

# ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES CHECKLIST - YEAR END REPORT

**Last Revised: January 2, 2014**

**Program:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Program Facilitator** \_\_\_\_\_ **Academic Year:** \_\_\_\_\_

## I. USE OF RESULTS FROM PREVIOUS YEAR:

- \_\_\_ Are the issues/concerns that were raised by the previous year's data addressed (e.g., a plan for improvement, revision to the program, etc.)?
- \_\_\_ Has a plan been described that addresses the student performance that did not meet the criterion?
- \_\_\_ has a plan been described that advances/maintains successes in the program?

## II. MISSION STATEMENT: A departmental statement of educational philosophy

- \_\_\_ Is the Mission Statement included?
- \_\_\_ Is the Mission Statement *obviously* and *appropriately* linked with the University's Mission Statement of "**Careers and Character**"?
- \_\_\_ Does the Mission Statement address BOTH aspects of the University Mission: Careers and Character?

## III. GOALS:

- \_\_\_ Are the goals appropriate for the program content?
- \_\_\_ Are the goals appropriate for the program level (undergraduate, graduate)?
- \_\_\_ Is the content of the Mission Statement reflected in the goals?
- \_\_\_ Are at least three (3) goals listed?
- \_\_\_ Do the goals report what students who graduate from this program should *know (knowledge)*, be able *to do (skills)*, and *think (dispositions)*?

## IV. OBJECTIVES:

- \_\_\_ Are objectives written in measurable terms? DO NOT use words like "understand," "know." Use words like: "demonstrate knowledge of," "apply," "evaluate," "critique," words that are behaviors a student can *do* that can be measured.
- \_\_\_ Is each objective clearly linked to at least one learning goal (and goal number is next to the objective)?
- \_\_\_ Are ALL the goals linked to at least one objective?
- \_\_\_ Are at least six (6) and no more than ten (10) objectives listed?
- \_\_\_ Are two (2) objectives assessed each year?
- \_\_\_ Are all objectives assessed at least once within a 5 year period?

## V. ASSESSMENT RECORD

### Means of Assessment:

- \_\_\_ Are at least but no more than two (2) objectives measured?

### FOR EACH OBJECTIVE ASSESSED IN THE REPORT:

- \_\_\_ Are two types of measurement (Means of Assessment) for each objective measured? You may use subjective or indirect measures (e.g., Asking students how well they think they have learned some knowledge base, a skill or acquired a disposition) as ONE (1) of the measures, BUT the other measure MUST be objective or direct (an exam, a presentation, a portfolio item, etc.)
- \_\_\_ Are the Means of Assessment described to clearly indicate what is used to measure the objective?
- \_\_\_ Is the plan of assessment clearly explained?
- \_\_\_ Are the means of the assessment a *valid* measure of that objective and is this indicated in the description (e.g., if a standardized test is used, like the ETS Major Field Tests, does the content of that test reflect the content of the objective. If a rubric is used, do the items that get ratings reflect the objective content)?
- \_\_\_ Is evidence provided that the means of measure is a valid measure of the objective?
- \_\_\_ Are ALL measures numerical?
- \_\_\_ **Are copies of ALL measures used included in Appendix A?**
- \_\_\_ If raters are used (for rubrics, for example), are there at least two?
- \_\_\_ If raters are used, is inter-rater reliability measured (compute a correlation between the two sets of ratings, then report the inter rater correlation; should be .80 or higher)
- \_\_\_ Are the raters identified (e.g., "Departmental ASLO committee" or "two outside observers")?
- \_\_\_ If rubrics are used, are all of the numerical levels behaviorally anchored?

Example: Employer survey asks if the graduate can make ethical decisions

1= is not aware of the profession's ethics

2 = is aware of the ethics but does not connect that to decision-making

3= makes connections between profession's ethics and decision-making

Example: Rubric for a paper that expects the student to evaluate information/critique/ and form an Opinion or conclusion

1 = others' ideas presented with no evidence of evaluation of those ideas, conclusion missing

2 = others' ideas presented and critiqued in obvious ways (authors of those ideas themselves point out the flaws); conclusion is a reiteration of others' ideas

3 = others' ideas critiqued in student's words, conclusion is student's but does not seem connected to the critique

4 = ideas critiqued by student, conclusion is original (in student's words) and linked to critique

AVOID single word anchors that can be idiosyncratically interpreted by the raters (like "exemplary", "adequate", "below average", or "needs remediation")

**Criterion for Success: FOR EACH OBJECTIVE**

\_\_\_ Is each criterion defined in a numerical manner?

\_\_\_ Is it clear exactly what is meant by each criterion?

\_\_\_ Are use of grades ***avoided*** as a criterion? (Use percentage correct, average, etc. DO NOT USE GRADES OR GPA)

\_\_\_ Is it indicated the number of students that need to achieve success for each criterion? (Do a certain percentage of students have to accomplish the criterion; is it a group average, will it be within a range)?

\_\_\_ Is the criterion a reflection of Cal U's level of excellence (that is, is the criterion set high enough)?

**Results: FOR EACH OBJECTIVE**

\_\_\_ Are sample sizes reported?

\_\_\_ Is all available appropriate data used (not just a sampling of senior, but all available seniors)?

\_\_\_ Are the reported measure of success in the terms of the criterion for success? (e.g., If 80% of the sample needed to achieve a 75% on an examination, then report the percentage who achieved a 75% on the exam)

\_\_\_ If means (averages) are reported, are standard deviations also included?

\_\_\_ Was a statement included regarding the achievement of each criterion for success?

**Use of Results: FOR EACH OBJECTIVE**

\_\_\_ Were the results discussed as a department?

\_\_\_ Were the results connect to future program objectives and goals?

\_\_\_ Were potential changes discussed in response to the results?

\_\_\_ Was a plan outlined to maintain the achieved results (if they met or exceeded the criterion for success)?

\_\_\_ If each criterion was not met, is a plan for program changes included?

\_\_\_ Was a plan described that addressed student performance for those who did not meet the criterion?

**ENTIRE REPORT:**

\_\_\_ Are all of the above reported in clear and understandable ways?

\_\_\_ **Are all of the above completed for EACH objective measured this year?**

\_\_\_ **Are copies of ALL assessment instruments included in Appendix A?**

\_\_\_ **Are the following included in Appendix B:**

\_\_\_ The *objectives* plan to measure for the next academic year

\_\_\_ The *means of assessment* and *criterion for success* according to the check lists above?

\_\_\_ Are copies included of all *assessment instruments* that are the means of assessment?

\_\_\_ Is the report ONE document – including the appendices? (use Adobe and save as .pdf)

\_\_\_ Have raw data (and any student names) been ***eliminated*** from the report?

\_\_\_ Is the report paginated?

\_\_\_ Has the document been labeled and submitted as: CatalogNameofProgram\_year\_DepartmentName\_LastNameofFacilitator

\_\_\_ Does the report ONLY pertain to ONE program (do not report findings from all programs in the department in one document – each program is to have its own report)

**Program Facilitator:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

**College Coordinator:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

Please submit your completed Annual Year-end Report to: ***D2L > Program-Level Assessment of Student Learning***