

Annual Departmental Plan Report

Program Information

Program/Department: B.S. in Communications Media/Communications Media Department
 B.S. in Game Design/Communications Media Department
 Department Chair: Mary Baker
 Department Assessment Committee Contact: Randy Howe

*Please be as detailed as possible in your responses. We will use this information to fulfill our NEASC requirements and this report will help with your next Program Review or aid with your external accreditation. This file is to be kept in the department and an electronic file is due to the Director of Assessment by **May 31** each academic year.*

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) (Educational Objectives)

I. List all PLOs and the timeline for assessment.

PLO #	PLO – Stated in assessable terms.	Timing of assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)	When was the last assessment of the PLO completed?
1.	Communications Media graduates are capable of professional work in their area of emphasis.	Bi-annual	Spring 2018
2.	Communications Media graduates are capable of producing technically and aesthetically accomplished media work.	Bi-annual	Spring 2018
3.	Communications Media graduates are capable of media work that communicates effectively to the target audience.	Bi-annual	Spring 2018
4.	Communications Media graduates are capable of applying critical thinking within their concentration.	Bi-annual	Spring 2018
5.	Game Design graduates are capable of professional work in their area of emphasis.	Bi-annual	Spring 2018

March 2018

6.	Game Design graduates are capable of producing technically and aesthetically accomplished media work.	Bi-annual	Spring 2018
7.	Game Design graduates are capable of media work that communicates effectively to the target audience.	Bi-annual	Spring 2018
8.	Game Design graduates are capable of applying critical thinking within their concentration.	Bi-annual	Spring 2018

II. PLO Assessment (Please report on the PLOs assessed and/or reviewed this year, programs should be assessing at least one each year.)

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the **direct method(s)** used to collect information assessing whether students are learning the core sets of knowledge (K), skills (S) and attitudes (A) identified as essential.

PLO #	Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with rubric, etc.)	When assessment was administered in student program (internship, 4 th year, 1 st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)	What is the target set for the PLO? (criteria for success)	Reflection on the results: How was the “loop closed”?
1-8	Portfolio review with rubric	4 th year	All	An average rating of “Acceptable” or higher. The Portfolio review rubric is included in the Assessment Plan for Program/Department section.	All students must meet the target set for the PLO in order to register for their capstone requirement: COMM 4880 Internship or GAME 4100 Game Studio. Students who do not meet the PLO target must revise their portfolio and repeat their portfolio review. Some students may be advised to take additional course work before repeating their portfolio review.
1-4	Internship Appraisal Form	4 th year	All	Interns demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be competitive with potential entry-level job applicants. The Internship Appraisal Form is included in the Assessment Plan for the Program/Department section.	The Internship Director compiles the results of the Internship Appraisal Form and shares them with the department. When faculty internship supervisors learn about a students skills, knowledge or

					attitudes that are lacking through their interactions with site supervisors the data is reported back to concentration coordinators, or specific faculty who may teach courses that address the area in question, to assess whether or not curriculum actions or changes should be taken.
--	--	--	--	--	---

III. Summary of Findings: Briefly summarize the results of the PLO assessments reported in Section II above combined with other relevant evidence gathered and show how these are being reviewed/discussed. How are you “closing the loop”?

Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence? (close the loop)
The B.S. in Communications Media uses a portfolio review in the semester prior to each student’s required 12-credit capstone course: COMM 4880 Internship.	Student portfolios are reviewed by one faculty member from the student’s concentration and the Internship Director.	Feedback from portfolio reviews can provide important data used to revise and update the curriculum in all concentrations. Prior to Fall 2017, all concentrations used the same portfolio review rubric, which was too general and somewhat vague. Starting in Fall 2017, Photography, Professional Communication,

March 2018

		<p>Theater and Technical Theater began using portfolio review rubrics with specific categories more relevant for those concentrations. The rubric is in the process of being updated for the other concentrations in Communications Media.</p>
--	--	--

<p>At the completion of COMM 4880, each student's on-site supervisor completes the Internship Appraisal Form to evaluate the student's knowledge, technical skills, and written and oral communication skills appropriate to the profession.</p>	<p>The Internship Director compiles the results of the Internship Appraisal Form and shares the data with the department.</p>	<p>Feedback from internship sites can provide important data used to review and update the curriculum in all concentrations. For example, in Spring 2016, the Graphic Design concentration undertook a major curriculum revision based on data from portfolio reviews and internship evaluations. Industry standard software is now taught earlier in the curriculum and a required course in Web Design was added.</p>
<p>The B.S. in Game Design uses a portfolio review in the semester prior to each student's required 12-credit capstone course: COMM 4880 Internship or GAME 4100 Game Studio.</p>	<p>Student portfolios are reviewed by one Game Design faculty member and the Internship Director.</p>	<p>Feedback from portfolio reviews can provide important data used to revise and update the curriculum. An effort is underway to update the portfolio rubric to make it more relevant for Game Design.</p>
<p>For Game Design students who opt to take COMM 4880 Internship as their capstone, each student's on-site supervisor completes the Internship Appraisal Form to evaluate the student's knowledge, technical skills, and written and oral communication skills appropriate to the profession.</p>	<p>The Internship Director compiles the results of the Internship Appraisal Form and shares the data with the department.</p>	<p>Feedback from internship sites can provide important data used to review and update the curriculum in Game Design.</p>
<p>GAME 4100 Game Studio was developed as a course in AY16 in response to the lack of internships available in the game design industry. Assessment tools for this course are currently in development.</p>	<p>In development.</p>	<p>In development.</p>

Assessment Plan for Program/Department

I. Insert the program or department Assessment Plan

The department plans to continue the assessment plan as outlined in the previous sections. It should be noted the B.S. in Communications Media is scheduled for a program review in AY19. The department will be doing an in-depth analysis of the current PLOs and assessment plan as part of the program review.

The portfolio review rubrics for the Photography, Professional Communication, Theater and Technical Theater concentrations as well as the general portfolio review rubric used by the Film/Video and Graphic Design concentrations and Game Design have been inserted in the following pages. The Internship Appraisal Form is also included.

Portfolio Defense Evaluation Form: Photo

* Required

1. **Student's Name: ***

(Full Name)

2. **Student's Concentration: ***

If student has more than one concentration, list all concentrations in "Other".
Mark only one oval.

Photography

Other: _____

3. **Name of Faculty Evaluator: ***

(Last Name)

4. **Current Semester and Year: ***

(i.e. Fall 2015)

5. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exceeds Expectations	Excellent
Photographic Quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Website Quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sequencing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Total Presentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional Usefulness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Portfolio Defense Evaluation Form: Pro Comm

* Required

1. **Student's Name: ***

(Full Name)

2. **Student's Concentration: ***

If student has more than one concentration, list all concentrations in "Other".

Mark only one oval.

Professional Communication

Other: _____

3. **Name of Faculty Evaluator: ***

(Last Name)

4. **Current Semester and Year: ***

(i.e. Fall 2015)

5. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exceeds Expectations	Excellent
Written Communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Design Quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Portfolio Presentation Quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Technical Competence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional Usefulness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Portfolio Defense Evaluation Form: Theater & Technical Theater

* Required

1. **Student's Name: ***

(Full Name)

2. **Student's Concentration: ***

If student has more than one concentration, list all concentrations in "Other".

Mark only one oval.

Theater

Technical Theater

Other: _____

3. **Name of Faculty Evaluator: ***

(Last Name)

4. **Current Semester and Year: ***

(i.e. Fall 2015)

5. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Exceeds Expectations	Excellent
Portfolio Quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research Quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Presentation Quality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Textual Analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional Usefulness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Internship Performance Appraisal

* Required

1. Date *

Example: December 15, 2012

2. Intern Name *

3. Internship Organization *

4. Internship Organization Address *

5. Did the intern demonstrate acceptable overall knowledge of his/her discipline to be competitive with potential entry-level job applicants?

Mark only one oval.

Yes

No

6. If NO, what areas of improvement are needed?

7. Did the intern demonstrate acceptable knowledge of software and hardware required to be competitive with potential entry-level job applicants?

Mark only one oval.

Yes

No

8. If NO, please identify specific software programs and/or technologies that the intern, in your opinion, should know.

9. Did the intern demonstrate appropriate initiative to be competitive with potential entry-level job applicants?

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No

10. If NO, what areas need improvement?

11. Did the intern demonstrate oral and written communication skills appropriate to your organization and/or profession?

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No

12. If NO, what areas need improvement?

13. Did the intern demonstrate appropriate time management skills?

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
- No

14. If NO, what areas need improvement?

15. Did the intern demonstrate appropriate ethical integrity?

Mark only one oval.

Yes

No

16. If NO, what areas need improvement?

17. If an opening for an employee at this level in your organization existed, would you consider this intern to be competitive?

Mark only one oval.

Yes

No

18. Additional Comments

March 2018

- II. Explain any changes in the assessment plan including new or revised PLOs, new assessments that the program/department plans to implement and new targets or goals set for student success.

As stated above, the B.S. in Communications Media is scheduled for a program review in AY19. The department will be doing an in-depth analysis of the current PLOs and assessment plan as part of the program review.

- III. If you do not have a plan, would you like help in developing one?

Yes

University Data

I. SSC Data

Indicate **at least one** Student Success Performance Measure that the department/program has identified for planned change or improvement.

Freshman retention, bottleneck courses, graduation rates, at risk student retention etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
1 st Term Attempted Credits at Institution (2002-2010) – Film/Video	Admissions might consider a student’s ability to handle multiple courses in the first term in their acceptance criteria. Film/Video advisors and the Registrar should be aware that 18 credits, may be too much for some film/video students to handle in the first term. All advisors should survey each student situation and use discretion when advising.	The department will continue with this implemented intervention until additional SSC data is available.
1 st Term Attempted Credits at Institution (2002-2010) – Graphic Design	Admissions might consider a student’s ability to handle multiple courses in the first term in their acceptance criteria. Graphic design advisors and the Registrar should be aware that 18 credits may be too much for some graphic design students to handle in the first term. All advisors should survey each student situation and use discretion when advising. Graphic Design professors face an additional challenge of incorporating web design (once Interactive Media) into their program (see Interactive Media numbers below).	The department will continue with this implemented intervention until additional SSC data is available.

	Interactive Media was disbanded in 2015.	
1 st Term Attempted Credits at Institution (2002-2010) – Photography	Admissions might consider a student’s ability to handle multiple courses in the first term in their acceptance criteria. Photography advisors and the Registrar should be aware that 18 credits, may be too much for some photography students to handle in the first term. All advisors should survey each student situation and use discretion when advising.	The department will continue with this implemented intervention until additional SSC data is available.

b. What will your focus be for the upcoming year?*

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
1 st Term Attempted Credits at Institution (2002-2010) – Film/Video	Of 3-5 attempted credit takers in the first term (n=2), 0% graduated, well below the 42.7% who graduated institution-wide; of 6-8 attempted credit takers (n=2), 66.7% graduated, well above the 44.4% who graduated institution-wide; of 9-11 attempted credit takers (n=5), 60% graduated, well above the 50.3% who graduated institution-wide; of 12-14 attempted credit takers (n=159), 46.5% graduated, just below the 48.2% who graduated institution-wide; of 15-18 credit takers (n=679), 50.7% graduated in concentration, 10 percentage points below the 60.2% who graduated institution-wide.	Admissions might consider a student’s ability to handle multiple courses in the first term in their acceptance criteria. Film/video advisors and the Registrar should be aware that 18 credits, may be too much for some film/video students to handle in the first term. All advisors should survey each student situation and use discretion when advising.	To move Film/Video student graduation rates to be as close as possible to institution-wide graduation rates.	No

<p>1st Term Attempted Credits at Institution (2002-2010) – Graphic Design</p>	<p>Of 6-8 attempted credit takers in the first term (n=5), 20% graduated, well below the 44.4% who graduated institution-wide; of 9-11 attempted credit takers (n=4), 75% graduated, well above the 50.3% who graduated institution-wide; of 12-14 attempted credit takers (n=105), 47.6% graduated, just below the 48.2% who graduated institution-wide; of 15-18 takers (n=254), 53.9% graduated in concentration, six percentage points below the 60.2% who graduated institution-wide.</p>	<p>Admissions might consider a student’s ability to handle multiple courses in the first term in their acceptance criteria. Graphic design advisors and the Registrar should be aware that 18 credits may be too much for some graphic design students to handle in the first term. All advisors should survey each student situation and use discretion when advising. Graphic Design professors face an additional challenge of incorporating web design (once Interactive Media) into their program (see Interactive Media numbers below). Interactive Media was disbanded in 2015.</p>	<p>To move Graphic Design student graduation rates to be as close as possible to institution-wide graduation rates.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>1st Term Attempted Credits at Institution (2002-2010) – Photography</p>	<p>Of 9-11 attempted credit takers in the first term (n=1), 0% graduated, well below the 50.3% who graduated institution-wide; of 12-14 attempted credit takers (n=46), 32.6% graduated in concentration, well below the 48.2% who graduated institution-wide; of 15-18 attempted credit takers (n=140), 50.7%</p>	<p>Admissions might consider a student’s ability to handle multiple courses in the first term in their acceptance criteria. Photography advisors and the Registrar should be aware that 18 credits, may be too much for some photography students to handle in the first term. All advisors should survey each student situation and</p>	<p>To move Photography student graduation rates to be as close as possible to institution-wide graduation rates.</p>	<p>No</p>

	graduated in concentration, 10-points below the 60.2% who graduated institution-wide.	use discretion when advising.		
--	---	-------------------------------	--	--

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

II. Trend Data

Indicate **at least one** Department Performance Measure that the program/department identified for change or improvement. Number of graduates, number of majors, credit production, substitutions etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
The Communication Studies concentration is available to Communications Media students only as a second concentration. Phase I data shows enrollment at zero in AY14, AY15, and AY16.	A poster will be developed and hung in several locations in Communications Media to educate students about the option. This poster will be shared with faculty during a faculty meeting to generate a little excitement for a push during advising. Simultaneously an email will be composed and eventually distributed to all Communications Media students about the option, to be released just prior to Spring 2018 and Fall 2018 registration periods.	Unfortunately, there was no action taken on this implemented intervention in AY18.
Our Interactive Media concentration disbanded two years ago, officially through governance. AY16 Phase I data shows 14 students remaining with one listed as a freshman, underscoring a problem.	Current students are advised into substitute courses or independent studies. Graphic Design professors take a lead role in ensuring that existing students are accommodated. Admissions	There has been a reduction in the number of Interactive Media students. AY17 Trend Data shows 5 students remaining in the program. The department will continue to work towards a goal of zero students

	must be reminded not to enroll students in this old program.	enrolled in Interactive Media by AY20.
The Photography concentration has seen a steady decrease in enrollments from AY14 (51) to AY15 (46) to AY16 (38).	The department must engage in a discussion about Photography, its sustainability, and its department role. Concentration Coordinator Peter Laytin should lead the effort. With department buy-in, efforts must be made to work with Admissions who further must devote their resources to more actively recruit students into the program.	According to the Trend Data for AY17, the enrollment in the Photography concentration has continued to decline and is now at 29 students. Data provided by Admissions shows nine students have been accepted into the Photography concentration for AY19. The department will continue to work with Admissions to recruit students for the Photography concentration.

b. What will be the focus next year?*

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
The Interactive Media concentration disbanded three years ago, officially through governance. AY17 Phase I data shows 5 students remaining.	Courses originally developed for Interactive Media are no longer offered.	Current students are advised into substitute courses or independent studies. Graphic Design professors take a lead role in ensuring that existing students are accommodated. Admissions must be reminded not to enroll students in this old program.	Zero students enrolled in Interactive Media by AY20.	No

March 2018

<p>The Photography concentration has seen a steady decrease in enrollments from AY14 (51) to AY15 (46) to AY16 (38)) to AY17 (29).</p>	<p>The department has the facilities and internship sites to support 18 new students per year whose focus is photography.</p>	<p>The department must engage in a discussion about Photography, its sustainability, and its department role. Concentration Coordinator Peter Laytin should lead the effort. With department buy-in, efforts must be made to work with Admissions who further must devote their resources to more actively recruit students into the program.</p>	<p>Photography enrollment to reach and sustain 18 new students per year.</p>	<p>No</p>
---	---	---	--	-----------

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

Program Review Action Plan or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report

Annual Reflection/Follow-up on Action Plan from last Program Review or external accreditation (only complete the table that is appropriate for your program)

I. Programs that fall under Program Review:

- i. Date of most recent Review:
- ii. Insert the Action Plan table from your last Program Review and give any progress towards completing the tasks or achieving targets set forth in the plan.

Specific area where improvement is needed	Evidence to support the recommended change	Person(s) responsible for implementing the change	Timeline for implementation	Resources needed	Assessment Plan	Progress Made this Year

- iii. If you do not have an action plan, would you like help in developing one based on your last program review and needs of the program?

Yes

II. Programs with external Accreditation:

- i. Accreditor:
- ii. Date of last review:
- iii. Date of next review and type of review:
- iv. List key performance indicators:

List key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report.	Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.)(If required.)	Update on fulfilling the action letter/report or on meeting the key performance indicators.

UARC Peer Review of the Program Annual Report

Program: _____ Date of Review: _____

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</i>	All or almost all PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	Most of the PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	PLOs written in general, broad or abstract statements OR are not measurable.	PLOs not provided.	
<i>Expected Timing of Assessment</i>	All or almost all PLOs have a timeline stated.	Most PLOs have a timeline stated.	Very few PLOs have a stated timeline.	No timelines are given or are To Be Determined (TBD).	
<i>Assessment Tool Quality</i>	Assessment tool(s) is/are strong: very good quality and appropriate.	Assessment tool(s) are acceptable: good quality and appropriate	Assessment tool(s) are a good start but could use some strengthening or changes.	Assessment tool(s) are either not appropriate or not discussed.	
<i>PLO Assessment</i>	More than one PLO assessed and information is complete in the chart.	At least one PLO assessed and information is complete in chart.	At least one PLO assessed, information is not complete in chart.	No assessments completed during the academic year reported.	
<i>Criteria for Success</i>	The criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Most criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Criteria for student success discussed or touched upon but not clearly stated or is not appropriate.	Criteria for student success not provided.	
<i>Summary of Findings</i>	Measures used in from PLO assessment fully incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the	Very limited use of data from PLO assessment incorporated with additional evidence to	Used evidence other than PLO assessment to formulate the	No summary utilizing assessment data is evident.	

	summary and analysis supports the summary.	formulate the summary and analysis somewhat supports summary.	summary or analysis of the data doesn't seem to support summary.		
Assessment Plan for Program/Department					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Department or Program Assessment Plan</i>	Assessment Plan provided. Has clearly stated process with reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided. Has somewhat clear process and/or somewhat reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided, the process is not clear and/or the expectations are not reasonable.	No Assessment Plan provided.	
<i>Activities and Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department/Program Assessment Plan</i>	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are clearly stated and decision(s) are appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are described in general terms and may be appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are vague and lack clarity.	No changes are discussed.	
University Data					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>SSC Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one SSC data point. No plan implemented.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>SSC Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the SSC data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate	At least one component of the SSC selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to	SSC data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	

	based on information provided.	be appropriate based on information provided.	emerging but not fully appropriate.		
<i>Trend Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one Trend data point. No plan implemented.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>Trend Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the Trend data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the Trend selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	Trend data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
Action Plane or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Only for those under Program Review Annual Reflection on Program Review</i>	Full Action Plan provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Full Action Plan provided with some discussion of on-going progress plans stated.	Full Action Plan provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Action Plan is either not provided or there no progress or plans stated for progress discussed.	
<i>Only for those under External Accreditation Annual Reflection on Report/Letter from accrediting body.</i>	Key issues and performance standards provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with some discussion of on-going progress stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Key issues and/or performance standards are either not provided or there has been no progress or plans	

March 2018

				stated for progress.	
Comments:					

NOTE: This rubric is NOT an evaluation of the program/department. It is simply a tool for UARC to use as an aid in reviewing and providing constructive feedback to each program.