

_____ **This appears to be a duplicate plan** (or mostly) that was already submitted for another UI program. UI is required to have assessment plans in place that are specific to the major and degree level for all degree programs. The rubric used in this evaluation is based on this assumption being met, and therefore, will not produce a meaningful score. This assessment plan is being recorded as **NOT COMPLIANT**.

_____ **This plan/report was not updated for the 2016-17 assessment cycle.** The plan only contains that information that was rolled over by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation, as a courtesy to the program. UI is required to have an active assessment plan and reporting process, and the program has not participated in this process. The rubric used in this evaluation is based on this assumption being met, and therefore, will not produce a meaningful score. This assessment plan is being recorded as **NOT COMPLIANT**.

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Established	4 -- Mature
1. Identifying Measurable and Observable Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes			
A. Clarity and Specificity			
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., <i>know</i> , <i>understand</i>), 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., “ <i>graduating seniors in the Biology B.A. program.</i> ”)	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 (e.g., “ <i>graduating seniors in the Biology B.A. program.</i> ”) SLOs may be aligned with learning standards set by the industry-specific accreditor or professional association.
B. Student-centered Orientation			
No student learning outcomes are stated in student-centered terms	Some student learning outcomes are stated in student-centered terms	Most student learning outcomes are stated in student-centered terms	All student learning outcomes are stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do)
C. Program and Level Specific Outcomes			
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 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 specified level of study.
2. Mapping the Curriculum			
No activities/courses listed or documentation uploaded, 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

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan Progress (2017-18 Assessment Plans)

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Established	4 -- Mature
3. Using Effective Measures for Assessment			
A. Relationship between measures and student learning outcomes (alignment)			
No apparent relationship between student learning outcomes and measure indicated for one or more student learning outcomes	At a superficial level, it appears the content assessed by the stated measure matches the student learning outcomes, but no reassuring explanation or detail is given	General detail about how student learning outcomes relate to measures is provided. For example, the faculty wrote test items to match the student learning outcomes, or the instrument was selected “because its general description appeared to match our student learning outcomes”	Detail is provided regarding student learning outcomes and measurement match. For example, specific items on the test are aligned directly with the student learning outcome being assessed. The alignment and direct match is confirmed by faculty subject experts and documented accordingly.
B. Type of Measurement			
No measurement indicated for one or more student learning outcome(s)	Student learning outcomes are not assessed via direct measures (only with indirect measures)	Most student learning outcomes are assessed with direct measures	All student learning outcomes assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., tests, essays, student work product)
C. Benchmarks			
No benchmark given for one or more direct measures of student learning outcome(s)	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 or one or more benchmarks not aligned to measure; or did not provide both target and aspirational benchmarks	Desired result specified (e.g., “ <i>Our students will gain ½ standard deviation from junior to senior year.</i> ”, “ <i>Our students will score above a faculty-determined standard.</i> ”). “Gathering baseline data” is acceptable for this rating. Gives both target and aspirational benchmarks.	Desired result specified AND justified (e.g., “ <i>Last year the typical student scored 20 points on measure ‘x.’ The current cohort underwent more extensive coursework in the area, so we hope the average student scores 22 points or better.</i> ”)
D. Data Collection & Research Design Integrity			
No information is provided about the data collection process or data from direct measures is not collected, without reasonable justification (such as a 3-year cycle or other timeline)	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., 35 seniors took the test)	Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process, such as description of the sample, testing protocol, testing conditions, and student motivation. Several methodological flaws are persist such as under-representative sampling, convenience sampling, or inappropriate test conditions.	The data collection 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)
E. Reliable Results			
No process in place to check for inter-rater reliability, nor details provided on effort to improve reliability.	Reliability estimates (e.g., internal consistency, test-retest, inter-rater reliability) provided for more scores, although reliability tends to be poor. Or, author states how efforts have been made to improve reliability (e.g., raters were trained on rubric).	Reliability estimates provided for most scores, most scores are marginal or better. Evidence of inter-rater reliability efforts and/or improvement of scores.	Reliability estimates provided and are good. Plus, other evidence of a multi-year process and improvement to inter-rater reliability made.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan Progress (2017-18 Assessment Plans)

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Established	4 -- Mature
4. Reporting Program-Level Findings of Assessment			
A. Presentation of findings			
No findings presented for one or more direct measures of student learning outcomes, and no justification for lack of presentation	Findings are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the student learning outcomes or benchmark	Findings are present, and they directly relate to the student learning outcomes and the benchmark but presentation is sloppy or difficult to follow. Statistical analysis may or may not be present.	Findings are present, and they directly relate to the student learning outcomes and benchmark, are clearly presented, and were derived by appropriate statistical analysis.
B. History of findings (trend data or evaluation of findings over time) and closing the loop			
No documented 'closing of the loop' through documented reflection; or no past findings to reflect upon.	Only current year's findings provided or discussed in report; report lacks discussion of trend data.	Past iteration(s) of findings (e.g., last year's) provided for some assessment(s) in addition to current year's.	Past iteration(s) of findings (e.g., last year's) provided for majority of assessments in addition to current year's. Continuous findings allow for evaluating improvement; evidence of supportive and related discussion.
C. Interpretation of findings			
No interpretation attempted for one or more of direct findings reported; or there were no direct findings reported.	Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the student learning outcomes or benchmark. Or the interpretations are clearly not supported by the methodology or findings.	Interpretations of findings seem to be reasonable inferences given the student learning outcomes, benchmark, and methodology.	Interpretation of findings seem to be reasonable given the student learning outcomes, benchmarks, and methodology. Plus, multiple faculty interpreted findings (not just one person).

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan Progress (2017-18 Assessment Plans)

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Established	4 -- Mature		
5. Communicating Assessment Information and Data					
No evidence of communication documented or discussed	Information provided to limited number of faculty or communication process unclear	Information provided to all faculty, mode (e.g., program meetings, emails) and details of communication clear	Information provided to all faculty, mode and details of communication clear. In addition, information shared with others such as advisory committees and other stakeholders		
1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Established	4 -- Mature	Cusp of National Model for Learning Improvement	National Model for Learning Improvement
6. Documenting the Discussion/Use of Assessment Findings Toward Program Improvement					
A. Program modification and improvement regarding student learning and development					
No mention of any changes to improve student learning and / or achievement	Examples of changes documented but the link between the changes and the findings is not clear. It is not evident how changes resulted from assessment activity, nor why or how the change is expected to positively affect student achievement of student learning outcomes specifically.	Examples of changes. Or plans to modify documented and directly related to findings. However the changes lack specificity such as plans for implementation, who will be responsible, and/or a timeline.	Examples of or plans to make changes are documented and directly related to the findings. These changes are very specific and include approximate dates of implementation and where in the curriculum the changes will occur.	Evidence, from direct measures, suggesting learning improvement due to changes made. This program responded to previous assessment findings, made changes, RE-assessed, and found that student learning improved. Lack of clarity leave legitimate questions regarding the improvement interpretation.	Strong evidence, from direct measures, supporting substantive learning improvement due to program changes. This program responded to previous assessment findings, made changes, RE-assessed, and found learning improved. The rationale and explanation of the modifications leading to the change in findings is clear and the improvement interpretation can withstand reasonable critique from stakeholders and experts.
B. Improvement of assessment process					
No mention of how this iteration of assessment is improved from past administrations / cycle; no discussion for future improvement of assessment activities	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	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment activity, including flaws; plus evidence of revision, or general plans for improvement	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment activities including flaws; improvement have been made and more are planned. Specific details are given.	N/A	N/A

Scoring Sheet / Feedback

Course/Program/Degree Name:

Score with Sub-scoring

Section	Raw Score (total points for section)	Multiplier (weighting of section)	Sub-score
1. Student learning outcomes		Multiply by 1.667	/20
2. Curriculum map (bonus)		Multiply by 5	/20
3. Measures		Multiply by 1	/20
4. Findings		Multiply by 1.667	/20
5. Communication		Multiply by 5	/20
6. Use of Findings		Multiply by 2.5	/20
Trend Data:		Total Score (used for rating)*	/100
2015-16 Score:		Total Score w/curriculum mapping	/120
2016-17 Score:		Rating (section 2/mapping not included)	
2017-18 Score:			
Beginning	Developing	Established	Mature
1-29	30-50	51-75	75+
Submitted an assessment plan for the program but does not have a fully implemented process; and/or plan is not complete.	Is collecting some data, piloting efforts, engaged in conversations, and/or has operationalized a plan.	Some strategic and comprehensive assessment taking place for one or more learning outcomes. Some areas require further revision, clarification or additional evidence or analysis. Plan may need time to mature further.	Assessment plan fully supported by documentation and findings demonstrate student learning of most outcomes. Faculty are involved, evidence of meaningful analysis is presented, and the process is continuous, and being used to improve student learning and outcomes.

*The assessment system does not currently provide a dedicated section for curriculum mapping. While this is a key component of an assessment plan, due to system limitations in capturing this detail, it is not used for the quality rating of the plan. However, some programs choose to upload this detail as an attachment and are encouraged to continue this practice in preparation for a new system that will require collecting this information too.

Comments/Feedback from Evaluator:

NOTE:

Recommendations for continuing to improve the assessment plan and report: