

Evaluation Component	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Emerging (2)	Inadequate (1)	Not Evident (0)	Row Total
Organization of report	<p>100% of report sections (9) were included.</p> <p>Report was in the proper order.</p>	<p>At least 75% of report sections (7) were included.</p> <p>Report sections included were in the proper order.</p>	<p>At least 50% of report sections (5) were included.</p> <p>Report sections included were not in the proper order.</p>	<p>At least 25% of report sections (3) were included.</p> <p>Report sections included were not in the proper order.</p>	<p>Two or fewer sections were included.</p>	
Desired Outcomes (PLO GOALS)	<p>At least four PLOs are identified.</p> <p>100% of the PLOs are aligned with Mission Statement.</p>	<p>At least four PLOs are identified.</p> <p>75% of the PLOs are aligned with Mission Statement.</p>	<p>At least three PLOs are identified.</p> <p>75--100% of the PLOs are aligned with Mission Statement.</p>	<p>At least three PLOs are identified.</p> <p>Less than 50% of the PLOs are aligned with Mission Statement.</p>	<p>No PLOs are identified.</p>	
Desired Student learning outcomes (SLO Goals)	<p>At least four SLOs are identified.</p> <p>100% of the SLOs are aligned with Program Learning Outcomes.</p> <p>Targets are stated and quantified for 100% of the stated outcomes.</p> <p>100% of Benchmarks provide baseline data.</p> <p>100% of Benchmarks are related to data from (a) prior academic year(s). Benchmarks are realistic based on prior year performance and proposed program upgrade.</p> <p>100% of the outcomes are quantifiable and are aligned with Program Level Outcomes.</p>	<p>At least four SLOs are identified.</p> <p>75% of the SLOs are aligned with Program Learning Outcomes.</p> <p>Targets are stated and quantified for at least 75% of the stated outcomes.</p> <p>75% of the Benchmarks provide baseline data.</p> <p>75% of the Benchmarks are related to data from (a) prior academic year(s). Benchmarks are realistic based on prior year performance and proposed program upgrade.</p> <p>75% of the outcomes are quantifiable and are aligned with Program Learning Outcomes.</p>	<p>At least three SLOs are identified.</p> <p>50% of the SLOs are aligned with Program Learning Outcomes.</p> <p>Targets are stated and quantified for at least 50% of the stated outcomes.</p> <p>50% of the Benchmarks provide baseline data.</p> <p>50% of the Benchmarks are related to data from (a) prior academic year(s). Benchmarks are realistic based on prior year performance and proposed program upgrade.</p> <p>50% of the outcomes are quantifiable and are aligned with Program Learning Outcomes.</p>	<p>At least two SLOs are identified.</p> <p>25% of the SLOs are aligned with Program Learning Outcomes</p> <p>Targets are stated and quantified for at least 25% of the stated outcomes.</p> <p>25% of the Benchmarks provide baseline data.</p> <p>25% of the Benchmarks are related to data from (a) prior academic year(s). Benchmarks are realistic based on prior year performance and proposed program upgrade.</p> <p>25% of the outcomes are quantifiable and are aligned with Program Learning Outcomes.</p>	<p>No SLOs are identified.</p> <p>No evidence that the standard of performance is quantified for each stated goal.</p> <p>0% of the stated performance standards provide quantified baseline data.</p> <p>0% of the quantified outcomes are trend-supported and/or statistically relevant to the baseline standard.</p> <p>0% of the quantified outcomes are aligned with Program Learning Outcomes</p>	

Evaluation Component	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Emerging (2)	Inadequate (1)	Not Evident (0)	Row Total
Assessment Methods & Procedures	<p>Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section.</p> <p>Explained the methods and the procedures that were used to assess each outcome</p> <p>Direct and indirect measures were utilized</p> <p>100% of the assessment approaches encompassed multiple-methods—(Exams, papers, presentations, projects, etc.)</p>	<p>Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section.</p> <p>Explained the methods and the procedures that were used to assess each outcome</p> <p>Direct and indirect measures were utilized</p> <p>At least 75% of the assessments approaches encompassed multiple-methods—(Exams, papers, presentations, projects, etc.)</p>	<p>Restated some of the numbered student learning outcome from previous section.</p> <p>Explained some of the methods and the procedures that were used to assess each outcome but not clear</p> <p>Direct measures were utilized but no evidence of indirect measures</p> <p>At least 50% of the assessment approaches encompassed multiple-methods—(Exams, papers, presentations, projects, etc.)</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated.</p> <p>Did not explain the methods and the procedures that were used to assess each outcome</p> <p>Indirect measures were utilized but no evidence of direct measures</p> <p>At least 25% of the assessment approaches encompassed multiple-methods—(Exams, papers, presentations, projects, etc.)</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated.</p> <p>No coverage of methods and the procedures t evident</p> <p>No evidence of direct or indirect measures utilized.</p> <p>No evidence that the assessments methods evaluate a desired outcome.</p>	

Evaluation Component	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Emerging (2)	Inadequate (1)	Not Evident (0)	Row Total
Results	<p>Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section.</p> <p>100% of the results are aligned with the assessment methods.</p> <p>Results are presented for 100% of the assessments methods.</p>	<p>Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section.</p> <p>75% of the results are aligned with the assessment methods.</p> <p>Results are presented for 75% of the assessments.</p>	<p>Restated some of the numbered student learning outcome from previous section.</p> <p>50% of the results are aligned with the assessment methods.</p> <p>Results are presented for 50% of the assessments.</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated.</p> <p>25% of the results are aligned with the assessment methods.</p> <p>Results are presented for 25% of the assessments.</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated.</p> <p>0% of the results are aligned with the assessment methods.</p> <p>Results are presented for 0% of the assessments.</p>	
Planned Improvements based on assessment results (Closing the loop and planning for the next cycle)	<p>Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section.</p> <p>100% of the actions are directly linked to stated results.</p> <p>100% of the actions linked to specific student. Learning outcomes</p>	<p>Restated each numbered student learning outcome from previous section.</p> <p>75% of the actions are directly linked to stated results.</p> <p>75% of the actions linked to specific student. Learning outcomes</p>	<p>Restated some of the numbered student learning outcome from previous section.</p> <p>50% of the actions are directly linked to stated results.</p> <p>50% of the actions linked to specific student. Learning outcomes</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated.</p> <p>25% of the actions are directly linked to stated results.</p> <p>25% of the actions linked to specific student. Learning outcomes</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes from the previous section were not restated.</p> <p>0% of the actions are directly linked to stated results.</p> <p>0% of the actions linked to specific student. Learning outcomes</p>	

Evaluation Component	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Emerging (2)	Inadequate (1)	Not Evident (0)	Row Total
Appendix	Provided supporting information for the report (Four or more items)					
Readability of report	<p>Report was written for a broad audience and contained no jargon.</p> <p>Report was concise and did not contain unnecessary information.</p> <p>100% of the section headings and transitions were clear.</p> <p>All tables were appropriate and supported the text</p>	<p>Report was written for a broad audience and contained very little jargon.</p> <p>Report was concise but contained unnecessary information.</p> <p>75% of section headings and transitions were clear.</p> <p>75% of tables were appropriate and supported the text</p>	<p>The report was technical and not written for a broad audience and contained too much jargon.</p> <p>Report was overly verbose.</p> <p>50% of section headings and transitions were clear.</p> <p>50% of tables were appropriate and supported the text</p>	<p>The report was far too technical and not written for a broad audience and contained far too much jargon. .</p> <p>Report very verbose.</p> <p>25% of section headings and transitions were clear.</p> <p>25% of tables were appropriate and supported the text</p>	<p>The report was poorly organized</p> <p>The report was unreadable.</p> <p>0% of section headings and transitions were clear.</p> <p>0% of tables were appropriate and supported the text</p>	
Score						

Score = (Column Total)/32 * (100)