Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Clarity and specificity	All SLOs are stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs and rich descriptions of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students upon completing the program.	SLOs generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students.	SLOs are inconsistently defined for the program, descriptions of the knowledge, skill and value domains are present but lack consistent precision.	3
Student-Centered	All SLOs are stated in student-centered terms (i.e. what a student should know, think, or do).	Most SLOs are stated in student-centered terms.	Some SLO's are stated in student-centered terms.	3
Expectation Level	SLO's exceed basic expectations established by the University and other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	SLO's meet the basic expectations established by the University and other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	SLOs meet only a portion of the expectations established by the University or other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	2

Recommendations:

The Committee found that Human Services (HS) had clear Student Learning Outcomes. While SLOs were deemed exemplary, there were three outcomes identified that used the phrase "students will understand". Replacing "will understand" with an action verb could strengthen these SLOs by clarifying what is meant to be "understood". Finally, the Committee acknowledges that there is not a shared understanding of University expectation levels with regard to SLO's. For this reason, the Committee scored this section of the rubric as "Acceptable" and accepts the expectation levels assigned by HS faculty to their SLOs.

Programmatic Curricular Map

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Content Alignment	All SLOs are mapped to common classes or learning activities expected of all students completing the program.	Most SLOs are mapped to common classes or learning activities expected of all students completing the program.	Common classes or learning activities are identified for all students completing the program but most SLO's are not clearly mapped to classes or activities.	3
Student Learning Development of SLOs (Learning Benchmarks)	Curricular Map clearly identifies the progression of student learning relative to all SLOs at specific points in the curriculum	Curricular Map identifies levels of expected learning relative to most SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.	Curricular Map identifies expected levels of learning for some SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.	3
Student Engagement	Classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined in the SLOs.	Classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined by most of the SLOs	Classes and/or activities do not consistently engage students in the work outlined by most of the SLOs.	3

Recommendations:

The Committee found strong evidence in the "Copy of Assessment HSRV 2019" spreadsheet that SLO's are evaluated through multiple measures, that SLOs and their measures are aligned to courses and that measures have clear benchmarks. The Committee noted a few 400 level courses (e.g., Internship courses) were coded "A" for assessed, but it was unclear as to the desired benchmark level.

Alignment with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
IPFW Baccalaureate Framework Alignment	Specific, clearly defined, student-centered Program-Level SLO's are aligned to all foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	Generally defined student-centered Program-Level SLO's are aligned to all foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	Program-Level SLO's are aligned to some foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	3

Recommendations:

There is strong evidence that the program is aligned to the PFW Baccalaureate Framework.

Assessment Plan – Part 1

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Relationship between assessments and SLOs	Detail is provided regarding SLO-to-measure match. Specific items included on the assessment are linked to SLOs. The match is affirmed by faculty subject experts.	Description of how SLOs relate to assessment is general but sufficient to show alignment.	Description of how SLOs relate to assessment is incomplete or too general to provide sufficient information for use in determining progress toward SLO.	3
Types of Measures	All SLOs are assessed using at least two measures including at least one direct measure	Most SLOs are assessed using at least one direct measure.	Most SLOs are either assessed using only indirect measures or are not assessed.	3

Recommendations:

The Committee was impressed by the number of measures. In some instances, measures are used to evaluate SLOs multiple times in each course when the SLO only needs to be measured at least twice during the span of the program. The Committee is simply expressing a concern that HS may be gathering significantly more evidence than is necessary to monitor student learning or to collect evidence in order to make program improvements.

Assessment Plan – Part 2

Established Results	Statements of desired results (data targets) provide useful comparisons and detailed timelines for completion.	Statements of desired results provide a basic data target and a general timeline for completion.	Statements of desired results are missing or unrealistic for completion.	3
Data Collection and Design Integrity	The data collection process is sound, clearly explained, and appropriately specific to be actionable.	Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process with limited methodological concerns.	Limited information is provided about the data collection process or includes sufficient flaws to nullify any conclusions drawn from the data	3
Evidence of Reliability of Measures	Methods used to ensure reliability of findings are clearly explained and consistently support drawing meaningful conclusions.	Methods used to ensure reliability of findings are stated and generally support drawing meaningful conclusions.	Methods to ensure reliability of findings are insufficient for drawing meaningful conclusions.	2

Recommendations:

The Committee encourages faculty in HS to consider whether or not too many measures are associated with SLOs. The concern is that too many measures can make collecting and reporting evidence an overwhelming task and detract from critical conversations about student learning and program effectiveness (i.e., the primary purpose for data collection and analysis). With respect to Reliability of Measures, the Committee noted the work of HS as presented in Appendix D and recognizes that until the Institution can provide technologies to formally evaluate reliability, it will be difficult for HS to completely ensure reliability of findings.

Reporting Results

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Presentation of Results	Results are clearly present and directly related to SLOs. Results consistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLOs. Results are derived from generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment.	Results are present and related to SLOs. Results generally demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLOs. Results are derived from generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment.	Results are provided but do not clearly relate to SLO's. Results inconsistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLO's. Use of generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment is unclear.	3
Historical Results	Past iterations of results are provided for most assessments to provide context for current results.	Past iterations of results are provided for the majority of assessments to provide context for current results.	Limited or no iterations of prior results are provided.	3
Interpretation of Results	Interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLOs, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. Multiple faculty interpreted the results including an interpretation of how classes/activities might have affected the results.	Interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLO's, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. Multiple faculty interpreted the results.	Interpretation of results does not adequately refer to stated SLO's or identify expectations for student learning relative to SLO's. The interpretation does not include multiple faculty.	2

Recommendations:

The Committee found evidence that historical data is analyzed, but could not find evidence of how faculty are using such an analysis to make changes to courses or the program. The Committee recommends establishing either an annual or biannual faculty meeting to review longitudinal data and discuss the need for course or program changes.

Report Dissemination and Collaboration

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Documents and results are shared with faculty	Information is routinely provided to all faculty with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.	Information is provided to all faculty through an effective mode and with sufficient detail to be meaningful.	Information is not distributed to all faculty or provides insufficient detail to be meaningful.	3
Documents and results are shared with other stakeholders	Information is routinely provided to stakeholders (beyond faculty) with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.	Information is shared with stakeholders (beyond faculty) through an effective mode and with sufficient detail to be meaningful.	Information is not distributed to stakeholders (beyond faculty) or provides insufficient detail to be meaningful.	3

Recommendations:

The Committee had no concerns on dissemination; but as previously discussed, the Committee encourages HS to identify ways to document collaborative conversations around collected data/evidence.

Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success – Part 1

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Programmatic and Curricular Improvement	Evidence reported demonstrates a consistent pattern of an integrated assessment, pedagogy and curricular approach that assesses student performance relative to SLOs, uses assessment data to make curricular and/or pedagogical changes and re-assesses learning to determine how or the extent to which the change positively influenced student learning.	Evidence reported demonstrates assessment of student learning relative to SLO's and describes curricular and/or pedagogical changes planned or made as a result of assessment of student learning. Some evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/ re-assess is demonstrated.	Assessment findings are reported but insufficient evidence of curricular or pedagogical changes are present and limited or no evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/re-assess is demonstrated.	2

Recommendations:

In reviewing Appendix F, the Committee felt that HS may be misunderstanding the focus of this section of the report. There was much included in Appendix F about student engagement levels, but the focus of this area is really on how faculty are using data to make "curricular and/or pedagogical changes" (i.e., as a result of assessment data being collected). While the Committee believes that faculty may be aware of trends in data, there was little evidence provided of how data is being used to make decisions about changes to courses or programs.

Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success – Part 2

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Improvement of Assessment Process (mechanics)	Past and current assessment process are critically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, present and intended improvements to process are identified (when needed) and specific changes to the assessment process are detailed.	Past and current assessment process are critically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, present and intended improvements to process are identified (when needed) and moderate changes to the assessment process, or general plans for improvement of assessment process are proposed.	Past and current assessment process are sporadically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, but no evidence of improving upon past assessment or making plans to improve assessment in future iterations is proposed.	2

Recommendations:

The Committee is aware of the limitations created by not having technologies to support the collection and analysis of data that may contribute to quickly identifying problematic assessments. As such, the Committee felt that HS faculty are engaging sufficiently to determine if assessments are effective measuring desired student learning outcomes. The Committee would encourage HS to continue to question the purpose and need for each assessment to effectively monitor student performance and program quality.