

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's **assessment**):-----

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, and submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2014. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2013-2014 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2014-2015 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2013-2014 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2012-2013. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
1) Students new to AIP will articulate an accurate understanding of university policies and	Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 were assessed Spring 2013.	AIP Post-Session Survey and self-report.	New AIP students were assessed. AIP students are defined as students with	AY 13-14 Target Goal: 85% of new AIP students will express verbally and	(N = 82) 100% of new AIP students indicated verbally and on AIP post session survey an	New AIP students leave initial AIP session knowing the difference between academic and financial aid probation policies.	Assessment indicates that AIP is doing an acceptable job of informing students of important policy distinctions. Though

procedures regarding academic probation, with particular emphasis on the distinctions between academic and financial aid probation policies.			sub-2.0 grade point averages, who both attended an Academic Improvement Program session and completed an Academic Improvement Plan.	indicate on AIP survey a clear distinction between academic and financial aid probation/warning policies. (2012-2013 data report that 98.9% of AIP students could articulate academic probation policy, while only 75% distinguished between academic and financial aid probation policies.)	understanding of academic probation policies and procedures as well as academic and financial aid probation policy differences.		unlikely to be directly assessed in future, AIP will continue to highlight academic/financial aid probation policy differences.
2) students will demonstrate the ability to identify skills and behaviors impacting their academic performance.	Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 were assessed Spring 2013.	AIP Follow-up survey and end-of-semester grade point averages collected in AIP semester spreadsheet(s).	New AIP students were assessed. AIP students are defined as students with sub-2.0 grade point averages, who both attended an Academic Improvement Program session and	AY 13-14 Target Goal: AIP students will have identified skills and behaviors to improve their academic performance at a 75% level.	107 AIP students took the AIP post-session survey AND the AIP follow up survey AY 13-14. 100% of AIP students reported improvement in at least 2 of 5 identified areas of focus (attendance, communication with faculty/staff, resource use, time	Results indicate that improvements made in identified skills and behaviors impacting academic performance correlate to improved grade point averages.	AIP will continue to emphasize the identified skills and behaviors impacting academic performance for probationary students with added focus on improved attendance, resource use, and time management.

			completed an Academic Improvement Plan.		management, academic skills such as note-taking, study methods and testing.)		
3) Students will show greater grade point average improvement as compared to probationary students not participating in AIP activities.	Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 were assessed June 2013.	End-of- semester grade point averages collected in AIP semester spreadsheet(s).	441 total "probationary" students enrolled AY 13-14; assessed populations include GPA Alert, Probation 1, Probation 2, Transfer on Probation and Readmitted on Probation. 289/441 (65.5%) were AIP students; 152 (34.5%) did not participate in AIP.	Target Goal: AY 13-14 data will report that 30% more AIP students will improve their grade point average as compared to non-AIP students.	219/289 AIP students (75.8%) improved their grade point averages ; 80/152 Non-AIP students (52.6%) improved their grade point averages . AIP gpa-increase exceeded Non-AIP gpa-increase by 23.2% . (Note: the average change in gpa for AIP students AY 13-14 was +0.321; for Non-AIP students, the average gpa change was +0.179.)	The Academic Improvement Program appears to be of significant value to students who are on academic probation and complete an Academic Improvement Plan; however, a 30% difference between AIP and Non-AIP students who improve their gpa's may be excessive. Greater than 20% seems both reasonable and doable.	No significant changes to the program are warranted. AIP efforts to improve academic performance among AIP students will continue.

Comments:

II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
AY 12-13 SLO #1: Students new to AIP will articulate an accurate understanding of university policies and procedures regarding academic probation, identifying his/her position in the probationary process.	Spring 2013	"AIP Coordinator will continue to employ the In-session survey as a means to present complete information, and will seek to communicate the difference between academic and financial aid probation more effectively."- AY 12-13	Yes, Spring 2014, in US 291 and individual AIP sessions.	Revised AIP post-session survey to include academic versus financial aid probation differences; AIP-session focus on making the distinction clear to new AIP students. The changes proved effective, raising the percentage from 75% to 100%.
AY 13-14 SLO #1: Students new to AIP will understand university probation policy, making a clear distinction between academic and financial aid probation policies.	Spring 2013	Spring 2013 offered US 291, Applied Academic Success Strategies, an academic recovery course designed specifically for GPA Alert students. US 291 included university policy review, with particular emphasis on the distinction between academic and financial aid probation. New AIP students NOT on GPA Alert were assessed in individual appointments.	Yes. 5 sections of US 291 were offered Spring 2014.	Method of delivery (291 versus individual appointments) did not impact outcome in that the overall percentage rose from 75% to 100%. It remains to be seen whether US 291 will be offered Spring 2015.

AY 12-13 SLO #2: AIP students will employ academic practices and behaviors conducive to improving their academic performance.	Spring2013	"In AY 13-14, AIP Coordinator will explore alternative methods of measuring student improvement in academic practices and behaviors."- AY 12-13	Yes.	<p>Revised follow up survey included reference to specific academic practices and behaviors (attendance, communication with faculty/staff, resource use, time management, academic skills such as note-taking, study methods and testing); use of AIP semester spreadsheet showing grade improvements was interpreted as evidence of improved practices and behaviors by AIP students.</p> <p>More effective and relevant.</p>
---	------------	---	------	--

Comments:

Assessment Survey #1

Academic Improvement Program

Created fall 2013, for use AY 2013-2014

Colorado State University-Pueblo

AIP Post-Session Survey

Fall 2013

PID (A PID is both useful and preferred, but it is not necessary; if you would prefer to remain anonymous, do not include your PID, but please complete the survey and return it to Student Academic Services, LARC 267.)

Program assessment is a vital and important aspect of a university's process. Student participation in surveys such as this one provides an incredibly valuable way of gauging a program's effectiveness and use to our students.

Please take a few minutes and respond to each of the entries below. When you have completed the survey, return to form to Student Academic Services, LARC 267. Your input really is valuable, and it is appreciated.

1. As a whole, how would you rate your experience with the Academic Improvement Program?

5	4	3	2	1
Excellent	Very Informative	Useful	Unnecessary	Poor

2. Are there any particular parts of the AIP session or discussion you found especially noteworthy? Being specific as possible, please explain briefly.

3. As a result of your AIP session, how would you rate your understanding of CSU-Pueblo Academic Probation policy?

5	4	3	2	1
Excellent	Good	Fair	Could be better	Poor

4. How would you rate your understanding of the difference between academic probation/suspension and financial aid probation/suspension policy?

5	4	3	2	1
Excellent	Good	Fair	Could be better	Poor

5. To what degree has your AIP session contributed to your knowledge of and likelihood of using university resources?

5	4	3	2	1
Significantly	A Fair Amount	Moderately	A Little Bit	None

6. Can you name specific resources which will be useful to improved academic performance?

7. Please rate the following in terms of importance in improving your own academic performance.
Use the flowing scale for each item:

1 - Much improvement is needed in this area.

2 - Some improvement needed in this area.

3 - Not a significant factor either way.

4 - I am pretty good here already.

5 - One of my strengths as a student.

Attendance:	5	4	3	2	1
Faculty/Staff	5	4	3	2	1
Communication:					
Resource use:	5	4	3	2	1
Time management:	5	4	3	2	1
Study skills:	5	4	3	2	1
Testing issues:	5	4	3	2	1

8. Are there any specific concerns that are not addressed above?

9. Are there any comments or suggestions for improvement you would like to offer?

AIP Continuous Student/Follow-up Survey

PID (A PID is both useful and preferred, but it is not necessary; if you would prefer to remain anonymous, do not include your PID, but please complete the survey and return it to Student Academic Services, LARC 267.)

Program assessment is a vital and important aspect of a university's process. Student participation in surveys such as this one provides an incredibly valuable way of gauging a program's effectiveness and use to our students.

Please take a few minutes and respond to each of the entries below. When you have completed the survey, return to form to Student Academic Services, LARC 267. Your input really is valuable, and it is appreciated.

1. Date of initial AIP appointment:
2. Overall, how would you rate the impact or influence of your initial AIP session on your academic behaviors and attitude since that time?
 - 5 Significant
 - 4 Noticeable
 - 3 Moderate
 - 2 Little
 - 1 None
3. Since creating my academic improvement plan, my attendance has improved:
 - 5 Significantly
 - 4 Noticeably
 - 3 Moderately
 - 2 Little at all
 - 1 None at all
 - 0 Attendance was never a problem
4. Since creating my academic improvement plan, my relationships with CSU-Pueblo faculty and staff has improved:
 - 5 Significantly
 - 4 Noticeably
 - 3 Moderately
 - 2 Little at all
 - 1 None at all
 - 0 Faculty/staff relationships building was never a problem

5. Since creating my academic improvement plan, my use of academic resources has improved:

- 5 Significantly
- 4 Noticeably
- 3 Moderately
- 2 Little at all
- 1 None at all
- 0 Resource use was never a problem

6. Since creating my academic improvement plan, my time management has improved:

- 5 Significantly
- 4 Noticeably
- 3 Moderately
- 2 Little at all
- 1 None at all
- 0 Time management was never a problem

7. Since creating my academic improvement plan, my study skills have improved:

- 5 Significantly
- 4 Noticeably
- 3 Moderately
- 2 Little at all
- 1 None at all
- 0 Study skills were never a problem

8. Are there other specific academic skills or behaviors that were introduced in your initial AIP session that are not listed above? Briefly explain.

9. Are there any comments or suggestions for improvement you would like to offer?

Program: Writing Room

Date: May 16, 2014

Completed by: Felicia Tapia (Interim Writing Room, OWL & GenED Tutoring Coordinator)

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's **assessment**):-----

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, and submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2014. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2013-2014 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2014-2015 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2013-2014 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2012-2013. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed ? Please indicate these semester and year .	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed ? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment ?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance ?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment ?
---	---	--	---	---	---	--	--

<p>TLO#1: Tutors will work with students to identify areas where revision is beneficial to the writing process. Tutors will teach why and how to apply revisions and utilize the information in other revisions and writings.</p>	<p>Spring 2013</p>	<p>The Tutor Evaluation Rubric and Session Reflection Coding Responses were both used as methods to assess TLO#1 (see Addendums A, 8.1, 8.2).</p>	<p>All CSU-Pueblo undergraduate student Writing Room Tutors were assessed with the TLO #1 measures. Each tutor is trained using writing center pedagogy and best practices to more effectively help students identify and apply revision processes.</p> <p>Fall Tutors N; 10</p> <p>Spring Tutors N:9 and 10 (At mid-semester evaluation, we had 9 tutors. By the end of spring semester, we had a total of ten tutors.)</p>	<p>Eighty percent of tutors will score 4 and 5 on the Sessions and Content Knowledge categories of the Tutor Evaluation Rubric.</p> <p>Tutors in their first year with the Writing Room will self code and peer code session summaries at a consistency rate of 70%. Continuing tutors will demonstrate consistency at a rate of 90%. Session content, as reported post-session by the tutor, will be evaluated for 5 themes: Purpose, Revision, Structure, Documentation, and 21st Century Skills.</p>	<p>Writing Room and CHASS GET Coordinator did not complete the Tutor Evaluation Rubrics for the Fall 2013 Semester.</p> <p>For the middle of the Spring 2014 Semester, 2 out of 9 tutors (22.22%) scored 4 and above on the Sessions category of the Tutor Evaluation Rubric. Similarly, 22.22% of the tutors scored 4 and above on the Content Knowledge category. When reevaluated at the end of the Spring 2014 Semester, 4 out of ten tutors (40%) scored 4 and above on both the Sessions and Content Knowledge categories of the Tutor Evaluation Rubric.</p> <p>All sessions for the year were self and peer evaluated or coded for the 5 themes of Purpose, Revision, Structure, Documentation, and 21st Century Skills. For fall 2013,</p>	<p>Although tutors did not meet the expectation of 80% scoring 4 and above on the Tutor Evaluation Rubric, we did see an increase in that expectation from mid-semester evaluations to end of the semester evaluations. Implementation of more tutor training from mid-semester to the end of the semester might explain the increase. Further, supervisor and tutor conferences to review the rubric and individual evaluation scores might be a factor as well.</p> <p>For coding, both first year tutors and continuing tutors met and exceeded the expectation of identifying session content consistently. The results show that tutors understand what they learn in</p>	<p>We will work to include more tutor training through consistent supervisor and tutor conferences and discussions about progress. The Tutor Evaluation Rubric will be clearly explained and expectations outlined throughout the semester to increase tutor awareness about expectations and progress.</p> <p>To help ensure continuing and new tutors understand writing center work, we will maintain and further develop tutor training to help tutors identify the fundamentals of writing center practice. We will continue to emphasize the importance of teaching rather than editing through clearly focused sessions that incorporate 1 or 2</p>
---	--------------------	---	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>Tutors will limit session themes to one or two areas at a rate of 80%.</p>	<p>the goal of 70% consistency rate for first year tutors was surpassed with an overall average consistency rate of 86% and no tutor falling below the goal.</p> <p>For spring 2014, first year tutors surpassed the goal with an overall average consistency rate of 90% and no tutor falling below the goal.</p> <p>For fall 2013, the goal of 90% consistency rate for continuing tutors was met with an overall average consistency rate of 91% and 1 tutor falling below goal at 89%.</p> <p>For spring 2014, continuing tutors surpassed the goal with an overall average consistency rate of 94% and no tutors falling below the goal of 90%.</p> <p>The goal of limiting sessions to 1 or 2 themes at a rate of 80% was met for the fall and spring semes-</p>	<p>training about the writing process and writing center best practices. The 5 themes identified are major focal points of most writing sessions. For the tutors to be able to consistently identify these themes based on session form information shows that the tutors grasp the knowledge of the pillars of writing center ideology. In addition to consistently identifying the 5 themes, session form information as coded by tutors demonstrates that sessions focused on only 1 or 2 themes per session. Tutors learn that writing center work involves teaching instead of editing. By focusing on just 1 or 2 themes per session aids the teaching process and steers away from editing to</p>	<p>writing elements per session.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>ters with first year tutors demonstrating an average of 85% for the fall and 91% for the spring. Continuing tutors met this goal with an average of 87% for the fall and 90% for the spring.</p> <p>(For all coding result graphs for TLO #1, see Addendums 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, and 8.6.)</p>	<p>help the student learn writing skills instead of make revisions based on editing.</p>	
<p>TLO #2: Tutors will encourage students to return for multiple sessions to develop writing and revision processes.</p>	<p>Spring 2013</p>	<p>Data Analysis, the Tutor Evaluation Rubric, and Session Reflection Coding Responses were all used as methods to assess TLO#2 (see Addendums A, 8.1,</p>	<p>All CSU-Pueblo undergraduate student Writing Room Tutors were assessed with the TLO #2 measures. Each tutor is trained using writing center pedagogy and best practices to more effectively help students develop writing and revision processes.</p>	<p>Repeat sessions should remain at 40% or higher each semester.</p> <p>Eighty percent of tutors will score 4 and 5 on the Professionalism category of the Tutor Evaluation Rubric.</p> <p>Purpose and Revision will be the focus of 70% of sessions on the Coding Re-</p>	<p>In the fall semester, students returned for more than 1 session at a rate of 43%. In the spring semester, students returned for more than 1 session at a rate of 49.3%.</p> <p>Writing Room Coordinator and CHASS GET Coordinator did not complete the Tutor Evaluation Rubrics for the Fall 2013 Semester.</p> <p>For the Professionalism category on the Tutor Evaluation Rubric, 55.55% of the tutors</p>	<p>Repeat sessions have surpassed the goal of 40% and show that tutors continue to invite and encourage students to return to the Writing Room, which helps to build writing skills over time.</p> <p>The increase in scores for Professionalism demonstrates that there was improvement in tutor performance; however, the expected 80% scoring a</p>	<p>Writing Room staff will continue to be trained and encouraged to invite students to return. We will put emphasis on the benefits of the revision process to help students understand the process of writing and build writing skills.</p> <p>To help tutors develop professionalism, we will incorporate more training that involves customer service awareness.</p>

		8.2).	<p>Fall Tutors N= 10</p> <p>Spring Tutors N= 9 and 10 (At mid-semester evaluation, we had 9 tutors. By the end of spring semester, we had a total of ten tutors.)</p>	<p>sponse Form.</p> <p>Ninety percent of sessions will have 1 or 2 codes (focus of the session) on the Coding Response Form.</p>	<p>scored a 4 or above at the mid-semester Spring 2014 evaluation. That number increased to 60% by the end of the spring semester.</p> <p>The goal of 70% of sessions having a focus of the Purpose or Revision theme was met according to the evaluation/coding of each session by the supervisor. This goal was met for fall 2013 at 77% and for spring 2014 at 72% of all sessions focusing on Purpose or Revision themes. The goal of sessions having 1 or 2 theme focuses at a rate of 90% was met with a rate for fall 2013 of 94% and for spring 2014 of 93% according to all sessions evaluated/coded by the supervisor (see Addendums 8.7 and 8.8).</p>	<p>4 and above was not reached. One explanation is that the majority of our tutors were new tutors. Expectations of performance and professionalism might not be as evident in tutors who have had less training.</p> <p>Per the coded sessions from the supervisor, we can see that most tutors are exploring Purpose and Revision as main themes for sessions. The emphasis on these two areas coincides with writing center best practices to help students learn the process of writing.</p>	<p>We will also meet with each tutor regularly to discuss expectations and progress based upon the Tutor Evaluation Rubric.</p> <p>Continued tutor training that highlights the importance of Purpose and Revision will be maintained. This will include both pedagogical training through readings from writing center theory and practical applications through open discussions and supervisor-observed sessions.</p>
--	--	-------	---	---	--	---	---

<p>SLO #1: Students will apply information and practices discussed in face-to-face and online sessions to their writing.</p>	<p>Spring 2013</p>	<p>A Student Survey was e-mailed concluding the Spring 2014 semester through Survey Monkey (see Addendum C).</p>	<p>Individuals who participated in face-to-face sessions or who submitted to the OWL between January 15th and May 2nd, 2014 were e-mailed the Student Survey.</p> <p>Surveys E-mailed N= 250</p> <p>Responses N=7</p>	<p>Students will self identify agree or strongly agree use of session information and understanding of the revision processes at a rate of 70% or greater (questions 1 and 2).</p> <p>Students will self identify agree or strongly agree understanding thesis statement and topic sentences information at a rate of 70% or greater (question 3).</p> <p>Students will self identify agree or strongly agree understanding basic paragraph structure as part of the revision processes at a</p>	<p>All seven respondents reported strongly agree or agree that the Writing Room services helped him/her apply information from the session to his/her writing. Similarly, 100% of respondents reported strongly agree or agree that the Writing Room services provided ways to think about revision and understand the process of revision.</p> <p>To address question three from the survey, 71.43% of respondents reported strongly agree or agree that the Writing Room services helped understand and develop thesis statements and topic sentences. A majority of respondents (85.72%) reported that she/he did strongly agree or agree that the Writing Room services gave strategies to develop paragraph structure in the revision process. Finally, 71.43% of those</p>	<p>Although the percentage of respondents was lower than expected, the results show that students are learning the revision process, thesis statements, topic sentences, paragraph structure, and documenting sources.</p>	<p>To encourage survey participation, we will attempt to survey students on-site and post-session instead of at the end of the semester. Based on anticipated survey responses, we can make decisions to improve and/or maintain Writing Room services.</p>
---	--------------------	--	---	---	--	--	--

				<p>rate of 70% or greater (question 4).</p> <p>Students will self identify agree or strongly agree understanding documenting sources at a rate of 70% or greater (question 6).</p>	<p>surveyed stated that she/he did strongly agree or agree that the Writing Room services helped him/her understand documenting sources.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Comments:

11. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate these- mester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
--	--	--	---	--

SL0#1: Students will apply in- formation and practices discussed in face-to-face and online sessions to their writing.	Spring 2013	Program staff are discussing ways to im- mediately survey students after sessions and to better manage the information. To address the lack of responses, a new method of delivery and collection will be implemented next academic year.	No. The decision was made to attempt the online mode of survey collection to determine if we could receive more re- sponses this time.	Since the mode of online surveying off-site has not proved beneficial in collecting results, we will attempt a new mode of survey collection such as on-site and post-session for a sample of sessions.
TI0#2: Students will return for repeat sessions to de- velop writing and revi- sion processes.	Spring 2013	One of the areas of training for Writing Room tutors will include appropriate methods for encouraging students to fol- low up with their writing and visit for continued development. These methods will include providing goals for students and setting specific objectives relevant to a specific focus.	Yes. Tutors were trained to en- courage students to return by identifying and focusing on specific objectives. Tutors also practiced making appointments with the student after theses- sion was completed.	In the fall of 2012, 58% of our ses- sions were repeat sessions and 45.2% in the spring of 2013. For fall 2013, 43% of our sessions were re- peat and 49.3% in spring of 2014. Repeat sessions continue to meet and exceed our expectations. We will continue to train tutors to set objectives in sessions and invite stu- dents to return to the Writing Room to maintain repeat sessions at or above 40%
Objective from 2012-13 Assessment Plan: For the first semester, five students will com- plete a semester plan to establish writing goals to accomplish over the semester.	Spring 2013	Student tutors struggled with the process and were inconsistent with the materials collected and the follow up discussions with their students. This project will be reevaluated and revised.	No. Instead of revising this ob- jective, the decision was made to discontinue the objective for the 2013-2014 Assessment Plan.	

Comments:

Non-Instructional Program/Service Assessment/Evaluation Report Review Rubric
 Colorado State University-Pueblo
 June 2014

Reviewer: _____, Date: _____, Program/Service Reviewed: _____

	Yes	No	Partially	Unclear	Comments
1. Were the student learning outcomes/program objectives in Column A assessed/evaluated according to the assessment plan? (Please refer to the assessment plan included in your packet.)					
2. Does Column B describe the date on or during which the outcome/objective was last assessed/evaluated?					
3. Does Column C have an appropriate assessment/evaluation measure?					
4. If a rubric was used in the assessment process, is it attached? (Please indicate N/A in comments if no rubric was used)					
5. Does Column D describe the students or group of students involved in the assessment/evaluation process?					
6. Does Column E describe the percentage of students the program/service expects to perform at a given level (e.g., 80 percent of students assessed will perform at the "meets expectation" and "exceeds expectation" level)?					
7. From the information provided in columns F, G, and H , do you believe that the program/service has genuinely engaged in a meaningful assessment process to improve the program or service?					

8. In columns F, G, and H , does the program/service comment on actual student/program/service performance on the assessment instrument/process compared to the level it expected (the target level) in Column E? In other words, does the department discuss whether students/program/service performed at, below, or above the level the unit expected?			
9. Does the unit describe in Column H improvements in programs or services based on the assessment/evaluation instrument/process?			
10. Please comment on the strengths of the report:			
11. Please make constructive recommendations for improvement			