

Academic Degree Annual Assessment Audit

Degree: <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	Year: <input style="width: 85%;" type="text"/>	Assessment Score (Sections 1-2 only) 0%
Completion of Approvals & Information Block	Date Yes/No	Rating by Section
Department Head Approval	<input type="text"/>	0. Annual Plan Components 0%
Dean Approval	<input type="text"/>	1. Student Learning Outcomes 0%
Office of Assessment Review	<input type="text"/>	2. Student Learning Assessment 0%
Program Level context	<input type="text"/>	3. Curriculum and Co-Curriculum 0%
List of Student Learning Outcomes Assessed?	<input type="text"/>	4. Teaching and Learning 0%
Curriculum changes noted?	<input type="text"/>	[Program Review sections 5-7] 5. Support 0%
Project Status updated?	<input type="text"/>	6. Academic Audit Process 0%
Included attachments noted?	<input type="text"/>	7. Follow-up of Previous Audit 0%

Directions: Mark the appropriate box with an X to indicate whether the criterion is No/Not Evident, Some, or Yes/All.

0. Annual Plan Components	No/ Not Evident (0)	Some (1)	Yes/All (2)
0.1 Plan assesses at least one outcome.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
0.2 Plan includes at least one measure with target for each outcome assessed.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
0.3 Plan includes findings/results.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
0.4 Plan includes appropriate reflections on findings/results.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
0.5 Plan includes discussion of improvements from past cycles and/or plans for future assessment cycles.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
0.6 Plan has updated each target status.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Subtotals:	0	0	0
Comments: <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>			0%

Annual Assessment Plan Quality

Directions: Rate the quality of each topic by marking the appropriate box with an X to indicate whether the criterion is not evident, emerging, established, or highly developed.

1. Student Learning Outcomes	Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
1.1 The program faculty has identified student learning outcomes appropriate for the discipline.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
1.2 SLOs are clear, measurable, and based upon appropriate processes for the discipline.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
1.3 The faculty has an appropriate process for evaluating program learning outcomes on a regular basis.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
1.4 Evaluation process takes into account best practices, stakeholder feedback and appropriate benchmarks in the field.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
1.5 The faculty has provided evidence to support items 1.1-1.4 such as faculty meeting and advisory board minutes, emails, reports, rubrics, sample assignments and exams, specialized accreditation review, etc.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Subtotals:	0	0	0	0

Comments:		0%
------------------	--	----

2. Student Learning Assessment		Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
2.1	The faculty uses indicators of student learning success that are aligned with student learning outcomes.				
2.2	The faculty assesses student learning at multiple points throughout the program.				
2.3	The faculty uses a variety of assessment methods appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.				
2.4	The faculty modifies teaching methods to improve student learning.				
2.5	The program regularly implements continuous quality improvements ("closing the loop") based upon previous years' assessment data.				
2.6	The faculty has provided evidence to support items 2.1-2.4 such as schedules/calendars, rubrics, results/data reports, faculty meeting minutes, curriculum committee approvals, program reviews, etc.				
Subtotals:		0	0	0	0

Comments:		0%
------------------	--	----

3. Curriculum and Co-Curriculum		Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
3.1	The faculty collaborates regularly on the design of curriculum and planned improvements.				
3.2	The faculty regularly analyzes the content and sequencing of courses as applicable in terms of achieving program learning outcomes.				
3.3	The faculty regularly reviews the curriculum based on appropriate evidence including comparison with best practices where appropriate.				
3.4	The program regularly incorporates appropriate complementary co-curricular activities and programs to supplement and support student learning				
3.5	The faculty has provided evidence to support items 3.1-3.4 such as faculty meeting minutes, curriculum change forms, curriculum committee minutes, curriculum map, program reviews, documentations of co-curricular assessment, etc.				
Subtotals:		0	0	0	0

Comments:		0%
------------------	--	----

4. Teaching and Learning		Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
4.1	The faculty regularly collaborates in designing, developing and delivering teaching methods that improve student learning throughout the program.				

4.2	The faculty promotes the effective use of instructional materials and teaching tools, including technology as appropriate, for achieving student mastery of learning objectives.				
4.3	The program regularly evaluates the effectiveness of teaching methods and the appropriateness of instructional materials (peer review or other).				
4.4	The faculty analyzes and collaboratively reviews evaluation results on a regular basis.				
4.5	The faculty engages in regular professional development that enhances its teaching, scholarship and practice.				
4.6	The faculty has provided evidence to support items 4.1-4.5 such as faculty meeting minutes, proof of relevant professional development given and/or attended (schedules, emails, certificates), peer review schedules, etc.				
Subtotals:		0	0	0	0
Comments:					0%

Program Review					
Date of Self-Study:					
Date of Mid-Point Review:					
5. Support		Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
5.1	The program regularly evaluates its library, technology, equipment and facilities, encouraging necessary improvements within the context of overall college resources.				
5.2	The program's operating budget is consistent with the needs of the program.				
5.3	The program has a history of enrollment and/or graduation rates sufficient to sustain high quality and cost-effectiveness.				
5.4	The program has provided evidence to support items 5.1-5.3 such as library & resource inventories, approved purchase requests, program advisory minutes and/or program review addressing these items, reports on enrollment and graduation rates.				
Subtotals:		0	0	0	0
Comments:					0%

6. Academic Audit Process (Complete this section during Mid-point Review or Self-Study years)		Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
6.1	The Academic Audit process was faculty driven.				
6.2	The Academic Audit process (Self Study and site visit) included descriptions of the program's quality processes.				
6.3	The Academic Audit process resulted in a thorough description of program strengths and program weaknesses.				
6.4	The Academic Audit process resulted a prioritized list of initiatives for improvement.				
6.5	The Academic Audit process included involvement of and inputs from appropriate stakeholder groups (external reviewers).				

6.6	The program has provided evidence to support items 6.1-6.5 such as library & resource inventories, approved purchase requests, program advisory minutes and/or program review addressing these items, reports on enrollment and graduation rates.				
Subtotals:		0	0	0	0
Comments:					0%
7. Follow-up of Previous Audit (complete this section after a Self-Study year)		Not Evident (0)	Emerging (1)	Established (2)	Highly Developed (3)
7.1	The program has implemented the plans for its initiatives for improvement cited by the faculty in the previous self-study report including any changes to those initiatives for improvement.				
7.2	Recommendations made by the Academic Auditor Team have been considered and, when feasible and appropriate, implemented and tracked.				
7.3	The program has provided evidence to support items 7.1-7.2 such as institutional response to external review recommendations, advisory board and faculty meeting minutes, etc.				
Subtotals:		0	0	0	0
Comments:					0%
Auditor:	Title:		Date:		

