

Criteria	1	2	3	4
<p>Process</p> <p>Is the plan being implemented faithfully and revised as needed?</p>	<p>Assessment plan is not implemented.</p>	<p>Most aspects of plan are being implemented or all aspects are implemented to some degree.</p>	<p>Assessment plan is fully implemented.</p>	<p>Plan is faithfully executed and modified/evaluated as needed.</p>
<p>Explanations:</p>				
<p>Engagement</p> <p>Are all relevant parties are meaningfully involved in the creation/revision, implementation, analysis, interpretation and learning improvement process?</p>	<p>Limited involvement beyond chair/director</p>	<p>All department faculty are aware of process and results</p>	<p>All department faculty participate in conversations regarding the use of assessment data to improve student learning</p>	<p>All relevant stakeholders (students, employers, alumni) are meaningfully involved in the creation/revision, implementation, analysis, interpretation, and/or improvement processes associated with this assessment plan.</p>
<p>Explanations:</p>				

Criteria	1	2	3	4
<p>Student Learning Objectives</p> <p>Are the student learning objectives clear, measurable, aligned with ULOs/GLOs, and representative of the range of learning for that major/program?</p>	<p>Objectives are problematic (vague, abstract, not aligned with ULOs/GLOs) or missing.</p>	<p>Objectives are clear, mostly measurable, partially aligned with ULOs/GLOs.</p>	<p>Objectives are clear, measurable, aligned with ULOs/GLOs, and represent an overview of the knowledge, skills, beliefs, and values that are important for a graduate of this major/program, accounting for variations in learning outcomes due to tracks/concentrations</p>	<p>Objectives are clear, measurable, aligned with CW(G)EOs, and representative of the range of learning that is important for this program.</p> <p>The learning objectives provide a comprehensive view of the knowledge, skills, beliefs, and values that are important for a graduate of this major/program and accounting for variations in learning outcomes due to tracks/concentrations</p>
<p>Explanations:</p>				

Criteria	1	2	3	4
<p>Measures</p> <p>Are the instruments used to assess learning relevant for the objective? Do measures yield information/data you can use to drive improvement?</p>	<p>Not all objectives have a measure identified.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Measures do not directly connect to the objectives.</p>	<p>All objectives have at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Measures connect to learning objectives superficially or tangentially and/or include learning other than stated objectives.</p> <p>Relies almost exclusively on the same form of assessment (survey, exam, project).</p> <p>Relies almost exclusively on data from a single source (course, program, activity).</p>	<p>All objectives have at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Some objectives have multiple measures.</p> <p>Measures clearly connect to learning objectives.</p> <p>And two of the following four criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives measured more than one point in time (formative). • Indirect measures are used strategically. • Plan incorporates different forms of assessment (survey, exam, project). • Plan incorporates data from a variety of sources (course, program, activity). 	<p>Measures meet all of the following criteria:</p> <p>All objectives have at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Some objectives have multiple measures.</p> <p>Measures clearly connect to learning objectives.</p> <p>Objectives measured more than one point in time (formative).</p> <p>Indirect measures are used strategically.</p> <p>Plan incorporates different forms of assessment (survey, exam, project).</p> <p>Plan incorporates data from a variety of sources (course, program, activity).</p>
<p>Explanations:</p>				

Criteria	1	2	3	4
<p>Timeline</p> <p>Is the timeline for data collection manageable with sufficient data points to effectively inform decision making and program review?</p>	<p>Not identified clearly for all measures.</p>	<p>Clearly states semester/year for each objective/measure.</p> <p>Data analysis delayed from data collection.</p> <p>Time between collection points may not facilitate informed decision making.</p>	<p>Clearly stated and manageable schedule.</p> <p>At least two data points for each objective per review cycle.</p>	<p>Timeline for data collection is manageable and allows for continuous improvement with timely and meaningful decision making even before program review.</p>
<p>Explanations</p>				
<p>Targets</p> <p>Are the targets based on professional standards and/or experience with student work? Are targets challenging and achievable?</p>	<p>Some targets are missing.</p>	<p>Targets are arbitrarily chosen or reflect minimal expectations.</p>	<p>Targets are challenging and achievable based on prior data, and reflect the level of performance a novice professional knows/can do.</p>	<p>Targets are challenging and achievable.</p> <p>Targets are based on professional standards and/or prior data and experience with student work and reflect the level of performance a novice professional knows/can do.</p> <p>Targets are set at a level to inspire program improvement.</p>
<p>Explanations:</p>				

Criteria	1	2	3	4
<p>Use of student learning data from prior academic year</p> <p>Is the department effectively examining and using assessment data to revise curriculum and pedagogy to support student learning?</p>	<p>Assessment data not collected/analyzed/used for decisions and/or results not documented in AEFIS.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Data collected, documented and discussed by department. •Department reviewed confidence in measures and data as sufficient indicators of student performance. •If data indicated changes were needed, action plans were developed in consultation with dean (e.g. improving outcomes, measures, targets, curriculum or pedagogy). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Data collected, documented and discussed by department. •Department and dean confirmed confidence in measures and data as sufficient indicators of student performance. •Action plans (e.g. improving outcomes, measures, targets, curriculum or pedagogy) developed in consultation with dean. •If prior year data warranted action plans, the department implemented the changes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Department collected and discussed follow-up data after the implementation of action plans in order to determine whether changes resulted in improvement or whether additional action is necessary, and/or •Data confirms effective curriculum and pedagogy for learning outcomes. <p>*Score of 4 should be assigned only if objectives, measures, targets and timeline all score a 4.</p>
<p>Explanations:</p>				
<p>Dissemination</p> <p>Is the department communicating learning objectives, results and improvements related to student learning to a wide audience?</p>	<p>No record of assessment results and changes made as a result of assessment findings.</p>	<p>The department/program retains records of assessment results and positive changes made as a result of assessment findings, and results are entered in assessment software system.</p>	<p>The department/program retains records of assessment results and changes made as a result of assessment findings, results are entered in assessment software system, and assessment results and improvements are publicly posted.</p>	<p>The department/program retains records of assessment results and changes made as a result of assessment findings, and results are entered in assessment software system. Assessment results and improvements are publicly posted and shared proactively with faculty, prospective students, employers and alumni in ways that facilitate their discussion.</p>

Criteria	1	2	3	4
Explanations:				