

Assessment Report Qualitative Feedback Checklist

Please read this form in its entirety; it will answer many of your questions.

Program: _____

Date: _____

Addressing Feedback

How to decode feedback provided:

- **Red Text:** needs to be addressed on your end; items are numbered
- **Orange Highlight:** will be addressed by our team
- **Blue Text:** for future reference
- **Purple Text:** best practice considerations (optional)

Step 1: Outcomes and Methods

This is feedback that needs to be addressed in the first two columns (Outcomes and Methods) of the report. Once submitted via the chart below, the IE team will make these changes in the system.

Instructions: If **red numbered text** feedback was provided for the Outcomes and Methods columns, please **type the corrective actions/changes below in its corresponding number.**

| Assessment Report – Outcomes and Methods | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| Comment Number | Changes for Outcomes and Methods (Type changes you'd like to make below) | Need Help (X) |
| 1. | | |
| 2. | | |
| 3. | | |
| 4. | | |
| 5. | | |
| 6. | | |
| 7. | | |
| 8. | | |
| 9. | | |
| 10. | | |

Continue to next page for Step 2: Results, Use of Results & Follow-ups.

Step 2: Results, Use of Results for Improvement & Follow-Ups

This is feedback that needs to be addressed in the second two columns (Results and Use of Results) of the report. Once submitted via TracDat, the IE team will review these changes in the system.

Instructions: If **starred red text** feedback was provided for these areas, **please log-in to TracDat to make the necessary corrections to each starred item.**

If you need assistance with TracDat, please [visit our website](#) for video tutorials and guides. If you need further assistance, please [request an appointment](#).

Have you addressed all **starred feedback in the Results, use of Results and Follow-up/Evidence sections of the report?**

Yes _____

- Thank you for completing all revisions, the IE team will review your changes.

No _____

- Contact reviewer for assistance

Does the assessment report state “data not collected” or “data not available”?

Note: “Data not available” has been entered by IE staff when there were blanks under the RESULTS column.

_____ Yes, and I do **not** have data to report or my data were not collected.

_____ Yes, and I do have data to enter. **(If so, then enter data in related results.)**

_____ No, I do not have “data not collected” or “data not available” in the results column.

Step 3: Future Assessment Plans

Assessment Plan for Next Cycle

Do you have new or modified outcomes and/or methods for the next academic year? (Please check below). This is **not** related to the feedback provided on your redlined report.

Yes _____

- [Find appropriate template on our website](#) and complete new plan
- [Use this form](#) to submit new plan

No _____

- No further action required

Assessment Report

Program - CEC Information Technology SLO (BS) ONLINE

① Missing mission statement.

| Outcomes | Assessment Method | Results | Use of Results for Improvement |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>C.K. -</p> <p>Practical proficiency in state-of-the-art software systems/Content Knowledge. - Students will demonstrate practical proficiency in selection, installation, customizing and maintenance of the state-of-the-art software systems.</p> <p>Outcome Status: Active</p> <p>Competency Category: Content Knowledge and Skills (including Technology)</p> <p>Outcome Start Date: 08/01/2018</p> <p>Outcome End Date: 08/01/2030</p> <p>Sub-competency: Technology</p> | <p>Rubric - A sample of students' responses (all students in one section) to embedded multiple choice questions (designed by the faculty as appropriate) in the final examination of CGS 3767 is evaluated to assess the level of student achievement.</p> <p>Sampling: All students' responses in one section of CGS 3767.</p> <p>Minimum Criteria for Success: Students will demonstrate proficiency or better based on the following scoring rubric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Novice, - Apprentice, - Proficient, - Expert. <p>Method Status: Active</p> <p>Course Assessed: CGS 3767</p> | <p>Reporting Period: 2018 - 2019</p> <p>Criterion Status: B. 90% to 99% Met</p> <p>For the software concepts, out of 40 students: 33 students got Expert, 6 students got Proficient. No students got Apprentice, 1 student got Novice. (10/10/2019)</p> <p>Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:</p> <p>Final Exam Review.pptx</p> <p>CGS3767 Evidence Fall 2019.docx</p> <p>Syllabus for CGS3767 RVC 1198.pdf</p> | <p>Use of Results for Improvement:</p> <p>The professor will change the exam to be proctored beginning in Summer 2019. (10/10/2019)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Beginning in the summer of 2019 the exam for this course was modified so it is now proctored using Honorlock. The actual test bank was not changed. This was changed in the syllabus. (03/03/2020)</p> |
| <p>②</p> <p>This outcome is no longer required. Please let us know if you would like to archive.</p> <p>Technology</p> <p>Proficiency in state-of-the-art computing infrastructure/Technology - Students will demonstrate proficiency in selection, installation, customizing and maintenance of the state-of-the-art computing infrastructure.</p> | <p>Rubric - A sample of students' responses (all students in one section) to embedded multiple choice questions (designed by the faculty as appropriate) in the final examination of CGS 3767 is evaluated to assess the level of</p> | <p>Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018</p> <p>Criterion Status: A. 100% Met</p> <p>For the software concepts: 24 students got a 4 or higher, No students got below 4. The average score was 4.81 (10/09/2018)</p> <p>Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017</p> <p>Criterion Status: N/A</p> <p>This is a new program and results will be reported starting in the 2017-2018 AY. (09/04/2017)</p> | <p>Use of Results for Improvement:</p> <p>This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (01/09/2019)</p> <p>Use of Results for Improvement:</p> <p>This is a new program and results will be reported starting in the 2017-2018 AY. (05/04/2018)</p> |
| <p>Proficiency in state-of-the-art computing infrastructure/Technology - Students will demonstrate proficiency in selection, installation, customizing and maintenance of the state-of-the-art computing infrastructure.</p> | <p>Rubric - A sample of students' responses (all students in one section) to embedded multiple choice questions (designed by the faculty as appropriate) in the final examination of CGS 3767 is evaluated to assess the level of</p> | <p>Reporting Period: 2018 - 2019</p> <p>Criterion Status: B. 90% to 99% Met</p> <p>For the hardware concepts, out of 40 students: 39 students got Expert, 0 students got Proficient. 1 student got Apprentice 0 got Novice.</p> | <p>Use of Results for Improvement:</p> <p>The professor will change the exam to be proctored beginning in Summer 2019. (10/11/2019)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Beginning in the summer of 2019 the exam for this</p> |

* How might this improve content knowledge

* Indicate how this might improve skills related to technology

| Outcomes | Assessment Method | Results | Use of Results for Improvement |
|----------|-------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
|----------|-------------------|---------|--------------------------------|

Outcome Status: Active
Competency Category: Content Knowledge and Skills (including Technology)
Outcome Start Date: 08/01/2018/6
Outcome End Date: 08/01/2030
Sub-competency: Technology

student achievement.
Sampling: All students' responses in one section of CGS 3767.
Minimum Criteria for Success: Students will demonstrate proficiency or better based on the following scoring rubric:
 - Novice,
 - Apprentice,
 - Proficient,
 - Expert.
Method Status: Active
Course Assessed: CGS 3767

(10/11/2019)
Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018
Criterion Status: A. 100% Met
 For the hardware concepts: 23 students got 4 or higher, 1 student got 3 or higher. The average score for hardware concepts was 4.88. (10/09/2018)
scored at the expert level
scored proficient

course was modified so it is now proctored using Honorlock. The actual test bank was not changed. This was changed in the syllabus. (03/03/2020)

Use of Results for Improvement: This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (01/09/2019)

Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017
Criterion Status: N/A
 This is a new program and results will be reported starting in the 2017-2018 AY. (09/04/2017)

Use of Results for Improvement: This is a new program and results will be reported starting in the 2017-2018 AY. (05/04/2018)

Proficiency in one area of specialization/Critical Thinking
 Students will demonstrate proficiency in at least one area of specialization within the field of Information Technology including:-
 System Administration (CTS4348)
 Applied Network administration (CNT4504),
 Databases (COP4722),
 Application Development (COP4813 and/or COP4005)
Outcome Status: Active
Competency Category: Critical Thinking
Outcome Start Date: 08/01/2019/6
Outcome End Date: 08/01/2030
Sub-competency: Technology

Rubric - A random sample of (a minimum of 10) students' responses to embedded questions (designed by the faculty as appropriate) in the final examination of appropriate courses is evaluated to assess the level of student achievement.
Sampling: A random sample of students' responses (a minimum of 10)
Minimum Criteria for Success: Students will demonstrate proficiency or better based on the following scoring rubric:
 - Novice,
 - Apprentice,
 - Proficient,
 - Expert
Method Status: Active

Reporting Period: 2018 - 2019
Criterion Status: N/A
 (1) System Administration (CTS4348): During 2018-2019, SCIS offered CTS4348. Most of the students achieved a score of apprentice or lower on the short answer regarding high level question about various UNIX services. The question encompasses the configuration, management, ports and network setup understanding of the client/server service. Based on the 21 assessed students we gathered the following: 1. For students who only pointed at the obvious issue received novice with a total of 7 students. 2. For students who dived deeper into the client/server relationship issue received apprentice with a total of 5 students. 3. For students with a clear definition of the issue and understanding of the bigger picture received proficient with a total of 5 students. 4. For students who understood the problem to the point of postulating multiple fixes to the issue received expert with a total of 4 students.

Use of Results for Improvement: CTS 4348: Provide more feedback to students earlier in the semester. This will help those who need extra help get the resources needed to succeed. Add more hands on configuration examples so that students don't just repeat the material from the book, but rather speak authoritatively from experience on the subject matter.

COP 4813: The instructor will focus more on building the understanding of browser & server interaction which will allow such a question to be better interpreted.

COP 4722: To improve the course I am going to institute a more rigorous review process for the exams, since all the materials in

(2) Web Applicatn
 Prog. (COP 4813): Total students: 16 Expert: 5 Proficient: 6 Apprentice: 5 Novice: 0
 (3) Database

③ Are these courses electives (in curriculum map) *please report total # meeting

minimum criteria for success

| Outcomes | Assessment Method | Results | Use of Results for Improvement |
|----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>(COP4722): Spring 2019 section, 18 students assessed: Expert: 0 Proficient: 1 Apprentice: 0 Novice: 0 Failed: 17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: right;">(4) Win</p> <p>Programming - It: (COP4005): COP4005: 1 out of 19 assessed students (all students enrolled in online section of COP 4005) performed at or above expert (≥ 90) level (5.26%), 3 performed at or above proficient (≥ 80 & < 90) level (15.79%), 5 performed at the Apprentice (≥ 70 & < 80) level (26.32%), 3 at the Novice (≥ 60 & < 70) level (15.79%) and 7 at the Failed (< 60) level (36.84%). (10/10/2019)</p> <p>Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents: CTS 4348- Lab HAProxy.pdf CTS 4348- Lab- HTTPD.pdf Final Exam Review- COP 4005.pptx</p> | <p>these questions are well covered in the course material.</p> <p>COP 4005: Opened mid-term discussion among students asking for feedback and suggestions; got quite positive response. The instructor will post a "Review" for final exam and summarize all knowledge points learned in this course to help students for a better understanding (10/10/2019) <i>cat: course resources, fac/stu int.</i></p> <p>Follow-Up: CTS 4348: A couple of hands on labs were implemented with step by step instructions for students which has helped. On the second exam there was an increase of students answering the same question leading to proficient and expert levels for Fall 2019.</p> <p>COP 4813: I have created and shared individual white board style videos for various topics, in particular the understanding of browser and server interactions, to help the students build a solid underpinning understanding of this topic.</p> <p>COP 4722:</p> <p>COP 4005: I attached the COP 4005 Final Exam Review as specified in 2018-2019 report. The following is the mid-term check in for students survey: Student Major(s):</p> |

| Outcomes | Assessment Method | Results | Use of Results for Improvement |
|----------|-------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
|----------|-------------------|---------|--------------------------------|

Student Classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Graduate Student Master Year 1, PHD Year 2...):

Purpose to Take This Course:

To get credits for graduation
 To explore some area of Computer that I have interests
 To plan for my future career
 To follow my current career path
 Other, please specify:
 Any suggestion to instructor:

College math or computer course(s) taken (please specify title & course code, number, e.g. COP 4005 Windows Programming for IT Majors): (02/16/2020)

** Same comment as above*

Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018

Criterion Status: C. 80% to 89% Met

(1) System Administration (CTS4348): During 2017-2018, SCIS offered CTS4348-RVCC. Most of the students achieved a score of proficient or higher on the short answer regarding high level troubleshooting of DNS services. The question encompasses the configuration, management and network setup understanding of a client/server in regard to DNS. Based on the 20 assessed students we gathered the following: 1. For students who only pointed at the obvious issue received novice with a total of 4 students. 2.

For students who dived deeper into the client/server relationship issue received apprentice with a total of 4 students. 3. For students with a clear definition of the issue and understanding of the bigger picture received proficient with a total of 7 students. 4.

For students who understood the problem to the

Use of Results for Improvement:
 This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (09/14/2018)

| Outcomes | Assessment Method | Results | Use of Results for Improvement |
|----------|-------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
|----------|-------------------|---------|--------------------------------|

point of postulating multiple fixes to the issue received expert with a total of 5 students.

_____ (2) Applied Network Administration (CNT4504): This course is not available to fully online students at this time.

_____ (3) Database (COP4722): 9 out of the 12 students assessed in COP 4722 in Fall 2017 met the minimum criterion of answering at least 75% of the embedded questions correctly. The average score was 81% questions answered correctly across all 12 students. Students tended to fail at questions related to the concepts relating to the Query Optimizer, JOINS and Advanced Data Models more than the other concepts addressed.

_____ (4) Application Development (COP4813 and/or COP4005): COP4813: In Spring 2018, 14 students took the final exam. Results: Expert: 5 - Proficient: 7 - Apprentice: 2 - Novice: 0 COP4005: 10 out of 19 assessed students (all students enrolled in one section of COP 4005) performed at or above expert level (52.6%), 8 performed at the Proficient level (42.1%), 0 at the Apprentice level (0%) and 0 at the Novice level (0%). (09/14/2018)

Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017
Criterion Status: N/A
 This is a new program and results will be reported starting in the 2017-2018 AY. (09/04/2017)

Use of Results for Improvement:
 This is a new program and results will be reported starting in the 2017-2018 AY. (05/04/2018)

Reporting Period: 2018 - 2019
Criterion Status: H. 30% to 39% Met
 Of the 19 students who were evaluated: 3 were at expert level 4 were at proficient level 4 were at apprentice level 8 were at novice level (10/11/2019)

Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:
[CGS 3095 - 17-18 vs 18-19 Oral and Written - Graham.docx](#)

Use of Results for Improvement:
 Students are doing well, but I have changed the exam to proctored beginning in Summer 2019. (11/04/2019)

Follow-Up: Just prior to the 2017-2018 year, to give students more practical experience, I changed

④ Are there any specific indicators?

Oral

Communication Skills in IT -Oral -
 Students will demonstrate effective oral communication skills in information technology.
Outcome Status: Active
Competency Category: Communication (Oral or Written)
Outcome Start Date: 08/01/2018

Rubric - Student achievements on oral presentations in CGS3095 are evaluated to assess student achievement in effective communication skills.
Sampling: All students in CGS 3095
Minimum Criteria for Success: All students will demonstrate Proficient


* Relationship to improvement in oral skills?

⑤ please be more specific

| <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Assessment Method</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Use of Results for Improvement</i> |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Outcome End Date: 08/01/2030 Sub-competency: Oral</p> | <p>(3) of better in oral communications skills on the following scoring rubric:</p> <p>1= Novice 2 = Apprentice 3 = Proficient 4 = Expert</p> <p>Method Status: Active Course Assessed: CGS3095</p> | <p style="color: red; font-size: 1.5em; text-align: center;">* missing follow-up and evidence</p> | <p>the assignment for individual presentations significantly. The new assignment required students to choose one of the source articles they'd found to use in their individual paper research and to summarize it in two written forms – a discussion form post and a single "quad chart"-style powerpoint slide – and then to orally present their work in class while their "quad chart" was being displayed. Each student was required to evaluate every other student's in-class presentation, giving them the chance to reflect on what made a good presentation, seeing a wide variety of recent source articles, and potentially finding articles that would help in their own research.</p> <p>This process worked well in 2017-2018 (compared to previous years), so only minor tweaks to the repeated discussions and instructions given in class were made in 2018-2019. By Spring 2019, most students were compliant in all aspects of the semester-long assignment. (02/14/2020)</p> |
| | | <p>Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018 Criterion Status: F. 50% to 59% Met Out of 50 students assessed in Summer 2017, 0 students scored a 3 and 28 students scored a 4. The average score from this sample is 3.32. (10/06/2018)</p> | <p>Use of Results for Improvement: This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (03/07/2019)</p> |
| | | <p>Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017</p> | <p>Use of Results for Improvement:</p> |

| Outcomes | Assessment Method | Results | Use of Results for Improvement |
|----------|-------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
|----------|-------------------|---------|--------------------------------|

Criterion Status: N/A
 This is a new program and results will be reported starting in the 2017-2018 AY. (09/04/2017)

 This is a new program and use of results will be reported starting when two years of data are collected. (05/04/2018)

written

Communication Skills in IT - Written
 Students will demonstrate effective written communication skills in information technology.
Outcome Status: Active
Competency Category: Communication (Oral or Written)
Outcome Start Date: 08/01/2018
Outcome End Date: 08/01/2030
Sub-competency: Written

Rubric - Student achievements on final papers in CGS3095 are evaluated to assess student achievement in effective communication skills.
Sampling: All students in CGS 3095
Minimum Criteria for Success: All students will demonstrate Proficient (3) of better in oral communications skills on the following scoring rubric:

- 1= Novice
 - 2 = Apprentice
 - 3 = Proficient
 - 4 = Expert
- Method Status:** Active
Course Assessed: CGS3095

Reporting Period: 2018 - 2019
Criterion Status: F. 50% to 59% Met
 Of the 19 students who were evaluated:
 5 were at expert level
 5 were at proficient level
 0 were at apprentice level
 9 were at novice level (10/11/2019)

* Same comment as above

Attach Follow-up Evidence or Related Documents:
[CGS 3095 - 17-18 vs 18-19 Oral and Written - Graham.docx](#)


Use of Results for Improvement:
 Students are doing well, but I have changed the exam to proctored beginning in Summer 2019. (11/04/2019)

Follow-Up: Just prior to the 2017-2018 year, to give students more practical experience, I changed the assignment for individual presentations significantly. The new assignment required students to choose one of the source articles they'd found to use in their individual paper research and to summarize it in two written forms – a discussion form post and a single "quad chart"-style powerpoint slide – and then to orally present their work in class while their "quad chart" was being displayed. Each student was required to evaluate every other student's in-class presentation, giving them the chance to reflect on what made a good presentation, seeing a wide variety of recent source articles, and potentially finding articles that would help in their own research.

This process worked well in 2017-2018 (compared to previous years), so only minor tweaks to

6
 → Please add more details.

7 Any specific indicators?

| <i>Outcomes</i> | <i>Assessment Method</i> | <i>Results</i> | <i>Use of Results for Improvement</i> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | <p>the repeated discussions and instructions given in class were made in 2018-2019. By Spring 2019, most students were compliant in all aspects of the semester-long assignment. (02/14/2020)</p> |
| | | <p>Reporting Period: 2017 - 2018 Criterion Status: E. 60% to 69% Met Out of 50 students assessed in summer 2017, 12 students scored a 3 and 18 students scored a 4. The average score from this sample is 2.99. (10/06/2018)</p> | <p>Use of Results for Improvement: This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. No Use of Results required. (03/07/2019)</p> |
| | | <p>Reporting Period: 2016 - 2017 Criterion Status: N/A This is a new program and results will be reported starting in the 2017-2018 AY. (10/08/2017)</p> | <p> Use of Results for Improvement: This is a new program and results will be reported starting in the 2017-2018 AY. (10/08/2018)</p> |

Metric of Assessment Performance

| | Developing - 1 | Satisfactory - 2 | Exemplary - 3 | Score |
|--|--|--|---|-------|
| Outcomes | | | | |
| Requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum quantity required not met • Not written in correct formula (Who + Verb + What) • When applicable, no apparent difference between degree level outcomes (e.g., BS and MS) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets minimum number required • Written in correct formula (Who + Verb + What) • When applicable, little or no apparent difference between degree level outcomes (e.g., BS and MS) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds required quantity • Written in correct formula (Who + Verb + What) • When applicable, distinguishable between degree levels (e.g., BS and MS) and progressively advanced | 2 |
| SMARTER | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack specificity, measurability and/or relevance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses SMART (specific, measurable, reliable, timely) criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses SMART (specific, measurable, reliable, timely) criteria • Depth and breadth are evident | 2 |
| Alignment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not aligned to category • No mission statement provided to determine alignment • Not aligned with discipline-specific/program-specific competencies/metrics • Alignment with specialized accreditation requirements and/or industry standards not evident | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligns with selected category (e.g., content knowledge) • Mission statement provided but outcomes are not aligned • Aligns with discipline-specific/program-specific competencies/metrics • Alignment with specialized accreditation requirements and/or industry standards not evident | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligns with selected category (e.g., content knowledge) • Aligned with program/unit mission • Specifies discipline-specific/program-specific competencies/metrics • When applicable, aligned with specialized accreditation requirements and/or industry standards | 2 |
| Mapping (Only applicable for academic program SLO reports) | Curriculum map is not available | Curriculum map is available but does not clearly indicate where competencies are introduced, reinforced, and assessed | Curriculum map is available and clearly indicates where competencies are introduced, reinforced, and assessed | 2 |

Metric of Assessment Performance

| Methods | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Relationship to Outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alignment between outcome(s) and method(s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is clear alignment between outcome(s) and method(s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is clear alignment between outcome(s) and method(s) <u>and</u> explanation of alignment is provided (i.e., <i>why</i> is this the best method to assess the outcome?) | 2 |
| Instruments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No direct measure used Instrument and/or data collection method not described | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct measure used Instrument and/or data collection method described | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct measure(s) used with complementary secondary measure(s) Thoroughly described: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale Competencies/items assessed Collection methods (e.g., source) | 2 |
| Who, When & Where | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target population and sampling strategy not specified and/or appropriate Timeframe for data collection is not explained Course/location/modality where data are collected not specified When applicable, no description of evaluators/raters | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target population and sampling strategy is specified Timeframe for data collection is explained Course/location/modality where data are collected is specified Description of evaluators/raters, if applicable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target population and sampling strategy are clearly specified <u>and</u> justification for selection provided Timeframe for data collection is clearly explained, including repetitions within the academic/fiscal year Course/location/modality where data are collected is clearly specified Thorough description of evaluators/raters, if applicable | 2 |

Metric of Assessment Performance

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|----------|
| Minimum Criteria for Success | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum desired result not specified or appropriate • If below 70%, justification is not provided • Does not account for all students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum desired result specified and aligned to the scale • Justification for criteria selection not provided or limited • Accounts for all students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum desired result specified and aligned to the scale • Justification provided for criteria selection (e.g., baseline data, licensure exam results, pre-post data) • Accounts for all students | <p>2</p> |
| Results | | | | |
| Data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data reported is not aligned with outcome and method • Reporting period (defined by academic year: Summer, Fall, Spring <i>or</i> Fiscal Year) is not provided • Semester assessed (for UCC courses only) is not provided • Number of students/artifacts not included • Does not address the minimum criteria • Average score(s) across the sample not provided • No breakdown of scores by competency • No breakdown of scores by rating | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data reported is aligned with outcome and method • Reporting period (defined by academic year: Summer, Fall, Spring <i>or</i> Fiscal Year) is provided • Semester assessed (for UCC courses only) is provided • Number of students/artifacts included • Addresses the minimum criteria • Average score(s) across the sample <u>not</u> provided • No breakdown of scores by competency • No breakdown of scores by rating | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data reported is directly aligned with outcome and method • Reporting period (defined by academic year: Summer, Fall, Spring <i>or</i> Fiscal Year) • Semester assessed (for UCC courses only) • Number of students/artifacts included • Address the minimum criteria (was it met and by how much?) • Average score(s) across the sample • Breakdown of scores by competency (e.g., in a rubric indicate the average score for each competency addressed) • Breakdown of scores by rating (e.g., In a three-point rubric, indicate how many | <p>2</p> |

Metric of Assessment Performance

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-----|
| | | | students score at each of the three ratings) | |
| Analysis | No analysis of the data provided | Limited analysis of the data provided (e.g., minimal comparison, no analysis of trends, etc.) | Analysis of what the data mean (e.g., compare to previous results, analyze trends, describe strengths and weaknesses, etc.) | 2 |
| Improvement Actions | | | | |
| Communication with stakeholders | No description of how data gathered were shared with stakeholders provided | Limited description of how data gathered were shared with stakeholders provided | Description of how data gathered were shared with stakeholders is provided (e.g., date, time, attendees, etc). | 2 |
| Use of Results for Improvement | No improvement actions provided or improvement actions provided do not directly impact outcome attainment | At least one improvement action directly related to outcomes is clearly described | At least one improvement action directly related to outcome is clearly described, <i>including</i> timeframe for implementation, individual(s) responsible for implementation of actions), and integration to teaching and learning research-based practices | 1.5 |
| Follow-Ups | No description of the implementation of the improvement action planned is provided | Limited description of the implementation of the improvement action planned is provided | A detailed description of the implementation (or status of) of the improvement action planned is provided | 2 |
| Evidence of Implementation | No documentation of implementation of improvement strategies is provided or is not relevant | Relevant documentation of implementation of improvement strategies is provided, per outcome | Relevant documentation of implementation of improvement strategies is provided, per outcome | 2 |