Annual Departmental Plan Report

Program Information

Program/Department: Exercise and Sports Science (EXSS)
Department Chair: Danielle Wigmore
Department Assessment Committee Contact: Lindsay Parisi

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	Students will demonstrate effective communication		
1.1a	Verbal: Formal setting	triennial	2011
1.1b	Verbal: Informal setting	triennial	2011
1.2a	Written: Formal setting	triennial	Has not been assessed
1.2b	Written: Informal setting	triennial	Has not been assessed
2	Students will implement fitness testing		
2.1	Health-related fitness testing	triennial	2012
2.2	Performance-related fitness testing	triennial	Has not been assessed

3	Students will design exercise programs		
3.1	For the general population	triennial	2012
3.2	For athletic performance	triennial	2011
4	Students will demonstrate information literacy	triennial	Revised goal 2018- has not been assessed
5	Students will demonstrate quantitative reasoning.	triennial	New goal- Has not been assessed

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, 4th year, 1st 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"?

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"?

N/A. No PLOs were assessed this year. We spent time honing in our PLO's from a list of 15, to a list of five We have attached the rubrics used for prior assessment. These rubrics will be reviewed and revised as needed and rubrics will be developed for other goals when they come up in the assessment rotation.

Other than GPA, what data/ evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g.,	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)

capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)		
A combination of artifacts from various courses taught in the core curriculum is used. We are in the process of identifying assignments at the early and later stages of our curriculum for assessment of PLOs. Examples of assignments used in previous years include: Research Papers from Sports Nutrition and Cardiovascular Physiology, Exercise Physiology II group research papers, Internship presentations, Practical exams in ETP, final program prescription reports in ETP and Strength and Conditioning	2 faculty review each paper/presentation using the same rubric. An average score is calculated for each paper. For PLO 7 and 8, we will use information gathered from an alumni survey that we plan to launch this summer.	We added a Research Methods course in fall 2016 and would like to see if students' performance in the area of *information literacy* improves as a result of the course. We will be comparing the scores on papers from EPII prior to adding the course, with the scores on papers from EPII after adding the course. We are in the process of revising the information literacy rubric in order to complete this comparison

Assessment Plan for Program/Department

I.   Insert the program or department Assessment Plan
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.

We will be working with the Director of Assessment this summer on developing our departmental assessment plan. This year, we did revise, and get rid of some of our PLOs.

Program SLOs Prior to 2018	Revised PLOs (2018)
1a Demonstrate effective verbal communication in general formal presentation	1 Students will demonstrate effective communication 1.1a Verbal: Formal Setting 1.1b Verbal: Informal Setting 1.2a Written: Formal Setting

	1.2b Written: Informal Setting
1b Demonstrate effective verbal communication in formal scientific presentation	PLO 1a and 1b were combined into PLO 1.1a
1c Demonstrate effective verbal communication in informal setting	Now PLO 1.1b
2 Demonstrate effective writing	We determined that effective writing is a form of communication and belonged as a part of PLO 1

3 Demonstrate competence in health-related fitness testing	2 Students will implement fitness testing
	    2.1 Health-related fitness testing
	    2.2 Performance-related fitness testing

4 Demonstrate competence in performance-related fitness testing	PLO 3 and 4 were combined (Now PLO 2)
5 Demonstrate competence in exercise programming for healthy populations	3 Students will design exercise programs 3.1 For the *general* population 3.2 For athletic performance
6 Demonstrate competence in exercise programming for higher level athletic performance	PLO 5 and 6 were combined (Now PLO 3) PLO 5 re-worded from healthy population to general population
7 Demonstrate ability to adapt strength and cardiovascular conditioning protocols for special populations	Removed—This is mostly addressed in courses outside of the core curriculum.
8 Demonstrate ability to collect and interpret physiological data	Removed—This was incorporated into goals 2.1 and 2.2.
9 Demonstrate ability to describe and demonstrate safe and effective strength and conditioning methods	Removed—faculty felt this was addressed through goals 3.1 and 3.2.
10 Demonstrate ethical reasoning	Removed—While discussed in several classes, ethical reasoning is not assessed in the curriculum.
11 Demonstrate knowledge in a variety of content areas	Removed—We felt this was reflected through achievement of other PLOs as well as grades in courses throughout the curriculum.

12 Demonstrate ability to apply knowledge in work-related settings	Removed—desire to pare down PLOs.
13 Demonstrate ability to critically evaluate emerging information in the field	4 *Students will demonstrate information literacy*
	5 *Demonstrate competence in quantitative reasoning* (new PLO)
14 Gain admissions into graduate programs when desired	Removed—this is a program goal, not an outcome
15 Pass national certification exams when desired	Removed—this is a program goal, not an outcome

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

☐   We received help in developing an assessment plan on May 31, 2018 at the assessment workshop. A number of changes from this workshop are reflected in this document. Four members of the EXSS department participated in the workshop.

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)
Percent of students who graduate in the EXSS Major when they earn below a 2.0 in either A&P I or Introduction to Exercise Science.	Minimum grade requirements of a 2.0 in both A&P I and Introduction to Exercise Science in order to take any courses in the major aside from Human Motor Development. This policy was implemented in Fall 2016.	We are satisfied with the outcome and will continue with the minimum grade requirements.

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)
Percent of students who graduate in the EXSS Major when they earn below a 2.0 in either A&P I or Introduction to Exercise Science.	No students earning a D or F in Intro to EXSS, and only 6% of students earning a D or F in A&P I, went on to graduate with a degree in EXSS. These classes are important indicators of students' ability in science and predict success in the major. While we have a minimum GPA requirement in the major, many students get too far into the program before reaching the point where they are placed on probation or ultimately removed from the major. Further, the EXSS department has noted that the probation/removal process can happen over an academic year. Thus, if a student is ultimately removed from the major for inadequate academic performance in EXSS, he/she has lost a year of coursework that could have been put towards another major. The intent of adding the minimum grade requirement is to identify students early on who may not be successful	Minimum grade requirements of a 2.0 in both A&P I and Introduction to Exercise Science in order to take any courses in the major aside from Human Motor Development. This policy was implemented in Fall 2016. Students who receive less than a 2.0 in A&P I and/or Introduction to Exercise Science will be given 1 chance to retake the course in order to improve their grade to a 2.0 or better. If they do not achieve this grade, we will assist them in finding another major at FSU.	We discussed using scores for retention rate changed major and graduation rate in the major to determine whether or not the minimum grade requirement is working. The current graduation rate in the major based on an average of AY09, AY10, and AY11 is 38.21%. Target score: Institutional Average of AY09, AY10, and AY11 (55.54%). The current retention rate changed major, based on an	No

		average of AY15, AY16, AY17 is 16.44%. Rather than set a target, we would like to monitor this over time.	
	in EXSS. Subsequently, they can be advised towards a more appropriate major which in turn may allow them to progress more efficiently towards their graduation requirements.		

*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)
Retention Rate in Major (Freshman) + Retention Rate Changed Major	Members of the assessment committee discussed ways that we could identify students who were considered Moderate-High risk through SSC upon their arrival to FSU and discussed strategies for early intervention with those students. In AY18, we would like to implement these early intervention strategies.	Target Score: 77.76% Current Score (using an average of 3 years, AY15, AY16, AY17): 67.91% (increased from 64.45% for AY14, AY15, AY16 average)

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)
Retention Rate in Major (Freshman) + Retention Rate Changed Major	The retention rate for freshmen in the major and the retention rate for freshmen who changed their major was chosen because a number of freshmen coming into the EXSS major do not realize how science-based the major actually is. For this reason, it is unrealistic to expect that we will retain the same number of freshmen in the major as the institutional average; however, with proper advising, it can be expected that we can meet the institutional average when the retention rate in the major is added to the retention rate for freshmen who changed their major.	We would like to ID students in SSC who are entering the major and are considered to be at Moderate-High Risk in the major, and use this information to implement more intensive advising and/or supplemental instruction and/or study groups for those students. We would also like to ID students who may need more extensive advising upon arrival to the university. We discussed the ways in which we can be proactive with these students rather than waiting to see how they do.	We used an average of 3 years (AY15, AY16, AY17) of data from Phase I. Current Score: 67.91% Target Score: 77.76% (*Interestingly, in AY17 alone, this score was 76.47%)	No
Percentage of Overall Declared Majors	The percentage of overall declared majors increased from AY13 to AY14, where it reached a peak, and has	We added a concentration in Strength and Conditioning which is a growing field in Exercise and Sports	Current Score for percent of declared majors that are EXSS	No

	been decreasing each year since AY14.	Science. Additionally, we would like to work with admissions to better market ourselves, particularly our Clinical Exercise Science (CES) concentration. We would like to make sure that potential students are aware that the CES concentration can prepare students for graduate school programs in the rehabilitation sciences (PT, AT, OT), in addition to nursing programs and the field of cardiac rehabilitation.	majors: AY17 5.84% Target Score: Peak Score from AY14 6.91%	

*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: 2013
   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.

*Note: The action plan created after our last program review did not fit well into the table provided in this report. Below is the action plan in its current form, with the bolded sections reflecting progress to date.

Action Plan

Spring 2014:

-Develop course "Introduction to Research in Exercise Science" for submission to All University Committee. The goal of adding this course was to improve students' abilities to critically evaluate information in the field. **The course was added in the fall of 2016.** Contact: Tim Hilliard

-Submit extraordinary budget proposal for Venous Occlusion Plethysmography Unit. **This was purchased in 2014.** Contact: Danielle Wigmore

-Develop course "Neuromechanics of Human Motion" for submission to All University Committee. The faculty had determined there was redundancy in our Motor Learning and Biomechanics courses and combined them into this one course with a lab component.**This course became named Biomechanics and Motor Control of Human Movement and was added in the spring of 2017.** Contact: Tim Hilliard and/or Dave Heikkinen

Fall 2014:

-Feasibility study on the development of Pre-Major In EXSS. **Preliminary discussions occurred this year, but no action was taken.** Contact: Tim Hilliard

-Feasibility study on the development of IDIS program specializing in Fitness and Coaching or Physical Education. **No action taken.** Contact: Danielle Wigmore

-Feasibility study on the development of tracks in Clinical Exercise Physiology called Sports Medicine or Pre-Physical Therapy/Occupational Therapy. **This topic has been discussed multiple times by faculty.** Contact: Monica Maldari

-Develop a proposal for the incorporation of Apprenticeships in Strength and Conditioning, Personal Fitness Training, and Fitness for Special Populations to promote university-wide health and fitness and enhance performance of student athletes. **This is still of interest, but other priorities have pushed this back.** Contact: Jeff Godin

Spring 2015:

-Feasibility study on the development of EXSS Concentration: Strength and Conditioning. **Completed.** Contact: Jeff Godin and Dave Heikkinen

-Submit proposal to the All University Committee for the addition of Sports Medicine or Pre-Physical Therapy/Occupational Therapy track. **This was not warranted because students completing our clinical exercise physiology concentration would have the pre-requisite courses for graduate programs and physical therapy and occupational therapy. Based on this as well as consultation with Admissions, the faculty have indicated a desire to first work on marketing and promotion of our clinical exercise physiology concentration (which may include a name change) before considering the addition of a new concentration.**

-Submit proposal to the All University Committee for IDIS program specializing in Fitness and Coaching. **No action taken.**

-Submit extraordinary budget proposal for high speed motion filming, and software for the computer generation of biomechanical models. **This was postponed due to the lack of space to use such equipment. With the recent completion of the new strength and conditioning facility, a budget proposal for such equipment will be submitted during AY19.** Contact: Tim Hilliard

Fall 2015:

- Incorporate EXSS Pre-Major if warranted and approved. **Work in the AY2016 revealed that students earning a D or F in Intro to EXSS or A&P I were rarely going on to graduate with a degree in EXSS. Based on this, we created a minimum grade policy for these two classes rather than a pre-major in EXSS. Students now need to earn a 2.0 in both classes to move on in the major. This policy was implemented in fall of 2016.** Contact: Danielle Wigmore

- Develop courses to support Strength and Conditioning Concentration Contact: **This development of the new concentration was postponed due to lack of an appropriate facility to carry out the courses to be included in the concentration. With the recent completion of the new strength and conditioning facility, these courses were designed and submitted to AUC in AY18 along.** Jeff Godin, Dave Heikkinen, Jason Talanian.

- Submit proposal to the All University Committee for the addition of Strength and Conditioning concentration to the Exercise and Sports Science Major. **This development of the new concentration was postponed due to lack of an appropriate facility to carry out the courses to be included in the concentration. With the recent completion of the new strength and conditioning facility, the proposal for the concentration in Strength and Conditioning was submitted to AUC in AY18. The concentration will be among our offerings beginning in Fall 2018.** Contact: Dave Heikkinen, Jeff Godin.

Spring 2017:

-Begin EXSS Department Internal Review for Fall 2017. **At our faculty retreat in May 2018, we reviewed the self-study from 2013, and began divvying up the work between the department faculty. We have set a tentative date for a draft before academic advising begins in October 2018.**

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.

March 2018

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Program goal 1.1 a: Students will demonstrate effective communication in a formal setting
Competency level: Basic knowledge and skills
Artifact:

Student's initials: _____

Indicator	Did Not Meet the Standard (1)	Acceptably Meets the Standard (2)	Comprehensively Meets the Standard (3)
Content and Organization	Presentation is not well organized. Content is not appropriate and/or discussion is weak. PowerPoint slides are unclear, too wordy, and/or contain more than 2 typos.	Presentation is well organized and follows a logical flow. Purpose of the presentation is clear, and content is appropriate, but discussion could be more thorough in some areas. PowerPoint slides are effective but either have too much text per slide OR contain 1-2 typos.	Presentation is well organized and follows a logical flow. Purpose of the presentation is clear, and content is appropriate with thorough discussion of the topic. PowerPoint slides are clear and readable, include the appropriate amount of text, make good use of figures, and lack typos.
Delivery and Presentation	Students mumble or speak too softly, fail to make eye contact with the audience, and/or read all parts of the presentation from notes or slides. Transitions are choppy, and presentation needs more practice.	Students present in a clear voice and enunciate but make minimal eye contact with the audience and/or read from the slides. Delivery is good, but could be more polished.	Students present in a clear voice and enunciate. Students make eye contact with the audience, and do not simply read from slides or notes. Presentation is polished.
Overall Effectiveness	Students failed at two or more of the following: dressing professionally, using a professional tone, or articulately and accurately answering questions, observing the time limit.	Students failed at one of the following: dressing professionally, using a professional tone, or articulately and accurately answering questions, observing the time limit.	Students present themselves in a professional manner, which includes using a professional, not conversational, tone and dressing professionally. Students articulately and accurately answer questions and observe the time limit.

March 2018

Total Score: _____

Program goal 1.1b: Students will demonstrate effective communication in an informal setting
Competency level: Demonstrated competence
Artifact:

Student's initials: _____

Indicator	Did Not Meet the Standard (1)	Acceptably Meets the Standard (2)	Comprehensively Meets the Standard (3)
Description of test purpose and procedures	Student either fails to describe the purpose of the test or test procedures or describes them incorrectly	Student makes small error when describing test procedure or omits one or two points	Student describes test purpose and procedures clearly and completely
Attentiveness to subject/client	Student neglects to communicate and observe client, inquire how s/he is doing, or ensure that client is completing tests correctly and safely	Student observes client most of the time, but either has one instance where focus is more on data than subject or where client performs task incorrectly or unsafely.	Student continually watches client, inquires how s/he is feeling, and responds to client's needs or questions. Student notices and corrects client when performing a task incorrectly and ensures that all tasks are performed safely.
Description of fitness test results	Student does not discuss test results with client, or gives them incorrect information about their results	Student describes test results with client, but may fail to use layman's terms or relate to fitness or disease risk	Student clearly and completely describes all test results in layman's terms and relates to fitness and risk for disease
Professionalism	Student is inappropriate or too informal with client		Student conducts him/herself in a professional manner at all times

Total Score: _____

Program goal 2.1: Students will implement health-related fitness testing
Competency level: Demonstrated competence
Artifact:

Student's initials: _____

Indicator	Did Not Meet the Standard (1)	Acceptably Meets the Standard (2)	Comprehensively Meets the Standard (3)
Knowledge and execution of test	Student lacks thorough knowledge of the test procedure and/or makes significant mistakes in the setup and/or execution of the test.	Student displays adequate knowledge of test, sets up test appropriately (including adjusting and/or calibrating equipment) with only minor errors, and accurately completes all parts/stages of test with only minor errors.	Student displays thorough knowledge of the test and sets up and executes test without error.
Data Collection	Student does not collect all relevant physiological data and/or performs measurements inaccurately or at the wrong time.	Student collects appropriate physiological data at correct time points and with only minor errors.	Student collects appropriate physiological data at correct time points and with accuracy.
Calculations/data interpretation	Student makes multiple errors on calculations and/or misclassifies the client's fitness level.	Calculations are performed correctly with no more than one error and client's fitness level is appropriately determined for each fitness test performed.	Calculations are performed correctly without error and client's fitness level is appropriately determined for each fitness test performed.
Safety	Student makes multiple mistakes that compromise safety.	Student executes test safely with no more than one safety oversight.	Student executes all parts of the test safely.

Total Score: _____

Program Goal 3.1: Students will design exercise programs for the general population.
Competency Level: Demonstrated Competence
Artifact:

Student's initials: _____

Indicator	Did Not Meet the standard (1)	Acceptably Meets Standard (2)	Comprehensively Meets Standard (3)
Risk Factor identification and stratification	Missed more than 1 risk factor and/or incorrectly stratified client's risk	Missed only 1 risk factor and correctly stratified client's risk based on risk factors identified	Identified all risk factors and correctly stratified risk
Assessment	Incorrectly categorized more than one test item	Incorrectly categorized only test item	Correctly categorized according to the norms
Program Design - General	Did not include one or more components of physical fitness		Included all components of physical fitness
Program design CR Fitness	Did not include all components of FIT	Included all components of FIT, program was reasonable based off of client status and fitness level	Included all components of FIT, program was reasonable based off of client status and fitness level. Specifically calculated target HR, a specific mode, specific duration, and specific days for activity
Program design Strength	Did not include all components of FIT	Included all components of FIT, program was reasonable based off of client status and fitness level	Included all components of FIT, program was reasonable based off of client status and fitness level. Specifically prescribed appropriate reps, sets and exercises
Program design flexibility	Did not include all components of FIT	Included all components of FIT, program was reasonable based off of client status and fitness level	Included all components of FIT, program was reasonable based off of client status and fitness level. Specifically prescribed appropriate time, reps, sets, and exercises

Total: _____

Program Goal 3.2: Students will design exercise programs for athletic performance
Competency Level: Demonstrated Competence
Artifact: Strength and Conditioning Papers

Student's initials: _____

Indicator	Did Not Meet the Standard (1)	Acceptably Meets the Standard (2)	Comprehensively Meets the Standard (3)
Scientific	This paper doesn't show significant scientific thought in the strength training and/or conditioning portion of the training program	Two or fewer mistakes in the training plan, but does not affect the overall effectiveness of the program.	Excellent scientific basis for the program; no fundamental mistakes in application of the science to the training plan.
Organization	This paper lacks a clear sense of direction. One or more cycles are missing and/or the transitions between cycles are missing.	The program has pre-season, in-season, and out-of-season cycles with only minor flaws in the transition between cycles.	The program has out-of-season, pre-season, in-season and post-season cycles with appropriate transitions between cycles.
Training Load	The training load for either the strength or condition portion is completely inappropriate for the athlete described.	The training load described is appropriate for the individual described with only minor flaws in the frequency, intensity, and volume of training prescribed.	Excellent program design with no flaws in the magnitude of the training load prescribed.

Total Score: _____

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**
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	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.	
Expected Timing of Assessment	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).	
Assessment Tool Quality	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.	
PLO Assessment	More than one PLO assessed and information is complete in the chart.	At least one PLO assed 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.	
Criteria for Success	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.	

| *Summary of Findings* | Measures used in from PLO assessment fully incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis supports the summary. | Very limited use of data from PLO assessment incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis somewhat supports summary. | Used evidence other than PLO assessment to formulate the summary or analysis of the data doesn't seem to support summary. | No summary utilizing assessment data is evident. | |

| **Assessment Plan for Program/Department** |||||||

Criterion	**Highly Developed (3)**	**Developed (2)**	**Emerging (1)**	**Initial (0)**	**Score**
Department or Program Assessment Plan	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.	
Activities and Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department/Program Assessment Plan	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**
SSC Data for Current Review Period	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.	

	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	
SSC Data for Upcoming Review Period	At least one component of the SSC data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the SSC selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	SSC data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
Trend Data for Current Review Period	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.	
Trend Data for Upcoming Review Period	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**
Only for those under Program Review *Annual Reflection on Program Review*	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.	

Only for those under External Accreditation Annual Reflection on Report/Letter from accrediting body.	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 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.