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Executive Summary

The 2014 Graduate and Professional Program Assessment Summary Report, dated December 8, 2014, is the Graduate School’s summary of assessment report findings for the WSU graduate and professional programs that submitted annual assessment reports to the Graduate School in spring 2014. The reporting requirement is designed to support WSU’s commitment to program assessment and improvement, as well as to meet the university’s NWCCU accreditation requirements.

The Summary Report includes all responsive graduate and professional programs at all campus locations and presents the following findings regarding the status of assessment for graduate and professional programs:

- 96% of the programs participated in this reporting cycle and submitted an annual assessment report as required by the Graduate School
- Nearly two-thirds of the programs have an assessment process in place that meets the Graduate School’s expectations
- 100% of the programs have assessment plans that include student learning outcomes and methods for assessing students
- Nearly all programs use multiple direct and indirect measures to assess student learning outcomes
- Most of the programs provided an action plan that described steps to improve student learning outcomes in the program
- 80% of the programs reported that they had used assessments results for program planning and decision making, compared to 61% in 2012

After reviewing the assessment reports, the Graduate School sent letters to all program directors/chairs acknowledging the activities and assessment results that faculty accomplished during this assessment period and recommended practices to improve, enhance and sustain their assessment process. To assist programs in this effort, the Graduate School will: 1) continue to work with faculty in developing strong assessment practices, 2) conduct Ph.D. program reviews in Spring 2015, 3) provide training and guidelines for future reporting, and 4) communicate regularly with the university community regarding the graduate and professional program assessment process.
Introduction
All WSU graduate and professional programs are required to submit annual assessment reports to the Graduate School each spring. The reporting requirement is designed to support continuous quality improvement in a proactive manner and meet NWCCU accreditation requirements. In even years, graduate and professional programs submit a narrative assessment review report that includes data analysis, faculty conclusions, and an action plan for program improvement. In odd years, programs submit an assessment update form that describes recent assessment activities and accomplishments. The deadline to submit the assessment reports to the Graduate School was changed to June 1 to agree with undergraduate program reporting and match faculty availability during the academic year.

The Graduate School distributed a suggested outline and timeline for completing the assessment review report to program directors/chairs in January 2014. The outline was revised from the previous format to focus on the assessment of student learning outcomes and program changes that occurred during the last two academic years. Program directors/chairs could use a different outline of their choice provided it met the core reporting requirements for the assessment review period, AY 2012-14. Graduate and professional programs with professional accreditation could submit a recent self-study report and meet the reporting requirements.

The Graduate School offered technical assistance to faculty and staff, sent email reminders, and conducted four workshops on Analyzing and Reviewing Assessment Data and Using Assessment Results to help graduate and professional programs meet the reporting deadline. Faculty and staff also had access to the Graduate School's Program Review and Assessment SharePoint site with program review materials, assessment reports, and best practices and examples identified by the Graduate School’s assessment team.

This 2014 Graduate and Professional Program Assessment Review Summary Report discusses the major themes and findings from the program-level assessment reports and includes recommendations from the Graduate School to support graduate and professional program assessment for the next assessment review period, AY 2014-16.

---

2 Graduate School Program Review and Assessment SharePoint Site (WSU network login required): https://sharepoint.ogrds.wsu.edu/ProgramAssessment/SitePages/Home.aspx
2014 Graduate and Professional Program Assessment Review Reports

Graduate and Professional Program Assessment

All graduate and professional programs have key assessment elements in place including an assessment plan with program objectives, student learning outcomes, and direct and indirect measures of assessment. The majority of programs are collecting, reviewing, and using assessment data on a consistent basis as documented in the assessment review reports. A small number of programs, however, has made slower progress, and one program did not meet the reporting requirement. The Graduate School will work with faculty and staff from these programs to ensure that they develop more robust and systematic assessment practices. In 2014:

- Sixty-nine graduate and professional programs (96%) submitted an assessment review report to the Graduate School. (See Appendix A for a list of graduate and professional programs.)
- Of the sixty-nine programs, 46 programs (67%) followed the Graduate School’s suggested outline, nine programs with professional accreditation (13%) submitted a recent self-study report, and 14 programs (20%) used an alternate outline of their choosing.
- One graduate program did not submit an assessment report due to turnover in key faculty/staff positions (M.S. and Ph.D. in Chemical Engineering) and two programs were in transition (Ph.D. in Nutrition and Exercise Physiology and M.S. in Engineering and Ph.D. in Engineering Science).

Campuses Covered in Assessment Plans

Multi-campus programs used various methods to collect assessment data and coordinate assessment activities on different campuses. Faculty frequently consider campus-related factors when they review, interpret, and use assessment results; however, the small size of many graduate programs makes it difficult or impractical to determine meaningful differences in student learning outcomes when data is disaggregated by campus. Despite this challenge, several programs presented detailed assessments of student learning outcomes and/or instructional methods including strategies for disseminating good practices across campuses. Eight programs included assessment results for students in Global Campus programs with varying degrees of detail.

Individuals and Groups Receiving Assessment Reports

The program director/chair was almost always involved in the assessment reporting, either in their role as the lead administrator for the program or as the person directing the assessment process itself. The assessment reports were frequently shared with some or all faculty, the graduate coordinator, the program coordinator, and/or the dean/associate dean of the college. Assessment coordinators and graduate studies committees provided additional support when they were included in the assessment process. The involvement of graduate studies committees, in particular, helps ensure that faculty are connected to the assessment process and the process is not dependent on any one individual.

---

3 The lead program administrator for graduate and professional programs may be the program director, graduate chair, department chair, or program coordinator depending on the academic unit and/or college.
Assessment Process

Overall, nearly two-thirds of graduate and professional programs are meeting Graduate School expectations for collecting, analyzing, and using assessment data. The remaining programs require additional work in these areas. For example, some graduate programs collected assessment data but did not interpret the data or provide a detailed assessment of student learning outcomes. Other programs did not indicate how the assessment results were being used to address areas in need of improvement or give an action plan based on evidence presented in the report. The Graduate School will offer support to these programs in the form of workshops, individual feedback, and other technical assistance.

Figure 1: Using Assessment Results – Detail

Assessment Systems and Practices

**Assessment Plans and Student Learning Outcomes:** 100% of graduate and professional programs have assessment plans in place that include student learning outcomes and methods for assessing student learning at the program-level. Several graduate programs revised their learning outcomes to be more specific/easier to measure or developed separate learning outcomes for masters and doctoral programs.

**Assessment Leads:** All graduate and professional programs have identified a faculty/staff member who is responsible for coordinating and reporting assessment activities for the program or department and/or have assigned assessment responsibilities to a departmental committee.4

**Graduate Faculty:** The majority of programs discuss and review assessment results at faculty meetings, graduate studies committee meetings, assessment committee meetings, and/or at faculty retreats. Many programs have developed formal assessment systems to replace informal practices. Additional review of assessment data frequently occurs at the departmental and/or college level.

---

4 WSU Executive Policy: “The chair/school/program director is responsible for working with faculty to a) ensure each degree program has learning outcomes and an assessment plan that involves all campuses offering the degree, including online degrees, b) implement the program’s assessment plan, c) share results with faculty on all campuses offering the degree, and d) manage implementation of program improvements based on assessment results.”
**Graduate Students**: Several programs indicated that they had formed graduate student committees and/or were including graduate students in the assessment process through student representation on departmental committees. These practices help ensure that students are involved in the review and use of assessment results.

**Student Annual Reviews**: All graduate programs are required to review each student on an annual basis.

A number of programs revised their annual review process to be more inclusive, provide better feedback to students, and/or collect outcomes data for program assessment.

**Program Changes**: Several graduate programs were restructured and/or underwent organizational changes that interfered with the assessment process. In a few instances, assessment reports were delayed or were not submitted due to faculty/staff turnover.

**Professional Programs**: The Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) program and the Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) program both submitted comprehensive self-study reports to meet their assessment requirements for this review period.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

**Direct and Indirect Measures**: Nearly all graduate and professional programs use multiple direct and indirect measures to assess student learning outcomes. A number of programs are refining their measures to support deeper analysis and provide better information for decision-making. Several programs made changes to evaluation rubrics, preliminary exam protocols, student annual review forms, and exit interviews and surveys.

**Data Collection**: The majority of programs collect and review assessment data annually or more frequently depending on the program, availability of data, and professional accreditation requirements (if applicable). Many programs have added a data collection matrix to their assessment plan to align student learning outcomes with data sources and measures and to keep assessment activities on track.

**Data Analysis**: Data analysis typically focused on quantitative measures such as raw scores, course grades, grade point averages, output values, and rubric scores but also included qualitative measures such as exit interviews, survey comments, observations, and feedback from students, faculty, and alumni. Some programs submitted appendices with raw data, additional data analysis, and supporting documents. In many cases, the analysis could be improved by aggregating/disaggregating data; triangulating data; using mixed methods; using means, medians, and distributions; using small-n techniques; setting targets/faculty expectations; using several discrete measures instead of one broad measure; and limiting the use of input and output measures.

**Faculty Conclusions**: In general, faculty conclusions were well-connected to the student learning outcomes and assessment results presented in the assessment reports. The conclusions frequently addressed individual and collective student achievement, program strengths and weaknesses, and areas in need of improvement. The descriptions also provided important context about the graduate or

---

professional program, its faculty and students, and changes occurring within the program and/or discipline. The majority of graduate and professional programs were able to identify one or more areas where the program could be strengthened or improved.

Closing the Loop

**Action Plans:** Nearly all of the programs provided an action plan that described the steps taken and/or planned by faculty to improve student learning outcomes in the program. The steps were frequently based on the assessment evidence and faculty conclusions presented in the assessment review report but sometimes included other strategic priorities of the department. Several programs reiterated recommendations from previous reports or added to them at the end of the assessment cycle.

**Deans/Associate Deans:** Both professional programs and approximately half of the graduate programs submitted their assessment report to the dean/associate dean of their college. All of the graduate programs in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Nursing included this review.
Using Assessment Results

Graduate and professional programs have increased their use of assessment data since the previous assessment review period. In 2014, 80% of graduate and professional programs reported that they had used assessment results for program planning and decision-making compared to 61% of programs in 2012.

Figure 2: Using Assessment Results

The majority of graduate and professional programs are using assessment data to improve student learning outcomes (52.2%) or to make substantive changes to the program (20.3%). A small percentage of programs (7.2%) are using assessment results to improve assessment practices, typically related to other programmatic and/or organizational changes.

Figure 3: Using Assessment Results – Detail
Using Results to Improve Student Learning Outcomes
Graduate and professional programs described many examples where faculty used assessment results to improve student learning outcomes and enhance their experience in the program. The examples include changes to graduate courses, graduate curricula, preliminary and final exam processes, teaching methods, professional development opportunities, graduate seminars, student advising and mentoring, graduate committee membership and administration, assistantship/internship placements, and program requirements. Professionally accredited programs often track core competencies and make changes to their curricula based on embedded assessments and scores on standardized exams.

Using Results for Program Improvement
A number of programs primarily use assessment results to inform program planning and decision-making that contribute to overall program quality but do not directly support student learning outcomes. For example, programs indicated that they have used assessment results to update new student orientation, change course scheduling, improve the student annual review process, publish information in student handbooks and on departmental websites, hire new faculty and staff members, improve admissions and recruitment efforts, and develop new degree offerings or tracks.

Using Results to Improve Assessment Practices
Several graduate programs were reorganized and/or restructured their curriculum during the assessment review period, which required changes to the assessment process. In these cases, programs may have collected and reviewed assessment data but decided to refine their assessment practices until the reorganization has been completed.

Not Using Assessment Results Effectively
Approximately 20% of graduate programs that submitted assessment reports did not meet all of the reporting requirements and/or were not able to sufficiently demonstrate that assessment results are being used for program improvement. These programs typically need to revise their student learning outcomes to be more specific, measurable, and/or realistic; use direct and/or indirect measures to assess learning outcomes; do more thorough data analysis; or use assessment results in a meaningful way to support program planning and decision-making.
Graduate School Response Letters

After reviewing the assessment reports, the Graduate School’s Assessment Specialist provided individualized response letters to each graduate and professional program director/chair together with an acknowledgement letter from the Dean of the Graduate School. The response letters recognize the activities and assessment results that faculty accomplished during the assessment review period and include recommendations to improve the assessment process. Copies of the response letters were sent to each Dean’s office/college as appropriate.

All graduate programs received similar recommendations to:
- Collect and review assessment data with faculty on a regular basis and/or according to the schedule described in the assessment plan,
- Discuss assessment results with faculty for each student learning outcome as data become available,
- Use assessment results to inform program planning and decision-making (focusing on improving student learning outcomes), and
- Document progress in annual assessment reports.

All professionally accredited graduate and professional programs received similar recommendations to:
- Continue to meet professional accreditation requirements,
- Continue to collect and review assessment data with faculty on a regular basis,
- Use assessment results for program planning and improvement, and
- Document progress in annual assessment reports and/or self-study reports for professional accreditation.

Selected graduate programs received or were asked to consider similar recommendations to:
- Assign program assessment responsibilities to your graduate studies committee or other departmental committee,
- Refine your assessment plan and implement assessment practices as indicated in your assessment report,
- Submit an updated assessment plan to the Graduate School when it is finalized,
- Develop separate assessment plans and/or student learning programs for individual degree programs,
- Update your program objectives to describe the general aims of the graduate program,
- Revise your student learning outcomes to describe the knowledge, skills, and/or values that students are expected to learn or master,
- Consider revising your student learning outcomes so they are more specific/easier to assess,
- Publish your student learning outcomes on your website and/or in your student handbook,
- Use a curriculum map and/or direct measures to assess student learning outcomes and/or core competencies,
- Assess student learning outcomes with direct and indirect measures that are specific, measureable, and realistic,
- Use rubrics to measure student achievement across different learning outcomes and sub-areas,
- Add a data collection matrix to your assessment plan so assessment activities can occur on a regular schedule,
- Update exit interview, job placement, and other assessment data on a regular basis,
- Analyze assessment data and/or focus analysis of issues on specific outcome indicators and/or core competencies,
- Limit the analysis of program inputs and outputs and focus on core competencies and quality measures,
- Consider using weighted averages, case studies, and raw numbers to analyze data with small n's,
- Consider revising rubric scales to be more descriptive and/or support deeper analysis of issues,
- Disaggregate data for on campus and online courses and programs as appropriate,
- Include more detail in your analysis of issues in your next assessment review report,
- Consider setting and/or revising faculty expectations for outcome indicators to support better measurement and/or ensure that quality standards are met,
- Implement assessment practices as indicated in your assessment report – includes assessment rubrics; changes to qualifying, preliminary, and final exams; student annual reviews; exit surveys; and alumni surveys,
- Standardize assessment practices across campuses as indicated in your assessment report,
- Continue to include graduate students in your assessment process,
- Implement the action plan/recommendations as indicated in your assessment report,
- Develop an action plan to support implementation,
- Document progress achieving the strategic initiatives described in your action plan in your next assessment review report,
- Incorporate your assessment of student learning outcomes into the main body of your next assessment review report, and/or
- Review your assessment process and refine assessment tools and methods as necessary.
Graduate School Recommendations

To support graduate and professional programs and meet NWCCU accreditation requirements, the Graduate School recommends the following actions for AY 2014-16:

Graduate and Professional Programs are advised to:

1. Assign program assessment responsibilities to the graduate studies committee or other departmental committee to ensure faculty engagement and sustainability of effort,
2. Publish program-level student learning outcomes in the student handbook and/or on the department webpage,
3. Collect, analyze, and review assessment data with faculty on a regular basis,
4. Use exit surveys, alumni surveys, and/or social media to collect job placement data,
5. Share assessment results with students through graduate student committees and/or student representation on departmental committees, and
6. Refine assessment practices and use assessment results to provide meaningful information for program planning and decision-making.

To continue its support of graduate and professional programs, the Graduate School will:

1. Assist faculty/staff in developing and managing useful assessment practices that include on-campus, online, and multi-campus graduate and professional programs,
2. Conduct PhD Program Reviews with graduate program directors/chairs in Spring 2015, reviewing assessment practices to ensure program improvement,
3. Submit this 2014 Assessment Summary Report to the Graduate Advisory Committee and Office of the Provost for institutional review,
4. Distribute the 2015 Assessment Update form in Spring 2015 and prepare a summary assessment report,
5. Distribute guidelines for the 2016 Assessment Review Report in Spring 2016, coordinate the collection of the reports at the college-level before submission to Graduate School, and prepare a summary assessment report, and
6. Ensure that graduate and professional programs systematize and strengthen assessment to meet standards in WSU’s next accreditation report to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU).

Upcoming NWCCU standards include: Standard 3 (Planning and Implementation), Standard 4 (Effectiveness and Improvement), Standard 5 (Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation, and Sustainability), and Updates to Standards 1 (Mission) and Standard 2 (Resources and Capacity). [http://accreditation.wsu.edu/](http://accreditation.wsu.edu/)

---

6 Upcoming NWCCU standards include: Standard 3 (Planning and Implementation), Standard 4 (Effectiveness and Improvement), Standard 5 (Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation, and Sustainability), and Updates to Standards 1 (Mission) and Standard 2 (Resources and Capacity). [http://accreditation.wsu.edu/](http://accreditation.wsu.edu/)
## Appendix A: Graduate and Professional Programs Reporting in 2014

### Professional Programs Reporting in 2014 (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Not Separately Accredited (0 reports)</th>
<th>Professionally Accredited Programs (2 reports)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Pharmacy (COP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor of Pharmacy Program (PharmD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor of Veterinary Medicine Program (DVM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate Programs Reporting in 2014 (67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Not Separately Accredited (58 reports)</th>
<th>Professionally Accredited Programs (10 reports)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences (CAHNRS) | M.A. in Apparel, Merchandising, and Textiles Program  
M.S. and Ph.D. in Animal Sciences Program  
M.S. and Ph.D. in Biological and Agricultural Engineering  
M.S. and Ph.D. in Crop Science and Soil Science  
M.S. and Ph.D. in Entomology Program  
M.S. and Ph.D. in Food Science Program  
M.S. and Ph.D. in Horticulture Program  
M.S. and Ph.D. in Plant Pathology  
M.S. in Agriculture Programs  
M.S. in Applied Economics and Ph.D. in Economics and Agricultural Economics Programs  
Ph.D. in Prevention Science Program | Ph.D. in Psychology Program (Clinical Psychology) |
| Arts and Sciences (CAS)                      | M.A. and Ph.D. in American Studies Program  
M.A. and Ph.D. in Anthropology Program  
M.A. and Ph.D. in Criminal Justice Program  
M.A. and Ph.D. in English Program  
M.A. and Ph.D. in History Program  
M.A. and Ph.D. in Political Science Program  
M.A. and Ph.D. in Sociology Program  
M.A. in Foreign Languages and Cultures (Spanish)  
M.A. in Music Program  
M.S. and Ph.D. in Chemistry Program  
M.S. and Ph.D. in Mathematics and M.S. in Statistics Programs  
M.S. and Ph.D. in Physics Program  
M.S. in Biology and M.S. and Ph.D. in Botany and Zoology Programs  
Master’s in Fine Arts (MFA) Program  
Master’s in Public Affairs (MPA) Program  
Ph.D. in Psychology Program (Experimental Psychology) | |
| Business (COB)                               |                                       | M.B.A. and Executive M.B.A. Programs  
Master’s In Accounting (MAcc) Program  
Ph.D. in Business Administration |
| Communication (COM)                          | M.A. in Strategic Communication and M.A. and Ph.D. in Communication Programs | |
| Education (COE)                              | Ed.M. and M.A. in Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) Program  
Ed.M. and M.A. in English Language Learners/Bilingual Education (ELL/BLE) Program  
Ed.M. and M.A. in Literacy Education Program  
Ed.M. and M.A. in Sport Management Program  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Not Separately Accredited (3 reports)</th>
<th>Professionally Accredited Programs (0 reports)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engineering and Architecture (CEA) | M.S. and Ph.D. in Chemical Engineering Program<sup>7</sup>  
M.S. in Engineering and Ph.D. in Engineering Science<sup>8</sup> | |
| Pharmacy (COP) | M.S. and Ph.D. in Nutrition and Exercise Physiology (NEP) program<sup>9</sup> | |

<sup>7</sup> The M.S. and Ph.D. in Chemical Engineering program did not submit an assessment review report due to changes in key faculty and/or staff positions.

<sup>8</sup> The M.S. in Engineering and Ph.D. in Engineering Science program did not submit a report due to program transition.

<sup>9</sup> The M.S. and Ph.D. in Nutrition and Exercise Physiology (NEP) program did not submit a report due to program transition.
Appendix B: Guidelines for the 2014 Graduate and Professional Program Assessment Review Report

Due June 1, 2014

Instructions

All WSU graduate and professional programs are required to submit annual assessment reports to the Graduate School each spring. For 2014, programs should enter their information below and submit an assessment review report that includes data collection and analysis for the last two academic years. The report should cover all locations where the program is offered including multi-campus, interdisciplinary, and online degree options. Analysis for degrees with substantially different curricula or learning outcomes should be presented in separate reports. Several options and a timeline for preparing your report are provided with these instructions. Please contact Scott Avery (scottavery@wsu.edu), the Graduate School’s assessment specialist, if you have questions about the report requirements or how to present your assessment results in the suggested outline. The deadline to submit the 2014 Assessment Review Report to the Graduate School (scottavery@wsu.edu) is June 1, 2014.

Section A: Enter Your Program Information

1. Program Name: (i.e., Sociology): Click here to enter text.
2. Graduate Chair or Program Director: Click here to enter name.
3. Person Submitting the Report: Click here to enter name. 4. Title: Click here to enter text.
5. Degrees Covered in Assessment Plan: (i.e., MS in Sociology, PhD in Sociology)
   a. Click here to enter text.
   b. Click here to enter text.
   c. Click here to enter text.
   d. Click here to enter text.
   e. Click here to enter text.
   f. Click here to enter text.
   g. Click here to enter text.
   h. Click here to enter text.
6. Campuses Covered in Assessment Plan: (select all that apply)
   □ WSU Pullman
   □ WSU Spokane
   □ WSU Tri-Cities
   □ WSU Vancouver
   □ WSU Global Campus
   □ Other Locations: Click here to enter text.
7. Individuals or Groups Receiving this Report: (select all that apply)
   □ Some Faculty
   □ All Faculty
   □ Graduate Coordinator
   □ Program Coordinator
   □ Department Chair/Program Director
   □ Assessment Coordinator
   □ Assessment Committee
   □ Dean/Associate Dean
   □ Chancellor/Vice Chancellor
   □ WSU Graduate School
   □ Other Individuals or Groups: Click here to enter text.

Section B: Select an Outline for Your Report

Select an outline from the options listed below and present the results of your graduate and professional assessment activities for the last two academic years, AY2012-14.

☐ Option 1 – Suggested Outline

The following outline is recommended for programs that have not completed a self-study report for professional accreditation within the last two academic years or do not have a preferred but comparable format for reporting assessment results.
A. **Title**
   2014 Graduate and Professional Program Assessment Review Report for [Program Name]
   [Department Chair Name], [Title]/[Program Director Name], [Title]
   Report prepared by [Name], [Title]
   Date: [Date]

B. **Introduction (.5 - 1 page)**
   Briefly describe any broad program, student, faculty, or organizational changes that occurred during the last two academic years, AY2012-2014.

C. **Changes to Assessment Plan (.5 pages)**
   Briefly describe any changes that were made to the assessment plan or student learning outcomes during the last two academic years. Please submit an updated assessment plan with your report if changes were made.

D. **Assessment Activities Directed by Faculty (.5 – 1 page)**
   Briefly describe any assessment activities including faculty meetings, work groups, special studies, or review of assessment results by faculty that occurred during the last two academic years.

E. **Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (3 – 5 pages)**
   List each student learning outcome in the assessment plan and describe how faculty have assessed student progress in each area including data collected, analysis of data, faculty conclusions, and areas of needed improvement. **This section should form the bulk of the report.**

F. **Conclusion/Action Plan (1 – 2 pages)**
   Describe the steps taken and/or planned by faculty to improve student achievement in the program based on evidence presented in the previous section of the report.

☐ **Option 2: Self-study Report**

Programs that have completed a self-study report for professional accreditation within the last two academic years may submit their self-study report and meet the reporting requirements for this review period.

☐ **Option 3: Other Outline**

Programs may use a different outline of their choice if their report focuses on the assessment of student learning outcomes including a detailed analysis of data and program changes that occurred during the last two academic years.

**Section C: Submit Your Report to the Graduate School**

_The deadline to submit your 2014 Assessment Review Report to the Graduate School (scottovery@wsu.edu) is June 1, 2014._ A suggested timeline to help plan your report is provided below.

___ Ongoing: Collect and analyze assessment data
___ February-April: Discuss assessment results with faculty
___ April-May: Write assessment review report
___ May: Share results with faculty and academic leadership
___ June 1, 2014: Submit completed report to the Graduate School