Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (2019) | **http://uwf.edu/offices/cutla/**

Reviewer: _____

Department: _____

updated: January 2019

Assessment Goals:	Quality of Evidence in Annual Report		
	Complete	**Partial or Ambiguous**	**Missing or N/A (no report for an optional item)**
	2	**1**	**0**
Thorough documentation of assessment work, understandable to an external audience			
Identify ALC/ALP Domain **(Rubric element eliminated for 2019 scoring)**			
Identify specific SLO(s) assessed			
Identify the location(s) and/or modality of instruction examined (check box on Qualtrics form)			
Credible evidence of data collection during current cycle (describe measure, students assessed, and "executive summary" of findings).			
Document **breadth of faculty involvement** (% of dept. faculty attending meetings where assessment findings were discussed & decisions made, involved in data collection & analysis, etc.).			
Describe specific decisions made and/or actions that will be implemented based on reflection on assessment evidence. (Decisions and actions should align with assessment findings for the SLO assessed.)			
Total score Goal 1 (Compliance with assessment expectations):			
Assessment work follows best practices for credible, meaningful, sustained assessment processes			
Student learning outcomes written in measurable language			
Direct measures used to assess student learning outcomes. Direct measure(s) algin with the SLO(s) assessed and reported.			
Indirect measures used only to supplement interpretation of direct measures (not the only form of assessment used).			
Assessment samples include full representation of all forms of instruction (data gathered from all locations and modalities of instruction used in the program).			
Programs that assess multiple locations/modalities of instruction disaggregate findings and make comparisons or clearly state why such comparisons will not be informative. Department reflects on and interprets assessment evidence in terms of program quality and degree to which curriculum and instruction support student learning outcome goals.			
Department reflects on and interprets assessment evidence in terms of program quality and degree to which curriculum and instruction support student learning outcome goals. **(Rubric element combined with previous element - 2019 scoring)**			
Assessment work informs decisions for continuous improvement ("Gold Star" assessment efforts)			
Decisions made are logically related to interpretation of assessment evidence			
Department has assessed a new initiative implemented in previous cycle and evaluated the impact of the change (e.g., adopting a new teaching strategy, create new courses, revised programs, etc.). Clear reflection on assessment data associated with a change made in response to previous assessment work.			

Guidelines for Reviewers

General Instructions

1. Plan to review all reports for a specific department in one sitting. Departments that have separate, independent cohorts of students completing the program in different locations or modalities (e.g., face-to-face and online) should file separate templates, one for each location/modality. You will see this pattern when you review all reports together.

2. Departments might discuss assessments gathered online and face-to-face in one template if they do not identify independent cohorts unique to each location. Believe the pull-down menu when determining whether the department should have submitted independent reports for cohorts in different locations/modalities.

3. Consider information reported in supporting documents as well as information reported on the template when responding to specific questions.

Identify ALC/ALP Domain: Rubric element deleted. Do not score.

Identify specific SLO(s) assessed

May appear as text in the "identify SLO domain assessed" response (Q9 on Qualtrics form) or in the response to Q10 (summary of findings). Score collectively if more than one SLO is identified in the report.

0	No SLO reported
1	One or more SLOs identified.
2	One or more SLOs identified and written in measurable language; aligned with the measures reported.

Data Collection: **Credible evidence of data collection during current cycle**

0	Not Applicable *or No mention of data collection,* no evidence of data collection.
1	**Describes and documents** a process for data collection. **Data collection documented but does not align with the SLO reportedly assessed.** Upload an example of rubric, description of embedded assignment or other strategy for gathering data. Data collection process is credible and generates a direct measure of student learning. **Evidence that is not credible**: data reported or rubric used does not align with the SLO assessed.
2	Describes the data collected (either tables of data in the report or an attached document or summaries of analyzed data based on a direct measure). **Reported assessment findings (data, results) align with the SLO assessed.**

Document breadth of faculty involvement

0	No mention of faculty. Report is based on the work of the chair or a faculty member. *Assessment work appears to be managed by 1 or 2 people only.*
1	Department describes a faculty meeting and/or clearly indicates that **multiple faculty contributed to the assessment** of student artifacts. However, assessment *work appears to be* **concentrated in a committee or small sub-group of faculty, no clear documentation of how other faculty are involved (other than attending a faculty meeting).**
2	**Broad faculty involvement is documented.** Report clearly documents how all faculty in the department contribute to assessment efforts (e.g., provide data from assessments embedded in their course, serve on assessment committee, or participate in full faculty reflection). Might entail the work of a curriculum committee that then facilitates a full faculty discussion of the assessment findings. Or the data collection clearly involves multiple faculty supplied relevant data from their courses (i.e., assessments draw from multiple courses, not just one or two key courses).

SLO language

0	None
1	SLOs present but do not use measurable language
2	SLOs present and use measurable language

Samples represent instruction mode

This element is just about *data collection and whether the sample represents where and how the department teaches.* If they have multiple locations, do the data reflect those locations? That is, does the sample represent the locations? It doesn't ask anything about what they do with the data they collect. For F2F, if they have multiple sections (might be hard to tell), does the sample reflect the faculty who teach those sections (e.g., both adjunct and full-time faculty)? Departments need to *provide some evidence that their sample is a good representation of the way instruction on this outcome is delivered.* Don't assume that whatever data they collect is a representative sample.

0	N/A (program presented in only one mode or location) or no mention (missing)
1	Discussion of multiple instruction modes (sources of data); reports data from multiple locations or modalities (online, F2F, Tandberg, etc.)
2	Disaggregation of data by instruction mode; explicit comparison of learning performance in different modalities. Department submitted multiple reports and explicitly discusses and compares student learning observed in the locations/modalities. *Clear evidence of reflection on an assessment question about the comparability of student learning by location or modality.*

Multiple location explanation   Rubric element merged with Samples element (above)

Reflection on data

0	No data; no discussion of reflection on or interpretation of the findings.
1	Evidence that faculty discussed the findings (had a meeting, reflected) but no evidence that they made any decision informed by the findings
2	Compelling evidence that faculty discussed the findings and made an evidence-based decision