Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)				
	Exemplary 3	**Acceptable 2**	**Developing 1**	**Score or Holistic Evaluation**
Clarity and specificity	All SLOs are stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs and rich descriptions of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students upon completing the program.	SLOs generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students.	SLOs are inconsistently defined for the program, descriptions of the knowledge, skill and value domains are present but lack consistent precision.	3
Student-Centered	All SLOs are stated in student-centered terms (i.e. what a student should know, think, or do).	Most SLOs are stated in student-centered terms.	Some SLO's are stated in student-centered terms.	3
Expectation Level	SLO's exceed basic expectations established by the University and other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	SLO's meet the basic expectations established by the University and other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	SLOs meet only a portion of the expectations established by the University or other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	2

Recommendations:

- The program is working to find a way to synthesize the current 13 SLOs to reduce the number of overall program outcomes being systematically measured to make determinations about student performance and program efficacy. It may be possible to address specific statements of knowledge, skills and dispositions as indicators under more broadly written SLOs.

Programmatic Curricular Map				
	Exemplary 3	**Acceptable 2**	**Developing 1**	**Score or Holistic Evaluation**
Content Alignment	All SLOs are mapped to common classes or learning activities expected of all students completing the program.	Most SLOs are mapped to common classes or learning activities expected of all students completing the program.	Common classes or learning activities are identified for all students completing the program but most SLO's are not clearly mapped to classes or activities.	3
Student Learning Development of SLOs (Learning Benchmarks)	Curricular Map clearly identifies the progression of student learning relative to all SLOs at specific points in the curriculum	Curricular Map identifies levels of expected learning relative to most SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.	Curricular Map identifies expected levels of learning for some SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.	3
Student Engagement	Classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined in the SLOs.	Classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined by most of the SLOs	Classes and/or activities do not consistently engage students in the work outlined by most of the SLOs.	3

Recommendations:

- Current SLOs are clearly mapped to core courses, including identification of where SLOs are measured at defined points in the program.

Alignment with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework				
	Exemplary **3**	**Acceptable** **2**	**Developing** **1**	**Score or Holistic Evaluation**
IPFW Baccalaureate Framework Alignment	Specific, clearly defined, student-centered Program-Level SLO's are aligned to all foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	Generally defined student-centered Program-Level SLO's are aligned to all foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	Program-Level SLO's are aligned to some foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	3
Recommendations:				

Assessment Plan – Part 1				
	Exemplary 3	**Acceptable 2**	**Developing 1**	**Score or Holistic Evaluation**
Relationship between assessments and SLOs	Detail is provided regarding SLO-to-measure match. Specific items included on the assessment are linked to SLOs. The match is affirmed by faculty subject experts.	Description of how SLOs relate to assessment is general but sufficient to show alignment.	Description of how SLOs relate to assessment is incomplete or too general to provide sufficient information for use in determining progress toward SLO.	2
Types of Measures	All SLOs are assessed using at least two measures including at least one direct measure	Most SLOs are assessed using at least one direct measure.	Most SLOs are either assessed using only indirect measures or are not assessed.	2

Recommendations:

- Program faculty are encouraged to continue to examine ways to reduce the number of program assessments needed to evaluate the SLOs. This will help to ensure that the program is able to engage in critical conversation and not be overwhelmed by the scope of systematic data collection required by having too many SLOs.

Assessment Plan – Part 2				
Established Results	Statements of desired results (data targets) provide useful comparisons and detailed timelines for completion.	Statements of desired results provide a basic data target and a general timeline for completion.	Statements of desired results are missing or unrealistic for completion.	2
Data Collection and Design Integrity	The data collection process is sound, clearly explained, and appropriately specific to be actionable.	Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process with limited methodological concerns.	Limited information is provided about the data collection process or includes sufficient flaws to nullify any conclusions drawn from the data	2
Evidence of Reliability of Measures	Methods used to ensure reliability of findings are clearly explained and consistently support drawing meaningful conclusions.	Methods used to ensure reliability of findings are stated and generally support drawing meaningful conclusions.	Methods to ensure reliability of findings are insufficient for drawing meaningful conclusions.	`1

Recommendations:

- As the program faculty continue to work to synthesize SLOs and refine and reduce the number of overall program assessments continue to study potential ways to improve the systematic collection of program data. This will allow for improved methods for determining the reliability of program measures.

Reporting Results				
	Exemplary 3	**Acceptable 2**	**Developing 1**	**Score or Holistic Evaluation**
• Present ation of Results	Results are clearly present and directly related to SLOs. Results consistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLOs. Results are derived from generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment.	Results are present and related to SLOs. Results generally demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLOs. Results are derived from generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment.	Results are provided but do not clearly relate to SLO's. Results inconsistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLO's. Use of generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment is unclear.	2
Historical Results	Past iterations of results are provided for most assessments to provide context for current results.	Past iterations of results are provided for the majority of assessments to provide context for current results.	Limited or no iterations of prior results are provided.	2
Interpretation of Results	Interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLOs, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. Multiple faculty interpreted the results including an interpretation of how classes/activities might have affected the results.	Interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLO's, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. Multiple faculty interpreted the results.	Interpretation of results does not adequately refer to stated SLO's or identify expectations for student learning relative to SLO's. The interpretation does not include multiple faculty.	3
Recommendations:				

- The program is proactively working to move from measuring the scope of assessments to the actual quality. Subsequently, the program is engaging in critical conversations about what program assessments yield the best information with respect to student performance and program efficacy.

Report Dissemination and Collaboration				
	Exemplary **3**	**Acceptable** **2**	**Developing** **1**	**Score or Holistic Evaluation**
Documents and results are shared with faculty	Information is routinely provided to all faculty with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.	Information is provided to all faculty through an effective mode and with sufficient detail to be meaningful.	Information is not distributed to all faculty or provides insufficient detail to be meaningful.	3
Documents and results are shared with other stakeholders	Information is routinely provided to stakeholders (beyond faculty) with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.	Information is shared with stakeholders (beyond faculty) through an effective mode and with sufficient detail to be meaningful.	Information is not distributed to stakeholders (beyond faculty) or provides insufficient detail to be meaningful.	3

Recommendations:

Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success – Part 1				
	Exemplary **3**	**Acceptable** **2**	**Developing** **1**	**Score or Holistic Evaluation**
Programmatic and Curricular Improvement	Evidence reported demonstrates a consistent pattern of an integrated assessment, pedagogy and curricular approach that assesses student performance relative to SLOs, uses assessment data to make curricular and/or pedagogical changes and re-assesses learning to determine how or the extent to which the change positively influenced student learning.	Evidence reported demonstrates assessment of student learning relative to SLO's and describes curricular and/or pedagogical changes planned or made as a result of assessment of student learning. Some evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/ re-assess is demonstrated.	Assessment findings are reported but insufficient evidence of curricular or pedagogical changes are present and limited or no evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/re-assess is demonstrated.	3

Recommendations:

- The program has documented the ability to revise program requirements as needed to be relevant in meeting the needs of current and prospective students. This has included soliciting feedback from the human services field in the larger community.

Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success – Part 2				
	Exemplary **3**	**Acceptable** **2**	**Developing** **1**	**Score or Holistic Evaluation**
Improvement of Assessment Process (mechanics)	Past and current assessment process are critically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, present and intended improvements to process are identified (when needed) and specific changes to the assessment process are detailed.	Past and current assessment process are critically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, present and intended improvements to process are identified (when needed) and moderate changes to the assessment process, or general plans for improvement of assessment process are proposed.	Past and current assessment process are sporadically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, but no evidence of improving upon past assessment or making plans to improve assessment in future iterations is proposed.	3

Recommendations:

- As program faculty work to synthesize the number of program SLOs, it is expected the quality of assessment criteria reflected in program key assessments will actually strengthen (i.e., with respect to alignment to standard indicators).