Foreword

The purpose of this document is to address the Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1 of the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement (2008 Edition) published by the Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 2008.

3.3 Institutional Effectiveness

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)

- 3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
- 3.3.1.2 administrative support services
- 3.3.1.3 educational support services
- 3.3.1.4 research within its educational mission, if appropriate
- 3.3.1.5 community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate

Overview of SACS Program Assessment

Assessment is "A systematic process of looking at student achievement within and across courses by gathering, interpreting and using information about student learning for educational improvement" (Thomas A. Angelo, AAHE Bulletin, April 1995, p.11). Program assessment is done through obtaining information to demonstrate what the program’s graduates know (knowledge) and what they can do (skills).

The purpose of program assessment is to produce meaningful feedback for the academic unit on the performance of its students; it is not an evaluation of individual students, courses or faculty. The intent is to collect, analyze and report data in a format to help inform program faculty of the progress/accomplishments of their students and their program, support decisions targeting improvement of the program outcomes and inform strategic planning and accreditation. For students, outcomes assessment will communicate clear expectations about what's important in a program, inform them that they will be evaluated in a consistent and transparent way, reassure them that there is common core content across the major, and allow them to make better decisions about programs based on outcomes results.

Although a particular method of demonstrating institutional effectiveness is not mandated in the current SACS criteria for accreditation, each institution is expected to determine institutional effectiveness by implementing an assessment plan that:

- is broad-based,
- is derived from the institution’s purpose and goals,
- uses a variety of assessment methods, and
• demonstrates the use of results for the improvement of both academic programs and administrative support units.

**Program Assessment at USC Upstate**

USC Upstate students are expected to attain proficiency in an academic discipline, and the faculty is responsible for (1) designing a curriculum and educational experiences to achieve these goals, (2) assessing how well the goals are attained, and (3) using the assessment data to develop and implement modifications to the program aimed at improving student knowledge and skills. In creating an assessment plan and report for any academic program, it is important for the program faculty to define what they are trying to do. What is it that they intend for the graduates of their program to learn from the cumulative experiences of the academic program? After determining the intent of the program, it is just as important to determine how well they are doing on what they intended, and how they can improve the outcomes. All disciplines that award degrees at USCUpstate must submit an annual report on the assessment of each degree program.

**Timeline**

Oct 1 – Academic program assessment reports are to be submitted to the Chair of the Assessment Committee with a copy to the office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning (IRAP)

Dec 1 – Review of the academic program assessment reports is completed and feedback is returned to the assessment coordinator

Mar 1 – Any revisions to reports based on feedback must be submitted to the IRAP for final review

Mar 15 – Any revisions to assessment plans must be submitted to IRAP for review

**Program Assessment Reports**

To support the development of academic assessment plans and reports, the Program Assessment Committee has developed a template for plan development and report submission. Each program should develop a set of goals, each associated with several student learning outcomes and assessment measures. While it is not expected that the program goals, student learning outcomes, and assessment methods will change significantly on a regular basis, the department faculty is expected to review the plan at a minimum of every three years to ensure its continued applicability.
## Components of Academic Program Reports

### Academic Program Assessment Report

*For additional explanation and examples, see Attachment 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Mission Statement</strong></td>
<td>Statement should articulate the unit/program mission in support of the institutional mission and include a clearly defined purpose appropriate to collegiate education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goal # ( )</strong></td>
<td>Describe what you want students to learn expressed in general terms (clear communication, problem-solving skills, etc). Goals should focus on discipline-specific outcomes relevant to the program. All programs with specific concentrations should have one goal with specific SLOs for that concentration in addition to the core set of program goals and SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objectives SLO’s (student learning outcomes)</strong></td>
<td>Describes the specific knowledge and skills students should be able to exhibit that reflect the broader goals. Objectives (student learning outcomes) transform the general program goals into specific and measurable student performance/behaviors that demonstrate student learning and skill development along these goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment Methods</strong></td>
<td>Describes the measure(s) by which the department will know the students are meeting the departmental learning objectives. Includes both direct and indirect assessment. Each SLO should have at least one assessment method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Level of achievement you are targeting. Indicate benchmarks, scores on assessment instruments, etc… that would indicate acceptable achievement under your plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment Results &amp; Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Actual results and data collected. Make sure to break down data by subgroups (e.g. other campuses or emphases). As appropriate, also include item or category analysis and explain what conclusions can be made from the data analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action Plan</strong></td>
<td>What actions or modifications have been or will be made based on this assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementation and Evaluation of Previous Years’ Action Plan</strong></td>
<td>Which of the modifications indicated in the previous years’ reports were implemented this year and what was the impact?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Components 1-5 are the components included in the assessment plan. These components are to be completed by the assessment coordinator, in consultation with the program faculty, prior to beginning collection of data. The plan is to be submitted to the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning (IRAP) and reviewed for approval by the program Assessment Committee. The program Assessment Committee will provide feedback on the plan to the assessment coordinator via a standardized feedback rubric. Once a plan is approved by the Committee, it will remain in effect until the unit sees fit to modify it. The assessment coordinator will coordinate data collection over each academic year in preparation for completing the assessment report for the fall.

Assessment reports are due annually on Oct 1. The reports detailing the assessment results from the previous academic year should include aggregate and disaggregated data as necessary. The Action Plan section is to explain what is going to be done differently during the next academic cycle based on the review of the data and intended to improve results.
Assessment Coordinator Responsibilities

In the College of Arts and Sciences, departmental chairs are responsible for completing program assessment reports annually; in professional schools, Deans bear this responsibility. However, specific individuals or groups of faculty in a particular program may accept secondary responsibility and complete the report. The individuals completing program assessment reports are referred to as Assessment Coordinators. They are responsible for collecting and aggregating assessment data from faculty in the department, analyzing the collected data, and presenting the results of this analysis to the department faculty for discussion. It is the responsibility of the entire department, however, to determine modifications to the program aimed at improving student performance. The Assessment Coordinator then compiles all of the assessment information into the program assessment report that is submitted to the Assessment Committee. Upon the Committee’s review of the report, the Assessment Coordinator is also responsible for submitting a revised report if necessary.

Assessment Coordinator Stipends

Because the work involved in compiling the program assessment report necessitates working over the summer, Assessment Coordinators who are on a nine-month contract are paid a stipend based on the size of their program. The Program Assessment Committee voted on April 3, 2009 to amend the manner in which stipends are awarded for assessment reports. While there is a guaranteed base amount of the stipend for completion and submission of the report (67%), the Committee wanted to strongly encourage timely submission of good quality reports, (i.e. meeting the adequate or established level of standards specified on the rubrics that the Committee uses for reviewing the reports). Below is a break down of the stipend amounts awarded, based on the number of majors, and the scales noting the percent and dollar amount (both rounded) to be awarded based on the timeliness and the quality of the assessment reports (as judged by review of the Assessment Committee). Note that stipend payments will not be made until aspects of the report rated less than adequate have been remedied, resubmitted to the Assessment Committee, and rated adequate or established.

The purpose of the base stipend (67%) is to compensate the faculty assessment coordinators for work done over the summer writing the report, so the report is prepared for review by department faculty when they return in the fall and ready for submission on Oct. 1. The additional compensation above the base stipend is to reward coordinators for their role in facilitating data collection throughout the year, and the timely submission of a quality report.

If a faculty member is completing more than one report, he/she will be paid the stipend amount for the report of the program with the most majors and an additional $250 for each additional report.
### Faculty Assessment Coordinator Stipend Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeliness and Quality of the Report</th>
<th>Percent of stipend (rounded)</th>
<th>0-100 Majors ($750)</th>
<th>101-800 Majors ($1,000)</th>
<th>801+ Majors ($1,500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports Submitted With “Data”, “Action Plan”, and “Implementation and Evaluation of Previous Years’ Action Plan” Rated Adequate or Established†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. On time and adequate in all areas (October 1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 1-15 days late and adequate in all areas (October 2-16)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$930</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 16-30 days late and adequate in all areas (October 17-31)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$870</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. More than 30 days late and adequate in all areas (After October 31)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on ratings of initial submission

†Stipend payment for reports with initially rated less than adequate in “Data”, “Action Plan”, or “Implementation and Evaluation of Previous Year’s Action Plan” will be processed upon submission of revised report with all areas rated “Adequate” or “Established”

### Process for Providing Feedback on Reports

Each assessment report will be reviewed by a staff member from the Office or Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning (IRAP) and at least one member of the Assessment Committee using a committee developed rubric for rating and collecting feedback.

The assessment rubric utilizes a standardized rating for the components noted above, e.g. mission statement, goals, etc. The ratings for each component of the report range from underdeveloped to established; acceptable component ratings are either adequate or established. Feedback from the Committee will be sent to the Assessment Coordinator and the Dean or Chair of the department. The mechanism for providing feedback is the Program Assessment Report Feedback template. Below is a portion of
the template. Any report components with a rating below adequate must be reworked by the Assessment Coordinator and resubmitted to the Committee.

### Program Assessment Report Feedback

**Department:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Needs Modifying</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Needs Modifying</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Mission**
- **Goals**
- **SLOs**
- **Assessment Methods**
- **Assessment Data**
- **Action Plan**
- **Implementation and Evaluation of Previous Years’ Action Plan**

Ratings:  
- E=Established
- A=Adequate
- D=Developing
- U=Underdeveloped
- N/D=No Data

The feedback template also has sections for comments and recommendations for each of the components. The intention of the feedback is to allow the department to track the ratings/improvements for their program over a period of time. The longitudinal view will also inform the Assessment Committee of the previous ratings so they can track multiple iterations of the report and ensure that modifications are being made based on the feedback given to the Assessment Coordinator/Department Chair.

### Appealing Report Evaluations

The Assessment Committee has developed the following appeal process for unit Assessment Coordinators who feel their program assessment report feedback does not accurately reflect the quality of their report.

1. The Assessment Committee Chair will e-mail program assessment report feedback to unit Assessment Coordinators (with a copy to the department chair). (Hereafter, this is referred to as “the feedback e-mail”.)
2. If the Assessment Coordinator disagrees with the Committee’s review of the report and desires to appeal their ratings, he/she must notify the Assessment Committee Chair within two weeks from the date the feedback e-mail was sent.
3. The Coordinator must submit the written appeal to the Assessment Committee Chair within four weeks from the date the feedback e-mail was sent. This appeal
must be on the committee-approved *Program Assessment Feedback Appeal Form* and must conform to all instructions provided on the form.

4. The Assessment Committee Chair will confirm receipt of the appeal with the Coordinator.

5. The Assessment Committee Chair will forward the appeal to all members of the Assessment Committee.

6. The Assessment Committee will elect an “Analyst” for the appeal. (The Analyst may be a voting member of the Committee, an ex-officio member of the Committee, or a representative of an ex-officio member. The Analyst may not be an initial reviewer of the report or in the same department as the report under consideration.) The Analyst’s responsibility is to review the report, the feedback, and the appeal document and compile relevant information regarding the Coordinator’s appeal.

7. If either the Analyst or the Assessment Coordinator feels it necessary, one may communicate with the other in order to clarify aspects of the appeal.

8. At the Assessment Committee’s next meeting, the Analyst will present both the appeal and any relevant information to the Committee.

9. The Assessment Committee will discuss and review relevant documents and then vote as to whether the appeal should be granted in whole, in part, or not at all. The Committee member from the unit of the report under consideration will recuse himself/herself from the voting. (If the Coordinator who authored the appeal is also a member of the Assessment Committee, he/she may not be present during the presentation by the Analyst, the discussion, or the voting relating to his/her appeal.)

10. The Assessment Committee Chair will communicate the result of the Committee’s vote to the Coordinator within four weeks from the date the completed *Program Assessment Feedback Appeal Form* was received by the Chair.

11. The result of this appeal process is final. Only one appeal may be made regarding the Committee’s initial review of the report.

**Archiving Program Assessment Reports**

All reports will be archived with the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment. The current report will be linked on the IRAP web page under the program assessment area.
Assessment Committee (revised and approved May 2009 Faculty Senate)

The Assessment Committee consists of one faculty member elected from each voting unit and one student representative appointed annually by the Chancellor from nominations submitted by the Student Government Association. The Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Organizational Development serve as ex-officio members.

The Committee is responsible, in cooperation with the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Organizational Development and the staff of Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning, for management of the assessment process on campus. The Committee develops policies and procedures for assessing programs and establishes deadlines for assessment activities for approval for the Faculty Senate and administration; evaluates disciplinary plans and reports to ensure their continuing alignment with the institutional mission, practices, and goals as well as SACS accreditation guidelines; provides feedback to program faculties that will be used to improve student learning outcomes; and assists disciplines in assessment activities and implementation of results as requested. The Committee will report results of assessment activities on an annual basis to the general faculty.
Further Explanation and Examples of Components of Academic Program Reports

1. Program Mission Statement

A program mission statement should articulate the unit/programs mission and clearly define the purpose, values and principles that guide the program and are appropriate to collegiate education. What is the program aiming to achieve? How is the program contributing to the education and careers of students graduating from the program? A program mission statement must be consistent with and explicitly in support of the institutions mission and goals.

Examples:

- The mission of the USC Upstate mathematics program is to provide a high-quality baccalaureate education in mathematics with the depth and breadth necessary to prepare students for careers in math related fields and to pursue graduate education in mathematics if they so choose. In keeping with the metropolitan mission of the University, graduates of the program will have the skills necessary to compete for jobs in the Upstate and contribute to the region’s economic productivity.

- The mission of the USC Upstate biology program is to provide a biological sciences education in the framework of an undergraduate liberal arts curriculum. As a metropolitan institution, we furnish our students with the knowledge, technical skills, and expertise to contribute to society in the Upstate region of South Carolina and beyond. The biology curriculum prepares students by promoting an understanding of scientific methodologies, concepts, and applications, preparing students for successful careers in research, healthcare, and industry in a global environment.

2. Goal # ( )

Describe what you want students to learn expressed in general terms (clear communication, problem-solving skills, etc). Goals should focus on discipline-specific outcomes relevant to the program, i.e. the knowledge, skills and competencies students should gain through their participation in the curricula and education experiences of the program. Program learning goals are statements that fundamentally answer the question: What do we expect graduates from this program to know and be able to do?

Examples:

- The student will demonstrate understanding of and apply basic research methods in the discipline.
- Students will be able to write and think critically.
- Students will have developed a comprehensive understanding of theories related to the discipline.
### Academic Program Assessment Policies and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Objectives SLO’s (student learning outcomes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | Describes the specific knowledge and skills students should be able to exhibit that reflect the broader goals. Objectives (student learning outcomes) transform the general program goals into specific and measurable student performance/behaviors that demonstrate student learning and skill development along these goals. Student learning outcomes (SLO’s) directly describe what a student is expected to learn as a result of participating in academic activities or experiences within the program. They focus on knowledge gained, skills and abilities acquired and demonstrated, and attitudes changed. Good learning outcomes focus on **what students can do** instead of the effort we put into teaching them. Good outcomes are **measurable** in some way; they communicate what student learning will be evaluated in the course.

**Examples:**
- The student will locate and interpret research and theory to develop appropriate research questions.
- Students will develop, elaborate, and defend a thesis, both orally and in writing.
- The student will identify theory and major research findings in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | Describes the measure(s) by which the department will know the students are meeting the departmental learning objectives. Includes both direct and indirect assessment. Each SLO should have at least one assessment method. All faculty members must agree upon and use a common assessment instrument, e.g. paper, presentation, etc and score it the same way, with a common scoring rubric. All data used for assessment must be scored, gathered and presented in a consistent manner. It is important for the Assessment Coordinator to develop a template for data submission to ensure consistency and comparability of data.

**Examples:**
- Course embedded questions in all sections of a course required for the degree (direct)
- Major Field Test (direct)
- Senior Seminar papers evaluated by rubrics (direct)
- Senior Seminar oral presentations evaluated by rubrics (direct)
- Majors Survey (indirect)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | Level of achievement you are targeting; a pre-determined standard of performance expected. Indicate benchmarks, scores on assessment instruments, etc... that would indicate acceptable achievement. Grades are not acceptable standards of performance. Assessments should measure discrete knowledge, skills, and abilities and grades would be a compilation of those assessments not the specific data from the discrete assessment.

**Examples:**
- Average of 70% or more of the common questions correct
- At or above national average on Major Field Test
- 90% of students score 4 or higher on 6-point Senior Seminar paper rubric
- 90% of students score 4 or higher on 6-point Senior Seminar oral presentation rubric
- 90% of students are **Satisfied** or **Very Satisfied** with the degree program
Examples:

- Common questions: Average percent correct of 70.4%
- MFT: USC Upstate average of 49%; National average of 53.2%. No measure of standard deviation exists for our sample on this indicator, so we cannot compute a one-sample t-test. Our score is well within one standard deviation (9.5) of the national average.
  - The USC Upstate average scores were at or above the national average on all subsections of the MFT except the “Neoclassical” subsection
- 85% of students scored 4 or higher on the Senior Seminar paper
- 92% of students scored 4 or higher on the Senior Seminar oral presentation
- 98% of students were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the degree program.
  - Only 78% were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the opportunities for internships
- There were no significant differences in performance based on campus, and course selection within the major doesn’t appear to affect performance.

Examples:

- Students met the benchmark on the common questions. No action.
- Although students’ average overall MFT score was comparable to the national average, their poorer performance on the “Neoclassical” subsection indicates a need for additional instruction in this area. Faculty teaching the 302 course have met and will increase instruction in this area in the course, including a required 2-page paper on the subject.
- Students exceeded the benchmark for the oral presentation in Senior Seminar, but their written project did not. Analysis of the rubric results indicate the major issue is with proper documentation in the written project. Therefore, additional writing assignments will be administered throughout the major curriculum and students will receive feedback and instruction in proper documentation techniques. At least one paper requiring documentation will be required in each 300- and 400-level course.
- Although students 98% of students were Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the degree program, only 78% were satisfied with the opportunities for internships. (All other areas of the survey met or exceeded the 90% benchmark). Associate Professor Jane Doe has taken the responsibility for fostering relationships with community organizations who could provide internships for our majors. She will receive one course release to compensate her for the time expended.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Implementation and Evaluation of Previous Years’ Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the previous year’s report, an action plan was identified based on analysis of the results. In this section in the subsequent year(s), explain how the modifications impacted assessment results and student performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Academic Program Assessment Policies and Procedures

## Attachment 2

### Program Assessment Feedback Appeal Form

#### General Instructions
1. All relevant sections of this form must be filled out completely.
2. Enter your name and the Department or Unit whose report rating you are appealing in the header above.
3. Complete the table below by entering the Committee’s Rating of each area (from the feedback provided to you by the Committee Chair) and what you believe the rating should be.
4. Each of the following pages relates to a single area of your report (Mission, Goals, SLOs, etc...). Each page includes an explanation of what should be included under that area of the report as well as the criteria by which the Committee determined the rating of that area. Find the page(s) relating to the area(s) whose ratings you wish to appeal, and explain your rationale for the revised rating in the space provided. Make sure to specifically reference the relevant criteria, including specific language that supports your appeal.
5. Please limit the justification for your appeal to the space provided. Do not attach additional sheets.
6. Return all eight (8) pages of this form via e-mail or interoffice mail to the Chair of the Assessment Committee.
7. This form must be received by the Chair of the Assessment Committee no later than four weeks from the date the feedback e-mail was sent by the Chair.
8. Direct any questions or concerns to the Chair of the Assessment Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee’s Rating</th>
<th>Suggested Revised Rating</th>
<th>Committee Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Prior Year’s Use of Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year’s Use of Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E=Established  A=Adequate  D=Developing  U=Underdeveloped  N/D=No Data Provided
Academic Program Assessment Policies and Procedures

Name: __________________________  Program Assessment Feedback Appeal Form  Dept/Unit: __________________

**Program Mission Statement**: Statement should articulate the unit/program mission in support of the institutional mission and include a clearly defined purpose appropriate to collegiate education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established (E)</th>
<th>Adequate (A)</th>
<th>Developing (D)</th>
<th>Underdeveloped (U)</th>
<th>No Data (N/D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As stated in the unit plan, the unit/program mission statement demonstrates a good understanding of the relationship between the program's mission and the institutional mission/goal statements.</td>
<td>As stated in the unit plan, the unit/program mission statement demonstrates a basic understanding of the relationship between the unit and institutional missions; more detail would help to clarify the linkage between unit and institutional missions.</td>
<td>As stated in the unit plan, it is difficult to understand how the statement relates the program's mission to institutional mission/goal statements.</td>
<td>As stated in the unit plan, the mission statement is apparently unrelated to the program or the institutional mission/goal statements.</td>
<td>The unit plan has no written unit/program mission statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, please provide the justification for your appeal of the rating of your **Program Mission Statement**. Be sure to include specific reference to the criteria and wording above.
Name: ____________________________ Program Assessment Feedback Appeal Form ____________________________ Dept/Unit: ____________________________

**Goals**: Describe broad learning outcomes and concepts (what you want students to learn) expressed in general terms (clear communication, problem-solving skills, etc). Goals should focus on discipline-specific outcomes relevant to the program. Programs should have 3 – 5 goal statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established (E)</th>
<th>Adequate (A)</th>
<th>Developing (D)</th>
<th>Underdeveloped (U)</th>
<th>No Data (N/D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The stated goals describe a good understanding of broad-based, discipline-specific learning outcomes and concepts for the major/program</td>
<td>Most of the goals stated describe broad-based, discipline-specific learning outcomes and concepts but not all.</td>
<td>Several goal statements are partially developed and it is difficult to determine what learning outcomes/concepts are expected.</td>
<td>The goal statements do not reflect concepts appropriate to program assessment.</td>
<td>No discipline specific goal statements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, please provide the justification for your appeal of the rating of your **Goals**. Be sure to include specific reference to the criteria and wording above.
**Student Learning Outcomes**: Describes the specific skills, values and attitudes students should be able to exhibit that reflect the broader goals. Objectives (student learning outcomes) transform the general program goals into specific student performance/behaviors that demonstrate student learning and skill development along these goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established (E)</th>
<th>Adequate (A)</th>
<th>Developing (D)</th>
<th>Underdeveloped (U)</th>
<th>No Data (N/D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student learning outcomes clearly describe realistic and achievable outcomes in simple language. The objectives define measurable expectations through one or more indicators.</td>
<td>Most of the student learning outcomes describe clear and measurable objectives.</td>
<td>Several student learning outcomes lack clarity and/or do not measure objectives.</td>
<td>No SLOs are clear and/or no SLOs are measurable.</td>
<td>No student learning outcomes mentioned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, please provide the justification for your appeal of the rating of your Student Learning Outcomes. Be sure to include specific reference to the criteria and wording above.
**Academic Program Assessment Policies and Procedures**

**Program Assessment Feedback Appeal Form**

Name: 

Dept/Unit: 

**Assessment Methods**: Describes the measure(s) by which the department will know the students are meeting the departmental learning objectives. Includes both direct and indirect assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established (E)</th>
<th>Adequate (A)</th>
<th>Developing (D)</th>
<th>Underdeveloped (U)</th>
<th>No Data (N/D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describes multiple assessment measures that are appropriate and utilize direct and indirect methods for each student learning outcome.</td>
<td>Describes at least one direct measure that provides appropriate assessment of student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>It is difficult to understand how the assessment method(s) are appropriate indicators for the objectives/learning outcomes.</td>
<td>The assessment measures are either inappropriate or are not based on best practices (i.e., assessment measure is course grade only).</td>
<td>No assessment methodologies are noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, please provide the justification for your appeal of the rating of your **Assessment Methods**. Be sure to include specific reference to the criteria and wording above.

---

USC Upstate Assessment Committee
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Program Assessment Feedback Appeal Form

Name: ___________________________  Program Assessment Feedback Appeal Form  Dept/Unit: ___________________________

Assessment Data: For quantitative data, summarize data collected by faculty individually and collectively to demonstrate level of student achievement by expected SLO. Summary data should be aggregated and disaggregated by SLO, faculty, location (Spartanburg, Greenville, Sumter) and instructional means (classroom vs. on-line).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established (E)</th>
<th>Adequate (A)</th>
<th>Developing (D)</th>
<th>Underdeveloped (U)</th>
<th>No Data (N/D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The data submitted for each objective (SLO) is presented in both an aggregated and disaggregated format that allows for easy interpretation of the data and decision making.</td>
<td>Good summary of aggregate data for each objective (SLO) and sufficient detail to begin basing decision for change.</td>
<td>Good summary/aggregate data for most, but not all objectives (SLO) and does not have data disaggregated, as needed, by variable to draw appropriate conclusions.</td>
<td>The data submitted is not sufficient for unit faculty to base decisions about change.</td>
<td>No assessment data submitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, please provide the justification for your appeal of the rating of your Assessment Data. Be sure to include specific reference to the criteria and wording above.
Implementation of Prior Year’s Use of Results: Describes how the previous year’s changes were implemented and/or improvement resulting from those modifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established (E)</th>
<th>Adequate (A)</th>
<th>Developing (D)</th>
<th>Underdeveloped (U)</th>
<th>No Data (N/D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is clear that faculty implemented the previous year’s “use of results” modifications and assessed whether the alterations positively impacted student learning.</td>
<td>Reference is made to prior year’s modifications, and current year’s data is compared with prior year(s).</td>
<td>Trend data is provided, allowing for comparison across years, and there is a suggestion that faculty look at data longitudinally for assessment of modifications.</td>
<td>There is no mention of implementation of previous year’s modifications, although trend data is provided for comparison across years.</td>
<td>No indication of implementation of prior year’s “use of results”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, please provide the justification for your appeal of the rating of your Implementation of Prior Year’s Use of Results. Be sure to include specific reference to the criteria and wording above.
Name:  
Program Assessment Feedback Appeal Form  
Dept/Unit:  

Current Year's Use of Results: Describes what will be done with the data that is collected and analyzed (Closes the assessment loop)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established (E)</th>
<th>Adequate (A)</th>
<th>Developing (D)</th>
<th>Underdeveloped (U)</th>
<th>No Data (N/D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is apparent that faculty of this unit are using the results from the assessment report to make changes that will likely improve student learning.</td>
<td>While it appears that changes are intended, they are not clearly reported.</td>
<td>There is implication of some use of results, but modifications have not been decided on or are unclear.</td>
<td>Use of results is very superficial and/or appears unrelated to the data.</td>
<td>No use of results indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, please provide the justification for your appeal of the rating of your Current Year’s Use of Results. Be sure to include specific reference to the criteria and wording above.