<h1 style="text-align:center">2015-2016 Yearly Assessment Report FEEDBACK TEMPLATE
For use by Faculty Directors of Curriculum Development (FDCDs)
College of Arts and Sciences (CAS)</h1>

Email Feedback should be addressed to the person(s) who submitted the report, and copied to the Chair/Program Director (if that person was not the submitter), June, the Area AD (Christina, Eileen, or Pamela), Marcelo, and Corie.

The subject line of the email should be "Feedback on 2015-2016 Yearly Assessment Report and Curricular Maps – *Name of Department/Program".*

Timeliness of Submission

a. For early and on-time submitters of yearly assessment report and curricular maps (those who submitted by July 1st):

Thank you for your efforts in support of student learning in the College. We appreciate your on-time submission of the *2015-2016 Yearly Assessment Report* and two curricular maps, which allows us to provide you with feedback that may help you to further strengthen your program and improve student learning during the 2016-2017 academic year.

b. For late submitters of yearly assessment report and curricular maps who initiated request for deadline extension:

Thank you for your efforts in support of student learning in the College. We appreciate your initiative in requesting an extension to the July 1st deadline for submission of your *2015-2016 Yearly Assessment Report* and two curricular maps. We hope that our feedback will be timely enough to support your efforts in further strengthening your program and improving student learning during the 2016-2017 academic year.

c. For late submitters who didn't initiate a request for deadline extension and who had to be prodded to submit their materials:

Thank you for your efforts in support of student learning in the College. We hope that you will find our feedback on your *2015-2016 Yearly Assessment Report* and two curricular maps useful to your efforts in further strengthening your program and improving student learning during the 2016-2017 academic year. Moving forward, we ask that you work to meet the university and college deadlines for submission of assessment materials, so that the review and feedback process can occur on a timeline that allows implementation of changes to strengthen your program in the next academic year.

NOTE: Many tables of example feedback will contain multiple potential responses. Select one or more potential responses, as relevant to each item in the Yearly Assessment Report.

_____

1. **Identifying Information**

Name of Program:
Type of Program (Major, Minor, Graduate Program, Non-Degree Granting):
College of Arts and Sciences Division (Arts, Humanities, Sciences, or Social Sciences):
Name/Title/Email Address of Submitter:
Name/Email Address of Additional Individuals Who Should Receive Feedback:

For those who completed this section accurately and completely:	*For those who did not complete this section accurately and completely:*
Thank you for providing all the requested identifying information at the beginning of your *Yearly Assessment Report*; this allows us to communicate effectively with everyone who is engaged with student learning assessment for your department/program.	Some of the requested identifying information at the beginning of your *Yearly Assessment Report* is missing; having accurate information about who is involved and/or invested with the report allows us to communicate effectively with everyone who is engaged with student learning assessment for your department/program. In future reports, we would appreciate your attention to these details.

2. Mission Statement:

Complete	Needs Improvement	Incomplete
The mission statement is concise, well-written, distinctive and memorable. It accurately captures the intent and purpose of your department/program, reflects your curriculum, identifies the specific population served by your department/program, and fits well within USF's mission statement.	The mission statement would be stronger if it wore a bit more concise; effective mission statements are 2 to 4 sentences long and typically 50 to 75 words in length. The mission statement would be more impactful if the language were a bit simpler. The mission statement needs to be more distinct; if your department/program name was absent, one should be able to figure out it was your mission statement. While the mission statement connects to your department/program curriculum, core aspects could be better reflected. Consider revising the statement to more accurately describe key aspects of the intent and purpose of your department/program Consider more clearly identifying the population served by your department/ program.	The mission statement is too long; effective mission statements are 2 to 4 sentences long and typically 50 to 75 words in length. The language of the mission statement is too complex and/or confusing; please work to simplify and clarify this statement. The mission statement does not effectively capture the intent and purpose of your department/program; aspects of your curriculum are not reflected and/or it describes elements which are not central to your curriculum. The mission statement is not distinct; if your department/ program name was absent, one should be able to figure out it was your mission statement. The population served by your department/program is not indicated. The mission statement does not fit clearly within USF's mission statement; please work to revise the language so that the connection between your department/program and USF's mission is more clear.

Has this statement been revised in the last few years?

For those who do not answer or do not adequately answer this question:

You have not provided us with (sufficient) information about whether or not your mission statement has been revised in the last few years. In future reports, please indicate the date on which the mission statement was last revised.

3. (Optional) Program Goals:

Have these goals been revised in the last few years?

4. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

Developed	*Emerging*	*Initial*
Your PLOs are stated with active verbs that describe how students can demonstrate their learning. Your PLOs are stated in simple language (details are in the rubrics). Your PLOs are well-organized and focus on the key knowledge, skills, and values students learn in the program. Your PLOs are measurable. Your PLOs do a good job of connecting to USF's ILOs and/or WASC core competencies. Each PLO describes how students can demonstrate learning (e.g., "graduates can write reports in APA style" or "graduates can make original contributions to biological knowledge").	Consider whether there are too many PLOs; it is best to capture a program's learning outcomes in 4 or 5 statements. More detail can be included in the rubrics used to evaluate student mastery of the PLOs. Consider whether there are too few PLOs; it is best to capture a program's learning outcomes in 4 or 5 statements. Reducing to fewer statements means either that multiple outcomes are contained within one PLO (which makes it more difficult to assess student achievement and determine in what areas the program is accomplishing its goals) or that the PLOs do not fully reflect the intent and goals of the program. The language in your PLOs is vague; they need to be written in a way that makes them more easily observable or measureable by (i.e., concrete enough that people would agree about what they mean). Your PLOs don't adequately connect to USF's ILOs and/or WASC core competencies.	Your PLOs use inactive verbs (e.g., understand, know, demonstrate understanding of, demonstrate knowledge of). The language in your PLOs is too detailed and complex; much of the information should be moved into the rubrics. Your PLOs are incomplete and/or overly detailed and/or disorganized. Your PLOs do not identify what students do to demonstrate learning (statements such as "Students understand major theories" do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and assessed. Your PLOs describe a process rather than an outcome (i.e., the language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the students learn). Your PLOs include only discipline-specific learning, ignoring USF's ILOs and the WASC core competencies. Your PLOs confuse learning processes (e.g., doing an internship) with learning outcomes (e.g., application of theory to real-world problems)

Have these PLOs been revised in the last few years?

5. **Brief Summary of Most Recent Assessment Plan**
   FDCDs - choose one or more statements that apply.

Developed	Emerging	Initial
You have a fully-articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each PLO will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented.	Your program relies on short-term planning for assessment, such as selecting which PLO(s) to assess in the current year. This is a good start. It is important that program faculty work together to articulate a sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each PLO will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented.	Your program has no formal plan for assessing each PLO. It is important that program faculty work together to identify which PLO(s) will be assessed in 2016-2017 and, eventually, to articulate a sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each PLO will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented.

6. **Academic Program Review**
   Date of most recent Academic Program Review's External Reviewer Visit:
   Date of most recent Action Plan Meeting:
   Brief Summary of the most recent Action Plan:

7. Methods
- What did you do with regard to assessment of your program/department in 2015-2016?
- What were your questions?
- How are these questions related to your most recent Program Review and/or Action Plan?
- What PLOs are these questions related to?
- What direct (most important) and/or indirect methods did you employ?

Some Possible Direct Methods (pick > 1 and *briefly describe*):

a. Published (Standardized) Test (e.g., Major Field Test)
b. Class Tests & Quizzes with Embedded Questions
c. Class Presentations
d. Off-Campus Presentations (NGOs, clients, agencies, etc.)
e. Research Projects Reports
f. Case Studies
g. Term Papers
h. Portfolio
i. Artistic Performances, Recitals & Products
j. Capstone Projects
k. Poster Presentations
l. Comprehensive Exams
m. Thesis, Dissertation
n. Pass Rates on Certification or Licensure Exams
o. Group Projects
p. In/Out-of Class Presentations
q. Competency Interviews (e.g., oral exams)
r. Simulations
s. Juried Presentations
t. Other

Some Possible Indirect Methods (*briefly describe*):

a. Student Survey
b. Student Interview
c. Focus Groups
d. Reflection Sessions
e. Reflection Essays
f. Faculty Survey
g. Exit (end of program) Survey
h. Exit (end of program) Interview
i. Alumni Survey
j. Employer Survey
k. Diaries or Journals
l. Data from Institutional Surveys (e.g., NSSE, SSI, GSS)
m. Curriculum/Syllabus Analysis
n. Other

Developed	Emerging	Initial
You have identified direct and indirect assessment methods, with an emphasis on direct methods, that measures student achievement of at least one PLO.	Your assessment methods need clarifying to better align with a specific PLO(s). More information/explanation is needed to describe how the assessment method(s) will measure student learning.	Your assessment method(s) is not aligned with a specific PLO(s). No direct methods are proposed. The description of the assessment method is vague and/or insufficient; more information is needed to understand how it will measure student outcome on the PLO(s). The methodology is unclear. You are using course grades as an assessment method. The methods do not seem to capture the "end of experience" effect of the curriculum/program.

8. **Results**

   What were the direct data results?

   What were the indirect results?

   What surprised you?

   What aligned with your expectations?

   What do you understand these results to mean?

   What are the implications of the data?

Developed	Emerging	Initial
The findings clearly indicate whether or not the PLO(s) is being met.	Some (but not all) of the findings clearly indicate whether or not the PLO(s) is being met.	Results are not included. Results are included by they are unclear and/or are missing key data. Findings do not indicate whether or not the PLO(s) is being met. The summary is incomplete or provides too much information.

9. **Closing the Loop**

   What might you do as a result of these assessment results? What curricular or programmatic changes might you implement?

   Possible Closing(s) of the Loop(s) (pick > 1 and *briefly describe*):

   a. **Revision of PLOs**
   b. **Changes in pedagogical practices**
   c. **Revision of program course sequence**
   d. **Revision of course(s) content**
   e. **Curriculum Changes (e.g., addition and/or deletion of courses)**
   f. **Modified program policies or procedures**
   g. **Designed measurement tools more aptly suited for the task**
   h. **Improved within and across school/college collaboration**
   i. **Improved within and across school/college communication**
   j. **Revised student learning outcomes in one or more courses**
   k. **Modified rubric**
   l. **Developed new rubric**
   m. **Developed more stringent measures (key assessments)**
   n. **Modified course offering schedules**
   o. **Changes to faculty and/or staff**
   p. **Changes in program modality of delivery**
   q. **Other**

   Have you or will you submit any course or program change proposals as a result of these results?

Developed	Emerging	Initial
You have described planned changes that flow directly from assessment results to improve department curriculum and/or programming so that student learning will improve.	You provide reflection on what you have learned during this assessment cycle about your students' learning. More information and/or clarity is needed about how you plan to improve department curriculum and/or programming so that student learning will improve. Consider changes to pedagogy, curriculum, student support, faculty support, and/or equipment/supplies/space.	You have provided little or no reflection on what you have learned during this assessment cycle about student learning. You have not described any planned changes to improve department curriculum and/or programming so that student learning will improve. The changes you propose are not related to the assessment results. You have described too many proposed actions; not manageable.

2015-2016 Curricular Maps FEEDBACK TEMPLATE
For use by Faculty Directors of Curriculum Development (FDCDs)
College of Arts and Sciences (CAS)

For the Courses-to-PLOs Map:

Developed	*Emerging*	*Initial*
Every course maps onto at least one PLO in a logical way and every PLO has courses that map onto it in a logical way. The map indicates increasing levels of proficiency throughout the curriculum. The map shows that students are provided with opportunities to learn and to develop increasing sophistication with respect to each PLO. Every course maps onto at least one PLO in a logical way and every PLO has courses that map onto it in a logical way.	Students appear to be given reasonable opportunities to develop the PLOs in the required curriculum. There are some PLOs that appear to be under-developed (e.g., xxx), with relatively few courses mapping onto them so that students do not have the opportunity to develop increasing sophistication and/or some PLOs that appear to be over-developed (e.g., xxx), with relatively large numbers of courses mapping onto them. Consider revising the PLOs and/or revising the curricular offerings so that each PLO is adequately represented across the curriculum.	There is no clear relationship between the PLOs and the curriculum that students experience. Some PLOs are under-supported, others are over-supported, and/or some courses don't appear to be connected to the PLOs And/or some PLOs do appear to be supported by the curriculum. Faculty should work together to revise the PLOs and/or the curriculum so that the progression of student learning is clear.