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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcome</strong></td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome is provided and is measurable.</td>
<td>Operational Outcome is present, and is not focused on learning (i.e., course completion, event attendance, graduation rates).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark/Target/Goal</strong></td>
<td>Benchmark/Target/Goal is provided.</td>
<td>Benchmark/Target/Goal is not provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemplary (3)</strong></td>
<td>A clear description of the tool/activity/method is provided.</td>
<td>No description of the tool/activity/method provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And Tools used to measure student achievement of the student learning outcome are primarily direct measures.</td>
<td>Or No relationship is apparent between outcome and assessment tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And An explanation is provided about how the assessment tool relates to the outcome being assessed.</td>
<td>Or Assessment tools are primarily indirect, and include measures such as head counts and course pass rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And Multiple tools are used to gather data for the outcome and/or assessment tool has been validated.</td>
<td>Or Assessment tools are primarily indirect, and include measures such as head counts and course pass rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection and Validation</strong></td>
<td>Complete explanation of data collection processes and protocols are provided such that the reviewer fully understands the data collection methodology (for example: time/semester and place, sampling process, population description, and/or data review process).</td>
<td>Limited information is provided about data collection (for example one of the following is missing: time/semester and place, sampling process, population description, and/or data review process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Include time/semester and place, sampling process, population description, and data review process)</td>
<td>And Complete explanation of data collection processes and protocols are provided such that the external reviewer fully understands the data collection methodology (for example: time/semester and place, sampling process, population description, and/or data review process).</td>
<td>Or No information is provided about data collection process or data was not collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemplary (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accomplished (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emerging (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Results**       | Results are present, specific, and disaggregated within the sample population (e.g., performance criteria, demographics, etc.).  
*And*  
Results are represented visually with a premium on clarity, simplicity, and ease of use by the external reviewer (e.g., tables and/or graphs). | Results are present, specific, and disaggregated within the sample population (e.g., performance criteria, demographics, etc.).  
*And*  
Results are provided in aggregate format only (e.g., 80% of the students met the target, or average score is 3.5). | No results are presented  
*Or*  
Results do not match assessment tool(s) or methodology (e.g., assessment method is a rubric; however graduation rates are provided as results). |
| **Interpretation of Results** | Interpretation of results draw connections between the methodologies and results, and seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcome(s).  
*And*  
A narrative is provided that outlines the discussion of results by pertinent parties involved in data analysis.  
*And*  
A narrative is provided that outlines the discussion of results by pertinent parties involved in data analysis. | Interpretation of results is ambiguous or superficial, or does not refer back to the outcomes, benchmarks, methodologies, or results. (e.g., We met our benchmarks, or the students were successful) | No interpretation attempted.  
*Or*  
The analysis of results repeats what is stated in the Results category of the report. (e.g., 14 students received distinguished ratings, or the average score was 3.5) |
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The report identifies the person(s) involved in the interpretation of data (Names are not required), and the results were shared with the program stakeholders (e.g., faculty, curriculum committee). 

*And*

The report discusses benchmarks/targets/goals, whether or not they were met, and why/why not. 

*And*

An in depth interpretation is provided (e.g., discussion of limitations, trend data, validation and reliability tests, results from previous years, or references to targets/goals are provided).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary (3)</th>
<th>Accomplished (2)</th>
<th>Emerging (1)</th>
<th>Beginning (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Improvement Actions** | **Improvement Actions focus on the improvement of student learning.**  
*And*  
Description of intended improvement actions are provided.  
*And*  
There is a clear explanation of the link between the improvement actions and assessment findings.  
*And*  
Rationale of intended improvement action is tied to | **Improvement Actions focus on the improvement of student learning.**  
*And*  
Description of intended improvement actions are provided.  
*And*  
There is a clear explanation of the link between the improvement actions and assessment findings.  
*And*  
The improvements are somewhat specific (e.g., | **Improvement Actions focus on the improvement of the assessment process.**  
*Or*  
Description of intended improvement actions are minimal or nonexistent.  
*Or*  
The explanation of the link between improvement actions and assessment findings is not clear.  
*Or*  
The improvements are too general (e.g., we will add an | **No improvements are provided.** |
| **Improvement Actions** | **Improvement Actions focus on the improvement of student learning.**  
*And*  
Description of intended improvement actions are provided.  
*And*  
There is a clear explanation of the link between the improvement actions and assessment findings.  
*And*  
The improvements are somewhat specific (e.g., | **Improvement Actions focus on the improvement of the assessment process.**  
*Or*  
Description of intended improvement actions are minimal or nonexistent.  
*Or*  
The explanation of the link between improvement actions and assessment findings is not clear.  
*Or*  
The improvements are too general (e.g., we will add an | **No improvements are provided.** |
| **Improvement Actions** | **Improvement Actions focus on the improvement of student learning.**  
*And*  
Description of intended improvement actions are provided.  
*And*  
There is a clear explanation of the link between the improvement actions and assessment findings.  
*And*  
The improvements are somewhat specific (e.g., | **Improvement Actions focus on the improvement of the assessment process.**  
*Or*  
Description of intended improvement actions are minimal or nonexistent.  
*Or*  
The explanation of the link between improvement actions and assessment findings is not clear.  
*Or*  
The improvements are too general (e.g., we will add an | **No improvements are provided.** |
| empirical/research based evidence. And | The improvement actions are specific, with a brief implementation plan (e.g., approximate dates of and person(s) responsible for implementation, and where in curriculum/activities and department/program they will occur) | approximate dates, and where in curriculum/activities and department/program they will occur. Or If no improvements are planned, then the program has provided a justification or rationale, such as: 1) increase the benchmark, or explain why the benchmark does not need to be increased; 2) state plans to focus on another area of concern for future assessments, 3) and work to monitor and maintain the current level of success for this outcome (i.e., “because” statements). | assignment, we will do better next year). Or No improvements planned and no justification or explanation given. |