| **CIR Section** | **Beginning** | **Developing** | **Good** | **Exemplary** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcomes**  **Note:** I realize these are based on standards in your field, but there is a lot packed in to SLO 1. For WCU purposes, you may want to separate that out into three separate SLOs that are worded to align with 7.01. I get it that you have the a, b, and c parts but that’s an atypical method. | * Outcomes are presented as a task, tactic, or strategy instead of the outcome of such activities. * Educational programs do not focus on student-centered, program-level learning outcomes. * Administrative units and student support units focus on outcomes that are not at the unit-level or are inconsistent with the unit’s role in the institution. * Outcomes are defined is ways that are difficult to observe and measure. * No outcomes are stated. | * Educational programs and student support units include student-centered, program-level learning outcomes. * Administrative units and student support units include unit-level outcomes that are consistent with the unit’s role in the institution. * Few outcomes are defined in measurable terms. * Few outcomes are precise and observable using specific, descriptive, active language. * Few outcomes have clear program- or unit-level targets. | * Educational programs and student support units focus on student-centered, program-level learning outcomes. * Administrative units and student service units focus on unit-level outcomes that are consistent with the unit’s role in the institution. * Most outcomes are defined in measurable terms. * Most outcomes are precise and observable using specific, descriptive, active language. * Most outcomes have clear program- or unit-level targets. | * Educational programs and student support units clearly focus on student-centered, program-level learning outcomes. * Administrative units and student service units clearly focus on unit-level outcomes that are consistent with the unit’s role in the institution. * All outcomes are defined in measurable terms. * All outcomes are precise and observable using specific, descriptive, active language. * All outcomes have clear program- or unit-level targets that are supported with a justification. |
| **Follow Up on Previous Improvement Actions**  **Note:**SLO 7.01c and 7.03 – we need something in section I. That might be “We have not evaluated or taken action specific to this SLO in the recent past/our advisory board recommended looking at this one/the faculty recommended it/*something* | * Educational programs and student support units’ actions do not focus on the design and improvement of educational experiences that enhance achievement of expected outcomes. * Administrative and student support units’ actions do not focus on operational efficiencies that enhance achievement of expected outcomes. * Lacking clarity or detail to understand the improvement action. | * Educational programs and student support units’ actions demonstrate some connection to the design and improvement of educational experiences that enhance achievement of expected outcomes. * Administrative and student support units’ actions demonstrate some connection to operational efficiencies that enhance achievement of expected outcomes. * Limited clarity or detail to understand the improvement action. | * Educational programs and student support units’ actions focus on the design and improvement of educational experiences that enhance achievement of expected outcomes. * Administrative and student support units’ actions focus on operational efficiencies that enhance achievement of expected outcomes. * Sufficient detail to understand the improvement action and why it was taken. | * Actions clearly focus on design and improvement of educational experiences (educational programs) or operational efficiencies (administrative and student support units) * Improvement action provided with clear context to previous related work and expected outcome(s). * Rationale provided, demonstrating clear connection of action to outcome. * Detailed description allows clear understanding. |
| **Assessment, Data Collection, and Target**  **Note:** SLO 7.01c – how many questions? Were they all related to the topics listed? I recommend a brief explanation how this exam aligns with the SLO – are entrepreneurial skills a core concept in knowledge of the “foundation of the profession” Someone not in your field may not think those are connected.  Similar issues in 7.03 | * Description of assessment methods lack sufficient detail to evaluate their appropriateness. * On the face of it, assessment methods do not measure the expected outcomes or are inappropriate to the nature of the discipline or unit operation. * There are no direct measures. * No a priori targets for outcomes. * As appropriate the assessment activities do not take population (student/client/stakeholder) in effect (e.g., residential, online, off-campus; graduate, undergraduate). | * At a superficial level, it appears the content measured by the assessment activities matches the outcomes, but little explanation is provided * Limited information is provided about data collection such as who and how many took the assessment, but not enough to judge the integrity of the process (e.g., thirty-five seniors took the test). * Few assessment activities are appropriate to the nature of the discipline or unit operation. * Outcomes are only measured with indirect measures. * Outcomes have statement of target (e.g., student growth, comparison to previous year’s data, comparison to faculty standards, performance vs. a criterion), but no specificity (e.g., students will grow; students will perform better than last year). * As appropriate few assessment activities take the stakeholder population into effect (e.g., residential, on-line, off-campus; graduate, undergraduate). | * General detail is provided to understand how assessment activities relate to outcomes. * General detail is provided to understand the data collection process, such as a description of the sample, assessment activity protocol, assessment conditions. * Most assessment activities measure the expected outcomes. * Most outcomes are assessed with direct measures. * Most assessment activities are appropriate to the nature of the discipline or unit operation. * Desired results are specified. (e.g., our students will gain ½ standard deviation from junior to senior year; our students will score above a faculty determined standard). “Gathering baseline data” is acceptable for this rating. * As appropriate most assessment activities take the stakeholder population into effect (e.g., residential, online, off-campus; graduate, undergraduate). | * In-depth detail is provided regarding outcome-to assessment match (e.g., specific items on the assessment are linked to the outcomes). * The data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired results (e.g., representative sampling, adequate motivation, two or more trained raters for performance assessment, pre-post design to measure gain, cutoff defended for performance vs. a criterion). * All assessment activities measure the expected outcomes. * All outcomes are assessed with direct measures. * Desired result are specified and justified. * As appropriate all assessment activities take the stakeholder population into effect (e.g., residential, on-line, off-campus; graduate, undergraduate). |
| **Results and Analysis** | * Findings and results are not provided. * Findings and results are not analyzed or evaluated. * Unclear or incomplete detail provided to see that conclusions are supported by the data. * There is no linkage between assessment activities and continuous improvement. | * Few findings and results are provided. * Few findings and results are analyzed or evaluated. * Limited or unclear detail provided to see that conclusions are supported by the data. * Analysis of results weakly link assessment activities and continuous improvement. | * Most findings and results are provided. * Most findings and results are analyzed or evaluated. * Sufficient detail provided to see that conclusions are supported by the data, including reference to the sampling. * Prior results are provided for some of the assessments. * Analysis of results link assessment activities and continuous improvement. | * All findings and results are clearly presented and relate directly to the outcomes and the target. * Prior results are provided for the majority of assessments. * Depth of detail provided to see that conclusions are reasonable given the outcomes, targets, and assessment activities. More than one individual (e.g., faculty, staff) interpreted results. * Analysis of results consistently link assessment activities and continuous improvement. |
| **Recommendations & Plans for Improvement**  **Note:** SLO 7.01c - Since students were successful, you don’t need to indicate a change. Also this is a change to the assessment, not directly to activities promoting student learning  Same for 7.03 | * No recommendations made for programmatic or unit modifications or improvement to the current assessment process. * Recommended changes are not informed by data. * No rationale given for “no improvements needed.” | * Recommendations address curricular, programmatic, and/or operational (as appropriate) revisions seeking improvement, but lack a clear link to the assessment findings. * The recommended changes lack specificity in terms of detail; next steps/actions are unclear. * Limited rationale for “no improvements needed” is provided. | * Data is used to inform recommended changes. * Recommendations address curricular, programmatic, and/or operational revisions (as appropriate). * Recommended changes are designed to seek improvement. * Rationale for “no improvements needed” is provided. | * Recommended changes are clearly based on the analysis of results. * Recommended changes are very specific (i.e., with details related who, what, when, and where). * Rationale for “no improvements needed” is provided. |
| **Overall Quality of Report** | * Report is unclear and incomplete providing limited evidence of seeking continuous improvement. * Provides little to no evidence of linkages among outcomes, assessments, and continuous improvement actions. * Administrative and student support unit report does not demonstrate a commitment to administrative effectiveness. * Educational program and student support unit report does not demonstrate a focus on educational experiences that enhance student learning and support student learning outcomes. * Provides little to no evidence that appropriate assessment methods are being used to measure the expected outcomes. * Provides little to no evidence of seeking improvement based on an analysis of findings. * Provides little to no evidence that data is used to inform recommended changes addressing curricular, programmatic, and/or operational revisions (as appropriate). | * Report is unclear in part and providing some evidence of seeking continuous improvement. * Provides some evidence of linkages among outcomes, assessments, and continuous improvement actions. * Indicates some commitment to administrative effectiveness (Administrative and student support units). * Provides some focus on educational experiences that enhance student learning and support student learning outcomes (Educational programs). * Provides some evidence that unit intends to use appropriate assessment methods to measure the expected outcomes. * Provides some evidence of seeking improvement based on an analysis of findings. * Provides some evidence that data is used to inform recommended changes addressing curricular, programmatic, and/or operational revisions (as appropriate). | * Report has a clear flow and logic with sufficient depth and detail providing evidence of seeking continuous improvement. * Report demonstrates clear linkages among outcomes, assessments, and continuous improvement actions. * Demonstrates a commitment to administrative effectiveness (Administrative and student support units). * Demonstrates a clear focus on educational experiences that enhance student learning and support student learning outcomes (Educational programs). * Demonstrates appropriate assessment methods are being used to measure the achievement of expected outcomes. * Demonstrates clear evidence of seeking improvement based on an analysis of results. * Provides evidence that data is used to inform recommended changes addressing curricular, programmatic, and/or operational revisions (as appropriate). * Recommended changes are designed to seek improvement with curricular, programmatic, and/or operational revisions (as appropriate). | * Report has a clear flow and logic with strong depth and detail providing clear evidence of seeking continuous improvement. * Demonstrates strong linkages among outcomes, assessments, and continuous improvement actions. * Demonstrates a strong commitment to administrative effectiveness (Administrative and student support units). * Demonstrates a clear focus on educational experiences that enhance student learning and support student learning outcomes (Educational programs). * Demonstrates appropriate assessment methods and data analysis are being used to measure the achievement of expected outcomes. * Demonstrates clear and substantial evidence of seeking improvement based on an analysis of results. * Provides evidence that data is used to inform recommended changes addressing curricular, programmatic, and/or operational revisions (as appropriate). * Recommended changes are designed to seek improvement with curricular, programmatic, and/or operational revisions (as appropriate). |

Note:with some revision this will be fine. In the future, apparently documenting involvement of most/all of the faculty in the program assessment will be important, so indicating that your faculty met as a group to go over data and decided together on changes to make will be important for SACS.