

If assessment is not useful, you're doing it wrong. Ask for help.

Fundamental Questions:

1. Have you clearly stated what you intend students to attain as a result of completing your program?
2. Are your curricular and co-curricular offerings designed to improve student attainment of those outcomes?
3. Do you measure student attainment of those outcomes with measures/methods that yield useful information?
4. Do you use assessment results to make improvements (to both your program and your program assessment)?

Annual Assessment Process (documents evidence for all 4 fundamental questions):

Forms are to be updated July 1 each year: drive.google.com

Forms will be evaluated again this year by the Assessment Committee. Feedback will be provided.

For 2013-14, 19 of our 72 programs met all expectations. 38 programs had not completed the online form.

Review the process and expectations at: sau.edu/Assessment/Resources_and_Reports/Annual_Assessment_Process.html

Materials from last year's annual assessment workshops are available upon request.

Programs that met 2013-14 expectations for annual assessment (as of 8/1/2014):

Accounting	Economics	Nursing
Biology	Finance	Psychology (B.A.)
Computer & Network Investigations	Master of Criminal Justice	Teacher Education
Computer Network Administration	Master of Ed. in Ed. Administration	Theology
Computer Science	Master of Education in Teaching	Women & Gender Studies
Doctor of Business Administration	Master of Occupational Therapy	
Doctor of Physical Therapy	Mathematics	

Program Review Process (focuses on evidence regarding fundamental questions 2 and 4):

See [Possible questions for 5 yr review for EPC members](#) on EPC Blackboard page (tab: Info for Reviews)

- A) Program evaluation (goals and evidence not directly linked to student learning outcomes)
- Student satisfaction/engagement, course evaluations, student/alumni surveys (The Outcomes Survey)
- Key Question: How are the results from these measures used for improvement?

B) Program assessment

1. Documentation: **annual assessment forms**, feedback from Assessment Committee, assessment results
2. Evidence that SLOs are appropriate to your mission, program, students (DQP tuning opportunity)
3. Evidence that SLOs are aligned across delivery formats
4. Document process of using assessment results
5. Evidence that your faculty share responsibility for assessment
6. Reflect on assessment evidence (propose improvements to program and program assessment)
7. Evidence that you share assessment results

Other Resources:

- Institutional Assessment & Evaluation Plan: http://www.sau.edu/Assessment/Assessment_Plans.html
- Campus-wide reports: sau.edu/Assessment/Resources_and_Reports/Campus-Wide_Assessment_Reports.html

Assessment Quality Indicator	Poor practice	Emerging practice	Good practice	Exemplary practice
Faculty attitudes We believe assessment...	is just a tool to address accreditation or for top-down accountability	is a nice-to-have add-on to our busy schedule	is useful for helping students learn and teachers teach	is a normal part of the learning cycle that can also be used for accountability
Faculty awareness of program-level assessment practices	Some of our faculty do not know we have program-level student learning outcomes or assessment methods.	Most faculty are aware of the existence of program-level outcomes and assessment methods, but they are not familiar with them.	The majority of our full-time faculty could identify our program-level outcomes and assessment methods. Faculty teach towards the outcomes.	Our full-and part-time faculty are familiar with program-level outcomes and actively teach towards (and assess attainment of) them.
Faculty awareness of program-level assessment requirements and expectations	I do not know or understand our institutional expectations for assessment.	I am aware of institutional expectations, but I need some help/training to improve my understanding.	I understand institutional expectations for assessment or know where to go to find this information	I understand institutional expectations and used those expectations to evaluate my assessment plan
Faculty collaboration	We assign one person to handle assessment for our department	We assign multiple faculty members to handle assessment.	Most of our full-time faculty discuss program-level assessment plans and results	A majority of our faculty actively collaborate on plans, assessment tools, and results.
Priority	We do not have the time, resources, or motivation to complete any formal program-level assessment.	We attempt to meet minimum requirements, but assessment is not a priority for our program (perhaps due to a lack of resources)	Assessment is a priority for our program. We have resources to ensure we can meet requirements for the current year.	Assessment is a top priority for our program. We actively plan assessment methods years in advance and budget accordingly.
Planning	We do not have an assessment plan that informs our practice for the next several years.	We have a multi-year plan, but we often need to make changes or defer assessment to the next year.	We have a multi-year plan and have managed to keep up with that plan.	Our multi-year assessment plan allows us to determine if changes we make positively impact learning.
Usefulness	We have not found program-level assessment to be useful.	We have assessed outcomes and collected data that were easiest to collect.	We have assessed some important outcomes & have used that information to make or propose changes.	We have made (and can document) improvements because of our program-level assessment activities.
Feedback to students	Students know little or nothing about program SLOs. Communication of outcomes to students is spotty or nonexistent	Students have some knowledge of program outcomes. Communication is occasional and informal, left to individual faculty or advisors	Students have a good grasp of program outcomes. They may use them to guide their own learning. Outcomes are included in most syllabi and the program website.	Students are well-acquainted with program outcomes. They are skilled at self-assessing in relation to the outcomes and levels of performance.
Did we do assessment?	We did not turn in assessment results or we went through the motions to meet requirements.	We tried to meet the request for assessment, but we need some more help/training to get better at this.	We submitted assessment results last year and found those results to be useful	We have used assessment data for years to make changes in curriculum and/or teaching that should improve student success.

Plan Quality Indicator	Poor practice	Emerging practice	Good practice	Exemplary practice
Clear, student-focused program-level student learning outcomes (SLOs)	Some SLOs are not student-focused; they are more like statements of what we do as instructors.	All SLOs are student-focused, but some are not clearly defined.	All SLOs are clear statements of what <u>students</u> should be able to do as a result of our program	All SLOs are clear, student-focused statements. SLOs specify criteria to evaluate successful attainment.
Appropriate SLOs	SLOs are not comprehensive or representative of our program. SLOs are not appropriate for the level of our program (SLOs are low-level knowledge outcomes).	SLOs are comprehensive and representative of our program but some may be not be appropriate for <u>program-level</u> outcomes.	SLOs, which may include affective outcomes, have been informed by external standards or professional organizations. They include higher-level skills.	SLOs specify criteria to evaluate successful attainment that are based on external benchmarks or standards.
Outcomes can be assessed	SLOs do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning. Verbs such as "understand" do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and assessed.	Most of the outcomes indicate how students can demonstrate their learning.	Each outcome describes how students can demonstrate learning, e.g., "Graduates can write reports in APA style"	Outcomes describe how students can demonstrate their learning. Faculty have agreed on explicit criteria statements, such as rubrics, and have identified examples of student performance at varying levels for each outcome.
Alignment (Curriculum Map)	There is no clear relationship between the outcomes and the curriculum that students experience.	The map shows students appear to be given reasonable opportunities to develop the outcomes in the required curriculum.	The curriculum is designed to provide opportunities for students to learn and to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome.	Pedagogy, grading, curriculum, student support services, and co-curricular activities are intentionally aligned with SLOs. Curriculum map indicates increasing levels of proficiency.
Course alignment with program-level SLOs	Some courses do not contribute to program-level SLOs	All courses contribute to at least one program-level SLO, but students are not aware of this alignment.	The program can demonstrate how course outcomes align with program-level outcomes.	Course syllabi include course-level outcomes and clearly demonstrate alignment with program-level outcomes
Assessment measures	Some outcomes have not been assessed.	Some outcomes are assessed only once by one measure. Some outcomes are not assessed directly.	All outcomes are assessed with multiple measures, including at least one direct measure of student performance.	All outcomes are assessed with multiple measures, including at least one direct measure of student performance. Measures are authentic and include external benchmarks.
Quality measures	We do not know if our assessments are of high-quality. Assessments have not generated useful information.	All our measures align with our outcomes and have yielded useful information, but we have no evidence of the quality	We are actively working to collect evidence to demonstrate our measures are high-quality. We use rubrics, multiple-raters, and other quality control methods as needed.	We have documented evidence of the quality of our assessment methods/measures.

Based on Salt Lake Community College rubric: <https://www.slcc.edu/assessment/docs/Assessment%20Quality%20Rubric.pdf>

Plan Quality Indicator	Poor practice	Emerging practice	Good practice	Exemplary practice
Frequency of program assessment	Our schedule indicates some SLOs will not be assessed every 5 years.	All SLOs will be assessed over a 5-year period; at least one SLO is assessed each year	Each SLO will be assessed at least twice over a 5-year period; at least one SLO will be assessed each year.	All program SLOs will be assessed at least once every 3 years.
Results	We did not submit any assessment results by July 1	We provided results, but unfamiliar readers would find it difficult to understand what they mean.	We provided assessment results that an outside reader could understand. We identified the sample of students who were assessed (response rate), along with the assessment method.	We provided assessment results that an outside reader could understand. We identified the sample of students who were assessed (response rate), along with the assessment method. We also briefly described the assessment method (including how it was scored). Results were compared to criteria set by faculty.
Meaningful results	We did not consider the meaning of the results	We provided basic comments about each set of results we collected	We made meaning of each set of data in ways that could inform our teaching practice.	We explored and reflected on the meaning of the data in our report in terms of strengths and weaknesses in student learning and success. If possible, results were interpreted while considering curricular requirements and student experiences.
Useful results	We did not report any curricular decisions or changes to current practice	We listed mainly short phrases denoting future actions such as "goal met, no change" or "add more on x topic" in our report.	We described decisions/ changes to: curriculum, teaching practice, and/or operational procedures.	We reflected on our decisions & changes, in terms of student success.
Follow-up	We did not discuss future plans.	We mentioned what steps we would take next.	We suggested a way to measure the relative success of any changes we consider.	We described specific plans for measures that will help us determine if changes made a difference in student learning.
Dissemination	Results were not submitted.	Results were submitted to online form; faculty were not given results or did not discuss results	Results were submitted online and to faculty; results were discussed by faculty	Results were submitted online and to faculty; results were discussed by faculty, students, and other stakeholders