

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Department is expected to address:	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – OVERALL EVALUATION

Departments reviewed: Total = 10*	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Year: 2016 Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	----->8	->1	->1
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	----->8	-->2	
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	-->2	----->7	->1
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	----->5	---->4	->1
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	----->6	--->3	->1
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	----->7	--->3	

*College of Engineering – Aerospace Engineering; Biomedical Engineering; Electrical Engineering and Computer Science; Engineering Technology; Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering; Mechanical Engineering

*College of Liberal Arts and Sciences – Biology; Chemistry; Geology; Mathematics, Statistics, and Physics

Notes:

1. The Program Review Committee provided feedback to each unit in terms of their overall assessment of how the unit completed their assessment report.
2. Compared to 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 improvement continues to occur in the overall process.
3. This is the first year where 90% of programs were on “target” or “meeting expectations” in all areas.