

**Program:**  
**Reporting Year: 2023**

**Assessment Report - Section I: Assessment of Program Outcomes**

1. Outcome(s) Assessed:	Outcome(s) assessed: 1. 2. 3. etc.					
	<i>Advanced [A]</i>	<i>Satisfactory [S]</i>	<i>Developing [D]</i>	<i>Missing [M]</i>	<i>Not Applicable [N/A]</i>	<i>Score</i>
<b>Outcome Statement</b>	The outcome statement is a clear, concise and measurable statement which uses action verbs to describe the knowledge, skills and attitudes students will be able to demonstrate upon successful completion of the program.	The outcome statement uses action verbs (or is clear enough to infer student action) to describe the measurable knowledge, skills, and attitudes students will be able to demonstrate upon successful completion of the program (as in Bloom's Taxonomy).	The outcome statement is unclear and lacks a verb which would make it a measurable statement which describes the knowledge, skills and attitudes students will be able to demonstrate upon successful completion of the program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Learning/Research Question</b>	The learning/research question is clear and provides detailed information about the purpose and reason for examining the outcome(s) selected at the point in the curriculum indicated.	The learning/research question is clear and provides sufficient information about the purpose and reason for examining the outcome(s) selected.	The learning/research question is not indicated, restates the outcome, or is unclear and does not provide basic information about the purpose or reason for examining the outcome(s) selected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Achievement Level:</b>						
<b>Comments:</b>						

2. Data / Evidence	<i>Advanced [A]</i>	<i>Satisfactory [S]</i>	<i>Developing [D]</i>	<i>Missing [M]</i>	<i>Not Applicable [N/A]</i>	<i>Score</i>
<b>Artifact/Evidence: Direct versus Indirect</b>	A well-formulated collection of direct evidence <u>OR</u> a mixed methods approach with a combination of direct and indirect evidence was used.	At least a single source of direct evidence was used.	Only sources of indirect data/evidence (e.g., surveys, GPA, course grades) were used.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**DETAILED REPORT FEEDBACK: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**  
**UNDERGRADUATE/ FIRST PROFESSIONAL/GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM**

<b>2. Data / Evidence</b>	<b>Advanced [A]</b>	<b>Satisfactory [S]</b>	<b>Developing [D]</b>	<b>Missing [M]</b>	<b>Not Applicable [N/A]</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Sample</b>	The student sample is justified as representative of the population/program resulting in meaningful and generalizable results for the population/program.	The student sample appears to be sufficient enough to produce results which are generalizable to the population/program.	The student sample appears to be insufficient to be representative (the population to which the results would be generalized was not provided or was not clear) and may not produce useful results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Course and Time Sampling</b>	Data/evidence reflected student work across multiple courses/sections/requirements and multiple semesters.	Data/evidence reflected student achievement from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a comprehensive course or requirement (e.g. capstone, portfolio, thesis, comprehensive exams) <b>OR</b></li> <li>• a <i>representative number of sections</i> of a single course during a narrow timeframe <b>OR</b></li> <li>• at least <i>one course over multiple semesters</i>.</li> </ul>	Data/evidence reflected student achievement from a narrow course or time sample: student work examined from one course/one section/one semester.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Achievement Level:</b>						
<b>Comments:</b>						

<b>3. Evaluation Process</b>	<b>Advanced [A]</b>	<b>Satisfactory [S]</b>	<b>Developing [D]</b>	<b>Missing [M]</b>	<b>Not Applicable [N/A]</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>What Tool* Was Used to Evaluate the Student Work; Level of Student Achievement Expected (when using the tool)</b>	The evaluation tool was provided with additional details (about the evaluation process, the development of the tool) which enhanced the report; the expected level of achievement was provided.	The evaluation tool was described and provided; the expected level of achievement was provided.	The evaluation tool <u>or</u> the expected level of achievement was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Who Conducted the Evaluation Process, and How Was it Conducted</b>	Roles and responsibilities for the evaluation process were provided including how they used the evaluation tool; details of the evaluation process and/or additional documentation enhanced the report.	Roles and responsibilities for the evaluation process were provided; the evaluation process was described; engagement of more than one faculty member.	It is unclear who conducted the evaluation process, or there was limited if any faculty engagement to interpret the results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Who Interpreted the Evidence</b>	Roles and responsibilities for the interpretation of assessment results were provided with additional information which enhanced the report (e.g. how participants were convened; process by which results were aggregated and reviewed).	Roles and responsibilities for the interpretation of results were noted; identified faculty participation to support objectivity of interpretation of results and process.	It is unclear who interpreted the assessment results, or one person conducted the project and interpreted the evidence independently.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Achievement Level:</b>						
<b>Comments:</b>						

**DETAILED REPORT FEEDBACK: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**  
**UNDERGRADUATE/ FIRST PROFESSIONAL/GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM**

<b>4. Results &amp; Reflection</b>	<i>Advanced [A]</i>	<i>Satisfactory [S]</i>	<i>Developing [D]</i>	<i>Missing [M]</i>	<i>Not Applicable [N/A]</i>	<i>Score</i>
<b>Analysis of Quantitative/ Qualitative Results</b>	The analysis was clear and complete, included the identification of strengths and weaknesses, and was enhanced by supporting materials (graphs, charts, documents, etc.) which provided more depth to the report.	The analysis was clear and complete and included the identification of patterns of strength and weakness.	The analysis was unclear or incomplete.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Comparison between Expected &amp; Actual Results (includes qualitative results when appropriate)</b>	A quantitative comparison between the expected and actual results was provided with additional details which enhance the meaning of the comparison.	A quantitative comparison between the expected and actual results was provided.	The actual results provided were unclear or incomplete.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Reflection &amp; Conclusions</b>	Comprehensive reflection about the results supported detailed conclusions; includes who the program stakeholders are and how and when the results will be shared with them. Includes all results whether favorable or unfavorable.	Reflection about the results supported at least one conclusion; includes who the program stakeholders are <u>OR</u> how the results will be shared with them. Includes some results (whether favorable or unfavorable).	The reflection did not appear to support the conclusions; does not include who the program stakeholders are nor how the results will be shared with them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Achievement Level:</b>						
<b>Comments:</b>						

<b>5. Recommendations &amp; Action Steps</b>	<i>Advanced [A]</i>	<i>Satisfactory [S]</i>	<i>Developing [D]</i>	<i>Missing [M]</i>	<i>Not Applicable [N/A]</i>	<i>Score</i>
<b>Recommendations</b>	Reflections and conclusions were transformed into actions to be taken with detailed explanations on how results have been/will be used in programs' decision making.	Reflections and conclusions were transformed into at least one proposed action(s) to be taken, including some explanations on how results have been <u>OR</u> will be used in programs' decision making.	Reflections and conclusions were not translated into actions to be taken <b>OR</b> the actions were not clearly connected to the reflections and conclusions. Reflection includes little to no information on future use in decision making.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Action Steps</b>	A detailed plan and timeline for implementing recommendations and for re-evaluation was provided.	A basic plan and timeline for implementing the recommendations and for re-evaluation was provided.	Plans to implement recommendations were unclear, <b>OR</b> a timeline for re-evaluation was unclear.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Achievement Level:</b>						
<b>Comments:</b>						

**DETAILED REPORT FEEDBACK: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**  
**UNDERGRADUATE/ FIRST PROFESSIONAL/GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM**

5. Recommendations & Action Steps	<i>Advanced [A]</i>	<i>Satisfactory [S]</i>	<i>Developing [D]</i>	<i>Missing [M]</i>	<i>Not Applicable [N/A]</i>	Score
<b>Overall Achievement Level for Section I</b>						

**Program:**  
**Reporting Year: 2022**

**Assessment Report - Section II: Follow-up on Recommendations to Assess the Impact of Change**

1. Follow-up on prior recommendations	Outcome(s) Re-assessed: 1. 2. etc.					
	Advanced [A]	Satisfactory [S]	Developing [D]	Missing [M]	Not Applicable [N/A]	Score
Learning Outcome/ Research Question	Learning outcome and research question(s) were provided for each re-evaluated learning outcome in the previous report.	Learning outcome(s)/research question(s) were provided for <u>some</u> re-evaluated learning outcomes in the previous report.	No learning outcome(s)/research questions were provided from past report(s) for the re-evaluated learning outcomes in the previous reports.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Recommendations from prior reports	A description of the recommendation was provided, noting whether and when the change was implemented (including date), and how the program assessed the impact of the change.	A description of the recommendation was provided, noting if the change was implemented, and limited information on how the program assessed the impact of the change.	A description of the recommendation was provided only.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Achievement Level:</b>						
<b>Comments:</b>						

2. Data/Evidence	Advanced [A]	Satisfactory [S]	Developing [D]	Missing [M]	Not Applicable [N/A]	Score
Artifact/Evidence: Direct versus Indirect	A well-formulated collection of direct evidence <u>OR</u> a mixed methods approach with a combination of direct and indirect evidence was used.	At least a single source of direct evidence was used.	Only sources of indirect data/evidence (e.g., surveys, GPA, course grades) were used.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sample Size	The student sample is justified as representative of the population/program resulting in meaningful and generalizable results for the population/program.	The student sample appears to be sufficient and should be generalizable to the population/program and produce useful results.	The student sample appears to be insufficient to be representative and may not produce useful results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Course and Time Sampling	Data/evidence reflected student work across multiple semesters and multiple courses/sections/requirements.	Data/evidence reflected student achievement from: a comprehensive course or requirement (e.g. capstone, portfolio, thesis, comprehensive exams) <b>OR</b> multiple sections of a single course <b>OR</b> at least one course over multiple semesters <b>OR</b> multiple courses during one or more semesters.	Data/evidence reflected student achievement from a narrow course or time sample: student work examined from one course/one section/one semester.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

\*Examples: Rubric, juried form, scoring sheet

**DETAILED REPORT FEEDBACK: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**  
**UNDERGRADUATE/ FIRST PROFESSIONAL/GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM**

2. Data/Evidence	<i>Advanced [A]</i>	<i>Satisfactory [S]</i>	<i>Developing [D]</i>	<i>Missing [M]</i>	<i>Not Applicable [N/A]</i>	Score
<b>Achievement Level:</b>						
<b>Comments:</b>						

3. Evaluation Process	<i>Advanced [A]</i>	<i>Satisfactory [S]</i>	<i>Developing [D]</i>	<i>Missing [M]</i>	<i>Not Applicable [N/A]</i>	Score
<b>What Tool* Was Used to Evaluate the Student Work; Level of Student Achievement Expected (when using the tool)</b>	The evaluation tool was provided with additional details (about the evaluation process, the development of the tool) which enhanced the report; the expected level of achievement was provided.	The evaluation tool was described and provided; the expected level of achievement was provided.	The evaluation tool <u>or</u> the expected level of achievement was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Who Conducted the Evaluation Process, and How Was It Conducted</b>	Roles and responsibilities for the evaluation process were provided including how they used the evaluation tool; details of the evaluation process and/or additional documentation enhanced the report.	Roles and responsibilities for the evaluation process were provided; the evaluation process was described; engagement of more than one faculty member.	It is unclear who conducted the evaluation process, or there was limited if any faculty engagement to interpret the results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Who Interpreted the Evidence</b>	Roles and responsibilities for the interpretation of assessment results were provided with additional information which enhanced the report (e.g. how participants were convened; process by which results were aggregated and reviewed).	Roles and responsibilities for the interpretation of results were noted; identified faculty participation to support objectivity of interpretation of results and process.	It is unclear who interpreted the assessment results, or one person conducted the project and interpreted the evidence independently.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Achievement Level:</b>						
<b>Comments:</b>						

4. Results & Reflection	<i>Advanced [A]</i>	<i>Satisfactory [S]</i>	<i>Developing [D]</i>	<i>Missing [M]</i>	<i>Not Applicable [N/A]</i>	Score
<b>Analysis of Quantitative/ Qualitative Results</b>	The analysis was clear and complete, included the identification of strengths and weaknesses, and was enhanced by supporting materials (graphs, charts, documents, etc.) which provided more depth to the report.	The analysis was clear and complete and included the identification of patterns of strength and weakness.	The analysis was unclear or incomplete.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

\*Examples: Rubric, juried form, scoring sheet

**DETAILED REPORT FEEDBACK: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**  
**UNDERGRADUATE/ FIRST PROFESSIONAL/GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM**

<b>4. Results &amp; Reflection</b>	<i>Advanced [A]</i>	<i>Satisfactory [S]</i>	<i>Developing [D]</i>	<i>Missing [M]</i>	<i>Not Applicable [N/A]</i>	Score
<b>Comparison between Expected &amp; Actual Results (includes qualitative results when appropriate)</b>	A quantitative comparison between the expected and actual results was provided with additional details which enhance the meaning of the comparison.	A quantitative comparison between the expected and actual results was provided.	The actual results provided were unclear or incomplete.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Reflection &amp; Conclusions</b>	Comprehensive reflection about the results supported detailed conclusions; includes who the program stakeholders are and how and when the results will be shared with them. Includes all results whether favorable or unfavorable).	Reflection about the results supported at least one conclusion; includes who the program stakeholders are <u>OR</u> how the results will be shared with them. Includes some results (whether favorable or unfavorable).	The reflection did not appear to support the conclusions; does not include who the program stakeholders are nor how the results will be shared with them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Achievement Level:</b>						
<b>Comments:</b>						

<b>5. Recommendations &amp; Action Steps (Responses may vary if more than one outcome was examined; align response with outcome as needed.)</b>	<i>Advanced [A]</i>	<i>Satisfactory [S]</i>	<i>Developing [D]</i>	<i>Missing [M]</i>	<i>Not Applicable [N/A]</i>	Score
<b>(IF YES) Future Decision-Making and Planning</b>	Addresses whether the results will be/have been used in decision-making and planning, and includes a timeframe for implementation of the change and/or reassessment as needed.	Addresses whether the results will be/have been used in decision-making and planning, and/or includes a timeframe for reassessment as needed.	Does not address results being used in the decision making process or does not include a timeframe for implementation and reassessment as needed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>(IF NO) Recommendations &amp; Action Steps</b>	Indicated if the changes were not effective and included detailed follow-up information for responding to results, including future recommendations and/or a timeline as appropriate.	Indicated if the changes were not effective and included follow-up information, including any additional recommendations and/or a timeline as appropriate.	Indicated if the changes were not effective, but did not indicate follow-up plans OR did not make recommendations that appeared consistent with results and reflection.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Achievement Level:</b>						
<b>Comments:</b>						

<b>Overall Achievement Level for Section II</b>	
---	--

**DETAILED REPORT FEEDBACK: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**  
**UNDERGRADUATE/ FIRST PROFESSIONAL/GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM**

**Program:**  
**Reporting Year: 2022**

<u>Legend of Scores</u>
A = Advanced
S = Satisfactory
D = Developing
M = Missing
N/A = Not Applicable

**Assessment of Program Outcomes: Report Summary**

<b>Summary of Achievement Level Scores for Section I</b> <i>Outcome(s) Assessed: Must report on <u>at least one outcome</u>. Extra lines included just in case.</i>	Outcome Statement	Data/ Evidence	Evaluation Process	Results & Reflection	Recommendations & Action Steps	Level of Achievement for each Outcome
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
<b>OVERALL ACHIEVEMENT SCORE FOR SECTION I:</b>						

<b>Summary of Achievement Level Scores for Section II</b> <i>Outcome(s) Re-assessed: Refers to recommendations for change <u>associated with an outcome</u> but made in a prior assessment report(s). Extra lines included just in case.</i>	Prior Recomm	Data/ Evidence	Evaluation Process	Results & Reflection	Recommendations & Action Steps	Level of Achievement for each Outcome
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
<b>OVERALL ACHIEVEMENT SCORE FOR SECTION II:</b>						



**DETAILED REPORT FEEDBACK: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES  
UNDERGRADUATE/ FIRST PROFESSIONAL/GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM**