

Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders
CAPR 5 Year Review
March 2005

Self-study using *Academic Review Outcome Team Recommended Assessment Plan Rubric*

Plan element	Definition	Rubric	Self-rating	Documentation
1. Mission, Goals and Objectives				
A. state the department or program mission in terms of educational purpose or goals.	These are broad statements of purpose in philosophical terms often describing values and aspirations.	4 = very clearly stated 3 = stated with some clarity 2 = stated, but generally lacking clarity 1 = not stated	4	<i>Appendix A</i> 1.2.A.c pgs. 2-4 1.2.C pg 3
B. relate the department or program's mission/goals to the University mission.	These statements explain how the program's goals support the University's mission.	4 = relationship(s) very clearly stated 3 = relationship(s) stated with some clarity 2 = relationship(s) stated, but generally lacking clarity 1 = relationship(s) not stated	4	<i>Appendix A</i> 1.2.B pg.3 <i>Appendix D</i> pg. 5
C. describe program in content-centered terms.	These statements describe essential educational content covered in order to achieve the program mission/goals. They identify in content-centered terms (e.g., concepts, theories, paradigms, etc.) the knowledge and skills the program aims to convey.	4 = content very clearly stated 3 = content described stated with some clarity 2 = content described, but generally lacking clarity 1 = content not described	4	<i>Appendix A</i> 3.1.A.1 pgs. 20 – 27 3.1.B.1 pgs. 31 – 32 <i>Appendix D</i> pg. 1, 5-7 <i>Appendix E</i> pgs. 2-3

<p>D. state intended student-centered objectives at the program level in measurable or observable terms.</p>	<p>Student-centered objectives describe <u>intended</u> student learning outcomes in terms of what students will be able to do and/or what changes in knowledge, attitudes or behavior will occur as a result of the program.</p>	<p>4 = has student-centered objectives consistently stated in measurable or observable terms 3 = has student-centered objectives but only some are stated in measurable or observable terms 2 = has student-centered objectives but none are stated in measurable or observable terms 1 = offers no student-centered objectives</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><i>Appendix VI within Appendix A Curriculum offerings</i></p> <p><i>Appendix X within Appendix A ASHA KASA document</i></p> <p><i>Appendix D pg. 5-8</i></p>
<p>E. link program level student-centered objectives to specific course level student-centered objectives in measurable or observable terms</p>	<p>These are lists, tables, or other schema showing intended student learning outcomes within courses or sequences of courses as they relate to overall program student learning objectives (e.g., showing hierarchical programmatic connections and/or explaining how courses fit together within degree programs and other course sequences such as options, minors, credentials, or concentrations, etc.).</p>	<p>4 = linkage(s) very clearly described 3 = linkage(s) described with some clarity 2 = linkage(s) described, but lacking clarity 1 = linkage(s) are not described</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><i>Appendix A 3.5.A – C pg. 39-42</i></p> <p><i>Appendix VI within Appendix A Curriculum offerings</i></p> <p><i>Appendix X within Appendix A ASHA KASA document</i></p> <p><i>Appendix E pg. 7</i></p>

2. Developing and Implementing Assessment methods

<p>F. describe assessment methods for student-centered objectives (D) at the program level.</p>	<p>This section identifies and describes specific strategies and methods the faculty will use to determine whether students have achieved the program's intended student-learning outcomes (as listed in E).</p>	<p>5 = method (s) very clearly described, appear appropriate, and are consistently linked to specific objectives 4 = method (s) very clearly described, appear appropriate, but inconsistently linked to specific objectives 3 = method (s) as described are clearly inappropriate 2= method (s) named but are insufficiently described to ascertain appropriateness and/or linkage to objectives 1 = no methods are described</p>	<p>4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Appendix A</i> 1.6.A – E pg.6-9 3.1.A.2 – 4 pg. 27-28 3.1.A.6 pg.29 3.1.A.9 pgs. 30-31 3.1.B.2 – 3 pgs. 32-33 3.1.B.8-10 pg. 34</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Appendices IIA-C within Appendix A</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Appendix D</i> pg. 3</p>
<p>G. describe assessment methods for student-centered objectives at the course level.</p>	<p>This section uses course syllabi to illustrate specific strategies and methods the faculty use to determine whether students have achieved the intended student-learning outcomes within the courses that constitute the program.</p>	<p>5 = method (s) very clearly described, appear appropriate, and are consistently linked to specific objectives 4 = method (s) very clearly described, appear appropriate, but inconsistently linked to specific objectives 3 = method (s) as described are clearly inappropriate 2= methods(s) are named but are insufficiently described to ascertain appropriateness and/or linkage to objectives 1 = no methods are described</p>	<p>4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Appendix A</i> 1.6.B pg. 7 4.4.A pgs. 51-52</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Appendix I within Appendix A</i> Syllabus audit</p>

<p>H. present results of assessment activities as summaries of actual student learning outcomes data that have been collected by the unit.</p>	<p>This section summarizes the results (using narrative, qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) from surveys, exams, or other direct measures of program or student learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Y = yes, actual results from assessment activities are presented in the documentation N = none are presented</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p><i>Appendix A</i> 1.6.C pg. 8 <i>Appendices II A – C within Appendix A</i> <i>Appendix D</i> pg. 3</p>
<p>I. describe and present results of other measures relating to program quality or effectiveness.</p>	<p>These typically include surveys, exit interviews, focus groups and other non-instructional assessment measures.</p>	<p>4 = such description is explicitly offered 3 = such description is at least implied 2 = description not apparent, but it is possible that the document intended to do this 1 = no such description offered</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><i>Appendix A</i> 1.6.c pg. 7 1.6.F pg. 9 <i>Appendices I - P</i></p>
<p>J. offer well-reasoned conclusions concerning what action should be taken given the results of H and I above.</p>	<p>This section should present a logical analysis of the results (H and I) as they relate to intended and unintended program outcomes.</p>	<p>4 = conclusions are clearly supported by the data 3 = conclusions are only partially supported by the data 2 = conclusions are not supported by the data 1 = no conclusions are offered</p>	<p>3</p>	<p><i>Appendix E</i> <i>CAPR Report</i> <i>Five Year Plan.</i></p>

<p>K. describe how conclusions drawn from assessment data are or will be used in academic planning processes for the program.</p>	<p>This section should describe how the results of assessment activities will be or have been used to inform its curricular, instructional, and/or strategic planning and implementation activities (.g., program or course modifications, faculty development, advisement, or need for additional assessment data.)</p>	<p>4 = such description is explicitly offered 3 = such description is at least implied 2 = description not apparent, but it is possible that the document intended to do this 1 = no such description offered</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><i>Appendix E</i> <i>CAPR Report</i></p>
<p>L. describe an overall plan or process for program evaluation.</p>	<p>This goes beyond F and G above to describe an overall plan for action in terms of how the unit will determine whether the program is meeting its goals and objectives (e.g. process, personnel, methods, timelines, etc.).</p>	<p>4 = such description is explicitly offered 3 = such description is at least implied 2 = description not apparent, but it is possible that the document intended to do this 1 = no such description offered</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><i>Appendix A</i> 1.6.A – B pg. 6-7 <i>Appendix E</i> pg. 5 <i>CAPR Report</i></p>
<p>M. discuss student learning outcomes in the context of other planning or operational goals (e.g. resource, staffing, logistical, etc.).</p>	<p>These descriptions relate to additional activities or resources needed in order for programs or courses to achieve stated goals.</p>	<p>4 = such description is explicitly offered 3 = such description is at least implied 2 = description not apparent, but it is possible that the document intended to do this 1 = no such description offered</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><i>Appendix D</i> pg. 4 <i>Appendix E</i> pg. 4-6 <i>CAPR Report</i></p>

<p>N. show credible results of assessment activities in terms of their representation of student learning outcomes?</p>	<p>This is a composite judgment based on whether the measures appear valid (measure what they purport to measure) and reliable (measure it consistently) and whether the analyses of the data were done correctly.</p>	<p>4= totally credible 3= mostly credible 2= somewhat credible 1= not very credible or none offered</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><i>Appendix A</i> 1.6 A-F pgs. 6-9 <i>Appendices IIA-C within Appendix A</i> <i>Appendix L</i></p>
<p>4. Synthesis: Overall quality of plan</p>				
<p>O. show how the unit's use of student learning outcomes data is an effective part of that program's curriculum and course development and revision activities.</p>	<p>This section should present a well-developed and coherent assessment plan that includes continuous and well-integrated linkage among assessment, planning, and implementation activities.</p>	<p>4 = definitely 3 = probably 2 = possibly, but uncertain 1 = definitely not</p>	<p>3</p>	<p><i>Appendix D</i> pg. 11 <i>Appendix E</i> pgs. 1-3 <i>CAPR Report</i></p>