CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENT LEARNING FEEDBACK SYSTEMS

*Note: This document is intended to add to the knowledge of peer reviewers and program leaders. Its maturity levels are unrelated to the Program Review Rubric's rating scale.

Exceptional and Aspirational	Satisfactory	Insufficient
Characteristics of a Robust Program Feedback System*		
1. VARIETY OF STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK Program assesses or gets feedback from a variety of stakeholder groups, e.g., students, employers, advisory committee, secondary teachers or partner four-year institutions, accreditation, internship/clinical supervisors, alumni, local community, others).	Program gets feedback from at least one stakeholder group. This is often feedback from students on assessments.	Program gets feedback from no stakeholder groups.
2. DIVERSITY OF ASSESSMENT MEASURES To strengthen confidence in data findings, the program uses a diversity of assessment tools (more than one) such as direct assessment (portfolios, projects or assignments with rubrics, internship/clinical feedback forms, juried performance rubrics, co-curricular experience reflection, accreditation findings) and indirect assessment (surveys, KPIs, and interviews).	Program uses two or more types of assessment tools.	Program uses only one assessment tool.
3. MULTIPLE DATA-GATHERING POINTS OVER TIME Program uses an effective measurement frequency that includes multiple data gathering points during a typical student's degree program, e.g., measuring students' performance at the beginning, mid-point, and end of a degree program pathway.	Program measures a typical student's learning performance of program level competencies at least once during his/her program.	Program does not measure a typical student's learning performance of program level competencies during his/her program.
4. DIAGNOSTIC CAPACITY TO REVEAL PROGRAM STENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES Program uses/designs effective assessment tools or measurement methods so that the feedback information provides concise, diagnostic information revealing the strengths and weakness of program performance. For example, a program measures more than effective writing. It measures several quality characteristics of effective writing to include 1. conventional writing mechanics, 2. organizational clarity, 3. robust transition strategies, 4. strong thesis or argument development, 5. evidence of performing an expected Bloom's critical thinking level, 6. synthesis of supporting references, and others. This array of ratings verify uniform learning performance or reveal gaps useful for further research.	Program uses/designs assessment tools or methods so that the feedback information provides workable diagnostic information revealing the strengths and weakness of program performance. For example, a program measures more than effective writing. It measures some of the quality characteristics of effective writing to include 1. conventional writing mechanics, 2. organizational clarity, 3. robust transition strategies, 4. strong thesis or argument development, 5. evidence of performing an expected Bloom's critical thinking level, 6. synthesis of supporting references, and others.	Program does not use assessment methods having the diagnostic capacity for revealing strengths and weaknesses of program performance.
5. NEARLY ALL STUDENTS ASSESSED Program assesses the program level learning competencies of nearly all its students.	Program assesses the program level learning competencies of a majority of its students.	Program assesses the program level learning competencies of less than half of its students.

Exceptional and Aspirational	Satisfactory	Insufficient
Characteristics of a Robust Program Feedback System*		
6. EXTERNAL BENCHMARKING USED Program uses external benchmarking to compare its performance to a group of similar programs at other institutions that are often aspirational peers (small batch or regional scope). Because direct learning assessment is seldom standardized among programs at different institutions, this method favors more indirect assessments of learning. For example, a program might compare their transfer student performance in junior level courses at UW as compared to other community colleges' students at UW and UW native students. Comparisons among peers might also include selection of Wyoming institutions for indicators such as course success rates in the Wyoming Central Station data resource.	Program uses limited external benchmarking that compares the program against just one or two external programs that may not be aspirational, or it uses internal benchmarking. It may include student performance among selected programs on common LCCC institutional competency rubrics or may include some use of indirect learning assessment benchmarking such as Wyoming course success rates displayed within the Central Station.	Program does not use benchmarking.
7. COMPARISON USING LEARNING PERFORMANCE NORMS (may not apply to the majority of programs) Program applies external learning performance norms such as those found in national certification exams or licensure exams. This type relates more often to student testing performance (above or below a mean) for program learning competencies and involve large populations often national in scope.	Program uses limited norming that does not relate to direct assessment of program learning competencies but does include some use of indirect assessment norming such as that found in national CCSSE survey results on student engagement.	Program does not use norms.
8. ASSESSMENT ALIGNED TO SUPPORT COURSE SEQUENCING DESIGN Program aligns its learning assessment to its course sequencing to verify the effectiveness of scaling up student learning (introduction, reinforce, emphasize, mastery) to develop student proficiency of program level competencies. Program completes a curriculum map that shows what sequence of courses are used to capture learning assessment data.	Program shows some alignment between its feedback system or learning assessments and student performance on program level learning competencies. Program completes a curriculum map that shows which courses are used to capture learning assessment data.	Program shows no alignment between its feedback system or learning assessments and student performance on program level learning competencies.
9. SYSTEM ADAPTS TO STAKEHOLDER NEEDS Program provides for adaptability of the system with regular review and upgrading of processes to ensure assessments remain current with stakeholder needs. For example, each year faculty review and adjust the assignments students load or post into a portfolio so that they respond to changes in workplace needs.	Program provides for limited adaptability of the system by annually verifying with stakeholders that its learning assessments relate to current workplace/transfer needs. For example, each year faculty review and adjust the assignments students load or post into a portfolio that respond to changes in workplace needs.	Program's system does not include an adaptability feature.
10. LEARNING DATA SHARED WITH STAKEHOLDERS Annually, program formally shares its learning performance information with its multiple stakeholders.	Annually, program formally shares its learning performance information with at least one stakeholder group. For example, program shares information at annual advisory board meetings.	Program does not formally share its performance information with stakeholders.