

Alise C Hagan

From: Alise C Hagan <asc2995@louisiana.edu>
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2015 10:33 AM
To: Dubois Rebecca N
Cc: Stewart Geoffrey T
Subject: Review of Assessment Plan

Dear Becky,

Good morning. In preparation for the upcoming SACSCOC 5th Year Report, the University Assessment Council recently reviewed the assessment plans of academic units that are available in WEAVEonline. The rubric the reviewers used allowed them to evaluate the outcomes / objectives, measures, achievement targets, findings, and action plans for the “Hospitality Management BSBA” for the 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 cycles.

In the next month, I would like to meet to share these results with you and answer your specific assessment questions. I am scheduling one-on-one meetings (approximately 30-minutes) with each unit to determine how we can continuously improve assessment plans and make sure it is working for your unit. Please let me know three dates / times you are available between May 7 – 29; a confirmation in the form of a calendar invitation will be sent via email. If others should be included, please let me know that as well.

Sincerely,

Alise Chabaud Hagan
Director, Office of Institutional Assessment
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
Martin Hall, room 336A
(337) 482-9029
alise@louisiana.edu

ASSESSMENT PLAN & REPORT RUBRIC: Academic Units

The University Assessment Council will use this rubric to determine the overall quality of assessment plans for academic units and programs in order to identify areas of noted success and opportunities for improvement.

Review the assessment plans and reports:

- Step 1: Log in to WEAVEonline and access the assigned department / program.
- Step 2: Complete questions 1-3 below (Program name; Date reviewed; and Reviewer [your name])
- Step 3: Using the rubric (beginning on page 2 of this document):
 - Identify whether that section of the assessment plan is *Exemplary*, *Acceptable*, or *Developing*. If the item is not present, please indicate this in the Notes section.
 - Provide any additional recommendations that may assist the program / unit in updating their plans and reports.
 - Complete the rubric for each of the cycles listed (2012-2013, 2013-2014, and 2014-2015). NOTE: the Findings / Action Plans for 2014-15 may not yet be included in the plans you review.
- Step 4: Tally the results and record them below (questions 4 and 5)
- Step 5: SAVE this assessment review (“Your Last Name_Academic Unit Reviewed”, for example “Hagan_EnglishPhD), and then email it to alise@louisiana.edu by April 20, 2015.

Before you complete the review, please complete questions 1-3:

1. Program: Hospitality management BSBA
2. Date Reviewed: 4/20/2015
3. Reviewer: Chambers

After you complete the review, complete questions 4-5:

4. Assessment Cycle Thresholds: Please tally the scores for each cycle and list them here:
 7 2012-2013 (15 total points available) 7 2013-2014 (15 total points available) 5 2014-2015 (15 total points available)
5. Add the three scores from #4; based on that score, select one of the following:
 19 Total score 15-25 (overall, this unit’s assessment plan is developing)
 Total score 26-35 (overall, this unit’s assessment plan is acceptable)
 Total score 36-45 (overall, this unit’s assessment plan is exemplary)
 It was not possible to adequately review this assessment plan because of the lack of information provided in WEAVEonline.

ASSESSMENT PLAN & REPORT RUBRIC: Academic Units

2012-13 Cycle

ASSESSMENT PLAN (Outcomes / Objectives; Measures; Achievement Targets)

Outcomes / Objectives: Specific statements that articulate knowledge, skills, and abilities students should gain or improve through engagement in the academic program or learning experience.

<u> </u> X <u> </u> Developing (1)	<u> </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe a process, rather than an outcome (i.e.: language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns) Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome has been met Incomplete – not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program Outcomes identified don't seem aligned with the program mission Fails to note appropriate associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observable and measurable Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline Aligned with program, college and university mission Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observable and measurable Encompass a discipline-specific body of knowledge; focus on the cumulative effect of the program Reasonable number of outcomes identified – enough to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable to evaluate and assess Uses action verbs Describes the level of mastery expected, appropriate to degree type Aligned with college and university goals and with professional organizations, where applicable Accurately classified as “student learning” or “not student learning” Associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities) are identified, where appropriate

Reviewer notes or recommendations about Outcomes / Objectives:

All outcomes begin with the phrase “To develop...” indicating that the outcomes describe a process rather than an outcome.

Measures: The variety of measures used to evaluate each outcome; the means of gathering data.

<u> </u> Developing (1)	<u> </u> X <u> </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all outcomes have associated measures Few or no direct measures used Methodology is questionable Instruments are vaguely described; may not be developed yet Course grades used as an assessment method Do not seem to capture the “end of experience” effect of the curriculum / program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 1 measure or measurement approach per outcome Direct and indirect measures are utilized Described with sufficient detail Implementation may still need further planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple measures for some or all outcomes Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct Instruments reflect good research methodology Feasible – existing practices used where possible; at least some measures apply to multiple outcomes Purposeful – clear how results could be used for program improvement Described with sufficient detail (documents; e.g. rubrics, assignments, attached in Document Repository, where appropriate)

Reviewer notes or recommendations about Measures:

There is only one measure per outcome, and all measures come from student performance in one class, HRTM 404. Measures as written are identical to the Targets.

Achievement Targets: Result, target, benchmark, or value that will represent success at achieving a given outcome.

___X___ Developing (1)	___X___ Acceptable (2)	___X___ Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targets have not been identified for every measure, or are not aligned with the measure Seem off-base (too high / too low) Language is vague or subjective (e.g.: “improve”, “satisfactory” making it difficult to tell if met) Aligned with assessment process rather than results (e.g. survey return rate, number of papers reviewed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligned with measures and outcomes Target identified for each measure Specific and measurable Some targets may seem arbitrary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligned with measures and outcomes Represent a reasonable level of success Specific and measurable Meaningful (based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards)

Reviewer notes or recommendations about Achievement Targets:

All targets require a certain level of performance for 100% of the students. This is probably not realistic as a way to determine whether program-level corrective actions are required, since there is often one student who decides not to perform to the best of their ability, due to outside work, personal problems, etc. Even though the target for Awareness of Cost Control was changed in the Spring of 2013, the change is reflected in the Measure, but not in the Target.

ASSESSMENT REPORT (Findings; Action Plans)

Findings: A concise summary of the results gathered from a given assessment measure.

___X___ Developing (1)	___X___ Acceptable (2)	___X___ Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete or too much information Not clearly aligned with achievement targets Questionable conclusion about whether targets were met, partially met, or not met Questionable data collection / analysis; may “gloss over” data to arrive at conclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete and organized Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target Address whether targets were met May contain too much detail or stray slightly from intended data set 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete, concise and well-organized Appropriate data collection / analysis Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target Provide solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met Compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate Supporting documentation (rubrics, surveys, more complete reports, etc.) are included in the document repository

Reviewer notes or recommendations about Findings:

Action Plans: Actions to be taken to improve the program or assessment process based on analysis of results.

___X___ Developing (1)	___X___ Acceptable (2)	___X___ Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clearly related to assessment results Seems to offer excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretation or “next steps” for program improvement No action plan or too many to manage Too general; lacking details (e.g. time frame, responsible party) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects with sufficient depth on what was learned during the assessment cycle At least one action plan in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibits an understanding of the implications of assessment findings Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical “next steps” Possibly identifies an area of the assessment process that needs improvement Contains completion dates Identifies a responsible person/group Number of action plans are manageable

Reviewer notes or recommendations about Action Plans:

There is an action plan for each Outcome, but each action plan is identical.

ASSESSMENT PLAN & REPORT RUBRIC: Academic Units

2013-14 Cycle

ASSESSMENT PLAN (Outcomes / Objectives; Measures; Achievement Targets)

Outcomes / Objectives: Specific statements that articulate knowledge, skills, and abilities students should gain or improve through engagement in the academic program or learning experience.		
<u> X </u> Developing (1)	<u> </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe a process, rather than an outcome (i.e.: language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns) Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome has been met Incomplete – not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program Outcomes identified don't seem aligned with the program mission Fails to note appropriate associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observable and measurable Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline Aligned with program, college and university mission Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observable and measurable Encompass a discipline-specific body of knowledge; focus on the cumulative effect of the program Reasonable number of outcomes identified – enough to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable to evaluate and assess Uses action verbs Describes the level of mastery expected, appropriate to degree type Aligned with college and university goals and with professional organizations, where applicable Accurately classified as “student learning” or “not student learning” Associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities) are identified, where appropriate
Reviewer notes or recommendations about Outcomes / Objectives: See notes from 2012.		

Measures: The variety of measures used to evaluate each outcome; the means of gathering data.		
<u> </u> Developing (1)	<u> X </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all outcomes have associated measures Few or no direct measures used Methodology is questionable Instruments are vaguely described; may not be developed yet Course grades used as an assessment method Do not seem to capture the “end of experience” effect of the curriculum / program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 1 measure or measurement approach per outcome Direct and indirect measures are utilized Described with sufficient detail Implementation may still need further planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple measures for some or all outcomes Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct Instruments reflect good research methodology Feasible – existing practices used where possible; at least some measures apply to multiple outcomes Purposeful – clear how results could be used for program improvement Described with sufficient detail (documents; e.g. rubrics, assignments, attached in Document Repository, where appropriate)
Reviewer notes or recommendations about Measures: See notes from 2012.		

Achievement Targets: Result, target, benchmark, or value that will represent success at achieving a given outcome.		
<u> </u> X <u> </u> Developing (1)	<u> </u> X <u> </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> X <u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targets have not been identified for every measure, or are not aligned with the measure Seem off-base (too high / too low) Language is vague or subjective (e.g.: “improve”, “satisfactory” making it difficult to tell if met) Aligned with assessment process rather than results (e.g. survey return rate, number of papers reviewed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligned with measures and outcomes Target identified for each measure Specific and measurable Some targets may seem arbitrary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligned with measures and outcomes Represent a reasonable level of success Specific and measurable Meaningful (based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards)
Reviewer notes or recommendations about Achievement Targets: See notes from 2012.		

ASSESSMENT REPORT (Findings; Action Plans)

Findings: A concise summary of the results gathered from a given assessment measure.		
<u> </u> X <u> </u> Developing (1)	<u> </u> X <u> </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> X <u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete or too much information Not clearly aligned with achievement targets Questionable conclusion about whether targets were met, partially met, or not met Questionable data collection / analysis; may “gloss over” data to arrive at conclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete and organized Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target Address whether targets were met May contain too much detail or stray slightly from intended data set 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete, concise and well-organized Appropriate data collection / analysis Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target Provide solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met Compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate Supporting documentation (rubrics, surveys, more complete reports, etc.) are included in the document repository
Reviewer notes or recommendations about Findings: See notes from 2012.		

Action Plans: Actions to be taken to improve the program or assessment process based on analysis of results.		
<u> </u> X <u> </u> Developing (1)	<u> </u> X <u> </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> X <u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clearly related to assessment results Seems to offer excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretation or “next steps” for program improvement No action plan or too many to manage Too general; lacking details (e.g. time frame, responsible party) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects with sufficient depth on what was learned during the assessment cycle At least one action plan in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibits an understanding of the implications of assessment findings Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical “next steps” Possibly identifies an area of the assessment process that needs improvement Contains completion dates Identifies a responsible person/group Number of action plans are manageable
Reviewer notes or recommendations about Action Plans: See notes from 2012.		

ASSESSMENT PLAN & REPORT RUBRIC: Academic Units

2014-15 Cycle

ASSESSMENT PLAN (Outcomes / Objectives; Measures; Achievement Targets)

Outcomes / Objectives: Specific statements that articulate knowledge, skills, and abilities students should gain or improve through engagement in the academic program or learning experience.		
<u> X </u> Developing (1)	<u> </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe a process, rather than an outcome (i.e.: language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns) Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome has been met Incomplete – not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program Outcomes identified don't seem aligned with the program mission Fails to note appropriate associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observable and measurable Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline Aligned with program, college and university mission Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observable and measurable Encompass a discipline-specific body of knowledge; focus on the cumulative effect of the program Reasonable number of outcomes identified – enough to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable to evaluate and assess Uses action verbs Describes the level of mastery expected, appropriate to degree type Aligned with college and university goals and with professional organizations, where applicable Accurately classified as “student learning” or “not student learning” Associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities) are identified, where appropriate
Reviewer notes or recommendations about Outcomes / Objectives: See notes from 2012.		

Measures: The variety of measures used to evaluate each outcome; the means of gathering data.		
<u> </u> Developing (1)	<u> X </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all outcomes have associated measures Few or no direct measures used Methodology is questionable Instruments are vaguely described; may not be developed yet Course grades used as an assessment method Do not seem to capture the “end of experience” effect of the curriculum / program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 1 measure or measurement approach per outcome Direct and indirect measures are utilized Described with sufficient detail Implementation may still need further planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple measures for some or all outcomes Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct Instruments reflect good research methodology Feasible – existing practices used where possible; at least some measures apply to multiple outcomes Purposeful – clear how results could be used for program improvement Described with sufficient detail (documents; e.g. rubrics, assignments, attached in Document Repository, where appropriate)
Reviewer notes or recommendations about Measures: See notes from 2012.		

Achievement Targets: Result, target, benchmark, or value that will represent success at achieving a given outcome.

<u> </u> X <u> </u> Developing (1)	<u> </u> <u> </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> <u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets have not been identified for every measure, or are not aligned with the measure • Seem off-base (too high / too low) • Language is vague or subjective (e.g.: “improve”, “satisfactory” making it difficult to tell if met) • Aligned with assessment process rather than results (e.g. survey return rate, number of papers reviewed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with measures and outcomes • Target identified for each measure • Specific and measurable • Some targets may seem arbitrary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with measures and outcomes • Represent a reasonable level of success • Specific and measurable • Meaningful (based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards)

Reviewer notes or recommendations about Achievement Targets:
See notes from 2012.

ASSESSMENT REPORT (Findings; Action Plans) NOTE: The following may not yet be available in the 2014-15 cycle in the plans you review.

Findings: A concise summary of the results gathered from a given assessment measure.

<u> </u> <u> </u> Developing (1)	<u> </u> <u> </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> <u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete or too much information • Not clearly aligned with achievement targets • Questionable conclusion about whether targets were met, partially met, or not met • Questionable data collection / analysis; may “gloss over” data to arrive at conclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and organized • Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target • Address whether targets were met • May contain too much detail or stray slightly from intended data set 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete, concise and well-organized • Appropriate data collection / analysis • Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target • Provide solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met • Compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate • Supporting documentation (rubrics, surveys, more complete reports, etc.) are included in the document repository

Reviewer notes or recommendations about Findings:
NA

Action Plans: Actions to be taken to improve the program or assessment process based on analysis of results.

<u> </u> <u> </u> Developing (1)	<u> </u> <u> </u> Acceptable (2)	<u> </u> <u> </u> Exemplary (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clearly related to assessment results • Seems to offer excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretation or “next steps” for program improvement • No action plan or too many to manage • Too general; lacking details (e.g. time frame, responsible party) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflects with sufficient depth on what was learned during the assessment cycle • At least one action plan in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibits an understanding of the implications of assessment findings • Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical “next steps” • Possibly identifies an area of the assessment process that needs improvement • Contains completion dates • Identifies a responsible person/group • Number of action plans are manageable

Reviewer notes or recommendations about Action Plans:
NA



DRAFT