

Academic Degree Annual Assessment Audit

Degree:		Year:	2021	Overall Quality Score:	0%
Completion of Approvals & Information Block		Date	Yes/No		
Review	Department Head Approval		Program Level context provided?	A. Student-centered learning objectives	0%
	Dean Approval		List of Student Learning Outcomes Assessed?	B. Systematic method for evaluating progress on objectives	0%
	Office of Assessment Review		Curriculum changes noted?	C. Results of program assessment	0%
			Project Status updated?	D. Use of results for improvement	0%
			Included attachments noted?		
Comments:					

Annual Assessment Plan Quality

Directions: Rate the quality of each topic by entering the corresponding points to indicate whether the criterion is Not Evident (0), Emerging (1), Established (2), or Highly Developed (3).

A. Student-centered learning objectives		Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
A.1	The program faculty has identified student learning outcomes appropriate for the discipline.	No student learning outcomes are specific to the program or related industry's content. Outcomes are very vague or general and could apply easily to any degree program.	Some learning outcomes are specific to the program, but not all. Or they are all program-specific, but not all are appropriate for the degree level (example: B.A. vs M.S.)	Most or all learning outcomes are program specific and most or all are appropriate for the learning occurring for the degree level.	All student learning outcomes are clearly aligned to the content taught within the program and prepare graduates for employment in the related field. They are also appropriate for the degree level, referring to learning occurring during the specific level of study. Student learning outcomes may be aligned with learning standards set by the industry-specific accreditor or professional association.
	<i>Enter score in this row:</i>				
A.2	<u>Clarity and Specificity:</u> SLOs are clear, measurable, and based upon appropriate processes for the discipline.	No student learning outcomes stated; or highly deficit (most programs have 3-5 student learning outcomes or more)	Student learning outcomes present, but written with imprecise verbs (e.g., know, understand), vague description of content/skill or attitudinal domain, and non-specificity of whom should be assessed (e.g., "students")	Student learning outcomes generally are written using precise verbs, informative descriptions of the content/skill or attitudinal domain and specifications of whom should be assessed (e.g., "graduating seniors in the Bioogy B.A program")	All student learning outcomes are stated with clarity and specificity using precise verbs, informative description of the content/skill or attitudinal domain, and specification of whom should be assessed.
	<i>Enter score in this row:</i>				
A.3	<u>Orientation:</u> SLOs are student-centered.	No objectives stated in student-centered terms.	Some objectives stated in student-centered terms.	Most objectives stated in student-centered terms.	All objectives stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do).
	<i>Enter score in this row:</i>				
A.4	<u>Course/learning experiences are mapped to objectives:</u> The program has developed a curriculum map aligning student learning outcomes to courses and activities.	No activities/courses listed or documentation provided, lacks evidence of curriculum alignment	Related activities/courses documented but alignment to student learning outcomes is absent	Most student learning outcomes have classes or activities aligned to them	All student learning outcomes have classes or activities aligned to them.
	<i>Enter score in this row:</i>				
Comments:					0

B. Measures		Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
B.1	<u>Relationship between measures and objectives:</u> The faculty uses indicators of student learning success (measures) that are aligned with student learning outcomes.	Seemingly no relationship between objectives and measures	At a superficial level, it appears the content assessed by the measures matches the objectives, but no explanation is provided.	General detail about how objectives relate to measures is provided. For example, the faculty wrote items to match the objectives, or the instrument was selected "because its general description appeared to match our objectives"	Detail is provided regarding objective-to-measure match. Specific items on the test are linked to objectives. The match is affirmed by faculty subject experts (e.g., through a backwards translation).
	<i>Enter score in this row:</i>				
B.2	The faculty assesses student learning at multiple points throughout the program.	No evidence of student learning assessment at multiple points in the program	Evidence of student learning assessment in at least two points in the program	Evidence of student learning assessment occurring formatively and summatively for at least one outcome in the program.	Evidence of assessment for 3 or more objectives occurring formatively and summatively in the program.
	<i>Enter score in this row:</i>				
B.3	<u>Types of Measures:</u> The faculty uses a variety of assessment methods appropriate to the outcomes being	No measures indicated	Objectives are not assessed via direct measures (only with indirect measures)	Most objectives assessed with direct measures.	All objectives assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., tests, essays)
	<i>Enter score in this row:</i>				
B.4	<u>Specification of desired results for objectives</u>	No statement of desired results for objectives.	Statement of desired result (e.g., student growth, comparison to previous year's data, comparison to faculty standards, performance vs. a criterion), but no specificity (e.g., students will grow; students will perform better than last year)	Desired result specified. (e.g., our students will gain ½ standard deviation from junior to senior year; our students will score above a faculty-determined standard). "Gathering baseline data" is acceptable for this rating.	Desired result specified AND justified (e.g., Last year the typical student scored 20 points on measure x. The current cohort underwent more extensive coursework in the area, so we hope that the average student scores 22 points or better.)
	<i>Enter score in this row:</i>				

B.5	<u>Data collection & research design integrity.</u> The faculty has an appropriate process for evaluating program learning outcomes on a regular basis.	No information is provided about data collection process or data not collected.	Limited information is provided about data collection such as who and how many took the assessment, but not enough to judge the veracity of the process (e.g., thirty-five seniors took the test).	Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process, such as who and how many took the assessment and description of the sample. However, methodological flaws may exist such as unrepresentative sampling, testing conditions, testing protocol, or mismatch with specification of desired results.	The data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired results (e.g., representative sampling, adequate motivation, two or more trained raters for performance assessment, pre-post design to measure gain, cutoff defended for performance vs. a criterion)
<i>Enter score in this row:</i>					
Comments:					0
C. Results of program assessment		Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
C.1	Presentation of Results	No results presented	Results are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the objectives or the desired results for the objectives.	Results are present, and they directly relate to the objectives and the desired results for objectives but presentation may be difficult to follow. Statistical analysis may or may not be present.	Results are present, and they directly relate to objectives and the desired results for objectives, are clearly presented, and were derived by appropriate statistical analyses.
<i>Enter score in this row:</i>					
C.2	Interpretation of Results	No interpretation attempted	Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the objectives or desired results of objectives. Or, the interpretations are clearly not supported by the methodology and/or results.	Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable inferences given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology	Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. Plus, multiple faculty interpreted results (not just one person). And, interpretation includes how classes/ activities might have affected results.
<i>Enter score in this row:</i>					
C.3	The faculty has provided evidence to support results of program assessment such as faculty meeting and advisory board minutes, emails, reports, rubrics, sample assignments and exams, specialized accreditation review, etc.	No evidence provided	At least one item of evidence is included.	Faculty have provided more than one type of evidence to support program assessment.	Several types of evidence have been included to support statements made and provide strong argument for effectiveness of assessment activities.
<i>Enter score in this row:</i>					
Comments:					0
D. Use of results for improvement		Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
D.1	<u>Program modification and improvement regarding student learning and development.</u> The program regularly implements continuous quality improvements ("closing the loop") based upon previous years' assessment data.	No mention of any modifications	Examples of modifications documented but the link between them and the assessment findings is not clear.	Examples of modifications (or plans to modify) documented and directly related to findings of assessment. However, the modifications lack specificity.	Examples of modifications (or plans to modify) documented and directly related to findings of assessment. These modifications are very specific (e.g., approximate dates of implementation and where in curriculum they will occur.)
<i>Enter score in this row:</i>					
D.2	The faculty modifies teaching methods to improve student learning.	No evidence provided.	Unsupported statement that modifications have been made.	Statement of modified teaching methods provide evidence to support statement.	Strong rationale for teaching modifications provided along with evidence to show why such modifications were selected.
<i>Enter score in this row:</i>					
D.3	Improvement of assessment process	No mention of how this iteration of assessment is improved from past administrations.	Some critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws, but no evidence of improving upon past assessment or making plans to improve assessment in future iterations.	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws; Plus evidence of some moderate revision, or general plans for improvement of assessment process.	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws; both present improvements and intended improvements are provided; for both, specific details are given. Either present improvements or intended improvements must encompass a major revision.
<i>Enter score in this row:</i>					
D.4	The faculty has provided evidence to support use of results for improvement such as schedules/calendars, rubrics, results/data reports, faculty meeting minutes, curriculum committee approvals, program reviews, etc.	No evidence provided.	At least one item from description has been included.	Faculty provide multiple items of evidence to show how results have been used to improve student learning.	Evidence of student learning improvement along with a rationale and explanation of the choice is provided.
<i>Enter score in this row:</i>					
Comments:					0