



GUIDE TO ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

2024- 2025

Principles of Good Assessment

Assessment processes at Utica University are guided by accreditation requirements and best practices as defined by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA), the Association for American Colleges & Universities (AAC & U), the Association for the Assessment of Learning in Higher Education (AALHE), and other agencies relevant to Utica University's curricular and co-curricular offerings.

Consistent with the guiding principles articulated in the University's *Guide to Institutional Effectiveness*, academic assessment is

- Governed by the faculty
- Non-punitive and used to inform improved change
- Relevant, realistic, and sustainable
- Well-planned and well-documented
- Student centered

Effective assessment processes are characterized by the following:

- They are organized around goals, not individual courses or activities.
- They use multiple methods to assess each individual goal.
- They rely primarily on direct evidence; indirect evidence is used to supplement the narrative.
- They provide specific evidence regarding areas of strength and areas needing improvement.
- They result in a compelling narrative.
- They produce results that are useful to planning and resource allocations.
- They are shared with and analyzed by all relevant stakeholders.

Assessment Processes and Expectations

Academic Departments and General Education

Annual Goal Reports

All academic departments that have certificate or degree programs and the General Education Program expected to assess program-level student learning and operational goals on an annual basis. Plans and results should be completed and submitted to the Senior Associate Provost by September 15. Departments are responsible for reporting assessment findings only for majors or minors in their programs.

Best practice recommends assessing each learning goal twice during a 5-year review cycle. Direct methods should be used to assess student learning. Indirect methods may be used to supplement findings. Departments are urged to use assessments that measure multiple learning

goals (“work smarter, not harder”) and capitalize on assessments already being done systematically, such as internship evaluations, student teaching reviews, and clinical assessments. Both qualitative and quantitative measures are appropriate for assessing student performance.

All full-time faculty in a program are expected to participate in the department’s assessment process, from administering the assessments to interpreting the results and generating an action plan. Efforts should be made to include adjunct faculty in the process as well. When warranted, results should be shared with other stakeholders, such as students or alumni.

The Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) reviews reports and plans and provides feedback directly to departmental faculty in face-to-face meetings and/or by scored rubric. The AAC’s review focuses primarily on assessment processes and their effectiveness.

School deans may likewise review the annual goal reports and, if warranted, provide written, formative feedback to departments. If the department’s assessment findings suggest a need for additional or increased resources, the program director/chair should make an appointment to meet with the school dean to discuss the findings and the recommended action plan/resource request. When appropriate, deans will advocate for academic departments in their school.

Departments should submit their assessment *plans* for the current academic year to their respective school deans by October 15. The executive summaries from the previous cycle should likewise be submitted to the deans.

Course Syllabi

Course-level learning goals are expected to be clearly articulated in each syllabus and congruent with program-level learning goals. Syllabi should also include information about how the learning will be assessed, when the assessments will occur, and how much each assessment is worth towards the final grade. Utica University’s Syllabus Requirements have been appended to this document.

Faculty are required to submit copies of their course syllabi to the respective school office during the first week of classes. Syllabi will be filed in the school’s shared drive.

5-Year Program Review

Academic programs are also required to complete a 5-year program review. Departments scheduled for 5-year reviews should have the self-study completed by November 1 of the academic year when it is due. Policies, processes, and procedures related to the 5-year program review may be found in the *Academic Assessment Committee’s Handbook* or accessed at <https://www.utica.edu/academic/Assessment/new/review.cfm>.

For programs that have specialized accreditors, the accreditation reports typically replace the self-study. However, the University may require the program to engage in additional analyses of data, particularly with respect to enrollment trends and economic forecasts.

Institutional Data and Indirect Assessments

Utica University systematically collects information related to its effectiveness in achieving its mission, goals, and institutional priorities. Indirect assessments of student learning include the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes, and Undergraduate Withdrawal surveys. These reports may be found at the following site: <https://www.utica.edu/ir/studentsurveys.cfm>.

To reduce the likelihood of survey fatigue, any unit that plans on administering a campus-wide survey beyond the scope of a program or department should contact the Senior Associate Provost to make sure the timing does not coincide with the administration of another survey. The University's survey schedule is posted on the following site: [Institutional Surveys at Utica University | Utica University](#)

Sharing Assessment Results

All members of a department or program have a shared responsibility regarding assessment, both doing it and analyzing the results. Program-level assessment results should be shared with and reviewed by all departmental faculty members.

In each school, programs or departments should schedule retreats at the close of the term in order for faculty to review and interpret recent assessment findings and develop plans of actions based on these results. Departmental faculty should also meet prior to the beginning of each term to discuss ways to implement the action plans and to finalize the assessment strategies for the upcoming semester.

Program-level assessment results, whether related to student learning or operational effectiveness, are likewise shared with the respective school dean and the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) as part of the annual review process. The dean uses this information to determine resource needs; AAC uses it to assess the institution's assessment processes and identify faculty development needs. The Academic Assessment Committee reports at the close of each traditional semester to the Provost and the Faculty Senate on the status of assessment at Utica University. The Senior Associate Provost is responsible for reporting significant findings and evidence of continuous improvement to the University's leadership and the Board of Trustees.

Departments are urged to look for additional ways to share assessment findings with important stakeholders—i.e. advisory boards, alumni, prospective and current students.

With all learning assessments, assessment data remains confidential and is reported only in aggregate form at the program level. Faculty and program directors should adhere to FERPA regulations when reporting assessment results. When student artifacts are being submitted as part of the annual goal report or program review, all identifiable information should be scrubbed from the document. Likewise, if "raw" data are attached as supporting evidence for an assessment finding, all identifying information (students' names, ID numbers) should be removed.

Connecting Assessment to Planning and Budgeting

Through the annual goal report process, departments and programs indicate action plans based on assessment and other data sources and indicate resource needs. If the department's assessment findings suggest a need for additional or increased resources, the program director/chair should make an appointment to meet with the school dean to discuss the findings and the recommended action plan/resource request. When appropriate, the school dean will advocate for the department at the divisional and institutional levels. Resource requests may also be made through the University's budget process.

Assessment Resources

Assessment resources are available to faculty and staff on the "Assessment at Utica University" webpage (<https://www.utica.edu/academic/Assessment/new/resources.cfm>). These resources include links to professional development materials, University documents, and rubrics to assess student learning. The University also has a blog dedicated to sharing ideas about assessment and pedagogy. Blogs may be accessed at <https://assessmentuc.blogspot.com/>.

The Senior Associate Provost is likewise a resource to support faculty and staff with their assessment processes. The office is located in DePerno 201. She may also be reached at extension 2568 or by email: aedamian@utica.edu.

Glossary of Terms Associated with Assessment

Academic Program – According to NYS Education Department, an academic program is organized around the set of educational requirements necessary to qualify for a registered degree. The curriculum or program includes general education or specialized study in depth in a particular field, or both (NYSED, 2012).

Artifacts – The work produced by students while engaged in a learning experience.

Analysis of Findings - Examination of the data gathered during the assessment cycle, including reflective consideration about what actions, if any, should be taken.

Action Plans - Actions taken to improve the program or assessment process based on the analysis of results; “Closing the loop.”

Assessment – Measures the degree to which goals have been met; provides specific evidence of strengths and areas needing improvement.

Assessment Method – Indicates how an assessment was conducted. Examples include surveys, tracking, focus groups, performance evaluations, rubrics. Also referred to as **assessment measure**.

Assessment Process – The systematic collection, review, and use of information about student learning, educational programs, student support programs, and University services undertaken to improve teaching/learning and institutional effectiveness.

Assessment Plan - A document which outlines how and when selected outcomes will be assessed.

Assessment Report - An annual document based on the Assessment Plan that presents and explains assessment results and shows how assessment results are being used to improve the program.

Benchmark - A standard or point of reference against which things may be compared or assessed.

Closing the loop – The term used to signify the next step or ongoing steps in the assessment cycle. Also referred to as **action plan**.

Co-curricular Units – The areas outside the classroom where the University also achieves its educational mission.

Course-embedded Assessments – Direct methods to assess student-learning that are well integrated into and organic to the educational experience.

Course Student Learning Goals (CSLG) – the measurable learning/knowledge/skill expectations for all students completing an academic course, documented in the syllabi and program review documents. Direct measures are to be used; indirect measures/results will be

used to support the direct measure findings. CSGL are identified by faculty, described in the course syllabus, and it is the faculty of each course who determine what to measure and the tool to use for this faculty-driven process.

Course Operational Goals –focus on the functioning of the course, rather than the learning achieved by the students. Examples include development of new courses, deletion of a course, edits to a course, and course mapping to program goals.

Course Syllabus – A document that lays out the expectations, including the learning goals, for a single course.

Curriculum Map – A matrix representing a program's learning goals and indicating where they are developed in a program and to what extent.

Direct Methods of Assessment – Measures used to document student performance. Examples of direct measures include rubrics for capstone projects, portfolios, papers, and performances.

5-Year Program Review – Required of academic departments, the 5-year program review is a self-study completed within a 5-year review cycle. The self-study requires departments to examine curriculum, student learning, faculty expertise, enrollment in the major(s) and minor(s), and other areas of relevance to the institution.

Findings - Results (evidence, data and/or information) gathered from assessment.

Formative Assessments – Assessments that occur throughout the learning process that aim to understand and, therefore, improve learning.

Institutional Effectiveness - Institutional effectiveness refers to how well an institution is achieving its mission and goals. An effective institution is characterized by a clearly defined mission that articulates who it serves, what it aspires to be, and what it values. Likewise, an effective institution has clear goals that are broadly communicated to its stakeholders.

Indirect Methods – Measures used to assess students' perceptions of their learning and educational experiences. Examples of indirect measures include surveys, focus groups, and interviews.

Institutional Student Learning Goals – The measurable student learning goals that are realized in the complete educational experience, both curricular and co-curricular.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) – Measurable values that indicate the extent to which the institution is achieving its mission and goals.

Metrics - Standards of measurement used to assess efficiency, performance, progress, or quality.

Mission Statement - A concise statement outlining the purpose of a program, who it serves, and what distinguishes it.

Program Student Learning Goals (PSLG) – the measurable learning/knowledge/skill expectations for all students graduating from a particular curriculum/major or students being served by a particular unit.

Program Operational Goals – Goals set for and by a program, usually during the 5-year program review process. However operational goals may be set during a review for an external accreditor or in the interim between program reviews. Operational goals address the functioning of the program.

Program Review – Required self-study process completed by each academic program. It is usually conducted on a five-year rotation, unless external program accreditation cycles require a different review timeline.

Rubric - Specific sets of criteria that clearly define for both student and teacher what a range of acceptable and unacceptable performance looks like. Criteria define descriptors of ability at each level of performance and assign values to each level.

Strategic plan – A plan developed through a participatory process that articulates the University’s mission and values and identifies long-term goals and the tactics to achieve them. A strategic plan reflects the institution’s priorities and informs decisions about resources.

Target - A value that indicates whether or not a goal has been achieved.

Validity - The extent to which an assessment measures what it is supposed to measure and the extent to which inferences and actions made on the basis of test scores are appropriate and accurate.

Value added – Evidence that shows the effects educational providers have had on students during their programs of study beyond what would have occurred through natural maturation. A comparison of the knowledge and skills students bring to the educational process with the knowledge and skills they demonstrate upon completion of the educational process.

Syllabus Requirements

Course syllabi are documents that describe both the content and format of a course and clearly identify expectations for students and faculty members. Utica University has identified required and optional elements for course syllabi and created boilerplate language for specific required elements of the syllabus. This language is contained in this document.

Required Elements for all Courses

1. University name
2. Course prefix
3. Course number
4. Course title
5. Semester and year
6. Class meeting times
7. Course credit hours
8. Course prerequisites and co-requisites
9. Contact information for the instructor, including office hours
10. Departmentally approved course learning objectives
11. Course summary description (Catalog description)
12. Required and recommended readings
13. Schedule including topics and assignment deadlines
14. Breakdown of what percent of the final grade is allocated to each assignment
15. Translation table between numerical grades and letter grades
16. Utica University's policy for Intellectual Honesty
17. Utica University's policy for academic accommodations

Required Elements for Specific Delivery Modes

- Netiquette policy: required for all online courses and companion shells that contain graded discussion threads or virtual interactions.
- Class meeting times: required for all on-ground and blended courses.
- Identified off-campus experiences: required for courses that include graded off-campus experiences (e.g., field trips) that occur outside of the scheduled meeting time.

Optional Elements

1. Attendance policy
2. Statements about modifications to the syllabus/schedule and class cancellation
3. Information related to AI, academic honesty, peer tutoring, and academic accommodations.

Syllabus Elements (may be copied & pasted)

Grading Scale

This is the University's default grading scale. Faculty members may deviate from this default scale but must indicate clearly in the syllabus when they do so.

Undergraduate Grading Scale			
A	94 – 100	C	74 – 76.99
A-	90 – 93.99	C-	70 – 73.99
B+	87 – 89.99	D+	67 – 69.99
B	84 – 86.99	D	60 - 66.99
B-	80 – 83.99	F	0 - 59.99
C+	77 - 79.99		

Graduate Grading Scale			
A	94 – 100	C+	77 - 79.99
A-	90 – 93.99	C	74 – 76.99
B+	87 – 89.99	F	0 - 73.99
B	84 – 86.99		
B-	80 – 83.99		

Netiquette

"Netiquette" is civil and respectful behavior in electronic communication, including discussion forums, chat services, email, videoconferences, and social media. Such behavior is essential to the integrity of the academic environment and the free exchange of ideas. To keep your communication academically professional and appropriate you should avoid:

- Personal attacks. The subject under discussion is always the content of the idea and not the characteristics of the person expressing that idea.
- USING ALL CAPITAL LETTERS IN A SENTENCE, which implies you are yelling at the reader.
- Using many exclamation points to end your sentence as this also implies you are yelling at, or are very upset with, the reader!!!!!!!!
- Writing offensive or sarcastic messages.
- Sending numerous emails with the same point in a short period of time.

To keep your communication professional, remember the following principles:

- Always respect the opinions of others and keep your opinions positive. A robust discussion will have disagreements, even strong disagreements, but should not degenerate into personal attack.
- Always avoid offensive, rude, and sarcastic messages. If you receive a message of this nature, do not respond in the same tone. If this type of communication continues from someone, inform your faculty member.

- Never send a message when you are angry or upset. Leave it in draft form, walk away, and review it later after you have calmed down.

Utica University is committed to maintaining an open and free learning environment. Violations of the netiquette policy may result in disciplinary action, including being referred to the Student Judicial Process for violation of the Code of Student Conduct.

Academic Honesty

Academic honesty is necessary for the free exchange of ideas and Utica University expects academic honesty from all students.

Academic dishonesty includes both cheating and plagiarism. Plagiarism is the intentional or unintentional use of other people's ideas, words, and/or factual information without crediting the source. Cheating refers to both the giving and the receiving of unauthorized assistance in the taking of examinations or in the creation of assigned and/or graded class work.

Utica University faculty are authorized to assign a wide range of academic penalties for incidents of academic dishonesty. Depending on the nature of the offense, the penalty may include a reduced grade, or no credit for the assignment, a reduced grade for the course, or a grade of F for the course.

Incidents of academic dishonesty are reported to the Office of Academic Affairs. A repeat offense, or any particularly egregious first offence, will be referred to the Academic Standards Committee which may recommend a more severe penalty than that imposed by the faculty member.

<https://www.utica.edu/academic/facultyinfo/ascacadinteg.cfm>

Academic Accommodations

Any student who needs accommodation in this class due to a documented disability should speak with me as soon as possible, preferably within the first two weeks of class. You should also contact the Office of Accessibility Services (315-792-3032) in order to determine eligibility for services and to receive an accommodation letter. We will work with you to help you in your efforts to master the course content in an effective and appropriate way.

<https://www.utica.edu/directory/center-student-success/office-learning-services>

Statement on Artificial Intelligence (suggested wording for faculty who do not want students using AI)

Artificial Intelligence (AI) software (e.g. Chat GPT) should not be used for writing assignments in this class. Please be aware that although AI appears to make writing easy, the work it produces

is not always reliable and accurate. In addition, using AI is fairly easy to detect. More importantly, if you choose to let AI write a paper for you, you will lose the ability to learn, grow, and develop important skills that are part of the ultimate goal for attending this university. If you use AI, you are committing plagiarism (i.e., using ideas and words that are not your own) and are not fulfilling the requirements associated with writing your own paper. Plagiarism is a form of cheating and will be penalized accordingly.

Tutoring Services

Peer Tutoring Center

Peer Tutoring is available to on ground undergraduate students or any undergraduate student who can come to tutoring in person on campus. The university provides tutoring in many subject areas, including writing. The Peer Tutoring Center is located in the Library Learning Commons, but we have a satellite location, open to all in Hubbard 109. Please use the Navigate Student app to find tutors for appointments/drop-in availability in the Library or the satellite location.

Graduate/Upper-level Writing Support

We have a Writing Consultant GA who will prioritize working with graduate level writing, but will have some limited availability for upper-level undergraduate writing as well. This tutor will work online over zoom or in the Library Learning Commons. For more information on how to make an appointment with the graduate writing tutor, see our website, Utica.edu/tutoring

Online Tutoring/ Tutoring after hours

For tutoring online, please use ThinkingStorm, which provides 24/7 live video tutoring in many subject areas as well as asynchronous tutoring services such as feedback on papers from a writing tutor. This resource is the primary resource for online students. Please use your Utica Student username at <http://www.utica.edu/thinkingstorm>

ELEMENT	Exemplary	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Implemented Improvements Based on Previous Reviewers' Feedback	Provides clear and concrete evidence of how improvements from the previous assessment review were implemented. This may include improvements made as a result of assessment or improvements made to the department's assessment processes.	Some but not all of the recommendations for improving the department's assessment process were implemented. If action was not taken when warranted, a reasonable explanation is given as for why.	The report acknowledged feedback from previous reviews and outlined a plan for implementing these suggestions. However, the changes have not yet been fully implemented.	Feedback from reviewers from previous assessment cycles does not appear to have been considered for this cycle, and there is little to no explanation for why this is so. .
	<u>Comments:</u>			
Student Learning Goals	Goals are clearly articulated, observable, and measurable. They are congruent with the department's mission. Learning outcomes are clear.	Goals are observable and measurable, but the language of some is vague. Each goal is appropriate to the department's mission. The desired outcomes may lack clarity.	The goals are targets, not measurable goals. As such, they are not necessarily measurable.	Most of the goals are unclear, not measurable, and/or inadequate for meaningful assessment.
	<u>Comments:</u>			
Plan for Student Learning Assessment	The program has a sustainable assessment plan that describes when and how each learning goal will be assessed and how improvements based on findings will be implemented. Plan is based on thoughtful inquiry into student learning.	The program has an assessment plan but does not indicate how improvements will be implemented and assessed. The plan may not be sustainable and does not seem to be informed by inquiry into student learning.	The program has an assessment plan, but not all of the learning goals are included in the plan. Assessment does not appear to be ongoing or systematic in the program.	The program lacks a formal plan for assessing the student learning goals; it relies on short-term planning, such as selecting the goal or course to assess in the current year.

	<u>Comments:</u>			
Student Learning Assessment Methods and Targets	Multiple methods that align with learning goals are used to assess student learning. Methods are mostly direct. When warranted, student learning is assessed at multiple points in the curriculum. Targets and/or benchmarks are clearly indicated and reflect reasonable but challenging expectations.	Assessment methods align with the learning goals, but not all goals are measured by multiple methods. Targets and/or benchmarks are identified, but it is not clear how they were determined.	Most of the methods are indirect or non-specific (e.g. “exam”). Assessment tools are vague, poorly defined, and targets/benchmarks not indicated.	There is no clear relationship between the goals and the assessment methods. Targets are not specified, and measures are not acceptable for good assessment. (E.g. course grades)
	<u>Comments:</u>			
Student Learning Assessment Results and Analysis	Program-level results are clearly presented and easy to follow. They relate directly to the goals being measured. Results are specific enough to indicate strengths and weaknesses; they show precisely where and how students are performing at or beyond expectations and where they are performing below expectations. Supporting evidence is attached.	Clear and well-organized discussion of results is presented. Some results are incomplete, or findings are not yet available, and it is not entirely clear how the results have been interpreted or what they mean to the department. Trends or patterns, even when appropriate, are not noted. Supporting evidence is included.	Program-level results are presented, but the presentation is difficult to follow, or the results are summative and do not identify specific areas of strength or areas where improvement is needed. There is little analysis of findings, and no interpretation is provided. Little supporting evidence is included.	No evidence of assessment results is reported, or the evidence is so general and so brief, it does not report anything meaningful.

	<u>Comments:</u>			
Action Plans: Using & Sharing Assessment Results	Evidence demonstrates that assessment-based discussions have led to action or recommendations have been enacted. Improvements are <i>program</i> level, not course level, and concern curriculum or pedagogy. Results are shared with key stakeholders external to the department.	Evidence suggests that assessment-based discussions have considered action, but these actions lack specificity or are confined to a single course or assessment method—i.e. they are not really program level. The program indicated a resource need based on assessment results but did not indicate how the need might be addressed.	An action plan has been identified, but it is not clear how it resulted from assessment findings or assessment-based discussions. No explanation provided when the report concludes that no action is required.	No evidence that the department is using assessment findings to inform planning or continuous improvement.
Operational Goals & Evidence	<u>Comments:</u>			
	Goals are clearly articulated and measurable; they are assessed by valid measures, and solid evidence indicates the extent to which the goals have been achieved.	Goals are clearly articulated, but there is an over-reliance on one assessment method. Evidence that the goals have been achieved may be subjective. Further documentation might be required.	Goals are articulated, but the language is vague. There is a lack of alignment between the goals and the supporting evidence.	Goals are more of a process or action step than an outcome; questionable conclusions are made regarding the extent to which the goals were achieved.
	<u>Comments:</u>			

Operational Planning & Resource Needs	Planned improvements are clearly identified; they are specific and relate directly to assessment findings. Action plans are appropriate given current resources and demonstrated need.	The connection between the action plan and/or resource request and the assessment results or other evidence is not readily apparent.	Action plans are identified, but they are vague and non-specific. Plans may not be clearly linked to evidence or assessment results.	No operational plan indicated.
	Comments:			