

Tips and Guidelines to Avoid Citations in SACSCOC Interim Reports

Sample Narrative from AUD's 5th Year Interim
Report for Group 1

8.1 The institution identifies, evaluates, and publishes goals and outcomes for student achievement appropriate to the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs offered. The institution uses multiple measures to document student success. (*Student achievement*) [CR]
(Institutions are not required to answer the parts of this standard addressing publication of goals and outcomes.)

 X Compliance

 Non-Compliance

Identification and Publication of Goals for Student Achievement

The multiple constructs selected by AUD for measurement of student achievement are not uncommonly used as indicators of the same in the United States: (1) retention, (2) course completion, (3) degree completion and (4) job placement. These criteria have been chosen for their appropriateness, taking into account AUD's mission, students and programs. Furthermore, their objectivity, ease of quantitative measurement and facility with which they are communicated have also ultimately served as reasons for selection.

AUD has tracked performance on these constructs since very soon after its founding in 1995, and the university has always sought continuous improvement. However, it has only been since the establishment of its office of student retention and success four years ago that the university has engaged in a formal process of quantitative goal-setting. During this period, much discussion has ensued regarding the selection of constructs and the quantification of goals. See [Appendix 1](#) for an up-to-date statement of AUD's goals for student achievement.

Before deciding on the targeted goal levels, AUD established base-line of attainment based on 2014 data. The university tracks annually progress towards a long-term goal and has established improvement targets for every six to eight year period. AUD believes that the timeframe for improvement resulting from any interventions made is clearly much longer than annually (and may only be evidenced very late [or even following] in the four to six year period it takes a cohort to complete a baccalaureate degree). On all parameters, the targeted level of long-term attainment has been established with a view to the university's mission, the nature of

its students and the kinds of programs it offers. Separately, wherever possible, benchmarking is used in goal-setting. Note, however, that data for benchmarking purposes are not available for UAE-based universities. Hence, AUD relies on US-generated data as an aid to goal-setting and the assessment of achievement.

Related to the subjects of goal-setting and assessment, it is important to keep in mind that in addition to these institutional goals, each educational program defines learning outcomes, the extent of achievement of which is assessed on an annual basis. (Conclusions regarding the effectiveness of measures taken to address a weakness or capitalize on an opportunity for improvement may require longer than a one year timeframe.) The narrative for Core Requirement 8.2 (a), pp. 54-83, provides a discussion of AUD's outcome assessment process and includes numerous examples of goal- and strategy setting that lead to results that "close the loop" for continuous improvement.

Evaluation of Goals for Student Achievement

Retention

See [Appendix 2](#) for a performance tracking on this construct.

AUD's retention rate has historically been steadily in the 70-72% range. This is far in excess of the 2014-2015 retention level of 55% (all acceptance rates) reported by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for private, for-profit four-year institutions of higher learning, but yet not as high as the 82% (all acceptance rates) reported for private, not-for-profit four-year institutions. The AUD 70% level for fall, 2017 compares favorably with the 63% retention level reported by the NCES for private, not-for-profit institutions with open admissions.

AUD concludes from these data that its retention rate is satisfactory, but that it can and should set its sight on modest continuous improvement, realistically reaching approximately 75% over the next six to eight years. It is hopeful that this target will be achieved, as its student retention and success office has only been in existence for

four years; and as evidenced by the narrative for Core Requirement 12.1 (pp. 115-121), this office has and continues to implement several retention-building mechanisms and initiatives.

Course Completion

See [Appendix 3](#) for a performance tracking on this construct.

AUD's course completion rate is currently at 88%.

We benchmark this level to the median ratio of credit hours completed to credit hours attempted as reported by Ruffalo Noel Levitz in 2015 for four-year institutions with lower selectivity in both the private and public sectors:

Table 1 – Median Ratio of Completed to Attempted Credit hours for Four-year Private and Public Institutions

Private Institutions with Lower Selectivity	92%
Public Institutions with Lower Selectivity	86%

Source: *2015 Student Retention Indicators Benchmark Report*

The level of AUD student achievement as measured by the criterion of course completion, therefore, is very much in line with this US-based benchmark. AUD has set a goal of long-term maintenance for this parameter.

Degree Completion

See [Appendix 4](#) for a performance tracking on this construct.

AUD's graduation rate for 2016-2017 is at 61%, down three percentage points versus previous year. While this may appear to be disappointing, it is important to note that the current negative economic climate in the UAE dates back a couple of years and has been acting as a significant deterrent to completion. Scholarship opportunities at AUD are limited and available almost exclusively for applicants to

the freshman class. Other forms of financial aid are essentially non-existent. In spite of the university's efforts to extend payment facilities (e.g., post-dated checks, etc.), the downward pressure on enrollment has been considerable.

At the same time, however, the 61% previously cited is still three points higher than the level reported for AY 2014-2015 and is nearly three times the level (23%) reported by the NCES for the 2009 cohort in private, for profit institutions. In fact, it exceeds the 59% level for all and public institutions, and it is more in line with the 66% level reported for private, not-for-profit institutions.

AUD concludes that in spite of continued economic weakness, the potential remains for improvement in its graduation rate, especially in the face of diagnostic, pre-emptive and prescriptive activity vis-à-vis at-risk students by its retention and success office. A 66% level over the next six to eight years is reachable.

Job Placement

See [Appendix 5](#) for a performance tracking on this construct.

Data for May, 2017 graduates reflect a 74% job placement rate. While this is slightly less than the previous year, it is not out of line with historical performance. For the last couple of years, economic conditions in the UAE have not favored job placement, especially for entry-level positions. AUD does not expect these conditions to change significantly over the next two to three years.

It would be unreasonable to set a long-term (for the foreseeable future) goal for this parameter above the 85% level, given the approximate number of AUD graduates who simply do not seek a job (~5%) and the number who upon graduation, embark upon graduate studies (~5%), the latter being a number we expect to grow. Currently, taking macro-economic factors into account, in addition to those related to intentions upon graduation other than employment, AUD believes that a goal of 79% job placement is appropriate within six to eight years from base-line.

In assessing these data, AUD is encouraged by two factors: *US News and World Report's* publication on September 13, 2017 of a 41.5% rate of full-time employment for AY 2015-2016 graduates from US universities and more significantly, that in 2017, for the second year in a row, AUD ranked among the top 150 universities in the world according to the *Global University Employability Ranking*, published by *Times Higher Education* (London). Notably, AUD is only one of two universities in the Arab world to figure in the ranking. The published ranking can be found [here](#).

Appropriateness of the Goals to AUD's Mission

AUD's mission, given its centrality to university operations, is referenced throughout this *Fifth-Year Interim Report*. It reads as follows: "The mission of the American University in Dubai is to serve as a culturally diverse learning community committed to the pursuit of knowledge through excellence in teaching and scholarly and creative endeavor, leading to students' academic, personal and professional success, as well as the advancement of society." The narratives for Core Requirements 9.1 ([pp. 84-86](#)) and 12.1 ([pp. 115-116](#)) discuss fully the relationship between the institutional mission and the choice and structure of AUD's educational offerings and student support services.

Essentially, student "success" (i.e., achievement) is AUD's ultimate purpose; and in terms of "tracking the tangibles," AUD has chosen to measure and publish student achievement constructs that reflect academic and professional success. Once again, these are retention, course completion, degree completion and job placement.

Appropriateness of the Goals to the Nature of the AUD Student

In addition to selecting the goals of student achievement for their appropriateness to AUD's mission and educational programs, AUD has taken into account the nature of the AUD student. Specifically, AUD has chosen to establish goals and levels of achievement that are both realistic and attainable, yet contain the element of "ambition" necessary to serve as a catalyst for continuous improvement.

In terms of nationality and type (country system, public, private, language of instruction) of high school attended, AUD’s student body is highly heterogeneous. There are 106 nationalities currently represented; hence, the diversity in country educational systems at the high school level is very high; and although nearly 90% of applicants apply from schools where English is the medium of instruction, the quality of English proficiency imparted by these schools varies. Entering classes tend to skew significantly younger than their US-based counterparts. In fall, 2017, for example, 23.2% of entrants were under 18, while only 13.6% were over 24 (including those enrolled in four graduate programs).

AUD is neither an institution with an open enrollment admissions policy nor one that is highly selective. In fall 2017, of the 1,343 applicants to the university, 988 (i.e., 73.5%) were accepted. Data on rank within high school class or performance on standardized testing (except for TOEFL, Academic IELTS and, occasionally, SAT) are not collected, as the university does not require this testing for admission. As such, any claim that AUD’s average student is among the “best and the brightest” among graduating high school seniors in the UAE would be unfounded (or at least unsubstantiated). While there are certainly students who fit this description, there are many who do not. Furthermore, to be noted is the high percentage of accepted freshmen who in order to be considered bonafide candidates for the bachelor’s degree, must successfully complete one or more developmental courses:

Table 1 – Freshmen Placement in Developmental Courses (Fall, 2017)

	%
Placed in freshman developmental English (i.e., scoring between 520-549 TOEFL)	54.2
Placed in first developmental math course	26.0
Placed in second developmental math course	33.0

Even so, when all admissions criteria are taken into consideration, AUD has always characterized its entering class as having a reasonable chance of success in the collegiate level academic program for which they have been admitted.

Given the profile of AUD's freshman students (diverse, non-native English-speaking, often in need of one or more developmental courses), the university believes that its goals for performance on the achievement variables it has identified to measure student success are realistic, yet aiming for achievable improvement through the effective exercise of its mission.

Appropriateness of the Goals to the Nature of AUD's Programs

As discussed in the narrative for Core Requirement 9.1 (pp. 90-91), AUD's educational programs are typical of university programs in the US and worldwide. While many of these programs prepare graduates for entry-level positions in the professions, they are totally consistent with the offerings that have traditionally characterized higher education. (All AUD for-credit courses are college-transferable.) All programs require the successful completion of a general education core. Success in AUD's programs requires cognitive and conative capabilities, similar to those required universally. This also explains why the criteria selected for student achievement have much in common with those used to assess success in universities across the US (and around the world).

As demonstrated by the preceding, AUD is in compliance with Core Requirement 8.1 on *student achievement*.

Supporting Documentation and Evidence:

Appendix 1	AUD goals for student achievement
Appendix 2	Performance tracking: retention
Appendix 3	Performance tracking: course completion
Appendix 4	Performance tracking: degree completion
Appendix 5	Performance tracking: job placement

8.2 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results in the areas below:

- a. student learning outcomes for each of its educational programs.
(*Student outcomes: educational programs*)

 X Compliance

 Non-Compliance

Identification of Expected Program-specific* Student Learning Outcomes

Note: Assessment of student learning outcomes for programs accounting for 90% of AUD's enrollment are represented in this narrative. All schools are included. All graduate programs appear. The only undergraduate program certificate is included. Duplication of architecture and interior design and the adequacy of including two out of four undergraduate engineering programs have driven the sampling.

Each AUD educational program has a series of student learning outcomes that supports its goals. The outcomes are found in the program sections of the *2017-2018 AUD Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs*: pp. 89 and 159, pp. 67 and 99, respectively. See [Appendix 1](#) for tables that map each program's student learning outcomes to its goals. [Appendix 2](#) contains mappings of each program's goals to the goals that AUD has defined in support of its institutional mission. Throughout the university, the student learning outcomes for individual courses support the learning outcomes of the program to which the course "belongs." See [Appendix 3](#) for examples of course syllabi pages where student learning outcomes are clearly listed. The following narrative discusses the assessment of student learning outcomes within the broader context of educational program assessment. Emphasis is placed on the actual assessment of student learning outcomes.

Program goals and student learning outcomes, as well as the student learning outcomes for individual courses, are developed and reviewed by program faculty, subject to approval by each program's curriculum committee, the university

*Distinguished from assessment of student learning outcomes for collegiate-level general education competencies (Requirement 8.2 b).

curriculum committee (UCC) and the AUD Academic Council. On-going effort is invested in aligning student learning outcomes to SMART criteria, and their listing is preceded by some variation of the sentence, “Students (or graduates) will be able to ...”

See [Appendix 4](#) for the minutes of an Academic Council meeting in which construction management program goals and student learning outcomes are discussed and approved. [Appendix 5](#) contains a meeting report in which communications faculty (i.e., the school’s curriculum committee) review course learning outcomes. Other examples of course learning outcome deliberation are provided by [Appendix 6](#): business administration (learning outcomes for ACCG 201) and the school of arts and sciences (faculty proposal to revise learning outcomes for courses in Middle Eastern Studies).

At AUD, program goals and student learning outcomes are reviewed on a continuous basis; but formal reviews are fixed at five-year intervals to coincide with program-specific accreditation visits conducted by the Commission for Academic Accreditation of the UAE Ministry of Education – Higher Education Affairs. Self-studies are part of these reviews. See [Appendix 7](#) for a student learning outcome-related requirement contained in one of the reports of a visiting team and the university’s response. Separately, the commission requires that program learning outcomes be aligned with a qualifications framework known as *QFEmirates*. See [Appendix 8](#) for an example of program student learning outcome alignment with the *QFEmirates* framework.

Assessment of Extent of Learning Outcome Achievement

Given its relevance to supporting the institutional mission, the assessment of student learning outcomes at both the course and program levels is, therefore, of critical importance to AUD. The process involves the participation of various university constituencies: faculty; students; academic program administrators; the

office of institutional effectiveness (OIE); the provost and president; and alumni and employers (including members of program advisory councils).

See [Appendix 9](#) for the steps in AUD’s process for assessing the extent of student learning outcome achievement and [Appendix 10](#) for the AUD Annual Assessment Calendar. The steps in the process are essentially sequential, but implementation of these steps allows for iterative consideration and action. The process attempts to leave “no stone unturned” and is supported by a form called the “Outcome Assessment Report and Plan (‘OARP’).” Assessment of program goals and student learning outcomes is reflected on the form. The OARP is a “plan” in two ways: (1) at the beginning of each assessment cycle [i.e., academic year], the process of assessment of student learning outcomes for that cycle is organized, especially with regard to the selection of measurement tools; and (2) at the end of each cycle [academic year], actions prescribed for improvement in learning outcome achievement during the next cycle are planned. The OARP is a report in the sense that it communicates the current cycle’s assessment, including the results of action taken during the cycle. Interim reports are submitted at mid-academic year to indicate how program goal achievement is progressing. See [Appendix 11](#) for sample interim reports. These reports are based on assessment of student learning to date in the cycle and serve to bolster rationale for budget requests made each spring as part of the university’s annual strategic planning process.

Central to the assessment process is the completion of the OARP form. See [Appendix 12](#) for a blank form, including the cover page (“INSTRUCTIONS”) which presents an overview of the assessment process and shows how its cycle spans an entire academic year. It is integrated backward to the previous year’s cycle and forward to the next year’s cycle. Specifically, this form is divided into four parts and serves three essential purposes: (1) reporting on the extent of achievement of learning outcome-related objectives set at the end of the previous cycle and for which progress was expected during the current cycle [“Closing the Loop”]; (2) assessing the extent of achievement of course and program student learning outcomes; and program goals [“OARP Implementation”]. Multiple instruments and measures that provide input from various sources are used in this assessment process. Targeted areas for

improvement in student achievement and strategies to reach improved attainment levels are defined; and (3) providing a summative assessment of the educational program and an action plan for continuous improvement [“Leadership Overview and Prescribed Action”] in student achievement through intervention at various levels (course, program and institution). Although the OARPs frequently raise operational and logistical issues and indicate remedial action also of this ilk, every effort is made to focus on pedagogy and learning as they relate to the achievement of student learning outcomes.

The OARP form is completed by each educational program head in collaboration with faculty. It is reviewed by the dean of the school housing the program, the OIE and the office of the provost. Other constituencies previously cited provide input to the process through surveys, forums and other feedback mechanisms. See [Appendix 13](#) for the AUD Institutional Effectiveness Survey Calendar (surveys most often used in assessment of expected student learning outcomes are shaded in blue.) Separately, additional student input is obtained via an annual student forum, held each spring.

An analysis of key elements of the OARP form, providing examples for this text from the last two years of educational program assessment, evidences that AUD has a system for assessing the extent of achievement of student learning outcomes (course and program) that serves as the backbone for a process of continuous improvement. The examples that follow are verbatim excerpts from OARPs actually submitted. The only editing consists of writing out student learning outcomes and course names in long-hand (i.e., no reliance on numbers and codes with which the reader would be unfamiliar). Separately, the columns of the form not pertaining per se to the topic of discussion within each section (assessment, analysis of results, seeking improvement) have been removed in order to avoid distraction and ensure focus.

OARP Part II – Planning for Assessment

These questions are answered: What are the program student learning outcomes that support each program goal, and which measures (direct and indirect)

are intended for use in assessing the extent of goal achievement? Which are the courses that support the achievement of each program student learning outcome and which are the direct and indirect measures to be used in assessment? Tables 1-4 provide examples of the alignment of PLOs to program goals and the alignment of courses to PLOs. Measures are also reflected:

Table 1: Examples (AY 2015-2016)
Alignment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) to Program Goals

Program	Program Goals	Related Program Learning Outcomes
Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch.)	Goal 2: Prepare students for making choices and decisions with regards to technologies available in the market	<u>PLO 2</u> : Produce design that integrates building technology, construction, systems and materials in a creative and original manner. <u>PLO 6</u> : Produce design that demonstrates understanding of architectural practice in terms of administrative, financial, legal terms and observe ethical standards.
Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.)	Goal 5: Provide students with the ability to evaluate ethical implications of business decision making.	<u>PLO 5</u> : A global outlook and an appreciation of the international dimensions of business. <u>PLO 6</u> : An awareness of ethical issues and of the importance of ethical conduct in business practice.
Master of Education (M.Ed.)	Goal 3: To develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to meet the unique learning needs of all students and guide them to becoming life-long learners.	<u>PLO 3</u> : Be able to differentiate instruction to meet students' unique learning needs and create environments that are conducive to student learning and development; <u>PLO 4</u> : Be able to meet the challenges of teaching by designing and implementing an effective classroom management plan; <u>PLO 7</u> : Be able to conduct research and utilize important findings to inform current practices and make new contributions to the field of education.

Table 2: Examples (AY 2016-2017)
Alignment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) to Program Goals

Program	Program Goals	Related Program Learning Outcomes
Bachelor of Fine Arts in Visual Communication (B.F.A.)	Goal 3: To promote the value of an awareness and critical perception of the historical, cultural and theoretical foundations for visual art and design.	<u>PLO 1</u> : Effectively articulate the conceptual foundations of visual communication works. <u>PLO 2</u> : Demonstrate the design process for developing new, creative visual communication projects. <u>PLO 4</u> : Evaluate and critique contemporary art and design works.

		<u>PLO 5</u> : Recognize and integrate the ethical, and sociocultural ideals of the target audiences in each work of visual communication.
Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering	Goal 3: Contribute to socio-economic development and environmental sustainability.	<u>PLO 5</u> : Design elements, systems, and processes within realistic technical and non-technical constraints <u>PLO 9</u> : Describe the global impact of civil engineering solutions on the economy, environment, and society
Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.)	Goal 3: Provide students with the ability to research complex problems and formulate solutions using advanced analytic skills.	<u>PLO 2</u> : An ability to identify, analyze and propose solutions to business problems across a wide range of functional areas <u>PLO 3</u> : A profound understanding of the conceptual foundations of their selected functional area (for students completing a concentration) and an ability to investigate and formulate recommendations for managerial decision problems and policy issues in that area <u>PLO 4</u> : An ability to use quantitative and qualitative techniques skillfully to assess the functional and overall performance of business organizations.

Table 3: Examples (AY 2015-2016)
Alignment of Courses to PLOs and Selection of PLO Assessment Measures

Program	PLOs	Related Courses (Code & Title)	Direct Measures (At least two for each PLO)	Indirect Measures (At least two for each PLO)
Bachelor of Communication and Information Studies (B.C.I.S.)	PLO 2: Analyze the complexities of information gathering, evaluate the credibility of sources and ensure the highest possible reliability of information provided to the public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COMM104- Introduction to Non-Fiction TV Formats. • COMM105- Drama and Non-Fiction TV Formats Analysis. • COMM106-The Language of Film. • COMM 201- Media Economics and Research. • COMM202- Ethical and Legal Responsibilities of the Mass Media. • COMM221- Media Writing Skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course specific Pre- and Post-Test. • Jury evaluation of capstone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty feedback. • Completion survey.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COMM222- Multiplatform Storytelling. • COMM223- Screenwriting Fundamentals. • DPST302- Media and Public Service. • DPST323- Screenwriting and Producing for TV and the Web. • DPST422- Capstone Storytelling • DPST/JOUR441- The Documentary. • JOUR302- Newsroom Management and Decision Making. • JOUR321- Reporting. • JOUR322- Advanced Reporting. • JOUR323- Broadcast Journalism. • JOUR401- Current Issues in Journalism. • JOUR461- Media and Politics in the Middle East. • JOUR462- Capstone Project. 		
Middle Eastern Studies Certificate	PLO 1: Demonstrate required familiarity with Modern Standard Arabic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MEST 101- Elementary Arabic I • MEST 102- Elementary Arabic II • MEST 201- Intermediate Arabic I • MEST 202- Intermediate Arabic II • MEST 301- Arabic Proficiency I • MEST 302- Arabic Proficiency II 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Final Exam. • Final Oral Presentation. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course Evaluations • Student Feedback • Completion Survey

Master of Science in Construction Management (M.S.C.M.)	PLO 3: Thorough familiarity with the benefits and risks associated with different construction project delivery methods and contract types.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EICM 620 – Acct & Finance. • EICM 632 – Law & Regs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examinations. • Homework Assignments. • External Referee Evaluations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course Assessment Reports • Course Evaluation Reports. • External Reviews.
---	---	--	---	--

Table 4: Examples (2016-2017)
Alignment of Courses to PLOs and Selection of PLO Assessment Measures

Program	PLOs	Related Courses (Code & Title)	Direct Measures (At least two for each PLO)	Indirect Measures (At least two for each PLO)
Bachelor of Arts in International Studies (B.A.I.S.)	PLO 3: Apply the principles of political science to analyze key topics in international affairs and the interconnection between local and global geopolitical issues and events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POLS 200- Introduction to Political Science • POLS 210- Introduction to International Relations • POLS 320- The United Nations • POLS 340- International Diplomacy • POLS 401- Contemporary Political Issues • POLS 415- Geopolitics • MEST 319- Politics in the Middle East 	Course embedded assessment Capstone projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course evaluations • Exit survey • Completion survey
Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering (B.S.M.E.)	PLO 4: Identify, formulate, and solve problems in mechanical, thermal, and control systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMEC210 – Structure and properties of materials w/lab • EMEC320 – Solid mechanics I • EMEC330 – Fluid dynamics w/lab • EMEC340 – Thermodynamics • EMEC345 – Heat and mass transfer w/lab • EMEC365 – Control systems w/lab • EMEC499 – ME design project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of student exhibits by faculty during the assessment day • Assessment of course learning outcomes by the instructor using CARs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate completion survey • Assessment of student skills by the field experience supervisor

Bachelor of Fine Arts in Visual Communication (B.F.A.)	PLO 1: Effectively articulate the conceptual foundations of visual communication works.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARTS200 History of Art I. • ARTS201 History of Art II. • ARTS202 History of Art III. • VCCC100 Intro to Visual Com. • VCAD202 History of Advertising. • VCGD300 History of Graphic Design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course-embedded assessment. • Major projects. • External reviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students' course evaluations. • Exit interviews. • Alumni survey. • Employer survey. • NASAD Visitors' Report
--	---	---	---	---

As can be seen from the previous tables, in an effort to specify demonstrable skill and competence, in addition to knowledge, judgment, insight and understanding, action words are commonly used in the articulation of program student learning outcomes. Some examples are “produce,” “differentiate,” “evaluate,” “design,” “analyze” and “propose.” The same is true for the learning outcomes at the course-level (on syllabi) previously shown as examples.

Tables 3 and 4 also substantiate that diverse direct and indirect measures are in use at AUD for assessment of student learning outcomes: examinations, pre- and post-tests, presentations, student exhibitions, portfolios, jury evaluation, embedded exercises in capstone and senior project courses, faculty assessment sessions and advisory council input. The data generated by these measures are maintained in the course files submitted by faculty each term. The maintenance of survey data is the purview of the OIE. See [Appendix 14](#) for the table of contents for an AUD course file and [Appendix 15](#) for examples of data related to the achievement of student learning outcomes provided by completion and alumni surveys.

OARP Part III (A) – Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes Achievement

Using a combination of direct and indirect measures applied over a specified timeframe, each student learning outcome at the program level is assessed for the extent of its achievement (achieved, partially achieved, not achieved). Choice of form (Course Effectiveness Reports [CERs]* and Course-Level Learning Outcomes

*CARs for Engineering

Assessment Reports [CLLOARs]) to report the results of course-level assessment is left to each school. Of course, this course-level assessment is performed by faculty with oversight provided by program chairs and school deans. For each course section taught at AUD, data are collected and analyzed to determine the extent to which course-level student learning outcomes are achieved. The CERs or CLLOARs provide crucial input into the process of program student learning outcome assessment and program goal assessment, as reflected in the OARP. See [Appendix 16](#) for two examples of mappings of course to program student learning outcomes. Much of the assessment that is reflected on the forms is generated by data collected by direct measures at the course level. Rubrics are in common use. Table 5 provides examples of assessment of specific learning outcomes taken from CERs/CLLOARs for courses for five programs:

Table 5: Course Learning Outcome Assessment

Program	Course	Course Learning Outcome	Extent Achievement	Analysis	Action
Bachelor of Arts in International Studies (B.A.I.S.)	INST 498, International Studies Capstone	2. Synthesize information from multiple disciplines into a substantial, coherent Literature Review	Literature Review Exercise, Literature Review: 60% of the students reached this LO, despite having been given the chance to do a mini literature review before submitting the full-one lit rev.	The literature review turned out to be a much more difficult assignment for most students. Reading, synthesizing and connecting the literature in order to make sense of what is there and what needs more research was not an easy task. Even though I invited the library to the classroom to walk them through the process in addition to the many hours we discussed the process and the samples I gave them, it was	Before reaching their last year, students should have to take at least a seminar course in which they exclusively work on a final research paper of substance.

				difficult to achieve the LO satisfactorily.	
Program	Course	Course Learning Outcome	Extent Achievement	Analysis	Action
Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.)	BUSI 301, Business Research	LO 5: Demonstrate the principles for collection and analysis of data and other information.	Research Project: Target: 60% or more of students will score 3 or higher on the criteria in the rubric. Actual: 76%	57% of the students demonstrated some clear evidence of reliability in the data collection process. All presented data were relevant to the aims and objectives of the research. The findings have been presented to the reader adequately, been discussed and evaluated at a satisfying level, too. Finally, the findings have been compared properly with findings, theories, and concepts derived from the literature review, but some further effort was required. 19% of the students demonstrated strong and clear evidence of reliability in the data collection process. All presented data were relevant to the aims and objectives of the research. The findings have been presented to the	More in-class examples of effective data collection processes. Moreover, more paradigms of analyzed results from published academic papers would be beneficial to be studied by students. So, students would be able to enhance their academic critical ability to discuss and evaluate their findings appropriately to further extent.

				<p>reader sufficiently, been discussed and evaluated to a sound extent, too. Finally, the findings have been compared properly with findings, theories, and concepts derived from the literature review.</p> <p>However, 24% of the students' data collection process presented several omissions. The students did not demonstrate relevant data to the aims and objectives of the research. The findings could have been better presented to the reader, been discussed and evaluated, too. Lastly, the findings have not been compared with findings, theories, and concepts derived from the literature review.</p>	
Program	Course	Course Learning Outcome	Extent Achievement	Analysis	Action
Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.)	ECON 460, Applied Economics	1. Formulate an empirical model and estimate/interpret the results of simple and multiple time series, cross-sectional, panel and	Term Paper / Research Project: Target: 60% Actual: 83.3%	At least 83.3% of the students achieved a score of 3 or higher on the assessment scale. Students were able to provide literature, models and	More emphasis on interpretation and synthesizing policy implications from model results. Also plan to include a short revision session with librarian on citation/referencing starting Fall 2017.

		dummy dependent variable regression models.		regression analytics. The weakness seems to be related to how to interpret the results and identifying policy opportunity from the results; proper citation in text and referencing seems to be another.	
Program	Course	Course Learning Outcome	Extent Achievement	Analysis	Action
Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering (B.S.M.E.)	EMEC 320, Solid Mechanics I	2. Add the stress components of individual kinematic modes of deformation (axial, torsion, bending, and shear) to analyze and design structural members under combined loadings.	Homework Midterm exam Final exam Quizzes Level of Achievement (Mapped against School of Engineering rubric) 1. - 2. 15% 3. 10% 4. 75%	The key issue is the students' visualization from the problems	There should be more students' participation and involvement in problem solving during the lectures.
Program	Course	Course Learning Outcome	Extent Achievement	Analysis	Action
Master of Education (M.Ed.)	EDCO 621, Teaching in a Multicultural Classroom	Compose and construct activities that exhibit respect for cultural diversity	Research Project & presentation Target: 9 @ 90% Actual: 4 @ 90% 4 @ 80-85% Class discussions & Debates Target: 8 @ 90% Actual: 6 @ 90% 2 @ 80-85%	As a part of the research project, the students participated in simulations and other activities that were designed to demonstrate respect for cultural diversity. The students commented during and after the activity, as well as in the Exit Memo, that	Retain this aspect of the research project going forward.

				they found this exercise to be particularly helpful and enlightening	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Reference

CS 3.3.1.1 Institutional Effectiveness: Educational Programs, to include Student Learning Outcomes in the 2012 Principles

legal authority and operating control of the institution is clearly defined with respect to that entity; (2) the relationship of that entity to the institution and the extent of any liability arising out of that relationship is clearly described in a formal, written manner; and (3) the institution demonstrates that (a) the chief executive officer controls any fund-raising activities of that entity or (b) the fund-raising activities of that entity are defined in a formal, written manner which assures that those activities further the mission of the institution. **(Institution-related entities)**

3.2.14 The institution's policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of all intellectual property. These policies apply to students, faculty, and staff. **(Intellectual property rights)**

3.3 Institutional Effectiveness

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: **(Institutional Effectiveness)**

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

3.3.1.3 academic and student support services

3.3.1.4 research within its mission, if appropriate

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

3.3.2 The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. **(Quality Enhancement Plan)**

(Note: This requirement is not addressed by the institution in its Compliance Certification.)