INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

December 2014
AGENDA

SACSCOC Update
Compliance Certification - Preliminary Findings
IE Plan Expectations
Graduate Programs
Action Items and Deadline
Monitoring Status

- CS 3.3.1.1
  IE: Educational programs (SLO’s)
- First Monitoring Report submitted April 2013
- Second Monitoring Report submitted April 2014
- Removed from Monitoring Status June 2014

Compliance Certification

- Submitted September 2014
- Off site review November 2014
- Preliminary findings

Upcoming Events

- Focused report - February 2015
- QEP - February 2015
- On site visit - April 2015
- Board decision - December 2015
Substantial progress made

- Infrastructure (manual, paper process > electronic, web based system)
- Basic education (committee work, individual meetings, website)

As an institution = early in evolution
As individual units = quality varies

- Novice: e.g., weak student learning outcomes; course completion and grades cannot be used as measures
- Intermediate: e.g., valid measures in place (portfolios, papers, projects), but no standardized evaluation tools (rubrics, checklist)
- Expert: e.g., effective measures in place, thoroughly engaged in improvement process

Provide specific instructions and training materials to all units to ensure quality planning and assessment including

- Detailed expectations regarding the quality of outcomes, measures, targets, findings and action plans
WHAT THE SACSCOC REVIEWER WANTS

- SACSCOC Standards: every word
- Ongoing: multiple cycles
- Systematic: process in place
- Research based: numbers; percentages; comparative, longitudinal data
- Integrated: leaders analyze, share, discuss, act upon results
- Evidence of improvement: highlighted sections pointing to proof, not piles of data points, not 75 page reports
Program level = student learning outcomes
Department level = all other outcomes
  - Student satisfaction surveys, teaching evaluations = department level

Outcomes
  - Language should be learning focused
  - Incorrect: “Students will receive…”, “School will provide…”
  - Generic language of outcomes should be revised
  - Incorrect: “Core/advanced knowledge,” “Competencies that prepare”

Measures
  - Grades, course completion, self report – do not contribute to ability to determine whether SLOs are being achieved

Closing the Loop
  - Many action plans center around changes to assessment methods
  - Some action plans do not clearly map back to the SLO and measure
Competencies include:
- Knowledge – what should students know?
- Skills – what should students be able to do?
- Attitudes – what should students value, think or care about?

Student learning outcomes should be:
- Specific
- Measurable
- Aspirational, but Attainable
- Reasonable and Relevant
- Time-specific and Timely

Common errors:
- Not related to student learning
- Lacks specificity
Sample verbs for stating specific student learning outcomes

Grouped to demonstrate movement from lower to higher level thinking

**Evaluation**
- Appraise, Argue, Assess, Choose, Conclude, Critic, Decide, Evaluate, Judge, Justify, Predict, Prioritize, Prove, Rank, Rate, Select

**Synthesis**
- Compose, Construct, Create, Design, Develop, Integrate, Invent, Make, Organize, Perform, Plan, Produce, Propose, Rewrite

**Analysis**
- Analyze, Characterize, Classify, Compare, Contrast, Debate, Deduce, Diagram, Differentiate, Discriminate, Distinguish, Examine, Outline, Relate, Research, Separate

**Application**
- Apply, Change, Choose, Compute, Dramatize, Interview, Prepare, Produce, Role-play, Select, Show, Transfer, Use

**Comprehension**
- Conclude, Demonstrate, Discuss, Explain, Generalize, Identify, Illustrate, Interpret, Paraphrase, Predict, Report, Restate, Review, Summarize, Tell

**Knowledge**
- Count, Define, Describe, Draw, Find, Identify, Label, List, Match, Name, Quote, Recall, Recite, Sequence, Tell, Write
Incorrect: Students will learn biology.  
[lacks specificity]

Correct: Students will demonstrate an understanding of fundamental concepts in the fields of organismal biology, evolutionary biology, genetics, and ecology.

Incorrect: Students will receive instruction in historical music.  
[not learning focused]

Correct: Students will be able to identify important musical works in historical context.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME EXAMPLES

Incorrect: Students will acquire advanced knowledge in teaching for students with disabilities.  
[lacks specificity]
Correct: Students will demonstrate the ability to design, implement, and evaluate instruction for students with disabilities.

Incorrect: Students will acquire knowledge to prepare them for careers.  
[lacks specificity]
Correct: Students will be able to effectively initiate and produce original design concepts using both traditional and electronic media.
DEVELOPING OUTCOMES

Review

- Plans at other institutions
- External, end of program exam
  - What are outcomes measured?
  - Do they match your program?
- Specialized accreditation
- Learned societies
- Professional organizations

Consider

- Exemplary recent graduates
  - What did they know/could they do at end of program?
- What are the essential matters of content, skills, behaviors the graduate must have?
Course grades ≠ Program assessment
- Grading criteria often include attendance, participation, extra credit, improvement or effort that, while valued and may be correlated to learning, typically are not direct measures of learning. Impossible to infer what a student knows/can do based on a course grade.

Course completion ≠ Program assessment
- A program of study is not simply a series of courses. Courses are elements used to achieve a program’s student learning outcomes.
- Courses = Formative, Program = Summative

Direct vs. indirect measures
- In order to effectively measure learning, it is essential to employ multiple assessment methods

MEASURES
Assessment methods should measure what knowledge, skills, and attitudes the student has learned.
### Measures

#### Direct
- Authentic performances/demonstrations
- Comprehensive exams
- Internship evaluations
- Jury-judged capstone assignments
- Juried activities with outside panels
- Licensure/professional exams
- Portfolios of student work over time
- Pre/post tests
- Presentation or projects
- Theses/dissertations
- Standardized tests

#### Indirect
- Alumni surveys
- Employer surveys
- Exit interviews
- Focus groups
- Graduate rates
- Graduate school/job placement data
- Honors/awards
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data
- Retention rates
- Student evaluations
- Student satisfaction surveys
- Transfer acceptance
- Questionnaires
Good measures:
- Refined and aligned with outcomes
- Employ assortment of assessment types
- Recognize that surveys are indirect, subjective, incomplete assessments of academic programs

Common errors:
- Use course grades, course completion, GPA analysis
- Poorly align with outcomes
- Focus solely on participation in the course component
- Identify assignment (paper, portfolio, project, presentation), but no evaluation tool
- Fail to implement
MEASURE EXAMPLES

**INCORRECT**

Outcome: Students are able to conduct independent research  
Measure: Grades in COURSE 4567  
Target: 80% of students will achieve a B or better  
Finding: 85% of students achieved a B or better  
Problem: Cannot determine what students learned

**CORRECT**

Outcome: Students are able to conduct independent research  
Measure: Research paper graded by rubric  
Target: 80% of students will achieve score of 3 or higher on all components of rubric  
Finding: 85% of students achieved score of 3 or higher on two components, but only 65% achieved score of 3 or higher on the ability to synthesize information in literature review  
This level of data collection allows for closing the loop improvements
MEASURE EXAMPLES

INCORRECT

Outcome: Students will demonstrate the ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems
Measure: Exit survey
Target: 80% of students will report satisfaction in all three areas
Finding: 85% of students indicated that they were satisfied
Problem: Self-report, satisfaction, cannot determine what students learned

CORRECT

Outcome: Students will demonstrate the ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems
Measure: Final project in capstone course graded by rubric
Target: 80% of students will achieve score of 3 or higher on all components of rubric
Finding: 85% of students achieved score of 3 or higher on two components, but only 65% achieved score of 3 or higher on the ability to formulate problems

This level of data collection allows for closing the loop improvements
MEASURE EXAMPLES

INCORRECT
Outcome: Students will demonstrate proficiency in three art media
Measure: Portfolio
Target: All students will complete high quality portfolio
Findings: 10 of 12 student submitted high quality portfolios
Problem: Measure insufficient, ambiguous target, cannot determine what students learned

CORRECT
Outcome: Students will demonstrate proficiency in three art media
Measure: Portfolio graded using evaluation checklist
Target: 80% of students will achieve all benchmarks on checklist
Findings: 75% of students achieved benchmarks, 25% demonstrated inadequate blending skills in watercolor
This level of data collection allows for closing the loop improvements
MEASURE EXAMPLES

INCORRECT
Outcome: Students will apply skills related to editorial process of magazine publishing
Measure: Internship
Target: All students will participate in internship
Findings: 12 of 12 students participated in internship
Problem: Measure insufficient, dichotomous target, cannot determine what students learned

CORRECT
Outcome: Students will apply skills related to editorial process of magazine publishing
Measure: Internship evaluation completed by site supervisor
Target: 80% of students will score satisfactory or above on all items
Findings: 70% of students scored satisfactory on evaluation items, 30% of students scored unsatisfactory on proofreading element, evaluation comments from site supervisors indicated theme of unprofessionalism...
This level of data collection allows for closing the loop improvements
• Good targets:
  ▪ Aspirational, but attainable
  ▪ Meaningful
  ▪ Developed based on structure of assessment method being used
  ▪ Benchmark against other institutions

• Common errors:
  ▪ No target specified
  ▪ Low target, not ambitious enough
  ▪ High target, too ambitious
  ▪ Dichotomous, will not provide useful data

TARGETS
Criteria for success are quantifiable performance targets geared toward improvement with appropriate rationale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling graduate survey</td>
<td>50% of all graduates will be employed as counselor educator, counselor or in closely related positions [not ambitious enough]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening test score on final music exam</td>
<td>80% of students will score satisfactory or above on the rubric [good]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental qualifying exam</td>
<td>75% of students will pass the Qualifying Examination [on first administration? is pass/fail helpful info?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student satisfaction rate</td>
<td>100% of students will express high satisfaction rate with program [too ambitious]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEES Fundamentals of Engineering Exam</td>
<td>100% of students will complete the exam prior to graduation [dichotomous, consider: 85% of students will score within one standard deviation of national average]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good results:
- Reported in aggregate form (program or unit rather than individuals)
- Maintain anonymity of all participants
- Offer cogent analysis
- Exhibit multiple years of data to illustrate improvement
- Include supporting documentation

Common errors:
- Lack of follow through with measures
- Assume need for “enough” students for valid results
- No results = no use = no improvement = no compliance
- Summary of findings is unnecessarily detailed
- Lack of data to support findings
Exit Test Results (FALL 2013) in 1234, 2345, 3456. First for all students who took it; second, for the majors who took it. CLASS 1234 124 students took it; 110 passed; 14 failed Success rate: 88% Objective of 80% success attained. Majors who took it: 1 Successful results Objective attained: 100% CLASS 2345 62 students took it; 43 passed; 19 failed Success rate: 70% Objective of 80% success not attained. Majors. There were no majors enrolled in 2345 this term. CLASS 3456 16 students took it: 9 passed; 7 failed Success rate: 55.5% Objective of 80% success not attained. Majors who took it: 1 Unsuccessful results. Objective not attained. EXIT TESTS RESULTS (Spring 2014) in CLASS 1234, 2345, 3456. First for all the students who took it; second, for the majors in the concentration who took it. CLASS 1234 – 116 students took it, 95 passed and 21 failed. Success rate: 81.5%; objective of 80% success attained. There were no majors enrolled in CLASS 1234 in Spring 2014. CLASS 2345, 95 students took it, 79 passed and 16 failed. Success rate: 83%; our objective of 80% was attained. There were no majors enrolled in CLASS 2345 in Spring 2014. CLASS 3456, 31 students took it, 28 passed and 3... [too much detail, need to be able to easily compare year to year, summarize and use data management repository for supporting documentation]
RESULTS EXAMPLES

- The instructor forgot to send out the link to the survey. No data. [lack of follow through]
- Of the 16 students who completed a final project in our capstone course, 13 (or 81.2%) received more than 80% on their final project rubric. [nice summary, more detail in supporting docs]
- Goal was partially met. Assessment indicators reveal weaknesses in evolution, population, and plant biology. Analytical skills are weak, especially compared to the national sample of institutions. The program appears to be succeeding in content areas of Biochemistry, Cell and Molecular Biology and Genetics, but less so in analytical aspects. [nice summary, no numbers, but useful results gained, more detail in supporting docs]
- Fall 2013 1 P 2 P 3 P 4 P 5 P 6 P 7 P 8 P 9 P 10 P 11 P 12 P
  Spring 2014 1 P 2 P 3 P 4 P 5 P 6 P 7 P 8 P 9 P 10 P 11 P
  [not useful]
- 6/6 (100%) of doctoral students passed their dissertation defense on the first attempt with all committee members in agreement. [important to track, but not detailed enough to be useful for improvement purposes]
- **Good action plans:**
  - Clearly based on findings
  - Clearly state how/when findings were reviewed
  - Clearly state changes implemented
  - Include plan for how success of implemented changes will be tracked

- **Common errors:**
  - No plans made based on data collected
  - Modifications come from nowhere, not tied to assessment results, no cause and effect
  - Modifications only to assessment method
  - Plan is to “maintain”
  - Plans made, but not implemented
Our goal was met. No further action is needed. We will continue to monitor. [unacceptable]

Since 100% of students completing the degree passed the comprehensive exam on the first try, we are not planning any change of this outcome or measure. [unacceptable]

The actual thesis defense process needs to be reviewed. Better data on student performance during the thesis defense - quality of background investigation, quality of oral presentation, quality of computer-aided presentation, ability to answer questions during presentation, breadth and depth of knowledge of candidate. A questionnaire will be developed that all thesis committee members will complete at the thesis defense. [assessment]

Seek input from faculty teaching CLASS 1234 on how we can have better measure of the performance of students in this class. [assessment]

Develop capstone assessment course, add to curriculum. Effective Spring 2014, all BS students will be required to enroll in CLASS 4567 to take the ETS Major Field Test prior to graduation. [curriculum]
## Closing the Loop/Action Plan Categories
### Fall 2013 Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Curric Course</th>
<th>Assign Applic</th>
<th>Pedagogy</th>
<th>Assess Method</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Maintain</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COBA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COEHD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Specific
- Measurable
- Pay attention to verbs – Bloom’s taxonomy – choose higher level
  - Find, identify, label vs. develop, integrate, evaluate
  - Student will describe x, y, z [undergraduate]
  - Student will analyze x, y, z [graduate]
- Master’s level
  - Research
  - Advanced demonstration of skill
- Doctoral level
  - Independent inquiry
Students will receive a high quality accounting education that will allow them to pursue, or advance in, accounting, business, or related careers.
- Not learning focused, not measurable

The department will maintain high graduate student satisfaction with the program.
- Not learning focused, satisfaction

Students will acquire knowledge of an advanced area of computing and be able to communicate the acquired knowledge in written form.
- Lacks specificity

Students will develop advanced research skills.
- Lacks specificity, could be in any graduate program

Students will demonstrate competency in marketing skills that are pertinent to the hospitality and tourism industry.
- Lacks indicators of graduate level work and expectations

Students will develop skills in clinical counseling supervision and in advanced counseling practice during their academic programs.
- Two outcomes in one, separate for ease of measurement
Students will be able to analyze and critique the historical schools of thought that have shaped scholarly understanding of their chosen field(s) of study.

Students will develop an advanced understanding of research methods and their application in the hospitality and tourism industry.

Students will have a specialized knowledge in one of the subfields of physics such as, atomic and molecular physics, condensed matter physics, nuclear and particle physics. In addition the physics graduate will be able to demonstrate a basic knowledge in all the subfields mentioned above.

Students will demonstrate advanced skills in clinical counseling supervision including application of a theoretical framework and use of appropriate evaluation tools.
The following are logical assessment points for graduate programs:

- Research paper or project
- Thesis
- General/qualifying/comprehensive exam
- Internship
- Dissertation
- Departmental seminar/capstone course

Although the following findings are important to track, they are not useful in terms of assessing student learning:

- Five out of five students passed their qualifying exam.
- Four out of five students successfully defended their dissertation.
- 100% of students successfully completed their internship.
Therefore it is critical to develop an assessment tool that can obtain more meaningful data so as to facilitate closing the loop/action plan improvement efforts. Consider:

- Rubric
- Checklist
- Evaluation

Please note that course completion and grades may not be used to assess student learning.

The following may not be used to assess student learning, but are appropriate to be used in the department level plan.

- Teaching evaluations/instructor ratings
- Student satisfaction survey
- Exit interview
- Job or graduate school placement data
- Alumni survey
# SAMPLE THESIS RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Component Fully Met (Rating = 3)</th>
<th>Component Met (Rating = 2)</th>
<th>Component Partially Met (Rating = 1)</th>
<th>Component Not Met (Rating = 0)</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Effectively and insightfully develops an arguable, persuasive thesis</td>
<td>Develops an arguable, clear thesis</td>
<td>Develops a thesis</td>
<td>Develops no viable point of view or is vague or is seriously limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop claims</td>
<td>Effectively and insightfully develops strong claims on the issue and demonstrates outstanding critical thinking</td>
<td>Develops claims on the issue and demonstrates competent critical thinking</td>
<td>Develops inconsistent claims on the issue and demonstrates some critical thinking, but may do so inconsistently</td>
<td>Develops no viable point of view or claims are vague or seriously limited, demonstrates weak critical thinking or provides little or no reasoning to support its position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting evidence</td>
<td>Provides clearly appropriate evidence to support position</td>
<td>Provides adequate evidence to support position</td>
<td>Provides inappropriate or insufficient evidence to support position</td>
<td>Provides little or no evidence to support position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of relevant scholarship</td>
<td>Sophisticated integration, synthesis and critique of literature from related fields</td>
<td>Provides a meaningful summary of the literature</td>
<td>Fails to cite important, relevant scholarship</td>
<td>Provides little or no relevant scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Places work within larger context</td>
<td>Shows understanding of relevant literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical framework</td>
<td>Framework is integrated, illuminating all aspects, sophisticated understanding</td>
<td>Grounded in relevant framework, understood and explained</td>
<td>Framework is poorly understood or not used effectively</td>
<td>No framework or lacks relevance or is inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE THESIS RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintains purpose/focus</th>
<th>Purposefully focused</th>
<th>Generally focused</th>
<th>Somewhat focused or minor drift in focus</th>
<th>Lacks focus or major drift in focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques (e.g., models of inquiry specified and justified, variables identified, procedures described, data analysis strategies are delineated), includes detailed timeline</td>
<td>Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques, but some details are missing or vague</td>
<td>Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques, but many details are missing or vague</td>
<td>Not suited or poorly suited for testing the hypothesis or not described or poorly described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sampling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity and organization</strong></td>
<td>Purposeful organization of complex claims, clearly considers intended audience</td>
<td>Generally organized including a logical sequence of claims</td>
<td>An attempt at organization, but overall exist some errors that confuses communication of ideas</td>
<td>Lacks organization and fails to include logical sequence of claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectively uses a variety of transitional strategies</td>
<td>Adequately uses transitional strategies</td>
<td>Inconsistently uses basic transitions</td>
<td>Few or no transitions used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References and citations</strong></td>
<td>Properly and explicitly cited</td>
<td>Properly cited</td>
<td>Improperly cited</td>
<td>Improperly cited or no citations present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sample Oral Presentation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestures/movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate word choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing/pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE ORAL PRESENTATION CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and readable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free of mechanical and grammatical errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant and meaningful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance overall presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTION ITEMS

Fall 2014 Cycle
- Report findings for all measures
- Upload supporting documentation to Document Management file
- Create closing the loop action plans based on data

Spring 2015 Cycle
- Review IE plan
- Make changes to ensure quality components
  - Student learning outcomes
  - Measures
  - Targets

Due Jan 9

Due Dec 19