<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. MISSION STATEMENT</th>
<th>BEGINNING</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>ACCEPTABLE</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Statement pertains only to the department &amp; does not specifically address the academic program.</td>
<td>□ Statement includes the department &amp; program, but does not clearly distinguish between the missions of the department &amp; academic program.</td>
<td>□ Statement is directly related to the academic program (not the department). □ Statement addresses the purpose, primary activities, &amp; whom the program serves. □ Statement is aligned with the institutional mission.</td>
<td>□ Statement is directly related to the academic program (not the department). □ Statement addresses the purpose, primary activities, whom the program serves, as well as the standards to which it aspires. □ Statement is aligned with specific elements of the institutional mission along with the standards of an external professional organization, if applicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME</th>
<th>BEGINNING</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>ACCEPTABLE</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Outcome is too broad or vague to guide the assessment process.</td>
<td>□ Outcome is unclear about who should be assessed. □ Outcome contains imprecise verbs (e.g., “know,” “understand”). □ Outcome contains vague description of content/skill/attitudinal domain. □ Outcome contains an achievement level which reflects an inappropriate depth of knowledge. □ Outcome must necessarily be measured by more than one method.</td>
<td>□ Outcome is clear about who should be assessed. □ Outcome contains an action verb which identifies the behavior to be demonstrated. □ Outcome contains a learning statement that specifies the object of the behavior to be demonstrated. □ Outcome contains an achievement level which reflects an appropriate depth of knowledge. □ Outcome specifies criteria for evaluating the object of the behavior to be demonstrated. □ Outcome can be evaluated by a single method.</td>
<td>□ Outcome is clear about who should be assessed &amp; at what point in the student’s progression through the program. □ Outcome contains a precise action verb which identifies the explicit &amp; observable behavior to be demonstrated. □ Outcome contains a learning statement that specifies the object of the behavior to be demonstrated. □ Outcome contains an achievement level which reflects an appropriate depth of knowledge. □ Outcome specifies discipline-specific criteria for evaluating the object of the behavior to be demonstrated. □ Outcome may be measured by more than one method.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A. TEACHING STRATEGIES | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ | ❏ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. MEASURES</th>
<th>BEGINNING</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>ACCEPTABLE</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ The outcome is only assessed with indirect measure(s) [i.e., surveys] or no relationship exists between outcome &amp; measure(s).</td>
<td>□ The outcome is measured with direct measure(s) [i.e., rubrics, multiple-choice exams]. □ Only general information about how the measure relates to the outcome is provided.</td>
<td>□ The outcome is measured with direct measure(s) &amp; may be supplemented with indirect measure(s). □ Details regarding how the measure relates to the outcome are provided. □ Specific test items or rubric traits are aligned with the outcome.</td>
<td>□ The outcome is measured with direct measure(s) &amp; may be supplemented with indirect measure(s). □ Details regarding how every element of the measure relates to the outcome are provided. □ Specific test items or rubric traits are clearly linked to the outcome. □ Each level of the rubric is clearly explained. □ A description of the rubric or test development process is included to illustrate appropriateness &amp; accuracy (validity &amp; reliability) of the measurement tools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. MEASURES

#### ii. Data Collection & Integrity
- □ No information is provided about the data collection process.
- □ Information is provided about data collection, but additional information is needed concerning student population, sample size, alignment of assignment(s) & measurement instruments with SLOs, assignment parameters, student motivation conditions, artifact evaluation, or other contextual information in order to judge the integrity of the process.
- □ Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process; however, minor methodological flaws are evident.
- □ A general description of the data collection process includes information about student population, sample size, alignment of assignment(s) & measurement instruments with SLOs, assignment parameters, student motivation conditions, artifact evaluation, other contextual information, & in the case of rubrics, multiple raters.
- □ The data collection process is clearly explained, contains no methodological flaws, & thus can make justifiable claims about the findings.
- □ The data collection process includes information about student population, a rationale for representative sampling, alignment of assignment(s) & measurement instruments with SLOs, consistent assignment parameters, adequate & consistent motivation conditions, & in the case of rubrics, multiple trained raters.

### C. TARGETS

- □ No targets stated, or targets seem arbitrarily chosen.
- □ Targets are vague or contain subjective language.
- □ Targets are aligned with the assessment process rather than student performance.
- □ No justification is given for targets.
- □ Targets are specific & justified.
- □ Targets are aligned with outcomes & measures.
- □ Targets are based on current disciplinary standards, previous results &/or benchmarks.
- □ Targets represent a reasonable level of student success.
- □ Targets were developed based on the input of multiple faculty.
- □ Targets are specific & justified.
- □ Targets are aligned with outcomes & measures.
- □ Targets are based on current disciplinary standards, previous results, &/or benchmarks.
- □ Targets represent a reasonable level of student success.
- □ Targets were developed based on the input of multiple faculty.
- □ Multiple levels of performance are described, suggesting basic (acceptable) & higher (desired) levels of performance.

### D. FINDINGS

#### i. Presentation of Results
- □ No results are presented, or it is unclear how the results relate to the outcomes.
- □ Results are presented & relate to the outcomes, but there is a lack of specificity.
- □ Presentation is insufficiently detailed: only overall student scores are given instead of presenting results by SLO.
- □ Results are presented by SLO & an explanation is provided about how the results directly relate to the measures & targets.
- □ Tables & graphs effectively communicate results.
- □ For multiple-choice exams, results are presented according to test blueprint (alignment of questions, SLO, & cognitive level).
- □ For rubrics, results are presented according to rubric trait.
- □ Results are presented by SLO & an explanation is provided about how the results directly relate to the measures & targets.
- □ Tables & graphs effectively communicate results.
- □ For multiple choice exams, results are presented according to the test blueprint (alignment of question, SLO, & cognitive level) and includes item analysis information.
- □ For rubrics, results are presented according to rubric trait & show a direct correspondence to the SLO.
- □ Students' performance strengths & weaknesses are clearly visible.
- □ New findings are compared to past trends, as appropriate.

#### ii. Interpretation
- □ No interpretation attempted, or the interpretation does not relate to the SLOs &/or results, but the interpretation is either
- □ Interpretation attempted, relates to the SLOs &/or results, but the interpretation is either
- □ Interpretation of results is reasonable given the outcomes, measures, methodology, &
- □ Interpretation of results is reasonable given the outcomes, measures, methodology, &
### ii. Interpretation of Results

- Insufficient to support programmatic decisions or not aligned with the program's action plans.

E. ACTION PLANS

#### i. Results of Prior Action Plans Implementation

- No action plans implemented last year.
- No justification is given for actions taken during the current cycle that were not based on the prior year's action plan.
- Actions taken seem unrelated to the improvement of the educational program & therefore student learning.

- All proposed actions from the prior year's action plan were not addressed.
- If proposed actions were not implemented, no reasonable justification is given.
- Seems to offer excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretations for next steps or student learning improvement.

- A copy of the proposed action plan from the previous cycle is included.
- All proposed actions from the prior year's action plan are addressed.
- If actions proposed during the previous cycle were not implemented, reasonable justification is given.
- If actions taken during the current cycle were not proposed during the previous cycle, they are reasonably justified through external evidence.
- Implemented actions produced associated data which informed the assessment process.
- The report reflects with sufficient depth on the implementation of proposed actions & the data returned from them during the assessment cycle.

- Includes all under “acceptable.”
- Elements are focused primarily on student learning; modifications to the assessment process are minimized.
- Actions were implemented by multiple faculty.
- Additional documentation is provided showing the implementation of proposed actions (e.g., meeting minutes, curriculum change forms, etc.).

#### E. ACTION PLAN

#### ii. Proposed Action Plans for Next Academic Year

- No action plans proposed for next year.
- Proposed actions are not based on the data captured through the assessment process.
- Proposed actions are unrelated to the improvement of the educational program & student learning.

- The connection between proposed actions & program SLOs is weak.
- Proposed actions are too broad or vague to guide the improvement of the educational program & student learning.
- The connection between the proposed actions & the findings is weak.
- Proposed actions do not demonstrate evidence of input from more than one person.
- Proposed actions pertain only to assessment plan changes.

- The connection between proposed actions & program SLOs is clear.
- Proposed actions directly relate to the assessment findings, & focus on the improvement of the educational program & student learning.
- Proposed actions demonstrate evidence of input from multiple faculty.
- Carryover actions from the previous cycle are noted.

- Includes all under “acceptable.”
- Proposed actions are specifically detailed, including approximate dates of implementation & notes about where in the curriculum & in specific classes they will occur.
- If a SLO is not addressed by any proposed actions, justification is given for maintenance of ongoing curriculum & instruction.