Use collaboration and group processes to achieve a common goal.
Initial Reaction

• Workload
• Don’t we do this already
• Conversation continues
• DQP Learning Community Presentations
  – Assemblies
  – Academic Councils
  – Senate
GC and UGC

- Review learning
- Discuss the implications
- Determine the definition of the degrees
- If this is the national model:
  - Is it to NU’s advantage to use it?
  - Is it to our students’ advantage to use it?
Next Steps

• Academic Councils define degrees
• IR provides initial mapping
• Program faculty modify initial maps
• Maps added to Taskstream
• Reviewed as part of Five Year Program Review