# West Liberty University

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Spring 2018

BOG Program Review:

- Business Administration
- Music BM
- Social Science

BOG Assessment Updates:

- Biology
- English
- Social Science
- Speech Pathology
- Visual Communication

# WEST LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

Board of Governors Chair Leslie DeFelice
208 University Drive (304) 281-2409
West Liberty, WV 26074
lesd@visitingangelswv.com

May 22, 2018

The West Liberty University Board of Governors, at its April 4, 2018 meeting, was asked to approve the five-year program review for the following degree programs and recommend continuation of the programs at the current level of activity:

- Bachelor of Music
- Bachelor of Arts in Social Science
- Bachelor of Science in Social Science
- Bachelor of Science in Business Administration

On motion and second, it was unanimously adopted by the West Liberty University Board of Governors to approve the stated program review recommendations.

Sincerely,


Leslie DeFelice, Chair
West Liberty University Board of Governors

# BOG Program Review Assessment Update
## Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

Degree Program: <u>Biology Department</u>          Chair: <u>Karen Ketter</u>          Assessment Coordinator: <u>Vacant</u>          Date: <u>April 2018</u>

Committee Action: ☒ Assessment Plan Approved     ☒ Next BOG Program Review scheduled for <mark>spring 2020</mark>
<u>HEPC Policy</u>: an External Consultant is required one year prior to BOG Review

## Biology:

1. The committee would like to commend you on another solid assessment report, and we would like to pass on some suggestions as you continue to move forward.

2. If we are understanding the report correctly, it appears that Biology has four program goals and 11 student learning outcomes.  While the SLOs for program goals #3 and #4 are written in a measurable terms, the SLOs for the first two goals are not all measurable.  This can be easily corrected by choosing an action verb to more accurately reflect your expectations.  The committee noted that you are perhaps making things more difficult for yourselves by having 11 different SLOs to measure.  It may be worth considering how you could develop one broader SLO for each goal, and then incorporate the current SLOs into sub goals that operationalize the new SLO but allow you to measure and report on fewer SLOs.

3. The committee would like to remind you that it is not necessary to address each general study outcome in every course, but that you integrate each GS outcome into your Program Goals/SLOs.  We suspect that you are doing this, and would like to encourage you to make the connection more explicit in your report.

4. Your direct assessment measures seem to be identified at the course level, rather than the program level.  From an assessment standpoint, it is not necessary to assess the program goals in every course, though the course goals should align with the overall program goals so that at the completion of the program, graduates have been provided the opportunity to master each of the program goals.  By simplifying your programmatic assessment schedule, you may be able to make the data analysis easier and more useful.

5. One caution regarding your indirect measure is to be sure that they are addressing the program SLOs.

6. The committee would like to see more specific information in the timeline to the extent possible, and a clear connection, possibly with illustrative examples, of how data is being used and the connection between the SLOs and the assessments being administered.

7. We want to again commend you for your efforts and encourage you to continue with the momentum you have built.

| Biology | (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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (A) Student Learning Outcomes | 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) General Studies Integration | 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 *either* 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. |
| (C)Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments) | 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. |
| (D) Location of Measures | 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. |
| (E)Timeline for Assessment Implementation | 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 |
| (F)Implementation of Program Revision | 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. |
| ← Indicates improvement over last review | | | | | ➔ Indicates a decline over last review |

Degree Program: Social Sciences, Department Chair: Jeremy Larance, Faculty Assessment Coordinator, Aron Massey

A&A Committee Action: ☒ Assessment Plan Approved ☒ Next Assessment Update due with Program Review scheduled: <mark>spring 2019</mark>

HEPC Policy: an External Consultant is required one year prior to BOG <mark>Review</mark>

**Social Sciences:**

1. Overall, your work in assessment is definitely moving forward. The committee noted some very nice progress (which is indicated by the increasing scores on the attached rubric). And overall, we would like to encourage you to continue that progress. That said, there were a few additional notes the committee would like to communicate about your assessment work.

2. The committee is not necessarily supportive of the idea to move the comprehensive exam. It is the committee's opinion that the constitution of the exam (rather than the location) may be the issue. If the students are unable to answer the exam questions at the end of the program, one has to wonder if the exam is truly testing the program's SLOs. If the exam is appropriately keyed to the program's SLOs, then it would be fine to give a *comprehensive* exam at the *end* of the program. Moving it to the middle of the program seems to defeat its purpose as an instrument to give you information on the students' ability to meet the program's SLOs. We wonder if the stronger revision here would be to rethink the instrument itself (rather than moving its location).

3. In addition, the committee feels you might be able to do more with the portfolio. Rather than merely an endpoint assessment, we wonder if you might be able to use the portfolio in an ongoing way throughout the program. In addition, the committee wondered if it would be beneficial to develop a rubric (or rubrics) of your own to use in assessing the portfolio. That might give you a better chance of appropriately linking the portfolio to the outcomes it is designed to measure.

4. In short, your progress has been good and the committee would like to see you continue to move forward in collecting data. It simply seems as though there might be some ways to refine and tighten up the instruments you're using to make them more successful in delivering information about your SLOs.

| Social Sciences | (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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (A) Student Learning Outcomes | 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) General Studies Integration | 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 *either* 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. |
| (C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments) | 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. |
| (D) Location of Measures | 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. |
| (E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation | 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 |
| (F) Implementation of Program Revision | 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. |
| ← Indicates improvement over last review | | | | → Indicates a decline over last review | |

Degree Program: **BA English**      Department Chair: Jeremy Larance      Assessment Coordinator: Angela Rehbein      Department**:** Humanities-April 2018

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee: ☒ Assessment Plan Approved ☒ Next BOG Program Review scheduled for <mark>spring 2020</mark>

HEPC Policy: an External Consultant is required one year prior to BOG Review

## English:

1. The committee would like to congratulate you on your continued progress.  It is obvious that you took to heart the suggestions from your previous review and worked to incorporate them into your assessment program.
2. You have three specifically stated and measurable goals.  Goal four is not measurable as it is written, but could easily be made measurable.  You may want to think more about what it would look like if students were acknowledging culturally diverse perspectives.  One trick that might help is to consider the statement, "Watch me…" to determine if an objective is measurable.  "Watch me analyze, compose, and synthesize research" are all easy to see.  "Watch me acknowledge" is less so.  Perhaps using a stronger verb would come closer to your true intent.
3. Because English courses are such an integral component of the General Studies outcomes, it can be difficult at times to differentiate coursework from programmatic assessment.  Your program SLOs seem to align well with the GS outcomes for written communication, critical thinking, and cultural awareness.  We believe that you could also include the assessment of verbal communication into your program goals as you are most certainly expecting this form of expression from your students.
4. The committee would like to see the connection between the program SLOs and the GS outcomes, as well as the connection between the direct and indirect assessment measures and the program SLOs they are measuring more explicitly.  We would also encourage you to ensure that your indirect measures focus on the program goals and not just on satisfaction.
5. The committee was unclear about whether students are assessed multiple times on all program goals, or if they are assessed on each SLO one time over the course of their time in the program.  We suspect the former, but would like more clarification on this.
6. Your timeline was outstanding and provided us with a very clear understanding of your plans.
7. While your implementation of program revision is scored relatively low, it could easily increase dramatically as you begin sharing and using the data you are collecting in your decision making.  We would also encourage you to develop a simple strategy for sharing data with the faculty.
8. We once again want to commend you for the progress you have made and encourage you to continue with the momentum you have built.

| English | (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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (A) Student Learning Outcomes | 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) General Studies Integration | 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 *either* 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. |
| (C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments) | 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. |
| (D) Location of Measures | 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. |
| (E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation | 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 |
| (F) Implementation of Program Revision | 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. |

← Indicates improvement over last review  → Indicates a decline over last review

Degree Program: Speech Pathology Program Director: <u>Stephanie Bradley</u>            Date: <u>April 2018</u>
Committee Action: ☒ Assessment Plan Approved     ☒ Next BOG Program Review scheduled for <mark>spring 2019</mark>
<mark>HEPC Policy</mark>: an External Consultant is required one year prior to BOG Review

## Speech Pathology:

1.  The committee wants to first say how amazed we are with the progress that you have made in such a short period of time.  You are well on your way to a very solid assessment program, and we appreciate your work on this.
2.  We would like to offer a few suggestions as you move to the next steps in your planning.  Program SLOs #2-4 are written in a clear and measurable way. You may want to change the verb used in #1 to make it more measurable. Perhaps you are trying to convey the goal of students being able to apply (or demonstrate or some verb that is higher on the blooms taxonomy) their knowledge of the basic components of human communication?  You may also want to consider whether preparing students for graduate work would apply to all of your students.
3.  The General Studies Integration section is often a source of confusion for those who are just beginning the assessment process.  The intent is not to focus on which courses in a program are taught within the general studies program, but to allow programs to demonstrate the ways in which the three GS outcomes are integrated and assessed within the program.  Your current program goals suggest that by meeting your program goals, they will also be meet the first 2 goals of the GS outcomes.  While students in your program most likely gain self & cultural awareness, demonstrating the alignment between the program goal and the GS goals would make this more obvious.
4.  There may also be some confusion between grading, which happens at the course level, and assessment, which happens at the program level.  Assessment answers the question, "What do I want my graduates to know and be able to do?" and "How do I know that they have met those goals?"  It is bigger than just one course.  You may be making it more difficult on yourself than you need to.  You have four program goals, and you just need to have multiple (direct & indirect) ways of assessing students to ensure that they are meeting those goals.   For example, how will you know if they have met Program goal #2? You may develop a rubric of what that would look like and then use the rubric on three assignments across the curriculum (beginning, middle, and end).
5.  You do have several direct measures to choose from for your SLOs.  You may want to differentiate in your own mind what is necessary for grading in a specific class versus what is necessary for assessment at the program level.  Streamlining the assessment process to some key points may make the assessment process more manageable.  You also have an indirect measure through self-assessment which can provide you with useful assessment data. A common mistake the committee has seen is for programs to assess student's satisfaction with the program rather than their progress toward or obtaining the program goals.
6.  Your timeline is very clear and will provide you with a useful guide as you move through the assessment process.
7.  We are excited to see how you are able to implement this process moving forward, and are impressed with how much you have accomplished in such a short period of time.  We want to encourage you to keep the momentum you have developed.

| **Speech Pathology** | (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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (A) Student Learning Outcomes | 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) General Studies Integration | 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 *either* 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. |
| (C)Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments) | 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. |
| (D) Location of Measures | 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. |
| (E)Timeline for Assessment Implementation | 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 |
| (F)Implementation of Program Revision | 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. |

← Indicates improvement over last review      → Indicates a decline over last review

Degree Program: Visual Communication      Department Chair: Brian Fencl      Assessment Coordinator: James Haizlett      Date: April 2018

University Assessment and Accreditation Committee Action: ☒ Assessment Plan Approved ☒ Next BOG Program Review scheduled for <mark>spring 2020</mark>

HEPC Policy: an External Consultant is required one year prior to BOG Review

## Visual Communication:

1. The committee would like to commend your ongoing efforts to improve your programmatic assessment.  Your student learning outcomes are clearly stated and measurable.  We noted the addition of a Sophomore Portfolio Review that serves as a formative assessment.

2.  You have obviously continued your efforts to integrate the general studies outcomes into your program outcomes.  While it appears that you have integrated the GS outcomes into specific classes in your curriculum, it is less clear how the GS outcomes are assessed within the program.  One possible way to address this is to develop an assessment rubric which addresses each of the five program goals and incorporates the GS outcomes into the rubric.

3. We would have liked to see a robust portfolio rubric included with your submission which clearly links back to the program and general studies goals.

4. You have several methods of directly assessing students learning, but we did not find evidence of indirect assessment of the program goals.  This could be easily addressed by having students or supervisors rate how well they feel students have met the programs goals.

5. While your timeline seems to suggest that no further assessment implementation is required, we would encourage you to continue analyzing the data you collect from your assessments and make curricular adjustments.  While job placement is one measure of success, it is not the only one of importance for liberal arts graduates and perhaps only indirectly measures your program goals.

6. You mentioned your faculty's efforts to use your assessment data when making decisions, and it would be helpful for the committee to have some specific examples of how you have used the data.

7. The committee would once again like to commend you on the progress that you have made and to encourage you to use the data you are collecting in a concrete way as you continue your assessment efforts.

| Visual 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (A) Student Learning Outcomes | 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) General Studies Integration | 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 *either* 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. |
| (C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments) | 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. |
| (D) Location of Measures | 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. |
| (E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation | 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→ |
| (F) Implementation of Program Revision | 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. |

← Indicates improvement over last review → Indicates a decline over last review