

Biology 2013-2014 Baseline Assessment Report Review

IAC Review Group: Dr. April Gentry, Dr. Katrina Savitskie, Ms. Autumn Johnson, Dr. Mohamad Mustafa

⤴ IAC Baseline Report Feedback Rubric

	4.000 Exemplary	3.000 Established	2.000 Developing	1.000 Undeveloped	N/A
Department or Program Mission weight: 0.000	✓ • Focuses on program function and purpose • Clear, precise language • Two or three balanced sentences • Clear link to SSU mission	✓ • Identifies program function and purpose • Clear language • Less than a paragraph	✓ • Some insight into function and purpose • May be somewhat vague or general • May be excessively wordy or lengthy • May be too short to distinguish the unique function/purpose of the dept. or program	✓ • No mission present • Mission present but very vague, general, unclear, unfocused or does not address function and purpose	✓ N/A
Comment:	The list of goals need not be included in the mission. A few concise, specific sentences should suffice.				
Student Learning Outcomes or Service Delivery Outcomes weight: 0.000	✓ • Outcomes are clear and specific • Outcomes are measurable • Outcomes fully align with mission	✓ • Outcomes are clear • Outcomes are measurable • Outcomes relate to mission	✓ • Outcomes listed but difficult to measure • Outcomes do not relate to mission • There are too few or too many outcomes	✓ • No outcomes listed • Outcomes listed but unclear or vague	✓ N/A
Comment:	Outcomes should identify the specific and measurable knowledge, skills, abilities and values students will obtain through completing the program.				
Opportunities to Achieve Outcomes weight: 0.000	✓ • More than two opportunities per outcome AND some opportunities cover multiple outcomes • Specific opportunities are clearly identified	✓ • More than two opportunities identified per outcome • Opportunities are general but identified	✓ • One or two opportunities are provided for each outcome • Opportunities are only vaguely identified	✓ • No opportunities are identified for some/all outcomes • Only one opportunity is identified per outcome	✓ N/A
Comment:	A map that links opportunities to specific outcomes would be useful here.				
Assessment Tools weight: 0.000	✓ • More than two tools for each outcome • At least two tools measure more than one outcome • Tools include both direct and indirect measures	✓ • More than two tools for each outcome	✓ • One or two tools for each outcome • Tools include only direct or only indirect measures but not both	✓ • No tools linked to outcomes or only one tool per outcome • Tools may be present but not linked to specific outcomes	✓ N/A
Comment:	The exit exam and MFT are useful tools at the end of each student's studies; what tools are or could be used to assess progress along the way? What indirect assessments (surveys, focus groups, interviews) might also provide useful information about the program's effectiveness?				
Assessment Timeline and Information Sharing weight: 0.000	✓ • Timeline includes two or more assessment times • information is shared with two or more groups • information is shared within the program AND across campus units	✓ • Timeline is present and complete (identifies gathering, analyzing, reporting data and implementing changes) • information is shared either internally or with other units	✓ • Timeline is present but not complete • Sharing of information is not included	✓ • No timeline • No sharing of information • information provided is vague or confusing	✓ N/A
Comment:	This statement indicates how test results impact individual students. How and when is data (both these test scores and other data) collected, analyzed, and evaluated for the program as a whole? With whom are the results of this program-wide assessment shared?				
Use of Results weight: 0.000	✓ • Systematic use of assessment results for improvement is evident • Includes evaluation of improvements	✓ • Systematic use of assessment results for improvement is evident	✓ • Use of assessment results for improvement is present but not systematic • May be too vague or missing key components	✓ • No evidence of using assessment results for improvement	✓ N/A
Comment:	The information provided is on track but somewhat vague.				
Link to Budget/Resources weight: 0.000	✓ • Clear systematic link between assessment results and budget/resource allocation is evident • includes evaluation of the impact of allotted resources	✓ • Clear systematic link between assessment results and budget/resource allocation is evident	✓ • Link between assessment results and budget/ resource allocation is present but not systematic • May be too vague or missing key components	✓ • No evidence of a link between assessment results and budget/resource allocation	✓ N/A
Comment:	Systematic link between assessment results and resource allocation should be indicated.				