

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18

Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.

Unit/Program Name: Social Work- BSW Program

Contact Name(s) and Email(s): Robyn Lugar, robyn.lugar@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

Part One: Fall 2017-Spring 2018

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?</p> <p>*** 1) There were scores not reported by Field Instructor or Task Supervisor (when both were involved in evaluation of student in the Final Field Evaluation). This year students were required to identify Field Instructor AND Task Supervisor vs. OR to insure that the student was evaluated for each core behavior. This change impacted two measures per competency. (See *** below)</p> <p>*** The majority of Field Instructors and Task Supervisors score only were using whole numbers (ex. 6, 7, 8) which skewed scores. Instructions to field instructors/task supervisors were changed to highlight that they are able to use continuous scoring (ex. 7.5, 7.8) to reflect more accurately the performance of student so as to increase precision in scoring.</p>
---	---	---	---	--

C1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior C1CB1: Make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, relevant laws and regulations, models for ethical decision making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to the context	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	92.3	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 89.7 Student performance improved.
C1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior C1CB2: Use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	92.7	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** <i>Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 94.9</i>
C1: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior C1CBOValues assessment to demonstrate ethical and professional behavior	494 In-class exam	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.1	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. This assignment was changed this year (had been measured by the SOWK 494 Ethics Paper). Faculty felt that there was more in-depth demonstration of the competency in the In-class exam in SOWK 494. <i>Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 97.4</i>
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2CB3: Present themselves as learners and engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	86.9	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** <i>Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 84.6.</i>
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2CB4: Apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	90.4	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** <i>Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 87.2</i>
C2: Engage diversity and difference in practice C2CBO: Knowledge assessment of engaging diversity and difference in practice	498 Diversity Presentation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	97.0	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. <i>Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 100</i>
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3CB5: Apply their understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system levels	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	89.6	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** <i>Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 100.</i>
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3CB6: Engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	91.5	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** <i>Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 87.2</i>
C3: Advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice C3CBO: Skills assessment of advancing human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	491 Grant Proposal	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	85.1	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. <i>Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 95.1</i>

C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4CB7: Use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 75% or higher	87.3	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 76.9 Student performance improved.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4CB8: Use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 75% or higher	86.2	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 76.9 Student performance improved.
C4: Engage in practice informed research and research informed practice C4CBO: Critical thinking assessment in engaging practice informed research and research informed practice	490 GIM Paper	80% of students getting an 75% or higher	89.6	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. Faculty review instructions for expectation of this assignment and reviewed the rubric. Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 80 Student performance improved.
C5: Engage in policy practice C5CB9: Assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of and access to social services	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 75% or higher	90	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 74.4 Student performance improved.
C5: Engage in policy practice C5CB10: Apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 75% or higher	89.6	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 94.9
C5: Engage in policy practice C5CBO: Knowledge assessment of engaging in policy practice	494 Policy Paper	80% of students getting an 75% or higher	89.6	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 97.4
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6CB11: Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	91	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 84.6 Student performance improved.
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6CB12: Use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage with diverse clients and constituencies	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	93.5	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 94.9
C6: Engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C6CBO: Critical thinking assessment of engaging with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	490 Group SIM (self, peer, and instructor evaluations)	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	91.5	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 100

C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7CB13: Collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	90	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 89.7 Student performance improved.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7CB14: Select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies.	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	91	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 82.1 Student performance improved.
C7: Assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C7CBO: Exercise of judgement assessment in assessing individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	498 Planning SIM	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	81.9	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. This assignment was changed this year (had been measured by the SOWK 498 Case Staffing). Faculty felt that there was more in-depth demonstration of the competency in Planning SIM assignment in SOWK 498. Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 80.5 Student performance improved.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8CB15: Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 75% or higher	89.2	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 84.6 Student performance improved.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8CB16: Negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 75% or higher	89.8	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 76.9 Student performance improved.
C8: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C8CBO: Affective reactions assessment of intervening with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	499 Process Recording	80% of students getting an 75% or higher	88.3	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 79.5 Students did not meet the benchmark. As a result, faculty will be added clarifying instructions for expectation and the form used was modified to bring clarity to expectation. Student performance improved.

C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9CB17: Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	87.3	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 84.6 Student performance improved.
C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9CB18: Critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcomes	499 Final Field Evaluation	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	90.4	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. *** Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 92.3
C9: Evaluate practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities C9CBO: Skills assessment in evaluating practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	490 Planning SIM (Self, Peer, and Instructor Evaluations)	80% of students getting an 80% or higher	91.5	Relevant Course instructor and BSW Director; Email in May discussion in August. Fall 2016-Spring 2017: 92.5

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. *Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practice, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.*
- c. *Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”*
- d. *Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark”).*
- e. *Curriculum Map and excel grid of measurements. Measurement by course. Attach Rubrics and Plan*

Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

Fall 2017: Measures were pulled from three senior courses: SOWK 490, 491, 498. All of the Competencies and Core Behaviors actual Mean Scores met or exceeded the benchmarks. The Percentage of Students Achieving the Benchmarks also met or exceeded the Competencies and Core Behaviors goal benchmark. All Actual Mean Score for all assignments met the benchmark and Percentage of Students for all assignments met the benchmark.

Spring 2018: Measures were pulled from two senior courses: SOWK 494, 499. Competencies and Core Behaviors actual Mean Scores met or exceeded the benchmarks. The Percentage of Students Achieving the Benchmarks also met or exceeded the Competencies and Core Behaviors goal benchmark. All Actual Mean Score for all assignments met the benchmark.

Comparison from Fall 2016-Spring 2017: This was an improvement in Field Evaluations from Spring 2017 where the Percentage of Students did not meet 80% for Five (5) Core Behaviors measured in Field Evaluations: C4B7 (76.9), C4CB8 (76.9), C5CB9 (74.4) C8CB16 (76.9), C8CB16 (76.9) and SOWK 499 Process Recording Assignment (CBCBO) (79.5).

Fall 2017-2018: Composite measures from both semesters (SOWK 490, 491, 498, 494, 499): SOWK 494, 499. All Competencies and Core Behaviors actual Mean Scores met or exceeded the benchmarks actual Mean Scores met or exceeded the benchmarks. The Percentage of Students Achieving the Benchmarks for each Competency was met or exceeded.

Review of Actions for fall 2017-2018:

- 1) **SOWK 499 Process Recording:** Faculty will be adding clarifying instructions for expectation and the form used will be modified to bring clarity to expectation. **Accomplished**
- 2) **SOWK 499 Field Evaluations by the Field Instructors:**
 - a. There were scores not reported by Field Instructor or Task Supervisor (when both were involved in evaluation of student). Student will identify Field Instructor AND Task Supervisor vs. OR to insure that the student is evaluated for each core behavior. **Accomplished by Field Director and Field Liaison**
 - b. The majority of Field Instructors and Task Supervisors score only using whole numbers (ex. 6, 7, 8) which skews scores. Will include in the instructions to field instructors/task supervisors that they are able to use continuous scoring (ex. 7.5, 7.8) to reflect more accurately the performance of student so as to increase precision in scoring. **Accomplished by Field Director and Field Liaison but continuing to monitor.**
 - c. There were 5 students who scored 70% or lower in 10 or more core behaviors. Will discuss with Field Instructors/Task Supervisors to identify these areas earlier with students to develop additional assignments in this area to increase competency in these areas. **Accomplished by Field Director**
- 3) **SOWK 498 Case Staffing:** Benchmark was met by 0.5% (19.5% of students did not meet the benchmark). Faculty will review instructions for expectation and review the rubric. **Accomplished by Field Director and faculty teaching SOWK 498**
- 4) **SOWK 490 GIM Paper:** Benchmark (75%) was met (17.5% of students did not meet). Faculty will review instructions for expectation and review the rubric. **Accomplished by BSW Director and faculty teaching SOWK 490**

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

Fall 2017-Spring 2018

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
1. SOWK 499: Improve performance on process recordings. Benchmark was not met Spring 2017.	Beginning Fall 2017, Faculty added clarifying instructions for expectation and the process recording form was modified to bring clarity to expectation.	Spring 2018: Program Measure obtained from Process recording rubric graded by faculty member of course	Changes in the syllabus were made as well as oral instructions to students.	Goal accomplished. Benchmark was met in Spring 2017
2. SOWK 499: Some scores were not reported by Field Instructor or Task Supervisor (when both were involved in evaluation of students in Spring 2017	Beginning Fall 2017: On the Learning Plan students. Were instructed by the SOWK 499 faculty to identify Field Instructor "AND" Task Supervisor vs. "OR" to insure that the student is evaluated for each core behavior. Field Director changed instructions for completing Learning Plan.	Spring 2018: (Student progress in field data is obtained from Field Evaluation in SOWK 498 and 499.) The final program measure is obtained from the final evaluation for SOWK 499.	Field Director changed instructions for field instructors and task supervisors. Field Director discussed changes in Field Instructor training meeting. Scores in Field Evaluation were all completed by the field instructor and task supervisor	Goal accomplished. Task Instructors and Field Supervisors documented/reported all appropriate scores in the Learning Plan.
3. SOWK 499: In Spring 2017, the majority of Field Instructors and Task Supervisors rate students only using whole numbers (ex. 6, 7, 8) which skews student scores and grade for field.	Beginning Fall 2017: Included in the instructions to field instructors/task supervisors that they are able to use continuous scoring (ex. 7.5, 7.8) to reflect more accurately the performance of student so as to increase precision in scoring.	Student progress in field data is obtained from Field Evaluation in SOWK 498 and 499. The final program measure is obtained from the final evaluation for SOWK 499.	Field Director changed instructions for field instructors and task supervisors. Field Director discussed changes in Field Instructor training meeting.	Continuing Goal. This year the BSW Curriculum Committee and Field Director will re-evaluate our rating system of students in the field. The current rating system does not seem to be intuitive.

<p>4. SOWK 499: In Spring 2017, there were 5 students who scored 70% or lower in 10 or more core behaviors.</p>	<p>Field Director Training Fall 2017 and in Spring 2018: Discussion with Field Instructors/Task Supervisors to identify areas earlier with students where they are not meeting benchmarks to develop additional assignments in this area to increase competency in these areas.</p>	<p>All 9 competencies have two measures obtained from Field performance. Benchmarks were met Spring 2018.</p>	<p>Field Director changed instructions for field instructors and task supervisors. Field Director discussed changes in Field Instructor training meeting.</p>	<p>Continuing Goal: Need to continue to monitor progress of students in the field, especially if changes in the rating system is modified.</p>
<p>5. SOWK 498 Case Staffing: In the Fall 2017, the benchmark was met by 0.5%, however 19.5% of students did not meet the benchmark. Faculty will review instructions for expectation and review the rubric.</p>	<p>Fall 2017, Faculty teaching SOWK 498 modified the instructions for case staffing, faculty member's expectation and how the rubric was to be reviewed.</p>	<p>Measure was drawn from Case staffing rubric. Benchmark was met and the percentage of students who met the benchmark improved.</p>	<p>Changes in the syllabus were made as well as oral instructions to students.</p>	<p>Goal accomplished. Benchmark was met and the percentage of students who met the benchmark improved (Fall 2017, SOWK 498 Case Staffing).</p>
<p>6. SOWK 490 GIM Paper: In the Fall 2017, the benchmark (75%) was met, however 17.5% of students did not meet the benchmark.</p>	<p>Fall 2017, Faculty teaching SOWK 490 modified the instructions for GIM paper, faculty member's expectation and how the rubric was to be reviewed.</p>	<p>Measure was drawn from GIM paper rubric. Benchmark was met and the percentage of students who met the benchmark improved.</p>	<p>Changes in the syllabus were made as well as oral instructions to students.</p>	<p>Goal accomplished. Benchmark was met and the percentage of students who met the benchmark improved (Fall 2017, SOWK 490 GIM Paper)</p>

Notes

- a. **These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).**
- c. **Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.**

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

Action Plan for Fall 2018-2019 based on BSW Director and BSW Faculty recommendations:

- 1) BSW CAAC will review and update the Instructions for Faculty in collecting and reporting data.
- 2) BSW Director will develop master calendar for when assignments are due in SOWK 490, 491, 498, 494 and 499 that have measures to report
- 3) Faculty will scan copies of rubrics with program measures to the BSW Director upon completion of grading the assignment.
- 4) Faculty data will be reported per assignment with program measures throughout the semester vs. at the end of the semester.
- 5) Faculty will report data by names of student vs. 991 number for tracking purposes. Question is: are we graduating students who are not consistently meeting competencies? Should students be asked to redo an assignment? Students need to be encouraged to complete work that meets the department standards.
- 6) The BSW Director will develop a grid to calculate if the individual student meets each competency.
- 7) BSW Director will develop a grid to calculate if the individual student meets each competency. Currently we are gathering aggregate scores.
- 8) BSW CAAC and Field Director will review Field Instructor scoring. A percentage needs to be reported to the department rather than just a letter grade.
- 9) BSW CAAC will review exit surveys completed by senior students.

Dear Robyn,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: Bachelor of Social Work	
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Mature (2.75/3.00)	
Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue): Exemplary (3.00/3.00)	
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clear, measurable learning outcomes that align with professional standards.• Clear information provided about which courses and assignments were used for assessing student learning relative to outcomes. Good selection of assignments across different courses in the curriculum.• Clear information provided about expected and actual student performance.• Excellent information provided about faculty and field instructor/task supervisor involvement in sharing and using assessment findings to improve assessment and student learning. Good insight into assuring that instructors and supervisors knew to use continuous scoring to increase precision. Useful reference to past data to describe increases in student performance.• Clear goals, data-informed from assessment findings, and focused on improving student learning and faculty assessment of student learning.• Clear action plans with supporting data for achievement or ongoing monitoring .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some outcomes (ex: C9) are highly compound, meaning students must demonstrate multiple competencies to achieve the learning outcome. This can make measurement difficult if the tool being used isn't sufficiently complex. Consider how your current evaluative tools address the complexity to provide accurate results.• When an exam is used as an assessment, make sure to note if just a sliver of the questions that address the specific learning outcome should be used to the assessment (ex: C1, 494 in-class exam). Using the specifically related questions provides more accurate data than using an average score of all questions (related and unrelated) would. Noted that this was changed to a paper for more in-depth demonstration.• Describe or attach the rubrics used in the future so that the criteria and levels of performance can be understood in light of the data.• Consider adding student success information related to the retention, persistence, completion, or career readiness to your planning to compare student learning (in which your faculty and students are excelling) to these related metrics.

Assessment (Parts 1a & 1b) Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success (Parts 2a & 2b) Scoring Rubric is included on the last page for reference only. Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)Unit/Program:

Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary