

**Assessment Advisory Council (AAC)**  
**Process for Review of Academic Assessment Plans**  
(November 2005)

---

By fall 2004, each academic department/school is to have on file for annual review its academic assessment plan, which must contain the critical elements consistent with effective educational practice, as well as Goal 5 of the IBHE *Illinois Commitment*. The role of the members of the AAC is to examine the documents during the 2004-05 academic year and to recommend an annual process that both satisfies the requirement by the IBHE and facilitates a reasonable and appropriate exercise for chairs, directors, and faculty.

The assessment plans will be reviewed using a rubric developed by the members of the AAC (see attachment) which represents both the necessary elements and a range of sophistication and completion within each. The focus of the examination is the evidence within the program's plan that reveals a systematic and dynamic assessment process.

Beginning with the 2005-06 academic year the AAC will review assessment plans based upon the Program Review Schedule. Each fall the AAC will review the current assessment plans of schools/departments who have programs scheduled for Program Review two years from the fall the review is initiated. The specific schedule of activities is as follows:

- a. Chairs/directors submit completed academic assessment plans (by academic major) to the Director of University Assessment Services (UAS) via e-mail or disk (UAS staff posts the plans on the UAS web site at <http://www.assessment.ilstu.edu/program>) as modifications are made.
- b. Each fall semester a two or three-person team within the AAC reviews the elements of the plan using the assessment plan rubric and records comments and questions, and returns the report to UAS.
- c. In February/March (~20 months from the Program Review deadline) of the spring semester, the Director of UAS contacts the chair/director to discuss the feedback provided by the AAC peer-review team. The results may necessitate revisions or additions to the public plan.
- d. The UAS will provide consultation to the chairs/directors in the development of any suggested modifications. It is recommended that changes be finalized 14-16 months before the Program Review deadline.
- e. A final report of "Academic Assessment Plan Status" is submitted to the appropriate Dean's Office.

On-going assumptions and processes:

- a. It is assumed that the chair/director and faculty within a discipline will continue to engage in educational processes that improve the academic program through curricular planning, delivery, and assessment of student learning outcomes.
- b. It is appropriate and expected that the documents submitted to the AAC will be a summary of the more detailed plan being used at the department/school level.
- c. The feedback supplied by the peer-review team from the AAC is designed to be formative in nature, with the intent to provide constructive comments that may be useful to the chair/director.
- d. The director and research associate of UAS will be available to assist the department/school in any areas requested in order to facilitate improved processes and strategies. If there are perceived deficiencies in the documentation of the plan or the plan itself, the director of UAS and the chair/director of the department or school will work together to develop an action plan for improvement. Follow-up and reporting mechanisms will be designed on a case-by-case basis.
- e. Once the program's documented assessment plan is determined to be at least "established" (according to elements within the "Status and Implementation Rubric"), the chair/director will be expected to submit to UAS a one-page "update" annually, independent of the Program Review process (on or about March 15). This update should document any revisions made to the plan within the previous year, as well as changes and improvements made to the program *based on evidence reviewed as a result of assessment-related strategies*. Additionally, the report could document conclusion that have been drawn as a result of recent evidence that supports past changes to the curriculum. In other words, is there evidence that curricular or other revisions have resulted in the desired outcomes?
- f. The AAC will review the "annual update" documents and give formative feedback to chairs/directors.