1. **Collaborate across campus locations when the course is offered in Perimeter and Atlanta.**

   Perimeter and Atlanta coordinators must collaborate on the assessment of SLOs when a course is offered on both campuses. Ideally, both coordinators would administer the identical/a similar assessment and use the same rubric/scoring instrument. Both coordinators have access to the workspace and should use their permissions to submit paragraphs for their location. The results should also include a summary of overall results.

2. **Access Taskstream and read previous reviews before starting a report.**

   - Take a few minutes to click on the “Submissions and Read Reviews” tab.
   - Click on each “Score/Results Report” to read reviewers’ feedback and suggestions.
   - Before getting started, consider using the feedback to strengthen the program’s reports and assessment processes.

   **Resource:** Taskstream
   - Access [https://login.taskstream.com/signon](https://login.taskstream.com/signon)

### Standard Requirements Checklist

3. **Select the appropriate Core Area Learning Outcome.**

   Identify the General Education/Core student learning outcome that the assessment will address.

   **Example:** Communicate clearly and effectively using written and oral communication skills.

### Assessment Plan Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Taskstream automatically populates the SLO into the assessment template.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Provide a phrase (agreed upon by both locations, and for all modalities, when applicable) that briefly describes the direct assessment (e.g., final exam, project, paper, presentation, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Example:** Respond to prompts by applying the communications skills (e.g., organization, development, mechanics/usage, and rhetorical situation) taught in class.

   **Resource:** Direct measures [https://oie.gsu.edu/our-services/assessment/guide-to-program-assessment/#1632415861457-c298a5b7-3116](https://oie.gsu.edu/our-services/assessment/guide-to-program-assessment/#1632415861457-c298a5b7-3116)

| Details/Description of Measure | Provide a brief paragraph (by campus and modality – i.e., face-to-face vs online) describing how students will be asked to display their skills, knowledge, abilities, and/or attitudes in completing an assessment (e.g., exam, project, poster, paper, etc.) and the department’s strategy for collecting and scoring the results. Also describe any differences – between the Atlanta and |
Perimeter campuses—In the way assessments will be implemented. If there is a difference in the process for ATL and PC, include a brief (but separate) narrative for each.

Example (same final, both campuses):
Perimeter and Atlanta
Students will be asked to submit a two-page response to a prompt. Using a communications rubric, each student will be graded on organization, development, mechanics/usage, and rhetorical situation. The rubric’s scale is as follows: “0 – Missing,” “1 – Beginner,” “2 – Developing,” “3 – Proficient,” and “4 – Expert.” Students will need to score at least “3 – Proficient” to pass the assessment. Faculty will use the rubric to score the assessment and provide feedback. The department will use iCollege to administer the exam, score the assessment, and collect the results.

NOTE: We discourage the use of course grades, because they sometimes include points for activities unrelated to the SLO (e.g., attendance, participation, etc.,). Instead, we encourage programs to identify an SLO-related assignment whose results can yield clear clues to students’ strengths and areas for improvement. Rubrics are the ideal assessment tool, because they allow a program to specifically identify the areas where students performed well and/or struggled.

### Target (e.g., 80% of students will achieve XX level) & rationale

In addition to offering a target (i.e., benchmark of success), programs *must* provide the rationale (i.e., the reason) that justifies their target. If implementing a previously-established assessment, explain why the program chose the target. Was it based on previous results? Is it an industry expectation/standard? If implementing a new assessment, consider explaining that the assessment/activity/assignment is in its first year and the program will collect baseline data. If the two campuses are using a different target, remember to provide the rationale.

Example: 75% of students will earn a “3 – Proficient” or “4 – Expert” on the rubric. The course prepares students for success in college, which means they must— at a minimum— show proficiency to succeed in upper-level courses.

### Supporting attachments

*Always* attach documentation that supports any assertions made in the plan/report.
- Copy of the instructions and assessment
- Copy of the scoring instrument (e.g., rubrics, scoring guide, etc.) for each assessment
- If each campus is using different assessments, include the location (ATL or PC) in the file name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Findings Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Document the student participants. Use the Sampling Worksheet (see attachment) to include the number and percentage of students that participated in the assessment by campus and modality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide only a <em>quantitative</em> list of findings that reflect the SLO, disaggregated by campus and modality. Use the “Action Plan” to provide an analysis of the results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Met? Met? Exceeded?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add/Edit Attachments and Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Always</em> attach documentation that supports any assertions made in the plan/report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completed version of the Sampling Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Copy of results (usually an Excel file)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Plan Checklist**
### Analysis/Interpretation of Assessment Findings

Meaningful analyses/interpretations go beyond numbers. Use this space to delve deeper into the summary of findings to provide the contextual information that will help faculty decide how to improve the student learning experience.

By campus and modality:
- Were there specific skills, knowledge, abilities, and attitudes that students excelled? struggled or failed to demonstrate?
- As a result, what are the areas for improvement (overall, by group, faculty member, etc.)?

Your responses will serve as the foundation for the Analysis and Action Plan (when it is due); however, it also helps programs identify areas in need of immediate or future attention.

### Impact of Past Changes on Assessment Findings

If the department implemented changes from previous assessments that had an impact on the current findings, provide a list of the changes/strategies *and* the impact.

### Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings

Describe the process the program used to share, discuss, and act (e.g., assessment committee meetings, faculty meetings, etc.) on assessment findings. Use titles and names. This information is very helpful whenever a new person assumes responsibility for assessment. Attach a copy of the meeting agendas and minutes, if any.

### Actions

List the SLOs that require action. Next, use sub-bullets to list actions (for each SLO) the program will implement in the next assessment cycle.