

Assuring QUALITY

An Institutional Self-Assessment Tool
for Excellent Practice in Student
Learning Outcomes Assessment

new leadership
ALLIANCE 
for student learning and accountability

Assuring QUALITY

An Institutional Self-Assessment Tool
for Excellent Practice in Student
Learning Outcomes Assessment

new leadership
ALLIANCE 
for student learning and accountability

©2012 by New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability. All rights reserved.
This material may not be reproduced, displayed, modified or distributed without the express prior written permission of the copyright holder.

Published by New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability
1825 K Street NW, Suite 705
Washington, DC 20006

Phone: 202.263.7478 | Fax: 202.234.7640
E-mail: office@newleadershipalliance.org
www.newleadershipalliance.org

ISBN-13: 978-0-9881937-1-0

This publication was made possible by grants from Carnegie Corporation of New York, The Teagle Foundation, and The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. The statements made and views expressed are solely the responsibility of the authors.

CONTENTS

From the Executive Director	2
Acknowledgments	3
Introduction	4
Assuring Quality Institutional Self-Assessment Tool	5
Conducting the Self-Assessment Process	7
AAHE Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning	9
Criteria	13
Worksheets	23
Section 1: Demonstrate Commitment to Assessment and Accountability	24
Section 2: Articulate Institution-Wide Student Learning Outcomes	26
Section 3: Articulate Academic Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes	36
Section 4: Articulate Cocurricular Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes	46
Section 5: Document Assessment Practices and Processes in a Formal Plan	56
Section 6: Gather Evidence of Student Learning Outcomes (Institution-Wide, Academic Program Level, and Cocurricular Program Level)	64
Section 7: Use Evidence To Improve Student Learning Outcomes (Institution-Wide, Academic Program Level, and Cocurricular Program Level)	66
Section 8: Report on the Process and Results of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (Institution-Wide, Academic Program Level, and Cocurricular Program Level)	76
Overall Evaluation of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Performance	82
Step B Template	84
Glossary	85
Selected Bibliography	86
Board of Directors and Staff	88

FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Graduates of postsecondary institutions must achieve at high levels to be prepared for work, life, and citizenship. To ensure that graduates do so, colleges and universities must integrate student learning outcomes assessment into their cultures, and everyone at these institutions — presidents and chancellors, faculty members, academic and student affairs administrators, and students — must work together to assess learning across the entire institution.

Assessment of student learning outcomes should be comprehensive and systematic so it provides an accurate, clear picture of what students know and are able to do as well as where improvements can be made. Institutions should explicitly state expected outcomes, collect and use evidence, and share results.

The New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability created this institutional self-assessment tool to help institutions improve the assessment of student learning on their campuses. Zaneeta Daver, associate director, coordinated the development of this tool with significant input from Trudy Banta and Ephraim Schechter (titles available on page 3) and the assistance of an advisory board and pilot administration participants. It reflects the best thinking in student learning outcomes assessment. It will allow your institution to look at its efforts critically, discover areas for improvement, and strategically plan for the future. It is designed to serve as a framework for best practice in assessing and ensuring quality.

We in the Alliance are pleased with this first edition of the tool, but we also ask for your feedback. The Alliance plans to continually revise this instrument to make sure it is appropriate for all institutional types. The strength of this tool lies in it being used widely so that institutions improve their assessment processes and, in turn, improve student learning outcomes.

Similarly, we encourage you to use this tool as appropriate to your institution and with a solid dose of common sense. Each criterion includes substantial checklists of items. While the Alliance believes it is important for all types of institutions to be familiar with all of the criteria, some items within a criterion may not be relevant to your institutions. For example, some of the information relevant to a criterion may apply to some institutions and not to others, and some of the criteria may not be applicable to all institutional types or fit your current institutional culture. The tool is not meant to be a mechanical exercise, but a guide to conversation and self-examination leading to improvement at your institution.

David C. Paris
Executive Director

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability thanks the individuals and institutions that helped design and test Excellent Practice in Student Learning Assessment, a proposed certification program, from which this publication is derived. Their collective expertise and guidance moved an innovative idea from a concept to an initiative, and together they have made an outstanding contribution to the higher education community.

Advisory Board

Trudy W. Banta

Professor and Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Academic Planning and Evaluation, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Charlie Blaich

Director, Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College and the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium

Marilee Bresciani

Professor, Postsecondary Education, San Diego State University

Peter T. Ewell

Vice President, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

George Kuh

Director, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment

Pamela Glenn Menke

Vice Provost, Education, Miami Dade College

Linda Suskie

Assessment and Accreditation Consultant

Former Vice President at the Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Randy Swing

Executive Director, Association for Institutional Research

Pilot Evaluators

Daniel Bernstein

Professor and Director of Center for Teaching Excellence, University of Kansas

Linda Cabe Halpern

Dean of University Studies and Professor of Art History, James Madison University

Gavin Henning

Associate Professor of Higher Education and Director, Educational Administration Programs, New England College

J. Joseph Hoey

Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation, Bridgepoint Education

Peggy Maki

Education Consultant specializing in assessing student learning and Assessment Consultant to the Advancing a Massachusetts Culture of Assessment at the Massachusetts Department of Higher Education

Robert Mundhenk

Board President, Association for the Assessment of Learning in Higher Education

Visiting Scholar, The Higher Learning Commission

Ephraim Schechter

Founder of HigherEdAssessment.com

Former University Director of Assessment, North Carolina State University (retired)

Jeff Seybert

Director, National Higher Education Benchmarking Institute, Johnson County Community College

Steve Weisler

Professor of Linguistics, Hampshire College

Carrie Zelna

Director, Office of Assessment, North Carolina State University

Pilot Institutions

Barton College
Camden County College
Capella University
Connecticut College
Elon University
James Madison University
Keene State College
Middlesex Community College
St. Petersburg College
United States Naval Academy
University of Central Florida
University of San Francisco
Westminster College

INTRODUCTION

As postsecondary education becomes ever more important both for the U.S. economy and democracy, the rallying cry is becoming “more degrees, cheaper and faster.” U.S. higher education must broaden the dialogue to include a focus on quality.

Many people assume that if a degree has been earned, then learning has occurred. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. Awarding more degrees will be meaningful only if those degrees reflect a high level of student accomplishment. Those granting education credentials must ensure that students have developed the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes that prepare them for work, life, and responsible citizenship. U.S. higher education must focus on both quantity and quality — increasing graduation rates and the learning represented by the degree.

A true focus on quality requires everyone at a postsecondary institution — presidents and chancellors, faculty members, academic and student affairs administrators, and students — to work together to answer the question “Are our students learning?” That effort — assessing student learning outcomes — will help institutions attain multiple goals, including ensuring that degrees reflect a high level of student achievement; increasing retention and completion rates; and reaffirming the quality of the credentials they award.

Assuring Quality is a self-evaluation tool for colleges and universities to identify their strengths and weaknesses with regard to assessing student learning. It is a follow up to the Alliance’s 2012 publication, *Committing to Quality: Guidelines for Assessment and Accountability in Higher Education*. *Committing to Quality* provides a framework for discussing educational quality and taking action to improve it. It is endorsed by more than 35 national higher education organizations and encourages institutions to set clear goals for student achievement, regularly measure performance against those goals, report on evidence of success, and continuously work to improve results.

The Assuring Quality Institutional Self-Assessment Tool:

- ◆ Can be used by an institution as a model for designing an institutional assessment process and for providing professional development activities;
- ◆ Can be used by an institution for self-study of its assessment process, allowing it to clearly see its strengths and areas in need of improvement and to plan strategically for the future; and
- ◆ Can help an institution accurately assess its performance against a set of criteria. Meeting all of the established criteria indicates that high-level student learning outcomes assessment and accountability practices and processes are integrated into the culture of an institution.

ASSURING QUALITY INSTITUTIONAL SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

Concept

Committing to Quality: Guidelines for Assessment and Accountability in Higher Education, published in January 2012 by the Alliance, serves as a conceptual framework for the design, development, and evaluation of institutional assessment and accountability processes. *The Assuring Quality Institutional Self-Assessment Tool* expands on the guidelines, allowing an institution to easily evaluate its student learning outcomes assessment efforts, and provides a model for high-quality assessment and accountability.

This self-assessment tool sets out 29 criteria institutions can use to evaluate their assessment of student learning on their campuses. These 29 criteria in eight areas comprise the essential indicators of high-quality student learning outcomes assessment and accountability practices. Meeting all of the stated criteria demonstrates excellent student learning outcomes assessment practice. The process of discussing the criteria and conducting the self-assessment will help institutions identify their strengths, uncover gaps in their assessment processes and practices, and allow them to plan strategically for improvement. The worksheets will help institutions gather documentation, draw conclusions about their efforts, and document their findings.

This evidence-based self-assessment is designed to be part of an institution's formative evaluation process with a focus on continuous improvement. In addition, the self-assessment supports program redesign. It also can be useful to build consensus around the features and indicators of high-quality practices.

Guiding Principles

Assuring Quality was designed using the following principles.

- ◆ Postsecondary institutions, individually and collectively, must be able to demonstrate that learning is occurring and that students are graduating prepared for work, life, and citizenship.
- ◆ Self-regulation is crucial for quality assurance.
- ◆ Assessment processes and practices must be institution-specific.
- ◆ Assessment should be used for improvement and not for making comparative institutional judgments or ranking.

Development

The *Assuring Quality Institutional Self-Assessment Tool* emerged from the Alliance's proposed institutional certification initiative, Excellent Practice in Student Learning Assessment (EPSLA). When it is launched, the EPSLA process will certify institutions for excellent student learning outcomes assessment. The initial concept was to establish an incentive for institutions to change their student learning outcomes assessment practices more quickly. Certification would be voluntary, much like the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and

Environmental Design (LEED) certification program for environmentally sound building practices. The resulting recognition would provide a powerful incentive and examples that institutions can use to set and meet higher standards for evidence-based improvement of student learning.

An advisory board helped the Alliance design the EPSLA program. Members included Trudy Banta, Charlie Blaich, Marilee Bresciani, Peter Ewell, George Kuh, Pamela Menke, Linda Suskie and Randy Swing (titles available on page 3). The advisory board helped the Alliance develop a process that would lead to institutional certification for high-level performance in assessment and in using evidence to improve student learning. Over the course of one-and-a-half years, and through a collaborative and iterative process that took into account the views and thoughts of many experts, the Alliance developed an application and evaluation rubrics based on the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) principles and current research and practice. The resulting application and rubrics represented the best thinking in student learning outcomes assessment and documented what a comprehensive, systematic, and integrated assessment process should look like.

With a grant from The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Alliance ran two pilot tests in 2011 and 2012 in which 17 institutions filled out certification applications that were then reviewed by the advisory board and the pilot evaluators. The pilot tests were successful and led to a final version of an application and review process. It also became clear that the model established would benefit practitioners and that all of the good work that had been done should not be put on hold until EPSLA could be launched. This model could be used by institutions, regardless of whether they chose to apply for certification in the future or not.

After the successful release of the publication *Committing to Quality*, a statement of principles designed to get institutions to embrace student learning outcomes assessment and start discussions of putting theory into practice, developing the *Assuring Quality Institutional Self-Assessment Tool* seemed the logical next step.

CONDUCTING THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

What is self-assessment?

Self-assessment is a process that provides information to participants, allowing them to clearly evaluate and understand the overall quality of their work and identify areas for improvement. It provides structure for comparing perceptions, voicing concerns, and identifying outcomes; it strengthens communication among stakeholders; and it helps build a collective vision of desired outcomes and a plan to achieve them.

Why conduct a self-assessment?

The most important benefit of self-assessment is that it is free from the pressure of external monitoring and evaluation systems. While it can be used to inform and complement external evaluation efforts, it is a low-stakes process designed for improvement purposes. Organizations that practice ongoing self-assessment are better prepared to share clear program goals, promising practices, and measurable outcomes.

How do you conduct a self-assessment?

The following steps are meant to serve as a guide for institutions to follow. These steps may not be appropriate for all institutional cultures and should be amended accordingly.

Step 1 Assign a leader.

Self-assessment is a group exercise, not an individual task. For best results, choose a leader to facilitate the process. The leader may be internal, though an external facilitator may provide a neutral voice in discussions.

Step 2 Assemble a team (e.g., a committee or working group) and develop a timeline.

Prior to formally beginning the self-evaluation, assemble a diverse team representing appropriate constituent groups from across the institution. Those involved should have clear expectations for their roles. It is best if the leader clearly communicates the purpose of the self-assessment and how the results will be used. It is critical that the leader communicates and ensures that the process ends with a plan for improvement.

After the team is assembled, hold an introductory meeting so participants can get to know one another; learn about the self-assessment process and the tool; and gain a common understanding of the purpose, timeline for completion, and expectations.

In establishing the timeline, provide ample time for completing the process.

Step 3 Gather documentation.

The tool suggests that institutions consider questions and list supporting evidence that documents and demonstrates that practices and processes are being carried out. It is recommended that all information be gathered and organized prior to evaluating the criteria.

Step 4 Complete the worksheets.

The tool suggests that institutions assess their practices and processes based upon the question answers and documentation collected. It is recommended that team members first individually complete the evaluation and that the group works together to come to a consensus.

Step 5 Develop an action plan for improvement.

Based upon the results of the self-evaluation, the team should develop a future action plan that describes next steps in detail.

Step 6 Write a report.

It is suggested that the results and action plan be documented in a formal report.

Step 7 Debrief on the process.

What was it like to complete the process? What was learned? Was the process beneficial to the campus? What could be done differently next time?

AAHE PRINCIPLES of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning

The Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning were developed under the auspices of the AAHE Assessment Forum in 1992 with support from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). This statement built on earlier efforts by campuses and other groups to articulate guidelines for assessment's practice; its intent was to synthesize important work already done and to invite further statements about the responsible and effective conduct of assessment.

They are included in this publication because they express the values on which the Alliance's efforts and this tool are based. The Alliance endorses this philosophy of student learning outcomes assessment and believes that all assessment processes and practices should be consistent with these principles.

AAHE PRINCIPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE FOR ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING

1 THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING BEGINS WITH EDUCATIONAL VALUES. Assessment is not an end in itself but a vehicle for educational improvement. Its effective practice, then, begins with and enacts a vision of the kinds of learning we most value for students and strive to help them achieve. Educational values should drive not only what we choose to assess but also how we do so. Where questions about educational mission and values are skipped over, assessment threatens to be an exercise in measuring what is easy, rather than a process of improving what we really care about.

2 ASSESSMENT IS MOST EFFECTIVE WHEN IT REFLECTS AN UNDERSTANDING OF LEARNING AS MULTIDIMENSIONAL, INTEGRATED, AND REVEALED IN PERFORMANCE OVER TIME. Learning is a complex process. It entails not only what students know but also what they can do with what they know; it involves not only knowledge and abilities but also values, attitudes, and habits of mind that affect both academic success and performance beyond the classroom. Assessment should reflect these understandings by employing a diverse array of methods including those that call for actual performance, using them over time so as to reveal change, growth, and increasing degrees of integration. Such an approach aims for a more complete and accurate picture of learning, and therefore firmer bases for improving our students' educational experience.

3 ASSESSMENT WORKS BEST WHEN THE PROGRAMS IT SEEKS TO IMPROVE HAVE CLEAR, EXPLICITLY STATED PURPOSES. Assessment is a goal-oriented process. It entails comparing educational performance with educational purposes and expectations — those derived from the institution's mission, from faculty intentions in program and course design, and from knowledge of students' own goals. Where program purposes lack specificity or agreement, assessment as a process pushes a campus toward clarity about where to aim and what standards to apply; assessment also prompts attention to where and how program goals will be taught and learned. Clear, shared, implementable goals are the cornerstone for assessment that is focused and useful.

4 ASSESSMENT REQUIRES ATTENTION TO OUTCOMES BUT ALSO AND EQUALLY TO THE EXPERIENCES THAT LEAD TO THOSE OUTCOMES. Information about outcomes is of high importance; where students "end up" matters greatly. But to improve outcomes, we need to know about student experience along the way — about the curricula, teaching, and kind of student effort that lead to particular outcomes. Assessment can help understand which students learn best under what conditions; with such knowledge comes the capacity to improve the whole of their learning.

5 ASSESSMENT WORKS BEST WHEN IT IS ONGOING, NOT EPISODIC. Assessment is a process whose power is cumulative. Though isolated, "one-shot" assessment can be better than none, improvement is best fostered when assessment entails a linked series of activities undertaken over time. This may mean tracking the progress of individual students, or of cohorts of students; it may mean collecting the same examples of student performance or using the same instrument semester after semester. The point is to monitor progress toward intended goals in a spirit of continuous improvement. Along the way, the assessment process itself should be evaluated and refined in light of emerging insights.

6 ASSESSMENT FOSTERS WIDER IMPROVEMENT WHEN REPRESENTATIVES FROM ACROSS THE EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY ARE INVOLVED. Student learning is a campus-wide responsibility, and assessment is a way of enacting that responsibility. Thus, while assessment efforts may start small, the aim over time is to involve people from across the educational community. Faculty play an especially important role, but assessment's questions cannot be fully addressed without participation by student affairs educators, librarians, administrators, and students. Assessment may also involve individuals from beyond the campus (alumni/ae, trustees, employers) whose experience can enrich the sense of appropriate aims and standards for learning. Thus, understood, assessment is not a task for small groups of experts but a collaborative activity; its aim is wider, better-informed attention to student learning by all parties with a stake in its improvement.

7 ASSESSMENT MAKES A DIFFERENCE WHEN IT BEGINS WITH ISSUES OF USE AND ILLUMINATES QUESTIONS THAT PEOPLE REALLY CARE ABOUT. Assessment recognizes the value of information in the process of improvement. But to be useful, information must be connected to issues or questions that people really care about. This implies assessment approaches that produce evidence that relevant parties will find credible, suggestive, and applicable to decisions that need to be made. It means thinking in advance about how the information will be used, and by whom. The point of assessment is not to gather data and return “results”; it is a process that starts with the questions of decision-makers, that involves them in the gathering and interpreting of data, and that informs and helps guide continuous improvement.

8 ASSESSMENT IS MOST LIKELY TO LEAD TO IMPROVEMENT WHEN IT IS PART OF A LARGER SET OF CONDITIONS THAT PROMOTE CHANGE. Assessment alone changes little. Its greatest contribution comes on campuses where the quality of teaching and learning is visibly valued and worked at. On such campuses, the push to improve educational performance is a visible and primary goal of leadership; improving the quality of undergraduate education is central to the institution's planning, budgeting, and personnel decisions. On such campuses, information about learning outcomes is seen as an integral part of decision-making, and avidly sought.

9 THROUGH ASSESSMENT, EDUCATORS MEET RESPONSIBILITIES TO STUDENTS AND TO THE PUBLIC. There is compelling public stake in education. As educators, we have a responsibility to the publics that support or depend on us to provide information about the ways in which our students meet goals and expectations. But that responsibility goes beyond the reporting of such information; our deeper obligation — to ourselves, our students, and society — is to improve. Those to whom educators are accountable have a corresponding obligation to support such attempts at improvement.

Alexander W. Astin, University of California at Los Angeles; Trudy W. Banta, Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis; K. Patricia Cross, University of California, Berkeley; Elaine El-Khawas, American Council on Education; Peter T. Ewell, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems; Pat Hutchings, American Association for Higher Education; Theodore J. Marchese, American Association for Higher Education; Kay M. McClenney, Education Commission of the States; Marcia Mentkowski, Alverno College; Margaret A. Miller, State Council of Higher Education for Virginia; E. Thomas Moran, State University of New York, Plattsburgh; Barbara D. Wright, University of Connecticut.

— Authors of the AAHE Principles (1992)

CRITERIA

The self-assessment tool sets out 29 criteria by which you can evaluate the assessment of student learning at your institution. The criteria are listed on the next eight pages. The worksheets that follow this listing will help you evaluate your efforts, draw conclusions, and document your findings for each criterion.

CRITERIA

SECTION 1 DEMONSTRATE COMMITMENT TO ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

CRITERION 1. AN ONGOING AND INTEGRATED COMMITMENT TO ACHIEVING STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IS VISIBLE IN THE ACTIONS OF THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY.

- 1a. Is there an explicit, visible commitment to student learning outcomes assessment on the part of the governing board, president/chancellor, and senior academic and cocurricular leadership?
- 1b. Is the commitment communicated within the institution? To whom specifically? How?
- 1c. Is the commitment communicated outside the institution (to external stakeholders and the general public)? To whom specifically? How?
- 1d. Is student learning outcomes assessment pervasive — part of the institutional culture, ongoing, consistent, systematic, and sustainable across programs, departments, and the entire institution? How do you know?
- 1e. Is student learning outcomes assessment collaborative? Is evidence collected and discussed across programs, departments, and the entire institution? How do you know?
- 1f. Are there expectations for student learning outcomes assessment within academic programs? What are they, and how are they communicated?
- 1g. Are there expectations for student learning outcomes assessment within cocurricular programs? What are they, and how are they communicated?
- 1h. Is there a process in place to ensure that expectations for student learning outcomes assessment within academic and cocurricular programs are met? What is the process?

SECTION 2 ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

CRITERION 2. THE INSTITUTION HAS INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS THAT CLEARLY ARTICULATE WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO, ACHIEVE, DEMONSTRATE, OR KNOW UPON GRADUATION.

- 2a. Does the institution have institution-wide student learning outcomes — the shared set of outcomes pertaining to all undergraduate students regardless of degree or major? What are they?
- 2b. Are the institution-wide student learning outcomes expressed as knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes?
- 2c. Are the actions mentioned in the institution-wide student learning outcome statements achievable?
- 2d. Are the actions mentioned in the institution-wide student learning outcome statements observable?
- 2e. Are the actions mentioned in the institution-wide student learning outcome statements measurable?

CRITERION 3. INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS ARE EASILY UNDERSTOOD BY INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS.

- 3a. Do faculty, administrators, and staff understand the relationship of the coursework and cocurricular experiences they provide to the institution-wide student learning outcomes? How do you know?
- 3b. Do current students know what they are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation? How do you know?
- 3c. Do prospective students, parents, and families know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation? How do you know?
- 3d. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation? How do you know?

CRITERION 4. INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS ARE ACCESSIBLE TO INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS.

- 4a. Are the institution-wide student learning outcome statements shared widely? How are they shared?
- 4b. Can the institution-wide student learning outcome statements be easily located by those looking for them? How do you know?

CRITERION 5. APPROPRIATE STAKEHOLDERS WERE FULLY INVOLVED IN ESTABLISHING INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.

- 5a. Were faculty members involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements?
- 5b. Were cocurricular educators involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements?
- 5c. Were governing board members involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements?
- 5d. Were students involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements?
- 5e. Were external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements?

CRITERION 6. INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE EXTERNALLY INFORMED OR BENCHMARKED, REFLECT GENERALLY ACCEPTED HIGHER EDUCATION GOALS, ARE OF APPROPRIATE COLLEGE-LEVEL RIGOR, AND ARE APPROPRIATE GIVEN THE MISSION OF THE INSTITUTION.

- 6a. Are the institution-wide student learning outcomes externally informed? How?
- 6b. Are the institution-wide student learning outcomes externally benchmarked? Against what?
- 6c. Do the institution-wide student learning outcomes reflect appropriate higher education goals and college-level rigor? How do you know?
- 6d. Are the institution-wide student learning outcomes appropriate given the mission of the institution? Please explain.

SECTION 3 ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

CRITERION 7. ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS CLEARLY ARTICULATE WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO, ACHIEVE, DEMONSTRATE, OR KNOW UPON GRADUATION.

- 7a. Do all academic programs have student learning outcomes — the shared set of outcomes pertaining to all undergraduate students in the degree or major?
- 7b. Are the academic program-level student learning outcomes expressed as knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes?
- 7c. Are the actions mentioned in the academic program-level outcome statements achievable?
- 7d. Are the actions mentioned in the academic program-level outcome statements observable?
- 7e. Are the actions mentioned in the academic program-level outcome statements measurable?

CRITERION 8. ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS ARE EASILY UNDERSTOOD BY INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS.

- 8a. Do faculty members understand the relationship of the courses they offer to the program-level learning outcomes? How do you know?
- 8b. Do current students know what they are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of their selected degree/major? How do you know?
- 8c. Do prospective students, parents, and families know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of a selected degree/major? How do you know?
- 8d. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of a selected degree/major? How do you know?

CRITERION 9. ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS ARE ACCESSIBLE TO INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS.

- 9a. Are the academic program-level student learning outcome statements shared widely? How are they shared?
- 9b. Can the academic program-level student learning outcome statements be easily located by those looking for them? How do you know?

CRITERION 10. APPROPRIATE STAKEHOLDERS WERE FULLY INVOLVED IN ESTABLISHING ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.

- 10a. Were faculty members involved in establishing the academic program-level student learning outcomes?
- 10b. Were students involved in establishing the academic program-level student learning outcomes?
- 10c. Were external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) involved in establishing the academic program-level student learning outcomes?

CRITERION 11. ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE EXTERNALLY INFORMED OR BENCHMARKED, REFLECT GENERALLY ACCEPTED HIGHER EDUCATION GOALS, ARE OF APPROPRIATE COLLEGE-LEVEL RIGOR, AND ARE APPROPRIATE GIVEN THE MISSION OF THE INSTITUTION.

- 11a. Are the academic program-level student learning outcomes externally informed? How?
- 11b. Are the academic program-level student learning outcomes externally benchmarked? Against what?
- 11c. Do the academic program-level student learning outcomes reflect appropriate higher education goals and college-level rigor? How do you know?
- 11d. Are the academic program-level student learning outcomes appropriate given the mission of the institution?

SECTION 4 ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

CRITERION 12. COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS CLEARLY ARTICULATE WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO, ACHIEVE, DEMONSTRATE, OR KNOW UPON GRADUATION.

- 12a. Do all cocurricular programs have student learning outcomes?
- 12b. Are the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes expressed as knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes?
- 12c. Are the actions mentioned in the cocurricular program-level outcome statements achievable?
- 12d. Are the actions mentioned in the cocurricular program-level outcome statements observable?
- 12e. Are the actions mentioned in the cocurricular program-level outcome statements measurable?

CRITERION 13. COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS ARE EASILY UNDERSTOOD BY INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS.

- 13a. Do cocurricular educators understand the relationship of their programs' activities to institution-wide student learning outcomes? How do you know?
- 13b. Do current students know what they are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of cocurricular programs in which they participate? How do you know?
- 13c. Do prospective students, parents, and families know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of cocurricular programs in which they participate? How do you know?
- 13d. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of cocurricular programs in which they participate? How do you know?

CRITERION 14. COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME STATEMENTS ARE ACCESSIBLE TO INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS.

- 14a. Are the cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements shared widely? How are they shared?
- 14b. Can the cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements be easily located by those looking for them? How do you know?

CRITERION 15. APPROPRIATE STAKEHOLDERS WERE FULLY INVOLVED IN ESTABLISHING COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.

- 15a. Were cocurricular educators involved in establishing the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes?
- 15b. Were students involved in establishing the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes?
- 15c. Were external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) involved in establishing the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes?

CRITERION 16. COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE EXTERNALLY INFORMED OR BENCHMARKED, REFLECT GENERALLY ACCEPTED HIGHER EDUCATION GOALS, ARE OF APPROPRIATE COLLEGE-LEVEL RIGOR, AND ARE APPROPRIATE GIVEN THE MISSION OF THE INSTITUTION.

- 16a. Are the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes externally informed? How?
- 16b. Are the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes externally benchmarked? Against what?
- 16c. Do the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes reflect appropriate higher education goals and college-level rigor? How do you know?
- 16d. Are the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes appropriate given the mission of the institution?

SECTION 5 DOCUMENT ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND PROCESSES IN A FORMAL PLAN

CRITERION 17. THERE IS A WRITTEN ASSESSMENT PLAN IN PLACE THAT DESCRIBES WHEN, HOW, AND HOW FREQUENTLY EACH STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME IS ASSESSED.

- 17a. Does the assessment plan demonstrate how student learning outcomes assessment is integrated across the entire institution?
- 17b. Does the assessment plan include when, how, and how frequently each institution-wide student learning outcome is assessed?
- 17c. Does the assessment plan include academic program-level assessment?
- 17d. Does the assessment plan include cocurricular program-level assessment?
- 17e. How was the assessment plan developed, and were appropriate stakeholders (internal and external) from all constituencies involved in the development of the assessment plan?
- 17f. Does the assessment plan align with the institution's strategic planning process?
- 17g. Does the assessment plan align with the institution's budgeting process?

CRITERION 18. THE ASSESSMENT PLAN IS SUPPORTED BY ADEQUATE AND APPROPRIATE INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES TO ENSURE ITS SUSTAINABILITY.

- 18a. Are human resources sufficient to carry out the assessment plan? Provide an explanation.
- 18b. Are financial resources sufficient to carry out the assessment plan? Provide an explanation.

CRITERION 19. THE ASSESSMENT PLAN IS REGULARLY RE-EXAMINED.

- 19a. How often is the assessment plan reviewed?
- 19b. Were appropriate internal and external stakeholders involved in the reviews?
- 19c. Has the assessment plan been revised as a result of these reviews? If so, how?

CRITERION 20. THE INSTITUTION HAS A CHART, DIAGRAM, MAP, NARRATIVE, OR OTHER DOCUMENT THAT IDENTIFIES THE PLACES IN THE CURRICULUM AND COCURRICULUM WHERE STUDENTS ENCOUNTER AND/OR ACHIEVE EACH STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME.

- 20a. Can the institution demonstrate where in the curriculum and cocurriculum students encounter and/or achieve each institution-wide student learning outcome? How is this information collected?
- 20b. Can the institution demonstrate where in the curriculum students encounter and/or achieve academic program-level student learning outcomes? How is this information collected?
- 20c. Can the institution demonstrate where in the cocurriculum students encounter and/or achieve cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes? How is this information collected?

SECTION 6

**GATHER EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)**

CRITERION 21. THE INSTITUTION HAS EVIDENCE OF THE LEVELS AT WHICH STUDENTS ACHIEVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.

- 21a. Is there evidence that shows how well students have achieved institution-wide student learning outcomes? How was it observed and/or measured?
- 21b. Is there evidence that shows how well students have achieved academic program-level student learning outcomes? How was it observed and/or measured?
- 21c. Is there evidence that shows how well students have achieved cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes? How was it observed and/or measured?

SECTION 7

**USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)**

CRITERION 22. COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS ABOUT EVIDENCE AND ITS USE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING TAKE PLACE ACROSS PROGRAMS, DEPARTMENTS, AND THE ENTIRE CAMPUS.

- 22a. Do collaborative discussions about evidence include sharing of data and analysis? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 22b. Do collaborative discussions about evidence include making recommendations? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 22c. Do collaborative discussions about evidence occur on campus frequently? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?

CRITERION 23. A PLAN EXISTS FOR USING EVIDENCE FROM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING. THE PLAN INCLUDES A CLEAR DECISION-MAKING PROCESS FOR APPROVING AND IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS.

- 23a. What is the plan for using evidence from student learning outcomes assessment to inform decision-making about how to improve student learning? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 23b. What is the decision-making process for approving and implementing recommendations? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?

CRITERION 24. EVIDENCE FROM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT IS USED TO INFLUENCE OR SHAPE PLANNING, BUDGETING, AND DECISION-MAKING AND TO RECOMMEND STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING STUDENT LEARNING.

- 24a. How does evidence from student learning outcomes assessment influence or shape planning? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 24b. How does evidence from student learning outcomes assessment influence or shape budgeting? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 24c. How does evidence from student learning outcomes assessment influence or shape decision-making? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 24d. How is evidence from student learning outcomes assessment used to make recommendations for improvement of student learning? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?

CRITERION 25. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING BASED ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT ARE IMPLEMENTED, INCLUDING MAKING CHANGES IN PRIORITIES, PROGRAM OFFERINGS, AND THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES.

- 25a. How have recommendations for improvement of institution-wide student learning outcomes, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 25b. How have recommendations for changes in academic priorities, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented?
- 25c. How have recommendations for changes in cocurricular priorities, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented?
- 25d. How have recommendations for changes in academic program offerings, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented?
- 25e. How have recommendations for changes in cocurricular program offerings, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented?
- 25f. How have recommendations for changes in the allocation of resources, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?

CRITERION 26. THE IMPACT OF EVIDENCE-BASED CHANGES IS CONTINUOUSLY REVIEWED AND EVALUATED TO DETERMINE HOW EFFECTIVELY STUDENT LEARNING IS IMPROVED.

- 26a. How often is the impact of evidence-based changes reviewed and evaluated to determine how effectively student learning is improved? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 26b. How have evidence-based changes impacted student learning? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 26c. Have the results of evidence-based changes led to further changes and re-assessment?

CRITERION 27. REPORTING ON THE PROCESS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT IS DIRECTED AT THE APPROPRIATE AUDIENCES AND DESIGNED TO MEET THEIR NEEDS.

- 27a. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment directed at prospective and current students? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27b. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment directed at faculty, staff, and administrators? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27c. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment directed at the governing board? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27d. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment directed at external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27e. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at prospective and current students? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27f. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at faculty, staff, and administrators? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27g. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at the governing board? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27h. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27i. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at prospective and current students? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27j. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at faculty, staff, and administrators? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27k. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at the governing board? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27l. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)? What is reported and in what ways?

CRITERION 28. REPORTING ON THE PROCESS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT IS EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS.

- 28a. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to prospective and current students?
- 28b. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to faculty, staff, and administrators?
- 28c. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to the governing board?
- 28d. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)?
- 28e. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to prospective and current students?
- 28f. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to faculty, staff, and administrators?

- 28g. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to the governing board?
- 28h. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)?
- 28i. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to prospective and current students?
- 28j. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to faculty, staff, and administrators?
- 28k. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to the governing board?
- 28l. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)?

CRITERION 29. REPORTING ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IS EASILY UNDERSTOOD BY INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS.

- 29a. Do prospective and current students understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29b. Do faculty, staff, and administrators understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29c. Does the governing board understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29d. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29e. Do prospective and current students understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29f. Do faculty, staff, and administrators understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29g. Does the governing board understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29h. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29i. Do prospective and current students understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29j. Do faculty, staff, and administrators understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29k. Does the governing board understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29l. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?

WORKSHEETS

Each criterion has a two-page worksheet you can use as you evaluate your institution's performance on that criterion.

Each worksheet will take you through a three-step evaluation process.

- ◆ Step A: Respond to specific questions related to components of the criterion.
- ◆ Step B: Gather and organize supporting evidence that documents your practices and processes relevant to the criterion. You can use the template on page 84 for this work.
- ◆ Step C: Use the evidence you assembled in steps A and B to assess your institution's progress toward meeting each component of the criterion. You'll use a five-point scale to assess how well you meet each component — and to provide an evaluation of your progress toward meeting the criterion as a whole.

DEMONSTRATE COMMITMENT TO ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SECTION 1

CRITERION

1

An ongoing and integrated commitment to achieving student learning outcomes is visible in the actions of the campus community.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 1a. Is there an explicit, visible commitment to student learning outcomes assessment on the part of the governing board, president/chancellor, and senior academic and cocurricular leadership?
- 1b. Is the commitment communicated within the institution? To whom specifically? How?
- 1c. Is the commitment communicated outside the institution (to external stakeholders and the general public)? To whom specifically? How?
- 1d. Is student learning outcomes assessment pervasive — part of the institutional culture, ongoing, consistent, systematic, and sustainable across programs, departments, and the entire institution? How do you know?
- 1e. Is student learning outcomes assessment collaborative? Is evidence collected and discussed across programs, departments, and the entire institution? How do you know?
- 1f. Are there expectations for student learning outcomes assessment within academic programs? What are they, and how are they communicated?
- 1g. Are there expectations for student learning outcomes assessment within cocurricular programs? What are they, and how are they communicated?
- 1h. Is there a process in place to ensure that expectations for student learning outcomes assessment within academic and cocurricular programs are met? What is the process?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

DEMONSTRATE COMMITMENT TO ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 1

CRITERION

1

	DOES NOT MEET		SOMEWHAT MEETS		MEETS
	1	2	3	4	5
1a.	There is an explicit, visible commitment to student learning outcomes assessment on the part of the governing board, president/chancellor, and senior academic and cocurricular leadership.				
1b.	The commitment is well communicated within the institution.				
1c.	The commitment is well communicated outside the institution (to external stakeholders and the general public).				
1d.	Student learning outcomes assessment is pervasive — part of the institutional culture, ongoing, consistent, systematic, and sustainable across programs, departments, and the entire institution.				
1e.	Student learning outcomes assessment is collaborative — evidence is collected and discussed across programs, departments, and the entire institution.				
1f.	There are clear expectations for student learning outcomes assessment within academic programs.				
1g.	There are clear expectations for student learning outcomes assessment within cocurricular programs.				
1h.	There is a process in place to ensure that expectations for student learning outcomes assessment within academic and cocurricular programs are met.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 1					

ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 2

CRITERION

2

The institution has institution-wide student learning outcome statements that clearly articulate what students should be able to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 2a. Does the institution have institution-wide student learning outcomes — the shared set of outcomes pertaining to all undergraduate students regardless of degree or major? What are they?
- 2b. Are the institution-wide student learning outcomes expressed as knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes?
- 2c. Are the actions mentioned in the institution-wide student learning outcome statements achievable?
- 2d. Are the actions mentioned in the institution-wide student learning outcome statements observable?
- 2e. Are the actions mentioned in the institution-wide student learning outcome statements measurable?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 2

CRITERION

2

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
2a. The institution has institution-wide student learning outcomes — the shared set of outcomes pertaining to all undergraduate students regardless of degree or major.				
2b. The institution-wide student learning outcomes are expressed as knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes.				
2c. The actions mentioned in the institution-wide student learning outcome statements are achievable.				
2d. The actions mentioned in the institution-wide student learning outcome statements are observable.				
2e. The actions mentioned in the institution-wide student learning outcome statements are measurable.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 2				

ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 2

CRITERION

3

Institution-wide student learning outcome statements are easily understood by internal and external stakeholders.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 3a. Do faculty, administrators, and staff understand the relationship of the coursework and cocurricular experiences they provide to the institution-wide student learning outcomes? How do you know?
- 3b. Do current students know what they are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation? How do you know?
- 3c. Do prospective students, parents, and families know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation? How do you know?
- 3d. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation? How do you know?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 2

CRITERION

3

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
3a. Faculty, administrators, and staff understand the relationship of the coursework and cocurricular experiences they provide to the institution-wide student learning outcomes.				
3b. Current students know what they are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation.				
3c. Prospective students, parents, and families know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation.				
3d. External stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 3				

ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 2

CRITERION

4

Institution-wide student learning outcome statements are accessible to internal and external stakeholders.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 4a. Are the institution-wide student learning outcome statements shared widely? How are they shared?
- 4b. Can the institution-wide student learning outcome statements be easily located by those looking for them? How do you know?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 2

CRITERION

4

DOES NOT MEET

SOMEWHAT MEETS

MEETS

1

2

3

4

5

4a. The institution-wide student learning outcome statements are shared widely.	
4b. The institution-wide student learning outcome statements can be easily located by those looking for them.	
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 4	

ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 2

CRITERION

5

Appropriate stakeholders were fully involved in establishing institution-wide student learning outcomes.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

5a. Were faculty members involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements?

5b. Were cocurricular educators involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements?

5c. Were governing board members involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements?

5d. Were students involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements?

5e. Were external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 2

CRITERION

5

DOES NOT MEET

SOMEWHAT MEETS

MEETS

1

2

3

4

5

5a. Faculty members were involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements.	
5b. Cocurricular educators were involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements.	
5c. Governing board members were involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements.	
5d. Students were involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements.	
5e. External stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) were involved in establishing the institution-wide student learning outcome statements.	
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 5	

ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 2

CRITERION

6

Institution-wide student learning outcomes are externally informed or benchmarked, reflect generally accepted higher education goals, are of appropriate college-level rigor, and are appropriate given the mission of the institution.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 6a. Are the institution-wide student learning outcomes externally informed? How?
- 6b. Are the institution-wide student learning outcomes externally benchmarked? Against what?
- 6c. Do the institution-wide student learning outcomes reflect appropriate higher education goals and college-level rigor? How do you know?
- 6d. Are the institution-wide student learning outcomes appropriate given the mission of the institution? Please explain.

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 2

CRITERION

6

DOES NOT MEET

SOMEWHAT MEETS

MEETS

1

2

3

4

5

6a. The institution-wide student learning outcomes are externally informed.	
6b. The institution-wide student learning outcomes are externally benchmarked.	
6c. The institution-wide student learning outcomes reflect appropriate higher education goals and college-level rigor.	
6d. The institution-wide student learning outcomes are appropriate given the mission of the institution.	
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 6	

ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 3

CRITERION



Academic program-level student learning outcome statements clearly articulate what students should be able to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 7a. Do all academic programs have student learning outcomes — the shared set of outcomes pertaining to all undergraduate students in the degree or major?
- 7b. Are the academic program-level student learning outcomes expressed as knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes?
- 7c. Are the actions mentioned in the academic program-level outcome statements achievable?
- 7d. Are the actions mentioned in the academic program-level outcome statements observable?
- 7e. Are the actions mentioned in the academic program-level outcome statements measurable?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 3

CRITERION



STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
7a. All academic programs have student learning outcomes — the shared set of outcomes pertaining to all undergraduate students in the degree or major.				
7b. The academic program-level student learning outcomes are expressed as knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes.				
7c. The actions mentioned in the academic program-level outcome statements are achievable.				
7d. The actions mentioned in the academic program-level outcome statements are observable.				
7e. The actions mentioned in the academic program-level outcome statements are measurable.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 7				

ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 3

CRITERION

8

Academic program-level learning outcome statements are easily understood by internal and external stakeholders.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 8a. Do faculty members understand the relationship of the courses they offer to the program-level learning outcomes? How do you know?
- 8b. Do current students know what they are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of their selected degree/major? How do you know?
- 8c. Do prospective students, parents, and families know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of a selected degree/major? How do you know?
- 8d. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of a selected degree/major? How do you know?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 3

CRITERION

8

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
8a. Faculty members understand the relationship of the courses they offer to the program-level learning outcomes.				
8b. Current students know what they are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of their selected degree/major.				
8c. Prospective students, parents, and families know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of a selected degree/major.				
8d. External stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of a selected degree/major.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 8				

ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 3

CRITERION

9

Academic program-level student learning outcome statements are accessible to internal and external stakeholders.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 9a. Are the academic program-level student learning outcome statements shared widely?
How are they shared?
- 9b. Can the academic program-level student learning outcome statements be easily located by those looking for them? How do you know?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 3

CRITERION

9

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
9a. The academic program-level student learning outcome statements are shared widely.				
9b. The academic program-level student learning outcome statements can be easily located by those looking for them.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 9				

ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 3

CRITERION

10

Appropriate stakeholders were fully involved in establishing academic program-level student learning outcomes.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 10a. Were faculty members involved in establishing the academic program-level student learning outcomes?
- 10b. Were students involved in establishing the academic program-level student learning outcomes?
- 10c. Were external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) involved in establishing the academic program-level student learning outcomes?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 3

CRITERION

10

DOES NOT MEET

SOMEWHAT MEETS

MEETS

1

2

3

4

5

10a. Faculty members were involved in establishing the academic program-level student learning outcomes.	
10b. Students were involved in establishing the academic program-level student learning outcomes.	
10c. External stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) were involved in establishing the academic program-level student learning outcomes.	
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 10	

ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 3

CRITERION

11

Academic program-level student learning outcomes are externally informed or benchmarked, reflect generally accepted higher education goals, are of appropriate college-level rigor, and are appropriate given the mission of the institution.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 11a. Are the academic program-level student learning outcomes externally informed?
How?
- 11b. Are the academic program-level student learning outcomes externally benchmarked?
Against what?
- 11c. Do the academic program-level student learning outcomes reflect appropriate higher education goals and college-level rigor? How do you know?
- 11d. Are the academic program-level student learning outcomes appropriate given the mission of the institution?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 3

CRITERION

11

	DOES NOT MEET		SOMEWHAT MEETS		MEETS
	1	2	3	4	5
11a.	The academic program-level student learning outcomes are externally informed.				
11b.	The academic program-level student learning outcomes are externally benchmarked.				
11c.	The academic program-level student learning outcomes reflect appropriate higher education goals and college-level rigor.				
11d.	The academic program-level student learning outcomes are appropriate given the mission of the institution.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 11					

ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 4

CRITERION

12

Cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements clearly articulate what students should be able to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 12a. Do all cocurricular programs have student learning outcomes?
- 12b. Are cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes expressed as knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes?
- 12c. Are the actions mentioned in the cocurricular program-level outcome statements achievable?
- 12d. Are the actions mentioned in the cocurricular program-level outcome statements observable?
- 12e. Are the actions mentioned in the cocurricular program-level outcome statements measurable?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 4

CRITERION

12

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
12a. All cocurricular programs have student learning outcomes.				
12b. The cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes are expressed as knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes.				
12c. The actions mentioned in the cocurricular program-level outcome statements are achievable.				
12d. The actions mentioned in the cocurricular program-level outcome statements are observable.				
12e. The actions mentioned in the cocurricular program-level outcome statements are measurable.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 12				

ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 4

CRITERION

13

Cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements are easily understood by internal and external stakeholders.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 13a. Do cocurricular educators understand the relationship of their programs' activities to institution-wide student learning outcomes? How do you know?
- 13b. Do current students know what they are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of cocurricular programs in which they participate? How do you know?
- 13c. Do prospective students, parents, and families know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of cocurricular programs in which they participate? How do you know?
- 13d. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of cocurricular programs in which they participate? How do you know?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 4

CRITERION

13

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

	DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS		MEETS
	1	2	3	4
13a.	Cocurricular educators understand the relationship of their programs’ activities to institution-wide student learning outcomes.			
13b.	Current students know what they are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of cocurricular programs in which they participate.			
13c.	Prospective students, parents, and families know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of cocurricular programs in which they participate.			
13d.	External stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) know what students are expected to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon completion of cocurricular programs in which they participate.			
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 13				

ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 4

CRITERION

14

Cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements are accessible to internal and external stakeholders.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 14a. Are the cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements shared widely? How are they shared?
- 14b. Can the cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements be easily located by those looking for them? How do you know?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 4

CRITERION

14

DOES NOT MEET

SOMEWHAT MEETS

MEETS

1

2

3

4

5

14a. The cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements are shared widely.	
14b. The cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements can be easily located by those looking for them.	
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 14	

ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 4

CRITERION

15

Appropriate stakeholders were fully involved in establishing cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 15a. Were cocurricular educators involved in establishing the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes?
- 15b. Were students involved in establishing the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes?
- 15c. Were external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) involved in establishing the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

SECTION 4

CRITERION

15

	DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
	1	2	3	4	5
15a.	Cocurricular educators were involved in establishing the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes.				
15b.	Students were involved in establishing the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes.				
15c.	External stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) were involved in establishing the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 15					

ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 4

CRITERION

16

Cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes are externally informed or benchmarked, reflect generally accepted higher education goals, are of appropriate college-level rigor, and are appropriate given the mission of the institution.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 16a. Are the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes externally informed? How?
- 16b. Are the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes externally benchmarked? Against what?
- 16c. Do the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes reflect appropriate higher education goals and college-level rigor? How do you know?
- 16d. Are the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes appropriate given the mission of the institution?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

SECTION 4

CRITERION

16

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

	DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
	1	2	3	4	5
16a.	The cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes are externally informed.				
16b.	The cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes are externally benchmarked.				
16c.	The cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes reflect appropriate higher education goals and college-level rigor.				
16d.	The cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes are appropriate given the mission of the institution.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 16					

SECTION 5

CRITERION

17

There is a written assessment plan in place that describes when, how, and how frequently each student learning outcome is assessed.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 17a. Does the assessment plan demonstrate how student learning outcomes assessment is integrated across the entire institution?
- 17b. Does the assessment plan include when, how, and how frequently each institution-wide student learning outcome is assessed?
- 17c. Does the assessment plan include academic program-level assessment?
- 17d. Does the assessment plan include cocurricular program-level assessment?
- 17e. How was the assessment plan developed, and were appropriate stakeholders (internal and external) from all constituencies involved in the development of the assessment plan?
- 17f. Does the assessment plan align with the institution's strategic planning process?
- 17g. Does the assessment plan align with the institution's budgeting process?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

DOCUMENT ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND PROCESSES IN A FORMAL PLAN

SECTION 5

CRITERION

17

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
17a. The assessment plan demonstrates how student learning outcomes assessment is integrated across the entire institution.				
17b. The assessment plan includes when, how, and how frequently each institution-wide student learning outcome is assessed.				
17c. The assessment plan includes academic program-level assessment.				
17d. The assessment plan includes cocurricular program-level assessment.				
17e. Appropriate stakeholders (internal and external) from all constituencies were involved in the development of the assessment plan.				
17f. The assessment plan aligns with the institution’s strategic planning process.				
17g. The assessment plan aligns with the institution’s budgeting process.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 17				

SECTION 5

CRITERION

18

The assessment plan is supported by adequate and appropriate infrastructure and resources to ensure its sustainability.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 18a. Are human resources sufficient to carry out the assessment plan? Provide an explanation.
- 18b. Are financial resources sufficient to carry out the assessment plan? Provide an explanation.

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

DOCUMENT ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND PROCESSES IN A FORMAL PLAN

SECTION 5

CRITERION

18

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5

18a. Human resources are sufficient to carry out the assessment plan.	
18b. Financial resources are sufficient to carry out the assessment plan.	
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 18	

DOCUMENT ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND PROCESSES IN A FORMAL PLAN

SECTION 5

CRITERION

19

The assessment plan is regularly re-examined.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 19a. How often is the assessment plan reviewed?
- 19b. Were appropriate internal and external stakeholders involved in the reviews?
- 19c. Has the assessment plan been revised as a result of these reviews? If so, how?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

DOCUMENT ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND PROCESSES IN A FORMAL PLAN

SECTION 5

CRITERION

19

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
19a. The assessment plan is regularly reviewed.				
19b. Appropriate internal and external stakeholders were involved in the reviews.				
19c. The assessment plan has been revised as a result of these reviews.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 19				

SECTION 5

CRITERION

20

The institution has a chart, diagram, map, narrative, or other document that identifies the places in the curriculum and cocurriculum where students encounter and/or achieve each student learning outcome.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 20a. Can the institution demonstrate where in the curriculum and cocurriculum students encounter and/or achieve each institution-wide student learning outcome? How is this information collected?
- 20b. Can the institution demonstrate where in the curriculum students encounter and/or achieve academic program-level student learning outcomes? How is this information collected?
- 20c. Can the institution demonstrate where in the cocurriculum students encounter and/or achieve cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes? How is this information collected?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

DOCUMENT ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND PROCESSES IN A FORMAL PLAN

SECTION 5

CRITERION

20

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
20a. The institution can demonstrate where in the curriculum and cocurriculum students encounter and/or achieve each institution-wide student learning outcome.				
20b. The institution can demonstrate where in the curriculum students encounter and/or achieve academic program-level student learning outcomes.				
20c. The institution can demonstrate where in the cocurriculum students encounter and/or achieve cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 20				

GATHER EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 6

CRITERION

21

The institution has evidence of the levels at which students achieve student learning outcomes.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 21a. Is there evidence that shows how well students have achieved institution-wide student learning outcomes? How was it observed and/or measured?
- 21b. Is there evidence that shows how well students have achieved academic program-level student learning outcomes? How was it observed and/or measured?
- 21c. Is there evidence that shows how well students have achieved cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes? How was it observed and/or measured?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

GATHER EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 6

CRITERION

21

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

	DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
	1	2	3	4	5
21a.	There is evidence that shows how well students have achieved institution-wide student learning outcomes.				
21b.	There is evidence that shows how well students have achieved academic program-level student learning outcomes.				
21c.	There is evidence that shows how well students have achieved cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 21					

USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 7

CRITERION

22

Collaborative discussions about evidence and its use to improve student learning take place across programs, departments, and the entire campus.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 22a. Do collaborative discussions about evidence include sharing of data and analysis?
At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 22b. Do collaborative discussions about evidence include making recommendations?
At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 22c. Do collaborative discussions about evidence occur on campus frequently?
At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 7

CRITERION

22

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
22a.	Collaborative discussions about evidence include sharing of data and analysis at the academic program level.			
22b.	Collaborative discussions about evidence include sharing of data and analysis at the cocurricular program level.			
22c.	Collaborative discussions about evidence include sharing of data and analysis institution-wide.			
22d.	Collaborative discussions about evidence include making recommendations at the academic program level.			
22e.	Collaborative discussions about evidence include making recommendations at the cocurricular program level.			
22f.	Collaborative discussions about evidence include making recommendations institution-wide.			
22g.	Collaborative discussions about evidence occur on campus frequently at the academic program level.			
22h.	Collaborative discussions about evidence occur on campus frequently at the cocurricular program level.			
22i.	Collaborative discussions about evidence occur on campus frequently institution-wide.			
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 22				

USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 7

CRITERION

23

A plan exists for using evidence from student learning outcomes assessment to improve student learning. The plan includes a clear decision-making process for approving and implementing recommendations.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 23a. What is the plan for using evidence from student learning outcomes assessment to inform decision-making about how to improve student learning? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 23b. What is the decision-making process for approving and implementing recommendations? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 7

CRITERION

23

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
23a.	A plan exists for using evidence from student learning outcomes assessment to inform decision-making about how to improve student learning at the academic program level.			
23b.	A plan exists for using evidence from student learning outcomes assessment to inform decision-making about how to improve student learning at the cocurricular program level.			
23c.	A plan exists for using evidence from student learning outcomes assessment to inform decision-making about how to improve student learning institution-wide.			
23d.	A decision-making process for approving and implementing recommendations exists at the academic program level.			
23e.	A decision-making process for approving and implementing recommendations exists at the cocurricular program level.			
23f.	A decision-making process for approving and implementing recommendations exists institution-wide.			
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 23				

USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 7

CRITERION

24

Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape planning, budgeting, and decision-making and to recommend strategies for improving student learning.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 24a. How does evidence from student learning outcomes assessment influence or shape planning? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 24b. How does evidence from student learning outcomes assessment influence or shape budgeting? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 24c. How does evidence from student learning outcomes assessment influence or shape decision-making? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 24d. How is evidence from student learning outcomes assessment used to make recommendations for improvement of student learning? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 7

CRITERION

24

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
24a.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape planning at the academic program level.			
24b.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape planning at the cocurricular program level.			
24c.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape planning institution-wide.			
24d.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape budgeting at the academic program level.			
24e.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape budgeting at the cocurricular program level.			
24f.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape budgeting institution-wide.			
24g.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape decision-making at the academic program level.			
24h.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape decision-making at the cocurricular program level.			
24i.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape decision-making institution-wide.			
24j.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to make recommendations for the improvement of student learning at the academic program level.			
24k.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to make recommendations for the improvement of student learning at the cocurricular program level.			
24l.	Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to make recommendations for the improvement of student learning institution-wide.			
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 24				

USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 7

CRITERION

25

Recommendations for improvement of student learning based on student learning outcomes assessment are implemented, including making changes in priorities, program offerings, and the allocation of resources.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 25a. How have recommendations for improvement of institution-wide student learning outcomes, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 25b. How have recommendations for changes in academic priorities, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented?
- 25c. How have recommendations for changes in cocurricular priorities, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented?
- 25d. How have recommendations for changes in academic program offerings, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented?
- 25e. How have recommendations for changes in cocurricular program offerings, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented?
- 25f. How have recommendations for changes in the allocation of resources, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, been implemented? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 7

CRITERION

25

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
25a. Recommendations for improvement of institution-wide student learning outcomes, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, have been implemented at the academic program level.				
25b. Recommendations for improvement of institution-wide student learning outcomes, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, have been implemented at the cocurricular program level.				
25c. Recommendations for improvement of institution-wide student learning outcomes, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, have been implemented institution-wide.				
25d. Recommendations for changes in academic priorities, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, have been implemented.				
25e. Recommendations for changes in cocurricular priorities, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, have been implemented.				
25f. Recommendations for changes in academic program offerings, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, have been implemented.				
25g. Recommendations for changes in cocurricular program offerings, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, have been implemented.				
25h. Recommendations for changes in the allocation of resources, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, have been implemented at the academic program level.				
25i. Recommendations for changes in the allocation of resources, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, have been implemented at the cocurricular program level.				
25j. Recommendations for changes in the allocation of resources, based on student learning outcomes assessment results, have been implemented institution-wide.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 25				

USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 7

CRITERION

26

The impact of evidence-based changes is continuously reviewed and evaluated to determine how effectively student learning is improved.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 26a. How often is the impact of evidence-based changes reviewed and evaluated to determine how effectively student learning is improved? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 26b. How have evidence-based changes impacted student learning? At the academic program level? At the cocurricular program level? Institution-wide?
- 26c. Have the results of evidence-based changes led to further changes and re-assessment?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
(INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 7

CRITERION

26

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
1	2	3	4	5
26a. The results of implementing change based on assessment findings have been reviewed at the academic program level.				
26b. The results of implementing change based on assessment findings have been reviewed at the cocurricular program level.				
26c. The results of implementing change based on assessment findings have been reviewed institution-wide.				
26d. Learning has improved based on assessment findings reviewed at the academic program level.				
26e. Learning has improved based on assessment findings reviewed at the cocurricular program level.				
26f. Learning has improved based on assessment findings reviewed institution-wide.				
26g. The results of evidence-based changes have led to further changes and re-assessment.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 26				

REPORT ON THE PROCESS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 8

CRITERION

27

Reporting on the process and results of the student learning outcomes assessment is directed at the appropriate audiences and designed to meet their needs.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 27a. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment directed at prospective and current students? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27b. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment directed at faculty, staff, and administrators? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27c. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment directed at the governing board? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27d. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment directed at external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27e. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at prospective and current students? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27f. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at faculty, staff, and administrators? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27g. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at the governing board? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27h. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27i. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at prospective and current students? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27j. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at faculty, staff, and administrators? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27k. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at the governing board? What is reported and in what ways?
- 27l. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment directed at external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)? What is reported and in what ways?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

REPORT ON THE PROCESS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 8

CRITERION

27

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

	DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
	1	2	3	4	5
27a.	Reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment is directed at prospective and current students.				
27b.	Reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment is directed at faculty, staff, and administrators.				
27c.	Reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment is directed at the governing board.				
27d.	Reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment is directed at external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public).				
27e.	Reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment is directed at prospective and current students.				
27f.	Reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment is directed at faculty, staff, and administrators.				
27g.	Reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment is directed at the governing board.				
27h.	Reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment is directed at external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public).				
27i.	Reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment is directed at prospective and current students.				
27j.	Reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment is directed at faculty, staff, and administrators.				
27k.	Reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment is directed at the governing board.				
27l.	Reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment is directed at external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public).				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 27					

REPORT ON THE PROCESS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 8

CRITERION

28

Reporting on the process and results of the student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to internal and external stakeholders.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 28a. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to prospective and current students?
- 28b. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to faculty, staff, and administrators?
- 28c. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to the governing board?
- 28d. Is reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)?
- 28e. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to prospective and current students?
- 28f. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to faculty, staff, and administrators?
- 28g. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to the governing board?
- 28h. Is reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)?
- 28i. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to prospective and current students?
- 28j. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to faculty, staff, and administrators?
- 28k. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to the governing board?
- 28l. Is reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment easily accessible to external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public)?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

REPORT ON THE PROCESS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 8

CRITERION

28

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

	DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
	1	2	3	4	5
28a.	Reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to prospective and current students.				
28b.	Reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to faculty, staff, and administrators.				
28c.	Reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to the governing board.				
28d.	Reporting on the process and results of the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public).				
28e.	Reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to prospective and current students.				
28f.	Reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to faculty, staff, and administrators.				
28g.	Reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to the governing board.				
28h.	Reporting on the process and results of the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public).				
28i.	Reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to prospective and current students.				
28j.	Reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to faculty, staff, and administrators.				
28k.	Reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to the governing board.				
28l.	Reporting on the process and results of the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public).				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 28					

REPORT ON THE PROCESS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 8

CRITERION

29

Reporting on student learning outcomes is easily understood by internal and external stakeholders.

STEP A: To accurately evaluate the criterion, consider the following questions.

- 29a. Do prospective and current students understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29b. Do faculty, staff, and administrators understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29c. Does the governing board understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29d. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29e. Do prospective and current students understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29f. Do faculty, staff, and administrators understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29g. Does the governing board understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29h. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29i. Do prospective and current students understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29j. Do faculty, staff, and administrators understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29k. Does the governing board understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?
- 29l. Do external stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results? How do you know?

STEP B: List supporting evidence, such as reports and plans, that documents the practices and processes you are undertaking in this area. Include all relevant work. See page 84 for a blank template you can use to manage your list.

REPORT ON THE PROCESS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)

SECTION 8

CRITERION

29

STEP C: Based on the evidence you assembled in steps A and B, use a scale of 1–5 to assess your institution’s progress toward meeting each component of this criterion. Write your score for each item below. The overall evaluation is your assessment of your institution’s overall progress toward meeting this criterion.

	DOES NOT MEET	SOMEWHAT MEETS			MEETS
	1	2	3	4	5
29a.	Prospective and current students understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29b.	Faculty, staff, and administrators understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29c.	The governing board understands the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29d.	External stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) understand the reporting on the institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29e.	Prospective and current students understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29f.	Faculty, staff, and administrators understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29g.	The governing board understands the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29h.	External stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) understand the reporting on the academic program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29i.	Prospective and current students understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29j.	Faculty, staff, and administrators understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29k.	The governing board understands the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
29l.	External stakeholders (e.g., graduates, employers, policymakers, general public) understand the reporting on the cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes assessment process and results.				
OVERALL EVALUATION of Criterion 29					

OVERALL EVALUATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PERFORMANCE

Using your overall evaluation from each criterion's worksheet, circle the appropriate number for each criterion. Then, look for patterns in your overall scores to identify your institution's strengths and areas in need of improvement.

SECTION 1	DEMONSTRATE COMMITMENT TO ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY					
	CRITERION 1. An ongoing and integrated commitment to achieving student learning outcomes is visible in the actions of the campus community.	1	2	3	4	5
SECTION 2	ARTICULATE INSTITUTION-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES					
	CRITERION 2. The institution has institution-wide student learning outcome statements that clearly articulate what students should be able to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 3. Institution-wide student learning outcome statements are easily understood by internal and external stakeholders.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 4. Institution-wide student learning outcome statements are accessible to internal and external stakeholders.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 5. Appropriate stakeholders were fully involved in establishing institution-wide student learning outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 6. Institution-wide student learning outcomes are externally informed or benchmarked, reflect generally accepted higher education goals, are of appropriate college-level rigor, and are appropriate given the mission of the institution.	1	2	3	4	5
SECTION 3	ARTICULATE ACADEMIC PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES					
	CRITERION 7. Academic program-level student learning outcome statements clearly articulate what students should be able to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 8. Academic program-level learning outcome statements are easily understood by internal and external stakeholders.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 9. Academic program-level student learning outcome statements are accessible to internal and external stakeholders.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 10. Appropriate stakeholders were fully involved in establishing academic program-level student learning outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 11. Academic program-level student learning outcomes are externally informed or benchmarked, reflect generally accepted higher education goals, are of appropriate college-level rigor, and are appropriate given the mission of the institution.	1	2	3	4	5
SECTION 4	ARTICULATE COCURRICULAR PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES					
	CRITERION 12. Cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements clearly articulate what students should be able to do, achieve, demonstrate, or know upon graduation.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 13. Cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements are easily understood by internal and external stakeholders.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 14. Cocurricular program-level student learning outcome statements are accessible to internal and external stakeholders.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 15. Appropriate stakeholders were fully involved in establishing cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 16. Cocurricular program-level student learning outcomes are externally informed or benchmarked, reflect generally accepted higher education goals, are of appropriate college-level rigor, and are appropriate given the mission of the institution.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 5	DOCUMENT ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND PROCESSES IN A FORMAL PLAN					
	CRITERION 17. There is a written assessment plan in place that describes when, how, and how frequently each student learning outcome is assessed.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 18. The assessment plan is supported by adequate and appropriate infrastructure and resources to ensure its sustainability.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 19. The assessment plan is regularly re-examined.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 20. The institution has a chart, diagram, map, narrative, or other document that identifies the places in the curriculum and cocurriculum where students encounter and/or achieve each student learning outcome.	1	2	3	4	5
SECTION 6	GATHER EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)					
	CRITERION 21. The institution has evidence of the levels at which students achieve student learning outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5
SECTION 7	USE EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)					
	CRITERION 22. Collaborative discussions about evidence and its use to improve student learning take place across programs, departments, and the entire campus.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 23. A plan exists for using evidence from student learning outcomes assessment to improve student learning. The plan includes a clear decision-making process for approving and implementing recommendations.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 24. Evidence from student learning outcomes assessment is used to influence or shape planning, budgeting, and decision-making and to recommend strategies for improving student learning.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 25. Recommendations for improvement of student learning based on student learning outcomes assessment are implemented, including making changes in priorities, program offerings, and the allocation of resources.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 26. The impact of evidence-based changes is continuously reviewed and evaluated to determine how effectively student learning is improved.	1	2	3	4	5
SECTION 8	REPORT ON THE PROCESS AND RESULTS OF THE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT (INSTITUTION-WIDE, ACADEMIC PROGRAM LEVEL, AND COCURRICULAR PROGRAM LEVEL)					
	CRITERION 27. Reporting on the process and results of the student learning outcomes assessment is directed at the appropriate audiences and designed to meet their needs.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 28. Reporting on the process and results of the student learning outcomes assessment is easily accessible to internal and external stakeholders.	1	2	3	4	5
	CRITERION 29. Reporting on student learning outcomes is easily understood by internal and external stakeholders.	1	2	3	4	5

STEP B TEMPLATE

TITLE	DESCRIPTION
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	
11.	
12.	
13.	
14.	
15.	
16.	
17.	
18.	
19.	
20.	
21.	
22.	
23.	
24.	
25.	

GLOSSARY

A GUIDE TO KEY TERMS AS THEY ARE USED IN THIS BOOK.

Academic Programs. Academic work leading to degrees/certificates/majors, but this may not be the case for all institutional types.

Accountability. A call by external, and sometimes internal, stakeholders for higher education institutions to demonstrate they are not just graduating students but are actually encouraging and producing the learning they seek in graduates.

Cocurricular Programs. Activities that explicitly support and contribute to student learning but do not take place in formal classes. Most commonly, these activities are provided by student affairs professionals, though this may not be the case for all institutional types.

Evidence. Data that support a claim that something is true, relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable.

Institution-Wide Student Learning Outcomes. The shared set of outcomes pertaining to all undergraduate students regardless of degree or major.

Institution-Wide Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Processes. The institution's comprehensive, institution-wide student learning outcomes assessment plan that details how student learning is assessed across the entire institution, including **institution-wide** student learning outcomes expected of all students, **academic program** student learning outcomes, and **cocurricular program** student learning outcomes. It is a plan that demonstrates how student learning outcomes assessment is integrated across the entire institution.

Stakeholder. A person, group, organization, member, or system that affects or can be affected by an organization's actions (e.g., students, parents, families, faculty, staff, graduates, employers, accreditors, policymakers).

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment. The ongoing process of (1) establishing clear, measurable, expected student learning outcomes; (2) systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well students' learning matches expectations; (3) using the resulting information to understand and improve student learning; and (4) reporting on processes and results.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association for Higher Education Assessment Forum. (1992). *Principles of good practice for assessing student learning*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Banta, T. W. (2002). *Building a scholarship of assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Banta, T. W., Jones, E. A., & Black, K. E. (2009). *Designing effective assessment: Principles and profiles of good practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bresciani, M. J. (2007). *Assessing student learning in general education: A compilation of good practice case studies*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Anker Series.
- Bresciani, M. J. (2006). *Outcomes-based academic and co-curricular program review: A compilation of institutional good practices*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Bresciani, M. J., Gardner, M. M., & Hickmott, J. (2009). *Demonstrating student success: A practical guide to outcomes-based assessment and development in student affairs*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Bresciani, M. J., Zelna, C. L., & Anderson, J. A. (2004). *Assessing student learning and development: A handbook for practitioners*. Washington, DC: NASPA-Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2012). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (8th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2003). *Statement of mutual responsibility for student learning outcomes: Accreditation, institutions, and programs*. Washington, DC: Council for Higher Education Accreditation.
- Driscoll, A., & Wood, S. (2007). *Developing outcomes-based assessment for learner-centered education: A faculty introduction*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Harris, M., & Cullen, R. (2010). *Leading the learner-centered campus: An administrator's framework for improving student learning outcome*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Huba, M. E., & Freed, J. E. (2000). *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Keeling, R. P., Wall, A. F., Underhile, R., & Dungey, G. J. (2008). *Assessment reconsidered*. Washington, DC: International Center for Student Success and Institutional Accountability.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Maki, P. L. (2010). *Assessing for learning: Building a sustainable commitment across the institution* (2nd ed.). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

- Maki, P. L. (2010). *Coming to terms with student outcomes assessment: Faculty and administrators' journeys to integrating assessment in their work and institutional culture*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Middaugh, M. F. (2009). *Planning and assessment in higher education: Demonstrating institutional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Palomba, C. A., & Banta, T. W. (1999). *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing, and improving assessment in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terrenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terrenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schuh, J. H., & Associates (2009). *Assessment methods for student affairs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Suskie, L. (2009). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Upcraft, M. L., & Schuh, J. H. (1996). *Assessment practice in student affairs: An applications manual*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Upcraft, M. L., & Schuh, J. H. (1996). *Assessment in student affairs: A guide for practitioners*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wehlburg, C. A. (2008). *Promoting integrated and transformative assessment: A deeper focus on student learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Walvoord, B. E. (2004). *Assessment clear and simple: A practical guide for institutions, departments, and general education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Walvoord, B. E., & Anderson, V. J. (2009). *Effective grading: A tool for learning and assessment in college* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND STAFF

NEW LEADERSHIP ALLIANCE FOR STUDENT LEARNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Board of Directors

Gretchen M. Bataille

Senior Vice President, American Council on Education

W. Robert Connor

Senior Advisor, The Teagle Foundation

Judith S. Eaton, Chair

President, Council for Higher Education Accreditation

Richard Ekman

President, Council of Independent Colleges

Peter T. Ewell

Vice President, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

Paul E. Lingenfelter

President, State Higher Education Executive Officers

Sylvia Manning

President, The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association

David C. Paris, *ex officio*

Executive Director, New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability

Carol Geary Schneider

President, Association of American Colleges and Universities

Gail Schwartz

Senior Vice President, American Association of Community Colleges

David E. Shulenburger

Senior Fellow, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

Staff

David C. Paris

Executive Director

Zaneeta E. Daver

Associate Director

Dora Elías McAllister

Graduate Assistant

Nicole N. Long

Graduate Assistant

new leadership
ALLIANCE 
for student learning and accountability

1825 K Street, NW

Suite 705

Washington, DC 20006

Phone: 202.263.7478 | Fax: 202.234.7640

E-mail: office@newleadershipalliance.org

www.newleadershipalliance.org