How do you review the Assessment plans in the IE portal?
Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Suggested Review Questions

These rubrics are suggested for Academic Deans, Curriculum Committees and Vice Presidents and aim to help in evaluating IE Portal entries.

The entries in the IE portal may be viewed in several ways. Perhaps the easiest way to review entries within a given assessment unit is to use the four-column report. It can be reached through the reports box under the assessment unit on the left of the template once you have arrived at the assessment unit you want to view. Select “standard reports” under the reports box and that will bring up a note for “Unit Assessment Four Column” which you can choose to get you to a site that asks you open the report. This will provide a four column report once you have made the appropriate of selections about which you will be prompted by the software.

Each assessment unit in the IE Portal has a mission statement that typically remains unchanged from year to year. The current unit mission statement associated with the program is reported in the Nuventive IE portal. It is useful to review it periodically although such an review is not required under university institutional effectiveness guidelines.

### Evaluating the Mission Statement: Colleges and Vice Presidents

1. Does your mission statement orient everyone in the university about your direction and contribution to the furtherance of the university’s mission statement?
2. Does the mission statement provide the scope of your college’s or program’s activities within the university?
3. Does the mission statement include what makes the program unique and necessary to the university?
4. Is the mission statement sufficiently brief to allow for its communication easily?
5. Does the mission statement logically lead the reader to the subsequent outcomes for your departments or programs?
6. Does the mission statement provide a sense of the change your college hopes to accomplish and the conditions it hopes to improve?

### Student Learning Outcomes

**Evaluating the Outcome Statement:**

1. Are you satisfied with the way in which the outcome is stated?
2. Is the outcome clearly related to the mission of the degree or certificate program?
3. Has responsibility for the outcome been assigned correctly?
4. Is this outcome significant enough to warrant the time, energy and commitment needed for continued assessment?
5. Is the outcome core to the degree or certificate program?
6. Has the outcome been agreed upon by the appropriate set of faculty in accordance with the norms of the discipline and criterion-related validity?
7. Has the outcome been written with the S.M.A.R.T in mind

For SMALCs only (baccalaureate degrees)
8. Has the outcome been categorized (as communication, critical thinking, or content) correctly?

---

Program Outcomes

**Evaluating the Outcome Statement:**

1. Are you satisfied with the way in which the outcome is stated?
2. Is the outcome clearly related to the mission of the program?
3. Has responsibility for the outcome been assigned correctly?
4. Is this outcome significant enough to warrant the time, energy and commitment needed for continued assessment?
5. Is the outcome core to the program?
6. Has the outcome been agreed upon by the appropriate set of reviewers?
7. Has the Program Outcome been written with the S.M.A.R.T criteria in mind?
8. Does the outcome specify the year for which it will be assessed?
9. For solely administrative units, has a justification of the benchmark been provided?

---

Student Learning Outcomes

**Evaluating the Assessment Statement:**

1. Does the specific indicator measured in the assessment capture the outcome adequately? Does is provide a specific measure of student learning?
2. Is the standard set appropriately and at the right level? Does it avoid using grades?
3. Is the assessment method feasible?
4. Has the time frame for accomplishing the outcome been set appropriately? Has the year in which the assessment is made been reported?
5. Has the assessment method been reviewed and recommended by faculty?

For SMALCs only (baccalaureate degrees)
6. Can the validity of the assessment measurement be corroborated?
Program Outcomes

Evaluating the Assessment Statement:

1. Does the specific indicator measured in the assessment capture the outcome adequately?
2. Is the standard set appropriately and at the right level?
3. Is the assessment method feasible?
4. Will the assessment method yield valid measurements?
5. Has the time frame for accomplishing the outcome been set appropriately?
6. Has the assessment method been reviewed and recommended by appropriate faculty or directors?
7. For solely administrative units. Is there evidence for the general use of the benchmark?

Student Learning Outcomes and Program Outcomes

Evaluating the Results and Analysis Statement:

1. Are the results stated clearly?
2. Are the results summarized in a fair and representative fashion?
3. Is it clear how the results compare to the standards set in the assessment statement?
4. Is the significance of the deviation from the standard evaluated appropriately? Is there a conclusion whether the standard has been met?
5. Is there an analysis of the results? Why did these results occur?
6. Does the analysis consider the concerns raised by the results and provide a basis upon which an improvement plan can be developed? Does it lay out why you got the result you did?
7. Does the analysis avoid the use of student grades?
8. Is the evaluation method satisfactory?
9. Have separate sets of results been reported for each location and mode of delivery? (program results may not have to be reported for each location and mode of delivery depending upon its character)

Student Learning Outcomes and Program Outcomes

Evaluating the Improvements Made and Action Plan Statement:
1. Do the results and analysis support the recommended improvements?
2. Is the recommended improvement or action plan feasible?
   Are the improvements based on the analysis of results?
3. Is the timetable outlined in the recommendation acceptable?
4. Have any unintended or adverse consequences of the plan been identified?
5. Will the recommended improvements help ensure continuous improvement of the program?
6. Have budgetary implications been identified?
7. Has responsibility for the improvements been assigned correctly?
8. Do the budget recommendations merit further attention and forwarding?
9. Is there a separate improvement plan for each location and mode of delivery?
   (Improvement plans for each location and model of delivery may not be required depending of the nature of program)