

## Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Assessment Plan Dimensions

| Category   | Exemplary  | Accomplished   | Developing  | Beginning   |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| <b>OBJECTIVES</b>  |  |  |   |   |
| <b>Clarity</b>   | They clearly are all broad, general statements of [1] what the program wants students to be able to do and to know or [2] what the program will do to ensure what students will be able to do and to know.                   | Well defined broad, general statements of [1] what the program wants students to be able to do and to know or [2] what the program will do to ensure what students will be able to do and to know. | Fairly well defined broad, general statements of [1] what the program wants students to be able to do and to know or [2] what the program will do to ensure what students will be able to do and to know. | Not well defined.   |
| <b>Evaluatable</b>   | They all are evaluated directly or indirectly by measuring specific outcomes related to the objective.   | Most are evaluated directly or indirectly by measuring specific outcomes related to the objective.   | Some are evaluated directly or indirectly by measuring specific outcomes related to the objective.  | None are evaluated directly or indirectly by measuring specific outcomes related to the objective.  |
| <b>Relatedness</b>   | They all are related to the mission and goals of the department and college in which the program resides, and to the mission and goals of the University.  | Most are related to the mission and goals of the department and college in which the program resides, and to the mission and goals of the University.  | Some are related to the mission and goals of the department and college in which the program resides, and to the mission and goals of the University.   | No relation to mission and goals.   |
| <b>OUTCOMES</b>  |  |  |   |   |
| <b>Derivable</b>   | Outcomes are detailed and specific action statements derived from the objectives, used to determine the presence or absence of, amount of, or level of the behavior or knowledge specified by an objective.                  | Overall, a clear vision for and relationship between outcomes and objectives   | Generally clear distinction between outcomes and objectives   | No clear discernment between objectives and outcomes  |
| <b>Distinguishing</b>                                      | Outcomes clearly distinguish between the things the program wants students to know (cognitive), ways students think (affective/attitudinal), or things students should be able to do (behavioral, performance, psychomotor). | Outcomes generally match objectives with only minor discrepancies  | Outcomes sometimes misalign with the comprehensiveness of the objectives  | Outcomes often incongruent with the objective   |
| <b>Observable</b>  | Outcomes are consistently observable, measurable results or evidence of the educational experience.  | May have modest problems with the criteria of observable and/or measurable   | Some outcomes not observable and/or measurable  | Outcomes not observable and/or measurable   |
| <b>Detailed</b>  | Outcomes are consistently detailed and meaningful enough to guide decisions in program planning and improvement and decisions about pedagogy and practice.   | Provides enough details to be generally meaningful and useful in decision-making regarding planning, improvement, pedagogy, and practice   | Outcomes suggest some general directions for some decisions but not uniformly or comprehensively  | Outcomes lack detail to be useful in decision-making  |
| <b>APPLICATION OF ASSESSMENT METHODS/TOOLS TO OUTCOMES</b> |  |  |   |   |
| <b>Appropriate</b>   | Consistently used appropriate assessment methods to measure all outcomes in support of all objectives  | Generally able to identify, use, and defend appropriate assessment methods to measure the outcome  | Able to produce assessment methods to fit most outcomes, though sometimes the methods did not measure the outcome   | Often used methods that didn't measure the outcome  |
| <b>Applied</b>   | Consistently able to apply relevant method(s) appropriately (as intended by developers) and interpret results in light of decisions affecting continuous improvement   | Generally able to apply method(s) appropriately (as intended by developers) and interpret results  | Generally able to apply method(s) appropriately (as intended by developers) but may not understand results  | Misapplication of the method(s)   |
| <b>Multiple</b>  | Multiple sources of evidence used to provide distinctive perspectives on the assessment question; clear understanding of competing methods and their suitability for addressing the question                                 | Use both indirect and direct measures to provide perspective on outcomes; can defend selection of measures   | Occasional use of multiple methods/tools to measure specific outcomes but sometimes unable to defend the difference or the selection of methods   | Limited use of multiple methods to provide additional perspectives on measuring a particular outcome; often unable to defend method(s) in reference to a particular outcome |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | The outcome has been reviewed and criteria for identifying that the outcome has been met are articulated in the assessment method.   | The outcome has been reviewed and criteria has been identified, but it is not complete. Some key criteria are still missing.   | The outcome has been reviewed and criteria has been identified, but the assessment method does not measure the articulated criteria.  | There is no criteria articulated for identifying that the outcome has been met.   |

### Undergraduate Academic Program Review (UAPR) Assessment Plan Dimensions

| Category   | Exemplary  | Accomplished  | Developing  | Beginning  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| <b>APPLICATION OF RESEARCH FACTS/EVIDENCE TO MAKE DECISIONS FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT</b> |  |   |   |  |
| <b>Applied Facts</b>   | Consistently used appropriate and verifiable facts throughout to defend well-organized concepts and/or principles in support of decisions made for continuous improvement  | Generally able to use researched facts to support a decision for continuous improvement   | Able to produce facts/evidence to fit most decisions, though sometimes the facts/evidence are not the best (most persuasive, best organized, etc.) support for the decision | Often stated opinion without evidence, unable to align facts that with the decision; facts/evidence seem out of context; unable to defend a decision with evidence |
| <b>Sharing</b>   | Sharing of assessment strategies, facts, and resulting decisions regarding continuous improvements with relevant constituents and stakeholders was thorough, collaborative, well-timed, and effective  | Sharing of assessment strategies, facts, and decision making with relevant constituents and stakeholders was well-timed and effective                                   | Some evidence of consultation and collaboration with constituents and stakeholders regarding some assessment strategies and/or some decision making                         | Little or limited evidence of consultation and collaboration with constituents and stakeholders regarding assessment strategies and decision making                |
| <b>PROCESS PLAN AND CONTROL</b>  |  |   |   |  |
| <b>Continuation</b>  | Demonstrated commitment to continue the assessment cycle (timeline and milestones established; search for improved strategies, data sources, and decision-making processes)  | General understanding of the need and commitment to continue the assessment cycle   | Some evidence of an understanding of the need and/or commitment to continue the assessment cycle  | Little or limited understanding of the need and/or commitment to continue the assessment cycle   |
| <b>Total Process</b>   | Plan clearly establishes and communicates the ongoing nature of the entire assessment cycle from plan through study through implementation and review; participants and their roles are clearly delineated; all aspects of the process are well-timed and reflect appropriate milestones | An acceptable plan for the study and implementation; clear designation of participants in the process; process is well-timed and has established appropriate milestones | Evidence of a plan for the study and implementation; some sense of who does what; some evidence of appropriate timing and milestones  | Limited outline of the planning, study, and implementation process; little direction in who does what; weak sense of appropriate timing and milestones             |
| <b>Bottom to Top</b>   | Demonstrated ongoing commitment to bottom-to-top team approach and established resources for continuous assessment (i.e. evidence of faculty involvement, allocation of resources to develop and administer assessment instruments, etc.)  | Clear evidence of faculty role and inclusion at all ranks; adequate resources established for ongoing process   | Some evidence of faculty role as initiators; some evidence of some established resources  | Limited demonstrated commitment to bottom-to-top team approach and established resources for continuous assessment   |