# Contents

Introduction .......................................................................................................................................................... 2

Section 1: The Assessment Environment at John Jay .......................................................................................... 3

  Section 1.1: Office of Outcomes Assessment .................................................................................................. 3
  Section 1.2: Campus-Wide Assessment Committee ........................................................................................ 3
  Section 1.3: Systems of Assessment .............................................................................................................. 4

Section 2: Assessment Starts with Goals ............................................................................................................. 6

Section 3: Assessment in Administrative and Service Units ................................................................................ 6

  Section 3.1: Non-Academic Units Annual Assessment Report ...................................................................... 7

Section 4: Assessment of Student Learning ......................................................................................................... 7

  Section 4.1: Responsibility for Academic Assessment ..................................................................................... 8
  Section 4.2: The Importance of Mission ........................................................................................................ 8
  Section 4.3: Learning Goals ............................................................................................................................ 9
  Section 4.4: Layered Goals and Assessment .................................................................................................. 10
  Section 4.5: After Learning Goals, Then What? .............................................................................................. 10
  Section 4.6: Using Rubrics and Sampling Student Work .............................................................................. 15
  Section 4.7: Data and Action .......................................................................................................................... 15
  Section 4.8: Assessment and Part-Time Faculty ............................................................................................ 15
  Section 4.9: A Comprehensive Departmental Assessment Plan and Report .................................................... 15
    Section 4.9.a: Academic Department Assessment Plan ............................................................................ 16
    Section 4.9.b: Academic Department Annual Assessment Report .............................................................. 17

Appendix I: Samples of Learning Goals for Undergraduate Programs at John Jay College .................................... 18

Appendix II: Assessment Resources in the Social Sciences ................................................................................ 19

Appendix III: EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING ................................................................. 20

Appendix IV: John Jay College Mission ............................................................................................................ 22

Appendix V: Assessment Plan for Jay Express .................................................................................................... 23

Appendix VI: Sample Academic Curriculum Map ............................................................................................. 28

APPENDIX VII: Academic Department Annual Assessment Report Template {Revised Spring 2013} ........ 29

APPENDIX VIII: Assessment Committee Evaluation Rubric (Academic Departments) .................................... 34

APPENDIX IX: Assessment Committee Evaluation Rubric (Administrative Units) ............................................ 35
Comprehensive Assessment at John Jay College

Introduction

This is a guide to the systematic approach of both institutional assessment and assessment of student learning at John Jay College. As we enlarge our perspective on education to include the systematic assessment of learning as well as teaching, we have to ask not just what we do as instructors and staff, but what students get from their educational experiences at John Jay. This requires sharp focus on student experience and learning. Faculty and staff in academic, administrative and support units need to appreciate the impact of what we do on student learning. Through assessment, institutions learn to do a better job of serving students, staff and the community. Thus, assessment is an indicator of an institution’s capacity for learning. Assessment is the activity that links what we do to our hopes for the institution and to our hopes for our students.

So the stakes are high in assessment, and a successful approach will be deliberate and careful. Whether we are dealing with institutional or student learning, there are some guiding principles we should keep in mind:

1) Assessment should be practical. An assessment plan must be clear and manageable enough to be followed year after year.

2) Assessment must yield effective ideas for improvement. Assessment results must always be fed back into the planning process, and this must occur in a regular, predictable fashion. Continuous improvement is the main goal for all assessment activities; this is the other sense in which it must be practical.

3) Assessment is not about individual instructors or students or staff. It is about program improvement.

4) Assessment belongs to the faculty and staff whose programs are being assessed. Academic departments must determine the learning goals and means of assessment for majors, minors, certificates and other learning programs. Program administrators are responsible for the goals and means of assessment for support offices such as Financial Aid, Public Safety, Student Advisement, Counseling and all other College offices.

5) Assessment starts with defining our goals in line with the College Mission. In academic assessment, setting goals for majors, minors, and certificates is a collective activity within Departments; faculty have an obligation to be explicit about the major aims of each academic program. In support offices, the relevant administrators set goals, often in consultation with staff.

6) In the interest of properly informing prospective students, we need to make public our academic program goals, so they can see what they will learn and be able to do, and how they will be evaluated, as a result of pursuing a particular program. Such learning goals should be presented in such a way that they are clearly understandable to students and other who may reference them.
7) Our individual program goals must support and contribute to the fulfillment of the College Mission (see Appendix IV) and Master Plan (Link). In general, learning and assessment must be linked vertically (from College mission and institutional goals through to general education and course learning goals) and horizontally (across academic units and non-academic units). (See section 4.4 of this report for more on layered goals).

8) Assessment should rely on multiple measures—direct and indirect, quantitative and qualitative—since no assessment exercise is perfect.

9) Our Comprehensive Assessment Plan must be subject to periodic assessment itself.

10) We strive for a “culture of assessment” at John Jay so that systematic self-examination aimed at improvement becomes second nature to us.

Section 1: The Assessment Environment at John Jay

Assessment of student learning, as well as institutional assessment activities, take place throughout the college at multiple levels. Below is a description of the main assessment components at John Jay College.

Section 1.1: Office of Outcomes Assessment

The Office of Outcomes Assessment, led by the Director of Outcomes Assessment, Dr. Virginia Moreno, coordinates the comprehensive development of learning and other institutional outcomes. The Office supports academic departments and administrative units through the systematic evaluation of learner-centered objectives, the development of assessment tools, and the interpretation of data to inform strategic initiatives for program improvement and institutional effectiveness. In addition, the Office of Outcomes Assessment maintains the website.

Section 1.2: Campus-Wide Assessment Committee

We have an Assessment Committee with college-wide responsibilities. There is an advantage to a single group with oversight and reporting responsibilities since it allows for the most efficient sharing of information, plans, and best practices, and in general it promotes greater campus awareness about the benefits of systematic assessment. Since assessment became a critical activity in accreditation over the last twenty years, most colleges and universities have created assessment committees, and they perform similar roles, although their composition and size may vary from campus to campus. The Committee will help markedly with the College’s ability to meet requirements for accreditation and re-accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

The Campus-Wide Assessment Committee coordinates assessment efforts for both student learning and institutional effectiveness, broadly understood. The Committee works closely with the Director of Outcomes Assessment, who serves ex officio. The committee:

- Proposes to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the College Budget and Planning Committee—for its approval—a set comprehensive assessment guidelines and, with
support from the Office of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, facilitates their implementation.

- Receives assessment plans and reports from academic departments and other units of the College in order to make recommendations about them and to identify best practices for the College.
- Proposes to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee—for its approval—broad policy recommendations on the conduct and uses of assessment.
- With the assistance of the Director of Outcomes Assessment, maintains a log of campus-wide assessment activities, especially those actions taken in direct response to assessment findings (i.e. activity that “closes the loop”).
- Promotes assessment activities and a “culture of assessment” across the campus through dissemination of information and best practices.
- At the end of each academic year, prepares an annual report on significant, ongoing assessment activities, with recommendations for the next year; the report shall be submitted to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee and to all units of the College, including the College Council.
- In collaboration with the Director of the Center for the Advancement of Teaching, recommends faculty development programs on the practice of assessment.
- Guides the development of a website for campus assessment with the support of the Office of Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness.

The membership of the Committee is constituted as follows:

- Seven faculty members, nominated by the Faculty, Senate, distributed among the social sciences, humanities/arts, and natural sciences/mathematics.
- Three Higher Education Officers, nominated by the HEO Council, with no two from the same unit.
- The College Council shall elect the members of the Committee.

Section 1.3: Systems of Assessment

There are several distinct but overlapping systems of assessment at the College, and it is important that assessment resources not be duplicated. Each of the following is an important component of assessment and each contributes to institutional effectiveness:

- **Performance Management Process (PMP).** The PMP is set by CUNY; during the month of June the College provides goals and targets for the following year within specific areas defined by CUNY and submits evidence of accomplishment for the preceding year’s goals and targets. Among many other metrics, the PMP includes data on full-time faculty coverage of the instructional program; credit accumulation for first-year
students; passing rates on skills tests; retention and graduation rates; fund-raising and grants; and faculty average teaching hours. See the John Jay Goals and Targets for 2012-13 (Link) and the template provided by CUNY for 2012-13 Goals and Targets (Link).

- **Master Plan “Report Card.”** The broad goals of the Master Plan, which was adopted by the College Council, cover many of the activities at the College, but not all of them, since strategic plans typically focus on a limited number of areas that will receive added emphasis. Still, the Master Plan is vital for setting a direction for the College, and we must gauge progress in meeting its goals; hence we have the Master Plan Report Card which also becomes a basis for the subsequent year’s planning.

- **Administrative and academic support unit assessment.** Each unit at the College will have an assessment plan with measures for success drawn from various sources, but principally from the PMP and the newly defined Critical Functions Measures (2012).

- **Assessment of Student Learning within courses, programs, and institution.** Assessment of student learning is a realm unto itself, closely allied with Middle States expectations and practices, and it will contribute fundamentally to institutional effectiveness.
  - Institutional learning goals: General Education Assessment which will include in the future the Collegiate Learning Assessment examination.
  - Assessment of academic program learning goals—for majors, minors, certificates, and continuing education—as defined by Departments and interdisciplinary programs; these goals must support institutional goals.
  - Course learning goals that support program and institutional learning.

- **Academic Program Review.** Academic Program Review occurs for each degree program and department every five years. There is a template (“Instrument for the Self-Evaluation of Majors and Academic Programs”) developed by UCASC that spells out the categories of analysis. After preparing a self-study, the department invites an external reviewer to comment on the quality of the program. The results of the Program Reviews contribute to resource allocation decisions and pinpoint areas for improvement or emulation. The Reviews are important in overall academic planning.

Thus, the College has different but inter-related and overlapping systems of assessment, depending on the questions asked concerning institutional effectiveness. The processes of assessment must be highly efficient so that multiple systems of assessment do not imply multiple collections of the same data; one assessment database must serve multiple purposes; and data without a purpose must not be collected.
Section 2: Assessment Starts with Goals

In order to determine how we are doing we have to know what it is we want to do, and a statement of goals provides that frame. We want written statements of goals because they will most easily bring people together into a discussion of what’s most important for the unit, whether it’s a Purchasing Department or a Sociology Department. In the absence of an explicit set of goals, individuals pursue what feels right to them, but the aim is a conscious and concerted effort in the same direction. Learning goals for academic departments and performance goals generally for administrative units are the first steps in getting people to coordinate their activities. (See Appendix I for samples of learning goals at John Jay).

Section 3: Assessment in Administrative and Service Units

Planning informed by assessment should be part of every unit at the College. After developing a distinctive statement of mission or critical functions, administrative and service units should develop a list of goals and targets specific enough to be evaluated against corresponding performance indicators. For most units, the PMP report will supply some indicators for assessment. Where the PMP does not capture data for assessment of goals, the unit staff will have to look elsewhere or develop them anew. Other ready-made reports exist, such as the employee satisfaction survey conducted annually by the Division of Finance and Administration; there are student satisfaction surveys conducted by both John Jay and CUNY, and some student service units have developed “point of service” quick response (QR) surveys. The Critical Functions Measures should inform the assessment process for non-teaching units, but strictly speaking the CFM project is tied to functions rather than organizational units. The goals of administrative and academic support units will align with Division goals which in turn support institutional goals. There must also be a horizontal integration of goals so that we will find them shared and reinforced across the campus in different units: Academic Affairs will be linked to Student Affairs and the other Divisions in the common achievement of institutional goals.

Assessment will always take place in the context of the College Mission, which spells out the College’s reason for being and its goals for all students and members of the campus community. The statement of mission or critical functions should tie into the College Master Plan where applicable. Goals should include both short- and long-term targets and the timeframe specified for each. The statement of performance indicators should take into account the fact that staff will have to collect data; in other words, the process must remain manageable.

Mid-Year Reviews. In addition to the regular course of assessment among administrative units, each winter brings a handful of mid-year reviews based on presentations to senior staff at the College by different offices or programs. Each year the review subjects vary; those activities that have changed in important ways are likely to come up for review. There is formal feedback
from the President to the relevant Vice President, based on data and ideas presented, and the results should be incorporated into the annual assessment report.

Administrative units in most cases can reasonably work with the same set of goals each year and assess all of them.

**Section 3.1: Non-Academic Units Annual Assessment Report**

There should be an annual assessment report filed with the College-Wide Assessment Committee and the Office of Outcomes Assessment. Such a report should have the following components and be submitted annually:

1. Mission or Critical Functions
2. Goals and Targets (Learning goals where appropriate) that align with divisional and institutional goals.
3. Performance Indicators and data to demonstrate achievement of goals.
4. Auxiliary assessment if applicable (Mid Year Review, Special Survey results, etc.)
5. Brief analysis of results with proposals for improvements.

The assessment plan for an administrative unit, Jay Express, is attached as an example in Appendix V. The Campus Wide Assessment Committee will provide feedback on all annual assessment reports (see Appendix IX for the committee’s evaluation rubric).

**Section 4: Assessment of Student Learning**

The purpose of academic assessment is to collect systematic evidence of student achievement on the learning goals and to use the results of this process to improve student learning. The learning goals for a program of study frame not only the selection and development of courses that contribute to learning, but the selection, development, and scoring of assessment instruments (assignments, exams) that allow students to demonstrate mastery of content and skills in the chosen field. Assessment of student learning is best conceived as using information for program improvement; it is an integral part of teaching and should not be viewed as an adjunct to it. It is important for faculty to take ownership of the assessment process, and so we encourage a customized approach, but academic Departments should also feel free to use the process described here as a template.

The following guidelines have been developed to support faculty in the planning, implementation, and reporting of assessment activities. The basic elements of assessment planning follow the rationale for assessment outlined above. (See Appendices II and III for useful assessment resources).

The development of an Assessment Plan should consider the following questions:

- What is the purpose of the program (mission)? What do we expect students to know and do (learning goals) when they complete the program?
• How does the curriculum support learning? What is the alignment between program learning goals and course learning goals (curriculum map)?

• At what points in the program (e.g., capstone experience, internship) should evidence of learning be collected? What assignments and exams (assessment instruments) allow students to demonstrate that the learning goals were met? What are the assessment criteria for scoring (rubric)?

• What is the timeframe to collect assessment results and report on findings (assessment schedule)?

• What is the mechanism for using assessment results to improve the program?

Typical Problems often found in Assessment Plans include:

• Learning goals that are too specific and do not capture the programmatic goals.

• Rubrics that are not linked to learning goals or are constructed for giving a grade, instead of for measuring student performance against established learning goals.

The following lays out a generic program of assessment for majors; it should be usable pretty much as described for any degree program (major, minor, or graduate) but it can be made more sophisticated or more responsive to particular interests or needs. Please consult with the Director of Outcomes Assessment.

Section 4.1: Responsibility for Academic Assessment

Department Chairs and Graduate Program Directors are ultimately responsible for understanding, managing, and supporting assessment. Chairs and Program Directors must:

• Be aware of Departmental assessment plans in detail as they develop.

• Ensure that a Department assessment plan is created and updated on a yearly basis.

• Ensure that appropriate learning goals are placed on each syllabus, consistent with the curriculum map. (A course may appear on the curriculum map for more than one program, and it is conceivable that one learning goal might apply to one program and another to another program).

• Schedule and lead meetings to develop learning goals collectively; to discuss assessment results; and to decide on changes designed to improve results.

• Ensure that proposed changes are implemented.

• Ensure that all reports are submitted according to schedule.

Section 4.2: The Importance of Mission

Assessment will always take place in the context of the College Mission, which spells out the College’s reason for being and its goals for all students and members of the campus
community. Some of those goals are broadly knowledge-based while others define intellectual skills that students are expected to acquire. Other goals are more broadly defined; for example, John Jay College wants to instill in its students “the capacity for personal and social growth.” Our Mission Statement reminds us that the College “serves the community by developing graduates who have the intellectual acuity, moral commitment, and professional competence to confront the challenges of crime, justice, and public safety in a free society. It seeks to inspire students, faculty, and staff to the highest ideals of citizenship and public service.” These goals should be embodied across the curriculum and especially in the General Education program, which every student is bound to complete. Every college program should intentionally advance the Mission in some way.

Section 4.3: Learning Goals

Learning goals, always defined by the departmental faculty, should be limited to the most important knowledge and competencies that we can reasonably expect our students to retain a year or two after they complete the course or program which provides opportunities for the learning in question. Learning goals refer to what students should be able to do after they complete a program, not to the course activities that are designed to get them there (Suskie, 129). The focus should be high-level learning and not on memorization, as indispensable as the latter is to success in many courses. Finally, the goals must be clear enough for assessment and for use as the basis for improvement. Learning goals should:

- Include those things that answer the question “Why are we doing this?”
- Be as clear and descriptive as possible because clear learning goals are important to student learning
- Focus on ends, not means – that is, they should refer to what students should be able to do after they complete a program, not to the activities in courses that are designed to get them there
- Emphasize higher-order thinking skills that you want to be with the student a year after they leave the program

The periodic discussion of learning goals for academic majors is a highly beneficial exercise that will ensure that the latest changes in a field are reflected in the curriculum. Since learning goals must represent a consensus among faculty, a discussion about them will reinforce the common purpose of a departmental faculty and show how each contributes to the education of our students.

Learning goals must be communicated to students so they can know what is expected of them, and the learning goals should be tied explicitly to assignments and other class projects so students can see the rationale for them in terms of course outcomes. Indeed, the entire course and program should be a collection of learning opportunities for the students to meet the learning goals. In some classes it may be possible to invite suggestions from students about the best way, either individually or collectively, to master and demonstrate the learning goals. Student participation, where possible, in shaping assessment methods can be a powerful stimulus for serious engagement.
We also need to communicate program learning goals to prospective students who will be sizing up their options for college and curricula. Through the public listing of learning goals (via departmental websites, information flyers, etc.) for each major, departments can demonstrate their intentionality and organization; they can distinguish themselves from similar departments at other schools.

**Section 4.4: Layered Goals and Assessment**

Academic departments have to be concerned with at least three levels of assessment: institutional (General Education), programmatic (majors, minors, certificates, graduate programs), and courses. Departments without formal programs should link course goals to Departmental missions or goals and to institutional goals. These three levels of assessment are interconnected in multiple ways.

Institutional goals are supported by program and course goals. For example, in the John Jay Mission we read that students should have an “awareness of the diverse cultural, historical, economic, and political forces that shape our society.” Such a goal for all students finds support in, for example, a program goal that calls for students to use sociological theory to understand the causes of crime. And that program goal is supported by course learning goals, although such goals may not look exactly like the program goal, because students will be at different levels as they advance through the program to mastery of the program goals. Some courses will introduce a competency and others will reinforce and develop it, while capstone courses are designed to bring students to mastery. As program design moves from the higher-order institutional goals to programs and courses and possibly to units within courses, the language becomes more specific. For example, to support the program goal just cited, another required course may focus on sociological theory in historical context. The goals of the latter contribute in an obvious way to the program goal, but they will likely be stated more narrowly just as the program goals are stated more narrowly than the institutional goals. The relationship between program and course is normally displayed in a “curriculum map,” which indicates which of the program goals is supported in any given course. See for examples the very simple curriculum maps and learning goals for many majors at Goucher College (Link) or see Appendix VI for an example of a richer, more detailed curriculum map based on one from John Jay. The course goal will clearly connect to the broad institutional goals expressed in the General Education program.

Thus assessment at the College must be integrated from top to bottom so there is a clear relationship between course goals, program (major) goals, and institutional goals. For example, graduate program learning goals should be aligned in such a way that they are appropriately more advanced than undergraduate program learning goals. In parallel fashion administrative and academic support unit goals should align with Division goals and support institutional goals.

**Section 4.5: After Learning Goals, Then What?**

With your learning goals in hand, you’re ready to develop a “scoring rubric” (also called a performance scale, grading checklist, and other names) and to decide on which pieces of student work, in particular courses, to evaluate for evidence of achievement of learning outcomes. While a mature assessment process may involve assessments in multiple courses as
well as some indirect measures, it is in capstone courses that one typically finds evidence for all the learning goals in the major.

A scoring rubric is a really useful invention, and you may very well have created them informally many times as you’ve read through a group of papers or exams or projects. It’s simply a way to keep in mind what you’re looking for in student work and a way to assign credit to the variety of good and not so good pieces of student work before you. Thinking through carefully how to credit student work in advance lessens greatly the burden of evaluating papers; anyone who has graded papers knows this. Creating a scoring rubric for assessment purposes will allow you to focus efficiently on the evaluation of your learning goals by defining in advance what constitutes different levels of accomplishment for the work you are evaluating. Default performance levels at John Jay use the following scale:

- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Approaches expectations
- Does not meet expectations

So, for “exceeds expectations” we have to define what threshold students will have to reach for each learning outcome that corresponds with that rating, and of course that will depend on the judgment of the Department faculty as a whole. Of course we need in addition to define measures that correspond to “meets expectations” and “approaches expectations”; naturally, anything below the latter falls into the bottom, non-performing category. If you do not use a performance category entitled “meets expectations” then you should decide and label which performance level in your rubric does in fact meet your expectations. Looking at the proportion of students who fall into that category and above will permit a quick overview of program performance.

It’s important to emphasize that the operational standards must be the collective judgment of the Department faculty. It may take considerable conversation to reach agreement, but once done the results will prove enormously useful for guiding anyone teaching the course in question.

The following is an example of an assessment rubric designed to assess Program Learning Goals in a capstone course in the Humanities at Justice Major at John Jay:
The following example was designed to assess Program Learning Goals in a capstone course in the Humanities and Justice Major at John Jay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>4 - Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>3 - Meets Expectations</th>
<th>2 - Approaches Expectations</th>
<th>1 - Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objective 3:</td>
<td>Student formulates an original thesis statement, research question or problem relevant to the study of justice in the Humanities.</td>
<td>Thesis/question/problem displays original thought, is finely focused and clearly stated; relevance to justice is made explicit.</td>
<td>Thesis/question/problem is clearly stated; relevance to justice is only implied, or unstated, or not fully developed; thesis may be derivative, unoriginal, or too broad.</td>
<td>Thesis /focus is not identified; topic is general and only offers a sense of area of interest; justice-related aspect is not developed.</td>
<td>The focus is not stated; explicit connection to justice is not made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Comparative Analytical Skills)</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concept(s), principle(s) are clearly articulated; analysis of material proceeds within this framework.</td>
<td>Concept(s), principle(s) are stated; some connections are made between evidence / materials and concepts/principles.</td>
<td>Concept(s), principles may be suggested but few connections are made to evidence / materials.</td>
<td>No concepts or principles are introduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student rigorously applies one or more justice-related concepts, principles and/or values as a framework for the thesis.</td>
<td>Alternate views are seriously analyzed, objectively presented, fairly evaluated.</td>
<td>Alternate views are noted; some examples are included; some analysis is offered.</td>
<td>Alternate views are given little attention and/or are dismissed without analysis.</td>
<td>No attention is given to alternate views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student acknowledges and engages with counter-arguments and alternate perspectives.</td>
<td>Primary texts are very relevant; summaries and analyses are rigorous; persuasive connections are made to thesis.</td>
<td>Primary texts are relevant; summaries and analyses are clear, informative.</td>
<td>Few primary texts are introduced; connection to thesis is unclear.</td>
<td>No primary texts are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student engages with primary texts through critical close reading; student presents textual evidence persuasively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Learning Objective</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>4 - Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>3 - Meets Expectations</td>
<td>2 - Approaches Expectations</td>
<td>1 - Fails to Meet Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Objective 5:</strong></td>
<td>Student constructs, sustains and develops the stated focus of the thesis.</td>
<td>Attention to stated focus is consistently maintained; clear connections are made between thesis, evidence, and analysis.</td>
<td>Focus is maintained but connections to evidence are not always clearly established and/or persuasive.</td>
<td>There is no consistent focus; material is randomly presented; relevance is not established.</td>
<td>There is no focus, no sense of organization of material or its relevance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Prose is clear; needs of the audience are met; text is error-free re: sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, spelling; paragraphs are coherent and transitions are smooth.</td>
<td>Prose is generally clear; few errors in sentence structure or grammar or paragraph construction.</td>
<td>Prose is often unclear; paragraphs are poorly constructed; organization of material is confusing.</td>
<td>Many errors at many levels cause serious interference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Objective 6:</strong></td>
<td>Student locates, analyzes, evaluates, and integrates relevant secondary literature.</td>
<td>Secondary sources are more than sufficient; there is evidence of rigorous research; sources are peer-reviewed, authoritative; sources are well analyzed and evaluated.</td>
<td>Secondary sources are sufficient, usually peer-reviewed; most sources are fairly well analyzed.</td>
<td>Not enough sources are used; analysis is superficial; some sources lack credibility.</td>
<td>Few or no credible sources are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td>All sources are cited in the body with correct parenthetical data; all sources are listed on Works Cited in MLA format.</td>
<td>Most sources are acknowledged in the body and listed on Works Cited; most citations are complete and are properly formatted.</td>
<td>Some sources are not clearly identified in the body; some are not listed on Works Cited, are incomplete or not properly formatted.</td>
<td>Many sources are not identified in the body and/or on Works Cited; format is incorrect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following example was designed to judge a book journal and review. Adapted from *Student Learning Assessment* (Middle States Commission, 2007, 2$^{nd}$ edition, p. 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Approaches Expectations</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of grammar and style to communicate effectively</td>
<td>Grammar and style enhances the reader’s ability to understand the concepts presented, including nuances of thought.</td>
<td>Grammar and style allow the reader to understand easily the concepts presented.</td>
<td>Grammar and style adequate for the reader to grasp the main concepts.</td>
<td>Grammar and style that interfere with a reader’s ability to understand the ideas presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with author’s ideas</td>
<td>Rich, mature grasp of author’s ideas, coupled with analysis and synthesis of own ideas...</td>
<td>Frequent discussion and analysis of the author’s ideas, including expression of well-supported opinions about ideas...</td>
<td>Occasional discussion of the author’s ideas suggesting ability to engage.</td>
<td>Author’s ideas simply repeated, indicating that engagement was at or below surface level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections between course and book.</td>
<td>Continual connections to course material and sophisticated discussion...</td>
<td>Regular and meaningful connections to course material</td>
<td>Sporadic but meaningful connections with course material</td>
<td>Very few connections with course material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections between other experiences and book</td>
<td>Continual connections to other experiences and sophisticated discussion...</td>
<td>Regular and meaningful connections with other experiences</td>
<td>Sporadic but meaningful connections with other experiences</td>
<td>Very few connections with other experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4.6: Using Rubrics and Sampling Student Work

Designing appropriate and effective scoring rubrics often requires some trial and error, revision and recalibration. This is an important phase of the work as using the right rubric results in appropriate and useful data. After designing the scoring rubric, you will need to decide which sections of courses you’ll evaluate and how many papers or projects within each you’ll evaluate. It’s important to try for a random sample, and as for the sample size we will be looking at between 20% and 50% of the students in the selected target classes. The Director of Outcomes Assessment will work with you to decide on an appropriate number.

The default method of evaluating work will be to have the instructor score it. This approach will require a preliminary meeting of scorers to gain some common experience with the rubric (sometimes called a “norming session”) so that all share expectations about what constitutes a piece of work that “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “approaches expectations” for each learning outcome. Typically, you will reach consensus by grading a few sample papers and discussing application of the rubric. The goal, of course, is to achieve consistency of results across different scorers. There are other ways to address “inter-rater reliability,” and the Director of Outcomes Assessment can discuss them with you if you are interested in alternatives. Departments may designate evaluators who are not the instructors, but some means of norming is still important.

Section 4.7: Data and Action

The data we are interested in are the proportion of students at each level in the scoring rubric, for each learning outcome (i.e. what percentage of students exceeded expectations, what percentage met expectations, what percentage approached expectations, and what percentage failed to meet expectations). Based on these data, departments should recommend changes to the course, pedagogy, or program curriculum in the hope of obtaining better results in the next cycle of assessment. This last step is critical as it completes the assessment loop. Decisions concerning recommendations should occur at departmental meetings so all faculty can understand the issues, see the action plan, and gain awareness of the function of outcomes assessment.

Section 4.8: Assessment and Part-Time Faculty

We recommend that the faculty member of record be responsible for any assessment activities scheduled to take place in a course (although Departments may make other arrangements). This will mean that assessment work will at times fall to part-time faculty. Often assessment will involve little extra work, but in cases where part-time faculty are asked to perform extra duties on account of assessment—attending norming sessions, or other meetings preparatory to assessment of their courses, for example—the College will pay them for such work so long as it is attached to assessment of their own courses. Adjuncts must not be used as a general assessment resource.

Section 4.9: A Comprehensive Departmental Assessment Plan and Report

As a way to sum up and document the assessment process just described, each academic Department offering a major or minor should have a running, written five-year assessment
plan. The plan insures that members of the Department all understand the assessment goals and activities. In addition, each summer the Department will file a brief Assessment Report which documents assessment efforts for the Department and for Middle States evaluators.

Section 4.9.a: Academic Department Assessment Plan

The following indicates the components of a typical plan:

Mission Statement

State the purpose of the academic program (degree or minor) or Department if there is no major or minor.

Statement of Learning Goals for the Program (Major, Minor, Certificate, etc.)

Articulate the most important knowledge and skills students should have upon graduating from the program. Try for no more than five or six learning goals, developed collaboratively.

Curriculum Map

Align course learning goals with program goals to show how the program curriculum covers the learning goals in particular courses. This reveals where and how often students will be engaging the learning goals in the program as a whole. (See Appendix VI for a sample curriculum map.)

Assessment Philosophy

Briefly state the Department’s view of the role of assessment in student learning.

Five-Year Cycle of Assessment Activities

- State which learning goals will be assessed, year by year, in a rolling five-year plan; all goals must be assessed in a five-year period. Some assessment must take place each semester.
- For each goal, over the five-year period:
  - Identify key points of assessment (e.g. capstone course, post-graduate outcomes, etc.)
  - Identify multiple assessment methods. Include at least two direct assessments of student activities (tests, papers, performances); and one indirect measure such as a survey, grades, or post-graduate outcomes like data on jobs.
  - Describe sampling strategy and analysis where appropriate (How many papers will you look at, in which sections).
Section 4.9.b: Academic Department Annual Assessment Report

The Annual Assessment Report is a log of assessment activities for the previous year. Annual assessment reports are due each year on July 1. A template (optional) for the report is attached as Appendix VII. The annual Assessment Report should include:

- Direct Assessment data: Reported as percentage in each performance level of rubric, across all sections where the learning goals were assessed.
- Indirect Assessment data: Description of instruments used, sample size, learning goals assessed and findings from indirect measures.
- Brief description of assessment activity: methodologies, sample selection, instruments, scoring process, and assessment design.
- Conclusions based on discussion of data and the rationale for changes to curriculum, courses, or teaching as a result of considering assessment results (typically reflected in minutes from the meeting where data were discussed).
- Detailed description of actions taken (when and by whom) and the timeframe for their implementation.
- As attachments:
  - Sample papers exhibiting range of performance levels for each learning goal (for example: “Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Approaches Expectations, or Does Not Meet Expectations”).
  - Rubrics used for each learning goal.

The Campus Wide Assessment Committee will provide feedback on all annual assessment reports (see Appendix VIII).
Appendix I: Samples of Learning Goals for Undergraduate Programs at John Jay College

- Use and critically evaluate the variety of theoretical approaches that are relevant to Computer Information Systems.
- Recognize the legal and constitutional issues associated with correctional practice.
- Consider how race and ethnicity impact the construction and effectuation of crime control.
- Describe from a historical perspective criminal justice institutions and how they relate to each other.
- Analyze economic information by separating it into its constituent parts, carefully examining them so as to identify causes, relationships and possible results.
- Write critically on literature, including setting up a thesis, incorporating textual evidence, writing a coherent argument, and citing sources correctly according to a standardized format.
- Organize and communicate fire safety and fire protection information clearly to a variety of audiences by means of oral presentation, written documents and reports, and quantitative graphs, charts, tables, and architectural drawings.
- Gather, read, synthesize and critique primary source psychological and psycho-legal literature.
- Evaluate the reliability and usefulness of different forms of historical evidence.
- Use different social science methods to gather and organize data in the fields of international criminal justice and critically evaluate the use of such methods by others.
- Define and diagnose decisions situations, collect and analyze data, develop and implement effective courses of actions, and evaluate results.
- Compare, contrast, apply and evaluate the operative concepts, principles, values, and theories embedded in justice related issues, events, and literary texts.
- By studying other cultures and time periods, students learn to accept, recognize, and respect those unlike themselves.
Appendix II: Assessment Resources in the Social Sciences

General Resources

Internet Resources

Student Learning Assessment. Options and Resources: Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Internet Resources for Higher Education Outcomes Assessment
http://www2.acs.ncsu.edu/UPA/assmt/resource.htm

National Institute for learning Outcomes Assessment http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/

http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/publications/online_handbooks/course_based.pdf

Program-based review and assessment. Tools and techniques for program improvement. University of Massachusetts: Office of Academic Planning and Assessment
http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/publications/online_handbooks/program_based.pdf

Available in Print


Resources in the Disciplines

Criminal Justice

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. Assessment for Academic Programs.
http://www.acjs.org/pubs/167_2085_13678.cfm

Appendix III: EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING


$C = \text{evidence suitable for course-level as well as program-level student learning}$

Direct (Clear and Compelling) Evidence of What Students Are Learning
- Ratings of student skills by field experience supervisors
- Scores and pass rates on appropriate licensure/certification exams (e.g., Praxis, NLN) or other published tests (e.g., Major Field Tests) that assess key learning outcomes
- “Capstone” experiences such as research projects, presentations, theses, dissertations, oral defenses, exhibitions, or performances, scored using a rubric
- Other written work, performances, or presentations, scored using a rubric ($C$)
- Portfolios of student work ($C$)
- Scores on locally-designed multiple choice and/or essay tests such as final examinations in key courses, qualifying examinations, and comprehensive examinations, accompanied by test “blueprints” describing what the tests assess ($C$)
- Score gains between entry and exit on published or local tests or writing samples ($C$)
- Employer ratings of employee skills
- Observations of student behavior (e.g., presentations, group discussions), undertaken systematically and with notes recorded systematically
- Summaries/analyses of electronic discussion threads ($C$)
- “Think-alouds” ($C$)
- Classroom response systems (clickers) ($C$)
- Knowledge maps ($C$)
- Feedback from computer simulated tasks (e.g., information on patterns of actions, decisions, branches) ($C$)
- Student reflections on their values, attitudes and beliefs, if developing those are intended outcomes of the course or program ($C$)

Indirect Evidence of Student Learning
(Signs that Students Are Probably Learning, But Exactly What or How Much They Are Learning is Less Clear)
- Course grades ($C$)
- Assignment grades, if not accompanied by a rubric or scoring guide ($C$)
- For four-year programs, admission rates into graduate programs and graduation rates from those programs
- For two-year programs, admission rates into four-year institutions and graduation rates from those institutions
- Quality/reputation of graduate and four-year programs into which alumni are accepted
- Placement rates of graduates into appropriate career positions and starting salaries
- Alumni perceptions of their career responsibilities and satisfaction
- Student ratings of their knowledge and skills and reflections on what they have learned in the course or program ($C$)
· Questions on end-of-course student evaluation forms that ask about the course rather than the instructor (C)
· Student/alumni satisfaction with their learning, collected through surveys, exit interviews, or focus groups
· Voluntary gifts from alumni and employers
· Student participation rates in faculty research, publications and conference presentations
· Honors, awards, and scholarships earned by students and alumni

Evidence of Learning Processes that Promote Student Learning (Insights into Why Students Are or Aren’t Learning)
· Transcripts, catalog descriptions, and course syllabi, analyzed for evidence of course or program coherence, opportunities for active and collaborative learning, etc. (C)
· Logs maintained by students documenting time spent on course work, interactions with faculty and other students, nature and frequency of library use, etc. (C)
· Interviews and focus groups with students, asking why they achieve some learning goals well and others less well (C)
· Many of Angelo and Cross’s Classroom Assessment Techniques (C)
· Counts of out-of-class interactions between faculty and students (C)
· Counts of programs that disseminate the program’s major learning goals to all students in the program
· Counts of courses whose syllabi list the course’s major learning goals
· Documentation of the match between course/program objectives and assessments (C)
· Counts of courses whose final grades are based at least in part on assessments of thinking skills as well as basic understanding
· Ratio of performance assessments to paper-and-pencil tests (C)
· Proportions of class time spent in active learning (C)
· Counts of courses with collaborative learning opportunities
· Counts of courses taught using culturally responsive teaching techniques
· Counts of courses with service learning opportunities, or counts of student hours spent in service learning activities
· Library activity in the program’s discipline(s) (e.g., number of books checked out; number of online database searches conducted; number of online journal articles accessed)
· Counts of student majors participating in relevant co-curricular activities (e.g., the percent of Biology majors participating in the Biology Club)
· Voluntary student attendance at disciplinary seminars and conferences and other intellectual/cultural events relevant to a course or program (C)

Appendix IV: John Jay College Mission

The College Mission Statement

John Jay College of Criminal Justice of The City University of New York is a liberal arts college dedicated to education, research, and service in the fields of criminal justice, fire science, and related areas of public safety and public service. It strives to endow students with the skills of critical thinking and effective communication; the perspective and moral judgment that result from liberal studies; the capacity for personal and social growth and creative problem solving that results from the ability to acquire and evaluate information; the ability to navigate advanced technological systems; and the awareness of the diverse cultural, historical, economic, and political forces that shape our society.

The College is dedicated to fostering an academic environment, to promoting the highest quality of undergraduate and graduate study, to promoting and protecting academic freedom, to promoting scholarship and encouraging research, especially in areas related to criminal justice and public service. The breadth and diversity of scholarship at the College reflect our continuing commitment to innovative analyses, interdisciplinary approaches, and global perspectives. The College offers its students a curriculum that balances the arts, sciences, and humanities with professional studies. It serves the community by developing graduates who have the intellectual acuity, moral commitment, and professional competence to confront the challenges of crime, justice, and public safety in a free society. It seeks to inspire students, faculty, and staff to the highest ideals of citizenship and public service.
Appendix V: Assessment Plan for Jay Express

I. What are the Jay Express Services Areas and the Enrollment Management Call Center?

Originally established in 2007 as ONE STOP Services, our office was renamed by the students to Jay Express Services Center in anticipation of the move to the New Building October 2011.

We are a consolidation of Enrollment Management Services. We are the customer service area representing the Offices of the Registrar, Financial Aid, Testing, Admissions (Graduate and Undergraduate), and much more.

A fast-paced and high volume area, the Jay Express counter located in L.79.00 provides friendly, quality, and accurate in person information and transactions to students, faculty, and staff. The Jay Express Services Center located a few feet away from the counter houses the Enrollment Management Call Center plus the satellite offices for Registrar and Financial Aid, as well as a Designated School Official for our International Students, Public Notary Services and Financial Literacy workshops.

The Enrollment Management (EM) Call Center is an extension of the Jay Express Services Center and offers similar services by telephone or email. Our offices are staffed by cross-trained Enrollment Specialists, who will provide assistance in a courteous and professional manner. We are here to assist our students succeed in the business of being a student.

- To provide efficient, student-centered, and high quality services consistently to all constituents of John Jay College.
- To create an environment that stimulates teamwork, growth, and constant improvement.
- To provide an environment where all employees have opportunities to develop their potential, and where there is a shared passion for excellence and a commitment to respect for one another.
- To participate in the College’s retention efforts through a variety of events involving all constituents in the College community.
- To dedicate ourselves to ethical and responsible stewardship of financial, physical and environmental resources. We look for tools and strategies to create and enhance sustainable practices in all facets of operations.

II. Goals

A. Streamline Transactional Processes and Training

Professional development and training is ongoing in our department in order to have a fully cross trained staff that can stay abreast of the ever changing federal and state financial aid regulations as well as institutional policy changes. The staff must feel comfortable interpreting and navigating 12 databases and 3 websites to fully assist
the students that seek our services. We close every Friday at 12:00 pm in order to facilitate this process which is mission critical to our success.

**New Hires:** our training for new hires is a usually a month long process where they are first introduced to the policies of the Division of Enrollment Management, as well as those of the areas we service. This is done by reviewing the college’s compendium, college bulletin, our internal procedural manual, our forms, our web sites and the federal and state Title IV regulations. New staff members are rotated into the office of one of 4 supervisors for 2 hour meeting, a couple of days a week, to discuss the policies and how they apply to the services provided by this office.

The second part of the training process is shadowing the seasoned staff at the counter or at the phone. They are urged to ask questions from the staff. They are expected to trouble shoot questions at the kiosk in front of the counter because that exposes them to our students and their questions. It provides them with the ability to utilize their newly acquired skills in institutional policies as they attempt to answer questions from students. After two weeks of shadowing they are quizzed on their skills. Based on the results they are either allowed to assist student at the Jay Express Counter or through the Call Center. If they are deemed not ready more training is provided honing in on their areas of weakness.

Professional development for the entire staff occurs on a weekly basis in a variety of ways. We bring in subject matter experts from within the college and outside to speak to the staff on Friday afternoons about their field of expertise i.e. Interdisciplinary Studies, Certificate Programs, Customer Services, and Pell Verifications etc. We also utilize the Train the Trainer method, where we ask the staff to take ownership of a topic and present it to the rest of the staff via a PowerPoint or handout. The presentation will then be used to train New Hires as well as have it placed with their name as author in the procedural manual. We utilize role playing with screen shots as a fun, yet effective training tool. We also employ the resources made available by Human Resources for training and development through DCAS. Finally, weekly staff meetings are critical in maintaining open lines of communication. Without fail we meet to discuss what is happening around campus and we open up the discussion to the staff so they can share their impressions of the week. Email communication is an effective tool that is continuously utilized to maintain the line of communication open and flowing. It allows us to keep the entire staff in the loop of last minute changes and information.

**B. Financial Literacy**

In answer to an institutional need at John Jay College, we seized the opportunity to bring to the John Jay Community a free online Financial Literacy program called Cash Course. It has been hugely successful and our students have been very receptive to the online format and tools offered. We took it several steps further and developed Financial Literacy workshops that we offered our students and the community in
general during CUNY’s Financial Literacy month April 2010. Our supervisory staff in partnership with an outside agency became certified to conduct financial literacy workshops in 2011. Presently we offer 8 workshop topic presented twice a week over an 8 week period during community hour.

C. Customer Service

Our staff as part of their professional development takes customer services classes attend workshops as well as are provided reading materials in that area. As part of our services mission and philosophy we strive to provide friendly, respectful services that will enhance our professional image and contribute to the overall student experience.

Feedback from our students, staff and the community in general is encouraged and used as a valuable learning tool to tweak our services and develop employee performance. Customer service skills are discussed in every job performance appraisal, which is done on a quarterly basis in our department.

III. Assessment

A. Streamline Transactional Processes and Wait Time

We assess the effectiveness of our professional development and training by gauging the service time required in performing specific transactions at the counter. Our CRM product allows us to effectively see over time how long each transaction takes. We can then gauge the average time needed to conduct a specific transaction i.e. transcript intake. On average in 2011, that transaction took 6 minutes. If we see a staff member take on average 9 minutes over time to complete a transcript intake transaction, we will work with that staff person to streamline how they conduct that transaction. Therefore we can focus our training based on the needs of the individual. After training, the supervisor reviews the end of the month reports, to see if that individual staff member was able to reduce the average processing time to 7 minutes from 9 minutes, which would indicate a 22% reduction in processing time. The processing time impacts the wait time our students experience at the counter as a whole. The more training we do affects the efficiency of how we conduct our transactions, which correlates to the average wait time overall.

Based on our 2011 data for our Jay Express Services Counter, we conducted 47,546 transactions with an average processing time of 4 minutes and 59 seconds. The average wait time for our customers was 26 minutes and 33 seconds. The EM Call Center handled 55,690 calls with an average transactional talk time of 3 minutes and 42 seconds. The average wait time of our callers is 15 minutes and 53 second.
Goal: In 2012-13 we want to reduce the average processing time at the Jay Express Counter to 4 minutes and 30 seconds, which is a decrease of 10%. In turn the average wait time for our customers should also be reduced by 10% to 23 minutes and 54 seconds. We will attempt to fulfill this goal by utilizing our Federal Work Study students to pre-screen students’ needs and assist with completing standard forms before they see a representative.

A 10% reduction at the EM Call Center translates to a new average talk time of 3 minutes and 33 seconds and an average call wait time of 14 minutes and 29 seconds. We propose to accomplish this by tweaking and improving our EM Call Center scripts. The staff will email or direct clients to video demonstrations (Vodcast) to provide visual instructions on tedious and time consuming transactions.

B. Financial Literacy

In our financial literacy program we assess by simply doing exit interviews and by gauging how many students complete our series of workshops in a semester. Our survey results in 2011 have been 99% positive satisfaction rating. Students indicated that they took away on average two new concepts upon completion of each workshop. In 2012 we have had 8 workshop held over 4 weeks, which concluded on March 28th. We still have 4 more weeks and 8 workshops to conduct. To date we have a 12% return rate from workshop to workshop and a 98% positive customer satisfaction rating. On average students indicate they take away at least 1.5 new concepts in money management.

Goal: We are looking to increase our student return rate by 10% and to increase student attendance by at least 10%. As of late other literacy workshops from various areas across campus are being held during community hour. This causes confusion and is a duplication of services. We are planning to build partnerships with CSL classes, the Math Learning Center, Academic Advisement, SEEK and Student Activities to offer workshops for their students in the 2012-13 academic year. We hope to expand the number of workshops offered by providing a more diverse offering of topics based on our spring 2012 survey results. We want to tailor make workshops that are geared towards students’ interest. We hope to collaborate with the Math Learning Center in order to bring to life how to apply basic Math concepts learned through routine, everyday banking transactions and services, therefore, revealing the real life application of Math skills. We want to increase utilization of our Cash Course web page by introducing more of their topics / worksheets. Presently we had just 834 hits to the site, we aim to increase visit by 15%.

C. Customer Service

The assessment process for our customer service is dynamic and is expected to evolve over time. We presently use our own surveys twice a semester. The overall customer Service Satisfaction was high in 2011 at 94% from 608 surveys received. We also
utilize the Student Experience Survey done through the Office of Institutional Research. In the 2011 survey, our office received an overall 81.6% customer service satisfaction. We utilize email comments as well in gauging the satisfaction of customer service skills utilized by the staff.

**Goal**: We want to increase our overall customer service satisfaction in the 2012 Student Satisfaction Survey by 2%. We plan on achieving this goal by having more effective lines of communication with our students, assuring we have an updated web presence, adhering to our email turnaround time and sticking to our EM Call Center script for quality control. We are being conservative in this percent increase because we have no other baseline of comparison from other years. We would like to remain consistent in the 90th percentile in our own customer satisfaction surveys.
## Appendix VI: Sample Academic Curriculum Map

Sample Curriculum Map showing two courses aligned with program learning objectives 
(adapted for illustration from Humanities and Justice curriculum map)

### PROGRAM LEARNING GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge Acquisition: Students will gain a comprehensive foundation in major principles and theories of justice across Western and non-Western cultural traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comparative Analytical Skills: Students will learn to compare and contrast foundational concepts of justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary Methods of Inquiry: Students will learn to employ and evaluate the most important methods of inquiry used in history, literary study and philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Writing and Rhetorical Skills: Students will be able to produce well-reasoned, articulate, and compelling rhetorical writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Research Skills and Information Literacy: Students will be able to formulate, find a theoretical framework for, and seek answers to their own original research questions through critical, rigorous, properly documented, and ethical research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COURSE LEARNING GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Learning Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HJS 250</td>
<td>Justice in the Western Traditions</td>
<td>Analyze critically primary texts addressing major principles and theories of justice in the Western traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will learn to employ and evaluate the most important methods of inquiry used in history, literary study and philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will be able to produce well-reasoned, articulate, and compelling rhetorical writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJS 310</td>
<td>Comparative Perspectives on Justice</td>
<td>Analyze critically primary texts addressing major principles and theories of justice in non-Western traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will learn to compare and contrast foundational concepts of justice within the Western tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will learn to employ and evaluate the most important methods of inquiry used in history, literary study and philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will be able to produce well-reasoned, articulate, and compelling rhetorical writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will be able to formulate, find a theoretical framework for, and seek answers to their own original questions through critical, rigorous, properly documented, and ethical research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VII: Academic Department Annual Assessment Report Template (Revised Spring 2013)

Assessment Report

Department/Program:_______________________________________________________  Chair:_________________________

Degree /Minor/Certificate/or other Program:________________________________________________________

Time Period Covered for this Assessment Review:___________________

Assessment occurred in the following courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester and Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct Assessment of Learning Goals  (Please attach to the report a copy of each rubric used.)

After listing the learning goal(s), insert the percentage of students falling into each performance level in the following chart. Your descriptors for the performance levels may vary, and if they do please substitute yours, but it’s important to specify which level “meets expectations” for your program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal(s) Assessed</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Approaches Expectations</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Indirect Assessment of Learning Goals

Indirect assessment typically relies on surveys (Student Experience Surveys, NSSE, etc.), post-graduate outcome data, graduation and retention rates, grades, and a variety of other data. They may be used to assess particular learning goals or for more global assessment of the program. Indirect assessment should be part of every yearly review as a supplement to the direct assessment of learning. See attachment for examples of direct and indirect instruments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal(s)</th>
<th>Course or Program Based?</th>
<th>Sample Size, if Known</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Process  How did you go about assessing student learning in your program?
(Describe briefly the assessment methodology: sample selection, assessment instruments, scoring process, and assessment design)
Conclusions  What did you discover about student learning in your program?
### Actions Taken

What action decisions did you make based on your data and conclusions? (Plan actions to take effect in the following semester or sooner if practical.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions To Be Taken and By Whom</th>
<th>Timeframe for implementation and intermediate steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were last year’s actions implemented as planned? Please explain.

Assessment data and conclusions were discussed in a Department or Program meetings on ______________. [dates]

**Attachments:** Please attach rubrics used and samples of student work at each performance level within the rubric.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Components</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Meets Requirement</th>
<th>Approaches Requirement</th>
<th>Requirement not yet met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses and Learning Objectives</td>
<td>• All courses to be assessed are identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning objectives to be assessed for each course are clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tools</td>
<td>• Assessment tools (e.g., survey, exam, assignment) are clearly identified / explained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>• Where relevant, sample size and selection process are fully explained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Process</td>
<td>• Scoring process identified / clearly explained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Results</td>
<td>• For each learning objective assessed, data are reported in a table indicating % of students at each performance level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Findings</td>
<td>• Data reported in table are fully analyzed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion of findings presented in the context of departmental standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>• Specific actions to be taken as result of assessment fully described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Time table for program improvement clearly presented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Immediate actions to be taken as result of assessment fully described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>• Representative essay prompt, test item.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rubric(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX IX: Assessment Committee Evaluation Rubric (Administrative Units)

#### Administrative Units Outcomes Report - Assessment Committee Evaluation Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Components</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Meets Requirement</th>
<th>Approaches Requirement</th>
<th>Requiremen not yet met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>All goals to be assessed are identified. (When appropriate, learning objectives, courses, or educational experiences)</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives to be assessed for each goal are clearly stated</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tools, Performance Indicators, and Targets</td>
<td>Tools (e.g., survey, rubric), performance indicators, and targets are clearly identified / explained.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Where relevant, sample size and selection process are fully explained.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Process</td>
<td>Where relevant, scoring process identified / clearly explained.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Results</td>
<td>For each objective assessed, results and targets are reported clearly, indicating if performance met expectations.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Findings</td>
<td>Data reported are fully analyzed.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion of findings presented in the context of targets and standards.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Specific actions to be taken as result of assessment fully described.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time table for improvement clearly presented.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate actions to be taken as result of assessment fully described.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>Survey(s)</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric(s).</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>