

Revised September 2021

Reporting Compliance Criteria	
1.1	SLOs: Report on 20% or more of the SLOs identified for the program (on track to assess all SLOs within a 5-year period) (<i>All SLOs are listed on the assessment reporting form and numbered. You may also wish to refer to the IE site for the ALC to see a quick list of SLOs.</i>)
1.2	Summary: Complete the Executive Summary Sheet tab
1.3	Delivery: Clear description of program delivery (and establish expectations about the need for disaggregation by location/modality)
1.4	Reflection: Document faculty engagement and reflection on assessment evidence for program improvement
1.5	CM: Curriculum Map posted on IE site (if CM in supporting doc, score as 0 and add a note to comments to post doc on IE site)
1.6	Plan: 5-Year Assessment Plan posted on IE site

Maturity of Assessment (Evidence work represents credible, meaningful, sustained assessment processes)

Measures

2.1	Align: Description of measures; Measures align with Student Learning Outcome assessed (clearly relevant to the SLO - face validity). <i>At least one SLO must clearly align with the measure.</i>
2.2	Direct Measure: At least one measure is a <i>direct measure</i>
2.3	Multiple Measures: Use multiple measures (may be 2 direct measures or a mix of direct and indirect measures) to assess an SLO. <i>Score if at least 1 SLO has multiple measures (all need not have multiple measures).</i>
2.4	Reliable & Valid: Explicit efforts to establish reliability and validity of the measure

Data collection processes

3.1	Representative sample of work collected. Delivery (Representative sample): Provides information about modalities/locations and other information needed to determine if sample of data accurately represents program delivery
3.2	Disaggregated: Based on modality of program described on Summary Tab, the assessment findings are appropriately disaggregated by modality and/or location.
3.3	Description of Population or Sample: Gives context to the data provided (i.e. capstone section, required course, small number of thesis students)
3.4	Students: Reports the number of students who provided assessment data

Report of results

4.1	Benchmark: Articulates an appropriate benchmark (Articulate desired results. Specifically, benchmark is not below 70%. If benchmark is below 70%, provides a strong rationale for the lower benchmark.) Must have additional detail, not just the prepopulated 70% meet expectations benchmarked entered by IE on all templates.
4.2	Student Results: Report number of students that Met or Exceeded expectations
4.3	Comparison: Comparison of current findings with observations from previous assessments of this SLO (2 or more year comparison)
4.4	Results: Summary of results presented in the report or supporting documents (If you cannot find or open supporting docs referred to in report, contact Carolyn Beamer to locate)
4.5	Examples: Submit examples of assignments, rubrics, or other assessment instruments to explain how SLOs are assessed

Interpretation of assessment findings

5.1	Meeting Date: Document date of faculty meeting when assessment findings were discussed
5.2	Attendance: Report attendance at assessment meeting (Narrative gives names of attendees, number of faculty in attendance, <i>or</i> percentage of faculty attending)
5.3	Minutes: Submit minutes for the assessment meeting (Actual minutes as a supporting document)
5.4	Decision(s): Decisions made at assessment meeting align with assessment findings (logical relation between decisions and the assessment findings)

Use of results to improve student learning

6.1	Actions align with findings. Clear relation between assessment findings and actions taken to improve student learning on specific SLO(s). Decisions made are logically related to the interpretation of assessment evidence. Use of Results should be "action-oriented." (The department will implement/change)
6.2	Actions Clearly planned or Implemented: Unambiguous evidence that actions to improve learning have been or will be implemented

Faculty engagement

7.1	Breadth: Evidence of broad faculty engagement (> 50%) in reflection on and interpretation of the findings. Key indicators: are <i>references to meetings</i> (ex. At the spring departmental retreat; at the assessment meeting, etc.), and <i>documents such as meeting agendas and meeting minutes</i> reflecting a discussion of assessment findings and use of results. (ex. Departmental level "Making Sense" meeting.) In no clear documentation (e.g., "faculty decided" or "we decided", score as 0)
7.2	Communication: Describe how assessment findings and decisions are disseminated/communicated
7.3	To faculty: Dissemination to all faculty (including contingent faculty)
7.4	To Stakeholders: Dissemination to relevant stakeholders (students, advisory committee, community partners, etc.)
Evidence of Impact (Closing the loop from previous year)	
<i>Refer to the 5-Year Assessment Plan as appropriate to determine role of current assessment in the cycle for that outcome</i>	
8.1	Evaluate Impact: Current assessment evaluated the impact of an initiative implemented, based on previous assessment findings
8.2	Compelling Evidence: Assessment findings provide compelling evidence about the impact of the new initiative (positive or negative)