**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*