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Program Self-Study

• Review of New Professional Standards 2017

• (Team) Review Program Goals and Educational environment

• Establish a timeline on Project Review and completion of (standards) written report
Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment

- Development of program specific IE reports
- Standards of Assessment
- Integrated General Education
Writing Across the College Essay Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary 4</th>
<th>Good Work 3</th>
<th>Acceptable 2</th>
<th>Lacks Effort 1</th>
<th>Not Compl. 0</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Strong thesis statement supported by sound reasoning and persuasive details.</td>
<td>Arguable thesis statement is supported by sound reasoning and adequate details.</td>
<td>Thesis statement is provided and supported in most areas by sound reasoning and some details.</td>
<td>Thesis statement is missing or unclear. Support provided is weak and lacks focus.</td>
<td>No attempt to establish a thesis statement or to support one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Well-developed paper with a clear and logical format; easy to follow.</td>
<td>Generally well organized with a clear and logical format.</td>
<td>Some evidence of planning and organization; some portions may be difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Little evidence of planning and organization; essay is difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Presentation of information is random.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>Language is professional, clear and concise.</td>
<td>Language is professional with a few areas that lack clarity.</td>
<td>Language is somewhat informal with some areas that lack clarity.</td>
<td>Language is a mix of informal and slang. Clarity is not present.</td>
<td>Language is inappropriate or unintelligible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>Contains few if any grammar, spelling or punctuation errors.</td>
<td>Contains some errors in grammar, spelling or capitalization that do not interfere with meaning.</td>
<td>Contains many errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation; some portions may be difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Level of errors in grammar, spelling or capitalization eliminates meaning.</td>
<td>No evidence of attention to grammar, spelling or capitalization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Writing Across the College Research Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary 4</th>
<th>Good Work 3</th>
<th>Acceptable 2</th>
<th>Lacks Effort 1</th>
<th>Not Compl. 0</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Strong thesis statement supported by sound reasoning, persuasive details and relevant research.</td>
<td>Arguable thesis statement is supported by sound reasoning, adequate details and some relevant research.</td>
<td>Thesis statement is provided and supported in most areas by sound reasoning, some details and research.</td>
<td>Thesis statement is missing or unclear. Support provided is weak and lacks focus.</td>
<td>No attempt to establish a thesis statement or to support one.</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Well-developed paper with a clear and logical format; easy to follow.</td>
<td>Generally well organized with a clear and logical format.</td>
<td>Some evidence of planning and organization; some portions may be difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Little evidence of planning and organization; essay is difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Presentation of information is random.</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research:</strong></td>
<td>Credible sources selected and properly cited.</td>
<td>Most sources credible and properly acknowledged.</td>
<td>Sources are credible but not acknowledged OR Sources are questionable but acknowledged.</td>
<td>Sources are questionable and not acknowledged.</td>
<td>No evidence of research.</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad. or Ind. based in student prog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>Language is professional, clear and concise.</td>
<td>Language is professional with a few areas that lack clarity.</td>
<td>Language is somewhat informal with some areas that lack clarity.</td>
<td>Language is a mix of informal and slang. Clarity is not present.</td>
<td>Language is inappropriate or unintelligible.</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>Contains few if any grammar, spelling or punctuation errors.</td>
<td>Contains some errors in grammar, spelling or punctuation that do not interfere with meaning.</td>
<td>Contains many errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation; some portions may be difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Level of errors in grammar, spelling or capitalization eliminates meaning.</td>
<td>No evidence of attention to grammar, spelling or capitalization.</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Effectiveness Process

• Review of program and course competencies
• Selection of assessment points
• Determination of assessment periods
• Development of assessment rubrics
• Norming of assessment rubrics
• Tracking and review of assessment results
Campus Assessment

- Competencies
- Market Intelligence
- Technology
- Curriculum Components
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Alignment
Internal Assessment Methods

• Collective Projects and Portfolios
• Classroom Assessment and Teaching methodology
• Capstone Courses, ID and GE
• Exams with Objective Questions
External Assessment Review

• The Industry Roundtable (PAC)
• Industry transformation
• Emerging areas of employment
• Skills needed
Assessment Results

• Discussions with Program Advisory Committee

• Discussions with Interior Design Faculty

• Discussions with IE and Assessment Committee
Course by Course Evaluation - SWOT

- Course content changes
- Expansion of course objectives and outcomes
- Detailed project review by faculty
Examples for Review

• Course does not meet specific learning objectives

• Determine what needs to change?

• Course then scheduled for following quarter in order to provide submittals of work of work for review

• Department/faculty assessment
Documentation of Changes for Final Review

• Faculty finalize analysis of self-study findings

• Determination of courses showing weakness and needing specific change meet requirements

• Presentation at Assessment Committee Meeting
Preparing for Site Visit

• Edit Standards and Curriculum Matrix

• Bind, send one copy physically, one digitally
Preparing Evidence Room
Organization of work

• Organize work according to progression of classes on program matrix

• Keep it simple and straightforward for the benefit of faculty, observers and Site Visitors
Comprehensive Display
Final Review of Evidence
Writing Across Campus

• For consideration
• Visiting team comments
Good Luck and Thank you!