The list of all services and functions provided by Institutional Effectiveness can be located at:

http://www.uky.edu/ie
Introduction

What is Institutional Effectiveness?

“Institutional Effectiveness is the systematic, explicit, and documented process of measuring performance against mission in all aspects of an institution.” (SACS/COC Resource Manual)

Institutional Effectiveness is a cyclical process. The process includes an ongoing and continuous effort to improve student learning and achievement through regular assessment and program review. Assessments and program reviews are used to measure student performance against course, program, and university level learning outcomes. As performance is measured, improvements to courses, programs, and the university should occur to close the cyclical process as it begins anew.

As an accredited university through SACS/COC, we must demonstrate compliance with the ideas of measuring performance through documentation and student artifacts.
Benefits of Institutional Effectiveness

Faculty and Staff:

- Advise staff what is and is not working in their courses and programs
- Provides evidence to justify changes in programs, courses, and resources
- Aligns curricula, programs, and courses with institutional goals
- Assists in determining program and student strengths and weaknesses
- Provide evidence of course or program value to the university
- Encourage excellence across the university

Administrators:

- Demonstrate commitment to excellence at the university level
- Provide data to allow for evidence-based decision making and resource allocation
- Ensures accountability for resources that have previously been allocated
- Provide data for strategic and academic planning
- Informs external stakeholders of the University’s commitment and success at impacting the local community and economy

Institution:

- Provide data to allow for policy and procedure evaluation at the university level
- Provide data for grant funding efforts
- Demonstrate university impacts on public needs
- Demonstrate how the university is making a difference

Students:

- Understand clear expectations from the course and program levels
- Advises students of clear and consistent evaluation techniques
- Allows for informed decision making based upon successes and failures
Institutional Effectiveness at UK

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is under the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement (OFA) and supports the joint mission to promote academic and administrative excellence by working collaboratively with members of the University community and external stakeholders through professional development, assessment, and accreditation and compliance activities. Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is comprised of the Office of Assessment and the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.
Governing Regulations

The Office of Assessment and its activities are governed by UK Administrative Regulation 1:4 – Institutional Effectiveness: The Planning, Assessment, and Budgeting Cycle. This regulation calls for “ongoing, integrated, and institution wide evidence-based planning and evaluation process... [AR 1:4(1)]”

The deliverables discussed in this regulation include the Periodic Review, Annual Progress Report, Annual Student Learning Outcome Report, and Review of Chief Administrative Officers [AR 1:4(6)].

With regards to Student Learning Outcomes reporting, the regulation states:

“The Student Learning Outcomes Report is produced annually to document the continuous improvement of student learning and are required by all educational programs. This report shall focus on student learning outcomes; however, units may also include assessments of program curricula and teaching effectiveness [AR 1:4 (6)(C)].”
Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness

The mission of the Office of Assessment is to provide university-wide support for assessment of student learning, planning, and continuous improvement activities at the course, program, and institutional levels, and to develop and sustain across the university community a culture of assessment.

The Office of Assessment assists in all aspects of university, program, and course assessment. Assessment staff offer workshops, training, sessions, and will assist in all aspects of program review and assessment plan design that relate to student learning outcomes and rubrics. The Office of Assessment also coordinates the University Assessment Council and assists in the assessment activities of UK Core.

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Planning and Institutional Effectiveness oversees and monitors the implementation, evaluation, and management of institutional effectiveness activities, institutional accreditation, and state and federal initiatives.

The Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness oversees Annual Progress reports, new academic program approval processes, Periodic Reviews, strategic planning, and compliance reporting.
Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) describe specific performance that students of your program or course should demonstrate when completing the program or course.

Program Level Learning Outcomes are skills, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors that a student should demonstrate and possess upon completion of a degree or certificate program. Program Level Learning Outcomes should answer the question: “What should a student who graduates from this program be able to do?” When Program Level Learning Outcomes are created, they must be in line with the mission and vision of both the University and the College that houses the program.

Course Level Learning Outcomes are skills, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors that a student should demonstrate upon completing and individual course within a program. Course Level Learning Outcomes should answer the question: “What should a student who completes this course be able to do, and how does it contribute to the overall program?” Course Level Learning Outcomes must align to the Program Level Learning Outcomes, as well as the missions and visions of the University and College.
Benefits of Learning Outcomes

- Both faculty and students understand clearly identified skills, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. Faculty will be empowered to create engaging assignments and activities that align with the outcome. Students will understand what is expected of them, and allows increased transparency in assessment of student performance.
- Clearly identified learning outcomes assist faculty in ensuring the students are achieving the right skills, and that those skills are aligned with the program and university mission, vision, and goals.
- Student Learning Outcomes allow for continual improvement based upon assessment data and student performance.
- Student Learning Outcomes encourage teamwork amongst faculty.
- Student Learning Outcomes can be assessed using a wide variety of tools.
Guidelines for Writing SLOs

Learning Outcomes Should:

- “Describe what students should be able to demonstrate, represent, or produce based on their learning histories.”

- Rely on active verbs that identify what students should be able to demonstrate, represent, or produce over time.

- Align with the institution’s curriculum and co-curriculum outcomes.

- Be collaboratively authored and collectively accepted.

- Incorporate or adapt professional organizations outcomes statements when they exist.

- Be quantitatively and/or qualitatively assessed during a student’s studies.

Format of an SLO Statement

Sample Learning Outcome: Students will analyze and interpret statistical data as they support decision-making processes throughout an organization. 

Sample Learning Outcome: Students will evaluate the impact of monetary policy on the economy.
Examples of SLO Statements

"By the end of this course, students will be able to........
.......identify five key provisions of the clean air act"
.......outline the procedure for calibrating a gas chromatograph"
.......interpret poetry in the cultural context of its period"
.......distinguish between conduction and convection"
.......apply structured and semi-structured interviewing techniques in his/her fieldwork"
.......calculate the probability that two sample means will differ by more than 5%"
.......explain which economic and political factors contributed to the outbreak of W.W.II"
.......design an experiment to determine the effect of temperature on..."
....... formulate a resume in the foreign language for a job application abroad" [3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Understand</th>
<th>Apply</th>
<th>Analyze</th>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>Create</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>define</td>
<td>explain</td>
<td>solve</td>
<td>analyze</td>
<td>reframe</td>
<td>design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify</td>
<td>describe</td>
<td>apply</td>
<td>compare</td>
<td>criticize</td>
<td>compose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>describe</td>
<td>interpret</td>
<td>illustrate</td>
<td>classify</td>
<td>evaluate</td>
<td>create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>label</td>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>modify</td>
<td>contrast</td>
<td>order</td>
<td>plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list</td>
<td>summarize</td>
<td>use</td>
<td>distinguish</td>
<td>appraise</td>
<td>combine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>classify</td>
<td>calculate</td>
<td>infer</td>
<td>judge</td>
<td>formulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>compare</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>invent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>match</td>
<td>differentiate</td>
<td>choose</td>
<td>explain</td>
<td>compare</td>
<td>hypothesize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize</td>
<td>discuss</td>
<td>demonstrate</td>
<td>select</td>
<td>decide</td>
<td>substitute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>select</td>
<td>distinguish</td>
<td>discover</td>
<td>categorize</td>
<td>discriminate</td>
<td>write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examine</td>
<td>extend</td>
<td>experiment</td>
<td>connect</td>
<td>recommend</td>
<td>compile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locate</td>
<td>predict</td>
<td>relate</td>
<td>differentiate</td>
<td>summarize</td>
<td>construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memorize</td>
<td>associate</td>
<td>show</td>
<td>discriminate</td>
<td>assess</td>
<td>develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quote</td>
<td>contrast</td>
<td>sketch</td>
<td>divide</td>
<td>choose</td>
<td>generalize</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Image: Bloom, 1956)
Developing an Assessment Plan

Introduction to Developing an Assessment Plan

Assessment experts advocate that assessment should not occur because programs have to, but because they want to. So, what can assessment do for a program? The University of Central Florida says assessment should be used: to improve, to inform, to prove, and to support. Assessment is the process of investigating the program’s influence on student performance so that informed decisions can be made to foster improvements. No matter how good they may be, all programs can improve. The goal of assessment is to determine where there are weaknesses in student learning and seek ways to advance.

Assessment can take many forms including: standardized tests, observations of student performance, evaluations of student work, and surveys. Assessments can be standardized or “home-grown.” Ideally, assessments will ask students to demonstrate their knowledge or skills.

Program assessment can be structured in a variety of ways. Some programs choose to have only one person responsible for the collection and evaluation of evidence, but a more inclusive approach is regarded as being the best. The Office of Assessment at the University of Kentucky recommend that program faculty, department chairs, and the DUS or DGS take part in the assessment process. Of course, one person should be designated as the coordinator of the process which will help to keep assessment “on the table” instead of being pushed aside for other tasks. For your final assessment plan, you will be expected to designate an assessment coordinator for your program.
When assessing student learning outcomes, it is necessary to gather evidence. There are two types of evidence that will be discussed in this course: indirect and direct.

i. Indirect evidence is data from which you can make inferences about learning, but students do not demonstrate actual learning. Examples of this type of data includes but is not limited to: surveys, focus groups, exit interviews, grades, and institutional performance indicators.

ii. Direct evidence shows student achievement through the measurement of their performance of knowledge and skills. Direct evidence can be gathered using tools like: capstone experiences, score gains between entry and exit (also referred to as formative and summative assessments), and substantial course assignments that require performance of learning.

When programs write their student learning outcomes, they should also determine a benchmark or target for those outcomes.

i. A benchmark is a standard that is set for measurement, especially when compared to other like institutions or programs. Benchmark works well when you know the assessment results of another institution and when you are using the same or similar assessment processes.

ii. A target is a goal for achievement. Targets can be internally or externally set and should be difficult to obtain, but achievable. A target of 100% is probably not achievable if you are measuring something that is valuable.

The template for building an Assessment Plan can be located in Appendix B.

The flowchart outlining the Assessment Plan Review Process can be located in Appendix E.
1. **Establish Program Mission, Vision, and Program Level Outcomes** – For many programs, the mission vision, and program outcomes are already in place. For some programs, external accrediting bodies may have specific learning outcomes that must be assessed across specific timeframes in addition to those required by SACS/COC. From the beginning steps of writing a new assessment plan, it is good to review the mission, vision, and program level learning outcomes. Occasionally these will be updated or changed so they stay in line with the goals of the college and university. Program level outcomes may change as well. The answer to “What should a student who graduates from this program be able to do?” may change over time.
2. **Identify Course Level Outcomes that are in line with the Program Level Outcomes** – The Program Level Learning Outcomes will represent the skills, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors a graduate of a program should carry. Course Level Learning Outcomes are more specific and work towards achieving the Program Level Learning Outcomes.

3. **Determine the methods through which the outcomes, both course and program level, will be assessed** – At this stage, the Assessment Plan development team must ask: “How will we assess student performance?” Ideally, assessment methods will include a balanced mix of direct and indirect assessment tools.
4. **Set benchmarks for student performance** – Once the methods of assessment are determined, benchmarks, or goals, can be established. Benchmarks should meet the acronym: SMART. They should be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Results-focused, and Time-focused.

5. **Gather the artifacts of student achievement** – At this stage the faculty will collect the artifacts, or evidence, that have been pre-selected for assessment (Step 3).

6. **Assess the artifacts** – Evaluate student performance of the artifacts against the assigned rubric. There are many examples of good rubrics on campus, such as the VALUE rubric and the UAC Rubric. The Office of Assessment can assist in rubric development specific to a college or course’s needs.

7. **Recommend Actions for Improvement** – After the artifacts have been assessed, recommendations for improvement should be made. This can be done in committee format. It is recommended that peer review and feedback be used at this stage. All courses can be improved in some way. If benchmarks are being consistently met or exceeded, it may be an indication that the benchmarks need to be raised or other indicators of success may need to be measured to increase validity of the data. Approach this step from the perspective of creating the best possible learning experience for the student as possible.

8. **Make the appropriate changes** – Take the recommendations and make changes where applicable to the extent you are capable. There is assistance if assistance is needed, such as the Office of Assessment, the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching, and the Office for Faculty Advancement.

9. **Determine Methods** – At this step, you “Close the Loop.” Change has been implemented. Now you must evaluate the methods of assessment taking into account the changes that were implemented, and the cycle begins anew.
Assessment Methods

In determining assessment methods, it is important to understand the difference between direct and indirect assessment tools. **Direct** measurements for assessment include student work, products, and performances that demonstrate a specific learning outcome has been achieved. **Indirect** measurements for assessment include perceptions of learning, or opinions, as to whether or not specific learning outcomes have been achieved.

Some examples of Direct measurement methods include:
- Exams
- Standardized Tests
- Papers
- Projects
- Performances

Some examples of Indirect measurement methods include:
- Course Evaluations (TCEs)
- Retention rates
- Graduation rates
- Graduate school placement rates

In developing an Assessment Plan, both direct and indirect measurements should be used to gauge the success of the student, course, and program. A hollistic approach to assessment allows for a complete picture of student success to be achieved.
Curriculum vs. Artifact Map

Mapping is the process of documenting which courses or activities align to curriculum related data and assigned outcomes. It can be time consuming if done properly. However, if completed early in the Assessment Plan development cycle, it can guide the Assessment Process and assist faculty in assignment development. If the program level learning outcomes are in line with the course level learning outcomes, it informs the faculty what material to cover.

A Curriculum Map is a roadmap to success. It documents the Program Level Learning Outcomes and aligns the Course Level Learning Outcomes to the Program Level. Some courses may meet multiple Program Level Learning Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Outcome 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Outcome 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Outcome 3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Outcome is Introduced  R = Outcome is Reinforced
E = Outcome is Emphasized  A = Outcome is Applied
An **Artifact Map** is similar to a Curriculum Map in that it shows when and where certain outcomes are going to be covered and assessed. The Artifact Map takes it one step further. It identifies the evidence being used to assess achievement of an outcome. A program choosing to designate a course level outcome as A (Outcome is Applied) would document the course number and assessment method being used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Outcome is Introduced  R = Outcome is Reinforced

E = Outcome is Emphasized  A = Outcome is Applied
The Assessment Process

- **Annual SLO Report**
  - Oct 31st

- **Deans' Council Update**
  - 2nd Week of Nov

- **UAC Evaluations**
  - Early Dec

- **SLO Reflections Due**
  - Feb 15th

 solanay NOTATION
- **Assessment Plans Due**
  - May 15th
    - (Only if doing Program Review)

Subprocesses:
- **Annual SLO Report**
  - Year 4
  - Program Review

- **Annual SLO Report**
  - Year 3
  - All SLOs Assessed

- **Annual SLO Report**
  - Year 2
Student Learning Assessment at UK

The Office of Assessment operates as a support office for the assessment activities university-wide. This includes student learning, planning, and improvement activities. Some of the assessment activities include:

- Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)
- UK Core Assessment
- The Multi-State Collaborative (MSC)
- The Graduation Composition & Communication Requirement (GCCR)
- Presentation U!
Annual Assessment Processes

The Annual Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report is a regular deliverable to the Office of Assessment. It is due to the Office of Assessment by close of business on October 31st annually. The Office of Assessment has created a template to ensure all assessment activities are appropriately captured [See Appendix C]. It is the department’s responsibility to see that a high-quality review of the year’s assessment activities are documented.

Approximately two weeks after the Annual Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report is due, an update will be distributed to the Dean’s Council. The Council will be given compliance numbers by degree program for Annual Student Learning Outcome Assessment plan submission.

Reflections for the Annual Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report are due February 15th annually. This section of the report discusses what happened in the program after the recommended changes were implemented. Were the changes effective? What other considerations have been made for the program since the initial report filing?

Every December the University Assessment Committee (UAC) evaluates the Annual Student Learning Outcome Assessment Reports based on an established rubric [See Appendix D]. The UAC is comprised of individuals from all colleges across campus. Each report is evaluated by six criteria: (1) relationship between the outcome tools, (2) data collection and research design and integrity, (3) benchmark/target, (4) results, (5) interpretation of results, and (6) improvement action plan.

Program Review typically happens every 5-7 years. It is important to note that a new Assessment Plan is due to the Office of Assessment by May 15th of the Program Review annual cycle.
UK Core Assessment

The UK Core Assessment Initiative encompasses all of the UK Core classes offered at UK. These classes are offered by numerous departments across campus. The assessment includes the following steps: 1) each course must be designed to include at least one assessable artifact (assignment); 2) the student must upload this artifact via Blackboard for assessment purposes; 3) once the artifact is loaded into Blackboard, the system will harvest that artifact, and file it according to its associated UK Core outcome(s); 4) when it is time to begin the evaluation process, the computer will collect a sample of the stored artifacts; and 5) those artifacts will then be stripped of all identifying information (course, instructor, student name, etc.) and evaluation will begin by using faculty developed rubrics. The results of this assessment are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the UK Core program.

The Office of Assessment assists in UK Core assessment through:

- Attending all UKCEC meetings;
- Assisting in the creation of all program-wide assessment rubrics;
- Providing technical assistance with the chosen assessment system; and,
- Leading the annual assessment activities each spring.

More information on UK Core can be located at:

http://www.uky.edu/ukcore/Assessment
Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)

The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) is a nationally–normed, authentic assessment developed by the Council for Aid to Education to measure institutional achievements in student learning in four key general education core skills: critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving, and written communication. CLA results are controlled for incoming academic ability.

The University of Kentucky first administered the CLA as part of a longitudinal study of the general education learning of UK undergraduates in fall 2007. The initial administration tested two cohorts: (1) first-time, full-time freshman and (2) UK seniors. This test design ensures that the initial results are immediately useful as a cross-sectional (or "snapshot") analysis of learning.

A complete picture of UK’s general education learning, however, can only be gleaned from following a single cohort through their general education learning experience. Therefore, the longitudinal design of the CLA required that it be administered to the same cohort three times: first in fall 2007, next in spring 2009, and finally, in spring 2011.

More information on the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) can be located at:

http://www.uky.edu/ie/content/collegiate-learning-assessment
Accreditation

The University of Kentucky is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). The Commission strives to improve the effectiveness of institutions by ensuring that institutions meet standards established by the Council of Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) to address the needs of society and students. The SACSCOC is the regional body for the accreditation of degree-granting higher education institutions in the Southern United States and internationally (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Latin America and other international sites approved by the Commission).

SACSCOC has very specific requirements as it relates to Student Learning Outcomes. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 3.3.1: Comprehensive Standards — Institutional Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements, Standards, and Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Appendix A: Glossary

Analytic Rubric: A rubric in which each performance indicator is assigned a numerical value. The final score is the sum of the indicator values.

Anchor samples: Samples which are perfect illustrations of the sum of performance indicators on each level of the rubric scale.

Assessment: A strategy for understanding, confirming, and improving student learning through a continuous, systematic process.

Assessment Artifact: Any student work-product normally produced during a learning experience.

Assessment Plan: A document that outlines the program or department’s plan for assessing student learning. It includes: a mission statement, a statement of learning outcomes and/or a curriculum map, and explanation of who is responsible for assessment with the program, a description of the program’s assessment methods and procedures, and a clear articulation of the assessment cycle.

Course-level assessment: Assessment focused on ongoing pedagogical improvement.

Curriculum Map: A visual depiction of how learning outcomes and/or professional standards are translated into individual courses taught within a program.

Direct Evidence: Students show achievement of learning goals through performance of knowledge and skills. Includes, but is not limited to: capstone experiences, score gains between entry and exit, portfolios, and substantial course assignments that require performance of learning.

Formative Assessment: An assessment of student learning done at the beginning of a course or a program.
Holistic Rubric: A single score is assigned for the whole performance.

Indirect Evidence: Data from which you can make inferences about learning but do not demonstrate actual learning, such as perception or comparison data. Includes, but is not limited to: surveys, focus groups, exit interviews, grades, and institutional performance indicators.

Inter-rater Reliability: The measure of agreement between two different evaluators, who evaluate the same artifact with the same rubric.

Learning Outcomes: Statements of learning expectations.

Norming: A calibration process in which readers apply a rubric to a single sample, and come to consensus on the score. This process is repeated until consensus is reached on the first try.

Performance Indicators: The observable performance characteristics that signal a criterion has been achieved at a particular level.

Program-level assessment: Assessment focused on curricular improvement, planning, and budgeting.

Rubric: A focused, documented set of guidelines, usually in matrix form, that faculty can use to evaluate student work and provide feedback. Rubrics provide a clear articulation of how student performance is linked to specific course and program outcomes.

Summative Assessment: An assessment of student learning done at the conclusion of a course or a program.

Validation process: In practical assessment, generally an annual or biannual process through which the reliability and validity of data are ensured.
Appendix B: Assessment Plan Template
University of Kentucky Assessment Plan Template

*Updated every 5-7 years aligning with Program Review*

1. **Introduction** [identify college, unit, and degree programs]
   1.1. Unit Mission Statement
   1.2. Basic Assessment Approach
   1.3. Definition of Key Terms [if necessary]

2. **Assessment Oversight, Resources**
   2.1. College Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator
   2.2. Unit Assessment Coordinator [if applicable]
   2.3. Other Assessment Resources [if applicable]

3. **Program-Level Learning Outcomes**
   3.1. Learning Outcomes by Program [focused on student performance, clearly stated, and measurable]
   3.2. Accreditation Standards/Outcomes by Program [if applicable]

4. **Assessment Methods and Measures (Formative and Summative recommended)**
   4.1. Direct Methods/Measures Preferred/Used at the Course and Program Levels
      4.1.1. Which components of the outcome will be assessed?
      4.1.2. When will the components of the outcome be assessed?
      4.1.3. Examples of Rubrics are attached in the Appendices
   4.2. Indirect Methods/Measures Preferred/Used at the Course and Program Levels

5. **Data Collection**
   5.1. Data Collection Process/Procedures
      5.1.1. When will data be collected for each outcome?
      5.1.2. How will data be collected for each outcome?
      5.1.3. What will be the benchmark/target for each outcome?
      5.1.4. What individuals/groups will be responsible for data collection?
   5.2. Data Report Process/Procedures [Unit and College report structure]

6. **Data Analysis**
6.1.1. Assessment Cycle [1-3 years]
6.1.2. Includes measurement of all learning outcomes
6.1.3. Identifies at a minimum an annual date for sharing results with faculty and planning improvement actions

6.2. Data Analysis Process/Procedures
   6.2.1. How and will the data and findings be shared with faculty?
   6.2.2. Who was involved in analyzing the results?
   6.2.3. How are results aligned to outcomes and benchmarks/targets given?
   6.2.4. How will the data be used for making programmatic improvements?

6.3. Data Analysis Report Process/Procedures [Unit report structure; College and Institutional report structure; Integration with Program Review; Integration with Strategic Planning process]

7. Appendices - Required
   7.1. Report Forms, Curriculum Maps by Program, Assessment Tools (i.e. Rubrics, Surveys, Tests, etc.), Other important materials/documentation
   7.2. Teaching Effectiveness
   7.3. Identify measures of teaching effectiveness
   7.4. What efforts to improve teaching effectiveness will be pursued based on these measures?
   7.5. What are the plans to evaluate students’ post-graduate success?
Appendix C: Annual Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report

University of Kentucky
Annual Assessment Reporting
2013-2014

Please complete this form for the program’s 2013-2014 academic year student learning outcomes assessment. If you conducted multiple assessments, please fill in as needed by starting a new section. If you have documents relevant to the assessment conducted, please add them as an appendix. Add hyperlinks to websites as necessary. For our records, please save the file as Program Name and Level (e.g. English_Master).

College:
Department:
Program Name:
Level (Bachelor, Master, Doctorate, Certificate, or Other):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome(s) Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Method/Tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome(s) Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Method/Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark/Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Method/Tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment #2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome(s) Assessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Method/Tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark/Target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome(s) Assessed</td>
<td>Assessment Method/Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: UAC SLO Annual Assessment Report Rubric

Each category will be scored as *Meets expectations (2 points), Emerging (1 point), or Does not meet expectations (0 points)*. The total points for each report will be added together to provide an overall score for the Student Learning Outcome Report. Final scoring categories are as follows:

- Meets expectations: 10-12 points
- Emerging: 6-9 points
- Does not meet expectations: 0-5 points

Scores will be reported to the Dean and the UAC liaisons for each college or division.

I. Method(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Expectations (2 points)</th>
<th>Emerging (1 point)</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations (0 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Relationship between assessment tools and outcomes</td>
<td>A general explanation is provided about how the assessment tools relates to the outcome measured (e.g., the faculty wrote test items, essay questions, etc to match the outcome, or the instrument was selected “because its general description appeared to match our outcome”). May include pass rates for license or certification exams. Assessment tools are primarily indirect, and include things like head counts and course pass rates.</td>
<td>At a superficial level, it appears the content assessed by the assessment tools matches the outcome, but no explanation is provided. Assessment tools are primarily indirect, and include things like head counts and course pass rates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tools specified by a program’s accrediting body are considered to meet expectations, but it must be made clear to the reader that the tool is chosen by the accrediting body. If more than one outcome is linked to any one assessment tool, an explanation is provided for how each outcome can be measured using only one tool.
### B. Data collection and Research design integrity

| **Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process,** such as a description of the sample, evaluation protocol, evaluation conditions, and student motivation, when and where the data was collected (e.g., were students sampled, or was the population evaluated, adequate motivation, two or more trained raters for performance assessment, pre-post design to measure gain, cutoff defended for performance vs. a criterion). | **Limited information is provided about data collection such as who and how many took the assessment, but not enough to judge the veracity of the process (e.g., thirty-five seniors took the test). There appears to be a mismatch with specifications of desired results.** | **No information is provided about data collection process or data not collected.** |

### C. Specification of desired benchmark/target

| **Desired benchmark/target is specified (e.g., our students will gain ½ standard deviation from junior to senior year; our students will score above a faculty-determined standard).** | **Desired result (e.g., student growth, comparison to previous year’s data, comparison to faculty standards, performance vs. a criterion), but lack specificity (e.g., students will grow;** | **No a priori benchmarks/targets for outcomes.** |
“Gathering baseline data” is acceptable for this rating. Enough information was provided to understand how the benchmark was determined.

| “Gathering baseline data” is acceptable for this rating. Enough information was provided to understand how the benchmark was determined. | students will perform better than last year). |  |

II. **Results**

| Results are present, and directly relate to outcomes. The desired benchmarks for the outcomes are clearly presented, and were derived by appropriate analysis. If a rubric or grading scale was used, it is clear how many in the sample scored in each category. | Results are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the outcomes or the benchmark/target for the outcomes, but presentation lacks clarity or difficult to follow. Only the aggregate totals are given (e.g. 80% of the students met the target.) | No results presented. |
### III. Interpretation of Results

| Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcomes, benchmarks/targets, and methodology. It reflects a discussion of the results by pertinent parties. The position of the person or persons involved in the analysis is listed. | Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the outcomes or benchmarks/targets for the outcomes. Or, the interpretations are clearly not supported by the methodology and/or results. There is no mention of the person or persons that completed the analysis. | No interpretation attempted. The analysis simply repeats what was stated in the Results category. |

### IV. Improvement Action

| Examples of improvements (or plans to improve) are documented and directly related to findings of assessment. These improvements are very specific (e.g., approximate dates of and person(s) responsible for implementation, and where in curriculum/activities | Examples of improvements are documented but the link between them and the assessment findings is not clear. The improvements lack specificity. | No mention of any improvements. |
and department/program they will occur.)

If no improvements are found to be necessary then: the program must either increase the benchmark, or explain why the benchmark does not need to be increased; state plans to focus on another area of concern for future assessments and work to monitor and maintain the current level of success for this outcome.
Appendix E: Assessment Plan Review Process

1. Plans collected by Office of Assessment
2. Plans distributed to council members for review and feedback
3. “1st Read” comments are submitted back to Office of Assessment
4. Once all plans have been reviewed for a specific college/department, “1st read comments are sent to the respective assessment liaison for a “2nd Read”
5. Assessment liaison conducts “2nd Read” and disagrees or agrees with “1st Read”
6. Agreement: Review form is completed by assessment liaison, signed by appropriate faculty and the chair of the UAC
7. Disagreement: goes to Director of Assessment for ‘3rd read’
8. Director of Assessment conducts ‘3rd Read’ and submits comments to the respective assessment liaison
9. Review form is completed by assessment liaison, signed by appropriate faculty and the chair of the UAC