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I. INTRODUCTION

This document presents a plan for assessing student-learning outcomes at Adams State University (ASU), including both on and off-campus degree programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The plan is not meant to be a general assessment plan of all University goals and objectives but is limited to student learning. Program goals that are not academic in nature will be assessed in the five-year program review, rather than using the detailed plan outlined below. The plan provides a local definition of learning assessment, a purpose and rationale for doing assessment, a set of principles and a description of what is to be assessed and how the assessment activities will be coordinated and managed.

Enhancing learning by enhancing assessment

Assessment is a central element in the overall quality of teaching and learning in higher education. A well-designed plan for assessment of learning outcomes sets clear expectations, but also establishes a reasonable workload (one that does not push students into rote approaches to study and one that does not push faculty into artificial teaching modes). Assessment provides opportunities for students to self-monitor, rehearse, practice, and receive feedback; at the same time it provides opportunities for faculty to monitor the attainment of learning outcomes and to receive feedback for ongoing improvement of academic programs.

II. PURPOSE

The goal of this assessment initiative is to improve student learning thus helping the University fulfill its educational mission. Assessment provides evidence of how well the University is meeting its objectives and helps identify areas for improvement.

III. RATIONALE

Even if assessment were not required, educators, whose role is to improve student learning, should always engage in a regular process of assessment as a means to improve student learning.

IV. BASIC PRINCIPLES

Principles Underlying Adams State University’s Assessment Plan

- The University is committed to assessment and to implementation of a unified, coherent program to evaluate its educational activities.
- The University values the involvement of all stakeholders including students, alumni, faculty, administration, and staff, in the assessment process.
- The faculty of each program, under the leadership of the department chair, will have primary responsibility for the development, implementation, and maintenance of assessment activities that align with the assessment protocol developed for the Higher Learning Commission (HLC).
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Clearly defined program goals against which student learning outcomes can be evaluated are essential. Statements of desired program educational goals of all academic programs, will originate with, and be approved by, the faculty of those programs.

Programs evaluated by external accrediting bodies may have to meet additional requirements but must adhere to university assessment guidelines.

Student learning should be assessed using both direct and indirect methods and quantitative and qualitative data.

The non-aggregated data gathered for assessment purposes shall remain confidential and shall be used only for the purposes of assessment.

Assessment of student learning outcomes is about improving learning, not evaluating faculty.

Assessment is systematic, ongoing, and cyclic.

Assessment should be simple, doable, and consistent with the university’s mission.

Assessment may measure value-added learning but this is not a requirement.

The assessment program is dynamic and will evolve over time.

V. LEARNING GOALS & ASSESSMENT STRATEGY

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes occurs in two broad categories: General Education Program Goals, and Departmental, or major-specific Program Goals. A distinct assessment plan is necessary for each of these categories. Adams State University has three assessment plans at the undergraduate level: the general education assessment plan, the university-wide writing proficiency assessment plan, and the departmental assessment plan. Academic departments that house graduate programs must also engage in assessment of learning goals. The Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), or designee, in collaboration with Faculty Senate, the Assessment Coordinator, Academic Council, Assessment of Student Learning Committee, Graduate Council and the General Education Coordinating Committee, are responsible for establishing and updating procedures for all assessment plans.

The Academic Council and Graduate Council, with assistance from the Assessment of Student Learning Committee, reviews the procedures for assessment on an annual basis and makes recommendations to the VPAA for any changes. The Assessment Coordinator reviews undergraduate programs’ yearly assessment reports and complete a Summary Report for the VPAA. The Curriculum Review Committee reviews a cumulative assessment report for all undergraduate programs on a five-year cycle as part of the program review process. The Graduate Council reviews a cumulative assessment report for all graduate programs on a five-year cycle as part of the program review process. In addition, Graduate Council reviews yearly ‘progress reports’ between each program’s 5-year cycle.

The Assessment of Student Learning Committee, formed in spring 2015, will work with the Assessment Coordinator and is charged with determining how the gathering of evidence of student learning can strengthen ASU programs and enhance accountability. In the spirit of shared governance, the committee will provide the university-wide perspective on assessing student learning as carried out in undergraduate curricular, extra and co-curricular programs. The committee will maintain communications with the ASU Senate, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Curriculum Review Committee (CRC), General Education Coordinating Committee (GECC), Graduate Council and other appropriate committees and academic units.
1. General Education Program Goals

Adams State University has prescribed a program of general studies for all students seeking associate and baccalaureate degrees. This is done in the belief that our graduates must possess college level skills, competencies, and an acquaintance with major areas of knowledge commonly possessed by educated persons in a free society. Students pursue the general education program goals detailed below through a range of formal and informal activities including, but not limited to, the successful completion of the general studies curriculum and the academic major. Adams State graduates shall demonstrate satisfactory attainment of the following goals and student performance outcomes. Specifically, the program of general studies will foster in our graduates:

Goal 1. an understanding of and facility in the basic modes of communication and an ability to initiate inquiry, question conventional wisdom, and analyze problems;
   Students will demonstrate ability to:
   1(a) read, write, speak, and listen accurately, effectively, and critically;
   1(b) think analytically, cooperatively, creatively, and independently;
   1(c) function as productive members of groups;
   1(d) access information effectively;
   1(e) think analytically, cooperatively, and creatively.

Goal 2. a critical understanding of the current state of knowledge, of the methods by which that knowledge has been produced, and of the interrelationships among the major academic divisions of knowledge: fine arts, humanities, and the physical, natural and social sciences;
   Students will demonstrate an understanding of:
   2(a) the major fields of knowledge and their interrelationships;
   2(b) quantitative methods and their uses;
   2(c) implications and uses of technology;
   2(d) diverse moral and ethical philosophies;
   2(e) one’s place within a larger historical and multicultural framework;

Goal 3. the development of a global perspective (cultural, historical, societal, scientific) from which a strong set of ethical and moral values can evolve;
   Students will demonstrate an increased awareness of:
   3(a) the aesthetic dimensions of human experience;
   3(b) community involvement;
   3(c) diverse cultures, persons and ideas;

Goal 4. an awareness of the importance and desirability of continuing to pursue intellectual growth throughout one’s lifetime.
   Students will demonstrate and increased awareness of:
   4(a) connections between classroom content and issues outside the classroom

a. Assessment of General Education Program Goals

i. Assessment of Specific General Education Courses:
Assessment of student learning outcomes occurs within every general education course. Course syllabi clearly state Student Learning Outcomes that address the general education program goals. Additionally, course content provides evidence that these goals are being addressed. The course grading criteria provides evidence that students are being assessed within the class on their ability to meet the student learning outcomes of both the course and general education.

The department that delivers the general education course is responsible for ensuring that the Institutional Syllabus aligns with the goals for general education. It is also responsible for ensuring that individual instructor syllabi align with the approved institutional syllabus. In addition, the Institutional Syllabi for all general education courses will be reviewed and approved by both the CRC (Curriculum Review Committee) and the GECC (General Education Coordinating Committee) to ensure that student learning outcomes, course content and grading procedures align with and measure the goals for general education.

ii. Assessment of General Education Goals

The General Education Program Goals stated above includes goals that are not easily measured in a quantifiable manner. In order to effectively measure these goals, it is necessary to use a variety of assessment tools in addition to those provided within the general education course itself. Currently, the following assessment tools are used to assess general education learning outcomes:

- The NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) – measures student engagement. Exam is administered every three years. (Assesses General Education Goals 3, 4)
- The ACT CAAP Reading Exam – measures general education learning outcomes with regard to prose, humanities, and social, natural and physical sciences. Locally developed math questions are included in this exam. Exam is administered to graduating seniors annually and to entering freshman every three years (Assesses General Education Goals 1, 2)
- An alumni survey, developed by GECC, to measure general education learning outcomes perceptions of alumni.

The GECC (General Education Coordinating Committee), in consultation with Faculty Senate, Academic Council, and the VPAA, is responsible for determining which assessment methods are most appropriate for General Education at the college-wide level.

The GECC, working in collaboration with IR, will submit an annual report analyzing the assessment results to Faculty Senate, Academic Council, and the VPAA. The reporting format (5-question yearly report) will parallel that approved by the Academic Council for assessment of academic programs. Included in their report will be recommendations for actions to be undertaken in the next academic year. The Academic Council and Faculty Senate will review the report and modify or move to adopt the recommendations. The VPAA, or designee, will in turn consider these recommendations before endorsing the actions to be taken in the following year. Actions to be undertaken will be communicated to the Academic Council, Faculty Senate, and GECC by the VPAA, or designee, in order to facilitate implementing the plan the following year.
The responsibility to act on recommendations regarding specific content or instructional objectives lies with the program(s) responsible for delivery of courses with related content and instructional objectives.

iii. Annual Procedure & Calendar for General Education Assessment

OCTOBER
- GECC and IR collaborate to compile a report on ASU students’ performance from the previous year. The report will include analysis and recommendations to address any areas where performance is below the established benchmark. The reporting format will parallel that approved by the Academic Council for assessment of academic programs. GECC, in consultation with Academic Council, Faculty Senate and the VPAA, will annually evaluate which campus-wide assessment tests/tools best measure the General Education Program Goals and whether currently used tests/tools should continue to be administered regularly. GECC will determine the schedule for administration.

NOVEMBER
- GECC’s report is submitted to Faculty Senate, Academic Council and the VPAA, or designee, for review.
- Faculty Senate and Academic Council make recommendations to the VPAA, or designee, if action is needed to address performance deficiencies. If Faculty Senate and Academic Council are satisfied that students are successfully meeting the required benchmarks, they will endorse the report.
- The VPAA, or designee, endorses or modifies recommendations and relays them to GECC.
- Referring to the General Education assessment tool schedule, GECC will work with the IR Office, Grizzly Testing and Learning Center and any other relevant departments to establish a timeline and implement a plan for ordering and administrating assessment tools/tests.
- GECC will determine benchmarks for performance on specific tests.

DECEMBER-JANUARY
- GECC establishes a procedure for administering the tests. If a system has previously been established for administration of a particular assessment test, and GECC agrees that it is the most effective method, they may work with the existing responsible office or individual to ensure that process for administration is followed.

MARCH/APRIL
- Assessment tests/surveys are administered and returned to the IR Office. (Some tests/surveys are conducted in the fall semester.)
- IR Office sends tests/surveys to appropriate center for results tabulation.
- IR Office receives test/survey results.

MAY – OCTOBER
- Test/survey results are analyzed by IR and GECC. GECC summarizes general education assessment findings in an annual report.

2. University-wide Writing Assessments

All ASU students are expected to demonstrate proficiency in writing. Demonstrated proficiency is a requirement for graduation with all associate and baccalaureate degrees. All students are expected to
undergo an assessment of their writing during the semester in which they will have completed 60 credit hours. The method of writing assessment varies by discipline/major. Each department is responsible for determining the criteria for writing proficiency for their majors, as well as assessing their writing.

3. Undergraduate Assessment of Departmental Program Goals

Adams State University departments are committed to student learning and the goals and mission of the University. In pursuit of these, departments are committed to developing program goals that are in alignment with institutional goals and are measurable including quantitatively and qualitatively, at the program and course level. Academic department chairs and faculty are expected to implement departmental assessment plans in a manner that effectively measures student learning and that indicates a commitment to assessment and student learning by the program and its faculty. It includes benchmarks and a feedback loop to ensure that student learning is assessed and evaluated and appropriate curricular measures will be implemented based on the performance of the students.

Most measurement of student learning outcomes will occur at the program level through the assessment methods selected by the faculty. The compilation of these various assessment results will indicate the extent to which the goals are being achieved across the University.

It is not necessary to measure every objective every semester or even every year. A cycle for measurement should be established. Neither is it necessary to use the entire population of available students for each measurement. In certain courses (e.g., those with multiple sections) sampling techniques may be used.

At the undergraduate level, there are two assessment processes that should be completed: (a) Yearly Assessment Report, and (b) 5-Year Program Review Report.

3a) Yearly Assessment Reports (undergraduate)

All undergraduate programs submit yearly assessment reports to the Assessment Coordinator for review. The Assessment Coordinator completes a feedback report and shares this with the VPAA for his/her review. Once reviewed by the VPAA, the feedback report is forwarded to the academic program department chair to ensure planned actions, changes or improvements are implemented and tracked. These yearly reports should help to inform a department’s 5-year program review. Yearly assessment reports and feedback reports will be filed by the Assessment Coordinator with the VPAA. The template for the yearly report is Appendix A.

Yearly Assessment Plans and Reports (undergraduate)

a. Annual assessment plans for each academic program will include:
   1. Departmental Academic Goals (aligned with institutional goals)
   2. Program learning goal(s): what we want students to learn and why—the ends, not the means.
   3. Intended Student Learning Outcome(s): knowledge, skills, attitudes, and habits of mind
   4. Assessment strategy(ies)
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5. Criteria for success/benchmarks for each assessment measure
6. Timeframe of each measure (all goals should be assessed during the 5-year cycle used in program reviews)
b. Assessment reports will use a standardized template that answers the following:
   1. What information/evidence/data was gathered to inform the department about student learning in this area?
   2. How was the information discussed in the department?
   3. What was discovered? What are the department’s conclusions?
   4. What is planned to be the same or different based on the discoveries about students and their learning?
   5. What support or resources does the department need in order to make the planned changes happen?
c. The Assessment Coordinator and VPAA work in collaboration to review each report and provide written feedback to each department. The feedback form/scoring rubric is Appendix B.
d. The Assessment Coordinator will complete a summary report for the VPAA that presents an overview of evaluation scores, and the most frequently assessed goals and assessment tools. The template for the summary report is Appendix C.
e. Five-year program reviews will include the previous five years’ assessment reports in the appendix.

**Yearly Assessment Report Calendar (undergraduate)**

AUG-OCT
   Departments will complete and review an assessment plan for upcoming academic year and include any necessary follow-up assessment actions from prior year’s assessment report.

OCT-MAY (throughout academic year)
   Departments will conduct assessment methods/activities as indicated in assessment plan.

JUNE-OCT
   Department chairs and faculty will complete and submit academic program assessment reports from the previous academic year (fall & spring semesters) and identify goals & SLOs to be assessed in the following year (submit by August 15 to Assessment Coordinator).

OCT
   Assessment Coordinator, reviews assessment reports and completes and provides feedback report to VPAA. VPAA either accepts the report or returns to department for revision. Feedback is then shared with the academic departments.

OCT-NOV
   Assessment Coordinator completes summary report and forwards to VPAA

**3b) 5-Year Program Review Reports (undergraduate)**

The Curriculum Review Committee will review undergraduate program reviews on a five-year cycle. All yearly assessment plans/reports from the previous five years will be included in the program review appendix. All 5-year program review reports will be evaluated by an qualified external reviewer. Assessment plans will form a significant component on which the CRC bases its
overall recommendations for a program. Undergraduate programs will follow the phases/timeline outlined below.

The intent of the Program Review process is to assess how well the program is being delivered and to make suggestions for improvements to the program. It is not intended to be threatening to any program under review but to enable all programs to strengthen their performance. Program reviews are submitted electronically to the VPAA. Reviews are not to exceed 10 to 15 pages.

**Five-year Program Review Phases (undergraduate)**

**Phase 1—Preparation of Program Review Information**

Program reviews include each of the categories listed below and are as brief and as concise as possible.

I. Brief Overview of the Program (1 to 2 pages)
   - Program highlights & changes since the last program review
   - Identification of degrees offered and population served
   - Identification of any special programs

II. Program Data Sheet
   - Program Data Sheet from Institutional Reporting
   - Any discrepancies with departmental data are noted and explained
   - Any anomalies or data of concern are explained

III. Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, Assessment/ Measurement
    The following is indicated:
    - Goals (broad and comprehensive)
    - Learning outcomes supporting each goal (learning outcomes are narrower, measurable and specify who will accomplish them, how, and when)
    - How achievement of the learning outcomes is assessed
    - How assessment results are used to improve student learning/program delivery

IV. Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations
    - Strengths and weaknesses in the program are identified
    - Recommendations for improvements are listed

V. Appendix
   - List of faculty members and qualifications
   - Examples of assessment tests if not included under section III
   - Any other evidence critical to evaluation of the program

IV. External Review
   - All reports will be reviewed by an external reviewer who is appointed by the VPAA upon recommendation from the department chair. The VPAA reserves the right to ask for additional nominees. Evaluators must have expertise in the same discipline as the unit being reviewed and must be established scholars in the field under review. The external reviewer will review the self-study prior to the site visit and then conduct a site visit. The department may then incorporate any suggestions, clarifications, or corrections into the self-study report. The final report and the external reviewer’s report are then forwarded to CRC.
Phase 2—Informational Meeting with CRC

The CRC will meet with a representative or representatives of the department/program under review. The representative will discuss and clarify any questions the CRC has regarding the Program Review and external review. The main purpose of this phase is to identify strengths and weaknesses in the program and ensure that the CRC has a full understanding of the program. The CRC will base their written recommendations on the Program Review, external review, and this discussion. These written recommendations will be forwarded to the department offering the program and the VPAA.

Phase 3—Discussion of Recommendations

This phase will involve a meeting with the departmental representative(s), the CRC and the VPAA. This group will review the recommendations made by the CRC and the department. The main purpose of this phase is to find solutions to any weaknesses in the program. This discussion should focus on how well the goals and learning outcomes are being met and the assessment results. In addition, they will discuss other recommendations and the feasibility of implementing them. It offers the department an opportunity to respond to and act on the recommendations of the CRC. The outcome of this discussion should form the basis of a plan for program improvement.

Phase 4—Final Report

The CRC will submit a final written report to the VPAA based on the discussions in phases 2 and 3. This report will focus on achievable recommendations and plans for improving student outcomes.

Program Review Timeline

In the event that the deadline occurs on a weekend, the following Monday will be used.

SEPT 1
- VPAA will initiate Program Review Process with programs scheduled for a five-year program review.

SEPT-OCT
- Institutional Reporting will provide data sheet to departments undergoing review.

NOV-JAN
- Departments will prepare program review report.
- Departments will work with VPAA to secure an external reviewer

JAN 15
- Undergraduate programs undergoing the five-year program review will submit their program reviews and external review report to the CRC and the VPAA.

FEB 1
- CRC will meet with departmental representatives to discuss program review findings.

FEB 15
- CRC will submit its recommendations to the department of the academic program.
4. Graduate Program Assessment

At the graduate level, there are two assessment processes that should be completed: (a) Yearly Progress Reports, and (b) 5-Year Program Review Reports.

All graduate programs will submit, to Graduate Council, yearly progress reports that tracks any or no progress towards goals outlined in the previous 5-year program review. The purpose of the report is to assist graduate programs in their follow-up of the stated in the 5-year review and prepare for the next 5-year review.

4a. Yearly Progress Reports (Graduate)

Each graduate program will begin a yearly progress report based on stated goals in their respective 5-year program review report. The Yearly Progress Report template is Appendix D. The progress report will use a standardized template that contains the following:

1. What items did you propose to improve upon/change as stated in your 5-year program review?
2. What progress have you made on each recommendation for improvement?
3. What progress has not been made on each recommendation and why?
4. Are there any changes/updates/modifications to recommendations and why?

Yearly Assessment and Progress Report Calendar (Graduate)

For each year following the submission and review of the 5-Year Program Review, each graduate program will complete a Yearly Progress report by October 1 for review by Assessment Coordinator, VPAA, and Graduate Council

4-b. 5-Year Program Review Reports (Graduate)

The Graduate Council reviews all graduate programs on a five-year cycle. All yearly assessment plans/reports from the previous five years will be included in the program review appendix. All 5-year program review reports will be evaluated by an qualified external reviewer (need process here) Assessment plans will form a significant component on which Graduate Council bases its overall recommendations for a program.

The intent of the Program Review process is to assess how well the program is being delivered and to make suggestions for improvements to the program. It is not intended to be threatening to any
program under review but to enable all programs to strengthen their performance. Program reviews are submitted electronically to the VPAA. Reviews are not to exceed 10 to 15 pages.

**Five-year Program Review Phases**

Phase 1—Preparation of Program Review Information

Program reviews include each of the categories listed below and are as brief and as concise as possible.

II. Brief Overview of the Program (1 to 2 pages)
   - Program highlights & changes since the last program review
   - Identification of degrees offered and population served
   - Identification of any special programs

II. Program Data Sheet
   - Program Data Sheet from Institutional Reporting
   - Any discrepancies with departmental data are noted and explained
   - Any anomalies or data of concern are explained

III. Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, Assessment/ Measurement
    The following is indicated:
    - Goals (broad and comprehensive)
    - Learning outcomes supporting each goal (learning outcomes are narrower, measurable and specify who will accomplish them, how, and when)
    - How achievement of the learning outcomes is assessed
    - How assessment results are used to improve student learning/program delivery

IV. Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations
    - Strengths and weaknesses in the program are identified
    - Recommendations for improvements are listed

V. Appendix
   - List of faculty members and qualifications
   - Examples of assessment tests if not included under section III
   - Any other evidence critical to evaluation of the program

IV. External Review
   - All reports will be reviewed by an external reviewer who is appointed by the VPAA upon recommendation from the department chair. The VPAA reserves the right to ask for additional nominees. Evaluators must have expertise in the same discipline as the unit being reviewed and must be established scholars in the field under review. The external reviewer will review the self-study prior to the site visit, conduct a site visit and prepare a report.

Phase 2—Informational Meeting with Graduate Council and Department
The Graduate Council will meet with a representative or representatives of the department/program under review. The representative will discuss and clarify any questions the Graduate Council has regarding the Program Review and external review. The main purpose of this phase is to identify strengths and weaknesses in the program and ensure that the Graduate Council has a full understanding of the program. The Graduate Council will base their written recommendations on the Program Review, external review, and this discussion. These written recommendations will be forwarded to the department offering the program and the VPAA. The scoring rubric completed by Graduate Council is in Appendix E.

Phase 3—Discussion of Recommendations

This phase will involve a meeting with the departmental representative(s), the Graduate Council and the VPAA. This group will review the recommendations made by the Graduate Council and the department. The main purpose of this phase is to find solutions to any weaknesses in the program. This discussion should focus on how well the goals and learning outcomes are being met and the assessment results. In addition, they will discuss other recommendations and the feasibility of implementing them. It offers the department an opportunity to respond to and act on the recommendations of the Graduate Council. The outcome of this discussion should form the basis of a plan for program improvement.

Phase 4—Final Report

The Graduate Council will submit a final written report to the VPAA based on the discussions in phases 2 and 3. This report will focus on achievable recommendations and plans for improving student outcomes.

Program Review Timeline

In the event that the deadline occurs on a weekend, the following Monday will be used.

SEPT 1
  ● VPAA will initiate Program Review Process with programs scheduled for a five-year program review.

SEPT-OCT
  ● Institutional Reporting will provide data sheet to departments undergoing review.

NOV-JAN
  ● Departments will prepare program review report.
  ● Departments will work with VPAA to secure an external reviewer.

JAN 15
  ● Graduate programs undergoing the five-year program review will submit their program reviews to the VPAA and the Graduate Council.
FEB 1
- Graduate Council will meet with departmental representatives to discuss program review findings.

FEB 15
- The Graduate Council will submit its recommendations to the department of the academic program.

MAR 1
- Graduate Council and VPAA will meet with programs undergoing review to discuss recommendations.

APRIL 1
- Graduate Council will submit final report(s) on program reviews to VPAA.

MAY
- The VPAA will approve or modify Graduate Council recommendations for graduate programs.

VI. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Assessment of student learning is the responsibility of the faculty and instructional staff, students, the General Education Coordinating Committee, Faculty Senate, the Academic Council, the Curriculum Review Committee, the Graduate Council, the Assessment Coordinator, and the Office of the VPAA. The roles and responsibilities of the participants are described below.

Program Faculty
The faculty from each academic program is responsible for:
1. Developing a set of program goals and measurable learning objectives for the program
2. Developing course specific goals and learning outcomes that align with the program goals and learning outcomes
3. Designing a curriculum to achieve those goals
4. Developing course specific measures/rubrics that assess both course specific and program goals and learning outcomes
5. Creating a program assessment plan
6. Assessing student learning
7. Analyzing assessment data
8. Using assessment results to improve student learning
9. Participating in the annual assessment reporting process with their department.
10. Ensuring appropriate rigor for type and level of course.

Students
Students (including alumni) are responsible for:
1. Honest and accurate participation in any assessment activities in which they participate
2. Performing at the highest level possible when demonstrating their skills and knowledge if assessment is to be accurate
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The General Education Coordinating Committee
The GECC is responsible for:
1. Determining the assessment devices for General Education
2. Assisting in the administration of selected assessment tests/surveys
3. Analyzing assessment data
4. Using assessment results to improve student learning
5. Making recommendations based on the results of the assessment tests

The Academic Council & Faculty Senate
The Academic Council and Faculty Senate are responsible for:
1. Reviewing the recommendations of GECC
2. Reviewing the program assessment reporting format and structure
3. Making recommendations regarding assessment plans and reports

As the primary faculty governing bodies, the Academic Council and Faculty Senate support faculty and staff responsibilities by providing leadership and support for assessment activities. The Academic Council working with Faculty Senate, GECC, the Graduate Council, the CRC, and the Office of Institutional Reporting, is responsible for the coordination, review, and follow-up of assessment activities in each academic unit.

The Curriculum Review Committee
The CRC is responsible for evaluating the five-year program reviews of undergraduate programs. They will meet with representatives from the programs and make recommendations to the VPAA or designee. In addition, the CRC reviews and approves all curricular changes to undergraduate programs, including student-learning outcomes.

The Graduate Council
The Graduate Council is responsible for evaluating the five-year program reviews of graduate programs. They will meet with representatives from the programs and make recommendations to the VPAA or designee. In addition, the Graduate Council reviews and approves all curricular changes to graduate programs, including student-learning outcomes.

The Assessment Coordinator
The Assessment Coordinator is responsible for:
1. Completing feedback on annual reports and sharing results with VPAA and departments.
2. Meeting with Department Chairs to discuss assessment activities and provide guidance and support when necessary.
3. Meeting with VPAA to discuss assessment issues and progress made…
4. Providing professional development for faculty, staff, and administration on assessment and related topics.
5. Supporting faculty and staff in their assessment activities
6. Working with CRC and GECC to provide support and guidance on assessment related issues.
7. Remaining current with trends related to assessment in higher education.

The Assessment of Student Learning Committee
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This committee will work with the Assessment Coordinator and is charged with determining how the gathering of evidence of student learning can strengthen ASU programs and enhance accountability. In the spirit of shared governance, the committee will provide the university-wide perspective on assessing student learning as carried out in undergraduate curricular, extra and co-curricular programs.

The committee will work with the Assessment Coordinator to:

- identify key issues and/or concerns regarding evidence of student learning
- develop recommendations and promote best practices in gathering and sharing evidence of student learning
- develop and update policies with respect to institution-wide assessment of student learning
- identify gaps in assessment information
- recommend changes in assessment processes
- review the usefulness of assessment strategies, reporting strategies, and feedback processes
- encourage the use of evidence to inform decision-making at Adams State University
- assist the Assessment Coordinator with reviewing assessment reports from departments

The committee will maintain communications with the ASU Senate, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Curriculum Review Committee (CRC), General Education Coordinating Committee (GECC), Graduate Council and other appropriate committees and academic units.

Vice President for Academic Affairs

As the chief academic officer the VPAA is responsible for overseeing the assessment process and integrating the academic assessment plan with the overall University assessment plan.

1. The VPAA oversees the Academic and Graduate Councils, the CRC, and GECC and ensures that the academic assessment plans and reports are in alignment with the overall university assessment plan, strategic plan, and academic master plan.
2. The VPAA reviews recommendations of the Academic and Graduate Councils and modifies recommendations as needed to ensure assessment planning and reporting of undergraduate and graduate academic programs is effective.

Resource Requirements

Implementing an institutional academic assessment plan that will continue over time and be a constructive activity will require a commitment of resources. The exact nature of resources associated with assessment, both budgetary and other, will be determined through the institutional assessment and planning processes.

VII. ASSESSMENT PLANS

Evaluation of the Overall Adams State University Assessment Plan
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The proposed assessment plan outlined above is seen as a dynamic document that will change over time. Faculty Senate, the Assessment Coordinator, the Academic Council and Graduate Council, working with the VPAA will review the Academic Assessment Plan every three years and make revisions to the plan when deemed appropriate. Updates will be submitted to ASU Quality Improvement.

**VIII. REPORTING AND USING RESULTS**

Faculty Senate, the Academic Council and Graduate Council, working with GECC, the CRC and the Office of Institutional Reporting, will assist in the internal dissemination of information to relevant campus constituencies in order to facilitate the improvement of student learning based on the overall outcomes assessment results. It will also communicate assessment results within the ASU community to increase awareness of how assessment is being used to improve learning.
APPENDIX A

Adams State University
Yearly Assessment Program for Promotion of Student Learning
Undergraduate Programs

Each academic discipline or department at Adams State University should maintain an active program of analysis of its curriculum and pedagogical methods in order to maintain and enhance the quality of student learning provided by its courses and programs. An active program should include:

1. A published set of student learning outcomes for all majors and programs within the discipline or department.
2. An intentional set of curricular and program elements that promote the achievement of these student learning outcomes.
3. An active plan for gathering information on the quality of student learning with respect to all student learning outcomes.
4. An annual review of the evidence of student learning that is shared by all members of the discipline or department.
5. Evidence of the use of student learning assessment information in decisions regarding curricular and pedagogical change

Annual Student Learning Report Template

Yearly reports of student learning can be submitted using the following question-based template:

A. What Student Learning Outcomes did your department explore this year? 
*Please list the specific student learning outcomes measured in this cycle.*

For each component or aspect of student learning you explored, address the following questions:

1. What information/evidence/data did you gather to inform you about student learning in this area? 
*Include rubrics as attachments.*

2. How was the information discussed in your department? 
*Responses should include identification of individuals involved and a description of your impression of those discussions. Include information on the frequency that discussions occurred within the department. Discussions are documented but do not include in report.*

3. What did you discover? What were your conclusions?  
*A brief synopsis of the data – do not include a mass amount of raw data. Focus on the “meaning” of the data with respect to student learning. Include descriptive data and tie to findings.*

4. What do you plan to do the same and differently in the future based on your discoveries about your students and their learning? 
*Tie the conclusions to some planned actions with respect to pedagogy, curriculum or programming. If some evidence is strong in favor of no change, indicate that as well.*

5. What support or resources do you need in order to make your plans happen?
A request for support and/or resources must be directly tied to your conclusions. Any conclusions established must be clearly based on your gathered evidence.

B. “Closing the Loop” section:
Please include a brief section in the report that provides an update on any changes made based on the previous year’s report. Cite changes/modifications/strategies that were implemented in the past year to address question #4.
APPENDIX B

ADAMS STATE UNIVERSITY
Evaluation for Yearly Department Assessment Reports - “Feedback Report”

Date: 
Department: 
Chair: 1
List the student learning outcomes assessed:

Rubric for 5-Question “Short Form” Feedback Report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-form Question</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.SLOS are listed. Information/Evidence/Data Gathered to Inform Department of Student Learning</td>
<td>SLOs are listed. Variety of assessments gathered and assessments are valid for each measure of student learning. Rubrics attached to report. Assessment strategies described. ☑</td>
<td>SLOs are listed. Some information/evidence/data gathered to assess student learning outcomes for program</td>
<td>No SLOs are listed. Little to no information/evidence/data gathered to assess student learning outcomes for program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Departmental Discussion of Information</td>
<td>All faculty of department participated in in-depth discussion of info/evidence/data. Focused discussions of assessment and assessment processes are evident. ☑</td>
<td>Some faculty participation in discussion. Semi-focused discussions of assessment and assessment processes are evident.</td>
<td>Little to no discussion by entire department. No focused departmental discussions of assessment and assessment processes are evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Discoveries/conclusions</td>
<td>Synopsis demonstrates that the department made highly relevant discoveries and conclusions from data with respect to student learning. ☑</td>
<td>Connection between data and student learning is adequately relevant.</td>
<td>Connection between data and student learning is weak or lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Planned Actions Based on Discoveries About Students and Their Learning</td>
<td>Pedagogical, curricular or programmatic improvements planned based on evidence or it is noted that no change is necessary. ☑</td>
<td>Stated conclusions are present but not based on evidence or inconsistent with evidence</td>
<td>Little to no conclusions or plans presented in report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Support/resources</td>
<td>Requested resources, if any, clearly align with evidence and are realistic. Rational for no needed resources align with evidence. ☑</td>
<td>Requested resources, if any, somewhat align with evidence or are somewhat realistic.</td>
<td>Requested resources, if any, do not align with evidence and are not realistic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths of Assessment Report:

Challenges of Assessment Report:

Follow-up requirements: Follow-up assessment report of planned actions (#4 – for Goals 1-4)) due with next year’s annual assessment report.

Review of Assessment Report by VP for Academic Affairs and Assessment Coordinator , Adams State University

Approved Spring 2015  ASU Academic Assessment Plan
APPENDIX C

Summary Report of Yearly Assessments by Department
Completed by Assessment Coordinator

Academic Year Reviewed: _____________________________

Date: ________________________________________

Number of reports submitted: ______

Rubric Item #1:

Rubric Item #2

Rubric Item #3

Rubric Item #4

Most Common SLOs Measured:

Most Common Assessment Tools Used:
APPENDIX  D

Yearly Progress Report - Graduate Programs

Completed by:

Date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List “Recommendations for Improvement” from 5-year Review</th>
<th>Progress made on recommendation</th>
<th>Progress not made on recommendation and why</th>
<th>Changes to recommendations and why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

RUBRIC FOR PROGRAM REVIEW FINAL REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review Component</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Highlights since the last Review</td>
<td>□ Program review does not identify program highlights or does so without explanation</td>
<td>□ Program Review identifies highlights &amp; provides explanation of their significance</td>
<td>□ Program Review indicates highlights &amp; aligns their significance to student learning &amp; program development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees offered/Population served</td>
<td>□ Program review does not identify degrees offered or population served</td>
<td>□ Program review identifies degrees offered &amp; populations served</td>
<td>□ Program review identifies degrees offered &amp; population served; connections made to Institutional role &amp; mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs within of review period</td>
<td>□ Program review does not identify any special programs within the review period</td>
<td>□ Program Review identifies special programs occurring within the review period and offers explanation as to their impact</td>
<td>□ Program Review identifies special programs &amp; clearly explains their impact on the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Data Sheet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Data Sheet</td>
<td>□ Program Data sheet is not included</td>
<td>□ Program Data sheet is present but not incomplete</td>
<td>□ Program Data sheet included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancies identified &amp; explained</td>
<td>□ Program Data sheet is not included</td>
<td>□ Discrepancies identified and explained</td>
<td>□ Discrepancies effectively identified &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of anomalies or data of concern</td>
<td>Program Data sheet is not included</td>
<td>Anomalies or data of concern are identified and explained</td>
<td>Anomalies or data of concern are thoroughly identified &amp; explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goals, Student Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals Specified (broad &amp; comprehensive)</th>
<th>Goals are not specified or are unclear</th>
<th>Goals are specified; are broad &amp; comprehensive; changes during the review period are identified and explained</th>
<th>Goals are specified; are broad &amp; comprehensive; changes during the review period are clearly identified, thoroughly explained &amp; linked to assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) identified for each goal</th>
<th>Does not include measurable SLO’s</th>
<th>Includes SLO’s for each goal</th>
<th>SLO’s are appropriate and measurable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment measure identified for each SLO</th>
<th>Does not include measurable SLO’s</th>
<th>At least one assessment measure is identified for each SLO</th>
<th>Multiple assessment measures are included for each SLO if appropriate; Appendix includes sample rubrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment results are used to improve student learning &amp; program delivery</th>
<th>Program review provides minimal information on assessment</th>
<th>Program review describes assessment methods &amp; results and explains how they have been used to improve student learning</th>
<th>Program review clearly articulates how assessment results have been used to improve student learning and inform curricular changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths, Weaknesses &amp; Recommendations</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths &amp; weaknesses are identified and explained</strong></td>
<td>□ Strengths &amp; weaknesses are not stated or have minimal explanation</td>
<td>□ Strengths &amp; weaknesses are clearly stated with adequate explanation &amp; analysis</td>
<td>□ Strengths &amp; weaknesses are clearly stated, explained and analyzed; form the basis for recommendations; curricular aspects are tied to assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations for improvements are aligned with resources and assessment results</strong></td>
<td>□ No recommendations</td>
<td>□ Recommendations are stated; connections to assessment are clear; adequate consideration is given to available resources</td>
<td>□ Recommendations are stated, clearly linked to assessments results &amp; are compelling in light of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty members listed with qualifications</strong></td>
<td>□ No list of faculty members</td>
<td>□ Faculty members are listed and qualifications are listed</td>
<td>□ Faculty members &amp; qualifications are listed and aligned with their duties over the span of the program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment tools included if not part of Section III</strong></td>
<td>□ No assessment information provided</td>
<td>□ Assessment reports/ results included; sample rubrics included, and assessments linked to efforts in improving student learning.</td>
<td>□ Assessment reports/results included; sample rubrics included; convincing evidence that results are improving students learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional critical evidence provided</td>
<td>☐ No additional evidence provided</td>
<td>☐ Additional evidence and explained.</td>
<td>☐ Additional evidence included &amp; its relevance /importance convincingly explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualified External Reviewer used</th>
<th>☐ No external reviewer used</th>
<th>☐ Adequately qualified External Reviewer used; OR external reviewer not required</th>
<th>☐ Clearly qualified external reviewer used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Review report</td>
<td>☐ No external review report</td>
<td>☐ External review report included; adequate analysis</td>
<td>☐ Thorough external review report included; comprehensive analysis &amp; recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Informational Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting with Departmental Representative</th>
<th>☐ Did not occur</th>
<th>☐ Occurred; and adequately clarified questions</th>
<th>☐ Occurred &amp; convincingly explained any questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Dept. rep &amp; VPAA</td>
<td>☐ Did not occur</td>
<td>☐ Occurred; identified reasonable recommendations to shape annual departmental assessment/progress reports.</td>
<td>☐ Occurred; reached consensus on reasonable actions &amp; priorities in to implement departmental recommendations and measures of annual progress in departmental assessment/progress reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengths of Program Review:

Challenges of Program Review:

Grad Council Recommendations:

Vote by council to (check one): ___ approve program review ___ deny program review

Date: ________________