

ALOAR REVIEW RUBRIC¹
 A Review Guide for the Assessment Committee
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:

College/School:

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

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 #11:

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:

Learning outcomes are clearly and appropriately written.

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

- 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	LO #8
Score								

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #3 and #4:

At least two university assessment themes are supported (across all learning outcomes).

- 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	LO #8
Score								

ALOAR Process/Performance Question #6:

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	LO #8
Score								

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #7 and #8:

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	LO #8
Score								

ALOAR Process/Performance Question #9:

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	LO #8
Score								

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #10, #11, and #12:
Sampling strategy is accurate, reliable, and sufficient for assessment of the learning outcome.

1	2	3	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sampling rationale is difficult to understand. - Sample size is too small for the program size. - Sampling distribution is skewed or biased. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sampling rationale need minor clarification. - Sample size is a bit too small. - Sampling distribution is somewhat skewed or biased. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sampling rationale is clearly articulated. - Sample size is sufficiently proportional to the program size. - Sample distribution is appropriate for the program population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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	LO #8
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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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	LO #8
Score								

ALOAR Process/Performance Question #14:

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	LO #8
Score								

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #15 and #16:

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	LO #8
Score								

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #16 and #17:

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	LO #8
Score								

ALOAR Process/Performance Question #17:

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	LO #8
Score								

ALOAR Process/Performance Questions #18 and #19:

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	LO #8
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 #2:

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:

CORE COMPETENCIES REVIEW GUIDE AND RUBRIC¹
 A Review Guide for the Assessment Committee
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:
College/School:
Program Chair/Director's Name:
Report Writer's Name (if different than chair/director):

CC Program Information – Contact Person #1:

- Has the reporter changed since last year? If yes, 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:

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

PROCESS SECTION

CC Process Section Question #1:

The 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 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 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.

	the learning outcome could be more specific		- 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 Questions #4 and #5:

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

	CT	OC	WC	IL	QR
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					

CC Progress Question #2:

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					

Comments for this section: