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 | ***Program Assessment Feedback Form*** |
| **Program Name:**  |
| **Student Learning Outcomes** | **Rating Guidelines** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| 1. Each student learning outcome is clearly stated in terms of measurable student learning (what should students know, be able to do and/or value). | All student learning outcomes are stated in terms of measurable criteria. | Yes  |   |
| Not all student learning outcomes are clearly stated and/or are measurable according to specified criteria. The comments should address which outcomes are not measurable and provide suggestions for improvement. | Partially  |
| Student learning outcomes or measurement criteria are not articulated. | No |
| 2. The assessment plan. | There is a clear yearly or multi-year assessment plan. | Yes  |   |
| There is an assessment plan, but it is incomplete or lacks clarity. | Partially  |
| There is no assessment plan. | No |
| 3. Alignment of PLOs with course content and assignments. | Each program learning outcome is aligned with course content and assignments.  | Yes  |   |
| Some PLOs are aligned. | Partially  |
| There is no alignment. | No |
| **Annual Assessment Activity** | **Rating Guidelines** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| 4. Evidence is collected for at least one program learning outcome. If not, there is a plan for systematically assessing each learning outcome on a regular cycle. | Evidence is collected for at least one student learning outcomes and/or the program describes a specific cycle for collecting evidence for each student learning outcome. | Yes  |   |
| Evidence collection mechanism is in place, but it is difficult to determine how it links to the student learning outcomes and/or evidence are not collected for every student learning outcome. | Partially  |
| No clear evidence collection mechanism exists. | No |
| Some evidence collection mechanism seems to be in place, but difficult to determine to what extent it is used to track student learning outcomes. | Unable to determine |
| 5. The evidence sources are appropriate to the student learning outcomes being assessed. | Evidence sources are appropriate to the objective measurement of student learning outcomes and the evidence collection is sustainable.  | Yes  |   |
| Some evidence sources are appropriate and applicable to the student learning outcomes but not all. | Partially  |
| No evidence is collected and/or the evidence does not seem appropriate. | No |
| Unable to determine whether the evidence source used is appropriate and/or absence of link to specific student learning outcomes. | Unable to determine |
| 6. The evidence collection approach is clearly identified including the type of measure, when it is administered, and to whom it is administered, as applicable. | Evidence collection description includes the type of measures/methodology, when and to whom it is typically administered are clearly outlined.  | Yes  |   |
| Evidence collection occurs, but the measure(s), timing and/or population are not specified for each evidence source. | Partially  |
| No clearly identified evidence collection approaches are in place. | No |
| 7. There are multiple evidence sources (direct, indirect, longitudinal, cross-sectional) used for each student learning outcome. | Multiple evidence sources are being used for several student learning outcomes. | Yes  |   |
| Multiple evidence sources are used for one or two student learning outcomes and/or plans are underway to add other evidence sources in the near future. | Partially  |
| Multiple evidence sources are not used. Program does not seem to have plans to use multiple evidence sources. | No |
| Use of multiple evidence sources deemed not applicable to the program. This designation may require justification as to why the program cannot use multiple evidence sources.  | N/A |
| 8. Students are involved in the culture of assessment. | There is documentation of specific methods and processes for student involvement. | Yes  |   |
| Reference to student involvement is generic, but not specifically described and/or no follow-up discussion on actions called for by findings.  | Partially  |   |
| No evidence of student involvement. | No |   |
| **Analysis of Results** | **Rating Guidelines** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| 9. The results and interpretations are appropriate for assessment of each student learning outcome. | Results and interpretations presented are appropriate for assessing all student learning outcomes. Tables and charts or narrative summaries are provided for clarity. | Yes  |   |
| Results and interpretations are appropriate for assessing at least some of the student learning outcomes. | Partially  |
| No analysis or interpretations of results. | No |
| Some analysis and interpretations provided, but unable to determine how they relate to assessing the student learning outcomes. | Unable to determine |
| 10. There are benchmark targets or expectations, either as a percentage or in qualitative terms, for student achievement of the learning outcomes are articulated and evaluated. | Target performance level, as a percentage or qualitative expectations, of student achievement of the student learning outcomes clearly specified. | Yes  |   |
| Target performance level indicated for some student learning outcomes but not all.  | Partially  |
| No target performance levels indicated.  | No |
| Some reference to desired achievement level but references are unclear and/or not linked to any student learning outcome. | Unable to determine |
| 11. The findings are compared to earlier years' results, with a description of similarities and differences, where relevant. | Findings include trend analyses and year-to-year comparisons, outlining the differences and similarities. Qualitative comments are encouraged. | Yes  |   |
| Findings include some trend analyses and/or year-to-year comparisons, but not for each student learning outcome. | Partially  |
| No trend analysis presented. |   |
| No trend analysis is relevant. | No |
| **Use of Results** | **Rating Guidelines** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| 12. The faculty are involved in discussion of findings and recommended actions based upon them. | Clear documentation of program faculty and/or staff discussion of findings and follow-up actions called for by the findings. | Yes  |   |
| Reference to faculty involvement is generic, i.e. "discussed in faculty meeting" but not specifically described and/or no follow-up discussion on actions called for by findings.  | Partially  |
| No faculty involvement in discussion of findings. | No |
| Unable to determine the extent to which all faculty members are involved in the discussion of findings and determination of appropriate actions. | Unable to determine |
| 13. Where appropriate, actions have been taken to improve the program as a result of the assessment. | List of specific actions taken to improve the program vis-à-vis the findings and/or as a result of year-to-year assessment activities including feedback from Peer Review outlined or described.  | Yes  |   |
| Some actions taken to improve the program, including decisions to put some actions on hold for unspecified reasons. | Partially  |
| No actions taken to improve the program. | No |
| Unable to determine what specific actions were taken and/or how the actions listed relate to program assessment findings and/or improvements in student learning outcomes. | Unable to determine |
| 14. Where appropriate, actions have been taken to improve the assessment methods as a result of the current or previous years' assessment findings. | Substantial improvements have been made to the program's assessment process as a result of year-to-year assessment findings and/or consultation with faculty. | Yes  |   |
| Some improvements to program assessment process made as a result of the assessment findings. | Partially  |
| No changes were made to the assessment process.  | No |
| **Summary** | **Rating Guidelines** | **Rating** | **Comments** |
| 15. Please comment on the strengths and limitations of the program assessment activities and provide a summary rating.  | Yes on all 14 items --and supported by documentation. Solid assessment process based on student learning outcomes, faculty involvement and discussion of the findings; meaningful and usable evidence collection and analysis; assessment evidence used to improve and build on program and student learning outcomes.  | Exemplary |   |
| Mostly yes on items #1-#14. The presence of some strategic blueprint toward complete and comprehensive assessment of all student learning outcomes. Some areas still need further clarification or additional evidence collection and analysis work. | Established |
| Beyond initial development stages, collecting some evidence on a pilot basis, continuing conversations about various elements of the assessment plan. | Progressing |
| Acknowledges the role of program assessment, but does not yet have a fully implemented process. | Emerging |
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