

MSUM Assessment Summary for the Three-Year Cycle 2022-2025

Summary of the Cycle

Minnesota State University Moorhead (MSUM) conducts assessment of curricular (academic) programs on a three-year cycle and assessment of co-curricular programs on an annual basis.

For academic assessment, in the first year of the cycle, General Education course-level assessment is done. These are assessments of the LASC, WI, and FYE courses. In the second year of the cycle, programmatic assessment is done. This is assessment of our majors, both undergraduate and graduate programs. Note that assessment of minors, certificates, and pre-professional programs is not conducted separately from the major programs that they are embedded within. In the third year of the cycle the MSUM Assessment Coordinator and members of the University Assessment Committee's Academic Subcommittee visit with academic departments to remind them of the feedback from their most recent assessment results, talk about the upcoming cycle, and answer any questions and concerns that the department has about assessment.

This summary is for the three years from the Fall 2022 to the Spring 2025 semesters.

Curricular (Academic) Assessment

General Education Assessment [updated October 2025] – AY 2024-2025, Reports due January 2025

Note on FYE Assessment: This is the first cycle after the FYE courses were added to the General Education assessment process. In the last cycle, with reports due in Spring 2022, the FYE program was asked to submit a plan to assess their courses. The first report on those courses was due with the Spring 2025 reports.

Overall summary: The following is the overall summary of the General Education reports that were submitted in Spring 2025. General Education covers the Liberal Arts and Sciences Curriculum (LASC), the Writing Intensive Curriculum (WI), and the First Year Experience (FYE) courses.

Designation	expected reports	waivers (not taught)	submissions	notes	total courses	subs/expected	(subs+waivers)/total
LASC 1A	1	0	1		1	100.0%	100.0%
LASC 1B	1	0	1		1	100.0%	100.0%
LASC 2	13	2	13		15	100.0%	100.0%
LASC 3	34	3	27		37	79.4%	81.1%
LASC 4	13	0	13		13	100.0%	100.0%
LASC 5	31	3	29		34	93.5%	94.1%
LASC 6	39	8	34		47	87.2%	89.4%
LASC 7	21	2	18		23	85.7%	87.0%
LASC 8	35	8	25		43	71.4%	76.7%
LASC 9	24	4	18		28	75.0%	78.6%
LASC 10	20	3	18		23	90.0%	91.3%
WI	106	14	97	one unexpected sub	120	91.5%	92.5%
FYE	1	0	1		1	100.0%	100.0%
total	339	47	295	0	386	87.0%	88.6%

Waivers were only given for courses that were not taught during the cycle. Assessment reports are submitted as one report for the course as a whole, not for each section, term, or instructor separately.

Note that this table summarizes submissions only, and does not include information about the submission itself.

The University Assessment Committee (UAC) reads the reports with an eye to whether assessment data had been collected, analyzed, and reflected on and whether the faculty developed action plans in response to that reflection. Each report is then rated as “No concerns”, “Concerns but not probation”, “Concerns and probation”, or “Recommend Sunset the Designation”. Updates to the process for the Spring 2025 submissions as compared to the Spring 2022 submissions included better tracking of the results, reminders to faculty to submit, explicit checking against the published general education student learning outcomes for each course, and more intentional discussion within the committee to improve interrater reliability.

Comparison to the previous two cycles: Note that the data collection was significantly different in 2019 compared to 2022/2025, in that 2019 counted courses only once regardless of how many designations they had, while starting in 2022 a course was counted once per designation.

Designation			
LASC 1A	1	1	1
LASC 1B	1	1	1
LASC 2	3	10	13
LASC 3	16	32	27
LASC 4	11	13	13
LASC 5	21	20	29
LASC 6	11	27	34
LASC 7	5	11	18
LASC 8	14	24	25
LASC 9	12	15	18
LASC 10	18	15	18
WI	65	84	97
FYE			1
total	178	253	295
		142.13%	116.60%

Feedback was provided to the departments and faculty via email to the department chair and all instructors for the course during the cycle. The feedback was also loaded into the D2L course shell that faculty have access to, in the Content area.

A summary memo was sent to the Provost/Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs (PSVPAA), that summarized the findings and recommended action. An overview of that memo is below. The full updated memo is in the D2L course shell. Note that the actions in this summary and memo were recommendations to the PSVPAA. Courses that were recommended for sunsetting the designation by UAC where the PSVPAA removed them from the sunset list were moved to the probation list. Probation has no immediate consequences, but it is an indication from the UAC to the department that the relevant issue(s) need to be addressed before the next reporting cycle or the recommendation would be to end the designation for that course.

From memo to PSVPAA, as amended							
Designation	Recommend sunset due to lack of sub	Recommend sunset due to other reasons	Removed from sunset list	Probation	No concerns*	Not taught (waivers)	total
LASC 1A	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
LASC 1B	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
LASC 2	0	0	0	1	12	2	15
LASC 3	6	0	0	5	23	3	37
LASC 4	0	0	0	1	12	0	13
LASC 5	2	0	0	2	27	3	34
LASC 6	4	1	0	6	28	8	47
LASC 7	3	1	0	1	16	2	23
LASC 8	4	0	0	11	20	8	43
LASC 9	5	0	1	5	14	4	28
LASC 10	2	1	0	2	15	3	23
WI	4	2	1	13	87	14	120
FYE	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
total	30	5	2	47	257	47	386
*Note that UAC had "No Concerns" and "Concerns but not probation" as separate categories in the feedback to the departments/faculty, which were combined in the memo to the PSVPAA.							
87.12% No concerns of submitted							
75.81% No concerns of expected							

Of the 33 remaining sunset recommendations, 3 were requested by the faculty, 5 designations have since been reinstated by the faculty bring the course through the curricular process, and 17 were for courses that are not currently expected to be offered again.

It is important to recognize in this overview that when a department conducted the assessment, they generally did it well – with 87% of submissions resulting in no concerns reported to the PSVPAA.

The most common issue that caused concern for the UAC (whether or not it resulted in probation) in the last cycle was a lack of substantial participation, where substantial participation was defined as data from a majority of instructors who taught the course as well as either a majority of sections or a majority of students taught. That issue was largely no longer present as departments had solidified their assessment practices and developed processes to house data in a central location during this most recent cycle.

In this cycle, the most common issues that caused concern for the UAC were a lack of detail on either the results or the action plans or a mismatch of the student learning outcomes assessed versus those published in the MSUM Bulletin. To address the mismatch of the student learning outcomes, faculty were advised to update their courses in the curriculum system. In addition, it was determined that for future reports, that issue will result in probation, and communication to the faculty of that determination has been included in many of the standard messages. These issues will be emphasized when member of the UAC meet with individual departments during AY 2026-2027.

The UAC also took the feedback that they received during the assessment process in Spring 2025 and used it to update a variety of practices. These include an updated and more streamlined form for the 2028 cycle and an updated rubric that UAC will use to rate the reports in 2028. Both the form and the rubric include clarifying language to help UAC maintain better consistency as well as to help the faculty know how their answers to various questions feed into the overall rating. In addition, additional language was included in the planning document that UAC follows as they implement General Education

assessment to further address consistency issues. The updated forms and rubric were posted in the D2L shell in Summer 2025 so faculty would have them available as they collect data for the three-year reports due in Spring 2028.

Programmatic Assessment [August 2024] – Academic Year 2022-2023, Reports due October 2022

Programmatic assessment is collected at the department level, but departments choose whether to assess their programs together or separately, so the count of expected assessment reports is less than the number of academic majors. All majors are expected to be assessed, including undergraduate and graduate programs and whether the program has specialized accreditation or not. If a program has specialized accreditation and the reports to that accrediting body include an assessment report, the program is asked to fill out an abbreviated form that provides the UAC with basic information about the program, but then attaches the assessment report provided to the accrediting body. The following table summarizes the results of the programmatic assessment collected in October 2022.

2022 Summary		
		Row Labels
expected	50	downloaded
expected	6	downloaded - update but not a report
expected	2	No Submission
	3	new program - expect report 2025
	5	did not exist
	0	(blank)
58	66	Grand Total
submitted of expected	96.6%	
reports submitted of expected	86.2%	
Those without reports	11	
Submitted data		
Of remaining, prog fac met with		
Total reports sub'd or later data	50	
Of	58	
%	86.2%	

It's informative to compare this to the similar information from the 2019 submission.

2019 Summary		
		Row Labels
expected	38	downloaded
expected	5	downloaded - update but not a report
	1	newly revised program - no data yet and group is new
expected	6	No Submission
expected	1	No Submission - new program with no graduates yet in 2019
expected	1	plan submitted, no results yet
	1	ugrad ended, grad not yet started/approved
	7	did not exist
	0	(blank)
51	60	Grand Total
submitted of expected	84.3%	
reports submitted of expected	74.5%	
Those without reports	14	
Submitted data	6	
Of remaining, prog fac met with	8	
Total reports sub'd or later data	44	
Of	52	
%	84.6%	

As can be seen from these two tables, the number of reports submitted increased from 38 to 50, increasing the percent of expected reports that were submitted from 74.5% to 86.2%. The number of non submissions also decreased substantially, from 6 to 2, although the number of “submitted non-submissions” increase slightly (from 5 to 6). Those are often faculty submitting the form with a statement that data was not collected along with an explanation.

The two non-submissions were for the English/Mass Communications dual major (housed in the department of English) and the Sustainability program. At this moment, Sustainability is moving departments from Physics/Astronomy to Anthropology/Earth Science, and is currently under consideration for revision or suspension.

The submitted non-submissions were Women’s and Gender Studies, Computer Information Systems, Computer Information Technology, Computer Science, Global Supply Chain Management, and Operations Management. Of these, only Computer Science submitted data in AY 2023/2024, in preparation for the report in the next cycle.

Third Year [August 2024] – Academic Year 2023-2024, Meet with Departments

There were a total of 26 groups that are responsible for submitting assessment reports: 23 academic departments, Honors, the Library, and the University Studies program. Due to time constraints, members of the academic subcommittee of the UAC was unable to meet with all of the groups, but prioritized those groups with the highest importance. High importance was determined by using the

programmatic assessment report of the previous year and their scores, though both programmatic and general education assessment was discussed in the meetings. Of the 26 groups, UAC met with 11. The other 15 groups were all considered low priority, with all programs in the department having submitted programmatic assessment reports, and most of those represented reports receiving scores of 18 or higher (out of 24 possible).

Feedback from members of the academic subcommittee was shared with the full UAC committee throughout the Spring 2024 semester. See the March and April minutes of the UAC meetings in particular for details.

As a result of those discussions, programmatic assessment reports will also be added to the Content area of the D2L Assessment course, so departments will be able to find both general education and programmatic assessment results from previous submissions in the same place. The programmatic reports and results will also be available in the assignment section of that D2L course, where they have been submitted and stored for the past couple of cycles.

Also in response to those discussions and feedback from the departments, the UAC co-chairs, Ellen Fagerstrom and Robert Nava, also met with IT during Summer 2024 to investigate the possibility of making some of the data collection more automatic for the departments. Initial feedback from IT was not encouraging, however, about the feasibility of making that happen.

Co-Curricular Assessment [updated October 2025]

Co-curricular assessment is done on an annual basis. Assessment plans for the upcoming academic year are due in August, reports on the year that just finished are due in June, and then the process repeats. Members of the co-curricular subcommittee of UAC review reports in late June or early July, and provide feedback to the departments prior to their submissions of new plans in August. The co-curricular subcommittee also reviews the plans after they are submitted, and provides feedback to the departments on their plans.

Through the leadership of Heather Phillips, a long-time member of the UAC and lead of the co-curricular subcommittee, co-curricular assessment underwent a significant update in Academic Year 2021-2022, including workshops with outside speakers on conducting effective co-curricular assessment and an update on the student learning outcomes. As a result of this update, although Plans were submitted in Summer 2021, no reports were asked for at the end of the year as the transition to the new process was happening. In Summer 2025, another significant update of the process was conducted, streamlining much of the reporting. The Summer 2025 updates did not change the student learning outcomes, but did make significant changes to the submission forms.

The summary of the co-curricular plans and reports is below. Note that there was a reorganization of departments in Summer 2025, so the number of departments included has changed for AY 2025-2026.

Totals	AY 2021-2022	AY 2022-2023	AY 2023-2024	AY 2024-2025	AY 2025-2026
Number of departments	12	12	12	12	13
Plans submitted (complete)	9	10	8	12	11
Plans and Reports submitted	NA	8	7	9	
Percent of plans submitted	75.0%	83.3%	66.7%	100.0%	84.6%
Percent of reports submitted		66.7%	58.3%	75.0%	

Participation is a bit variably but is generally growing. Note that although due in late Summer, Assessment Plans can be submitted late but will not necessarily be reviewed by UAC prior to the report. So the tentative numbers for AY 2025-2026 may increase.

It is noted that the quality of the reports have also been improving. In particular, they indicate that the departments are engaged in improving the student experience and co-curricular learning.

Distribution Summary

The sections of this report on the Academic/Programmatic Assessment and Academic/Third Year were finalized 2024/08/05. The sections on Academic/General Education Assessment and Co-Curricular Assessment were updated 2025/10/31. The report was and submitted to the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs, members of Provost's Council, and members of the University Assessment Committee on those dates. The report was prepared by the University Assessment Director Ellen Fagerstrom.