



Institutional Effectiveness Framework Implementation-audit form

Academic Department

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

Component	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Rating (0-3)	Evidence/Comments
1. All courses have clearly defined CLOs aligned with department competencies	All courses have clearly defined CLOs with explicit and consistent alignment to department competencies	Most courses have defined CLOs aligned with department competencies, but consistency varies	Some courses have defined CLOs with limited alignment to department competencies	No courses have defined CLOs or alignment with department competencies		
2. CLOs are measurable and appropriate to course level	All CLOs are clearly measurable and appropriately matched to course level with clear action verbs	Most CLOs are measurable and mostly appropriate to course level, but inconsistencies exist	Some CLOs are measurable but many are vague or not appropriate to course level	CLOs are either not defined or not expressed in measurable terms		
3. CLO-LoC matrix exists for all courses	Complete CLO-LoC matrices exist for all courses with consistent format	Most courses have CLO-LoC matrices, but some are missing or incomplete	Some courses have CLO-LoC matrices but many are missing	No CLO-LoC matrices exist		
4. CLO-LoC connections are logical and meaningful	All CLO-LoC connections are clearly logical, meaningful, and supported by evidence	Most CLO-LoC connections are logical but some inconsistencies exist	Some connections exist but many are unclear or seem arbitrary	No logical connections between CLOs and LoCs, or matrices do not exist		
5. Course grades are distributed logically and appropriately across different CLOs	Course grades are distributed logically and appropriately across different CLOs in a balanced way.	Course grades are distributed logically and appropriately across different CLOs but with some imbalance in	Course grades are distributed across different CLOs but distribution is somewhat imbalanced.	Course grades are not distributed across different CLOs, where grades are concentrated for some CLOs and not		

		distribution.		others.		
6. CLO analysis and assessment forms are completed for all courses	High-quality CLO analysis and assessment forms completed for all courses	CLO analysis forms completed for most courses with varying quality	CLO analysis forms completed for some courses only	No CLO analysis forms completed		
7. CLO achievement ratios are analyzed by instructors	All instructors thoroughly analyze CLO achievement ratios with actionable insights	Most instructors analyze CLO achievement ratios, but depth of analysis varies	Limited analysis of CLO achievement ratios by some instructors	No analysis of CLO achievement ratios by instructors		
8. CLO assessments and analyses are analyzed by the department council	CLO assessments are analyzed by the department council with clear and actionable plan of improvement.	CLO assessments are analyzed by the department council, but depth of analysis and improvement plan is limited	CLO assessments are analyzed by the department council, but with no depth or actionable plan for improvement.	CLO assessments are not analyzed by the department council.		
9. Formative assessment conducted at least twice per semester	Systematic formative assessment conducted at least twice per semester in all courses	Formative assessment conducted twice per semester in most courses	Formative assessment conducted once per semester or inconsistently	No formative assessment conducted		
10. Formative assessment data used to adjust teaching strategies	All instructors systematically use formative assessment data to make effective adjustments to teaching strategies	Most instructors use formative assessment data to adjust teaching with varying effectiveness	Limited evidence that some instructors use formative assessment data	No evidence that formative assessment data influences teaching		

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

Component	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Rating (0-3)	Evidence/Comments
11. PLOs clearly defined and aligned with department mission	PLOs are clearly defined, and explicitly aligned with department mission	PLOs are mostly clear and aligned with department mission	PLOs exist but are vague or have limited alignment with department mission	PLOs not defined or no alignment with department mission		
12. PLOs are measurable and appropriate to program level	All PLOs are clearly measurable and appropriate to program	Most PLOs are measurable and appropriate to	Some PLOs are measurable but others lack clarity or	PLOs are not measurable or inappropriate to		

	level with precise terminology	program level	appropriate level	program level		
13. PLO-LoC matrix completed with clear connections to competencies	Comprehensive PLO-LoC matrix with explicit, logical connections to all competencies	PLO-LoC matrix mostly complete with generally clear connections	PLO-LoC matrix exists but connections to competencies are unclear or incomplete	No PLO-LoC matrix exists		
14. PLO analysis and assessment form completed (at the end of the academic year)	Comprehensive PLO analysis and assessment form completed with thorough analysis	PLO analysis form mostly complete with adequate depth	PLO analysis form exists but is incomplete or superficial	No PLO analysis and assessment form completed		
15. Department council reviews PLO analysis results	Thorough review of PLO analysis results with documented discussion and action plans	Regular review of PLO analysis results but limited action taken	Limited or superficial review of PLO analysis results	No review of PLO analysis results by department council		
16. AMR completed	Comprehensive AMR completed on schedule with thorough analysis	AMR completed but with limited depth or missing elements	AMR partially completed or completed inconsistently	No AMR completed		
17. PRA assessment conducted (every 4-5 years)	Comprehensive PRA assessment conducted on schedule with thorough methodology	PRA assessment conducted but with limited depth or scope	PRA assessment initiated but incomplete or irregular	No PRA assessment conducted		
18. Benchmarking against leading universities	Comprehensive benchmarking against appropriate leading universities with thorough analysis	Benchmarking conducted but with limited scope or analysis	Limited benchmarking with inadequate comparisons	No benchmarking conducted		

Assessment Tools Implementation

Component	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Rating (0-3)	Evidence/Comments
19. Exit surveys are analyzed by department council	Exit surveys are thoroughly analyzed and discussed by department council, with a clear and insightful improvement plan.	Exit surveys are analyzed by department council, with a limited improvement plan.	Exit surveys are analyzed by department council, but without an improvement plan.	Exit surveys are not analyzed or discussed by department council.		
20. Drop-out surveys are	Drop-out surveys are thoroughly analyzed and	Drop-out surveys are analyzed by	Drop-out surveys are analyzed by	Drop-out surveys are not analyzed		

analyzed by department council	discussed by department council, with a clear and insightful improvement plan.	department council, with a limited improvement plan.	department council, but without an improvement plan.	or discussed by department council.		
21. Alumni surveys conducted	Comprehensive alumni surveys conducted systematically with thorough analysis	Alumni surveys conducted regularly but with limited analysis	Alumni surveys conducted sporadically with low response rates	No alumni surveys conducted		
22. Employer surveys conducted	Comprehensive employer surveys with strong representation and thorough analysis	Regular employer surveys with adequate representation	Limited employer surveys with poor representation	No employer surveys conducted		
23. AQACHEI competency test results analyzed	Comprehensive analysis of AQACHEI results with clear applications for program enhancement	Regular analysis of AQACHEI results but limited use for improvement	Limited analysis of AQACHEI test results	No analysis of AQACHEI competency test results		
24. Graduate employment and further education tracked (if applicable)	Comprehensive tracking with thorough analysis informing program decisions	Regular tracking but analysis lacks depth	Limited tracking with incomplete data	No tracking of graduate outcomes		

General Education

Component	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Rating (0-3)	Evidence/Comments
25. GE courses identified with appropriate learning outcomes	All GE courses clearly identified with appropriate, measurable learning outcomes	Most GE courses identified with generally appropriate outcomes	Some GE courses identified but learning outcomes are vague	GE courses not identified or lacking learning outcomes		
26. GE courses undergo CLO analysis and assessment	All GE courses systematically undergo thorough CLO analysis and assessment	Most GE courses undergo CLO analysis	Limited CLO analysis for some GE courses	No CLO analysis for GE courses		
27. GE PLO-LoC matrix completed with clear connections to GE competencies	Comprehensive matrix with explicit, logical connections to all GE competencies	Matrix mostly complete with generally clear connections	Matrix exists but connections are unclear or incomplete	No GE PLO-LoC matrix exists		

28. GE PLO analysis and assessment form completed (at the end of the academic year)	Comprehensive GE PLO analysis form completed with thorough assessment	GE PLO analysis form mostly complete	GE PLO analysis form exists but is incomplete	No GE PLO analysis form completed		
29. GECC discuss and review the GE PLO analysis results	Thorough GECC discussion with documented outcomes and action plans	Regular GECC discussion but limited action	Limited GECC discussion with minimal documentation	No GECC discussion of GE PLO results		

Overall Implementation

Component	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Rating (0-3)	Evidence/Comments
30. Assessment findings are used to improve and enhance the teaching process and the program curriculum in a data-driven manner, and in alignment with achieving AUM mission.	Assessment findings are systematically used to improve and enhance the teaching process and the program curriculum in a data-driven manner, with clear alignment with AUM mission.	Assessment findings are mostly used to improve or enhance the teaching process and the program curriculum in a data-driven manner, with some alignment with AUM mission.	Assessment findings are sometimes used to improve or enhance the teaching process or the program curriculum, with limited alignment with AUM mission.	Assessment findings are not used to improve or enhance the teaching process or the program curriculum.		
31. Complete department folders are maintained and accessible	Complete, well-organized department folders readily accessible to appropriate parties	Most folders maintained but some information missing	Incomplete folders with inconsistent organization	No department folders maintained		
32. Regular review cycles adhered to the specified time	All review cycles consistently adhered to with proper documentation	Most review cycles followed but some delays	Inconsistent adherence to review cycles	No adherence to review cycles		

Action Plan

Based on this assessment, please identify:

1. Areas of strength:

2. Areas needing improvement:

3. Specific actions to be taken this academic year:

4. Resources needed to implement improvements:

5. Timeline for implementation:

Signatures

- Submitted by: _____
- Department: _____
- HoD: _____
- Date: _____

- Received and reviewed by: _____
- Accreditation and Quality Assurance
dep _____
- Date: _____
- Feedback: _____

