Trocaire College

Quinquennial Review of Academic Programs and Departments

Department or Program Undergoing Review:

Supervising Council Member:

Individual(s) Completing Report:

Type of Review: ☐ Initial ☐ 1-Yr Follow-Up ☐ 2-Yr Follow-Up ☐ 3-Year Follow-Up ☐ 5-Year Follow-Up

☐ Other (explain):

Date Submitted to College-Wide Assessment Committee:

Section I: Program Review

Reviewers are asked to complete each of the sections below as indicated. Reviewers should ask the program director to provide enough documentation and/or other evidence to support the findings. **Please note: The reviewer completes this form, not the program director. In addition, the reviewer should base the review on *current* rather than *future* assessment practices. If certain documentation or practices are not in place at the time of the review, the reviewer should base the review upon practices up to this point in time. A review should not be re-scheduled because the program wishes to create new documents or practices.**

Narrative:
[*Insert a very brief summary of the program purpose, and any other pertinent information not covered in the other sections of this document*]

Mission:

The mission of the program is: [*Insert the program mission here. Include information about how the program/department relates to the college's overall mission, and how it supports student learning (either directly or indirectly)*]

Major Goals and Objectives (PLAN): [*Request a copy of the program's 3-year strategic plan, 3-year outcomes assessment plan, or similar planning document. Review the plan, and, from the plan, provide a listing in this section of the major goals (general) and student learning objectives / outcomes (specific) of the academic program. Some of these goals and objectives might also appear in the program's annual report to the President's Council. If the program does not have a 3-year plan or similar, determine when such a plan will be developed and implemented*.]

Measurement of Expected Outcomes (DO): [*If the program has a 3-year plan or outcomes assessment plan, review the plan to determine what the primary outcome measures for the program are. List the primary program outcome measures here. If the program has no plan, use annual reports and other documents to make the determination of outcomes. Determine if the program has provided the specifics about how each of the expected outcomes listed in the plan has been measured. Has external benchmark information, where applicable, been provided? If external benchmark information is not available, has the program provided an indication of internal benchmarks or expectations of how a successful outcome is defined? If so, list here*].

Results (CHECK): [*Has the program provided a summary of the actual results of outcomes assessment for each of the goals / objectives listed in their plan? Have they compared their outcomes against either an external or internal benchmark?*]

Use of Assessment Results (ACT): [*Has the program provided specifics on how outcomes results have been used to improve / modify the program? Have policies, procedures, documentation, etc. been changed as a result of collecting these data? How else has the program / department changed in response to outcomes assessment? Has the program shared the results of outcomes assessment (with faculty, with students, with accreditors, with the community)? Has the program shown how the results of outcomes assessment have supported student learning (directly or indirectly), have helped the program / department to meet its mission, and /or have been useful in helping the college meet its mission?*]

Student Learning Outcomes At the Course Level:

[*Using the table format below, ask the program director to list all courses in the major for this academic program, and to indicate if student learning outcomes have been assessed in that course. Add rows as needed. If the course has been assessed, ask the program director to provide a brief explanation of how the findings were used to support student learning. If student learning outcomes have not been assessed, ask the program director to indicate when the course will be evaluated.*]

Course	When Last Assessed	When to be Assessed Next	Were Assessment Results Used to Improve Student Learning?
			[Note: Add extra lines as needed]

Linkage of Assessment Results to Budgeting and Planning

[*Ask the program director to demonstrate how the assessment results have been used to develop the department / program annual budget. Demonstrate how the assessment results have been used to assist with planning within the department / program. If relevant, indicate how the assessment findings within the program have impacted strategic planning of the entire college, and/or resource allocation for the entire college*]

Other Pertinent Information:

[*Provide information here that, while not reflecting outcomes assessment per se, had an impact on the department / program outcomes during the reporting period. This could include information on staffing changes, budgeting changes, major gifts from donors, certifications, changes in department / program structure or function, etc.*]

Section II: Reviewer Assessment of Program Use of Outcomes

Reviewers should evaluate the information provided in Section I, and then use the following rubric to determine where the program is, <u>at present</u>, on use of assessment information to support program objectives and to improve student learning.

Rubric Grid for Assessment of Academic Programs / Departments

	Level 1 Undeveloped	Level 2 Developing	Level 3 Established	Level 4 Exemplary	Evidence Supporting Scoring
Plan Evidence that the program has developed a program plan (typically, a 3-year plan or similar) which includes a focus on how the program will assess the program's attainment of major program goals / objectives, and how the program will engage in the process of continuous quality improvement. Such plans will typically involve all important constituents affected by the program (i.e., faculty, students, employers, etc.). Lastly, the plan includes information on the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course level.	The program has no 3-year plan, no assessment plan, or no similar documentation indicating <u>future</u> objectives and assessment activities. There is little if any information available on how the program will assess student learning outcomes at the course level.	The program has begun to develop a plan, and has some components in place, but the plan is not fully developed or not fully in place. The plan may be incomplete or may not contain sufficient information on the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course level.	The program has a plan, the plan covers most critical program goals and objectives, and the plan is being used, although may not have been used for more than a year. Assessment of student learning outcomes at the course level is a part of the plan.	The program has a plan, the plan covers critical program goals and objectives and covers the assessment of student learning outcomes at the course level, and there is evidence that the plan has been in use for more than a year.	*[Provide evidence indicating why a particular scoring level was chosen for this aspect of assessment]*
Scoring for Plan: (Circle One)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	
Do Evidence that the program has identified specific metrics associated with the areas needing assessment; evidence that the program has been collecting data on the areas needing assessment using these measures. Evidence that the	The program has not identified how it will measure program goals or objectives, or the assessment approach is too vague. The program has not indicated how it will perform	The program has begun to identify specific metrics used to measure program goals or objectives and student learning outcomes at the course level, but these are not fully developed or are incomplete. Metrics identified may	The program has specific metrics in place for the majority of program goals and objectives, and for the assessment of the majority of student learning outcomes. Some metrics may need	The program has specific metrics in place for all program goals and objectives, and for all student learning outcomes at the course level. The metrics being used appear to	*[Provide evidence indicating why a particular scoring level was chosen for this aspect of assessment]*

	Level 1 Undeveloped	Level 2 Developing	Level 3 Established	Level 4 Exemplary	Evidence Supporting Scoring
program has identified appropriate external and/or internal benchmarks to assess the metrics against.	assessment of student learning outcomes at the course level.	be inappropriate for the goal/objective in question or may be undergoing review. Benchmarks may not be identified.	to be adjusted, and some benchmarks may not be in place or may not be appropriate.	be valid and appropriate for the measures being assessed. Metrics are reviewed from time to time to ensure continued relevance	
Scoring for Do: (Circle One)	1	2	3	4	
Check Evidence that the program has tabulated data and presented the data in the areas needing assessment	The program has not collected data on outcomes identified above. Or, if some data have been collected, the data have not been used to assess outcomes.	The program has begun to collect data on program goals and objectives and student learning outcomes at the course level, but the data are incomplete and/or have not been fully analyzed.	The program has collected data on the majority of program goals and objectives and student learning outcomes at the course level. The majority of these data have been compared to appropriate benchmark information.	The program has collected data on all of the program goals and objectives, and student learning outcomes at the course level. These data have been compared to appropriate benchmark information.	*[Provide evidence indicating why a particular scoring level was chosen for this aspect of assessment]*
Scoring for Check: (Circle One)	1	2	3	4	
Act Evidence that the program has used assessment results to change or modify program activities.	The program has not used assessment results to change or modify program activities, including changes in courses as a result of measuring student	The program has begun to use assessment results to change or modify program activities, including changes in courses as a result of measuring student learning, but this process is incomplete.	The program has used assessment results for the majority of the program's goals and objectives, including changes in courses as a result of measuring student	The program has used assessment results for all program goals and objectives, including changes in courses as a result of measuring	*[Provide evidence indicating why a particular scoring level was chosen for this aspect of assessment]*

	Level 1 Undeveloped	Level 2 Developing	Level 3 Established	Level 4 Exemplary	Evidence Supporting Scoring
	learning.		learning, to change or modify program activities.	student learning, to change or modify program activities.	
Scoring for Act: (Circle One)	1	2	3	4	

Overall Scoring: The reviewer should score each level of the PDCA cycle listed above for the academic program by circling the number which applies to each section above. Then, the scores for each level should be added together. Finally, the total score should be divided by 4 to arrive at an average level score.

Sum of Level Scores:_____   **Average Level Score:**_____

Score on PLAN (1 to 4): _____

Based upon the results of the review, including the average level score and PLAN completion, the reviewer is asked to recommend a follow-up action from the choices below (***PLEASE CHECK ONE BOX ONLY***):

<!-- checkbox --> **<u>Average Score < = 1.5 – Undeveloped: Little / No Assessment And /Or the score for PLAN is = 1:</u>** This range of scores generally indicate that the program / department has not routinely engaged in outcomes assessment, does not have an outcomes assessment plan, does not have program goals and objectives, and/or has made only a minimal effort to collect outcomes data or otherwise engage in the assessment process. **Academic programs with no program plan, including a plan to assess program outcomes, will be assigned a mentor from the College-Wide Assessment Committee, who will work in conjunction with the program and their Cabinet-level supervisor to develop a plan. Programs with this score should be scheduled to be reviewed again in 1 year from the date of this assessment.**

<!-- checkbox --> **<u>Average Score > 1.5 and <= 2.5 - Developing: Developing but Insufficient Assessment:</u>** This range of scores generally indicates that the program / department may have begun to collect and assess program outcomes data but has not met the minimum threshold for performing adequate assessment. Outcome areas and measures may not be fully identified or defined, data are not being systematically collected, and/or data are being collected but incompletely or non-systematically. **Programs with this score should be scheduled to be reviewed again in 2 years from the date of this review.**

<!-- checkbox --> **<u>Average Score > 2.5 and <= 3.5 – Established: Meets Minimal Assessment Standards:</u>** This range of scores generally indicates that the program or department has goals and objectives in place, and is collecting outcomes data. However, the data may be partially incomplete, the measures themselves may not be valid or may be too vague for good measurement, or the data are not being fully utilized for program improvement. **Programs with this score should be scheduled to be reviewed again in 3 years from the date of this review.**

<!-- checkbox --> **<u>Average Score >3.5 - Exemplary: Fully Developed Assessment:</u>** This range of scores generally indicates a program / department that has fully embraced the College's assessment philosophy and model. Such programs will have clearly identified goals and objectives in place, will have reported on the outcomes data that has been systematically collected, and, most importantly, will have demonstrated that outcomes data has been used to improve program / department processes and policies. **Programs with this score should be scheduled to be reviewed again in 5 years.**

<u>Follow-Up Action:</u> [*Based upon the scoring range identified above, reviewers should indicate the date of the next review. Follow-up dates should be indicated as Quarter/Year (e.g., Q4/2015).]*

Summary and Recommendations: [*Reviewers should provide a brief summary of the findings of the review and then list any recommendations which will help the program to fully engage in the assessment process and, most importantly, to use continuous quality assessment to improve their programs and, ultimately, student learning.*]

Signature of Reviewers Completing the Form   **Date**