Text in green provides guidelines, instructions, information, etc. from UPAC to programs.

This assessment report template may need to be modified to capture the assessment practices of your program. Please feel free to use and modify this template as needed. Sections which appear in the template can be duplicated multiple times, or alternate ways of presenting your program’s assessment practices may require considerably changing the template to suit your program’s needs. The subsections provided later in this template will likely need major alterations to communicate work on multiple measures assessments, or to include information about indirect assessment alongside direct assessment.

UPAC’s goal with this template is to give programs an effective way to communicate their assessment practices, but we recognize that this template might not be the right starting point for some programs. If the information requested herein is communicated more effectively by dispensing with this template altogether, a program should feel free to upload a Word or PDF document into Canvas which looks considerably different than this template.

UPAC’s overall goal in interacting with programs is to keep the lines of communication open and accompany programs in their assessment process. As assessment is a journey, we recognize that there may be complete sections alongside newly proposed assessments where data has not yet been collected and/or analyzed.

As you approach your APR submission year, UPAC will provide feedback (and eventually an evaluation) of your assessment process per UPAC’s rubric. That is, 5 years prior to the program’s APR, UPAC will provide feedback, and 2 years prior to the program’s APR, UPAC will provide feedback and a formal evaluation in the form of a letter addressed to APR.

UPAC Assessment Report

*Department of Gemology*

BS Gemology

Submitted February 2021  
  
Please substitute the department and program name as well as the submission date. Additionally, please list the programs that are included in this report.

In each section, include a brief description of how your program/department members share responsibility in the assessment process, as applicable.

# Program Student Learning Outcomes

What are the programmatic learning outcomes associated with your assessment program?

1. Students will be able to identify a gemstone
2. Students will be able to grade a gem
3. Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of national and international laws regulating the mining and sale of gems
4. Students will distinguish natural, synthetic, and treated gems.
5. Students will assess gemstone value.

# Curriculum Map

UPAC is looking to verify that (1) each SLO is assessed in at least one course and that (2) each SLO is covered in at least one of the courses listed. UPAC does not evaluate the use of labels I, R, M beyond their concern related to SLO coverage. A program may therefore satisfy UPAC expectations by including only “A” labels where appropriate.

Clearly articulate any exceptional circumstances in your curriculum and/or assessment planning.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | SLO 1 | SLO 2 | SLO 3 |
| GEM 101 | I |  | I |
| GEM 201 |  | I, A | R |
| GEM 301 | R |  |  |
| GEM 401 |  |  | M |
| GEM 499 | M, A |  | A |

**I:** The SLO is introduced to students in this course.

**R**: The SLO is reinforced in this course

**M**: The SLO is mastered by students in this course

**A:** The SLO is assessed in this course

# Timeline

A program should assess at least one outcome per year and plan to have all outcomes assessed during one academic program review cycle (a program review cycle is once every seven years unless review follows external accreditation cycle). Complete the table below (or provide equivalent information in an alternate format) indicating assessment activities that have or are presently being carried out during the current review cycle.

Gemology timeline:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 |
| SLO 1 & 2 | SLO 1 & 2 | SLO 3 | SLO 4 | SLO 3 | SLO 1 & 2 | SLO 5 |

Assessment Results, Analysis, and Action Steps

The section below shows a sample template which can be used for a single assessment measure addressing a single program’s student learning outcomes. An assessment which is not a single measure may need to deviate from this template considerably, while multiple single assessments can be reported by copying this section of the template multiple times.

The template organizes assessments by measure, but this could be reformatted to be organized by SLO or over time by alternative formats if it includes the assessment measures, rubrics, results, analyses, and proposed actions.

# Assessment 1: Identify 10 Gems

Please precede each assessment with a page break and label the assessment so that UPAC can reference them in internal discussion and documentation.

## Student Learning Outcome Assessed

SLO1: Students will be able to identify a gemstone

## Measure

Each student in GEM 499 was given 10 gemstones and asked to identify them.

## Delivery (How the assessment was implemented/administered)

UPACs primary concern related to delivery is consistency. If, for example, the task is given as an optional and ungraded assignment by one instructor while another instructor in the same semester assigns the task as a graded homework assignment, the results cannot be aggregated.

The task was part of a mid-term exam administered to all students in GEM 499 during the Fall 2022 and Fall 2023 semesters. The same 10 gems were used for this assessment as they were available for inspection on a central lab table. Only one section of GEM 499 was offered, and the delivery was identical for all students.

## Rubric

UPAC understands that rubrics will vary greatly depending on discipline. UPAC is looking to verify that the rubric specifies how a student is classified and that the classifications do not overlap. If your program doesn’t utilize a rubric, please provide a discussion of the assessment criteria.

Each student was classified as either exceptional, proficient, satisfactory, or underdeveloped. The classification criteria are given below.

* Exceptional: All 10 gemstones were correctly identified.
* Proficient: Either 8 or 9 of the gemstones were correctly identified.
* Satisfactory: Either 5, 6, or 7 of the gemstones were correctly identified.
* Underdeveloped: Less than 5 of the gemstones were correctly identified.

## Benchmark

UPAC understands that benchmark levels will vary greatly across disciplines. UPAC does not expect to make judgements about whether a particular benchmark is too high or too low. It is reasonable that programs will alter benchmarks over different iterations of their assessment plan. Not meeting a benchmark does not make the assessment or the program “bad”. In the absence of a predetermined benchmark, briefly indicate general expectation for student performance.

Example: At least 85% of students are classified as satisfactory or above.

## Results

UPAC expects to see the results of the assessment. Any additional data that the program used in their analysis should also be included. In this example, the breakdown by gem-type is not necessarily part of the rubric or benchmark but provides valuable additional insight into student learning. Since this data is referenced in the programmatic analysis, it needs to be reported.

Students received the following classifications

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Fall 2022 | Fall 2023 |
| Exceptional | 5/29 | 4/26 |
| Proficient | 9/29 | 6/26 |
| Satisfactory | 12/29 | 12/26 |
| Underdeveloped | 3/29 | 4/26 |

The aggregate rate of successful identification is given below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gem | Fall 2022 | Fall 2023 |
| amber | 26/29 | 24/26 |
| beryl | 12/29 | 14/26 |
| chalcedony | 22/29 | 16/26 |
| coral | 15/29 | 18/26 |
| emerald | 18/29 | 14/26 |
| hessonite | 16/29 | 16/26 |
| lapis lazuli | 28/29 | 26/26 |
| moonstone | 5/29 | 15/26 |
| pearl | 29/29 | 25/26 |
| ruby | 18/29 | 15/26 |

## Analysis

UPAC expects that the analysis is directly aligned to the supplied data and the associated programmatic learning outcomes. Please provide a clear connection between the data collected and the analysis provided.

The benchmark was met in both semesters as 90% and 92% of students were classified as at least proficient. Students in the Fall 2022 course demonstrated less success in identifying moonstones than any other type. This result demonstrated the need to devote more attention to the distinct properties of moonstone that relate to correct identification. [Please use this space to also include other informative and/or unexpected patterns observed in the results.]

## Actions Taken

This section will describe those actions that were taken as a result of previously collected data. Please be clear on how the data supports the actions taken. If these actions are to be taken in the future, please add who will be involved in implementing proposed actions. Examples of possible actions include: curricular changes, modifying instructional practices, changing your assessment tasks, changing your benchmark, modifying learning outcomes, modifying assessment plans/timeline, etc.

Example 1: In the Fall of 2023, more attention was given in classroom lecture to the distinct properties of moonstone that relate to correct identification. The aggregate rate of success improved significantly; moving from 5/29 in the Fall of 2022 to 15/26 in the Fall 2023.

Example 2: In the Spring of 2028, instead of providing students with images of specific gems, students were tasked with identifying gems based on provided properties. The rate of success was much lower, going from 27/35 in Fall 2027 to 11/32 in Spring 2028. We feel that this is an important task that students can identify gems not only from their visual appearance, but also based on characteristics. The department assessment committee is going to start conversations with the curriculum committee, and we hope to propose curricular changes to GEM 101 at a department meeting in Fall 2028.

## Writing in the Major (as applicable)

Effective Summer 2025, all undergraduate programs that are not exempt from UPAC review must include evidence of writing-in-the-major assessment as part of their 5-year and 2-year assessment reports. Describe the goals of your Writing-in-the-Major program, assessment method(s), assessment results, and revisions made to the program based on assessment results and/or other reasons.

….

Below, there is a copy of the sections above for a second assessment. If this template is being used (or adopted with modifications), programs can make as many copies of this section as needed. Because assessment is an ongoing process, programs may have assessment in progress. Thus, for some task(s), it is reasonable that some subsections may be missing. For instance, a program may have a previously-proposed task for which data hasn’t yet been collected, or a program may have collected data on a task but hasn’t tabulated results yet, etc. That is, the expectation isn't that each assessment task has all subsections above completed. In addition, the analysis and proposed actions based on a previous assessment might lead a program to develop a different task which assesses the same learning outcome.

# Assessment 2: Bureau of Land Management Mining Law

## Student Learning Outcome Assessed

Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of national and international laws regulating the mining and sale of gems

## Task

Each student in GEM 499 was asked to describe the changes made in 1955 to the U.S. Bureau of Land Management Mining Law.

## Rubric

Each student was classified as either exceptional, proficient, satisfactory, or underdeveloped. The classification criteria are given below.

…

## Benchmark

….

## Delivery

The task was part of the final exam administered to all students in GEM 499 during the Fall 2023. There were two sections of GEM 499 taught by two different instructors that semester. Each instructor agreed that this task would account for exactly 10% of their final exam and that both instructor’s final exam would account for 30% of their overall course grade.

## Results

Students received the following classifications

…

The aggregate rate of successful identification is given below.

…

## Analysis

…

## Actions Taken

…

## Writing in the Major (as applicable)

…