1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 - Exemplary
I. Student-centered learning outcomes (SLOs)[2]			
A. Clarity and Specificity			
No SLOs stated.	SLOs present, but with imprecise verbs (e.g. know, understand), not measurable, vague description of content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and non-specificity of whom should be addressed.	SLOs generally (75%) contain precise verbs, measurable, rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and specification of whom should be assessed (e.g., graduating seniors).	All SLOs are measurable, stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs (Bloom's Taxonomy), rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and specification of whom should be assessed (e.g., graduating seniors).
B. Orientation			
No SLOs stated in student-centered terms.	Some SLOs stated in student-centered terms.	Most SLOs stated in student-centered terms.	All SLOs stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or be able to do).
II. Course/learning experiences/components that are mapped to outcomes[3]			
No activities/courses listed.	Activities/courses listed, but link to SLOs is absent.	Most SLOs have classes and/or activities linked to them.	All SLOs have classes and/or activities linked to them.
III. Systematic method for evaluating progress on SLOs			
A. Relationship between measures and SLOs			
Seemingly, no relationship between SLOs and assessment measures (assessment tools).	At a superficial level, it appears that the content assessed by the measures matches the SLOs, but no explanation is provided.	General detail about how SLOs relate to measures is provided. For example, the faculty wrote items to match the SLOs, or the measure/tool was selected because it appeared to match the SLOs.	Detail is provided regarding SLO-to-measure/tool match. Specific items on the tool are linked to the SLOs. The match is affirmed by faculty subject experts (e.g., through a backwards translation).
B. Types of Measures/Tools			
No measures indicated.	SLOs assessed only via indirect measures (e.g., student surveys).	At least one SLO is assessed by a direct measure (e.g., tests, essays).	All SLOs assessed using at least one direct measure.
C. Specification of desired results for objects (e.g., benchmarks)			
No a priori desired results for SLOs.	Statement of desired results (e.g., student growth, comparison to previous year's data, comparison to faculty standards, performance vs. a criterion), but no specificity in terms of standards (e.g., students will grow; students will perform better than last year).	Desired results specified (e.g., our students will gain ½ standard deviation from junior to senior year; out students will score above a faculty-determined standard). "Gathering baseline data" is acceptable for this rating.	Desired result specified and justified. (e.g., Last year, the typical student scored 20 points on measure x. The current cohort underwent more extensive coursework in the area, so we hope that the average student scores 22 points or better.)

IV. Results of program assessment			
A. Presentation of results			
No results presented.	Results are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the outcomes or the desired results for the SLOs.	Results are present, and they directly relate to the outcomes and the desired results for outcomes but presentation is sloppy or difficult to follow. Statistical analysis may or may not be present.	Results are present, and they directly relate to outcomes and the desired results for outcomes, are clearly presented, and were derived by appropriate statistical analyses.
B. Interpretation of results			
No interpretation attempted.	Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the SLOs or desired results of SLOs. Or the interpretations are clearly not supported by the methodology or results.	Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcomes, desired results of outcomes, and methodology.	Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable given the outcomes, desired results of outcomes, and methodology. Plus, multiple faculty interpreted results (not just one person). And, interpretation includes how classes/activities might have affected results.
V. Documents the use of results for improvement and "closing the loop"			
A. Improvement of programs regarding student learning and development			
No mention of impact of improvements on current year or any improvements based on analysis of results.	Does not state impact of improvements on current year. Examples of improvements based on analysis of results documented, but the link between them and the assessment findings is not clear.	States impact of improvements on current year results. Plus, provides examples of improvements based on analysis of results documented and directly related to findings of assessment period. However, the improvements lack specificity.	States impact of improvements on current year results. Plus, examples of improvements based on analysis of results documented and directly related to findings of assessment period. These improvements are very specific (e.g., approximate dates of implementation and where in curriculum they will occur.)

[1] Based on a model from James Madison University (2015)

[2] For greater detail in how to formulate assessable student learning outcomes, see Jill Triplett, 2017 UNCF Assessment 101 Webinar 101, and SACSCOC Annual Meeting 2014.

[3] For more detail on curriculum mapping, see Yongmei Li, 2017 AIR Forum Workshop.