

## Assessment and Accreditation Committee

### PROGRAM REVIEW APPROVAL

#### Consent Items

The Board of Governors is asked to approve the five-year program review for the following degree programs and recommend **continuation of the program at the current level of activity with the next review scheduled for (February 1, 2019).**

- Regent's R.B.A.
- Interdisciplinary B.S.
- Medical Laboratory Science B.S.
- Exercise Physiology B.S.

The Board of Governors is asked to approve the five-year program review and recommend **continuation of the program at the current level of activity with corrective action focused on further development of the program's assessment plan.**

Criminal Justice B.S. (February 1, 2016)

Additionally, the Board of Governors is asked to approve the following program review assessment reports and the recommendations of the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee.

**Assessment plan approved**, no additional reports required until the next scheduled BOG program review.

Psychology B.S./B.A. (February 1, 2016)

**Assessment Plan revision is required.**

- Communication B.S. (February 1, 2016)
- Chemistry B.S. (February 1, 2016)
- Mathematics B.S. (February 1, 2015)

## Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Chemistry**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **Wednesday, February 26, 2014**

Decision (check one):

Assessment plan approved

Assessment plan revision is required for February 1, 2016

### Committee Recommendations

#### Chemistry

1. First, the committee would like to commend you on the level of enthusiasm and commitment with which you have approached the creation of an assessment system for your program. We are well aware that you were essentially starting from scratch, and the level of engagement and collaboration you've shown in getting to where you are is impressive,
2. That said, the committee did have a few comments to relay about some aspects of the system that were not 100% clear. In regard to the Student Learning Outcomes, we had a few questions. One committee member wondered if you were really assessing two different things in SLO 3. Are evaluation and communication two entirely different skills each warranting its own objective? In addition, your use of the word "fundamental" in SLO 2 raised a question as to whether Chemistry majors' laboratory skills ought to reach a higher level than fundamental. We wondered if SLO 2 might be a place to articulate a desire for your Chemistry majors to *apply* laboratory skills, *demonstrate problem solving* in a laboratory setting, or some other higher order skill than merely displaying fundamentals (which they may, in fact, display as early as CHE 111).
3. There was also a question as to whether or not you were truly measuring what you say you're measuring in SLO 1. SLO 1 requires that students display *application* of chemical concepts, but it seemed that many of the measures tied to SLO 1 were merely measuring acquisition of knowledge. It seems that acquisition of that knowledge and application of that knowledge may be fundamentally different skills that will require different kinds of measures to assess.
4. It was also unclear to the committee how you were measuring the lab skills. It's clear that the students are completing experiments, lab reports, and even possibly presentations on those lab findings. However, it was unclear how they're doing so linked specifically to finding out about students' lab skills. For instance, embedded within the Organic Lab is an article presentation. It's clear how this aligns to SLO 3 regarding communication of chemical findings; however, it's unclear how this measure demonstrates the students' actual lab skills. In short, there needed to be a clearer link between the measures and SLO 2.
5. Finally, we were unsure how to read the #1-9 items under the long-term planning section. Were these to be possible revisions to SLOs? Were these to be components underneath the current SLOs that you wanted to find more information about? It wasn't clear exactly how these items figured into your plans.
6. But overall, this is a very fine report, and the committee was highly impressed with the good work and planning you've done in just a short time. Thanks for your commitment to the process, and best of luck moving forward.

Committee Membership

---

Steve Criniti, Chair, Keely Camden, Matthew Harder, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

### Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Chemistry	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
<b>(A) Student Learning Outcomes</b>	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
<b>(B) General Studies Integration</b>	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
<b>(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)</b>	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
<b>(D) Location of Measures</b>	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
<b>(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation</b>	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
<b>(F) Implementation of Program Revision</b>	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

#### Committee Membership

Steve Criniti, Chair, Keely Camden, Matthew Harder, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

## Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Communication**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **Wednesday, February 26, 2014**

Decision (check one):

Assessment plan approved

Assessment plan revision is required for February 1, 2016

**Committee Recommendations: Communication**

1. This report evidenced a step forward in the planning process. We as a committee recognize the difficulty of assessing such a multi-faceted program (with such a wide variety of tracks), and we appreciate the work you've put into planning an assessment system for such a complicated assessment task. The committee is impressed with the planning work you've done so far.
2. In fact, given our level of satisfaction with the planning you've done up to this point, the committee's primary recommendation to you at this point in the process is to begin moving forward with data collection. We recognize that the rubrics are still in the midst of an organic creation process, but we'd like to see you solidify those sooner rather than later. In addition to solidifying the instruments, it is also a good time to begin gathering at least preliminary data and working on implementation. As you know, even if the early data is insufficient, its very collection will tell you important things about your instruments and overall process. As a result, the committee commends your careful and collaborative planning up to this point and encourages you to go forward with implementation.

---

Committee Membership

Steve Criniti, Chair, Keely Camden, Matthew Harder, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

### Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Communication	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
<b>(A) Student Learning Outcomes</b>	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
<b>(B) General Studies Integration</b>	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
<b>(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)</b>	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO. ←	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
<b>(D) Location of Measures</b>	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program. ←	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
<b>(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation</b>	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
<b>(F) Implementation of Program Revision</b>	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

#### Committee Membership

Steve Criniti, Chair, Keely Camden, Matthew Harder, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

## Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Mathematics**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **Wednesday, February 26, 2014**

Decision (check one):

Assessment plan approved

Assessment plan revision is required for February 1, 2015

Committee Recommendations: **Mathematics**

1. Knowing the situation in which your program finds itself—faculty overhaul, shifting of assessment coordinators, etc.—the committee is highly impressed with the level of assessment planning you were able to accomplish.
2. In particular, we really liked the embedded/tagged exam question approach. That was a cool idea, and in fact, we've recommended a similar approach to another program looking for a way to utilize exams in the assessment process.
3. The committee did wonder about the weekly problem sets approach. We felt that might be a bit too ambitious to pull off and put to use.
4. The committee did have a question about the specificity of your outcomes. We were undecided as to whether or not they were too specific to be useful, as several committee members asserted. Other committee members thought it might be possible that this level of specificity is necessary in math. At the very least, it seemed worth raising the issue for your consideration. In addition, we wondered if the measure were substituted for the outcome in SLO D (the one about proofs). So overall, it might be worth initiating a discussion with your faculty about the level of specificity necessary in Math SLOs, or whether there may be “bigger picture” skills/dispositions you might prefer to aim for.
5. The committee recognized the integration of General Studies in your program outcomes; however, it didn't appear that the General Studies skills were being assessed within your program just yet (that may be a forthcoming development).
6. It appears that SLO E needs to be measured in at least one additional location.
7. Finally, it also appeared that many of your measures are currently described in the future tense. As a result, the committee would encourage you to move forward with pilot testing them and/or beginning to collect data with them.
8. Overall, the committee is impressed with the level of planning you've been able to accomplish in your circumstances. It appears that you're well positioned to move forward into the next phase of your assessment work. Keep it up!

Committee Membership

---

Steve Criniti, Chair, Keely Camden, Matthew Harder, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

### Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Mathematics	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
<b>(A) Student Learning Outcomes</b>	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity. ←	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
<b>(B) General Studies Integration</b>	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location. ←	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
<b>(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)</b>	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
<b>(D) Location of Measures</b>	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program. ←	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
<b>(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation</b>	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year. ←	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
<b>(F) Implementation of Program Revision</b>	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

#### Committee Membership

Steve Criniti, Chair, Keely Camden, Matthew Harder, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

## Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Psychology**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **Wednesday, February 26, 2014**

Decision (check one):

Assessment plan approved with no additional reports required until the next BOG Program Review scheduled for: **February 1, 2016**

Assessment plan revision is required

**Committee Recommendations: Psychology**

1. To be quite frank, the committee is highly impressed with your report and the work it represents. You became the “all stars” of this particular round of reviews, and given your permission, we might even be inclined to share some of your strategies and approaches with other struggling programs. So our first recommendation is to keep up the good work.
2. In the interest of offering at least *some* feedback (and perhaps we’re grasping at straws here), we did notice that your measures for the Personal Development outcome seemed to be a bit less formed (perhaps simply not as far along as the others) at this point.
3. In addition, the committee requested just a bit more specificity as to the timeline for future work (i.e., which semesters you’ll be gathering which kinds of evidence, when you plan to review your evidence and revisit the curriculum, etc.).
4. But overall, you have developed a model assessment program. The committee would like to commend you for your work, and we hope you’ll keep it up!

---

Committee Membership

Steve Criniti, Chair, Keely Camden, Matthew Harder, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

### Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Psychology	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
<b>(A) Student Learning Outcomes</b>	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
<b>(B) General Studies Integration</b>	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable ←←	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
<b>(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)</b>	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO. ←←	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
<b>(D) Location of Measures</b>	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)←←	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
<b>(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation</b>	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years. ←←	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
<b>(F) Implementation of Program Revision</b>	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

#### Committee Membership

Steve Criniti, Chair, Keely Camden, Matthew Harder, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

## Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Criminal Justice**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **Wednesday, February 26, 2014**

Decision (check one):

Assessment plan approved

Assessment plan revision is required for February 1, 2016

Committee Recommendations: **Criminal Justice**

1. As you know, in prior reviews, the committee has been impressed with your commitment to and understanding of the assessment process. The growth your program has shown in the last 5 years is nothing short of impressive.
2. However, the committee also felt that this most recent report demonstrated a bit more stasis than growth. While it's true that progressive exponential growth is not entirely sustainable, the committee did feel that your program hit a plateau with this report and needs to continue to push toward an improved assessment system for your program.
3. One of the primary issues the committee noticed was the use of classroom exams for assessment. While it's true that exams are undoubtedly a form of assessment, they are not sufficient, in their current form, to tell you what you want to know about your program. It's possible to tag certain exam questions that will indicate particular SLOs (and approach that the Math program is using with some success, for instance). However, simply giving exams and noting whether students pass them does not demonstrate a significant link between the measure and the SLO it is designed to interrogate.
4. In addition, if you attempt to use *every* class's exam as a location for assessment data, it will likely become too large a burden on the program. You are more likely to have success in identifying particular locations within your program to gather data about particular SLOs, thereby keeping the assessment process as simplified as possible.
5. You mentioned the use of portfolios. The committee is aware of the Social Science department's implementation of portfolios, and we are pleased with that development. However, in the case of CJ, it wasn't clear how you were planning to use the portfolios to find out what you want to find out about your students. It's one thing to collect artifacts in a portfolio, but it's another thing entirely to mine those artifacts for data about your students' abilities. Moving forward, you will likely need to be a bit more deliberate about how you plan to utilize the portfolios to gather the data you need from them.
6. Finally, the committee remarked that SLO 1 (explaining the justice system) may not adequately describe what you truly want them to do. Explaining the justice system would seem to be a lower order skill—perhaps even a skill that students could do by the end of an intro class. However, it seems that by the end of your program there are likely higher order skills (i.e., application of their knowledge of the justice system to a variety of controversial real-world scenarios, or something like that) that students may need to exhibit in order to be successful Criminal Justice professionals.
7. In short, the committee remains appreciative of the growth your program has shown in the area of assessment over the past 5 years, but we would also like to encourage you to push through the plateau and continue moving your assessment program forward.

Committee Membership

---

Steve Criniti, Chair, Keely Camden, Matthew Harder, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

### Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Criminal Justice	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
<b>(A) Student Learning Outcomes</b>	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity. ←	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
<b>(B) General Studies Integration</b>	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location. ←	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
<b>(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)</b>	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
<b>(D) Location of Measures</b>	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
<b>(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation</b>	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
<b>(F) Implementation of Program Revision</b>	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data. →	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

#### Committee Membership

Steve Criniti, Chair, Keely Camden, Matthew Harder, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White