Appendix 4: Planned Three-Year Assessment Cycle and Training Courses

Three-Year Assessment Cycle

The university's tentative plans for a three-year assessment cycle will use the following sequence:

Year 1

Programs will:

- ***Develop meaningful assessment questions***. To do so, programs will be asked to consider key courses and learning assessments to identify where students do well, where they struggle, why, and what is yet to be learned.
- ***Identify type(s) of evidence needed and design data collection and analysis plans.*** Programs will be asked to consider several designs, with varying data types, collection methods, and combinations of direct and indirect measures. They will use these resources to choose the data type(s) and collection methods most useful for answering their questions.
- ***Provide feedback on another program's questions and assessment design.*** Programs will use a validated rubric and a sequential process to-promote useful commentary.

Year 2

Programs will:

- ***Collect evidence.*** To do so, programs will implement the plans they developed during Year 1.
- ***Consider evidence.*** Programs will reflect on evidence in light of curricular designs, instructional approaches, and student supports shown to effectively improve academic achievement on other campuses.
- ***Develop planned improvements.*** By considering their local contexts in relation to possible improvement approaches, programs will define specific improvement plans to implement in Year 3.
- ***Consider the assessment design's effectiveness.*** Programs will discuss whether and to what extent their assessment design yielded useful information and will make any revisions needed.
- ***Provide feedback on another program's consideration of assessment evidence, planned improvements,*** and ***assessment design reflections.*** To do so, programs will use a rubric and a sequential process designed to elicit helpful comments.

Year 3

Programs will:

- ***Implement planned improvements.*** Using their Year 2 plans, programs will implement the improvements they chose.
- ***Collect evidence on improvements' impact.*** Programs will use their assessment designs as revised (or not) in Year 2.
- ***Consider impact of improvements.*** To do so, programs will reflect on their assessment findings in light of comparable approaches shown to improve academic achievement on other campuses.
- ***Continue, refine, revise,*** or ***replace improvements implemented.*** Based on their reflections, programs will determine how to proceed regarding the improvement implemented in Year 3.
- ***Consider the assessment design's effectiveness.*** Programs will discuss whether and to what extent their assessment design yielded useful information and will make any revisions needed.
- ***Provide feedback on another program's consideration of assessment evidence, decisions on improvements implemented,*** and ***assessment design reflections.*** Programs will again use a rubric and a process tailored to elicit helpful comments.

Following Year 3, programs may continue assessing the impact of improvements implemented if more evidence or revision are needed. In such a case, they will repeat the Year 3 process, in consultation with the university's assessment team. If improvements decisively succeeded or failed, programs will re-start the cycle with the Year 1 process.

Online Short Courses and Dashboards

To support colleagues in pursuing the assessment cycle described above, the university plans to build a series of **fully online asynchronous short courses** that require one to three hours for participants to complete. These courses will **use Canvas' features** for organizing course materials into sequential modules; for delivering templates, examples, short videos, and other resources; and for fostering interaction among participants. The courses will particularly highlight effective existing U of I program assessments. For instance, they will feature sample U of I assessment questions; assessments of learning, rubrics, and other data collection instruments; and video clips of colleagues explaining their assessment designs, program improvements, and impact.

Through these courses, the APR redesign will **integrate training and resources into the assessment cycl**e. Canvas is designed to scaffold learning, and most colleagues completing program assessments use it regularly. Therefore, building the APR process into Canvas will reduce perceived wasted time and reported frustration associated with the Anthology platform. By highlighting assessments that have led to meaningful improvements in academic achievement, the university will foster peer-to-peer engagement and understanding of the intrinsic value of assessment. The short courses' asynchronous, facilitated design will enable users to participate according to their schedules while fostering peer-to-peer dialogue and timely feedback from assessment colleagues.

Appendix 5: Student Success Steering Committee Key Projects Mobilize Data

1. **Identify** three to five **key UI drivers of retention**/ non-retention, e.g., sense of belonging, success in foundational courses, etc.

2. **Establish** one to three **leading indicators** for each identified retention driver, e.g., Canvas activity may predict success in key foundational courses.

3. **Develop dashboards** and periodic reports to **track** these **leading indicators *or* key course success indicators.**

Leverage Effective Models, Strategically Align Programs and Processes, Prioritize Effective Collaboration

1. **Conduct** a **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats** (SWOT) **Analysis** to **identify** the **national best practices with highest potential** to successfully increase student achievement here and to provide return on investment (ROI) sufficient to cover costs and fund additional efforts.

   a) **Investigate exemplary national programs**, e.g.:

   University of Nebraska-Lincoln's Course Insights dashboards.

   Oregon State's Every Student Graduates approach.

   Georgia State's Panther Retention Grants: Note that graduation rates for micro-grant recipients are higher than those for students dropped for nonpayment. Compare with MSU Completion Grants.

   Georgia State's use of chatbots to significantly reduce summer melt and improve performance in foundational courses.

   Review the University Innovation Alliance's Frontier Set Resources, particularly *Key Findings from the Frontier Set: Institutional Transformation among 29 Colleges and Two State Systems.*

   Consider National Institute for Student Success (NISS) diagnostic.