1. Mission Statement

Notes: The mission statement should clearly articulate the core purpose and educational focus of the program, describing what students are expected to achieve or be prepared to do after graduation, emphasizing the specific knowledge and skills they will have gained.

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
Purpose	The mission statement is exceptionally clear and detailed, explicitly stating the program's purpose and outcomes. It includes specific examples of career or academic paths that graduates are prepared for, reflecting alignment with broader institutional goals.	The mission statement is mostly clear and adequately details the program's purpose and expected graduate outcomes. It mentions general career or academic paths that graduates are prepared for but may lack some specifics. It aligns well with institutional goals.	The mission statement outlines the program's purpose but lacks details in describing expected outcomes. It provides a vague idea of what graduates are prepared to do, without specific examples or clear alignment with broader goals.	The mission statement is present but vague and generic. It fails to clearly articulate specific graduate outcomes or how the program prepares students. It does not align clearly with institutional goals and lacks elements that convey the program's unique value.	*No data entered.*

Review Criteria	1 – Yes	0 – No
Physical Geographic Location of Program Delivery: The program must clearly state the physical geographic location where it is delivered (main campus, or other approved teaching sites)	The location(s) where the program is delivered is clearly identified, including all relevant campuses and approved teaching sites.	The location(s) where the program is delivered is not stated or is incomplete.
Availability and Format of Education: The program clearly states its availability through distance education and specifies the format of delivery, whether asynchronous, synchronous, or both.	The program clearly states its availability through distance education and specifies the format of delivery, whether asynchronous, synchronous, or both.	The program does not mention its availability through distance education or fails to specify the format of delivery.

2. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs): Step 1C

*Notes: Academic programs must provide at least four (4) SLOs. For undergraduate programs, at least one (1) of the four (4) must be a Writing in the Major (WIM) SLO. Certificate/Diploma programs must provide at least two (2) SLOs. * The Time-Bound criterion is assumed to be by the time of graduation unless otherwise specified.*

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
Specificity	Outcomes are exceptionally clear, detailed, and explicitly outline actions, and expected outcomes.	Most outcomes are clear and include most necessary details for actions and outcomes.	Some outcomes are somewhat vague, missing some details on actions or expected outcomes.	Outcomes lack clarity, with minimal detail on actions and outcomes.	Outcomes are unclear and do not specify actions or outcomes and/or outcomes are missing.
Measurability	Outcomes have quantifiable and qualitative metrics clearly defined, allowing for precise measurement of success.	Most outcomes are measurable with defined quantitative or qualitative metrics.	Some outcomes have measurable criteria, but not all metrics are clearly defined.	Outcomes are measurable, with vague metrics that are difficult to quantify.	Outcomes lack measurable criteria and/or outcomes are missing.
Achievability	Outcomes are realistic and well within the program's capabilities and resources. They present a challenge yet are attainable.	Most outcomes are achievable, requiring effort but within realistic limits.	Some outcomes appear somewhat ambitious relative to resources and capabilities.	Outcomes are overly ambitious, with significant concerns about resources and capabilities.	Outcomes are unrealistic and unachievable given the current context and/or outcomes are missing.
Relevance	Outcomes are highly relevant, aligning perfectly with the institution's mission and the program's specific goals. They address critical aspects of program performance.	Most outcomes are mostly relevant, with good alignment to the institution's mission and program goals.	Some outcomes are relevant, but not all directly support the institution's mission or program goals.	Outcomes have limited relevance to the broader institutional mission or specific program goals.	Outcomes are not relevant to the institutional mission or program goals and/or outcomes are missing.
Time-bound*	Outcomes have a clear, well-defined timeline that is appropriate for achieving the stated outcomes.	Most outcomes include a general timeline, but some flexibility or lack of precision is noted.	Some outcomes have an implied timeline, not clearly defined or detailed.	Outcomes lack a specific timeline, with unclear expectations for achievement.	No timeline or deadline is associated with the outcomes and/or outcomes are missing.
Number of SLOs	4+ (degree programs) / 2+ (certificates/diplomas)	4 (degree programs) / 2 (certificates/diplomas)	< 4 (degree programs) / < 2 (certificates/diplomas)	< 4 (degree programs) / < 2 (certificates/diplomas)	0

3. Program Goals (PGs): Step 1C [*Not required for the 2025-2026 AY Report*]

Notes: Academic programs and certificate/diploma programs must provide at least one (1) PG for each program.

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
Clarity	The PG(s) are exceptionally well-defined, using specific language that clearly articulates the expected achievements.	The PG(s) are clearly articulated but may lack some level of specificity needed for exceptional clarity.	The PG(s) lack specificity and may be ambiguously stated, making it unclear what programs/units are expected to achieve.	The PG(s) are vaguely defined, with broad statements that do not specify exact achievements.	No coherent PG(s) are provided and/or are missing.
Measurability	The PG statement names a specific, observable indicator and the population/unit of analysis is clear.	The PG statement names a clear indicator, but either the population/unit or context is implied rather than explicit.	The PG statement describes an improvement that could be measured, but no indicator is named.	The statement is aspirational only with no discernible indicator.	No assessable goal statement.
Alignment	The PG(s) show deep integration with the institution's mission and the program's strategic goals, enhancing the educational direction.	There is good alignment with the program's goals and the institution's mission, supporting the strategic educational objectives.	The PG(s) align with broader educational goals, but connections to specific program objectives or the institution's mission are weak.	Minimal alignment with the program goals or the institution's mission, indicating a significant need for revision.	PG(s) do not align with any program or institutional goals and/or are missing.
Number of PGs	1+	1	1	1	0

4. Measures: Steps 2A, 2B, and 2C

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
Clarity	Measures are explicitly defined, easy to understand, and clearly linked to specific SLOs and PG(s). Descriptions leave no ambiguity about what is being measured and how.	Measures are well-defined and understandable, with minor areas that could benefit from more precise definitions or clearer links to SLOs and PG(s).	Measures are described but some remain vaguely defined or the linkage to specific SLOs and PG(s) is not consistently clear.	Many measures are poorly defined or their connection to SLOs and PG(s) is ambiguous.	Measures are undefined or completely unaligned with the specified SLOs and PG(s).
Relevance	Measures are perfectly aligned with SLOs and PG(s), ensuring that all outcomes are effectively assessed through appropriate methodologies.	Most measures are relevant and provide useful data for most of the SLOs and PG(s), with slight misalignments that do not significantly hinder effectiveness.	Some measures do not fully align with SLOs and PG(s), resulting in data that only partially supports program evaluation.	Many measures are not suitable for the intended SLOs and PG(s), leading to irrelevant or minimally useful data.	Measures do not align with SLOs and PG(s) at all, providing no useful data for program assessment.
Directness	Measures predominantly include direct assessment tools that provide concrete evidence of student learning and program effectiveness directly linked to SLOs and PG(s).	Includes a mix of direct and indirect measures, but direct measures clearly dominate and are effectively utilized.	Measures include both direct and indirect tools, but the balance is skewed towards indirect methods, or direct measures are not optimally utilized.	Reliance primarily on indirect measures with insufficient direct assessment tools to adequately gauge learning outcomes or program effectiveness.	No direct measures are used; assessment relies solely on indirect methods.
Comprehensiveness	A broad range of measures covering all aspects of SLOs and PG(s), ensuring a thorough assessment of all program facets.	A diverse set of measures is used, though some aspects of the SLOs and PG(s) could be more fully covered.	Measures address several but not all elements of the SLOs and PG(s), with significant gaps in coverage.	Measures are narrowly focused, significantly omitting key aspects of SLOs and PG(s).	Measures are either non-existent or fail to cover the scope of SLOs and PG(s) required for effective program evaluation.
Evidence	Detailed and well-documented rubric(s) that cover all aspects of SLOs and PG(s) provided.	Well-documented rubric(s) that cover most aspects of SLOs and PG(s) provided.	Rubric(s) that cover some aspects of SLOs and PG(s) are provided, but they need further refinement to fully support comprehensive evaluation.	Rubric(s) that significantly omit key aspects of SLOs and PG(s) are provided. They are too simplistic or general to be effective in a comprehensive evaluation.	No appropriate rubrics are provided, or the existing ones fail entirely to align with or cover the SLOs and PG(s) required for an effective program evaluation.

5. Targets: Steps 3A and 4A

Note: A response to Step 4A is required.

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
Clarity	The targets are explicitly stated, using precise and straightforward language that leaves no room for misinterpretation.	The targets are clear but could be expressed more concisely or may use technical jargon that is not universally understood.	The targets are somewhat vague, requiring interpretation or clarification to be fully understood.	The targets are unclear, with broad or ambiguous phrasing that significantly hinders understanding.	No clear targets are articulated.
Quantifiable	The targets are fully measurable with specific indicators and metrics that allow for outcome assessment.	The targets are measurable but may rely partially on subjective judgments or less precise metrics.	The targets have minimal quantifiable elements, making measurement imprecise or inconsistent.	The targets are stated in terms that are not measurable, lacking any quantifiable indicators.	There are no measurable targets defined.

6. Results and Findings: Steps 4B and 4C

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
Data Quality and Relevance	All data is highly relevant; methods ensure maximum accuracy and reliability.	Data is relevant; methods mostly ensure accuracy and reliability.	Data is somewhat relevant; some questions about accuracy or reliability.	Data lacks relevance or accuracy; unreliable methods used.	No data entered.
Analysis and Interpretation	Analysis and interpretation are thorough, insightful, and perfectly suited to outcomes. Demonstrates an excellent use of historical data and past results to inform current actions and future planning.	Analysis and interpretation are adequate and appropriate. Shows good use of past results, with a clear but not comprehensive analysis of historical data. Past findings are generally considered in current actions, though the integration could be deepened to further benefit project outcomes.	Analysis and interpretation are performed but lack depth or appropriateness. Some use of past results is evident, but the analysis of historical data is sporadic and not deeply integrated into current planning. There's a moderate connection between past findings and current actions, but it lacks consistency and depth.	Minimal or no analysis or interpretation performed. Minimal use of past results; historical data is occasionally referenced but not effectively analyzed or integrated. The connection between past findings and current actions is weak and lacks strategic impact.	No data entered.
Presentation and Communication	Data is excellently presented; enhances understanding and clarity.	Data is well presented; generally clear and understandable.	Data presentation is adequate but lacks some clarity.	Data presentation is poor; does not aid in understanding.	No data entered.
Impact and Action Planning	Provides compelling evidence of significant impact and detailed, innovative actions for improvement.	Provides clear evidence of impact and solid actions for improvement.	Provides limited evidence of impact; actions for improvement are vague.	Provides no evidence of impact or improvement; no specific actions planned.	No data entered.

7. Use of Results for Seeking Improvement (Action Plans): Steps 5A through 5F

Notes: At least one Action Plan must be developed even if all targets are met to show continuous improvement efforts.

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
Data-Driven Action Plans	Action plans are robustly supported by data, with explicit and detailed references to specific assessment findings.	Action plans are clearly connected to assessment results, with most actions justified by findings.	Some actions in the plan are linked to assessment results, but connections are not consistently clear or justified.	Action plans lack clear connections to assessment results, with few or no justifications provided.	*No data entered.*
Structured Implementation	Implementation details are comprehensively outlined, including well-defined actions, assigned responsibilities, and precise timelines.	Most necessary details are included; actions, responsibilities, and timelines are generally clear.	Some details on actions, responsibilities, or timelines are vague or missing.	Implementation plan lacks structure, with unclear or missing actions, responsibilities, and timelines.	*No data entered.*
Curricular and Pedagogical Adjustments	The plan includes detailed, innovative adjustments to curriculum and pedagogy, directly informed by assessment results.	Adjustments to curriculum and teaching methods are relevant and informed by some assessment results.	Some adjustments are made, but they are only loosely connected to assessment results or lack detail.	Few or no adjustments are made, or they are unrelated to assessment findings.	*No data entered.*
Reassessment and Continuous Improvement	A comprehensive reassessment schedule is integrated, with clear metrics for evaluating effectiveness and timelines for ongoing review.	Reassessment is planned, with some clear metrics and timelines, though some details may be less defined.	Plans for reassessment exist but lack detailed metrics or specific timelines.	Little to no plan for reassessment; lacks clear metrics or timelines.	*No data entered.*

8. Status Update on Action(s) Identified in the Previous Assessment Cycle: Steps 6A and 6B

Review Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Good	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning	0 – Absent
Status Update on Previous Action(s)	Provides a comprehensive and detailed update, including progress on all items, specific data or results achieved, and clear explanations of any deviations from the plan. Demonstrates proactive problem-solving and adjustments based on past performance.	Offers a clear and concise update on most actions, including general data or results, with some details on deviations. Indicates ongoing monitoring and some proactive adjustments.	Updates are somewhat vague or incomplete, covering some but not all actions. Includes basic data or results with minimal explanation of deviations or issues encountered.	Provides minimal and generic updates with little to no specific data or results. Lacks detail on progress for several actions and offers no explanation of deviations.	No update provided or updates are irrelevant and do not address specific previous actions.
Summary of Completed Action(s)	Summarizes actions comprehensively with detailed results and impacts. Reflects thorough analysis and lessons learned, clearly linking outcomes to initial goals and outcomes.	Provides a clear summary of actions completed with general results and some discussion of their impact. Includes some analysis of outcomes relative to goals.	Summarizes completed actions but with limited detail on results and impacts. Minimal linkage of outcomes to initial goals, with scant analysis.	Offers a very basic summary of actions with little to no information on results or impact. Does not effectively connect completed actions to goals or outcomes.	No summary provided or the summary is entirely off-topic or irrelevant to the actions supposedly completed.
Alignment Between Past Action and Future Action Plan	Demonstrates a strategic and logical connection between past actions and future plans. Clearly outlines how past results inform future outcomes, with detailed steps for continued improvement and goal achievement.	Shows a reasonable connection between past actions and future plans. Outlines how results are used to shape future actions, though some details may be missing or less developed.	Some effort to link past actions to future plans is evident, but the connections are not always clear or fully rationalized. Lacks comprehensive planning based on past outcomes.	Shows minimal or no clear linkage between past and future actions. Future plans appear disconnected from past results, indicating a lack of strategic planning.	No attempt to align past actions with future plans, or the component is missing entirely.