PEER REVIEW TOOL FOR ADPs   Name of program: [_____]   Cycle reviewed: 20____-____

Number of program SLOs: [____]   As a set, the SLOs seem: ☐ Discipline-specific   ☐ Suitably rigorous for the degree level (~Bloom's Taxonomy)

Is there a curriculum map that shows how the program's required courses/experiences allow students to progress to SLO mastery?   ☐ Yes ☐ No

Measures: ☐ Each SLO has at least 1 direct measure to gauge mastery   ☐ Frequency/schedule specified   ☐ Key forms/tools attached

☐ Detailed enough (who, what, when, how) that a new coordinator could execute the data collection/evaluation plan

☐ The assessment methods seem likely to yield data that's SLO-specific and actionable   ☐ Expectations specified for each measure

Was SLO data collected as planned for the cycle?   ☐ Yes   ☐ Partly   ☐ No   ☐ N/A – no students at assessment points

Findings summaries include: ☐ # of students/samples assessed   ☐ # or % meeting stated expectations

Analysis/interpretation of findings: ☐ Efforts to identify relative weaknesses (aspects of student learning that could be improved)

☐ Longitudinal comparisons   ☐ Comparisons by instructional modality/location   ☐ Comparisons by student characteristics of interest

Does the report include evidence (e.g., minutes) that results/data are shared broadly with program faculty to gather their input?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

Number of (unique) new/ongoing action plans geared toward learning improvement (**LI**): [____]

LI action plan(s) seem aligned with associated findings and interpretations: ☐ Yes   ☐ Somewhat   ☐ No   ☐ N/A

LI action plan(s) seem sufficiently detailed/timelined to improve learning: ☐ Yes   ☐ Somewhat   ☐ No   ☐ N/A

Comments/Suggestions