

	# and type of instruments:	The assessment plan does not list instruments or methods to assess all SLOs. If instruments are listed, they are too vague (e.g., exam, paper, presentation)	The assessment plan identifies at least one instrument or method to assess each SLO. Some outcomes are not assessed directly. All measures are described beyond general terms (e.g., exam, paper, presentation)	The assessment plan identifies at least two instruments or methods to assess each SLO. Each SLO is assessed by at least one direct measure.	All SLOs are assessed with multiple measures, including at least one direct measure per SLO. At least one externally-benchmarked exam is employed.		
	Quality of measures:	The program has no evidence regarding the quality of their chosen assessment instruments or methods. Assessments may not provide useful information. Course grades are employed as measures (without clearly indicating how grades provide pure measures of performance on the intended outcome)	The program identifies methods to ensure consistency (rubrics, multiple raters, external benchmarks), but the methods are not explained in any detail.	The program is working to gather evidence regarding the quality of the assessment methods or instruments. Methods to ensure consistency (rubrics, multiple raters, external benchmarks) are being employed when appropriate.	The program has documented evidence regarding the quality of their chosen assessment instruments or methods. Supporting materials (rubrics, assignments) are included.		
	Logistics:	The plan does not specify the intended audiences, times, or locations of assessment methods.	The plan identifies which assessments will be administered when (or in which courses)	The plan describes who is responsible for administering which assessments to which students at what points in time. The instruments and methods are described in enough detail to be meaningfully and consistently applied.	The plan describes who is responsible for administering which assessments at what points in time to which students. The plan also describes how results will be collected and analyzed. The instruments, methods, and analyses are described in enough detail to be meaningfully and consistently applied.		
	Schedule:	Not every SLO will be assessed within a standard program review cycle.	Every SLO will be assessed within a standard program review cycle, but not all SLOs will be assessed multiple times.	Every SLO will be assessed multiple times within a standard program review cycle. The schedule is sustainable.	Every SLO will be assessed multiple times within a standard program review cycle. The program provides evidence that the schedule is sustainable.		
	Assessment model:	The assessment model will not provide useful information to evaluate student learning and the contribution each learning experience makes towards student achievement.	SLOs are assessed only near the end of the program (typically in capstone experiences), but no overall sequence of assessment is in place that evaluates mastery at multiple levels. Students are not given feedback about performance on the program-level SLOs until they have nearly finished the program.	SLOs are assessed within individual courses, but no overall sequence of assessment is in place that evaluates mastery at multiple levels.	Multiple assessments of each outcome occur at multiple points throughout the program (and at multiple levels). This ensures students are provided opportunities to develop increasing sophistication as they progress through the program.		
0	= plan and methods score (out of 15 points possible)						

Use and Reporting of Assessment Results							
Score	(0) poor practice		(1) emerging	(2) good	(3) exemplary practice	Notes:	Program response:
	Specification of desired results:	No criteria for determining mastery have been identified.	Desired results are stated with no specificity (e.g., student growth, comparison to previous year's results, comparison to faculty standards). Results cannot be benchmarked to external standards.	Desired results are specified for each SLO (e.g., our students will score above a specific faculty-determined standard) and at least some results can be compared with external benchmarks.	Desired results are specified and justified (e.g., Last year, the typical student scored 20 points on this measure. With curricular and pedagogical improvements, we hope the average score will increase to 23). External benchmarks are used, when appropriate.		

	Results report:	Report does not analyze or summarize data. Raw data is reported.	Report includes qualitative or quantitative analysis of data, but the analysis is vague or questionably related to the results. Limited information is provided about data collection, such as how and how many took the assessment, but not enough to judge the veracity of the process (e.g., 35 seniors took the test). Only current year's results are provided.	Report provides analysis of assessment data presented in summary formats. Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process, such as descriptions of who was assessed, testing protocols, testing conditions, and student motivation.	Report provides a comprehensive analysis of assessment data presented in summary formats. The data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired results (e.g., representative sampling, adequate motivation, pre-post designs, instrument quality). Results from previous years are included for comparison.			
	Interpretation:	No interpretation is attempted.	Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the outcome or desired results. The interpretations are not clearly supported by the methodology or results.	Interpretations of results seem reasonable, given the outcome, desired results, and methodology.	Interpretation of results seems to be reasonable given the outcome, desired results, and methodology. Multiple faculty interpreted results (not just one person).			
	Planned use:	Recommendations are missing or not based on assessment results.	Ideas for improvement are provided, but no plan is presented. Lacks rationale for connecting recommendations to student learning. Recommendations deal with improving assessment rather than improving student learning.	Ideas for improving student learning are provided, but the plan is lacking in coherence or viability. Rationale for connecting recommendations to student learning are weak or missing.	The program provides a coherent and viable plan to improve student learning by redesigning curriculum, pedagogy, or student support services. The plan includes a rationale for how these modifications should improve student learning.			
0	= use and reporting score (out of 12 points possible)							

Program Review Evidence. This section will be evaluated once your program has submitted its program review narrative.							
Score		(0) poor practice	(1) emerging	(2) good	(3) exemplary practice	Notes:	Program response:
	Coverage:	The program did not fulfill its assessment plan since the previous program review. Only 1-2 years of data are available.	The program put forth effort to fulfill its assessment plan, but was unable to do so. Not all SLOs were assessed multiple times. At least 3 years of assessment data have been reported.	The program fulfilled its assessment plan since the previous program review. All SLOs were assessed multiple times.	The program fulfilled its assessment plan since the previous program review. All SLOs were assessed multiple times.		
	Communication:	No evidence that assessment results are shared with faculty.	Assessment results are shared with a limited number of faculty. Communication process isn't clear.	Assessment results are shared and discussed with all faculty. Mode of communication (e.g., email, program meetings) is clear.	Assessment results are shared and discussed with all faculty, with clear modes and details of communication. Information is also shared with other stakeholders, such as students or advisory committees.		
	Improved student learning:	Proposed modifications to curriculum, pedagogy, or support services are not clearly linked to assessment findings.	The program claims improved student learning due to previous modifications, but evidence is not clear. Proposed modifications to the program are linked to assessment results, however the results lack specificity.	Assessment evidence suggest learning improvements were due to program modifications. The program responded to previous assessment results, made modifications, and found improved student learning. Lack of clarity regarding interventions or methodological issues (unrepresentative sampling, concerns regarding student motivation, etc) leave legitimate questions regarding the improvement interpretation. Proposed modifications are linked to assessment results.	Strong evidence, from direct measures, supporting substantive learning improvement due to program modifications. The program responded to previous assessment results, made modifications, and found improved student learning. Proposed modifications are clearly linked to valid interpretations of assessment data.		

	Improved assessment:	No mention of how this iteration of assessment is improved from past administrations (or how future assessment will be improved)	Proposed changes to the assessment plan are in response to the program not fulfilling its previous assessment plan.	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment methods, including an acknowledgement of flaws, leads to proposed changes to the assessment plan.	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment is provided. Changes to the assessment plan represent improvements.		
0	= program review evidence score (out of 12 points possible)						

Self-evaluation. Department Chairs or Program Directors should enter these scores prior to program review.

Score	(0) poor practice	(1) emerging	(2) good	(3) exemplary practice	Notes:	Program response:	
	Faculty attitudes:	Faculty in this program feel assessment is just a tool to address accreditation or for top-down accountability	Faculty in this program feel assessment is a nice-to-have add-on to our busy schedules	Faculty in this program feel assessment is useful for helping students learn and teachers teach	Faculty in this program feel assessment is a normal part of the learning cycle that can also be used for accountability.		
	Faculty awareness:	Some of the faculty in this program do not know we have program-level student learning outcomes or are unaware of our assessment methods.	Most faculty are aware of the existence of program-level student learning outcomes and assessment methods, but they are not familiar with them	The majority of faculty in this program could identify our program-level outcomes and assessment methods. Faculty purposefully teach towards the outcomes.	Our full- and part-time faculty are familiar with program-level outcomes and actively teach towards (and assess attainment of) them.		
	Faculty collaboration:	We assign one person to handle assessment for our program	We assign multiple faculty members to handle assessment for our program	Most of our full-time faculty discuss program-level assessment plans and results.	All the faculty in our program actively collaborate on plans, assessment tools, and results.		
	Priority:	We do not have the time, resources, or motivation to complete any formal program-level assessment.	We attempt to meet minimum requirements, but assessment is not a priority for our program (perhaps due to a lack of resources).	Assessment is a priority for our program. We have resources to ensure we can meet requirements for the near future.	Assessment is a top priority for our program. We actively plan assessment methods years in advance and budget accordingly.		
	Usefulness:	We have not found program-level assessment to be useful	We have assessed outcomes and collected data that were the easiest to collect.	We have assessed some important outcomes and have used that information to make or propose changes.	We have made (and can document) improvements because of our program-level assessment activities.		
0	= program review evidence score (out of 12 points possible)						