|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1 - BEGINNING** | **2 - DEVELOPING** | **3 - ACCEPTABLE** | **4 - EXEMPLARY** |
| **A. MISSION STATEMENT****Clear, concise statement outlining the ultimate principles that guide the work of the program, who it serves, in what ways, & with what results** |
| * Statement pertains only to the department and does not specifically address the academic program, or does not clearly distinguish between the missions of the department and academic program.
 | * Statement is directly related to the academic program (not the department).
* Statement addresses the purpose, primary activities, and whom the program serves.
 | * Statement is aligned with the institutional mission.
* Statement is understandable to internal and external stakeholders (clear language).
 | * Statement identifies program goals and/or activities that impact specific elements of the institutional mission.
* Statement is aligned with the standards of an external professional organization, if applicable.
 |
| **B. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES****Specific statements that articulate the discipline-specific content, skills, and/or dispositions students should gain or improve through engagement in the program** |
| * SLO does not specify what group of students will achieve mastery of it, and/or at what point(s) in their progression through the program they will do so.
* SLO contains only imprecise verbs (e.g., “know,” “understand”), and thus is difficult to measure.
* SLO is too broad or vague to guide the assessment process.
 | * SLO is clear about what group of students will achieve mastery of it (e.g., majors, students in the program), but not at what point in their progression through the program they will do so.
* SLO contains action verbs that reflect an inadequate depth of knowledge for the program.
* SLO contains a general description of the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions to be measured, but the description is not discipline-specific.
 | * SLO is clear about what group of students will achieve mastery of it, and at what point in their progression through the program they will do so (e.g., “seniors,” “graduates”).
* SLO contains precise, measurable, and observable verbs that reflect an appropriate depth of knowledge for the program.
* SLO contains a discipline-specific description of the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions that students will demonstrate.
 | * A reasonable number of SLOs are identified — enough to adequately accomplish the mission of the program while still being manageable to assess on an annual basis.
* Overall SLOs align with the program mission statement.
* Overall SLOs focus on the central aspects of the discipline/field.
* Overall SLOs reflect appropriate level of expectation for the program type/level.
* Overall SLOs stated in student-centered terms, reflecting what students should know, do, and/or think as they engage in the program of study.
 |
| **C. TEACHING STRATEGIES****Where & how the students learning outcomes are mapped & addressed in the program’s curriculum** |
| * No courses/experiences are described, or information provided does not connect to SLOs.
* Absence of curriculum map, or some relevant program courses and/or SLOs are not addressed on the curriculum map.
 | * Courses/experiences provide opportunities for students to obtain the knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions described in the SLOs.
* All relevant program courses and SLOs are shown on the curriculum map, but the map does not indicate the depth of coverage for SLOs in the courses.
 | * Courses/experiences are linked to SLOs with multiple and diverse opportunities for students to obtain the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions specific to the discipline in the SLOs.
* All relevant program courses and SLOs are shown on the curriculum map, and the map indicates the depth of coverage for SLOs in appropriate courses.
 | * Courses/experiences connect to and/or build upon each other to help students achieve content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions specific to the discipline, as described in the SLOs.
* A continuum of learning demonstrated on the curriculum map. SLOs are well balanced throughout the courses/experiences in the program, with appropriate depth of coverage for each SLO.
 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1 - BEGINNING** | **2 - DEVELOPING** | **3 - ACCEPTABLE** | **4 - EXEMPLARY** |
| **D. ASSESSMENT METHODS I: MEASUREMENT TOOLS AND ASSIGNMENTS****Description of the measurement tool & the associated assignment, how they align with the SLO, & their validity** |
| * SLO is assessed with only indirect measure(s) (i.e., surveys).
* No information is provided about how the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) relate to the SLO.
 | * SLO is assessed with direct measure(s) (i.e., objective tests, rubrics).
* General description is provided of the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s).
* General information is provided about how the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) relate to the SLO.
 | * Detailed description of measurement tool(s) and its alignment with the SLO is provided. This includes:
* for an objective test measurement tool, test blueprint maps individual questions to the SLO (or element of the SLO), and expected levels of mastery are indicated;
* for an analytic rubric measurement tool, each trait is mapped to the SLO (or element of the SLO) and each level details expectations.
* Detailed description of the assignment(s) and alignment with the SLO is provided. This includes:
* for an objective test assignment, representative test items are described to indicate relevance to the SLO and the expected level of mastery;
* for a performance-based assignment evaluated with an analytic rubric, the assignment prompt is described to indicate relevance to the SLO and the expected level of mastery.
* Measurement tool(s) will provide a direct/observable result, and are appropriate to the SLO and the level of mastery expected.
* Assignment(s) are appropriate to the SLO and the level of mastery expected.
 | * Direct measures may be supplemented with indirect measures.
* Includes both formative and summative measures.
* A description of the development process for the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) is included to illustrate their appropriateness to the SLO.
 |
| **D. ASSESSMENT METHODS II: DATA COLLECTION AND INTEGRITY****When measurement tools are applied, to whom, at what point the in the program, & how the program ensures consistency across multiple administrations of the tools & assignments (reliability)** |
| * It is unclear how the information provided relates to this assessment cycle.
 | * Information is provided about the data collection process in this cycle, but not enough to generate confidence in the findings (e.g., sample size is too small, student motivation conditions are inconsistent, rubric is not normed with raters, etc.)
* Process will provide ***limited*** information for guiding instruction and curriculum.
 | * Enough information is provided about administration of the measurement tool and data collection process to generate confidence in the findings. This includes:
* adequate student population targeted with an assignment and measurement tool;
* sufficient sample size for statistically significant results (especially if different than the student population), with a rationale for representative sampling (if appropriate);
* consistent student motivation conditions across multiple administrations of the assignment and measurement tool;
* use of multiple raters for performance based assignments as well as norming and reconciliation process (how all raters apply and score the measurement tool consistently)
* Process will provide ***useful*** information for guiding instruction and curriculum.
 | * Information provided demonstrates that data collection occurs throughout the curriculum and involves multiple faculty members.
* Information is included about how data are collected, anonymized, and shared among faculty members.
* An ongoing, inclusive, systematic process is in place for collecting data to make decisions and improve learning within the program, appropriate to the program’s internal and external constituencies.
 |
| **E. RESULTS****Clear & concise illustration of data collected (presentation of data). Includes a narrative or table/figure with sample size, count, averages, percentages, & ranges as appropriate to the assessment tool** |
| * No results are presented, or it is unclear how the results relate to the SLO.
 | * Results are presented and relate to the SLO, but a lack of specificity does not allow useful conclusions to be drawn.
* Results are presented by measure instead of by SLO.
* Presentation is insufficiently detailed; only overall student scores or averages are presented.
 | * Results are presented by SLO.
* Tables and graphs effectively communicate results, including sample size, count, averages, percentages, and ranges, as appropriate to the measurement tool.
* For objective tests, results are presented according to items or groups of items connected to a SLO, as demonstrated in the test blueprint.
* For rubrics, results are presented according to rubric trait and level, including counts and percentages.
 | * Results are easily understood, as well as their implications.
* Strengths and weaknesses in student learning are easily identified.
* For an objective test, results are presented according to the test blueprint and include item analysis information.
* For rubrics, inter-rater reliability is ensured through reconciliation of scores across multiple raters
* New findings are compared to past trends, as appropriate.
 |
| **1 - BEGINNING** | **2 - DEVELOPING** | **3 - ACCEPTABLE** | **4 - EXEMPLARY** |
| **F. DISCUSSION****Explains the meaningfulness of the data presented above (interpretation of results) with a clear, complete, & succinct analysis focusing on the interpretation of & reflection on the assessment data** |
| * No interpretation is attempted, or the interpretation does not relate to the SLO and/or the results.
 | * Interpretation is attempted, relates to the SLO and/or results, but the interpretation is either:
* insufficient to support programmatic decisions,
* not aligned with the program’s previous action plans,
* offering excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretations leading to improvements in student learning.
 | * Interpretation is aligned with the program’s SLOs.
* Interpretation is explained in terms of the desired levels of student performance, and is based on student achievement of those levels.
* Interpretation is justified through current disciplinary standards, previous results and/or benchmarks.
* Interpretation includes how courses, experiences, and/or the assessment process might have affected results.
* Interpretation indicates the appropriate collaboration and consensus of multiple internal stakeholders (e.g., program faculty, committees, staff, and/or students).
* Interpretation is detailed enough to justify programmatic decisions concerning changes in instruction and/or curriculum.
 | * Interpretation directly addresses the program’s mission, SLOs, and action plans.
* Interpretation addresses past trends in student performance, as appropriate.
* Interpretation identifies possible areas of improvement, thus initiating future actions.
 |
| **G. ACTION PLAN I: IMPACT OF PAST IMPROVEMENTS AND CHANGES****Proposed action plan from the previous cycle is included, who implemented it, when it was implemented, & outcome of the implementation** |
| * No actions taken during the current cycle.
* No justification is given for actions taken during the current cycle that were not based on the prior year’s action plan.
* Actions taken during the current cycle seem unrelated to the prior year’s action plan.
 | * 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, but details about implementation are insufficient.
* If actions proposed during the previous cycle were not implemented, no reasonable justification is given.
 | * All proposed actions from the prior year’s action plan were specifically addressed, including who implemented them, when they were implemented, and the outcome of the implementation.
* 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.
* The report reflects with sufficient depth on the implementation of proposed actions and the data returned from them during the assessment cycle.
 | * Additional documentation is provided, showing the implementation of proposed actions (e.g., course syllabi, meeting minutes, curriculum change forms, etc.).
 |
| **G. ACTION PLAN II: USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT****Strategies planned for program improvement; actions designed to improve instruction & curriculum; rationale for action is based on data & analysis of results** |
| * No actions proposed for the next cycle.
* Proposed actions are not based on the data captured through the assessment process.
* Proposed actions are unrelated to the improvement of the educational program, and therefore student learning.
 | * The connection between proposed actions, results/discussion, and/or SLOs is not clear.
* Proposed actions are too broad or vague to guide the improvement of the educational program and student learning.
* Proposed actions do not demonstrate evidence of input from more than one person.
* Proposed actions pertain only to assessment plan changes (process/measure only).
 | * Proposed actions are directly connected to the SLOs.
* Proposed actions are data-driven, directly relate to the results/discussion.
* Proposed actions focus on the improvement of the educational program and student learning. If modifications are made to the assessment process, they are data-driven.
* Proposed actions contain a process for evaluating their effectiveness.
* Proposed actions demonstrate evidence of input from multiple internal stakeholders.
* Carryover actions from the previous cycle are noted.
* If a SLO is not addressed by any proposed actions, justification is given for maintenance of ongoing curriculum and instruction.
 | * Proposed actions are specifically detailed, including who will be responsible for implementation, approximate dates of implementation, and notes about where in the curriculum and in what specific classes they will occur.
 |