

ALOAR REVIEW GUIDE AND RUBRIC¹
Office of Accreditation and Assessment
Chapman University

Rating Guide:

Rate each area as follows: **1 = Needs improvement; 2 = Needs minor improvement; 3 = Meets Requirement; 4 = Exceeds Requirement**

Previous year's ratings (1-4 - if available; n/a – if unavailable)		
Process:	Performance:	Progress:

SECTION 1: PROGRAM INFORMATION

Name of Degree Program:

Department/School:

Program Chair/Director's Name:

Report Writer's Name (if different than chair/director):

Report Writer's Email:

ALOAR Program Information #4:

Reporter

- Has the reporter changed since last year? If so, the report will need a more critical review to ensure consistency (OARS Program Information Question #4)

ALOAR Program Information #10:

Curricular map is attached and depicts a clear and sufficient crosswalk of learning outcomes and courses.

- All learning outcomes are sufficiently identified and covered throughout the curriculum (i.e., Introduced, Reinforced/Practiced, Advanced/Mastered).

1	2	3	4
- Map is either missing or not representative of the program - According to the map, the learning outcomes are not clearly or adequately developed	- Map is missing some elements of development - Map shows unbalanced learning outcome development across the curriculum	- Map clearly shows development of learning outcomes - Map is balanced and the curriculum is appropriately sequenced	- Map indicates curriculum innovation and coursework coordination - Map shows robust development for each learning outcome

Score:

Comments for this section:

SECTION 2: PROCESS/PERFORMANCE

ALOAR Process/Performance Question #1:

¹ Developed by Dr. Paul Kang, Director of Accreditation and Assessment

Learning outcomes are clearly and appropriately written.

- Is each learning outcome clearly written and understandable?
- Would students (or parents) reading the learning outcome understand the program learning expectations?

1	2	3	4
- Learning outcomes are too general or vague - Unclear or unfit objective on knowledge, skills, and values gained (i.e., fit)	- Learning goals need minor clarification, adjustment - Objectives could use a little more explanation about knowledge, skills, or values gained (i.e., fit)	- Learning goals are clear and appropriately written for the program - Knowledge, skills, or values gain is appropriate for the program (i.e., fit)	- Learning goals (in sum) show a thorough and coordinated learning experience for the program - There are clear connections between learning outcomes on knowledge, skills, or value gained (i.e., fit)

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #4 and #5:

At least two university assessment themes are supported.

- Interdisciplinary programs, Faculty-Student Research, Global Education, Personalized Education & Student Writing.

1	2	3	4
- Two university themes are not supported	- The explanation for the connections between the university themes and the learning outcomes are not clear	- The explanation for the connections between the university themes and the learning outcomes are clear	- More than the minimum required themes supported and the connections are clearly explained

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

ALOAR Process/Performance Question #7:

Learning outcomes are published across program materials.

1	2	3	4
- The explanation does not indicate where learning outcomes are published - The program needs to publish learning outcomes that are widely accessible to students	- The explanation does not clearly indicate publication of learning outcomes, (i.e., they may be in course syllabi?) - Some publications are described, but student access may be limited	- Clear explanations about where the learning outcomes are published and are widely accessible to students	- Detailed explanations and examples about where the learning outcomes are published (e.g., website) - Specific learning outcomes are published in corresponding course syllabi

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #8 and #9:

Evidence of learning is sufficient for assessment of the learning outcomes.

- Are they consistent with the curricular map?
- Are the evidence of learning clearly explained?
- Sufficient direct assessments (e.g., assignments, exams, projects, etc.)?
- Indirect assessments (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.)?

1	2	3	4
- The evidence does not match the curriculum map - There is very little or insufficient evidence to demonstrate appropriate development for each learning outcome	- Some of the evidence match the curriculum map, but others are either missing or lacking - The program needs additional evidence to demonstrate proper development of learning outcome	- The evidence is consistent with the curriculum map - The evidence is appropriate and sufficient for each learning outcome	- The program provides supplementary evidence to substantiate more than adequate development of learning outcome (i.e., triangulation). - The program utilizes indirect assessments to support their direct assessments (not replacement, but in addition to)

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

ALOAR Process/Performance Question #10:

Level of achievement seems appropriate for the learning outcomes.

- Has the program established a benchmark for the learning outcomes?
- In your view, would meeting the benchmark demonstrate the program's successful preparation of their students?

1	2	3	4
- The benchmark is either missing or lacks clarity - The benchmark does not match the assessment tool	- The benchmark is set for some of the assessments, but stronger rationale is needed to get an adequate view of program success - Additional explanations are necessary about how the benchmark connects with each of the assessment tools	- The benchmark is appropriately set for each of the assessments - There is clear connection between the benchmark and the assessment tools	- The benchmark has been validated from previous findings or other standardized scales - There are strong justifications for how the benchmark has been established and connections to the assessment tools.

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

**ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #11, #12, and #13:
Sampling strategy is accurate, reliable, and sufficient for assessment of the learning outcome.**

1	2	3	4
- Sampling rationale is difficult to understand. - Sample size is too small for the program size. - Sampling distribution is skewed or biased.	- Sampling rationale need minor clarification. - Sample size is a bit too small. - Sampling distribution is somewhat skewed or biased.	- Sampling rationale is clearly articulated. - Sample size is sufficiently proportional to the program size. - Sample distribution is appropriate for the program population.	- Sampling rationale is thoughtfully planned and articulated. - Sample size is more than sufficient. - Sample distribution is appropriate for the program population.

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

**ALOAR Process/Performance Question #14:
Assessment tools are clearly tied to the learning outcomes and contain distinctive levels of evaluation.**

- Do the assessment tools correspond to the curricular map and evidence of learning?
- Quality of assessment tools:
 - Criteria are clearly indicated and explained
 - Performance levels are distinctive
 - Sufficiently address and assess respective learning outcomes?

1	2	3	4
- The assessment tools are not consistent with the curriculum map or evidence of learning - The assessment criteria (and performance levels) are missing or need significant development - There is little connection between the assessment tool and the learning outcome	- Some assessment tools align with the curriculum map and evidence of learning, but there are gaps - The assessment criteria (and performance levels) need to be improved - The connection between the assessment tool and the learning outcome could be more specific	- The assessment tools are consistent with the curriculum map and evidence of learning - The criteria and performance levels are appropriate for student performance evaluation - There is clear and sufficient connection between the assessment tool and the learning outcome	- There is evidence of purposeful coordination of assessment tools to gain a thorough view of student performance development - The criteria and performance levels are well designed, clearly articulated, and thoroughly assess student performance. - There is nuanced coordination between each tool and the learning outcomes

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

**ALOAR Process/Performance Question #15:
All assessment tools are attached.**

- Are the number of assessment tools sufficient and consistent with the curricular map and evidence of learning?

1	2	3	4
- Assessment tools are not attached	- Some assessment tools are attached, but others are missing	- Sufficient assessment tools are attached	N/A

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #16 and #17:

Student performance data is attached or on the report with appropriate analysis.

- Is it consistent with the curricular map and evidence of learning?
- Does the data sufficiently provide a transparent aggregate view of student performance?
- If summarized data, is it too abbreviated?

1	2	3	4
- There is insufficient assessment data - The data does not match previous sections - There is little assessment data analysis	- Missing some data to complete its learning outcome analysis - Some of the data does not match the previous sections - The data analysis is not clear or could be improved.	- There is sufficient data to analyze the learning outcome - The data appropriately match previous sections - The data analysis is clear and sufficient	- There is robust and individual student data for analysis - There is clear indication of assessment coordination - The data analysis is thorough and provides additional insight for program improvement

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #17 and #18:

Student performance data consistently supports the explanation of levels of achievement.

- Is it consistent with the levels of achievement explanation?
- Does the program provide a description of data analysis?
- Is the description of analysis clear and understandable?

1	2	3	4
- There is little connection between the levels of achievement and the data analysis	- There are some connections, but they are inconsistent	- There is consistency between the levels of achievement and data analyses	- Thoughtful data analysis contributes to and supports detailed explanations of the levels of achievement

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

ALOAR Process/Performance Question #18:
Explanation of levels of achievement captures either satisfactory achievement levels or unsatisfactory achievement levels with strong justifications/rationale.

- Is the explanation of actual performance clear and sufficient?
- If there are students below the target, does the program provide sound explanation?
- Does the program describe a remediation process?

1	2	3	4
- There are insufficient explanations for meeting or not meeting the expected level of achievement	- The explanations need additional narrative to better illustrate its conclusions about meeting or not meeting its expected level of achievement	- The explanations clearly and sufficiently articulate how the program is meeting or not meeting its expected level of achievement	- The explanation is not only clear and appropriate, but also nuanced, thoughtful, and purposeful for program improvement

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #19 and #20:
Three-year performance data is attached or on the report, and the data is reasonably comparable. Any gaps in the data trend are appropriately explained.

- Does the data sufficiently provide a transparent aggregate view of year-over-year student performance on respective learning outcomes?
- Is there progress on achievement?
- Does the program provide sufficient analysis of year-over-year student performance on respective learning outcomes?
- If year-over-year data has dips or gaps, does the program provide explanation of the dips, etc.?

1	2	3	4
- There are insufficient data and explanation to get a clear year-over-year view of student performance for each learning outcome - There is little or no year-over-year data analysis	- The year-over-year data and explanation are missing some elements to get a clear year-over-year view of the student performance for each learning outcome - Data analysis needs to be improved	- There are sufficient data and explanation to get a clear year-over-year view of student performance for each learning outcome - Data analysis shows suitable program progress	- There are data and explanations that span beyond three years - The data analysis and interpretation are thoughtful and lead to purposeful program improvement plans

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

Comments for this section:

PROGRESS SECTION

FOR ALL LEARNING OUTCOMES

ALOAR Progress Question #1:

Student performance data and analysis were satisfactorily shared with faculty and students.

- Do the students have access to review results? Do the faculty meet, review, and discuss data?

1	2	3	4
- There is little indication that the information is shared with faculty or students	- The information is shared with either faculty or students, but not both	- The information is shared and discussed with faculty and shared with students	- There is clear indication that the information is meaningfully integrated into discussions with faculty and students about program improvement

Score:

ALOAR Progress Question #1:

The narrative clearly responds to past years' recommendations.

- Does the program's explanation contain specific responses to past comments, questions, and recommendations from the assessment committee?

1	2	3	4
- There is insufficient response to past comments, questions, or recommendations	- There are some responses, but they need to more thoroughly address all past comments, questions, or recommendations	- The explanation is sufficient and appropriately addresses past comments, questions, and recommendations	- There is clear indication that the program is using the comments, questions, and recommendations to improve student learning

Score:

ALOAR Progress Question #2:

The narrative provides insights and learning points based on data analysis of student performance.

- Does the program seem to be thoughtfully working through what they are discovering from their assessment and results each year?

1	2	3	4
- There is little or no connection of how program is using the assessment information to understand student learning	- The program is showing some effort to understand its assessment data and student learning, but is not yet complete	- The program is using its data and information to understand student learning	- The program is critically studying its data, tools, and curriculum to understand student learning

Score:

ALOAR Progress Question #2:

The program articulates a good plan for program improvement (i.e., closing the loop).

- Is the program making meaningful program improvement (from year-to-year)?
- Have they made progress from previous program improvement efforts?
- Are they attempting to make meaningful assessment improvements?

1	2	3	4
- There is little indication of program improvement - The narrative about program improvement is superficial	- There is discussion about program improvement, but it is not well-aligned to assessment - The narrative needs additional information/description	- The discussion shows apt and meaningful program improvement accomplishments and plans - The narrative is clear about what the program has accomplished and what it plans to do for continuous improvement	- The discussion shows thoughtful, detailed, and appropriately-sequenced strategies for program improvement - The narrative is transparent and detailed about what the program has learned over the years and its commitment to continuous improvement

Score:

Comments for this section:

WSCUC CC REVIEW GUIDE AND RUBRIC²
Office of Accreditation and Assessment
Chapman University

Rating Guide:

Rate each area as follows: **1 = Needs improvement; 2 = Needs minor improvement; 3 = Meets Requirement; 4 = Exceeds Requirement**

Previous year's ratings (1-4 - if available; n/a – if unavailable)		
Process:	Performance:	Progress:

CT = Critical Thinking
 OC = Oral Communication
 WC = Written Communication
 IL = Information Literacy
 QR = Quantitative Reasoning

PROGRAM INFORMATION

Name of Degree Program:
Department/School:
Program Chair/Director's Name:
Report Writer's Name (if different than chair/director):
Report Writer's Email:

CC Program Information – Contact Person #1:

- Has the reporter changed since last year? If so, the report will need a more critical review to ensure consistency.

CC Program Information – Curriculum Map #5:

Curricular map is attached and depicts a clear and sufficient crosswalk of learning outcomes and courses.

- All learning outcomes are sufficiently identified and covered throughout the curriculum (i.e., Introduced, Reinforced/Practiced, Advanced/Mastered).

1	2	3	4
- Map is either missing or not representative of the program - According to the map, the learning outcomes are not clearly or adequately developed	- Map is missing some elements of development - Map shows unbalanced learning outcome development across the curriculum	- Map clearly shows development of learning outcomes - Map is balanced and the curriculum is appropriately sequenced	- Map indicates curriculum innovation and coursework coordination - Map shows robust development for each learning outcome

Score:

Comments for this section:

² Developed by Dr. Paul Kang, Director of Accreditation and Assessment

PROCESS SECTION

CC Process Section Question #1:

The WSCUC core competency learning outcomes are clearly and appropriately written.

- Is each learning outcome clearly written and understandable?
- Would students (or parents) reading the learning outcome understand the program learning expectations?

1	2	3	4
- Learning outcomes are too general or vague - Unclear or unfit objective on knowledge, skills, and values gained (i.e., fit)	- Learning goals need minor clarification, adjustment - Objectives could use a little more explanation about knowledge, skills, or values gained (i.e., fit)	- Learning goals are clear and appropriately written for the program - Knowledge, skills, or values gain is appropriate for the program (i.e., fit)	- Learning goals (in sum) show a thorough and coordinated learning experience for the program - There are clear connections between learning outcomes on knowledge, skills, or value gained (i.e., fit)

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Process Questions #2 and #3:

Evidence of learning is sufficient for assessment of the learning outcomes.

- Are they consistent with the curricular map?
- Are the evidence of learning clearly explained?
- Sufficient direct assessments (e.g., assignments, exams, projects, etc.)?
- Indirect assessments (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.)?

1	2	3	4
- The evidence does not match the curriculum map - There is very little or insufficient evidence to demonstrate appropriate development for each learning outcome	- Some of the evidence match the curriculum map, but others are either missing or lacking - The program needs additional evidence to demonstrate proper development of learning outcome	- The evidence is consistent with the curriculum map - The evidence is appropriate and sufficient for each learning outcome	- The program provides supplementary evidence to substantiate more than adequate development of learning outcome (i.e., triangulation). - The program utilizes indirect assessments to support their direct assessments (not replacement, but in addition to)

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Process Question #4:

Sampling strategy is accurate, reliable, and sufficient for assessment of the learning outcome.

1	2	3	4
- Sampling rationale is difficult to understand. - Sample size is too small for the program size. - Sampling distribution is skewed or biased.	- Sampling rationale need minor clarification. - Sample size is a bit too small. - Sampling distribution is somewhat skewed or biased.	- Sampling rationale is clearly articulated. - Sample size is sufficiently proportional to the program size. - Sample distribution is appropriate for the program population.	- Sampling rationale is thoughtfully planned and articulated. - Sample size is more than sufficient. - Sample distribution is appropriate for the program population.

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Process Question #5:

All assessment tools are attached.

- Are the number of assessment tools sufficient and consistent with the curricular map and evidence of learning?

1	2	3	4
- Assessment tools are not attached	- Some assessment tools are attached, but others are missing	- Sufficient assessment tools are attached	N/A

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Process Question #5:

Assessment tools are clearly tied to the learning outcomes and contain distinctive levels of evaluation.

- Do the assessment tools correspond to the curricular map and evidence of learning?
- Quality of assessment tools:
 - Criteria are clearly indicated and explained
 - Performance levels are distinctive
 - Sufficiently address and assess respective learning outcomes?

1	2	3	4
- The assessment tools are not consistent with the curriculum map or evidence of learning - The assessment criteria (and performance levels) are missing or need significant development - There is little connection between the	- Some assessment tools align with the curriculum map and evidence of learning, but there are gaps - The assessment criteria (and performance levels) need to be improved - The connection between the assessment tool and	- The assessment tools are consistent with the curriculum map and evidence of learning - The criteria and performance levels are appropriate for student performance evaluation - There is clear and sufficient connection between the	- There is evidence of purposeful coordination of assessment tools to gain a thorough view of student performance development - The criteria and performance levels are well designed, clearly articulated, and thoroughly assess student performance.

assessment tool and the learning outcome	the learning outcome could be more specific	assessment tool and the learning outcome	- There is nuanced coordination between each tool and the learning outcomes
--	---	--	---

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Process Question #6:

Level of achievement seems appropriate for the learning outcomes.

- Has the program established a benchmark for the learning outcomes?
- In your view, would meeting the benchmark demonstrate the program’s successful preparation of their students?

1	2	3	4
- The benchmark is either missing or lacks clarity - The benchmark does not match the assessment tool	- The benchmark is set for some of the assessments, but stronger rationale is needed to get an adequate view of program success - Additional explanations are necessary about how the benchmark connects with each of the assessment tools	- The benchmark is appropriately set for each of the assessments - There is clear connection between the benchmark and the assessment tools	- The benchmark has been validated from previous findings or other standardized scales - There are strong justifications for how the benchmark has been established and connections to the assessment tools.

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

Comments for this section:

PERFORMANCE SECTION

CC Performance Question #1:

Explanation of levels of achievement captures either satisfactory achievement levels or unsatisfactory achievement levels with strong justifications/rationale.

- Is the explanation of actual performance clear and sufficient?
- If there are students below the target, does the program provide sound explanation?
- Does the program describe a remediation process?

1	2	3	4
- There are insufficient explanations for meeting or not meeting the expected level of achievement	- The explanations need additional narrative to better illustrate its conclusions about meeting or not	- The explanations clearly and sufficiently articulate how the program is meeting or not meeting its	- The explanation is not only clear and appropriate, but also nuanced, thoughtful,

	meeting its expected level of achievement	expected level of achievement	and purposeful for program improvement
--	---	-------------------------------	--

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Performance Questions #2 and #3:

Student performance data is attached or on the report with appropriate analysis.

- Is it consistent with the curricular map and evidence of learning?
- Does the data sufficiently provide a transparent aggregate view of student performance?
- If summarized data, is it too abbreviated?

1	2	3	4
- There is insufficient assessment data - The data does not match previous sections - There is little assessment data analysis	- Missing some data to complete its learning outcome analysis - Some of the data does not match the previous sections - The data analysis is not clear or could be improved.	- There is sufficient data to analyze the learning outcome - The data appropriately match previous sections - The data analysis is clear and sufficient	- There is robust and individual student data for analysis - There is clear indication of assessment coordination - The data analysis is thorough and provides additional insight for program improvement

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Performance Questions #2 and #3:

Student performance data consistently supports the explanation of levels of achievement.

- Is it consistent with the levels of achievement explanation?
- Does the program provide a description of data analysis?
- Is the description of analysis clear and understandable?

1	2	3	4
- There is little connection between the levels of achievement and the data analysis	- There are some connections, but they are inconsistent	- There is consistency between the levels of achievement and data analyses	- Thoughtful data analysis contributes to and supports detailed explanations of the levels of achievement

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Performance Question #4:

Student performance data and analysis were satisfactory shared with faculty and students.

- Do the students have access to review results? Do the faculty meet, review, and discuss data?

1	2	3	4
- There is little indication that the information is shared with faculty or students	- The information is shared with either faculty or students, but not both	- The information is shared and discussed with faculty and shared with students	- There is clear indication that the information is meaningfully integrated into discussions with faculty and students about program improvement

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Performance Questions #4:

Three-year performance data is attached or on the report, and the data is reasonably comparable. Any gaps in the data trend are appropriately explained.

- Does the data sufficiently provide a transparent aggregate view of year-over-year student performance on respective learning outcomes?
- Is there progress on achievement?
- Does the program provide sufficient analysis of year-over-year student performance on respective learning outcomes?
- If year-over-year data has dips or gaps, does the program provide explanation of the dips, etc.?

1	2	3	4
- There are insufficient data and explanation to get a clear year-over-year view of student performance for each learning outcome - There is little or no year-over-year data analysis	- The year-over-year data and explanation are missing some elements to get a clear year-over-year view of the student performance for each learning outcome - Data analysis needs to be improved	- There are sufficient data and explanation to get a clear year-over-year view of student performance for each learning outcome - Data analysis shows suitable program progress	- There are data and explanations that span beyond three years - The data analysis and interpretation are thoughtful and lead to purposeful program improvement plans

	LO #1	LO #2	LO #3	LO #4	LO #5	LO #6	LO #7
Score							

Comments for this section:

PROGRESS SECTION

CC Progress Question #1:

The narrative clearly responds to past years' recommendations.

- Does the program's explanation contain specific responses to past comments, questions, and recommendations from the assessment committee?

1	2	3	4
- There is insufficient response to past comments, questions, or recommendations	- There are some responses, but they need to more thoroughly address all past comments, questions, or recommendations	- The explanation is sufficient and appropriately addresses past comments, questions, and recommendations	- There is clear indication that the program is using the comments, questions, and recommendations to improve student learning

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Progress Question #1:

The narrative provides insights and learning points based on data analysis of student performance.

- Does the program seem to be thoughtfully working through what they are discovering from their assessment and results each year?

1	2	3	4
- There is little or no connection of how program is using the assessment information to understand student learning	- The program is showing some effort to understand its assessment data and student learning, but is not yet complete	- The program is using its data and information to understand student learning	- The program is critically studying its data, tools, and curriculum to understand student learning

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

CC Progress Question #1:

The program articulates a good plan for program improvement (i.e., closing the loop).

- Is the program making meaningful program improvement (from year-to-year)?
- Have they made progress from previous program improvement efforts?
- Are they attempting to make meaningful assessment improvements?

1	2	3	4
- There is little indication of program improvement - The narrative about program improvement is superficial	- There is discussion about program improvement, but it is not well-aligned to assessment - The narrative needs additional information/description	- The discussion shows apt and meaningful program improvement accomplishments and plans - The narrative is clear about what the program has accomplished and what it plans to do for continuous improvement	- The discussion shows thoughtful, detailed, and appropriately-sequenced strategies for program improvement - The narrative is transparent and detailed about what the program has learned over the years and its commitment to continuous improvement

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
Score					

Score					
--------------	--	--	--	--	--

CC Progress Question #2:

Three-year performance data is attached or on the report, and the data is reasonably comparable. Any gaps in the data trend are appropriately explained.

- Does the data sufficiently provide a transparent aggregate view of year-over-year student performance on respective learning outcomes?
- Is there progress on achievement?
- Does the program provide sufficient analysis of year-over-year student performance on respective learning outcomes?
- If year-over-year data has dips or gaps, does the program provide explanation of the dips, etc.?

1	2	3	4
- There are insufficient data and explanation to get a clear year-over-year view of student performance for each learning outcome - There is little or no year-over-year data analysis	- The year-over-year data and explanation are missing some elements to get a clear year-over-year view of the student performance for each learning outcome - Data analysis needs to be improved	- There are sufficient data and explanation to get a clear year-over-year view of student performance for each learning outcome - Data analysis shows suitable program progress	- There are data and explanations that span beyond three years - The data analysis and interpretation are thoughtful and lead to purposeful program improvement plans

Score	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR

Comments for this section: