

	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>student learning outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- three student learning outcomes are listed</li> <li>- describe knowledge and skills students will possess after completing courses or degrees in your program</li> <li>- observable and measureable using appropriate action verbs</li> <li>- do not including verbs that cannot be observed, ex. understand, comprehend, appreciate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- less than three student learning outcomes listed or a very long list of student learning outcomes is listed</li> <li>- Describe a process, rather than an outcome (i.e. language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns).</li> <li>- uses verbs that cannot be observed, ex. understand, comprehend, appreciate</li> </ul>
<b>methods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- at least two methods for each outcome including at least one direct method for each outcome that directly examines student work for evidence of learning</li> <li>- if used, rubrics are of high quality with clearly differentiated levels of achievement</li> <li>- if used, rubrics are included in report</li> <li>- direct methods are sustainable and built into regular assignments and/or exams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not all outcomes at least two methods and include one direct method</li> <li>- poor quality rubrics are used which do not clearly differentiate levels of achievement</li> <li>- course grades used as an assessment method (end of course grades, not rubric scores that may be used as grades on particular assignments)</li> <li>- rubrics are not included</li> </ul>
<b>achievement targets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- represent a reasonable level of success (70-80%)</li> <li>- specific and measurable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no achievement targets listed</li> <li>- goal of 100% of students meeting a goal for a student learning outcome</li> <li>- aligned with assessment process rather than results (e.g. survey return rate, number of papers reviewed)</li> </ul>
<b>results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate</li> <li>- provide solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met; it's ok not to meet targets, as long as there is a plan to improve</li> <li>- appropriate data collection/analysis</li> <li>- complete, concise and well-organized</li> <li>- does not include information that could identify students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- incomplete, too much, or poorly organized information</li> <li>- questionable conclusion about whether targets were met, partially met, or not met</li> <li>- questionable data collection/analysis; conclusions not supported by data</li> <li>- includes information that could identify students</li> </ul>
<b>use of results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clearly respond to results of assessment</li> <li>- identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical next steps; includes changes to major/minor, courses, or assignments to improve student learning</li> <li>- possibly identifies an area of the assessment process that needs improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not clearly related to assessment results</li> <li>- no plans to change major/minor, courses, or assignments to improve student learning</li> </ul>