

Results, Review, and Recommendation (R3)

# Results, Review, and Recommendation (R3) Process

## Introduction

The Johnson College Results, Review, and Recommendation (R3) Process is structured to allow the program faculty and all levels of administration to regularly gauge the effectiveness and efficiency of college academic programs and Administrative, Educational, and Student Support (AES) Units. Programs and AES Units undergo review on a staggered, five-year cycle according to the Assessment Cycle Timeline.

## Procedure

The Johnson College Assessment Team (JCAT) reviews the assessment processes used by each department including the proper and robust use of templates, use of data in decision-making, and progress toward goals and objectives. The attached Program Assessment Plan rubric is used to provide feedback to the programs on the use of their assessment system. This process also reviews aggregated unit-level data such as Employer Surveys, Student Engagement and Exit Surveys, and Graduate Follow-up Surveys to identify areas of strength and weakness. The committee completes a Committee Data Review Form which provides feedback to programs and AES Units. Programs and AES Units will incorporate recommendations into their assessment processes moving forward.

**Name of Program/Department: Date of Review:**

When using this rubric, evaluators will need to refer to the Annual or Periodic template for the program. Programs may consider providing reports that use data (i.e. budget requests or curricular revision) to provide more evidence for the areas below.

When reviewing the materials, evaluators must look both holistically at the templates as well as individually at the goals, objectives, and accompanying data sections.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Target** | **Needs Revision** | **Below Standard** |
| **Mission Statement** | Mission statement is aligned with multiple institutional (i.e. mission, Strategic Plan), program (i.e. mission, conceptual framework), and accreditation (i.e. professional standards) documents. Statement is concise and addresses a broad description of the purpose of the program. | A mission statement is provided with little alignment to appropriate institutional, program, or accreditation documents. Minimal changes in the structure of the statement are needed as addressed in the comments. | Mission statement is either not available or does not adhere to the overall mission of the institution. Statement is not worded in a manner that provides a concise description of the program and/or the program’s purpose. |
| **Assessment of Department** | Annual and Periodic Templates are followed. Content is substantive and reflects a thorough assessment of the entire program/department. Areas for improvement are identified.Follow up is performed on all prior changes and recommendations. | The scope of the goals/objectives provides only a partial examination of the program and student learning throughout the program. | The goals/objectives are too narrow to provide information about program function and success. |
| **SOAR/SWOT Analysis** | The SOAR/SWOT analyses represent a thorough review of the program/department. Analyses have been updated on an annual basis to reflect changes in the program/department. | The SOAR/SWOT analyses are solid, but may benefit from some deeper reflection. Minor changes have been made to the analyses over the years, but not to the level of reflecting continuous improvement. | The SOAR/SWOT analyses are superficial and have not been updated on an annual basis. |
| **Use of Data** | Evidence is provided that data were used to informreflection on the program. Evidence might include: influence on curricular decisions, assessment policies,program design, or budget requests. Language mustclearly indicate where decisions were influenced by data (even if no change occurred). | Minimal evidence exists to indicate that datacollected were used systematically by the program/department to influence evaluation the program AND/OR Language used does not clearly indicateuse of data | Use of data not evident. |
| **Closing the Loop** | Updates on action plans, program/ department plans, objective results, etc. have been provided on at least an annual basis. The assessment cycle has been closed where applicable. | Updates on action plans, program/ department plans, objective results, etc. have been addressed, but closure is not identified. | Action plans, program/ department plans, objective results, etc. have not been addressed since identified. |

**Members of Review Committee:**

**Description of data reviewed:**

**Areas of commendation or strengths:**

**Areas of potential concern:**

**Recommendations for department:**

**Additional analysis requested by committee:**

**Additional comments if necessary:**