

This guide will show assessment coordinators the process of program assessment for 2017-18, including descriptions, examples and rubric measures for the annual program assessment report. Follow the guide description text in black while referencing the example text in blue and the rubric text in gray.

Section 1 – Program Mission and Educational Objectives

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions offer “programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission” (1.C.1.)

In this section, address the following:

- **Program Mission:** What is the purpose of the degree program? What professional and lifelong opportunities does it prepare students for? Where is it anticipated that graduates end up – both immediately after graduation and 5-10 years out?
- **Mission Alignment:** How is the program’s mission aligned with the university mission to offer “innovative, professionally-focused undergraduate and graduate degree programs,” providing a “hands-on, project based learning environment.”

[Note: In the past, we have asked programs to articulate distinct mission and educational objectives. Programs are welcome to keep these, but we are no longer requiring each as a separate entity. Instead, we encourage you to focus your mission and objectives statement on the sorts of professional and life experiences that your degree program prepares students for.]

(This content will stay fairly static from year to year.)

See also:

- [Section 1 Rubric \(below\)](#)

Section 2 – Program Description and History

This content will stay fairly static from year to year, and can be included in any reasonable order, but program enrollment, graduate, and employment, and (if applicable) board pass rates should be updated each year based on updated data.

In this section, provide an overview of your program, including information such as:

- Program History
- Program Locations
- Program Enrollment
- Program Graduates
- Employment Rates and Salaries
- Board and Licensure Exam Results (if applicable)
- Industry Relationships
- Showcase Learning Experiences – Particularly those that align with Oregon Tech’s mission to deliver a “Hands-On, project-based learning environment” and “innovative, professionally-focused programs”

- Success Stories – Descriptions of successful graduates (potentially including quotes from students highlight the programs' effective preparation)
- Program Changes – What recent changes have occurred within the program (e.g. new faculty, new facilities, curriculum changes)

See also:

- [Section 2 Template \(below\)](#)
- [B.S. Environmental Sciences, 2017-2018;](#)
- [B.S., Medical Laboratory Science, 2017-2018](#)

Section 3 – Program Student Learning Outcomes

NWCCU's standards for accreditation require that programs must "culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes." (1.C.1.)

In this section, address the following:

- **PSLOs:** What are the 5-10 program student learning outcomes – the key skills, supported and scaffolded across the program, which graduates will need to be able to demonstrate by graduation in order to successfully pursue the professional directions described the program's mission statement?
 - Resources on Bloom's Taxonomy: <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/coursedev/models/id/taxonomy/#table>
 - Resources on program student learning outcomes:
 - <https://manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment/howto/outcomes.htm>
 - <https://www.jmu.edu/assessment/files/How%20to%20Write%20Clear%20Objectives.pdf>
 - <https://www.jmu.edu/assessment/files/Objectives%20Made%20Easy.pdf>
- **Origin and External Validation:** How did the current set program student learning outcomes originate? and/or when were Program Student Learning Outcomes last reviewed by program faculty? What sort of external validation exists for the program student learning outcomes? When were program student learning outcomes last reviewed by the program's industry advisory board?
- **Changes:** Have there been any changes to program student learning outcomes? If so, how were these arrived upon and why were these changes made?

See also:

- [Section 3 rubric \(below\)](#)
- [B.S. Civil Engineering, 2017-2018](#)

Section 4 – Curriculum Map

NWCCU's standards for accreditation requires that programs must demonstrate "an appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning" of student learning outcomes. (1.C.2)

- **Curriculum Map:** How are each of your program student learning outcomes (and institutional ESLO's) supported and scaffolded throughout the program's curriculum?

To address this, please complete a table with program's curriculum map, with identification of how each PSLO and ESLO appears within the curriculum at the Foundation (Introduction), Practice (Reinforcement and Application) and Capstone (Synthesis) levels.

Resources to Guide Creation of Curriculum Maps:

- <https://manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment/howto/mapping.htm>

This content should remain relatively static from year to year, but should be updated as the program curriculum map changes.

See also:

- [Section 4 rubric \(below\)](#)
- [Section 4 template \(below\)](#)
- [B.S., Medical Laboratory Science, 2017-2018](#)
- [B.S. Civil Engineering, 2017-2018](#)

Section 5 – Assessment Cycle

In this section, please complete a table to show which courses (and, where known, what assignments) are used to assess each PSLO and ESLO in a three-year cycle. (Although some programs may have compelling reasons to adopt a different cycle, assessment of program learning outcomes should follow a three-year cycle, with the intention that improvements prompted by one year's assessment should be designed and implemented during the two years prior to the next scheduled assessment of that outcome.)

Each PSLO should be assessed with 2 direct measures and 1 indirect measure (the indirect measure is often the Student Exit Survey, which asks graduating students about each PSLO each year).

This content should remain relatively static from year to year, although it should be extended by at least one year (and the old year dropped off) each time a new report is submitted.

See also:

- [Section 5 rubric \(below\)](#)
- [Section 5 template \(below\)](#)
- [B.S., Medical Laboratory Science, 2017-2018](#)

Section 6 – Assessment Activity

NWCCU's standards for accreditation require that institutions engage in "an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs" that "recognizes the central role of faculty in establishing quality, assessing student learning, and improving instructional programs." (1.C.5.)

In this section, address the following for each assessment activity conducted during the academic year covered by the report. This section may be integrated with Section 7 (Action Plans) and 8 (Re-assessment) as appropriate:

- **Activity:** What is the activity – (for a direct assessment, typically the course assignment) – used to assess this outcome? Describe in enough detail to make it clear how the activity is a reasonable measure of the outcome, and attach the assignment as an appendix. (Archiving the assignment is critical for consistent reassessment.)
- **Rubric:** How is the activity to be scored/evaluated? (Especially if scoring to assess the outcome is different from course grading). Describe in enough detail to make it clear the rubric or scoring approach is a reasonable way to assess the outcome. Where a rubric is used, attach the rubric as an appendix. (Archiving the rubric is critical for consistent reassessment.)
- **Sample:** How many student artifacts were assessed? Was the population representative of the program as a whole? Were there any special or unusual characteristics of the student population that should be noted?
- **Reliability:** Who was involved in the scoring? How was consistency of rubric use assured? Have multiple faculty been involved in the scoring process to ensure reliability of the data? (Involving multiple raters for reliability is a best practice requested by NWCCU.)
- **Multiple Sites:** How is comparable assessment of this outcome carried out across all program sites? Although assessment processes do not need to be identical between different sites, the same measures should be assessed in comparable ways that facilitate exchange of ideas between program faculty at different sites.
- **Performance Target:** What was the target performance level? If less than 100%, why was the target performance level set at that point?
- **Performance Level:** What are the summary results? (i.e. What is the distribution of rubric scores?) What percentage of students exceeded the performance target? (Syu
- **History of Results:** Is there data from the previous assessment of this outcome, particularly if conducted with comparable methods? What trend(s) are seen in student performance over time?
- **Faculty Discussion:** How and when were results presented to and discussed by program faculty?
- **Interpretation:** What meaning or take-aways can be gleaned from this data? What are the factors, such as assignment design, course context, instructor, etc., that may have impacted student performance, either positively or negatively?

See also:

- [Section 6 rubric \(below\)](#)
- [Section 6 template \(below\)](#)
- [B.S., Electronics Engineering Technology, 2017-2018;](#)
- [B.S., Applied Mathematics, 2017-2018](#)

Section 7 – Data-driven Action Plans: Changes Resulting from Assessment

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions “uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning support planning and practices.”(1.C.7.)

Every program should, based on assessment data, identify at least one area to focus on for improvement stemming from assessment results. Performance is below target threshold should also trigger action.

In this section, address the following for each improvement activity sparked by assessment data:

- **Action Driver:** What assessment data prompted or supports action?
- **Action Specifics:** Is the needed action an improvement in instruction or in assessment? What improvement action is planned? How do you anticipate it will address the specific deficiencies found in assessment data?
- **Accountability:** What course, activities, or assignments will changes take place in? Who (specific names) will be responsible for implementation of these actions? When will these changes be implemented?
- **Planning and Budgeting:** What financial or resource needs will be require for implementation of these changes? How will they be sought or provided?
- **Improvements in Assessment Process:** What improvements are needed to the assessment process? How will they yield better, more actionable information?
- **Reassessment:** When will this outcome or measure be re-assessed, to determine if these changes have resulted in improved performance?

See also:

- [Section 7 rubric \(below\)](#)
- [B.S., Applied Mathematics, 2016-2017 \(page 6\)](#)

Section 8 – Closing the Loop: Evidence of Improvement in Student Learning.

NWCCU’s standards for accreditation require that institutions provide evidence of “continuous improvement of student learning.” (1.C.7.)

If this is an outcome being assessed following improvement activity, did you have past results from this outcome? If this is a specifically scheduled “closing the loop” assessment, how do this year’s results compare with the results that prompted improvements?

Did you have past action plans? Can you say that data supports that those plans resulted in improvements?

Look backwards: Discuss the last time that outcome was assessed.

- Were changes recommended?
- Were those changes implemented?
- If so, was improvement seen?

See also:

- [Section 8 rubric \(below\)](#)

EXAMPLE TEMPLATE, Section 2: (Format is not mandatory, but is meant for guidance. Choose the approach that works for your program).

Program History

The Vascular Technology Program officially began in 1992 and is one of the five current on-campus Medical Imaging programs at Oregon Institute of Technology. Enrollment trends from 2002 – 2016 have varied from 50 to 89 students per year in the program. By fall term of 2016, there were 50 students enrolled in the program. For the class of 2016, retention was 70.0% and attrition was 30%.

Program Location: Klamath Falls Campus only.

Program Enrollment:

Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	5 Year Difference	5 Year % Change
88	95	80	93	98	10	11.4%

Program Graduates:

2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
30	30	26	23	23	25	21	28	19	24

Employment Rates and Salaries:

Employed	Continuing Education	Looking for Work	Not Seeking	Median Salary	Success Rate
39	0	4	0	\$62,000	91%

Board and Licensure Exam Results (if applicable):

American Registry of Diagnostic Medical Sonographers Vascular Technology
100% Pass Rate
Class of 2016

EXAMPLE TEMPLATE, Section 4: (Format is not mandatory, but is meant for guidance. Choose the approach that works for your program).

Civil Engineering B.S. Student Learning Outcomes Table

F – Foundation

P – Practice

C – Capstone

COURSE	PSLO 1	PSLO 2	PSLO 3	ESLO 1 - Communication	ESLO 2 – Inquiry & Analysis	ESLO 3 – Ethical Reasoning	ESLO 4 – Quantitative Literacy	ESLO 5 - Teamwork	ESLO 6 – Diverse Perspectives
MATH 111	F								
WRI 121		F		F					
SPE 111			P	F					
ENGR 101				P					
CIV 100					P				

EXAMPLE TEMPLATE, Section 5: (Format is not mandatory, but is meant for guidance. Choose the approach that works for your program).

Civil Engineering B.S. Cycle for PSLOs and ESLOs

Outcome	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
PSLO 1	Direct CIV 100 Direct CIV 105 Indirect Student Exit Survey		
PSLO 2		Direct CIV 100 Direct CIV 105 Indirect Student Exit Survey	
PSLO 3			Direct CIV 100 Direct CIV 105 Indirect Student Exit Survey
ESLO 1	Direct CIV 100 Direct CIV 105 Indirect Student Exit Survey		
ESLO 2		Direct CIV 100 Direct CIV 105 Indirect Student Exit Survey	
ESLO 3			
ESLO 4			
ESLO 5			
ESLO 6			

EXAMPLE TEMPLATE, Section 6: (Format is not mandatory, but is meant for guidance. Choose the approach that works for your program).

PSLO 1: Klamath Falls Campus, CIV 100, 201701, Seth Anthony

PSLO 1: An ability to apply knowledge of mathematics, science, and engineering.

Performance Criteria	Assessment Methods	Measurement Scale	Performance Target	Results
Demonstrates knowledge of the professional code of ethics.	Ethics assignment in CHE260 evaluated by course instructor using Oregon Tech's Ethics Rubric (attached as appendix A)	1-4 according to attached criteria	75% of students scoring 3 or higher	75% more than 3 75% = 4
Describes ethical issue using code of ethics	Ethics assignment evaluated by course instructor using Oregon Tech's Ethics Rubric.	1-4 according to attached criteria	75% of students scoring 3 or higher	100% more than 3 50% = 4

OREGON TECH PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT RUBRIC (Section 1)

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
<i>Program Mission/Mission Alignment</i>			
No mission statement or educational objectives are included.	Mission statement and objectives are vague, unclear, or lack coherence. They are too general too <u>general</u> to distinguish it from other programs or are focused on the <u>department</u> rather than the program.	Mission statements and objectives identify the programs purpose, but needs some development. The statement <u>might not be focused on learners</u> as the primary stakeholders.	Well-developed mission statements and objective outlines why the program exists and what distinguishes it from other units or programs. The wording of the statement is focused on learners as the primary stakeholders and is clear to a general audience.

OREGON TECH PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT RUBRIC (Section 3)

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
<i>PSLOs</i>			
No outcomes stated.	Outcomes present, but with non-measurable verbs (e.g., know, understand; things internal to the student), vague description of content/skill/or attitudinal domain, or outcomes aren't student-centered.	Outcomes generally contain precise and measurable verbs with rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain. Outcomes describe how students demonstrate learning.	All outcomes are stated in student centered terms (i.e. "Students will...") with precise and measurable verbs (for example, from Bloom's taxonomy) articulating how students demonstrate learning, with rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain.
<i>Origin and External Validation</i>			
No discussion of external validation of outcomes.	At a superficial level, it appears the learning outcomes are aligned with industry needs, but no explanation is provided.	General detail about how outcomes relate to industry needs or are externally validated is provided, but lacks detail or specificity. Little to no evidence of recent discussions (either internally or with external partners) about the currency of program learning outcomes.	External validation of outcomes is clearly articulated, through reference to outcomes originating from external accreditors, industry advisory boards, employer surveys, etc.. Evidence of recent program and external discussions about the continued relevance of learning outcomes.

OREGON TECH PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT RUBRIC (Section 4)

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
<i>Curriculum Map: Scaffolding</i>			
No alignment of curriculum to outcomes.	Report contains a curriculum map connecting student experiences with some outcomes. Map is not clear or difficult to interpret.	Report contains a curriculum map clearly illustrating how each outcome is supported within the curriculum.	Report contains a curriculum map illustrating how the curriculum as a whole supports scaffolded, development (e.g., introduction, development, mastery) of each outcome for both program outcomes (PSLOs) and institutional outcomes (ESLOs).
<i>Curriculum Map: Detail of Alignment</i>			
Program doesn't demonstrate alignment of course activity with program learning outcomes.	Program asserts that course activity for at least some outcomes is at least somewhat aligned with program outcomes and points to some evidence to support this.	Program points to some level of detail about course activities (for instance, identifying an assignment by name) for each outcome that indicate meaningful and regular attention to program outcomes in course design.	Program points to publicly available materials (e.g. course syllabi, assignments, unit learning outcomes, class materials) which demonstrate thorough and consistent alignment in all course of relationships between course activity and program learning outcomes.

OREGON TECH PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT RUBRIC (Section 5)

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
<i>Assessment Cycle: Current Year</i>			
No activities/ courses listed for outcomes assessed during the current year	Activities/courses listed but link to outcomes is absent.	Most outcomes have classes and/or activities linked to them.	All outcomes assessed during the report year have classes (or activities) linked to them.
<i>Assessment Cycle: 2 Direct, 1 Indirect</i>			
No measures indicated	Most objectives are not assessed via direct measures (only with indirect measures).	Most objectives assessed with at least one direct measure and one indirect measure.	All objectives assessed using at least two direct measures (e.g., tests, essays) and one indirect measure.
<i>Assessment Cycle: Multiple Years</i>			
No formal assessment plan beyond current year.	Report contains a multi-year cycle outlining when assessment of all program student learning outcomes will occur.	Report contains a multi-year plan for assessment of learning outcomes, with courses identified for all assessment activities.	Clear, multi-year plan with several years of implementation (both past and future) outlined and clearly connected, with identification of courses (or activities where) assessment will occur. Plan extends out at least far as the next assessment of any outcomes assessed during the report year.

OREGON TECH PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT RUBRIC (Section 6)

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
<i>Activity: Valid relationship between outcomes and assignment</i>			
Seemingly no relationship between outcomes and assignment.	At a superficial level (e.g. based on the assignment title), it appears the assignment assessed by the measures matches the outcomes, but no explanation is provided.	General detail about how outcomes relate to assignment is provided. For example, the faculty wrote items to match the outcomes, or the assignment was selected “because its general description appeared to match our outcomes.”	Narrative describes assignment and its alignment with outcomes, <u>including</u> providing the assignment in an appendix. Assignment appears to be a natural feature of the course and not inserted arbitrarily. Report describes assignment (including fit with class context) in sufficient detail to see that it is a natural feature of the course (not inserted arbitrarily) and is a reasonable way to assess that outcomes.
<i>Rubric: Valid relationship between outcomes and rubric</i>			
Seemingly no relationship between outcomes and rubric. (No indication of rubric being used.)	At a superficial level (such as based on a listing of rubric criteria), it appears that an appropriate rubric is used to assess the outcomes, but no explanation is provided.	Rubric and description report doesn't fully justify the appropriateness of the rubric to evaluation of the outcome; or rubric is missing detailed performance criteria (e.g. is just 1-4 ratings for each criteria). Rubric appears largely disconnected from student evaluation and feedback.	Rubric is provided and shows clear alignment between outcome and rubric criteria and elements. Detail provided regarding outcome-to-rubric alignment. Rubric or variant of rubric is used to provide feedback to students (isn't totally disjoint from class goals and feedback).
<i>Sample: Data collection and research design</i>			
No information is provided about data collection process or data not collected.	Limited information is provided about data collection such as how many students took the assessment, but not enough to judge the veracity of the process.	Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process, such as a description of the sample size, course conditions (student motivation to participate).	The data collection process is clearly explained (e.g. term, number of students), in sufficient detail to assure that student work reflects representative sampling and adequate student motivation.

<i>Reliability</i>			
No additional reliability information provided.	Report identifies process for scoring (e.g. identifies rater).	Multiple raters involved in scoring for at least some scores, or an externally validated rubric used. Reports states how efforts have been made to ensure reliability (e.g., raters were trained on rubric; reported scores are average from multiple raters).	Reliability (inter-rater comparisons) used for all scoring, with clear evidence of both internal agreement. Or, externally validated rubric used with trained scorers and inter-rater agreement. (Raw data provided in an appendix/attachment)
<i>Multiple Sites</i>			
No discussion of alignment of assessment processes across sites.	Report includes data from all sites where the program is offered.	Reports includes data from approximately comparable assessment activity for each outcome from all sites where the program is offered.	Similar measures are used at all multiple sites/modes where program is offered. Differences in methodology between sites are clearly justified. [Or: Program is only at one site/mode.]
<i>Performance Targets</i>			
No desired results for objectives stated.	Statement of desired result in qualitative terms (e.g., comparison to previous year's data), but no fixed target (e.g., students will perform better than last year).	Desired result specified quantitatively (e.g. 80% of our students will score a "Proficient" or "Highly Proficient" on rubric). Desired result is not justified. ("Gathering baseline data" is acceptable for this rating.)	Desired result specified AND justified (e.g., "Last year the typical student scored 20 points on measure x. The current cohort underwent more extensive coursework in the area, so we hope that the average student scores 22 points or better.")
<i>Performance Level: Presentation of Results</i>			
No results presented	Results are presented in summary form with respect to performance criteria. (e.g. "Students performance met our criteria.")	Results are presented, and they directly relate to the objectives and the desired results for objectives (e.g. 78% of students scored "Proficient" or "Highly Proficient,"). Statistical analysis may or may not be present. Raw data is not provided.	Results are presented, and they directly relate to objectives and the desired results for objectives, are clearly presented, and were derived statistical analyses, as appropriate. Raw data is provided in attachments or appendices.
<i>History of Results</i>			
No results presented	Only current year's results provided.	Past iteration(s) of results provided for some assessments in addition to current year's.	Past iteration(s) of results provided for majority of assessments in addition to current year's.

<i>Faculty Discussion</i>			
No evidence of communication of results to faculty and others.	Results from assessment provided to limited number of faculty or communication process with program faculty is unclear (not in minutes)	Results from assessment provided to all faculty, and mode and details of communication are clearly described.	Information provided to all program faculty, mode and details of communication clear (e.g. meeting dates, minutes, etc.). In addition, information shared with others such as advisory committees or other stakeholders.
<i>Interpretation</i>			
No interpretation attempted	Limited narration of results. Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the objectives or desired results of objectives, or interpretations are not clearly supported	Some narration of assessment analysis and results. Interpretation of results seem to be reasonable inferences given the objectives, desired results of objectives, or limited methodology or discussion (e.g. only reviewed by a single faculty member).	A complete and clear narration and analysis of the assessment results. Interpretations of results seem reasonable. Multiple faculty involved in interpreting results. Interpretation includes discussion of context: how classes/ activities might have affected results, whether positively or negatively.

OREGON TECH PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT RUBRIC (Section 7)

Action Drivers

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
No improvement plans are outlined.	Some areas where performance is below targets results in plans to collect further data, program improvements, or assessment improvements.	All areas where performance is lower than targets result in either (1) plans to collect further data, (2) program improvements, or (3) assessment method improvements. [Or: no areas fall below performance thresholds.]	All areas where performance is lower than targets result in either (1) plans to collect further data, (2) program improvements, or (3) assessment method improvements. Further opportunities for program improvement are identified, such as areas where targets are met but improvement is still possible.

Action Specifics

No mention of any improvements to specific activity or courses.	Examples of improvements documented, but they are poorly described, and the link between them and assessment findings is not clear.	Plans to improve) are documented and directly related to the findings of assessment. However, improvements lack close ties with specific assessment findings, lack details, or are developed simply based on "best intuition" of program faculty.	Plans to make program, curricular, or course improvements or plans to improve) are documented and clearly relate to findings of assessment (e.g. specific criteria that fall below desired performance levels). Improvements draw upon knowledge of best practices in the field to maximize likelihood of success and make sense in the context of a rational, vertically-designed curriculum.
---	---	---	--

Accountability

No information is there on how the modifications will be re-evaluated, when and by whom.	Incomplete information is included on implementation timelines, responsible parties, and re-assessment plans.	Most information on implementation plan is included (timeline, responsible parties, re-assessment schedule) is included.	All modifications include timeline for implementation, names of responsible parties, and identify when re-assessment will occur (whether at the next time the outcome comes up in the assessment cycle or sooner).
--	---	--	--

<i>Planning and Budgeting</i>			
No attempt at aligning improvement plans with planning and budgeting processes. No recognition or discussion of resource needs to implement improvement plan.	Minimal or vague attempt at integrating improvement plans and planning and budgeting processes. (Acknowledgment that resources may be required, but doesn't specify or quantify then.)	Meaningful attempt at integrating improvement plans and planning and budgeting processes. Plan begins to quantify resource needs.	Improvement plan articulates needed resources and implementation plan explicitly feeds in to planning and resource request processes (e.g. staffing, equipment, etc.).
<i>Improvements in Assessment Process</i>			
No recommendations in improving the program assessment practices.	Some critical evaluation of past and current assessment practices, including acknowledgment of flaws. Minimal or surface-level recommendations in improving the program assessment practices.	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws. Some evidence of recommendations for revision improving the program assessment practices.	Critical and specific evaluation of past and current assessment, including recognition of flaws. Detailed recommendations for the improvement of the assessment practices in the program (changing methodology, collecting supplementary data, etc.), drawing upon specific analysis of past flaws in and best practices in assessment.

OREGON TECH PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT RUBRIC (Section 8)

Closing the loop

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
<p>No evidence of assessment concerning data following past curricular or programmatic changes.</p>	<p>Some evidence is presented to suggest improvement in student learning in response to program modifications. Evidence or improvements are vague and/or not clearly presented.</p>	<p>Evidence, from direct measures, suggesting learning curricular and/or pedagogical modifications, RE assessed, and found that student learning improved. Lack of clarity regarding the interventions or methodological issues (unrepresentative sampling, concerns regarding student motivation, etc.) leave legitimate questions regarding the improvement interpretation.</p>	<p>Strong evidence, from direct measures, supporting substantive and/or pedagogical modifications, RE-assessed, and found that student learning improved. The rationale and explanation of the modifications leading to the change are clearly laid out. The methodology is of sufficient strength that most reasonable alternative hypotheses can be ruled out (e.g., sampling concerns, validity issues with instrument or student motivation), and it is plausible to conclude that the improvement activity prompted improvement in student performance.</p>