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