

Guidebook for the Annual Assessment Reports Review

Introduction

The Annual Assessment Report (AAR) is an essential document that provides evidence of the achievement of program learning outcomes and their continuous improvement. It includes assessment results, analysis, and suggested improvement actions that aim to enhance the quality of the program. The report also demonstrates the implementation status of previously taken actions and closing the loop. It is, therefore, critical to review the AAR to ensure the program's continuous growth toward excellence.

To ensure a comprehensive and thorough review process, a Taskforce is in charge of evaluating the AARs. The Taskforce is composed of members who are knowledgeable about the program and the assessment process. Their responsibility is to review the annual assessment report and provide feedback to the programs to support their continuous improvement. In this guidebook, we will present the different aspects that the Taskforce should look at in the report and provide comments and a 4-point scale scoring rubric for each aspect to ensure consistency in evaluation among the Taskforce members.

The process that is adopted by the Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Office (APQAO) is illustrated in the following flowchart.

Definitions

Assessment: The aggregation of written, oral, and practical tests, and projects that are used to measure the student's progress in a course or program.

Assessment Activity: Assessment activity refers to a specific method or instrument used to gather information about student learning or program effectiveness. It can take various forms, such as exams, quizzes, essays, projects, presentations, observations, surveys, and focus groups, among others. Assessment activities are designed to measure specific learning outcomes or evaluate the overall performance of a program or institution. In summary, assessment activity is the broader term that encompasses all of the methods and tools used to evaluate learning, assessment method refers to the process of evaluation, and assessment tool refers to the specific instrument or technique used to collect data. The results of assessment activities are analyzed and interpreted to make data-driven decisions for improving student learning and program quality.

Assessment Context: Assessment context refers to the specific setting or environment in which the assessment of student learning takes place. This includes the specific course or program being assessed, the learning objectives being assessed, the methods and tools used for assessment, and any external factors that may impact the assessment results, such as the availability of resources, the demographics of the student population, and the overall educational culture of the institution. Understanding the assessment context is important for interpreting assessment results and making informed decisions about how to improve student learning outcomes.

Assessment Criteria: A description of what the student is expected to do to ensure that the learning outcomes are achieved.

Assessment Cycle: An assessment cycle is a period of time during which an academic program systematically collects and analyzes data related to student learning outcomes. The purpose of an assessment cycle is to evaluate the effectiveness of the program's curriculum and instruction, and to identify areas for improvement. The length of an assessment cycle can vary depending on the program, but it typically spans over a period of 2-3 years, as in the case of Qatar University. The cycle usually begins with the development of an assessment plan, followed by the collection of data, analysis of results, and the implementation of improvement actions, as well as the review and evaluation of the assessment process and outcomes. The assessment cycle is a continuous process that helps programs to maintain quality and ensure that students are achieving the intended learning outcomes.

Assessment Map: An assessment map is a table that identifies the specific courses and/or contexts that will be used to assess each of the PLOs.

Assessment Plan: It typically includes the assessment method(s) that will be used, as well as the timeline for when the assessments will take place. The assessment plan provides a clear and structured approach to assessing the

program learning outcomes and ensures that all outcomes are assessed regularly and systematically over the course of the program.

Assessment Rubric: A tool used to describe the areas used in evaluating/assessing student performance. Thus, the assessment rubric provides clear evidence on how to assess students' work.

Constructive Alignment: designing the curriculum to ensure that teaching and learning activities and assessment tasks are consistent and in line with the learning outcomes.

Continuous Assessment: It is the assessment that takes place during the period of regular education for the purpose of improving and developing the student's learning.

Curriculum Map: A curriculum map is a visual representation or document that outlines the courses, assignments, and learning outcomes that make up a curriculum. It provides a comprehensive overview of how the program's courses and activities are organized and aligned with the program's learning outcomes. The curriculum map also shows how different topics are addressed throughout the program and how learning builds from one course to the next. By providing a comprehensive view of the program's curriculum, a curriculum map can help faculty and program leaders ensure that the program's learning outcomes are met and that the curriculum is coherent and consistent.

Direct assessment: It involves looking at actual samples of student work produced in a programs. These include homework assignments, quizzes, exams, lab experiments, term projects, capstone projects, senior theses, field work, exhibits or performances.

Evaluation: Judging the value of an item for a particular purpose.

Formative Assessment: A type of assessment that helps inform the teacher and students about how students are progressing. Formative assessment is usually done at the beginning or during the program. The idea of this assessment is that the feedback that students receive from the teacher helps to improve learning.

Indirect assessment: It is gathering information through means other than looking at actual samples of student work. These include surveys, exit interviews, and focus groups.

Knowledge, Skill and Attitude: In the context of PLOs assessment, knowledge refers to the understanding and comprehension of subject matter and concepts related to the field of study. Skills refer to the ability to apply knowledge to real-world situations, solve problems, and perform tasks related to the field of study. Attitudes, on the other hand, refer to the values, beliefs, and behaviors that are developed through education and training, and which influence the way that students approach their studies and their future careers. In the context of PLOs assessment, knowledge, skills, and attitudes are used as key indicators of student learning and achievement, and are often assessed using rubrics and other evaluation tools.

Learning Outcomes: Statements that describe what the learner is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after completing a learning process.

Process: A series of actions, changes, or functions that lead to a result.

Rubrics: In the context of PLOs assessment, a rubric is a tool used to evaluate student work based on a set of criteria and performance levels. Rubrics typically consist of a set of performance criteria that are used to assess the student's achievement of a specific learning outcome. Each performance criterion is accompanied by a set of descriptors that are used to indicate the level of achievement. Rubrics can be designed to assess a wide range of learning outcomes, from simple knowledge recall to complex problem-solving skills.

Rubric Dimension: Rubric dimensions refer to the different aspects of a learning outcome that are being assessed. In other words, rubric dimensions are the specific components of a learning outcome that are evaluated. For example, if the learning outcome is related to critical thinking, the rubric dimensions might include aspects such as the ability to identify a problem, analyze data, and formulate a solution. The rubric dimensions are often defined based on the specific learning outcome being assessed and are used to guide the assessment process.

Summative Assessment: An assessment that attempts to summarize students' learning at some point in time—usually at the end of a unit or course. The use of summative assessment enables us to set a score that reflects the student's performance.

Annual Assessment Report Review Checkpoints

The Annual Assessment Report Review (AARR) process consists of the following checkpoints that are conducted by the Taskforce.

Checkpoint 1: "All PLOs are assessed with balanced distribution over the assessment cycle"

All learning outcomes are assessed through a balanced distribution throughout the evaluation cycle.

Examples:

- A program has 8 PLOs, with 2 of them being evaluated in each semester, ensuring the assessment of all PLOs over a 4-semester cycle within 2 years.
- A program has 8 PLOs, and each outcome is assessed at least twice over the course of 2 years (the duration of the assessment cycle). It is essential to ensure a roughly equal frequency of assessment for all PLOs.

Counterexamples:

- A program has 10 PLOs but only assesses 3 of them regularly, leaving the other 7 PLOs unassessed.
- A program has 5 PLOs and assesses all 5 PLOs in the first semester, but then doesn't assess any PLOs for the rest of the assessment cycle.

When reviewing the AAR, the taskforce is requested to ensure there is evidence that all PLOs have been assessed at least twice and in different contexts throughout the assessment cycle. They should also confirm the presence of a balanced distribution of the assessment of PLOs for the program over the duration of the assessment cycle. Assessment of PLOs should not be concentrated in a specific semester or academic year without considering the rest of the assessment period.

To verify this, the taskforce can review the documents presented in the AAR, such as the assessment plan and schedule, as well as any evidence of assessment activities that were conducted. They can also consider the nature of the program's PLOs and how they align with the curriculum, ensuring that all PLOs for the program have been assessed in a manner consistent with the program's educational objectives.

Using a 4-point scoring rubric, the taskforce can assign a score based on the level of balance and distribution of PLO assessments over the assessment cycle.

- 4 points: All PLOs assessed at least twice over the assessment cycle with a balanced distribution.
- 3 points: All program learning outcomes (PLOs) have been assessed at least once during the assessment cycle, but there is some inequality or concentration in specific assessments in certain semesters or years.
- 2 points: Some PLOs for the program have been assessed during the assessment cycle, but others have not, or there is an imbalance or significant clustering in assessments in certain semesters or years.
- 1 point: Several PLOs for the program have not been assessed during the assessment cycle, or there is a significant accumulation of assessments in specific cycles or semesters.
- 3 points: All PLOs are assessed at least once over the assessment cycle, but there is some unevenness or clustering of assessments in certain semesters or years.
- 2 points: Some PLOs are not assessed over the assessment cycle, or there is a significant unevenness or clustering of assessments in certain semesters or years.
- 1 point: Several PLOs are not assessed over the assessment cycle, or there is a significant unevenness or clustering of assessments in certain semesters or years.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 2: "All selected contexts (courses) are relevant to the PLOs"

The second checkpoint is also an important aspect in evaluating the quality of the program's assessment process for its specific learning outcomes and includes two components:

a) Ensuring the assessment of all learning outcomes in relevant contexts (courses).

Assessing PLOs in a related context (such as a specific course or project) is important because it allows for a more accurate and reliable evaluation of the extent to which students have achieved the intended outcomes.

Examples:

- The assessment of a PLO related to educational technology occurs in a course that emphasizes instructional design and technology integration.
- The assessment of a PLO related to critical thinking takes place in a course that emphasizes research methods in education.
- The assessment of a PLO related to cultural competence occurs in a course that focuses on multicultural education.

Counterexamples:

- A learning outcome related to educational technology is assessed in a course that focuses on educational policy and leadership.
- A learning outcome related to critical thinking is assessed in a course that emphasizes children's literature.
- A learning outcome related to cultural competence is assessed in a course that focuses on physical education.

To assess whether all PLOs have been evaluated in relevant contexts, the taskforce can review the AAR and, more specifically, the curriculum map to confirm whether the contexts (courses) used for assessment aligns with the PLO or not.

b) Selecting courses at the "Mastery" level for assessing learning outcomes.

Ensuring a greater emphasis on contexts related to the "Mastery" level when assessing PLOs.

Examples:

- Most assessments of program learning outcomes occur in courses at the "Mastery" level, where students are expected to have developed the skills and knowledge specified in the outcomes to a "Mastery" level.
- In an engineering program, the "Capstone" project requires students to apply their knowledge and skills to solve a real-world engineering problem. This context is related to the program's "Mastery" level learning outcome.
- In a business program, the advanced specialization course in strategic management requires students to analyze and make strategic decisions in business-related cases. This course is designed to provide a high level of critical thinking, problem-solving, and decision-making proficiency.

Counterexamples:

- A program assesses a PLO in prerequisite courses where students are not yet expected to have developed the necessary skills and knowledge to achieve "Mastery" level.
- In an education program, a student teaching practicum requires students to observe and assist teachers in the classroom. While this course may provide valuable experience, it does not assess a PLO at the "Mastery" level.
- In a computer science program, a software engineering course primarily focuses on programming languages and software technologies. While programming skills are important for PLOs, this course does not assess a learning outcome at the "Mastery" level.

To assess this, the taskforce can review the information available in the AAR, such as the curriculum map, the assessment plan, and the assessment schedule, in addition to any evidence of conducted assessments.

Using a 4-point evaluation model, the taskforce can determine the appropriateness of the chosen assessment courses as follows:

- 4 points: All PLOs have been assessed in relevant contexts, with a clear alignment between the learning outcomes and the adopted contexts. Assessment of PLOs has primarily focused on courses at the "Mastery" level, where students are expected to have already developed their skills and knowledge sufficiently.
- 3 points: Most PLOs have been assessed in relevant contexts, but there are some instances where there is a lack of alignment between the learning outcomes and the contexts used for assessment. Or assessment of PLOs for the program has mainly concentrated on courses related to the "Mastery" level, but there is some imbalance with the use of courses at the "Developing" or "Introductory" levels.

- 2 points: Some PLOs have not been assessed in relevant contexts, or there are significant gaps in alignment between the learning outcomes and the adopted contexts. Or assessment of PLOs for the program has primarily focused on courses at the "Developing" or "Introductory" levels, with some courses adopted at the "proficiency" level.
- 1 point: Many PLOs have not been assessed in relevant contexts, or there is a noticeable lack of alignment between the learning outcomes and the adopted contexts. Assessment of PLOs for the program has predominantly concentrated on courses at the "Developing" or "Introductory" levels, with no courses adopted for assessment at the "proficiency" level.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 3: "Procedures for collecting data are sufficiently described"

The next checkpoint is to evaluate whether the procedures for collecting data are sufficiently described in the AAR. It is essential to ensure that the assessment data are collected using appropriate and reliable methods and that these methods are transparently described in the report.

Examples:

- The program provides a clear description of the data collection methods for each assessment activity, including the types of data collected and the tools or instruments used.
- The program includes specific guidelines for data collection, such as instructions for administering assessments or collecting artifacts, and provides training for faculty and staff responsible for collecting data.

Counterexamples:

- The program does not provide any information on the data collection methods used, leaving it unclear how assessment data was obtained or what data was collected.
- The program provides vague or incomplete descriptions of data collection methods, such as simply stating that assessments were administered without specifying which assessments were used or how they were administered.

To evaluate this, the taskforce can review the documentation provided in the AAR, such as the assessment plan, procedures for data collection, and any evidence of the assessments conducted. They can also assess whether the methods used for data collection are clearly described, and whether they are appropriate for the intended learning outcomes. Since the taskforce has access to the Online Assessment System (OAS) in addition to the Annual Assessment Report (AAR), they can review the data and information in the OAS to verify the accuracy and completeness of the AAR. Here are some review criteria that the taskforce can follow:

- a) Verify that all PLOs scheduled for assessment during the academic year under review have been assessed in the OAS, and that assessment activities align with the program's assessment plan.
- b) Verify that the data and results present in the OAS have been included in the submitted AAR. The summary should encompass all essential information, such as the number of assessed students, assessment tools used, and assessment results.
- c) Evaluate the quality of the data in the OAS. This includes verifying that the data is accurate, complete, and reliable, and that appropriate statistical analyses have been used.

Using a 4-point scoring rubric, the taskforce can assign a score based on the level of completeness and accuracy of the AAR and OAS data. For example:

- 4 points: All data and results present in the OAS have been included in the submitted AAR.
- 3 points: Most data and results are present in the OAS or have been mostly included in the AAR.
- 2 points: Few data and results are present in the OAS or have been partially included in the AAR.
- 1 point: Data and results are not present in the OAS or have not been included in the AAR at all.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 4: "Assessment rubrics and target performance levels (not grades) for each learning outcome are clearly defined"

Examples:

- In a writing course, as a learning outcome, students must be able to write a clear and organized essay with strong supporting arguments. The description of the target performance level for this outcome is "Mastery," meaning that students should be able to meet the outcome requirements with minimal errors or weaknesses.
- In the mathematics course, as a learning outcome, students must be able to solve complex equations using advanced algebraic concepts. The description of the target performance level for this outcome is "Mastery," meaning that students should demonstrate a deep understanding of the concepts and apply them accurately in complex problems.
- A well-designed assessment matrix for the writing task includes clear descriptions and criteria for each performance level, such as "poor," "acceptable," "good," and "excellent," along with specific descriptions for each level.
- An assessment matrix for a group project task includes criteria for collaboration and communication, as well as individual contributions, and utilizes a points scale to differentiate performance levels.

Counterexamples:

- In the language course, as a learning outcome, students must be able to demonstrate basic language proficiency. However, the target performance level for this outcome is not clearly defined, leaving students and faculty members unsure about the expected level of proficiency.
- In the science course, as a learning outcome, students must be able to design and conduct experiments to test hypotheses. The target performance level for this outcome is described in terms of grades like A, B, C, which does not provide clear guidance on the specific skills or knowledge required to achieve the outcome.
- An assessment rubric for a presentation includes only general categories like "content" and "delivery," without specific descriptions of what each performance level should look like.
- An assessment rubric for an exam includes only a pass or fail system, without any differentiation of performance levels.

Here are some suggestions for the taskforce to review whether the targeted levels of performance for each learning outcome are clearly stated in the AAR:

- a) Ensure the presence of a section in the report that clearly defines the assessment rubrics for PLOs and the associated target performance levels.
- b) Verify that each assessment rubric for program learning outcomes is described in a precise and measurable way, explaining what students should be able to do or demonstrate, rather than displaying their earned grades.
- c) Ensure that the target performance levels are appropriate for the level and scope of the program, reflecting the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities required for success in the field.
- d) Confirm that the rubric is built with clear and specific criteria for each performance level for each outcome.
- e) Verify that the description of each performance level is distinct and unambiguous.
- f) Confirm that the language used in the rubric is easily understandable by both students and faculty members.
- g) Ensure that the rubric takes into consideration different contexts where the outcome can be manifested.
- h) Verify (if applicable) that the weight assigned to each criterion is appropriate for its contribution to the overall performance of the outcome.

Use a 4-point scoring rubric to assign a score based on the clarity and specificity of the targeted levels of performance for each learning outcome.

- 4 Points: The report clearly defines rubrics for the intended learning outcomes to be assessed and the associated performance levels in a measurable manner. The targeted performance levels are appropriate for the program's level and scope.

- 3 Points: The report defines rubrics for the intended learning outcomes to be assessed and the associated performance levels in a mostly measurable manner. The targeted performance levels are generally appropriate for the program's level and scope.
- 2 Points: The report defines rubrics for the intended learning outcomes to be assessed and the associated performance levels in a somewhat vague or imprecise manner. The targeted performance levels are somewhat inappropriate for the program's level and scope.
- 1 Point: The report provides insufficient or unclear criteria for the intended learning outcomes and the associated targeted performance levels. Additionally, the targeted performance levels are largely inappropriate for the program's level and scope.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 5: "Assessment tools are described in detail and in appropriate manner"

Examples:

- The assessment tools designed for assessing specific learning outcomes have been described in detail.
- The program utilizes a diverse range of assessment tools, including tests, projects, presentations, and direct observation of learning outcomes.
- Specific procedures are clearly outlined in the OAS and the AAR.
- The program integrates both direct and indirect assessment methods, such as surveys, focus group sessions, and interviews, to gather a variety of data about student learning. (Optional)

Counterexamples:

- The assessment tool has been described in a vague or general manner, lacking clear criteria and objectives, making it difficult to determine the effectiveness of the assessment.
- The program relies solely on a single assessment tool, such as the final exam, to evaluate all program outcomes without considering other possible assessment methods.
- The program uses "group work" (such as a group project report) as a tool to assess a learning outcome, and individual assessment is not possible through it; instead, the assessment is done collectively.

When the taskforce checks whether the assessment activities and measures are described in detail and are appropriate, they should consider the following criteria:

- 4 points: The assessment tools have been described well and are highly suitable for the learning outcomes being assessed.
- 3 points: The assessment tools have been described, but with some missing details or unclear information, or they are generally appropriate for the assessed learning outcomes.
- 2 points: The assessment tools have been described, but with many missing details or unclear information, or they are only partially suitable for the assessed learning outcomes.
- 1 point: The assessment tools have not been sufficiently described or are not suitable for the assessed learning outcomes.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 6: "Results are presented at the rubric dimensions level"

The taskforce is requested to review the report and ensure that the assessment results are presented at the level of the assessment matrices' dimensions. This ensures that the results are detailed enough to provide a deeper insight into the students' performance, facilitating their analysis by faculty members and making improvement suggestions more precise.

Use the 4-point scoring rubrics to determine the score for this part of the report:

- 4 points: Assessment results are presented clearly and in detail at the rubric dimensions level.
- 3 points: Assessment results are presented adequately at the rubric dimensions level, but there is room for improvement.
- 2 points: Assessment results are not presented adequately at the rubric dimensions level, or only partial information is provided.
- 1 point: Assessment results are not presented at the rubric dimensions level.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 7: “Results are summarized in aggregate form for each outcome with clearly defined performance levels”

Examples:

- The assessment report provides a clear summary of the results for each assessed PLO. The summary includes the number and percentage of students who achieved each performance level (e.g. 1, 2, 3, 4), along with a brief description of what each performance level represents.
- The assessment report includes a visual representation (e.g. a chart or graph) of the distribution of scores for each PLO, broken down by performance level. This provides a clear and easy-to-understand summary of the assessment results.
- The assessment report includes a clear table that summarizes the performance of each PLO across multiple assessment cycles, showing trends and changes over time.

Counterexamples:

- The assessment report provides a list of all the students who were assessed, along with their individual scores for each PLO. This makes it difficult to understand the overall performance of the program and the areas that need improvement.
- The assessment report includes a summary of the assessment results for each course, but does not provide an aggregate summary for each PLO. This makes it difficult to understand how students are performing across the program as a whole.
- The assessment report includes a summary of the assessment results for each PLO, but the performance levels are not clearly defined. This makes it difficult to understand what the results mean and how they can be used to improve student learning.

Use the following 4-point assessment scale to assign the score for this part:

- 4 points: The assessment results are presented clearly and accurately in an aggregated manner for each learning outcome. Performance levels are clearly defined and easy to understand.
- 3 points: The assessment results are presented in an aggregated manner for each learning outcome, but performance levels may not be clear or easy to understand.
- 2 points: The assessment results are partially presented in an aggregated manner for each learning outcome, and performance levels are not clearly defined or easy to understand.
- 1 point: The assessment results are not summarized in an aggregated manner for each learning outcome, or performance levels are not defined at all.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 8: “Analysis is conducted at the PLOs and rubric dimensions levels”

Here is an example of what the taskforce should review and check, as well as the 4-point scale scoring rubrics they can use:

- a) Check: Analysis conducted at the PLOs and rubric dimensions levels
- b) Check that the analysis was thorough and included both qualitative and quantitative data.

c) Determine whether the results were used to identify areas of strength and weakness in student performance.

Scoring Rubrics:

- 4 Points: The analysis was conducted at the level of PLOs and the rubric dimensions, and it was comprehensive, including both quantitative and qualitative data (if available). The results were used to identify strengths and weaknesses.
- 3 points: The analysis was conducted at the level of PLOs and the rubric dimension, but it was not comprehensive or did not include both quantitative and qualitative data (if available). The results were used to identify some strengths and weaknesses.
- 2 points: The analysis was conducted at only one level (either PLOs or rubric dimensions) and was not comprehensive, or it did not include both quantitative and qualitative data (if available). The results were used to identify limited areas of strength and weakness.
- 1 point: No analysis was conducted at any level (PLOs or rubric dimensions), or it was not comprehensive, and it did not include both quantitative and qualitative data (if available). The results were not used to identify strengths and weaknesses.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 9: "Interpretation of assessment results identifies areas of strength & weakness for each assessed PLO"

Examples:

- The assessment report shows that 80% of students achieved a score of 3 or 4 in the PLO related to critical thinking skills, while only 50% achieved the same score in the PLO related to communication skills. The report identifies critical thinking as a strength and communication as a weakness.
- The assessment report shows that most students achieved high scores in the PLO related to knowledge of the subject matter, but lower scores in the PLO related to applying that knowledge in practical situations. The report identifies knowledge as a strength and application as a weakness.

Counterexamples:

- The assessment report shows that 70% of students achieved a score of 3 or 4 in all PLOs, without providing any information on specific areas of strength or weakness.
- The assessment report identifies only one area of strength and one area of weakness for the entire program, without providing any specific information on how individual PLOs are performing.

Scoring Rubric:

- 4 points: The interpretation of assessment results clearly identifies specific areas of strength and weakness for each assessed PLO and provides clear examples and evidence to support these conclusions.
- 3 points: The interpretation of assessment results generally identifies areas of strength and weakness for each assessed PLO but could provide more specific examples or evidence to support these conclusions.
- 2 points: The interpretation of assessment results identifies some areas of strength and weakness for each assessed PLO but lacks specificity or clarity in the examples or evidence provided.
- 1 point: The interpretation of assessment results does not clearly or accurately identify areas of strength and weakness for each assessed PLO.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 10: "Evidence of faculty members' contribution to the analysis of results"

Examples:

- A faculty member led the analysis of the assessment results for a particular PLO and presented the findings to the program assessment committee.
- Multiple faculty members worked together to analyze the assessment results, discussing the findings and making recommendations for improvement.
- Meeting minutes: Minutes of faculty meetings where assessment results are discussed and analyzed can be included as evidence of faculty involvement in the process.
- Faculty feedback: Written feedback from faculty members on the assessment results, including comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the program, can be included as evidence of their contribution.

Counterexamples:

- The assessment results were analyzed solely by the program assessment coordinator, without any input or review from other faculty members.
- Faculty members were not involved in the analysis of the assessment results at all.

These are just a few examples, but there are many other ways that faculty members can contribute to the analysis of assessment results. The key is to provide clear evidence of their involvement and to recognize their contributions to the assessment process.

The 4-point scale scoring rubric is as follows:

- 4 points: There is clear evidence that faculty members were actively involved in the analysis of the assessment results, such as through participation in data collection and analysis or in-depth discussions of the results.
- 3 points: Some evidence is provided that faculty members contributed to the analysis of assessment results, such as through participation in meetings where results were discussed.
- 2 points: Limited evidence is provided that faculty members contributed to the analysis of assessment results, such as through occasional feedback on the results.
- 1 point: There is no evidence provided that faculty members contributed to the analysis of assessment results.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 11: "Identified improvement actions are directly related to assessment results."

Here is an example question that could be used for checking if Identified improvement actions are directly related to assessment results.

Question: Are the identified improvement actions directly related to the assessment results, with clear evidence of how the actions will address areas of weakness and build upon areas of strength?

Here is an example of 4-point scale scoring rubric for this question:

- 4 points: The identified improvement actions are directly related to the assessment results, with clear evidence of how the actions will address areas of weakness and build upon areas of strength.
- 3 points: The identified improvement actions are mostly related to the assessment results, with some evidence of how the actions will address areas of weakness and build upon areas of strength.
- 2 points: The identified improvement actions are somewhat related to the assessment results, with limited evidence of how the actions will address areas of weakness and build upon areas of strength.
- 1 point: The identified improvement actions are not related to the assessment results or there is no evidence of how the actions will address areas of weakness and build upon areas of strength.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 12: "Improvement action plan describes how assessment results are used to improve student learning"

Examples:

Assessment result: Students in a business course demonstrate a low level of proficiency in financial analysis.

Improvement action: The department decides to offer additional training for faculty on financial analysis techniques and incorporate more opportunities for students to practice these skills in the course.

In this case, the identified improvement action of providing additional training and practice opportunities directly relates to the assessment result of low proficiency in financial analysis.

Counterexamples:

Suppose an assessment report reveals that students in a particular course are struggling with a specific concept related to the course content. The improvement action plan developed by the faculty members recommends the purchase of new laptops for the computer lab. While the purchase of new laptops may be a beneficial action for the program in general, it is not directly related to addressing the learning difficulties identified in the assessment report. Therefore, this would be an unrelated improvement action.

In this case, the taskforce would need to review the improvement action plan and suggest revisions that are more directly related to addressing the learning difficulties identified in the assessment report.

Scoring rubric:

- 4: The improvement action plan provides a clear and specific description of changes to the curriculum or delivery based on the assessment results and how these changes will lead to improvement in student learning.
- 3: The improvement action plan describes some changes to the curriculum or delivery based on the assessment results, but the plan is not as specific or detailed as it could be.
- 2: The improvement action plan mentions some changes that could be made to the curriculum or delivery based on the assessment results, but the plan is not well-defined or lacks specificity.
- 1: The improvement action plan does not describe any changes to the curriculum or delivery based on the assessment results, or the plan is too vague or general to be useful.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 13: "How to implement improvement actions plan is well defined"

The Taskforce should check if the report clearly outlines an actionable improvement plan, including a clear timeline, responsibility for each point, and mention of the necessary resources."

The plan should specify the actions to be taken and how they will address the identified areas of weakness in student learning.

It should also indicate who is responsible for implementing the actions, when they will be implemented, and the expected outcomes of these actions.

The 4-point scale scoring rubrics that can be used for this criterion are:

- 4 points: Improvement action plan is detailed, comprehensive, and includes clear strategies, specific actions, and a timeline with assigned responsibilities, necessary resources, and expected outcomes.
- 3 points: Improvement action plan includes most of the necessary elements but may lack detail, specificity, or a comprehensive timeline.
- 2 points: Improvement action plan includes some strategies and actions, but these are not clearly linked to the identified areas of weakness, and the timeline or necessary resources are not well-defined.
- 1 point: Improvement action plan is insufficient, lacking detail, strategies, and actions, with no clear timeline, assigned responsibilities, or resources, and is not clearly linked to the identified areas of weakness.

The reviewer should provide comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the improvement action plan and assign a score based on the 4-point scale scoring rubrics.

Checkpoint 14: “Improvement actions are feasible and within the program’s reach.”

The taskforce is requested to review the feasibility of the improvement actions proposed in the report. The reviewers need to consider whether the resources (such as time, budget, expertise, technology,...) required for the implementation of the actions are within the program's reach. They also need to evaluate whether the actions are practical and realistic, given the program's current state and limitations. Reviewers need to provide feedback on the feasibility of the proposed actions and suggest alternatives if necessary.

The 4-point scale scoring rubrics that can be used to assess this criterion could be:

- 4 points: The improvement actions proposed are highly feasible and well aligned with the program's goals and resources.
- 3 points: The improvement actions proposed are feasible, but some adjustments may be needed to align them with the program's goals and resources.
- 2 points: The improvement actions proposed are somewhat feasible, but significant adjustments are needed to align them with the program's goals and resources.
- 1 point: The improvement actions proposed are not feasible, given the program's goals and resources.

Reviewers should provide feedback and comments on why they scored the report in a particular way and suggest any recommendations they have for improving the feasibility of the proposed actions.

Checkpoint 15: “Evidence of implementation of previously planned actions”

Examples:

- The program identifies a weakness in a particular PLO based on assessment data and determines that additional support resources are needed for students in that area. The program then implements a plan to provide students with extra tutoring sessions, and assessment data in subsequent cycles show an improvement in student performance.

Counterexamples:

- The program identifies a weakness in a particular PLO based on assessment data and determines that a new course needs to be developed to address it. However, there is no follow-up to ensure that the course is actually developed and offered.

The taskforce can check the AAR for evidence of the implementation of previously planned actions, such as descriptions of the actions taken and the results of those actions.

The program can be scored on a 4-point scale as follows:

- 4 points: The program provides clear and detailed evidence of the implementation of previously planned actions with a mention of progress percentages.
- 3 points: The program provides evidence that lacks some clarification on the implementation of previously planned actions with some mention of progress percentages.
- 2 points: The program provides limited evidence of the implementation of previously planned actions or does not mention progress percentages.
- 1 point: The program does not provide any evidence of the implementation of previously planned actions and does not mention any progress percentages.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Checkpoint 16: "Evidence of consideration of previous AARR comments"

Examples:

- The presence of Table 1-1 in the current annual report, which includes comments from previous reviewers and program notes explaining if and how they have been taken into account.
- Written responses to the previous annual report on the evaluation of program learning outcomes, indicating how the program dealt with the feedback and recommendations.
- Updates or changes in the program's evaluation plan or other relevant documents reflecting improvements based on feedback and recommendations.
- Meeting minutes or other documents that show the discussion and consideration of comments from the previous annual report review by the faculty.

Counterexamples:

- A lack of any documentation that demonstrates that previous AARR comments have been considered.
- No updates or changes to the assessment plan or other relevant documents that reflect improvements based on feedback.
- No indication in the current AAR that previous AARR comments have been taken into account.

The taskforce can use a 4-point scale to score the program on this checkpoint:

- 4: The program has demonstrated a clear and comprehensive consideration of previous AARR comments, and has taken meaningful steps to address any identified issues.
- 3: The program has demonstrated some consideration of previous AARR comments and has made some improvements, but there is room for further action.
- 2: The program has made minimal or no effort to consider previous AARR comments or address issues raised in previous reviews.
- 1: There is no evidence that the program has considered previous AARR comments or taken any steps to address any identified issues.

Reviewers are requested to provide feedback and comments on the reasons that led them to assess the report in this manner. Additionally, they may offer any recommendations for improvement.

Academic Planning and Quality Assurance (APQA) Office

The APQA office provides high-quality assurance services starting from academic planning, initiating new programs with the cooperation of Colleges, annual learning outcome assessment, academic programs review, and curriculum enhancement with efficiency and superlative performance.

The main objectives of the Academic Planning and Quality Assurance office are:

Objective 1: To develop and support university-wide learning outcome assessment processes with build-in flexibility so that colleges and academic programs will be able to tailor these processes to serve their particular needs and requirements.

Objective 2: To develop and support the implementation of policies and procedures related to academic programs.

Objective 3: To produce academic programs related reports including assessment reports offering data analysis and information in order to support the decision making and planning.

Objective 4: To promote a culture of assessment and continuous improvement by closely collaborating with other university offices, colleges, and academic programs and by identifying appropriate ways to engage the university community such as by organizing university-wide workshops and trainings.