UCF Assessment

Archives - Plan Review

Assessment Tips

Program/Unit: Communication - M.A. ▼

2017-2018 Plan Review   2016-2017 Plan Review   2015-2016 Plan Review   2014-2015 Plan Review   2013-2014 Plan Review   2012-2013 Plan Review

Mission:

What is the primary purpose and functions of the program/unit? Who are the stakeholders?

The Communication M.A. Program is dedicated to serving its stakeholders who are comprised of students, faculty, the Central Florida community and the professions associated with the field of communication. The mission of the program is to offer high-quality, academically challenging graduate education in Mass and Interpersonal Communication; to mentor students in the conduct of research and creative activities; to provide the program's students with the educational development that will enhance the intellectual, cultural, environmental, and economic development of the metropolitan region; to develop students' academic and professional competencies; to establish UCF as a major presence in local and global communication related professional and academic communities; and to, thereby, support the mission and vision of the University of Central Florida as a whole.

Assessment Process:

Who is conducting the assessment? What are they doing? What do you want to assess (what are your outcomes)? How do you plan to assess it (strategies, tools, measures)? How will you review and analyze the data? How are you going to use the assessment results to improve your program/unit? How will you communicate the results to other faculty or staff members?

The assessment process is designed to measure student competencies using direct and indirect assessments of student learning of academic, research, and professional skills. The plan includes direct measures of student competencies in the areas of theory, methodology, preparedness for doctoral work, critical thinking, and communication skills. Students' competencies are measured by evaluating specific sections of their theses (completed in the immediately previous fall, spring, and summer semesters) or by evaluating responses to specific comprehensive exam questions (completed in the immediate fall, spring, and summer semesters) addressing quantitative research methods, qualitative research methods, or communication theory; through surveys administered online; and through supervisors' assessments of students' workplace communication skills. Theses and comprehensive exam responses are evaluated by a panel of faculty members using a rubric. Reviews of exam responses occur in the first two weeks of the fall semester. Reviews of theses occur at the time of the thesis defense. Indirect measures of preparedness for doctoral work and relevance of the program to professional career settings are measured using an online survey of recently graduated students administered in late August or early September.

Relationship to Strategic Plan:

How are one or more of the outcomes or measures linked to the UCF Collective Impact Strategic Plan (i.e., please see sections that identify granular metrics and supporting strategies). In addition, you may link to supporting strategic plans at any subordinate level. Describe in explicit terms the alignment with strategic planning. You can find the UCF Collective Impact Strategic Plan through the hyperlink above or by going to the assessment login page under 'Related UCF Links,' click on 'Strategic Plan.'

Outcomes 1, 2, and 3, are all related to the strategic iniative aimed at improving graduate level education by assessing student knowledge of literature in the field and methods of inquiry.

Outcome 4 deals with preparing students for graduate education beyond UCF in our field. Measure 4.4 specifically deals with research produced by students which relates both to the strategic iniative above and the iniative dealing with scholarly research.

Mission, Process & Strategic Plan Comments:

Clear description of the program, the assessment, and how the outcomes relate to the strategic plan. AD 12/8

- Zack's notes 2/15/17
- Mission: looks good
- Assessment Process: Looks pretty good. I will just give the same feedback that I give to all coordinators for this section. Be sure to address all of the prompt questions in the blue text. When I am writing my own assessment plans I even go so far as to use bullets and answer each one directly one-by-one. That way I am sure that I've covered them all and it makes it easy for the reviewers to see that everything is there and allows them to easily find what they are looking for.
- Relationship to Strategic Plan: This is fine. FYI with the new strategic initiative document that was released this year we will soon be expected in our assessments to dig deeper, beyond just the 5 goals into more speficic strategic planning initiatives and

Please consider the following:

- Concise
- Lists stakeholders
- States purpose
- States primary functions, learning outcomes, and/or operations
- Supports the institution's mission
- Uniquely related to the Academic Program/Administrative Unit

draw connections between them and our assessment plans. Just informing all coordinators so that you are aware that this will be coming.

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Top

Outcome: 1
Students will demonstrate broad knowledge of the literature in the field of communication.

Measure: 1.1
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

90% of students taking comprehensive examinations will receive an evaluation of satisfactory on 2 out of 3 elective area comprehensive examinations.

The following rubric will be used to asses elective portion comprehensive exam questions. To receive a satisfactory evaluation, a student's answer must conform to 3 of 4 of the following requirements:

Response demonstrates specific and detailed knowledge of the literature relevant to the exam question.
Responses to question are accurate with analyses that go beyond the obvious.
Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence and, makes effort to contextualize it.
Responses contain distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
Although all of our measures are an attempt to improve student learning and unit performance by monitoring our students performance on key outcomes, this measure is not in response to last year's assessment results. We plan to continue using this measure over time to monitor student performance and identify problems as they begin to occur so we can make adjustments to program or curriculum at that time. Our students met the goal we set, so we didn't make any program or curriculum changes in response to assessment outcomes for this measure.

Measure: 1.2
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

90 % of thesis students' literature review chapter will be rated satisfactory or above satisfactory by their thesis commitee. Rubric: 3 = Above Satisfactory: both breadth and depth of literature review is at peer reviewed journal quality; 2 = Satisfactory: breadth or depth, but not both, at peer reviewed journal quality; 1 = Below Satisfactory: neither breadth nor depth at peer reviewed journal quality.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
Although all of our measures are an attempt to improve student learning and unit performance by monitoring our students performance on key outcomes, this measure is not in response to last year's assessment results. We plan to continue using this measure over time to monitor student performance and identify problems as they begin to occur so we can make adjustments to program or curriculum at that time. Our students met the goal we set, so we didn't make any program or curriculum changes in response to assessment outcomes for this measure.

Outcome & Measures Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed
◉ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Clear outcome and measures. AD 12/8

- Zack's notes 2/15/17
- The outcome and measure statements are good.
- It is reasonable that with the targets for both measure met last year there are no changes to attempt to create improvement at this time for these measures.

Attachments: thesis.docx

Top

Outcome: 2

Students will demonstrate ability to explain, critique, and apply appropriate research methods in a broad range of situations and contexts.

Measure: 2.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

90% of students taking the comprehensive examination will receive a satisfactory evaluation on the quantitative research methods portion on their first attempt.

The following rubric will be used to determine a satisfactory evaluation for the comprehensive examination:
Satisfactory: Student must complete 4 of the 5 tasks below.
Based on a sample research article:
Identifies independent and dependent variables
Identifies sample type and procedure
Identifies operational definitions
Identifies alternative measurement procedure
Accurately interprets statistical data.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

This was a new measure for last year. Our faculty believe it would be imprudent and counter-productive to make curriculum or program changes based on a single year's assessment results. However, this measure is in response to a lengthy process that began a few years ago to improve student's competence in the area of research methods. Although the measure isn't new as a response to last year's results, it is in response to results from the last few years. We are making a program change staring fall of '17 to address this but we will continue to use this measure to monitor student performance over time.

Measure: 2.2

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

90% of students taking the comprehensive examination will pass the qualitative research methods portion on their first attempt.

The following rubric will be used to determine a passing grade on the comprehensive exam:
Pass: The student demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of all three of the four elements below.
Fail: The student demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of two or fewer of the elements below.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit

performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

◯ Yes

◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

This was a new measure for last year. Our faculty believe it would be imprudent and counter-productive to make curriculum or program changes based on a single year's assessment results. However, this measure is in response to a lengthy process that began a few years ago to improve student's competence in the area of research methods. Although the measure isn't new as a response to last year's results, it is in response to results from the last few years. We are making a program change staring fall of '17 to address this but we will continue to use this measure to monitor student performance over time.

Measure: 2.3

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

100% of students' theses will be judged as satisfactory or above satisfactory on all of the following elements:
Methodology is appropriate to research question(s).
Quantitative/qualitative tools are utilized effectively.
Methodology produces sufficient evidence to address research question.
Student identifies weaknesses/tradeoffs in her/his methodology compared to other possible methodologies.
Rating scale: Above Satisfactory: Satisfactory: Below Satisfactory

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

◯ Yes

◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

This was a new measure for last year. Our faculty believe it would be imprudent and counter-productive to make curriculum or program changes based on a single year's assessment results. However, this measure is in response to a lengthy process that began a few years ago to improve student's competence in the area of research methods. Although the measure isn't new as a response to last year's results, it is in response to results from the last few years. We are making a program change staring fall of '17 to address this but we will continue to use this measure to monitor student performance over time.

Outcome & Measures Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

As these measures were changed recently it makes sense to not make changes to them again and instead continue collecting data to measure changes and the potential impact of the program change. AD 12/8

- Zack's notes 2/15/17
- outcome statement is good.
- measure 2.1: measure is good, and the explanation for no changes at this time is reasonable.
- Measure 2.2: measure statement is good, and the explanation for no changes at this time is reasonable.

Attachments: thesis.docx   Quantitative rubric.docx   Qualitative rubric.docx

Top

Outcome: 3

Graduates will be well prepared for life after graduation. Data will be gathered using an online survey and three year rolling averages will be reported.

Measure: 3.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

90% of graduates who have enrolled in doctoral degree programs will report satisfactory or above satisfactory preparation for doctoral work.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
Although all of our measures are an attempt to improve student learning and unit performance by monitoring our students performance on key outcomes, this measure is not in response to last year's assessment results. We plan to continue using this measure over time to monitor student performance and identify problems as they begin to occur so we can make adjustments to program or curriculum at that time. This was a new measure for last year. Our faculty believe it would be imprudent and counter-productive to make curriculum or program changes based on a single year's assessment results.

Measure: 3.2
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

At least 80% of our graduates who apply to doctoral programs will have published one or more peer-reviewed articles and/or presented one or more conference papers as a student in our Program.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
We missed this mark last year so we will continue to monitor it. We usually meet this goal. Our graduate faculty does not want to make changes to our program based on a single year's assessment data.

Measure: 3.3
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

90% of students will agree or strongly agree with the following statement: The skills and knowledge I aquired during the Communication MA program can be applied to my current job responsibilities.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
Although all of our measures are an attempt to improve student learning and unit performance by monitoring our students performance on key outcomes, this measure is not in response to last year's assessment results. We plan to continue using this measure over time to monitor student performance and identify problems as they begin to occur so we can make adjustments to program or curriculum at that time. Our students met the goal we set, so we didn't make any program or curriculum changes in response to assessment outcomes for this measure.

Measure: 3.4
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

90% of students will agree or strongly agree with the following statement: Completion of the Communication M.A. program has had (will have) a favorable impact on my professional advancement.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

◉ Yes

○ No

Specify prior year's results:
Communication - M.A.

☐ 1.1   ☐ 2.2   ☐ 3.1   ☐ 3.3   ☐ 4.1   ☐ 5.1

☐ 1.2   ☐ 2.3   ☐ 3.2   ☑ 3.4   ☐ 4.3   ☐ 5.2

☐ 2.1

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
Last year we missed our goal for the fist time in the 8 years I've been conducting and reporting assessment. We have added additional courses with applied professional skills in the hopes that our students will feel more prepared for their work once they graduate.

Outcome & Measures Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:
You should be commended for making program changes to better prepare your students as noted in Measure 4.4. I look forward to seeing the results of this change. AD 12/8

- Zack's notes 2/15/17
- Outcome statement is good.
- Measure 3.1 statement is good. explanation for no changes is reasonable.
- Measure 3.2 measure is good. explanation is reasonable.
- Measure 3.3 measure is good. explanation is reasonable.
- Measure 3.4 measure is good. The change reported appears to be in response to previous assessment and designed to create improvement in the results for the measure.
  - One additional note: In the explanation for a change being made, as a reviewer I look for 3 things. 1) What change was made? 2) Why was this change made? 3) How is this change expected to improve the results of this measure? ... I feel that you've lightly touched on all 3, but in the future consider adding a little more detail/specifics to answer those 3 questions.

Attachments: Graduate_Assessment_Survey.pdf

Top

Outcome: 4
Graduates will demonstrate skill as a writer at the graduate level.

Measure: 4.1
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

At least 90% of students will score above satisfactory or satisfactory on the writing skill rubric below. Student papers from the Mass Communication Theory and the Modern Communication Theory courses will be evaluated by the course instructor and one other judge.

Rubric for measure 7.1: Above Satisfactory: Writing shows high competence in the areas of precision, organization (including effective use of transitions), use of grammar, and language usage. Satisfactory: Writing is below the high competence level in one or more areas listed in the AS category, but is at least adequate in all areas. Unsatisfactory: Writing is below adequate and needs improvement in one or more areas listed in the AS category

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

○ Yes

◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

This was a new measure for last year. Our faculty believe it would be imprudent and counter-productive to make curriculum or program changes based on a single year's assessment results.

Measure: 4.3

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

90% of students will respond "strongly agree" or "agree" to the following survey item: "The NSC Communication M.A. program improved my writing skill." Data will be gathered using an online survey and three year rolling averages will be reported.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

○ Yes

◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

In response to the graduate faculty committee's curriculum mapping exercise and a discussion of our program's outcomes, we decided to delete the measure from last year that assessed interns' communication skills because we have too few interns each year and because our program does not teach interaction skills. Although we believe our courses will have this effect, it isn't something we assess or teach in our classes. We decided to add this measure as an affective learning measure.

Outcome & Measures Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

The new measure 4.2 (recorded as 4.3 here) is a good replacement given the small number of interns and the focus on being prepared for the workplace post graduation. It would be helpful to know when this survey is administered to graduates. AD 12/8

- Zack's notes 2/15/17
- Outcome statement is good.
- Measures are good. I agree with the reviewer though that I'd like to know more about the survey, who is it adminsitered to, when, etc.
- The change in measures is a good example of making a change to improve the assessment process showing that the program is conducting formative assessment.

Attachments: CCQ.docx   Writing and theory assessment form.docx

Top

Outcome: 5

Students will demonstrate ability to explain, critique, and apply communication theory in a broad range of situations and contexts.

Measure: 5.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

At least 90% of students will score above satisfactory or satisfactory on the writing skill rubric below. Student papers from the Mass Communication Theory and the Modern Communication Theory courses will be evaluated by the course instructor and one other judge.

The following rubric is used to determine pass/fail of comprehensive exam:
Above Satisfactory: Student satisfactorily completes all three of the following tasks
Satisfactory: Student completes two of the four following tasks
Unsatisfactory: Student completes one or fewer of the following tasks:

Student's explanation of fundamental principles/constructs is complete, specific, and clear
Student identifies evidence in support or contradition of theoretical predictions
Student identifies specific limitations of theory.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
Last year was the first time we used this assessment measure so we want more than a year's data before we make changes to the program.

Measure: 5.2
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

90% of graduates who have enrolled in doctoral degree programs will report be satisfied or very satisfied with their training in communication theory.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

○ Yes
◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
This was a new measure for last year. Our faculty believe it would be imprudent and counter-productive to make curriculum or program changes based on a single year's assessment results.

Outcome & Measures Review:
○ Revision or explanation needed
◉ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:
As these are newer measures changing them now is counterproductive. AD 12/8

- Zack's notes 2/15/17
- the outome and measure statements are good, and the explanations for no changes are reasonable.

Attachments: Writing and theory assessment form.docx

Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan Rubric
*If programs or units fail to provide any input, their plan will be evaluated with "No effort (0)."
○ Beginning (1)   ○ Emerging (2)   ○ Maturing (3)   ○ Accomplished (4)   ◉ Exemplary (5)
Indicators:

☑ 1. Mission statement describes the primary purpose, functions, and stakeholders of the program/unit.
The mission statement should be specific to the program or unit.

☑ 2. Assessment process describes the program or unit's assessment strategy; how that strategy is translated into outcomes and measures; and the process for reviewing, analyzing, and applying assessment data for program/unit improvement.
The assessment process statement should paint a clear picture of all major aspects of the program or unit's Institutional Effectiveness Assessment process. This may include a description of how the plan evolves over time and how it produces continuous qualify improvement for the program or unit. This narrative should be written for "external" reviewers so that someone not familiar with the program or unit will, after reading this statement, have a good understanding of how the program or unit pursues data-driven continuous quality improvement.

☑ 3. Number of outcomes:

- Administrative units: minimum of three outcomes
- Graduate academic programs: minimum of three student learning outcomes

- Undergraduate academic programs: minimum of eight student learning outcomes that incorporate academic learning compacts

For academic programs, course grades and/or GPA may NOT be used as the metric for a measure.

☑ 4. Number and type of measures: For the required outcomes per indicator #3 above, a minimum of two appropriate, quantitative measures, at least one of which is a direct measure.
What constitutes a "direct measure" is contextually dependent. For academic program plans, a "direct measure" is typically assessment of student learning, while a survey of students` self-perceived efficacy would be considered an indirect measure. For an administrative unit measuring customer satisfaction, a survey instrument could be a direct measure.

☑ 5. Measures for the outcomes that meet the minimum requirements listed in indicator #3 establish specific performance targets.
For those outcomes and measures that satisfy the minimum requirements (per Indicators 3 and 4) each measure should identify a quantitative variable and establish a specific target outcome. This requirement does not apply to any additional outcomes/measures (beyond the minimum requirements) that a program or unit includes in its plan.

☑ 6. Specific assessment instruments are made available (e.g., via URL, as attachments, etc.), if not proprietary.
Assessment instruments (unless proprietary) should be submitted along with the plan either as attachments or links to online instruments. In the event an instrument is still in development when the plan is submitted, a brief description of the planned instrument along with a timeline for implementation may be attached. When this occurs, the program or unit should attach the final instrument to the subsequent Results Report.

Additional Indicators:

☑ 7. The plan explicitly links one or more outcomes or measures to strategic planning.
Administrative units and academic programs should align one or more elements of an IE Assessment plan with the UCF Collective Impact Strategic Plan (i.e., please see sections that identify granular metrics and supporting strategies). In addition, you may link to supporting strategic plans at any subordinate level.

☑ 8. The plan clearly focuses on formative assessment to promote continuous quality improvement (e.g., establishes baseline data, sets stretch targets based on past performance, etc.).
IE Assessment is a formative process. The primary purpose is to collect data that will help identify opportunities for continuous quality improvement. This is best evidenced when baseline data reveal an opportunity for improvement and a "stretch" target is set accordingly. In general, when a target for a measure is 100% or when a measure is written to "maintain" a particular level of performance, it is unlikely that the measure has strong formative potential.

☑ 9. The plan builds on previous assessment by including at least one measure to assess the impact of an implemented change, demonstrating a "closed loop" IE Assessment process.
Collecting data that will be used to evaluate the impact of an implemented change is central to the IE Assessment process. Measures designed for this purpose are the means to close the IE Assessment loop.

Overall Comments on Outcomes and Measures:

This plan demonstrates a committment to assessment and shows that the faculty use the results to make changes to the program to improve outcomes for students. AD 12/8

- Zack's notes 2/15/17
- The plan is well written, and the provide examples of both changes to the assessment process demonstrating that the program is conducting formative assessement, and changes to pedagogy, curriculum designed to improve measure results (i.e. student/learning performance) setting the stage to "close the loop".
- Nice work!