# Program Assessment Handbook

Provided by the University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness at ASU.

## Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 31st</td>
<td>Assessment plans due to UOEEE for programs seeking establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 30th</td>
<td>Annual assessment reports due to UOEEE (Delegates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2nd</td>
<td>Assessment plans due to delegates (subject to individual schools)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Assessment:

- Reporting
- Process
- Plans
- Mapping
- APR
- Resources
- Navigating the Portal

---

assessment@asu.edu
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Arizona State University’s Philosophy and Approach to Program Assessment

The purpose of assessment in higher education is to provide evidence that will inform and support improvement in student learning and student success. Assessment of student learning is a process that collects data that is analyzed and discussed and when needed, supports change. Assessment data is meant to improve knowledge and insight of all of stakeholders including faculty and administrators. Collecting valid and reliable student learning data allows for informed planning and decision making around curriculum and pedagogy. Institutions are expected to assess all educational programs offered for academic credit (i.e., courses taken for degree and certificate programs) as well as curriculum complementing activities such as study abroad, service learning, career services, and student-faculty research experiences. Assessment is not grading or a mechanism to evaluate individual faculty performance. Multimodal assessment methodologies collect data on student learning and related indirect data on students’ perspective, attitudes, and dispositions. With assessment, faculty have the ability to analyze data and draw conclusions that inform continuous improvement of curriculum and pedagogy.

Assessment guidelines and practices at Arizona State University (ASU) are established by national organizations such as American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), Association for the Assessment of Learning in Higher Education (AALHE), and National Institute for Learning Outcomes and Assessment (NILOA) as well as being strongly influenced by ASU’s regional accreditor, The Higher Learning Commission (HLC). These entities expect a robust assessment infrastructure that identifies both strengths and weaknesses to ensure high quality programs and that students successfully meet the established program learning outcomes and general education outcomes.

In addition to these guidelines, assessment at ASU is also guided by ASU’s Charter. This charter serves as the university’s mission statement and guides all college, department, and program level mission statements and goals. It reads:

*ASU is a comprehensive public research university, measured not by whom it excludes, but by whom it includes and how they succeed; advancing research and discovery of public value; and assuming fundamental responsibility for the economic, social, cultural, and overall health of the communities it serves.*

University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness

The assessment department within University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness’ (UOEEE), is tasked with supporting academic programs in their development of methodologies to produce valuable and meaningful data for continuous improvement at ASU. UOEEE’s assessment goals include:

1. **Lead to a culture of data-based decision making and continuous improvement.**
2. **Be transparent and inform the community (including stakeholders) about student learning.**
3. **Involve all stakeholders including faculty, students and administration.**
4. **Develop and implement a process that is both systemic and systematic.**
5. **Work to develop assessment practices that result in valid, reliable, and meaningful assessment.**
**Cycle of Assessment:** The purpose of these efforts is to continually increase the quality of education provided to students at ASU through a cycle of assessment and evaluation (see Figure 1). This is accomplished in several ways such as supporting programs in the development of academic assessment plans (e.g., program learning outcomes), annual reporting, new program proposals, the assessment of general education, and academic program review (APR). UOEEE also provides the resources for these assessment activities through its website, Canvas site, and assessment portal. The assessment portal is a particularly dynamic tool that provides a single place for faculty to input their assessment plan and reports, submit new program applications, and receive input and approval from UOEEE. Even more importantly, it also serves as a repository for historical data that can be utilized for longitudinal analysis.

UOEEE staff also consult with and provide support to ASU’s co-curricular areas (EOSS) when requested. The assessment staff provide resources and support for assessment through the assessment portal, assessment reports, workshops, technology, special projects, resources, and research.
Key Processes and Due Dates
*Please note that the academic school year runs from June to May*

**New Degree Programs:** New program proposals seeking establishment at ASU will need approval from three administrative bodies in the following order:

- The Office of the University Provost at ASU
- Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR)
- ASU Governance Councils

After provost approval, but before ABOR submission programs must have an assessment plan developed for their proposed program and it must obtain provisional approval from UOEEE. Provisional approval is obtained by submitting the program’s assessment plan to UOEEE through the UOEEE Assessment Portal.

Undergraduate and graduate certificates do not go to ABOR for approval but are still required to have their assessment plan (as part of their proposal materials) approved by UOEEE after ASU’s Provost Office approval but before Governance Council submission.

Programs need to submit their assessment plans to UOEEE by **July 31st** in order to be reviewed and approved by ABOR within that calendar year.

**Annual Assessment Process:** It is recommended that programs collect assessment data throughout the academic year and then begin analysis and writing their Assessment Reports at the end of spring semester through to the beginning of the following fall semester. This timeline allows for data interpretation, analysis, and conclusions to be developed close to the time of data collection and completed before fall teaching duties begin. Programs going through APR will not have to submit a report the year following the APR process. For more details, please see the Academic Program Review section of the handbook. Please check with your program’s delegate to confirm the due date of your program’s assessment report. Final report submissions are due to UOEEE (from delegates) by **September 30th**, regardless of school or college.

**Annual Plan Reviews:** Programs are expected to review their assessment plans annually to ensure that they are still meeting the needs of the program. Programs can submit their assessment plans for their annual plan review (not to be confused with ASU’s Academic Program Review/APR assessment plan approval) in one of two ways (for specific steps within the portal, please see the Editing Assessment Plans and Reports section of the handbook):

- Programs not making any changes to their assessment plan from the previous year, are expected to mark their assessment plan as “continuing” by **December 2nd**. No further review or action is required for these plans (this option is not available for programs going through APR).
- Programs making additions or changes to their assessment plan will need to **submit** these changes to their delegates for approval. We recommend allowing enough time for the delegate to review the edits, request revisions (if necessary), and receive approval **BY** the **December 2**nd deadline mentioned above.

Programs can request feedback from UOEEE on their assessment plans at any point in the process. This feedback request should be factored into the program’s assessment plan submission timeline. Degree programs should also conduct an internal review halfway through the APR process (typically every 3 years) to ensure the plan is up-to-date and demonstrating innovation and meaningful data collection whenever possible.

**Academic Program Review:** Academic programs undergo a yearlong comprehensive review every seven years based on requirements from the ABOR. Part of this process requires programs to receive UOEEE approval of their assessment plan (through the assessment portal). This approval requires that programs incorporate the most up-to-date assessment standards and requirements put forth by UOEEE into their assessment plan. To accommodate the APR timeline, programs are expected to submit a first draft of their updated assessment plan by **July 15**th.
Program Assessment at ASU

All credit-bearing programs, degrees, and certificates are required by HLC to participate in institutional evaluation (assessment, program review). This includes AA, BA, BS, MS, and PhD programs among others. At this point, UOEFE does not assess minors. Programs are expected to plan for and report data on both in-person students as well as their online students separately (as determined by their registered campus). Starting in 2022, programs with \( \geq 20 \) online students, will be expected to provide data specific to their online students. A student is considered an “online student” when their registered campus is “Online” (as opposed to Tempe, Poly, etc.). For more information on this new requirement, please see the outcomes reporting component of the annual reports section in this handbook.

Academic program assessment at ASU follows a process that is structured, ongoing, and designed to measure the extent to which graduates leave the institution with the knowledge and skills expected of its majors. The program assessment process (see Figure 2) begins with programs developing an assessment plan proposal as part of their new program proposal materials sent to ABOR. Upon establishment, programs will maintain their assessment plan along with submitting an annual assessment report with student learning data based upon the assessment plan. This cycle of development, assessment, review, and update, informs subsequent decisions and activities and continues until a program’s disestablishment. An assessment methodology should be designed in such a way as to provide insight on the breadth and depth of the curriculum.

Figure 2

**ASU Assessment Cycle**

Develop New Program Assessment Plan  \( \rightarrow \) Establish New Program  \( \rightarrow \) Enroll Students, Offer Courses and Curriculum, Implement Assessment Plan  \( \rightarrow \) Submit Annual Report

Revise Assessment Plan (as needed)  \( \rightarrow \) Review Assessment Plan (small changes annually) or Comprehensive Academic Program Review (every 7 years)
Assessment Plan

Assessment plans serve as the foundation for evaluation of student learning at ASU, they outline student learning outcomes to be assessed during a term, identify specific artifacts and performance criterion to track student learning, provides a brief description of the data collection and analysis processes, and identify the individuals responsible for these tasks. Although programs conduct a comprehensive re-evaluation of their assessment plan every seven years through their programs APR, programs are also expected to review their assessment plans annually to ensure that they are still accurate and meeting the needs of the program. This annual revaluation does not require UOEEE reapproval, however.

For more details about the elements for assessment plans at ASU, please see the Elements of a Program Assessment Plan at ASU section of the handbook. For a guide to editing an assessment plan within the portal, please see the Editing Assessment Plans and Reports section of the handbook.

Annual Assessment Report

Academic programs are asked to conduct assessment of student learning each year. Academic programs are required to have at least three outcomes, each with at least two measures per outcome so that a typical assessment plan collects six data points minimally each year. Annual assessment reports are submitted each year by programs meeting specific criteria and serve as records of the assessment plans in practice (see the Portal Landing Page section of the handbook to see if your program meets the reporting criteria). In addition to student learning, annual reports record faculty and staff involvement in the overall assessment process, changes in data collection that deviate from the program’s original plan, as well as programmatic takeaways following thorough analysis of the data. These reports are particularly important as they are the primary means of data collection used for evaluation and assessment of program effectiveness. For more details about the elements of an annual report at ASU, please see the Elements of an Annual Report Plan at ASU section of the handbook. For a guide to editing an assessment report within the portal, please see the Editing Assessment Plans and Reports section of the handbook.

New Program Applications to Arizona Board of Regents

The university process for establishing new programs includes both internal approval through the provost office and external approval from ABOR. UOEEE guides and supports the assessment planning component within this larger establishment process.

UOEEE provides new programs with provisional approval of their assessment plan so they may move their application forward from the provost’s office to ABOR. The UOEEE Canvas site has a blank downloadable assessment plan template for inputting information that will help programs meet the ABOR requirements for the new program application process. Common characteristics of successful assessment plans include plans that are detailed, use valid assessment methods, and have all elements completed (see the Elements of a Program Assessment Plan at ASU section of the handbook for a list of required elements). Programs submitting a new program application will need to include a “Measures Summary” element that will be submitted to ABOR and/or the Provost’s Office along with other establishment materials. For more information on the “Measures Summary,” please see the Editing Assessment Plans and Reports section of the handbook.
It should be noted that a program’s learning outcomes (PLOs) are going to be made publicly available via ASU’s Degree Search site (see Figure 3) following the completion of a program’s APR. In addition, all assessment materials, including assessment plans and reports, may be reviewed by accrediting bodies and other external stakeholders. As such, programs need to remember these audiences when writing a new program assessment plan and provide detailed descriptions that leave readers with a strong understanding of what each element in the plan is intended to achieve. Well-developed plans give decision-makers confidence to support the program. For additional information about the university process for establishing new programs, please visit the provost office’s web page on curriculum development.

Note: Certificates do not go to ABOR for approval, yet the HLC requires all credit-bearing programs, degrees, and certificates follow assessment practices and requirements. UOEEE does not currently assess minors.

**Figure 3**

*Program Learning Outcomes as Shown on ASU’s Degree Search Site*

---

**Academic Programs**

- Undergraduate Degrees
- Undergraduate Minors and Certificates
- Graduate Programs

**Program Learning Outcomes**

Program learning outcomes identify what a student will learn or be able to do upon completion of their program. This program has the following program outcomes:

- Analyze and deconstruct complex social, technological, legal, ethical and social justice issues using multiple strategies.
- Apply foresight methods to assess emerging trends and plausible futures.
- Design creative strategies to address current societal and technological challenges.

---

**Academic Program Review (APR)**

Academic Program Review occurs on a seven-year cycle and programs can check when their college or department is scheduled for APR on the university’s APR page. APR is a designated time for programs to re-evaluate their assessment plan and have it re-approved by UOEEE. Assessment plan approval is provided by UOEEE and occurs alongside APR but it is not a requirement for APR. During a program’s APR process, programs have the opportunity to examine how effectively their program is meeting its mission, goals, and outcomes. Programs are also expected to use this opportunity to ensure that their assessment plans meet the most up-to-date requirements from ABOR. The university provost office oversees APR and has a web page with timelines, guides, and other important information. You can visit this site by clicking here. UOEEE is involved with two aspects: a. submission of a reflective essay on the last seven years of annual assessment report data (part of the APR process) and b. submission and approval of a revised assessment plan (occurs at the same time but outside of the APR process)
a. Reflective Essay

As part of an assessment of PLOs, programs write a reflection of their past seven years of assessment reports in their APR self-study. Assessment reports are submitted, reviewed and archived in the UOEEE assessment portal. To help programs reflect on past data, UOEEE has developed a tool that will aggregate the data from past reports into one convenient table. Programs can also review completed past reports with UOEEE feedback. Both of these are available via UOEEE’s assessment portal by going to the program archives (for instructions see the Program Archives section of the handbook) or through a program’s report edit page (for instructions see the Editing Assessment Plans and Reports section of the handbook).

UOEEE has included the reflective questions from the APR Manual to help guide programs with completing this section of the self-study.

1. Please discuss the results of your quantitative and qualitative assessment data for each outcome and measure.
2. Are your students achieving at the levels of performance you had expected? How well did they meet your performance criteria?
3. What plans do you have in place for students who are not achieving the desired level of performance?
4. What actions have you taken, or will you take based on your assessment data?
5. Describe how the results have been shared with program faculty and students.

b. Approval of a Revised Assessment Plan

Programs must receive UOEEE approval of their assessment plan (through the assessment portal) during the APR process. To receive UOEEE approval, programs must review their assessment plan and include all ABOR elements that are currently required, even if they were not a requirement when the assessment plan was first established. Programs are also asked to review their assessment plan and consider changes in preparation for the next seven years of assessment. Changes may be made based on insight that arises from the previously collected longitudinal data, staffing changes, and/or curricular changes. Most programs also have more than three outcomes and should identify the three they would like to assess during the next assessment cycle. During APR, programs may choose to assess different outcomes or revise the current outcomes they have. UOEEE will assist programs in updating their assessment plan if requested.

For programs preparing to go through APR, a short video has been prepared to explain how to update an assessment plan and also how to respond to the prompts in the APR Manual. This video is housed on the UOEEE Canvas site.

It should be noted that programs going through the APR process and making updates to their assessment plans, will not need to collect nor report on student achievement that occurred during the year of their APR. For example, a program going through APR in the academic year* 2021-2022, will not need to collect data during the 2021-2022 academic year and as a result they will not need to submit a report based upon that data, in the fall of 2022. They will begin to collect data with the new assessment plan the following year and submit the next report in the summer/fall of 2023.

*The academic year runs from June to May annually
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Program Disestablishment

Programs found within UOEEE’s assessment portal are annually pulled from ASU’s Institutional Analysis official records of established programs. Given this, the primary means of officially removing a program from UOEEE’s assessment portal is to complete ASU’s disestablishment process. The disestablishment process can be initiated via the academic plan process within the Kuali Curriculum Management System. For more information about the process, please visit the Office of the University Provost’s web page.
Elements of a Program Assessment Plan at ASU

Assessment plans are developed when a program first applies for “new program” status. Programs are expected to follow the most up-to-date requirements at the time of submission. The assessment delegate works with UOEEE to ensure plans are consistently evaluated and revised as needed. As new requirements are added, already established programs will not have to include them until they come up for APR. At that time, they must revise their plan to include all current requirements.

Below is a list of current (2022) program elements that are required for new programs and 2022-2023 APR programs. Please see table 1 for your program’s assessment plan requirements. A brief description of each plan elements is listed below along with a link to additional resources on the UOEEE Canvas site.

1. **Mission Statement**: The program’s mission statement should contain three components: the purpose and value of the program, how it serves students, and how it supports the university mission. When taken together, the statement also serves as a reference point for program goals and should show a conceptual tie between the goals and PLOs. [Canvas Link]

2. **Program Goals**: Program goals are broad statements that extend the mission statement. Program goals can explain the expectations of the curriculum and often operationalize the mission statement. Goals define what makes the program unique as well as how they support the university mission. [Canvas Link]

3. **Program Learning Outcomes**: PLOs measure the knowledge and skills students acquire upon completing a degree. Outcomes are written in measurable terms and are focused on student learning. Each PLO has its own set of concepts and competencies. Canvas Links: [Part 1]  |  [Part 2]

4. **Concepts**: Concepts are the content areas students need to understand to achieve an outcome and are directly related to the curriculum. Given this, program syllabi and course descriptions are a good place to start when developing concepts. The number of concepts in a higher education program can be abundant, yet not all need to be included in an assessment plan. Can be thought of as “what students should know.” [Canvas Link]

5. **Competencies**: Competencies are measurable components of the learning outcome. Competencies are assessed using measures and predetermined performance criteria. While concepts are knowledge areas, competencies are measurable components of the learning outcome. Can be thought of as “what students should be able to do.” [Canvas Link]

6. **Assessment Mapping**: Assessment mapping is a visual representation of the relationship between the PLOs and the program’s courses/curriculum. Mapping identifies where PLOs are introduced, reinforced, and mastered.

7. **Assessment Process**: This element provides a road map or steps on how the program outcome will be measured. A detailed process allows for future replication. Details that should be included in the process are:
a) A description of the population used for the data collection
b) The artifact (i.e., research paper, capstone project, etc.) being used as a performance indicator for the outcome and the course it will be collected from
c) The type of research instruments being used to evaluate the artifact (i.e., a rubric).
d) A process describing how the data will be collected, aggregated, analyzed, and reported. This should include enough details for it to be replicated.
e) Time frame in which the data will be collected and analyzed (i.e., a semester or academic year).
f) Research team or faculty participating.
g) How the data will be organized and analyzed.
h) How the data will be used for continuous improvement.

Canvas Link

8. Measures: Measures refer to the tools used for assessment. UOEEE recommends using rubrics as direct measures of student learning when possible and now requires at least one indirect measure (such as surveys or focus groups) per assessment plan to support the analysis. The course and the name of the student artifact should be included. Canvas Link

9. Performance Criteria: This element is a projection of the proportion of students that are expected to obtain a defined level of knowledge and performance. This criterion is usually established by the faculty (although some disciplines have national performance standards) and confirmed through longitudinal data collection. Canvas Link

10. General Education (Undergraduate Only): All undergraduate programs and certificates must ensure that their students are developing in the nine areas of knowledge identified by the university. New degree programs and programs going through APR must identify within the UOEEE assessment portal where these general education skills and intellectual habits are addressed either within the program’s curriculum or through ASU’s general studies coursework.

The following sections in this handbook provide greater detail for each of these elements. Further questions can be directed to the UOEEE program assessment team at assessment@asu.edu.
Table 1

Assessment Plan Element Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Programs</th>
<th>New Programs*</th>
<th>APR Programs*</th>
<th>University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness</th>
<th>APR Certificates*</th>
<th>New Certificates*</th>
<th>Existing Certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 2</td>
<td>≥ 3</td>
<td>≥ 3</td>
<td>Program Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>≥ 2</td>
<td>≥ 2</td>
<td>≥ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measures (Min. 2 per Outcome)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Measure of Student Learning*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measures Summary†</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Compliance Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Programs and certificates that have gone through the APR process in AY 20-21 or later or any program that submitted a new program application to UOEIE in AY 20-21 or later.
** Can be counted towards the two measure minimum per outcome.
† Programs and certificates seeking establishment will need to complete the "Measures Summary" element on their application. This element will not appear after a program is established.
Mission Statement
*Required for post APR and newly established programs

A program level mission statement should explain the purpose and values of the program as well as demonstrates the way it serves students. The mission statement is intended to provide a reference point for other elements of a program’s assessment plan including its goals and PLOs.

When writing a program mission statement, programs should also develop some points of alignment with the university mission statement and goals (see Figure 4). The university mission or otherwise known as the charter explains the purpose, values, and intentions of the institution. It serves as the foundation upon which its educational programs are based. Accreditors will evaluate how well an institution executes its mission through its academic programs and other endeavors.

Figure 4
Relationship Between Program and University Missions

Figure 5
Aligning a Program’s Mission with the University Mission

ASU Mission
ASU is a comprehensive public research university, measured not by whom it excludes, but by whom it includes and how they succeed; advancing research and discovery of public value; and assuming fundamental responsibility for the economic, social, cultural and overall health of the communities it serves.

Concepts to align to your mission
- Inclusion
- Student Success
- Public Value
- Community Impact
- Leadership
- Academic Excellence

ASU Goals
- Demonstrate leadership in academic excellence and accessibility
- Establish ASU as a leading global center for interdisciplinary research, discovery and development by 2025
- Enhance our local impact and social embeddedness
- Establish national standing in academic quality and impact of colleges and schools in every field
What UOEEE looks for in a mission statement:

1. Does it explain the **purpose and values** of the program?

2. How does the program **serve students** specific to the discipline?

3. Is there a relationship between the **university mission** and the program mission statement?

4. Do the **program goals and the program learning outcomes** directly relate to the mission statement?

Figure 6 provides a sample mission statement and identifies the various mission statement components within it.

**Figure 6**

*Mission Statement Breakdown*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRD (Program)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Mission</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ASU School of Community Resources and Development advances the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of our local and global communities through instruction, research and service. We provide nationally recognized interdisciplinary research expertise and innovative academic programs in nonprofit leadership and management, parks and recreation management and tourism development management.

- Does it explain the purpose of the program?
  - nonprofit leadership and management, parks and recreation management and tourism development management.

- What are the values of the program?
  - instruction, research and service

- How are students served?
  - expertise and innovative academic programs

- What do they gain from program participation?
  - advances the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of our local and global communities
  - interdisciplinary research

- Does it align to the University mission?
  - Inclusion, research, Community Impact
Program Goals

Program goals are broad statements that extend and operationalize the mission statement. They define what makes the program unique as well as identify programmatic alignment with the university mission. Program goals should also be able to describe what skills and knowledge students are expected to demonstrate to be academically successful within the program. The number of program goals is often between three and six per program. Examples of program goals can be found below.

Examples of Program Goals

- The goal of ASU Program X is to teach students how to build community.
- ASU Program X provides students with a high quality and creative experience at the undergraduate, graduate, professional and postgraduate levels.
- Students enrolled in ASU Program X will generate new knowledge through a broad array of scholarly, research and creative endeavors.
- ASU program X provides students with a foundation for dealing with the immediate and long-range needs of society.
- ASU Program X teaches students cultural understanding through study of social, political, economic, and technological change.
- Prepare students for employment in multiple settings to address the needs of people with communication, speech, language, literacy, and swallowing difficulties.
- Educate students in scientific foundations of communication, swallowing and related fields.
- Provide students with training in evidence-based, person-centered clinical practice, interprofessional collaboration, community service and life-long learning.
- The Graduate Certificate in Critical Theory teaches students to recognize and apply Continental Philosophy in the analysis of texts within the student's areas of study. Moreover, students develop the ability to create original applications of theory and to build on, qualify, and challenge claims made by other scholars. The result is students who create thoughtful, responsible work in teaching and research in the arts, humanities, and social sciences.
- The certificate aims for students to understand and use formal or programming systems, and how such systems can be used to understand, address, or model issues in human cognition.
Program Learning Outcomes

Outcomes identify what a student will learn or be able to do upon completion of the program. They typically are measured using course-based artifacts and tools (e.g., rubrics).

Programs can have as many outcomes as necessary to reflect the curriculum and create accurate program findings and support a faculty-driven culture of continuous improvement. UOEEE requires programs to choose at least three outcomes to assess through the assessment plan each year (for post APR and newly established programs). For reference, most programs tend to have between four and six PLOs. Certificates can similarly have as many outcomes as necessary to create accurate program findings but are required to assess a minimum of two outcomes each year (for post APR and newly established certificates). Programs are responsible for determining which of their PLOs they will be assessing.

Each outcome is required to have at least two related measures. For programs, this minimally produces just six data points (three outcomes with two measures each) from which to assess often complex degree programs and four data points for certificate programs. Therefore, programs are encouraged to develop as many learning outcomes as necessary to create accurate program findings and support a faculty-driven culture of continuous improvement.

Things to Consider When Developing Program Learning Outcomes

It is important to remember that outcomes should be measurable indicators of a student’s progress towards the program’s stated goals, which in and of itself is an operationalized extension of a program’s mission. For example, if a significant proportion of a program’s goals relates to training graduates to have a positive impact in one’s community, the program’s evaluation efforts would best be served with the inclusion of an outcome addressing skills or knowledge related to community development. Please note that not every single goal needs to be reflected in the outcomes, but external evaluators should be able to perceive overall alignment between the three elements (i.e., mission, goal, and outcome) without much difficulty.

It is also vital to use the correct level of student learning in describing what students are accomplishing. Outcomes should be rigorous and reflect the highest level of learning expected for degree attainment. For examples and suggestions on appropriate wording for each level of student learning, please reference Bloom’s Taxonomy Pyramid and Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy of Action Verbs below (see Figure 8 and 9). A good rule of thumb is that PLOs for lower-level
undergraduate courses should be at the Bloom Taxonomy level of “remembering” and “understanding,” outcomes associated with upper level undergraduate courses should be at the level of “applying” and “analyzing,” and graduate level students should be at the level of “evaluating” and “creating.” Most undergraduate programs will utilize verbs at the “applying” and “analyzing” levels for their outcomes as programs often focus on students’ knowledge at the completion of their undergraduate degree. Upper-level undergraduate courses that only reach the levels of “remembering” and “understanding,” or graduate courses that only “analyze” and “apply,” are considered not very rigorous or challenging. Such plans may not be eligible for UOEEE plan approval. Keep the outcome specific; don’t try to include too much in one outcome as broad outcomes are difficult to measure with any accuracy.

Writing Outcomes

After PLOs have been conceptually developed with the appropriate level of specificity and academic rigor, programs can begin constructing PLO wording. UOEEE recommends that programs develop PLO wording using the following process:

1. Identify and insert an appropriate action verb describing the level of student learning by using one of the Bloom Taxonomy figures (e.g., demonstrate, recall, apply, synthesize, create, etc.)
2. Identify what students will know or be able to do (the knowledge you will measure) as a result of learning or completing a curriculum
3. Identify the student product that will be used to evaluate student learning

Below are some examples of well written PLOs from several different fields.

**Bold black** is the verb
**Blue** is the knowledge being measured
**Green** is the student product

1. Demonstrate both an understanding and the practical application of the ethical standards implicit in science, such as appropriate attribution of ideas, good recordkeeping, and truthful presentation of data and conclusions when conducting research.
2. Explain and appropriately apply evolutionary theory to human and nonhuman primate biological phenomena in midterm exam
3. Write focused, analytical essays in clear, grammatical prose to a critical essay’s thesis
4. Employ primary and/or secondary sources, with proper acknowledgment and citation, as they contribute to a critical essay’s thesis

Science

1. Understand the objective of their chemical experiments, properly carry out the experiments, and appropriately record and analyze the results.
2. Know and follow the proper procedures and regulations for safe handling and use of chemicals (in laboratory procedures).
Humanities
1. The ability to **apply** creative approaches to problem-solving and self-directed study.
2. **Analyze** quantitative data to draw reasonable conclusions.
3. **Identify** examples of symbolism in short stories and **incorporate** symbolism in their own writing.
4. **Analyze** how American foreign policy **history** relates to current trends in American foreign policy papers.

Theater
1. **Demonstrate** a wide understanding of theatre practice and its varied components within the areas of acting, directing, playwriting, design and drama literature.
2. **Articulate** an understanding of the connection between historical periods within theatre, art, culture and society.
3. **Demonstrate** the ability to take on a leadership role in a rehearsal and performance process through the successful completion of a production experience.

Engineering
1. **Identify, formulate, and solve** complex engineering problems by applying principles of engineering, science, and mathematic.
2. **Function** effectively on a team whose members together provide leadership, create a collaborative and inclusive environment, establish goals, plan tasks, and meet objective. (student product)

Writing/English
1. **Participate** in critical conversations and prepare, organize, and deliver their work in public presentation.
2. **Practice** a deliberate writing process with emphasis on inquiry, audience, research, and revision.
3. **Analyze** literary texts and employ and recognize literary terms and features in these texts.
4. **Develop** interpretive arguments both in writing and discussion
5. **Apply** a variety of genres or adapt genres to suit different audiences and purposes

Program Mission → Program Goals → **Program Learning Outcomes** → Concepts and Competency → Assessment Process → Measures → Performance Criteria
Figure 8
Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy Pyramid

Figure 9
Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy Action Verbs
Concepts and Competencies
*Required for post APR and newly established programs/certificates

Concepts
Canvas Link

Concepts are high-level descriptions of the theories, ideas, paradigms, and understandings that students need to know and acquire during the program to successfully execute the outcome. These theories, ideas, paradigms, and understandings can come from a given profession or field of study that students will draw upon in the successful execution of the outcome. Within the assessment plan, programs can simply list out the concept needed for students to be successful. The number of concepts in a higher education program can be abundant, yet not all need to be included in an assessment plan.

Competencies
Canvas Link

Competencies are directly related to PLOs by breaking them down into measurable parts. Each PLO has its own set of concepts and competencies. Competencies are the skills, tools, and operational knowledge students need to be able to perform to achieve and successfully execute the outcome. Most competencies are summative in nature and are written for students to be able to achieve them upon program completion. A good rule of thumb is that competencies resemble how rubric dimensions break down an outcome into measurable components. For example, the outcome for an accounting program is often to evaluate financial risk for clients. Competencies for such a program would include the ability to assess, analyze, and manage risk using appropriate frameworks. On the other hand, concepts students would master include business law, ethics, process analysis and design, principles of auditing, and monetary unit assumptions.

Competencies differ from general education in that they are unique to a specific program or field, while general education skills are transferable across disciplines. Another differentiating feature is that competencies have measures to determine the degree of learning and performance criteria to establish exact expectations.

Similar to concepts, the number of competencies taught in a higher education program can be abundant, yet not all need to be included in an assessment plan. Programs need to identify the skills and operational knowledge that are summative in nature; in other words, which skills are built from knowing other skills.

Relationships with Other Plan Elements

The elements in an assessment plan should align with each other. You should see a relationship between the mission and the PLOs. Each outcome will be explained through concepts and then measured through competencies.
Assessment Mapping

*Required for post-APR programs*

Assessment mapping is required for programs going through APR. Certificate programs are exempt from this requirement. Assessment mapping is a visual representation of the relationship between the PLOs and the program’s courses/curriculum. Mapping identifies where PLOs are introduced, reinforced, and mastered, and can be very basic or complex. One particular benefit of assessment mapping is clarity of purpose. Mapping and measuring the development of specific competencies throughout the curriculum allows program leaders, faculty, and administrators to take an objective look at the PLOs (not just to succeed on any one assignment but to ensure the development of long-term skills over the course a student’s academic career) and help to articulate what students are expected to learn through the program.

UOEEE only asks for a single level assessment map. UOEEE recommends that programs begin to develop their assessment map using the following process:

**Step 1:** Examine the PLOs and determine where in the curriculum (which courses) they are introduced, reinforced or developed, and mastered. Most assessment occurs at the point of mastery.

**Step 2:** Work with faculty in the program and determine assignments that would provide opportunities to measure a students’ knowledge and ability to demonstrate achievement of the outcome.

**Step 3:** Create an IRMA map to identify when and where each program outcome is Introduced, Reinforced, Mastered, and Assessed through the core curriculum courses in the program.

**Introduced** – Students are not expected to be inherently familiar with the content or skill at the collegiate or graduate level. Instruction and learning activities focus on basic knowledge, skills, and/or competencies, and entry level complexity.

**Reinforced** – Students are expected to possess a strong foundation in the knowledge, skill, or competency at the collegiate or graduate level. Instructional and learning activities continue to build upon previous competencies and increased complexity.

**Mastery** – Students are expected to possess a mastery level of knowledge, skill, or competency at the collegiate or graduate level. Instructional and learning activities continue to build upon previous competencies and increased complexity.

**Assess** – Artifacts chosen in an assessment cycle to demonstrate students’ learning outcomes. Note: There is not a separate line within the portal’s mapping element for “assess.” Rather, the artifact and the course in which it is measured will be indicated in writing the “measure” element.
Assessment maps can be built within the UOEEE Assessment Portal using the plan edit page (see Figure 10). Within this particular plan element, programs are expected to enter in the courses where outcome competencies are introduced, reinforced, and mastered. No other information or materials are required. Courses can be entered in the same way other content for elements are entered, by utilizing one of the two edit buttons within the portal (Edit or Edit). When entering in courses, please observe and use the correct format: enter the subject and catalog number using all caps and a space between the letters and numbers (e.g., PSY 101, SOC 205, and ENG411, etc.).

**Figure 10**

*Editing Assessment Maps in the Assessment Portal*

After courses are entered for each outcome, you can download a more traditional assessment map (see Figure 11) that combines all the courses from each learning outcomes into one map, using the icon located in the top right of the plan edit page.

**Figure 11**

*Learning Outcome Map Output*
Assessment Process

*Required for post APR and newly established programs/certificates

Canvas Link

The assessment process should describe the approach or method developed to measure the PLOs. The assessment process can be broken down into categories or written in a narrative and should include the following:

- The **population** of students being assessed (e.g., students in a major vs a general population, all seniors in a program or freshman, students on an internship).
- Where the **artifacts** will come from (e.g., course code and type of artifact).
- Details describing the type of **instruments** to be used. This includes direct forms of assessment (e.g., rubrics, tests, lab practical's) and indirect forms of assessment (e.g., surveys, focus groups, etc.).
- How the assessment will occur. This should include steps in the **process** so they can be replicated.
- Who is included on the **assessment team**. More specifically, who will be involved in analyzing the data (students, faculty, external stakeholders)?
- The **timeframe** in which data will be collected and analyzed.
- How the data will be compiled and **analyzed**.
- How the data will be used for **continuous quality improvement**.

If there is any professional certification or accreditation involved, it should be included here. As previously mentioned, it is important that assessment process be as descriptive and robust as possible as program plans are accessible by university administration, accrediting bodies, and is available upon request to all stakeholders, journalists, and the public. The validity of the data reported is often based largely upon the process by which the data was collected. A thoroughly descriptive assessment process allows for replication as well as the proper context in which to interpret the data.

Lastly, a program’s assessment process will align with other elements of the assessment plan much like concepts and competencies. As such, a well-developed assessment process will aid programs in identifying appropriate “measures” along with their “performance criterion.”
Measures

Measures identify the student artifact and tool that will be used to “measure” the outcome and works in tandem with performance criteria. The measure element should minimally include three pieces of information: the artifact being measured (e.g., capstone project, final paper, etc.), what course or where the artifact is being collected (e.g., PSY 101, capstone course, external internship, etc.), and the measurement tool being used to make a judgement concerning demonstrable student and graduate abilities (e.g., a faculty developed rubric, a survey, an exam). Most of this information is likely to also be included within the assessment process but should still be included within the measures’ element but with more specificity. Both programs and certificates will be required to have at least two measures per outcome.

Direct and Indirect Measures

Both direct and indirect data are important for evaluating program quality. Direct measures collect data on student learning directly related to knowledge and academic performance as assessed through a program’s learning outcomes. Indirect measures can provide information on attitudes, experiences, and perceptions from stakeholders that can help support and explain findings taken from direct assessment data. Starting in 2022, each assessment plan is required to have at least one direct measure of student learning per outcome and one indirect measure of student learning per assessment plan.

A direct measure is based on a student-produced artifact or performance that is assessed for insight into learning, most often using a rubric or similar tool. Grades in courses or for exams are not recommended because they are one dimensional and only provide information on how many points have been earned rather than where the student’s strengths and weaknesses lie. When exams or grades are used, programs must include adequate rationale for how the proposed exam or grade is able to provide data/information that specifically address student progress towards the related outcome, details regarding the number of items used, and examples of the exam items. This rationale should be included in the assessment process element within the same outcome. One commonly approved use of exams is to identify and report on a subset of exam items that specifically relate to the assessment outcome.

Rubrics, either faculty-developed or externally validated, are recommended, and preferred for use wherever circumstances allow. Rubrics are preferred over grades (i.e., class and exam grades) since they provide a breakdown of the content and the level of knowledge learned as well as identify trends in the different areas of knowledge. Rubrics or score cards can be paired with a number of student artifacts including class assignments, research papers, capstone projects, performances, laboratory activities, or clinical examinations.

Indirect measures that assess students’ perceptions and attitudes can often help explain results obtained from direct assessments. Indirect data is often collected as qualitative or survey type data and can be collected from multiple populations including current/graduating students, alumni, faculty, and employers. Indirect data can be collected in many ways including focus groups or interviews where faculty or students can provide feedback and insight to a program’s curriculum or reflective essays asking where and how students learned specific information. UOEEE does collect survey data annually from several populations. The UOEEE assessment portal provides a tool to obtain custom reports with this data for assessment purposes (for more information on UOEEE survey data, please see the Survey Data section of the handbook).
When a measure uses a tool and information not generated by faculty, such as professional certification data or alumni survey responses, non-faculty staff can collect and process the information as long as faculty use these results when developing assessment findings. UOEee recommends that programs use information already being collected for accreditors and regulators in their program assessment plan when possible. Accreditation goals and outcomes can also be used assuming they are sufficiently summative and cumulative in nature.

**Formative and Summative Measures**

Like direct and indirect measures, including both formative and summative measures within a program’s assessment plan can provide a richer and fuller view of student learning. While direct and indirect measures differ in the type of information collected, formative and summative measures differ in when student learning is assessed.

Formative measures are assessments that occur during the learning process to monitor student progress and help identify instructional areas where continuous improvements can be focused. At ASU, bachelor programs can begin assessing students during the students' 200 and 300 level courses if it is important to measure learning gained while progressing through the program. Not all students in the program are expected to be assessed but should be eligible to be sampled if programs are large enough and reliability is tested to ensure accurate assessment results.

Summative measures are assessments that occur at the point of mastery, often as students graduate from the degree program. They provide insight into a program’s bottom line, assessing whether students have achieved the learning outcomes. Data collection after graduation also provides summative data. This data can include licensure exam scores, certification numbers, and student surveys asking students for insight on how well prepared they felt they were entering the workforce. A majority of measures used for assessment at ASU are the summative type.

**ePortfolios and Digication**

ASU has a digital portfolio system with features that include artifact collection and rubric scoring that can be adapted to the course and program level. Programs are encouraged to utilize the digital portfolio system to help students build their academic repertoires as well as aid in program assessment and continuous quality improvement. Incorporating rubrics into digital portfolios makes course expectations transparent, allowing students to understand how levels of performance are determined for a course or program. Furthermore, rubrics utilized within ASU's digital portfolio system allow faculty, programs, departments, and colleges to create a history of assessment and continuous improvement efforts. See [Digication](#).
Performance Criteria

While measures identify the student artifact and tool that will be used to “measure” the outcome, the performance criteria establish the expected level of performance and the proportion of students expected to meet that level of performance. This level of expected performance can be based on longitudinal data, such as past performance or nationally established criteria where available. When not available, performance criteria can be determined by the faculty based on their expertise in the field and then reinforced through longitudinal data collection.

Challenging Criteria

Most performance criteria expect 70% to 80% of students to attain a set level of proficiency for a measure to be considered met during reporting. Performance criteria differs from grading in this aspect. Quite often, criteria are met by a disproportionally high number of students being assessed because performance criteria have not been researched to determine which levels would be challenging to attain. If 100% of students meet a program’s criteria in all dimensions of a rubric, then the tool is not sensitive enough or the criteria is too low to be informative. Programs learn the most about their curriculum when they set criteria just above average performance, where more than half, but not all students can be expected to achieve it. Criteria are considered challenging when there is a realistic chance it may not be met by students and graduates. This delicate balance requires faculty to continuously consider quality improvements. This would then provide information on both the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum.

Because ASU wants criteria to be effective, challenging, and informative, UOEEE does not reward nor penalize programs for meeting or not meeting their learning outcomes within a given year. Outcomes not met are viewed as important data points and opportunities for improvement. Plans are considered effective if they can provide valuable information for making continuous instructional improvements.

Rubric Use and Canvas Benefits

As previously mentioned, UOEEE recommends programs use rubrics to assess student performance. When developing rubrics, faculty should first consider the rubric’s dimensions, the student population, and the number of students expected to attain “mastery” of a subject, skill, or intellectual habit. Performance criteria can change for students as they progress through a degree. Programs may also choose to use a single rubric at all levels of measurement. For example, programs may use a rubric in which sophomore students are likely to earn a 2 out of 4 on some or all dimensions, but then score a 3 out of 4 as they are reassessed with the same rubric as junior or seniors. The number of levels should be enough that each level sufficiently describes the spectrum of student performances for that assignment.

UOEEE recommends that programs utilize rubrics with four levels (1–4) with faculty calibrating their rubrics so that a majority of students, or an “average” student, would achieve a rating of 3 out of 4, with 4 being reserved for the exceptional student. Regardless of the number of levels chosen, UOEEE recommends the inclusion of a “0” rating to represent the absence of material or the absence of relevant work submitted as opposed to a “1” rating which signifies an attempt that failed to demonstrate the expected level of mastery. If the rubric does include a “0” rating, then the criteria should be described as “Information Not Present.” Please look at the sample rubric (see Table 2) and resources in Canvas for more instruction on how to develop rubrics.
Utilizing rubrics at ASU has additional benefits such as the ability to create dashboards displaying a program’s progress towards its programs learning outcome and to automate data collection for assessment purposes within Canvas. For more information and/or support with setting up dashboards, contact the Learning Experience Integration Group via ASU’s Learning Management System Training Page. Rubrics can also cover general education requirements and be applied across subjects. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has developed a set of rubrics entitled The Value Rubrics that can be adapted for use within multiple disciplines.

There are many rubrics in use today including external rubrics specific to a discipline that are already developed and tested for validity and reliability. Furthermore, many programs at ASU develop and use rubrics specific to an assignment. These faculty-developed rubrics are best when addressing an area with no standardized rubric is available. When an externally validated rubric is available, its use is strongly encouraged.

**Table 2**

*Sample Rubric*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Accomplishment: number scale</th>
<th>Outstanding (Above Average)</th>
<th>Meets Expectation (Average Performance Level)</th>
<th>Approaching Expectation</th>
<th>Not Yet Approaching Expectation</th>
<th>Information not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Accomplishment: narrative scale</td>
<td>Met the expectation but also extremely well done</td>
<td><em>50-70% of Students should score here</em></td>
<td>(Promising, but not quite there)</td>
<td>Student made an attempt but product does not correctly satisfy expectations</td>
<td>This could be due to the responder or poor fit of the assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 1</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 4</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
<td>(Dimension Description)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 50 to 70% is an example. Rubric developers can establish an appropriate performance criteria that meets their departments needs.*
General Education—Undergraduate Only

*Required for post APR and newly established programs

To meet new general education skill and habit expectations, both new programs and certificates as well as programs and certificates going through APR, must now provide information on how general education knowledge areas are addressed within their curriculum. Previously approved assessment plans will not need to include this information until the program’s next scheduled APR.

Programs can identify how these knowledge areas are addressed by selecting one of the following input options within the portal (see Figure 12): 1) measure, 2) proxy, 3) narrative, or 4) ASU General Studies.

- A **measure** is a form of assessment that is being utilized within the program’s current assessment plan. When this input method is checked, a dropdown will appear that allows the user to choose which measure within the assessment plan is assessing that particular area of knowledge.

- A **narrative** is reserved for general education areas of knowledge that are assessed within the program, but not included within the program’s current assessment plan. Selecting this option will allow the user to describe where and how students will master skills and knowledge not included in a program’s assessment plan.

- A **proxy** is an assessment performed by a legitimate professional or regulatory/accrediting organization or professional association, as opposed to faculty. Examples of a proxy include 1) testing by state or national regulatory board, 2) internships in the student’s area of study, 3) peer-reviewed publications and conference presentations.

**Figure 12**

*Editing General Education*
● Programs can also indicate when particular knowledge areas will be taught and assessed by ASU’s General Studies Coursework. This option is reserved for knowledge areas that are not specifically taught within a particular degree program (i.e., the English program not having a mathematics/quantitative reasoning component within its curriculum). Please note, that there are very few if any circumstances in which a program does not cover at least one general knowledge area.

In addition, the following instructions, directly from ABOR Policy 2-210, must be kept in mind while developing undergraduate programs.

ABOR Policy 2-210: https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/2-210%20General%20Education.pdf

● Evaluation of general education is also part and parcel of the review of the learning objectives of each degree program and those outcomes are reflected in the academic program reviews.

● Effective assessment depends fundamentally upon measurement and does not rely exclusively on a single project or capstone course. It …will inform curricular refinements and allow faculty & administrators to reconsider programs that do not meet expectations in terms of learned concepts and competencies.

● Each university will utilize rubrics, based on national standards or locally developed, to gauge whether students master the essential learning outcomes and intellectual qualities that are outlined in the policy.
Program Assessment Plan Quality Worktable

To help better guide the submission of assessment plans, UOEEE has developed a rubric (see Table 3) to help programs better understand what information should be included in each element of a program’s assessment plan. It is only when each element of the plan minimally meets expectations is it considered acceptable for submission at ASU. If any of these elements does not meet minimum requirements, the entire plan is considered unacceptable.

The worktable below includes a description of each rating for each plan element. UOEEE and assessment delegates will use this worktable to evaluate plans beginning in the summer of 2022 with UOEEE evaluating plans during a program’s APR and delegates evaluating plans whenever changes are being made. Programs will be able to reference this table through this handbook as well as on UOEEE’s Canvas site. Following UOEEE’s evaluation of the plan, a copy of the rubric along with its ratings and feedback will be emailed to any user who entered content into the plan as well as the program’s assessment delegate. Programs will also have access to previous UOEEE plan evaluation ratings (when applicable) through the portal’s program archives. For more information on how to access the program archives, please see the Editing Assessment Plans and Reports section in the handbook.
### Table 3

**Program Assessment Plan Quality Worktable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Elements</th>
<th>Plan is Exemplary</th>
<th>Plan is Acceptable</th>
<th>Plan is Unacceptable</th>
<th>Information Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Mission statement addresses all components: Explains purpose of the program and what they value, defines how it serves students, and how it aligns with university mission.</td>
<td>□ Mission statement addresses 3 of 4 these components: defines program, explains values, defines how it serves students, aligns with University mission.</td>
<td>□ Mission statement does not explain the purpose of the program, their value, how it serves students, nor alignment with the university mission.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>□ All goals extend the mission and align with the outcomes.</td>
<td>□ Some goals extend the mission and align with the outcomes.</td>
<td>□ Goals are broad and do not directly align with the mission and outcomes.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Goal</td>
<td>□ Four or more outcomes.</td>
<td>□ Three outcomes.</td>
<td>□ Two or less outcomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>□ All outcomes specific, measurable, and are active verbs that are appropriately rigorous. Aligns with appropriate levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy.</td>
<td>□ Three or more outcomes are specific, measurable and are active verbs that are appropriately rigorous. Middle Two Pedagogical Levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy.</td>
<td>□ Outcomes are not specific nor/or measurable OR outcomes are specific, measurable but active verbs are lowest Two Pedagogical Levels, Bloom Taxonomy.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>□ Well stated knowledge areas that students must successfully understand to achieve the outcome. Excellent alignment between concepts and outcomes.</td>
<td>□ Well stated knowledge areas that students must successfully understand to achieve the outcome.</td>
<td>□ Does not address theories, knowledge or skills that students must attain to accomplish the outcome.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>□ Well stated and measurable. Effectively breaks down the outcome into measurable components. Competency has strong alignment to the outcome and is a breakdown of a component of the outcome.</td>
<td>□ Related directly to the outcome and is measurable.</td>
<td>□ Unrelated or somewhat related statements but not well aligned with the outcome.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Process</td>
<td>□ Includes essential elements, student population, tool, timeline, and how the data will be used. Also includes information on data collection and analysis, assessment team including faculty, students, and other stakeholders in the process. If using an exam, they explain how they are using specific information such as exam questions to determine how students are meeting the outcome.</td>
<td>□ Three or more. Includes essential elements: student population, tools, timeline, and how the data will be used. Could be replicated but is missing some details.</td>
<td>□ Does not include most components of the recommended assessment process. The process cannot be replicated as written.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Elements</td>
<td>Plan is Exemplary 3</td>
<td>Plan is Acceptable 2</td>
<td>Plan is Unacceptable 1</td>
<td>Information Not Present 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Mapping</td>
<td>□ Outcomes are being assessed in multiple courses.</td>
<td>□ Each outcome is introduced, reinforced, and mastered within at least one course within the curriculum</td>
<td>Outcome introduction, reinforcement, and mastery are not addressed within the assessment map.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>□ Three or More</td>
<td>□ Two, minimum</td>
<td>□ None or One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Multimodal methodology using a rubric for direct and some form of indirect assessment (e.g., survey or focus group) for each outcome</td>
<td>□ Each outcome has at least one direct form of assessment and the plan as a whole has at least one indirect form of assessment.</td>
<td>□ One form of assessment only (all indirect or all direct)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Criteria</td>
<td>□ Explains the expected score on the rubric or survey and performance criteria is challenging.</td>
<td>□ Explains the expected score on the rubric or survey.</td>
<td>□ Does not include the expected score of the majority of the sample and/or identify percentage of the sample.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Educ-Undergrad Only</td>
<td>□ All nine areas of knowledge measured by the program (not by ASU general studies coursework)</td>
<td>□ Five to eight areas of knowledge measured by the program (not by ASU general studies coursework)</td>
<td>□ Zero – four areas of knowledge measured by the program (not by ASU general studies coursework)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Level</td>
<td>Plan has a strong methodology and should result in valid data and produce data effective for continuous improvement.</td>
<td>Plan is still developing yet is acceptable for program assessment purposes.</td>
<td>Any cell that does not meet criteria results in a plan not being accepted.</td>
<td>Any cell that is not complete results in a plan not being accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elements of an Annual Assessment Report at ASU

Annual assessment reports serve as records of the assessment plans in practice and are expected of nearly all programs with the “Report” or “Low Enrollment” statuses* (for more information on statuses, please see the Portal Landing Page section of the handbook).

When completing one’s annual assessment report, programs are expected to record the data associated with the artifacts laid out in their program’s assessment plan collected over the most recent academic year*. For example, a program completing a report in June 2021 would be entering in data collected over academic year 2020-2021*. To ensure consistent reporting and to avoid gaps in data, programs are expected to submit a report annually, even if no data was collected. These reports should contain an explanation for the lack of data as well as steps taken by the program to mitigate instances going forward.

Given that report data is archived and available for programs to review, it is important for programs to try to accurately report data for the purposes of longitudinal evaluation of their students’ success. Reporting on assessment activities should also be viewed as an opportunity for program faculty to reflect on their level of participation and whether assessment findings are providing information detailed enough for faculty to provide continuous improvement guidance.

As previously mentioned, it is important to remember that UOECEE does not reward nor penalize programs based on whether or not their outcomes were met within any given year. Outcomes not met are viewed as important data points and opportunities for improvement. Instead, UOECEE examines the process and approach taken to ensure that assessment plans provide information with the ability to inform faculty and administrators. Plans are considered effective if they can provide valuable information for making continuous instructional improvements.

When UOECEE reviews annual reports each year, it focuses on four primary areas that often result in high quality data: measures and data, rigor of performance criteria, faculty involvement, and changes based on assessment findings. The UOECEE evaluation rubric for annual reports can be found later in this handbook (see Table 4) as well as on the UOECEE Canvas site. Annual assessment reports are comprised of two primary sections (i.e., The Assessment Process, Changes, and Self-Assessment section and the Outcomes Reporting section) and several components within them. Each of these elements are described in further detail below.

*The academic year runs from June to May annually

---

The APR Reporting Break

Programs are excused from reporting the year following their APR. This is due to programs often making large changes to their assessment plan over their APR and because program reports are based upon data collected from the previous academic year. As such, it would be difficult for programs to collect and report data based on an assessment plan that is not yet finalized.

A sample timeline would be as follows:

- **Apr 2022**: Program begins APR process to be completed throughout AY22-23
- **May 2022**: Program completes annual report requirement with data collected over AY21-22
- **Jan 2023**: Program completes APR process
- **May 2023**: Program would normally submit data collected over AY22-23 but is excused from submitting an annual report
Assessment Process, Changes, and Self-Assessment

The Assessment Process, Changes, and Self-Assessment component is where programs have the opportunity to provide contextual information related to their program’s assessment efforts over the past year. Here programs record who participated in the evaluation process, any incidents that affected the program’s evaluation efforts, and lessons learned from the data within a given year. This is contextually important and helpful for programs when reviewing past/historical data and evaluation efforts led by other individuals. In addition, understanding how programs are utilizing data for quality improvement purposes is an important requirement for HLC accreditation. Components within this section include:

1. **Faculty**: Where programs describe which and how program faculty/staff are involved in the assessment process.

2. **One-Off Process Changes**: Where programs identify changes made to a program’s assessment process due to an extra-ordinary event or circumstance that programs do not anticipate becoming a permanent part of the assessment plan.

3. **Curriculum or Pedagogical Changes Based on Assessment Findings**: Where programs identify what if any changes will be made to their curriculum and/or assessment process after reviewing their data. Programs that decide to not make any programmatic or assessment changes should briefly summarize their logic for doing so.

**Figure 14**

*Assessment Process, Changes, and Self-Assessment Component of the Annual Report*
Outcomes Reporting

The Outcomes Reporting component of the assessment report is where programs enter data collected over the past academic year that is associated with their assessment plan. Programs are expected to complete each element within this section except for the contextual information, which is optional but encouraged. This contextual information is particularly helpful during program reviews, when the individual reviewing the reports is unlikely to have been the person entering in the data some years later. Components within this section include:

**Figure 15**

*Outcomes Reporting Component of the Annual Report*

1. **Outcome/Measure Disposition:** A simple way for programs to easily indicate whether their outcomes/ measures were met, not met, or unsure. As previous mentioned, UOEEM does not penalize nor reward programs for having met or not met their program learning outcomes.
2. **Contextual Information:** This space is provided to programs for contextual information to reference when reviewing past reports. These are particularly important when an outcome/measure was not met or if a program was unsure if it was met to provide reasons/insight for that particular determination.

3. **Total Number Collected/Met/Exceeded:** Where programs enter in data collected over the previous academic year. If possible, data entered into this component should be limited to students enrolled within the degree/certificate program and include both in-person AND online students.

4. **Online Number Collected/Met/Exceed (Starting Spring 2022):** A space for programs to enter in data collected ONLY from online students. This space will appear if the degree program has equal to or more than 20 of these students enrolled within their program over the academic year. A student is considered an “online” student when their registered campus is “Online” (as opposed to Tempe, Poly, etc.). It should be noted that students registered at one of ASU’s in person campuses (i.e., Tempe, Poly, West, etc.) may take online classes, but students with a registered campus of “online” are not able to take in person classes on campus.
Assessment Report Quality Worktable

To help better guide the submission of assessment reports, UOEEE has developed a rubric (see Table 4) to help programs better understand what information should be included in a program’s annual report. UOEEE has identified four primary areas that when properly completed, often results in high quality assessment data: measures and data, rigor of performance criteria, faculty involvement, and curriculum or pedagogical changes based on assessment findings. It is only when the report minimally meets expectations is it considered acceptable for submission at ASU. If any of these elements does not meet minimum requirements, the entire report is considered unacceptable.

The worktable below includes a description of each rating for the four primary areas along with an overall rating. UOEEE and assessment delegates will use this worktable to evaluate annual reports beginning in the summer of 2022. Programs will be able to reference this table in this handbook, within the assessment portal (within the report edit page; see Figure 16) by clicking the UOEEE Rubric button located near the top of the report page. Clicking this button will also allow delegates to enter ratings and provide feedback on the report as well. Once ratings have been entered, delegates need to click the button to save their ratings. Clicking the icon hides the dimension descriptions. The table is also available on UOEEE’s Canvas site. Following UOEEE’s evaluation of the report, a copy of the rubric along with its ratings and feedback will be emailed to any user who entered content into the report as well as the program’s assessment delegate. Programs will also have access to previous UOEEE report evaluation ratings (when applicable) through the portal’s program archives. For more information on how to access the program archives, please see the Editing Assessment Plans and Reports section in the handbook.

Table 16

Assessment Report Quality Worktable – Portal View
### Table 4

**Assessment Report Quality Worktable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Elements</th>
<th>Report is Exemplary</th>
<th>Report is Acceptable</th>
<th>Report is Unacceptable</th>
<th>Information Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall assessment plan and report</td>
<td>□ Characteristics of an excellent assessment report include, but are not limited to: data (quantitative and qualitative) that provides rich information on student progress towards outcomes, multimodal assessment, detailed descriptions of faculty roles and how faculty are using the data to close the loop.</td>
<td>□ Characteristics of an overall good assessment report include, but are not limited to: data that provides adequate information on student progress towards outcomes, a valid and reliable methodology resulting in good data, detailed descriptions of faculty roles and how faculty utilized data for continuous improvement.</td>
<td>□ Characteristics of an overall poor assessment report include, but are not limited to: data that provides little to no information on student progress towards outcomes, methodology that does not provide valid or reliable data, lacks detailed descriptions of faculty roles and how faculty utilized data for continuous improvement.</td>
<td>□ Characteristics of an overall poor assessment report include, but are not limited to: data that provides little to no information on student progress towards outcomes, methodology that does not provide valid or reliable data, lacks detailed descriptions of faculty roles and how faculty utilized data for continuous improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>□ The assessment data in the report is multimodal and provides strong data that informs the outcome.</td>
<td>□ The assessment data in the report provides data that informs the outcome.</td>
<td>□ Assessment data reported on does a fair to poor job of providing information about the outcome.</td>
<td>□ Assessment data reported on does a fair to poor job of providing information about the outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigor of the performance criteria</td>
<td>□ Performance criteria/measure was sensitive enough to differentiate between exceptional, adequate and weak performance.</td>
<td>□ Performance criteria were sensitive enough to differentiate between adequate and exceptional performance.</td>
<td>□ Performance criteria are not sensitive. No difference was identified between student performance. All met the criteria.</td>
<td>□ Performance criteria are not sensitive. No difference was identified between student performance. All met the criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>□ Data entry was complete, rational, AND good contextual information was provided (i.e., additional information beyond restating the results in word form).</td>
<td>□ Data entry was complete and rational. Missing data was accounted for.</td>
<td>□ Data was complete but contained issues (i.e., # met was greater than total sample size, sample size was greater than enrolled numbers, outcome was “Met” but none of the measures were “Met,” missing data not accounted for).</td>
<td>□ Data was complete but contained issues (i.e., # met was greater than total sample size, sample size was greater than enrolled numbers, outcome was “Met” but none of the measures were “Met,” missing data not accounted for).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>□ Report identifies an assessment team that includes multiple faculty/staff members involved in all stages of the process. Faculty involvement aligns with the assessment plan description</td>
<td>□ Report identifies an adequate group of faculty/staff members involved in the assessment process either collecting data, analyzing, sharing or using data for improvement. Faculty involvement aligns with the assessment plan description</td>
<td>□ Report identifies the faculty that conducted the assessment but the assessment team was too small and there is no indication that the assessment was shared with relevant and multiple stakeholders. Faculty involvement does not align with the assessment plan description</td>
<td>□ Report does not specify or identify how faculty participated in the evaluative process. No evidence of faculty participation was provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum or Pedagogy changes based on assessment findings</td>
<td>□ Faculty analyzed and applied assessment results for programmatic improvements Demonstrated thoughtful recommendations for closing the loop and using data for improvement.</td>
<td>□ Faculty analyzed the data and made reasonable recommendations for improvements or provided rational why improvements would not be needed.</td>
<td>□ Faculty reported on assessment data but did not make well thought out recommendations OR simply concluded that no changes were necessary based on the data.</td>
<td>□ Faculty reported on assessment data but did not make well thought out recommendations OR simply concluded that no changes were necessary based on the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Level</td>
<td>Report has strong and valid data and the program has already taken identifiable steps towards continuous improvement.</td>
<td>Report is complete and provides data that can easily be used towards closing the loop.</td>
<td>Any cell that does not meet criteria results in a report not being accepted.</td>
<td>Any cell that is not complete results in a plan not being accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UOEEE Assessment Portal

The content related to the UOEEE Assessment Portal found within this handbook is meant to serve as a general guide to navigating the portal. For more detailed explanations of features and basic use of the portal, please see the resources within the “Assessment Portal” module of the UOEEE Canvas site. Resources include blank assessment plan templates, a video walkthrough of the portal, and detailed descriptions of assessment plan elements.

Portal Landing Page

The portal landing page has been designed to provide schools with a more comprehensive overview of a program’s progress through the various assessment processes. The image below is an example of the portal’s landing page (see Figure 17). Delegates and their designees will see similar information for the schools and colleges that they have access to. All other users will be privy only to the program plans and reports they have been granted access to. Delegates and users should also be aware that each program has been assigned a program status based on several factors that include establishment date, enrollment numbers, and APR status. These program statuses have implications on a program’s reporting expectations (see Table 5). An explanation of each status and their reporting expectations, are as follows.

- **Report** – Programs that are expected to submit both a report and an assessment plan.
- **Plan** – Programs that will not have to submit a report for the previous academic year. Programs in this status are typically new programs that are given a few years to allow programs to enroll enough students to obtain a meaningful sample size, to enroll students in the classes where assessment is being conducted (usually higher-level courses or capstone courses), and to evaluate the plan’s feasibility based on the program’s capacity.
- **Low Enrollment** – Programs with enrollment between 1-20 students are classified as “Low Enrollment.” These programs will not be required to submit assessment data (but will still have the capability to if they choose). They will, however, be required to submit an abbreviated annual report (see the Editing Assessment Plans and Reports section for an example) with the following details:
  - Applicable plan components (i.e., the Assessment Process, Changes, and Self-Assessment component of the annual report.)
  - Confirmation of a program’s “Low Enrollment” status
- **Insufficient Plan** – Programs that are missing plan elements that were required during the program’s establishment or at their last APR. Programs will need to remedy their plans before they can continue their assessment efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Status:</th>
<th>Report:</th>
<th>Plan:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Enrollment</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Plan</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Enrollment</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Programs in APR will not have to submit a report the following year regardless of status

Table 5

Reporting Expectation by Program Status

- ✓ = Required
- * = Abbreviated Report
- ✗ = Not Required

Element Required

- **Report** – Programs that are expected to submit both a report and an assessment plan.
- **Plan** – Programs that will not have to submit a report for the previous academic year.
- **Low Enrollment** – Programs with enrollment between 1-20 students are classified as “Low Enrollment.” These programs will not be required to submit assessment data (but will still have the capability to if they choose). They will, however, be required to submit an abbreviated annual report (see the Editing Assessment Plans and Reports section for an example) with the following details:
  - Applicable plan components (i.e., the Assessment Process, Changes, and Self-Assessment component of the annual report.)
  - Confirmation of a program’s “Low Enrollment” status
- **Insufficient Plan** – Programs that are missing plan elements that were required during the program’s establishment or at their last APR. Programs will need to remedy their plans before they can continue their assessment efforts.
- **No Enrollment** – Programs with zero enrolled students. These programs can be seen by delegates but will be hidden from most other users. While these programs are not expected to update nor confirm their plans annually, they are expected to have an assessment plan within the portal for when these programs begin to enroll students and will be required to complete the APR process along with their department/college when scheduled. Programs with this designation will not be required to submit an annual report. The only way to remove these programs from the portal is to complete the official disestablishment process with the university. More information about this process can be found [here](#).

Please note that programs in APR will not need to adhere to the annual assessment plan expectation as their APR will satisfy this requirement. Additionally, APR programs will not need to submit an annual report the year following their APR. For more information, please see the [Academic Program Review](#) section of the handbook.

Within the portal, clicking on a program status (e.g., “Approved,” “Not Submitted,” “Insufficient Plan,” “Revise,” etc.) within the various tiles, will bring up tables displaying programs that fall into the selected category. Users can also view and/or edit assessment plans or reports from these tables where applicable. Please note that only delegates and administrators will have access to the user access management tile, where they can view who has portal access to their college, departments, and programs by clicking the “Look up” button. Delegates can also request changes to an individual’s access according to evolving needs of the program by clicking the ✒️ button in the “User Access Management” table or clicking the “Add user” button in the “User Access Management” tile on the portal landing page.

For new program applications, delegates can use the 🔄 button within the “New Program Applications” tile to open the new program form. Completing this form creates a new program shell in the UOEVEE portal. After a new shell is created, it can be automatically accessed by all people with college and department level access. Users without this level of access, however, will need to request access by sending an email containing the new program’s name, its academic plan code, and the ASURITE ID of the person needing access to assessment@asu.edu or ask their delegate to request it via the portal.

**Figure 17**

*Portal Landing Page*
Program Status Tables

Within each portal tile are several statuses illustrating how programs are progressing through that process. For a more thorough walk-through of the statuses within each tile, including the sequence of the statuses, please visit the UOEEE Canvas site and direct your attention to the “Explainer” documents located within the “Assessment Portal” module. Within the UOEEE portal, clicking the statuses within each tile will open a table displaying all programs within that status the user has access to (see Figure 18).

Figure 18

Assessment Plan Status Table – “Submitted” Plans View

Status tables for each tile will look relatively similar and have many of the same tools and functions as the one depicted above. One important feature within each table to take note of is the search bar. This search bar will search for any matching text within the visible program status table. This includes the last modified user, program description (e.g., Business Administration – Agribusiness, Theatre – Dramatic Writing), and a program’s unique academic plan code (e.g., BAAGRIPHD, FADRWRMTMFA, etc.).

Users can also click the number within the “Program Status” tile located on the portal landing page (see Figure 19) to see all the programs they have access to in one table, regardless of plan or report status. The search bar tool works similarly to the program status tables, allowing users to search for any matching text within the table. This includes the last modified user, program description, and academic plan code. Users can also search for programs going through or preparing to go through the APR process. To check on a program’s APR status, users can search for “APR” (to find programs currently in APR) or “Next Cycle” (programs going through APR in the next academic year) inside the table’s search bar.

Figure 19

Viewing All Programs a User has Access to
Editing Assessment Plans and Reports

Plan edit pages are where new plans/reports are first written and where they are later revised. From a program’s mission and goals, through all other elements in a plan, the assessment plan and report edit pages house all the information related to a program’s assessment plan and data collection efforts. Functions such as editing and submitting plans and reports will be similar across both edit page types. To edit plans/reports, users can click one of two editing buttons (Edit or Add) and enter content into the applicable fields. After all content has been entered, users MUST click the Edit or Pending buttons to save the entered content (see Figure 20).

Programs and certificates that are not making any changes to a previously approved program, can streamline the annual assessment plan process by submitting their program assessment plan under the “Continuing” designation. Programs that submit under this designation bypass the delegate review and approval process and fulfill their annual requirement to submit an assessment plan. To submit under the continuing status, programs will click the button located near the top of the plan edit page. This button will no longer be available once the website detects a change has been made to the assessment plan.

Figure 20

Plan Edit Page
Starting in 2021, programs and certificates seeking to be established will need to complete a “Measures Summary” found on their new program application’s assessment plan. This requirement is not a new requirement but has been made more prominent to ensure completion (see Figure 21). The purpose of this element is to provide the university’s provost office with a simple narrative description of the measures and performance criteria written by an individual with firsthand knowledge of the assessment plan. For this element, programs are to include the student artifact being assessed (i.e., a case study, dissertation, etc.) and tool used for measurement (i.e., a rubric, exam grade, etc.) but exclude performance criteria (i.e., numbers, percentages, or scales). There should be one summary per outcome that summarizes each measure within that outcome. When completing this element, the measures summary will initially contain the combined text of each measure within that outcome in gray. This text is to be replaced with a proper summary. Once text has been entered and saved, the measures summary text will turn black. For examples on language and how to combine multiple measures into a single summary, please visit the UOEEE Canvas Site.

Figure 21
New Program Application Measures Summary Plan Element

Programs going through the APR process or that will be going through the APR process the following academic year, will see a special designation under their program name within the plan edit page (see Figure 22). Those currently in the APR process will see “Conducting Academic Program Review” while those going through the APR process the following year will see “Next Cycle.” It should also be noted that plans submitted by programs going through the APR process will be reviewed by UOEEE rather than program delegates.

Figure 22
APR Designation on the Plan Edit Page

Regarding reports, low enrollment programs that are required to submit an abbreviated report, will see a report edit page that is nearly identical to the standard report edit page with the addition of a single item where programs can confirm their low enrollment status (see Figure 23). In addition, given that data entry is optional for most low enrollment programs, fields for data entry are collapsed by default but can be expanded to allow for data entry*. To expand the data entry fields, click the green arrow below the “Outcomes Reporting” header.

*Reporting requirements, and thus the default view of the report, will vary by college. Please follow the direction of your college’s delegate.
Additional Plan/Report Features

The assessment portal has additional features to help programs submit their plans and reports. These features can be accessed via buttons located in the upper right corner of the assessment plan and annual report pages (see Figure 24).

- The “Comments” ( 💬) feature allows anyone with access to the plan to record comments for others to read and act upon accordingly. Over time, these comments can be used to record program challenges and developments as well as help guide future assessment processes. UOEEE provides overall plan/report feedback as well as feedback on specific plan elements. Overall feedback can be found above the plan/report, while element specific feedback can be found in the side panel to the right of the plan/report. Programs can also mark individual comments as “resolved” by clicking the 🔄 button found below each comment. Resolved comments will be highlighted green at the top. Programs can also download plan comments along with the assessment plan by clicking the 📄 button located inside the maroon comments’ header. These features are found on both plans and reports.

- The “UOEEE Surveys” ( 📊) feature allows programs to link measures to individual items from UOEEE administered surveys. Measures that are linked will auto-populate data within the program report edit page after survey data is collected. This feature is managed within the plan edit page. For more information about UOEEE administered surveys, please see the UOEEE Survey data section of the handbook.

- The “History” feature documents when changes to the plan have been made and saved. This feature is similar to Google’s history feature for Google docs in that users can view previously saved versions of specific plan elements. This information
can be useful in showing a plan’s development over time. The number of changes made to each element will be indicated with gray numbers ( ). Clicking this number will bring up previous versions of the plan element. This feature is found on the plan edit page.

- The “Handbook” ( ) feature allows you to display the UOE3E Program Assessment Handbook section of a particular plan element within a side panel on the plan edit page. This increases ease of use when preparing program assessment plans. This feature is found on the plan edit page.

- The “Evidence” feature is an optional ability to upload materials used for assessment and evaluation within a particular program. Programs may want to use this feature to keep all assessment materials in a single location or for programs to reference surveys and rubrics used within an academic year for APR. Uploaded materials need to be combined into a single PDF or .zip file per evidence type (i.e., Rubrics, Sample Data, Artifacts, etc.). This feature is found in the report edits page.

- The “Program Archive” feature allows programs to access aggregated program entered data from the past six years as well as past UOE3E feedback including rubric ratings and comments. The aggregated data is particularly helpful for those in APR or wanting to review the long-term progress towards their PLOs. Programs can access this data by clicking the button located on the top right of the report edit page to bring up past data within the page itself. The summary page can be downloaded by clicking the button also located in the top right of the page. Programs can also access reports and evaluation data from specific years by clicking the radio buttons with the corresponding academic year of interest. Programs can also access this data using through the program archives. Steps to accessing the program archives is described in the following section.

- Traditionally, annual reports are only updated to match assessment plans once a year (when the portal was turned over in March), but delegates will now have the ability to update the contents of the annual report to match the current assessment plan by clicking the button located under the program’s name on both the plan and report edit page (see Figure 25). Please note that delegates will only be able to do this for programs who’s plans have already been given delegate approval within that cycle.

For more information on how to navigate to and use these features, please see the Assessment Portal Walk Through video on UOE3E’s Canvas site.
Program Archives

Programs can access past reports, aggregated data, as well as past UOEEE feedback including rubric ratings and comments by clicking the button within the “UOEEE Review and Archives” tile. Clicking this button will open program table with all the programs a user has access to. This table is similar in functionality and look as the plan and report tables. Some additional functions that the program archives table has is the ability to download past program reports from specific years as well as a summary of all the previously collected data directly from the table (see Figure 26).

Clicking the icon will bring up the archived data for the corresponding program (see Figure 27). The data aggregation summary table will appear first and is particularly helpful for those in APR or wanting to review the long-term progress of their program towards their PLOs. It provides information on how often outcomes were met as well as the percentage of students that met the performance criterion for each individual measure within each year as well as accumulatively. Reports from specific years can be viewed by clicking the corresponding radio buttons. A video walkthrough on navigating to and through the program archives can be found on UOEEE’s Canvas site.

Figure 26

Program Archive Legend

Table:

- **Summary**: Queues a summary table of previously collected data for download.
- **1920**: Queues the program report from the 19-20 academic year for download.
- ****: Downloads the selected/queued reports.

Program Archive:

- **Download**: Downloads a summary of program data spanning the last 6 years.
- **Download**: Downloads report for a specific year in .docx format.

Program Archives

![Program Archive Legend](image)

Glossary:

- **O1** = Outcome 1
- **1920** = Academic year 2019-2020
- **1819** = Academic year 2018-2019

- **Met?** = Did the program meet the established program criteria?
- **#** = Number of data points collected
- **% Met** = Percentage of students collected that met performance criterion
- **#Met** = Number of students collected that met performance criterion
UOEEE Survey Data

One relatively lesser known aspect of the UOEEE website is the availability of UOEEE collected survey data. UOEEE’s Surveys and Systems team is tasked with designing and conducting original survey research for administrative planning, decision making, policy development, accreditation, and official reporting. This directive has led to the creation and implementation of various annual surveys that sample multiple populations (e.g., incoming freshmen, transfer students, graduating undergraduate students, and graduating graduate students among others) whose results are regularly provided to ABOR, HLC, and the Arizona State Legislature among other organizations.

These survey results are also available internally to all ASU programs (making it an excellent source of indirect data for program assessment) and can be disaggregated at the college, department, and program levels. Users with access to the portal can learn more about the different surveys available and access their results by visiting the survey reporting page on the UOEEE website. Programs can view the survey directly from the Qualtrics survey site from the user’s perspective or a pdf version of the survey by clicking the button or button respectively. Users without access to the portal can reach out to their assessment delegate to request access or email assessment@asu.edu with the following information: first name, last name, user email, ASURite ID, and the college, department, or specific academic program you need access to.

To view the data related to a specific college, department, or program, users can create a custom report by selecting “Custom Report” from the dropdown menu in the upper left corner of the survey reporting page under the “UOEEE Reporting” tile (see Figure 28). From there, users will need to identify the specific survey questions they would like data on by first selecting the survey(s) that contain the question(s; users can include questions from multiple surveys and questions within a single report) in the “Surveys” drop down box, followed by the specific question(s) in the “Select a questions…” box (see Figure 29) and then clicking the “Run Report” button in the middle of the tile to bring up the requested data. Once the data and charts have been generated for the requested items, users can further refine the sample by identifying a specific college, department, and academic program to limit the data to using the corresponding drop-down boxes (see Figure 30). Please note, users must first identify the college, then the department, and then the program in that order. Once the user has satisfactorily narrowed down the data to their desired population, they can download the data in a word doc using the icon, in an excel spread sheet using the icon, or download both simultaneously using the icon.

Similar to the data found in the program archives section of the portal, data is separated by academic year (i.e., 1920 = academic year 2019-2020) as well as aggregated across the displayed years in the “Overall” column. Please note that data is not displayed if the choosen sample results in an n < 4.

Figure 28
Creating a Custom Report on UOEEE Survey Reporting Site
Figure 29

*Example of Custom Report Inputs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UOEER Reporting</th>
<th>Customize a Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select one of the feature reports below or create a custom report by filtering our available questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a Custom Report</td>
<td>Run Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Student Report Card</td>
<td>Graduating Student Report Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate and Law Student Report Card</td>
<td>Graduate and Law Student Report Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SSRC] Overall undergraduate experience</td>
<td>[SSRC] ASU’s contribution to Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[GLSRC] Overall graduate experience</td>
<td>[GLSRC] Rating of preparation for a job in field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30

*Inputs for Refining Survey Data to Specific Academic Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Reporting</th>
<th>Custom Report</th>
<th>Download</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA/W.P. Carey School of Business</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMARKET</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[BAMKDIMCE] Marketing (Digital and Integrated Marketing Communications)</td>
<td>Minority Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource Links

ASU Assessment Links

UOEEE Home Page: https://uoeee.asu.edu/

UOEEE Assessment Portal: https://uoeee.asu.edu/assessment-portal


UOEEE Survey Reporting Portal: https://uoeee.asu.edu/survey-reporting

ASU Academic Program Review Portal: https://provost.asu.edu/academic-program-review

Assessment in General

References:

AAC&U VALUE Rubrics: https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics

UC Berkeley: https://teaching.berkeley.edu/resources/improve/evaluate-course-level-learning/rubrics


Higher Learning Commission: Guiding Values

https://www.hlcommission.org/Publications/guiding-values.html

Assessment References from ASU Library Resources:

- Assessment in arts education / Philip Taylor ISBN: 9780325007953
- Assessment in Mathematics Education: Large-Scale Assessment and Classroom Assessment (online text)
- Research Assessment in the Humanities: Towards Criteria and Procedures / Hans - Dieter Daniel; Sven E. Hug; Michael Ochsner. Springer 2016 (online text)
- Assessment in the Science Curriculum / Marlow. Ediger. S.I. : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 2001
- Assessment in social work practice Carol H. Meyer 1924-New York: Columbia University Press c1993
- Assessment: a sourcebook for social work practice Julia B Rauch; Families International (Milwaukee, Wis.) - Milwaukee, Wis.: Families International c1993
- Assessment in Student Affairs, Second Edition John H. Schuh, J. Patrick Biddix, Laura A. Dean, and Jillian Kinzie (online text)
- Assessment in Mathematics Education: Large-Scale Assessment and Classroom Assessment Suurtamm, Christine; Thompson, Denisse R.; Kim, Rae Young; Moreno, Leonora Diaz; Sayac, Nathalie; Schukajlow, Stanislaw; Silver, Edward; Ufer, Stefan; Vos, Pauline: Springer International Publishing, Cham 2016 (online text)
- Measuring up: educational assessment challenges and practices for psychology Dana Dunn; Chandra Mehrrota; Jane S Halonen: Washington, DC: American Psychological Association c2004 (online text)
- Assessment for Learning in Law John O. Mudd: S.I. : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 1986
- Assessing public journalism Edmund B Lambeth; Philip Meyer; Esther Thorson: Columbia: University of Missouri Press c1998
- Assessment in Mass Communication Susan Tyler. Eastman: S.I. : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 1993
- The problem of assessment in art and design Trevor Rayment Bristol: Intellect 2007
- Student Assessment in Architecture Schools Sarah M. Dinham: S.I. : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 1988
- Assessment in Management, Nursing, and Teaching at Alverno College Georgine. Loacker: S.I. : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 1986
- Assessment in education D. G. Lewis: New York, Wiley c1975
- Assessment in the History Curriculum Marlow. Ediger : S.I. : Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse 2000

Articles / studies / reports:

- Down and In Assessment Practices at the Program Level (2011) NILOA

Other sources:

- Assessment of student learning in business schools: best practices each step of the way / Kathryn Denise Martell; Thomas G Calder