1. **Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)**
2. Program Learning Outcomes are listed.

[ ]  A complete, list of ***assessable*** PLOs is provided.

1. PLOs reflect the knowledges, skills, and dispositions that indicate the scope of the program and student achievement expectations.

[ ]  PLOs indicate discipline specific knowledge, skills, and (where applicable) dispositions. (and) The variety of outcomes reflects the breadth of instruction in the program.

[ ]  The action word central to each PLO is student-centered, and indicates the level of learning complexity expected of students (i.e. action words show alignment with Bloom’s taxonomy).

[ ]  Each PLO is written in a format that makes them assessable (one action word, measurable action).

1. The focal PLO is identified.

[ ]  Focal PLO is clearly indicated, and consistent through the report.

1. **Current Curriculum Map**
	1. The curriculum map is sufficiently detailed to be useful for evaluating the program.

\*The map does not need to show ALL course offerings in the program—just those that are integral to student achievement of learning outcomes. A ***Curriculum Map Template*** is available through CITL.

[ ]  The curriculum map shows a matrix of courses and PLOs.

[ ]  The matrix indicates which courses are required of all students and which courses form requirement clusters that fulfill the same programmatic requirements and from which students choose one or more courses, making the pathways that students follow to proficiency clear.

[ ]  The map or legend indicates how students are expected to progress through the program (e.g. any sequence to course enrollment or prerequisite relationships are indicated).

* 1. The curriculum map clearly depicts the courses/experiences that will allow students to meet all PLOs.

[ ]  Students are able to achieve the highest indicated level of proficiency for all PLOs in the courses that are **required** for the major, so that electives need not be included in the map.

[ ]  The curriculum map indicates how courses or experiences contribute to achievement of relevant PLOs (e.g. Whether the courses introduce, help to develop, or are where students reach proficiency of specific PLOs is indicated)

1. **Summary of Previous Results**
	1. A concise abstract of results (less than 500 words) describes previous assessment results with enough information for comparison with current results, if applicable.

[ ]  Previous results are reported in the table, indicating the numbers of students who exceeded, met, partially met, or failed to meet performance criteria for the focal PLO.

[ ]  The summary includes information on where (course/non-embedded assessment; specific section or instructor) prior assessment occurred.

[ ]  The summary includes information on when (the terms and years) the data were collected and reported.

[ ]  The summary includes information on how the assessment was conducted.

[ ]  Type of instrument used is detailed. (e.g. rubric for an assignment; a set of exam questions)

[ ]  How student achievement of the PLO was evaluated (e.g. Student exceeding, meeting, partially meeting or not meeting expectations for the PLO met a specified set of criteria on rubric or earned specific total scores on a set of exam questions, etc.).

[ ]  A summary of student performance including the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations during the previous assessment (for comparison, assuming different numbers of students are evaluated each time assessment occurs).

1. **Description of Previous Actions**
	1. There is an explicit statement of the changes (or not) to curriculum, instruction, or assessment methods based on previous assessment of the focal PLO.

[ ]  A summary of what actions the program took in response to the previous assessment is provided.

[ ]  Details on changes to curriculum, assessment, and/or instruction taken to improve student achievement are provided, including how the changes are expected to improve student performance, or an explanation of why no changes were made is provided.

* 1. Did the previous action seek to impact assessment, curriculum, instruction? (Checkbox)
1. **Current Assessment Strategies/Measures/Techniques/Methods**
	1. Direct and/or indirect assessment methods employed as appropriate.

[ ]  Direct assessment methods that measure the level of achievement of PLOs are used for knowledge and skills.

[ ]  These may be supplemented with information on student perception of their own achievement (an indirect assessment).

[ ]  Indirect assessment methods (e.g. surveys of dispositions, Likert scales, or student’s written descriptions of values) are used for dispositional outcomes.

* 1. A concise description of assessment methodology (i.e. course, semester, instrument, constituency, method of analysis).

[ ]  A description of methodology is provided.

[ ]  The description details where the assessment took place (the course number, sections, instructor, or non-embedded assessment.)

[ ]  The description details which students were assessed (e.g. majors in their last semester before graduation.)

[ ]  The description details when assessment data were collected (the semester/s and years being reported).

[ ]  The description details the nature of the assessment instrument (e.g. project, paper, exam, etc.)

[ ]  The description details how performance of students was analyzed (Was a rubric used for scoring? What criteria were included on the rubric? Which rubric criteria were relevant to the PLO in question? What student performance constituted exceeding/meeting/partially meeting/not meeting expectations for the PLO?)

1. **Benchmark and Additional Attachments**
* In Assessment of student learning within a program, a benchmark is defined as the percent of students meeting or exceeding performance expectations for a specific learning outcome that your program is attempting to meet. The benchmark is a means of gauging the performance of the program as a learning platform. It details the overall performance of the PROGRAM, not of individual students.
* Because the goal of assessment is to use data on student performance to make adjustments to curriculum, instruction, or assessment to improve student learning or the measurement of student learning, the BEST benchmarks are derived from previous assessment results. If the PLO has not been previously assessed, your program may use a “desired” goal for a benchmark. If a specific proportion of students must meet or exceed PLO mastery requirements for external accreditation, you may also state or use this goal.
	1. An explicit benchmark of student achievement expectations is provided and justified.

[ ]  A benchmark for the program is articulated as the expected percent of assessed students meeting or exceeding the criteria for PLO mastery.

[ ]  A justification for choosing this benchmark is articulated.

* 1. Useful material (e.g. descriptions of assignments, rubrics) are attached as appendices as necessary.

[ ]  Detailed descriptions of the assessment instrument are appended. This can be in the form of the assignment instructions or a copy of the exam.

[ ]  For assignments evaluated using a rubric, criteria relevant to determining student achievement of the focal PLO are indicated. If an exam or question set is used, the specific questions related to the PLO are indicated.

1. **Current Assessment Results/Findings/Interpretations**
	1. What was measured (e.g. number of sections, number of students, level of student achievement) is meaningfully summarized.

[ ]  Results are provided in the table, with numbers of students in relevant categories of achievement.

[ ]  A summary of the findings and interpretations if present.

[ ]  The course, number of sections, and number of students assessed are summarized for course embedded assessments.

[ ]  If an assessment is used that is not embedded in a course, details of who, when, and where, and what the assessment was are provided.

[ ]  The percentage of assessed students meeting or exceeding expectations for achievement of the focal PLO is indicated.

* 1. Figures and/or tables are used when necessary for clarity and to depict trends.

[ ]  Figures and tables are used to make the patterns more visible (clarity) and to depict results and trends in a highly detailed and expanded manner, considering multiple facets of the data.

* 1. Results are discussed in the context of the stated benchmark(s) and/or previous results.

[ ]  A summary discussion of what the data collected reveal about student achievement of the focal PLO is provided and includes the following:

[ ]  A critical analysis of the educational effectiveness of the program in helping student reach the highest level of performance on the focal PLO.

[ ]  An explicit statement about whether the results exceeded, met, or didn’t meet the benchmark for program performance.

[ ]  Data are compared to previous results and whether improvement in learning has occurred is discussed.

[ ]  Any patterns or trends are discussed (e.g. If students who didn’t take a particular elective did worse than students who took the course; If students in one section did worse than in another section, etc.), or the absence of patterns is noted.

[ ]  Any problems with the design, alignment, and/or administration of the assessment are discussed, or absence of problems is mentioned.

1. **Current Implications/Actions**
	1. It is explained how the results can be used to improve student achievement through changes to curriculum, instruction, and/or assessment methods.

[ ]  A discussion of how the results can inform departmental strategies to improve student achievement of the focal PLO is present.

[ ]  The discussion specifically addresses remediation of, and problems identified with, the assessment, curriculum, or instruction noted in the discussion of results. Remediation may include changes to the assessment assignment/instrument, changes to courses that support development of focal PLO (e.g. changes to instruction/content, addition of assignments, changes to existing assignments, changes to course learning outcomes, etc.), or changes to curriculum (addition or removal of courses).

[ ]  If previous actions were taken to improve student learning, their efficacy is evaluated.

[ ]  If no changes are suggested, a justification of the reasoning behind doing nothing to improve student learning is provided.

* 1. Do the actions seek to impact Assessment, curriculum, Instruction? (Checkbox)
1. **Dissemination of findings.**
	1. The report has been shared with and approved by faculty.

[ ]  The means by which the report has been shared with the program faculty is presented.

[ ]  The date of a faculty meeting in which the current assessment report was discussed and approved in provided.

1. **Updated Five-Year Assessment Plan.**
	1. The plan covers (at least) five years into the future from the current year.

[ ]  An assessment plan for the NEXT five years is provided.

* 1. The plan makes explicit when, where, and how each PLO will be assessed, and when it will be reported.

[ ]  The plan indicates when each PLO will be assessed (i.e. when the program will collect data—is it ongoing and collected each term? Each year? Or only during a specific year/term?)

[ ]  The plan indicates where each PLO will be assessed (i.e. in a specific course or courses, designated by course number and title, or through a non-embedded artifact, such as a student portfolio or standardized test).

[ ]  The plan indicates how each PLO will be assessed (i.e. Is there a paper, project, or exam? Is there a rubric evaluating criteria for mastery of the PLO? Is there a total score? A subset of questions on a standardized exam?)

[ ]  The plan indicates when assessment results for each PLO will be reported to the assessment subcommittee (i.e. year of report).

* 1. The plan will result in all PLOs being assessed and reported within a 5-year cycle.

[ ]  The plan includes all PLOs being assessed within 5 years.