Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Review Rubric

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE AND ASSESSMENT

		(4) Highly Developed	(3) Developed	(2) Emerging	(1) Initial	(0) Unable to Review
	Mission Statement	Program mission is clearly stated: the program is identified, its unique role/purpose is defined, program values/aspirations are described, strong connection to department/college/university mission, goals and values is established	Program mission is sufficiently clearly stated: the program is identified, its role/purpose is defined, program values/aspirations are described, connection to department/college/university mission, goals and values may be strengthened	Program mission is fairly clearly stated: the program is identified, its unique role/purpose and values/aspirations are described with some detail, connection to department/college/university mission, goals and values is weak	Program mission is not stated clearly: the program is or is not identified, its unique role/purpose and values/aspirations are described vaguely, connection to department/college/university mission, goals and values is not established or is weak	Program Mission is missing
PLAN SECTION	SLO Name, Statement and Category	**SLO Name** is succinct, descriptive, matches SLO Statement, meaning is crystal clear; **SLO Statement** is clearly articulated (specific, distinguishable set of knowledge/skills/values is identified); evidence of learning is measurable (Bloom's taxonomy verbs are used); learning is time-bound (SLO is set to be achieved by the end of specific course(s) or by certain time/milestone in the program); Assigned **SLO Category** perfectly matches SLO Name and Statement and only one category per SLO is selected	**SLO Name** is sufficiently brief, yet descriptive, adequately matches SLO, meaning is mostly clear; **SLO Statement** is articulated well (set of knowledge/skills/values is identifiable and sufficiently distinct); evidence of learning is mostly measurable, but can be improved (Bloom's taxonomy verbs are used imprecisely); learning is time-bound (SLO is set to be achieved by an identifiable time point); Assigned **SLO Category** matches SLO Name and Statement well and only one category per SLO is selected	**SLO Name** encapsulates SLO fairly well, meaning is not very clear, may be stated more succinctly; **SLO Statement** is articulated vaguely (set of knowledge/skills/ values is too broad or hard to distinguish); evidence of learning is not easily measurable (Bloom's taxonomy verbs are barely used or used inappropriately); learning is loosely time-bound (little information about when SLO is set to be achieved is provided); Assigned **SLO Category** somewhat matches SLO and/or more than one category is assigned to the same SLO	**SLO Name** is overly descriptive/long, meaning is unclear, is not appropriate; **SLO Statement** is poorly or not articulated (set of knowledge/skills/values is not specific and/or not distinguishable); evidence of learning is not measurable (Bloom's taxonomy verbs are not used); learning is not time-bound (no information about when SLO is set to be achieved); Assigned **SLO Category** does not match SLO or all possible categories are selected	SLO Name, Statement, and Category are missing
	Assessment Process/ Methodology	**Assessment Process** -- is the best approach for assessment of SLO; -- is described in great detail (it is clear who will assess student learning, in which course(s), during which semester(s), and under what circumstances); -- the assessment instrument is an excellent fit, how it will be used is clear, the description of the instrument is provided, including its psychometric properties; -- final course grades are not used to measure SLO; -- includes more than one relevant attachments (e.g., copy of assessment instrument(s), filled out curriculum map); -- appropriate indirect measure(s) (e.g., student survey, exit interview) used in addition to direct measure(s)	**Assessment Process** -- is appropriate for SLO; -- is described in sufficient detail (enough information is provided about who will assess student learning, in which course(s), during which semester(s), and under what circumstances); -- the assessment instrument is suitable, description of the instrument and how it will be used is adequate; -- final course grades are not used to measure SLO; -- includes one relevant attachment (e.g., copy of assessment instrument(s), filled out curriculum map)	**Assessment Process** -- is minimally suitable for assessment of SLO; -- only some details are provided (it is not fully clear who will assess student learning, in which course(s), during which semester(s), and under what circumstances); -- the assessment instrument measures SLO crudely, very little description is provided about the instrument and/or how it will be used; -- it is not likely that final course grades are used to measure SLO; -- includes attachment(s) that may not be relevant	**Assessment Process** -- is not appropriate for SLO; -- is not described in sufficient detail (no or very little information is provided regarding who will assess student learning, in which course(s), during which semester(s), and under what circumstances; -- no information about how the assessment instrument will be used is provided; -- final course grades are used to measure SLO; -- includes no attachments	Assessment process is missing
	Goal/ Benchmark	**The goal/benchmark** is: -- specific (clearly stated and focused on one competency); -- measurable (number and percent of students is identified and exact level of student learning mastery is identified); -- attainable (based on results from prior years, the expected level of student learning is ambitious, yet achievable)	**The goal/benchmark** is: -- relatively specific (stated with enough clarity and focused on one competency); -- mostly measurable (number and/or percent of students is identified and level of student learning mastery is identified); -- appears attainable (based on prior results, the expected level of student learning is appropriate)	**The goal/benchmark** is: -- not sufficiently specific (ambiguously stated and/or may be aimed at multiple competencies); -- not easily measurable (only some information about number of students and mastery level is provided); -- attainable with little effort (based on prior results, the expected level of student learning may be increased)	**The goal/benchmark** is: -- not specific (focused on multiple competencies and/or is vaguely stated); -- not measurable (number and/or percent of students is not stated and/or desired level of student learning is not identified); -- very easily attainable (based on results from prior years, the expected level of student learning is too low)	Goal/ benchmark is missing

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Review Rubric

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE AND ASSESSMENT

		(4) Highly Developed	(3) Developed	(2) Emerging	(1) Initial	(0) Unable to Review
RESULTS SECTION	Results Statement	**Results Statement** -- Clearly addresses the established Goal/Benchmark and states whether criteria were met or not met; -- Includes student headcount(s) and percentage(s); -- Is largely quantitative and provides relevant methodological details (who, when, how, etc.); -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, a separate statement of results is provided for each location/modality; -- If it is inconclusive whether criteria were met or not, either results are reported using best available data or a clear explanation is provided as to why the data are not available; -- Includes attachments showing progression across years	**Results Statement** -- Addresses the established Goal/Benchmark and states whether criteria were met or not met; -- Includes most student headcount(s) and percentage(s); -- Is sufficiently quantitative and provides enough methodological details (who, when, how, etc.); -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, a separate statement of results is provided for some, but not all program locations/modalities; -- If it is inconclusive whether criteria were met or not, either results are reported using best available data or some explanation is provided as to why	**Results Statement** -- Addresses the established Goal/Benchmark indirectly and/or does not clearly state whether criteria were met; -- Includes student headcount(s) or percentage(s); -- Little quantitative information and few methodological details are provided (who, when, how, etc.); -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, some information is provided about student learning results at some locations/modalities in a separate or combined statement; -- If it is inconclusive whether criteria were met or not, effort is made to provide some data and/or explanation	**Results Statement** -- Does not address established Goal/Benchmark and/or it is unclear whether criteria were met; -- Does not include student headcount(s) and percentage(s); -- Lacks quantitative information and methodological details (who, when, how, etc.); -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, very little or no reference is made to student learning results at other locations/modalities	Results Statement is missing
	Analysis of Results	**Analysis of Results** -- Clearly presents the reason(s) for why the results were achieved at the level that they were; -- Includes prior years results for comparison; -- Contains convincing cause-and-effect statements and educated hypotheses; -- References specific people and actions that positively impacted student learning results; -- Identifies specific challenges and potential solutions; -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, contains detailed description of how different locations/modalities are comparable; -- Provides a clear logical link between results and improvement plan; -- Is focused on the take-aways from internal discussions or investigations regarding the data; -- Attachments include documentation of internal discussions about results (meeting minutes, notes, executive summary)	**Analysis of Results** -- With sufficient clarity, presents the reason(s) for why the results were achieved at the level that they were; -- Includes some prior years results for comparison; -- Contains plausible cause-and-effect statements and/or educated hypotheses; -- References general actions that positively impacted student learning results; -- Identifies some challenges/obstacles with or without potential solutions; -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, describes how different locations/modalities are comparable; -- Is linked to results and improvement plan; -- Mentions some take-aways from internal discussions or investigations regarding the data	**Analysis of Results** -- Presents somewhat unclear reason(s) for why the results were achieved at the level that they were; -- Briefly references prior years results for comparison; -- Contains cause-and-effect statements or educated hypotheses that lack detail; -- Makes some reference to factors that positively impacted student learning results; -- Identifies a non-specific challenge/obstacle without potential solution; -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, briefly mentions how different locations/modalities are comparable; -- Briefly mentions results and/or improvement plan; -- Provides little information about internal discussions regarding the data	**Analysis of Results** -- Presents vague or no reasons for why the results were achieved at the level that they were; -- Does not or barely references prior years results for comparison; -- Cause-and-effect statements and/or educated hypotheses are missing or weak; -- Does not or vaguely mentions factors that positively impacted student learning results; -- No specific challenges/obstacles are identified; -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, provides very little or no description of how different locations/modalities are comparable; -- Is missing clear link to results and improvement plan; -- Mainly restates the results statement	Analysis of Results is missing
	Improvement Plan	**Improvement Plan** -- Clearly explains how results and their analysis were used to inform changes/next steps; -- Describes well-thought-out, specific change(s) based on data/evidence; -- Identifies specific people/entities, actions, and timeframes; -- Includes improvement actions that are within program's control; -- If improvement action requires new financial and/or human resources, a description of it being included in budget request is provided along with an attached copy; -- If improvement action requires changes to assessment instrument and/or methodology, the refinements are described in detail; -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, contains detailed description of improvement actions at each location/modality; -- Includes relevant attachments (updated syllabi, curriculum maps, policies and procedures, filled-out budget request for next year)	**Improvement Plan** -- Sufficiently clearly explains how results and/or their analysis were used to inform changes/next steps; -- Describes at least one specific change based on data/evidence; -- Identifies specific people/entities or actions or timeframes; -- Includes at least one improvement action that is within program's control; -- If improvement action requires new financial and/or human resources, either a description of it being included in budget request is provided or a copy of filled-out budget request is attached; -- If improvement action requires changes to assessment instrument and/or methodology, the refinements are described with sufficient detail; -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, contains sufficiently detailed description of improvement actions at each location/modality	**Improvement Plan** -- Provides some connection between results and/or their analysis and proposed changes/next steps; -- Describes at least one general change loosely based on data/evidence; -- Provides some information about people/entities and/or actions and/or timeframes; -- Includes at least one improvement action that is mostly within program's control; -- If an improvement action requires new financial and/or human resources, it is stated but without budget request; -- If improvement action requires changes to assessment instrument and/or methodology, the refinements are briefly described; -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, contains short description of improvement actions at each location/modality	**Improvement Plan** -- Provides weak or no connection between results and/or their analysis and proposed changes/next steps; -- Describes one vague change that is not based on data/evidence; -- Refers to non-specific people/entities, actions or timeframes; -- May only include an improvement action that is hardly within program's control; -- May simply state that new financial and/or human resources are needed; -- May simply state that changes to assessment instrument and/or methodology are needed; -- For programs with multiple locations/modalities, very little or no reference is made to improvement plans at other locations/modalities	Improvement Plan is missing

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Review Rubric

		(4) Highly Developed	**(3) Developed**	**(2) Emerging**	**(1) Initial**	**(0) Unable to Review**
PLAN SECTION	SLO Name, Statement and Category	SLO #2 - Knowledge of Archeological Methods; Upon completion of the core methodological course (ANT3101 Fundamentals of Archeology), students will accurately characterize the methodologies and tools used in modern anthropological archaeology; Content/Discipline Knowledge and Skills	SLO - Archeological Methods; Upon completion of ANT3101 Fundamentals of Archeology, students will classify the research methodologies used in modern archaeology; Content/Discipline Knowledge and Skills	SLO - Disciplinary Methods; Upon completion of the course, students will write about the research methods used in archaeology; Communication Skills	SLO - Methods; Students will understand methodologies used in the field; Content/Discipline Knowledge and Skills Communication Skills Critical Thinking Skills	
	Assessment Process/ Methodology	Student's compassionate nursing care skills will be assessed in Professional Nursing Internship (NUR 4945) capstone course taught every Spring term. During the last two weeks of class, two teaching faculty will conduct an in-person, 20-minute-long observation of a care-giving session delivered by the student to a genuine patient. The rating that the student will receive on the 'Compassionate Care' criterion in the clinical performance evaluation form will be used to measure this SLO. Two faculty ratings will be averaged. The evaluation form lists eight nursing skills to be observed, each rated on a 3-point scale (from Does Not Meet Expectation=1 to Exceeds Expectation=3). This assessment instrument was adapted from the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE). It has sound validity and reliability properties [link to article]	We will assess the Knowledge of Research Ethics outcome by testing students in all sections of PSY 3213C (Research Methods in Psychology) offered during the academic year (Fall, Spring, Summer). To assess this outcome we will use a departmental exam that was written and is curated by our faculty. The exam assesses student knowledge of research methods in psychology. The exam is multiple-choice and is given at end of semester. Eight items from the exam were designed to assess the Research Ethics learning outcome.	Student's communication skills in Differential Equations SLO will be measured in upper-division Mathematics classes. Final exam will be used to assess this outcome. The exam has several different types of questions. The instructor will grade the exam and give a score to each student.	Students' skills in French vocabulary will be assessed by TAs every semester. Final course letter grades will be used to measure student learning of French words.	
	Goal/ Benchmark	At least 80% of students enrolled in the Research Methods (GEO 5118) course in Fall and Spring will demonstrate learning at the level of 'Satisfactory' (3) or higher ('Good' (4) and 'Exemplary' (5)) on the final project analytic rubric criterion corresponding to the 'Analysis and Synthesis' SLO	At least 80% of students enrolled in the Research Methods course in academic year will correctly answer at least 5 out of 8 final exam questions that assess the target SLO	80% of students in the course will learn core genetic principles; Students will correctly answer half of the questions on the quiz	Students will learn content; Most students will understand the topic; Students will show a lot of progress; Students will pass the course	
RESULTS SECTION	Results Statement	17 (81%) out 21 students enrolled in the Research Methods (GEO 5118) course in Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 received a score of 85 or above on their final term papers. The benchmark set for this SLO (at least 80% of students receiving a score of 85 or above) was achieved	17 (81%) students enrolled in GEO 5118 in 2019-2020 academic year received a score of 85 or above on their term papers. This is above our established goal/benchmark.	Over 80% of students in the course received a score of 85 or above.	Most students achieved mastery.	
	Analysis of Results	Compared to Fall 2018-Summer 2019 results indicating that 82% of students scored at or above the benchmark, this academic year, a greater proportion of students - 85% - correctly answering at least 3 out of 5 exam questions on research ethics. We hypothesize that the high level of knowledge demonstrated by the students on this outcome is due to the ever increasing instructional quality of the course. Last year, based on the analysis of student scores on the final exam items, we noticed that students struggled with choosing the appropriate statistical test for different research questions. Program faculty and curriculum committee decided to improve instructional materials for, and pedagogical approaches to, teaching this specific topic (see last year's Improvement Plan for details). This change appears to have positively impacted student learning as this year, more students correctly answered this block of questions on the final exam, which increased the overall number of students who have scored 85 points or higher on the final exam used to assess this SLO.

This year, we also noticed that student performance on the SLO correlated with their attendance: those who attended fewer classes showed lower levels of SLO mastery. The undergraduate program director suggested to increase student attendance through greater engagement in the classroom and greater incentives for attending lectures. These changes were discussed and approved at the curriculum committee meeting (see minutes attached). Details of how these two changes will be implemented this upcoming academic year are provided in the Improvement Plan below. | Compared to last year's results of 82%, this year 85% of students met the Goal/Benchmark. We believe that this slight increase is due to increasing instructional quality of the course. Last year, we noticed that there was one particularly problematic topic for students, so we revised how it was taught (improved lecture slides and added a classroom activity). This change seems to have positively impacted student learning because their final exam scores went up compared to last year.

We also noticed that student performance on the SLO correlated with their attendance. We will be making some changes to increase student class participation and attendance. | 85% of students met the Goal/Benchmark, which is higher than last year. This increase happened because the provided instruction is of high quality. Every year, we review the SLO results and then revise and improve course materials. This year, we are somewhat concerned that attendance may be affecting student scores on the exam. | Students met the Goal/Benchmark for this student learning outcome. 85% is a high percentage. It was achieved because of high-quality instruction. | |
| | Improvement Plan | Because for the last three years, the goal/benchmark for this SLO has been achieved by the students with relative ease, academic program faculty and curriculum committee decided to increase it from 75% to a higher goal/benchmark. Beginning Fall 2021, we expect at least 80% of students enrolled in SPC 2608 Public Speaking course to attain mastery in this SLO by receiving an average 'Good' or 'Excellent' rating on all five criteria in the grading rubric.

In addition, we also want to make a change to one of the class assignments. The results showed that the lowest ratings were consistently given for in-class delivery of the Persuasive Speech. As was mentioned in the analysis of results, students shared that the time allotted for this speech was insufficient. Undergraduate curriculum committee decided to increase the time students are given to deliver the Persuasive Speech from 5-7 minutes to 6-8 minutes.

Because student learning results from different campuses were comparable (PC Campus = 86% and Tallahassee Campus = 84%), these improvements will be implemented at both geographic locations at the same time. | Because the goal/benchmark for this SLO has been consistently achieved, our curriculum committee decided to increase it from 75% to 80%. We also want to make a change to one of the class assignments. Based on analysis of student scores on the grading rubric and student comments about the Persuasive Speech assignment, we decided to increase the time students are given to deliver the Persuasive Speech from 5-7 minutes to 6-8 minutes. Because student learning results from different campuses were comparable (PC Campus = 86% and Tallahassee Campus = 84%), these improvements will be implemented at both geographic locations at the same time. | We decided to increase the goal/benchmark to a higher percentage based on prior years results. We also want to add at least one graduate student grader to assist instructors with providing timely feedback to students. These improvements will be implemented at both geographic locations (PC Florida campus and Tallahassee campus) at the same time. | We will increase the goal/benchmark to a higher percentage. We also want to improve our instructor-to-student ratio. | |