

Academic Year 2024-25

ANNUAL RUBRIC AND FEEDBACK REPORT: Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)

UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS

PROGRAM NAME:

.: GENERAL FEEDBACK AND OBSERVATIONS :.					



.: ALIGNMENT TO NEW CERTIFICATE PROTOCOL :.							
CONDITION	DOES THE CERT MEET NEW PERIMETERS?	NOTES					
Undergraduate-level certificate is coherent,	☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ PARTIALLY						
distinct course of study below baccalaureate							
degree-level.							
Undergraduate-level certificate leads to mastery in	☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ PARTIALLY						
a more narrowly defined set of program-learning							
outcomes than those obtained in a bachelor's							
degree program.							
Undergraduate-level certificate is at least 12 credit	☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ PARTIALLY						
hours (absolute minimum is 9)							
Undergraduate-level certificate includes at least 3	☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ PARTIALLY						
core-credits.							
Undergraduate-level certificate features a	☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ PARTIALLY						
culminating experience (e.g., exit exam, capstone							
project, capstone course, seminar paper).							
No more than 30% of credits are shared between	☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ PARTIALLY						
programs. Distinction and integrity of credentials is							
clear.							
Undergraduate-level certificate includes	☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ PARTIALLY						
independent and appropriately-leveled SLOs for							
credential.							
Undergraduate-level certificate is a stand-alone	☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ PARTIALLY						
SLO report.							
Undergraduate-level certificate has a stand-alone	☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ PARTIALLY						
curriculum map.							



.: CURRICULUM MAP :.							
CATEGORY	NO FURTHER ACTION NEEDED	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	IMPROVING	INCOMPLETE			
CORE COURSES	☐ Met or Exceeded Expectations in previous cycle(s).	☐ Identifies all common core courses that all students must take in order to complete program.	☐ Some common core courses that all students must take in order to complete program are identified, but list is incomplete.	☐ Does not identify any common core courses that all students must take in order to complete program.			
ALIGNMENT TO SLOS	☐ Met or Exceeded Expectations in previous cycle(s).	☐ Map explicitly aligns with student learning outcomes (SLOs) identified throughout annual SLO report.	☐ Map aligns with some, but not all, student learning outcomes (SLOs) identified throughout annual SLO report.	☐ Map does not explicitly align with any student learning outcomes (SLOs) identified throughout annual SLO report.			
ALIGNMENT TO DIRECT MEASURES	☐ Met or Exceeded Expectations in previous cycle(s).	☐ Map explicitly aligns with SLOs' Measures/Learning Activities identified throughout annual SLO report.	☐ Map aligns with some, but not all, SLOs' Measures/Learning Activities identified throughout annual SLO report.	☐ Map does not align with any SLOs' Measures/Learning Activities identified throughout annual SLO report.			
STYLE, CRAFT, CLARITY	☐ Met or Exceeded Expectations in previous cycle(s).	☐ Clear and concise to the outside reviewer.	☐ Lacks clear and concise writing.	□ No map provided.			



.: PROGRAM MISSION STATEMENT :.						
CATEGORY	"EXTRA CREDIT" EXEMPLAR	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	IMPROVING	DEVELOPING	INCOMPLETE	
ALIGNMENT TO UNIVERSITY'S MISSION	☐ It is clear where the program aligns with the university's strategic plan, Cardinal Principles, and/or other institutional values or initiatives.	☐ Explicitly aligns with the university's mission statement.	☐ Aligns with most—but not all—tenets of the university's mission statement.	☐ Needs refinement to better align with the University's mission statement.	☐ Not aligned with the University's mission statement.	
PROGRAM SPECIFICITY	☐ Unique purpose of the program is communicated in a way that is understandable across myriad audiences.	☐ Describes the unique purpose of the program.	☐ Additional information provided since previous cycle, or unique purpose not fully distinguished.	☐ Too general to distinguish the unique purpose of the program.	☐ Does not provide the purpose of the program.	
POPULATIONS	☐ Identified population(s) touch upon those the program looks forward to serving.	☐ Identifies specific population(s) served by the program (beyond students).	☐ Identifies student population(s) served.	☐ Population(s) served by the program not clearly communicated.	☐ Does not identify population(s) served by the program.	
STYLE, CRAFT, CLARITY	☐ Writing craft (syntax, grammar, tone, etc.) are strong and language is accessible to outside reader.	☐ Clear and concise writing.	☐ Writing improved since previous cycle, but additional refinement is needed.	☐ Lacks clear and concise writing.	☐ Incomplete information is provided.	
PROGRAM-LEVEL LANGAUAGE	☐ Statement explicitly names and writes into the program's degreetype/level.	☐ Statement identifies degree-level program, and includes details specific to that program.	☐ Statement not discernable from other programs affiliated with department, and statement is mostly crafted at the departmental-level.	☐ Departmental-level only statement provided.	□ No statement is provided.	



	.: PROGRAM GOALS :.					
CATEGORY	"EXTRA CREDIT" EXEMPLAR	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	IMPROVING	DEVELOPING	INCOMPLETE	
ALL COMPETENCIES UNIQUELY ADDRESSED	☐ All 4 competencies are aligned with the end-of-program and could not be mistaken for occurring at the beginning, middle, or course-level.	☐ Identifies the 4 required competencies.	□ 4 required competencies identified, but overlap with one another (e.g., one goal for one competency is nearly duplicated for another): □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ Missing the following required competencies related to: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ No program goals identified.	
STYLE, CRAFT, CLARITY	Goal's structure is written from the perspective of the program rather than the student, and does not include language and terminology better-suited for a student learning outcome. Goals are clearly and concisely written and are not lost within a larger narrative statement within the reporting module.	☐ All program goals have broad statements that address the 4 key competency areas that students will acquire and demonstrate upon graduation.	□ Some improvements made to language; however, refinement is needed to distinguish all goals from one another: □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ Some (but not all) program goals need refinement to include broad statements that address the 4 key competency areas that students will acquire and demonstrate upon graduation. □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ No program goals have broad statements that address the 4 key competency areas that students will acquire and demonstrate upon graduation.	
ALIGNMENT TO MISSION STATEMENT	☐ It is clear how the program goals align to or support the university's mission.	☐ All program goals are clearly aligned to the program's mission statement.	□ Some improvements have been made to goals since the previous cycle, however, additional refinement is still needed in order to align with program's mission statement: □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ Some (but not all) program goals need refinement to more clearly align with the program's mission statement. □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ No program goals align to the program's mission statement.	



.: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES :.						
CATEGORY	"EXTRA CREDIT" EXEMPLAR	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	IMPROVING	DEVELOPING	INCOMPLETE	
ALL COMPETENCIES UNIQUELY ADDRESSED	☐ All 4 outcomes are representative of the end-of-program and could not be mistaken for occurring at the beginning, middle, or course-level.	☐ Identifies at least 1 outcome for each of the 4 corresponding competencies.	□ 4 required competencies are identified, but overlap with one another (e.g., one outcome for one competency is nearly duplicated for another): □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	☐ Missing outcomes for competencies related to: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ No outcomes are identified.	
STYLE, CRAFT, CLARITY	☐ Outcomes' structure and style have been significantly revised on a granular-level by integrating precise language. Extraneous language and detail have been excised or moved to Additional Notes component.	☐ All outcomes describe the specific knowledge, skill, or perception to be gained or improved upon graduation through participation in the program.	☐ Some improvements made to language; however, refinement is needed to distinguish some outcomes from one another: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ Some (but not all) outcomes need refinement to better describe the specific knowledge, skill or perception to be gained or improved upon graduation through participation in the program. □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ No outcomes describe the specific knowledge, skill or perception to be gained or improved upon graduation through participation in the program.	
MEASURABILITY OF LEARNING ACTIVITIES	☐ Terminology used in learning outcomes is clearly derived from resources such as Bloom's Taxonomy.	☐ All outcomes are measurable learning activities.	☐ Some improvements have been made to outcomes, but additional refinement is still needed in order for outcomes to be measurable: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ Some (but not all) outcomes need refinement to better identify measurable learning activities. □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ No outcomes identify measurable learning activities.	



	.: MEASURES :.					
CATEGORY	"EXTRA CREDIT" EXEMPLAR	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	IMPROVING	DEVELOPING	INCOMPLETE	
LEARNING ACTIVITIES ARE <u>DIRECT</u> ASSESSMENT MEASURES	☐ Direct assessment measures provide strong detail of learning activities' assignment perimeters and expectations.	☐ Identifies at least 1 direct assessment measure for each learning outcome.	☐ Direct measure(s) identified since previous cycle, but does not align to associated SLO: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	☐ Missing direct assessment measure(s) for outcomes related to: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	☐ No direct assessment measures are identified.	
DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION TOOLS/CRITERIA	☐ Direct assessment measures provide strong detail of evaluation tools/criteria, and/or copies of these tools/criteria accompany the annual SLO report.	☐ All direct assessment measures describe how students' work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency.	☐ Direct measure(s) updated since previous cycle, but additional information is still needed: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ Some (but not all) direct assessment measures need refinement to better describe how students' work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency: □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ No direct assessment measures describe how students' work will be evaluated to determine their level of competency.	
ALIGNMENT TO LEARNING OUTCOMES	☐ Direct assessment measures' level of rigor is appropriate to an end-of-program learning outcome (e.g., direct measures are from upper-level courses or the CUE rather than 200-level courses).	☐ All direct assessment measures are clearly aligned to a specific outcome.	□ Some refinement is needed to better-align rubrics and supplemental material to learning activity and overarching SLO/competency: □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ Some (but not all) rubrics or supplemental materials identified in report are not included: □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ No direct assessment measures are aligned with specific outcomes.	



	.: TARGETS :.					
CATEGORY	"EXTRA CREDIT" EXEMPLAR	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	IMPROVING	DEVELOPING	INCOMPLETE	
EACH MEASURE HAS A TARGET	☐ Target threshold established for all identified activities ☐ Criteria is N/A to program.	☐ Identifies at least 1 target for each direct measure.	☐ Improvements have been made, but additional refinement or clarification is needed:	☐ Missing targets for direct assessment measures related to: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ No targets are identified.	
EXPRESSION	☐ Language in targets' threshold(s) is explicitly aligned activities' evaluation tools.	☐ All targets express %, #, rating and appropriate threshold for achievement of each assessed SLO.	☐ Improvements have been made since previous cycle, but some information is still missing: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ Some (but not all) targets to refine expressions (e.g. %, #, rating) and appropriate threshold for achievement of each assessed SLO. □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ No targets indicate the applicable expression (e.g. %, #, rating) or appropriate threshold for achievement of SLOs assessed.	
ALIGNMENT TO MEASURE	☐ All targets have been adjusted appropriately so as to reinforce the integrity of the program's rigor.	☐ All targets are clearly aligned to a specific measure.	☐ Improvements have been made, but additional refinement is needed or not all direct measures have an associated established target: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ Some (but not all) targets need refinement to better align to a specific measure. □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ No targets align with specific measures.	
DELINEATION OF TARGETS' N BASED ON PROGRAM MODE OF DELIVERY (FACE- TO-FACE, ONLINE, OFF-SITE)	☐ Targets across all modes of delivery are discussed comparatively to the previous cycle's Targets. (E.g., the author notes whether enrollment numbers fluctuate or remain consistent.)	☐ All targets identify # of students being assessed based on program mode-of-delivery.	☐ Improvements need to be made to how numbers across program mode-of-delivery are expressed: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ Some (but not all) targets identify # of students being assessed based on program mode- of-delivery: □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ No targets identify # of students being assessed based on program modeof-delivery.	
	☐ Criteria is N/A to program.	☐ Criteria is N/A to program.	☐ Criteria is N/A to program.	☐ Criteria is N/A to program.	☐ Criteria is N/A to program.	



		.: FIND	INGS :.		
CATEGORY	"EXTRA CREDIT" EXEMPLAR	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	IMPROVING	DEVELOPING	INCOMPLETE
IDENTIFICATION OF FINDINGS	☐ A discussion or response to each finding is provided.	☐ Identifies at least 1 finding for each direct assessment measure.	☐ Findings are provided, but there are discrepancies between the data provided and the numbers identified in the associated target: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	☐ Missing findings for direct assessment measures related to: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ No findings are identified.
INDICATION OF TARGETS' MET/UNMET/PARTIALLY MET STATUS	☐ Findings are discussed comparatively to the previous cycle's findings. (E.g., the author notes where previously unmet targets have now been met, or the author notes where targets are consistently met.)	☐ All findings clearly indicate whether the target was met.	☐ Findings are indicated as met, but the numbers or percentages are inconsistent: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	☐ Some (but not all) findings need refinement to better indicate whether the target was met: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	□ No findings indicate whether the targets were met.
DELINEATION OF FINDINGS BASED ON PROGRAM MODE OF DELIVERY (FACE-TO- FACE, ONLINE, OFF- SITE)	☐ Findings across all modes of delivery are discussed comparatively to the previous cycle's findings. (E.g., the author notes where previously unmet targets have now been met, or the author notes where targets are consistently met.)	☐ All findings are clearly delineated based on program mode-of-delivery.	☐ Findings are delineated based on program modeof-delivery, but there is some inconsistency or discrepancies between the data provided and the numbers identified in the associated target: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	☐ Some (but not all) findings are delineated based on program modeof-delivery:	□ No findings are delineated based on program mode-of-delivery.
	☐ Criteria is N/A to program.	☐ Criteria is N/A to program.	☐ Criteria is N/A to program.	☐ Criteria is N/A to program.	☐ Criteria is N/A to program.



.: ACTION PLAN :.					
CATEGORY	"EXTRA CREDIT" EXEMPLAR	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	IMPROVING	DEVELOPING	INCOMPLETE
ALL FINDINGS (WHETHER MET/UNMET/PARTIALLY MET) ARE IDENTIFIED	☐ Analysis of Findings is provided for each Target.	☐ Identifies each unmet performance target or indicates that all current targets were met.	☐ Some, but not all, targets are indicated as met or not met: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	☐ Does not identify the following unmet performance targets: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	☐ Does not identify unmet performance targets or indicate that all current targets were met.
ALL FINDINGS (WHETHER MET/UNMET/PARTIALLY MET) ARE ADDRESSED & PLAN INDICATES HOW ASSESSMENT RESULTS ARE UTILIZED TO FACILITATE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	□ Narrative goes a step further and addresses barriers to implementation; offers a timeline of planning and implementation; identifies those who need to become involved in order to implement plan (e.g., additional faculty, support staff, etc.).	□ Describes changes to improve functions, services and processes based on unmet targets or, if all targets were met, describes how the expected level of performance will be increased to facilitate continuous program improvement.	☐ Only unmet targets are addressed.	□ Does not describe changes to improve functions, services and processes based on the following met and unmet targets: □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4	□ Does not describe changes to improve functions, services or processes based on the unmet targets, or, if all targets were met, does not describe how the expected level of performance will be increased to facilitate continuous program improvement.
PREVIOUS CYCLE'S ACTION PLAN/STEPS PROVIDED	☐ Action Plan from the previous cycle is clearly presented so that it is clear to the reader which SLO each part addresses.	☐ Action Plan from the previous year is included.	☐ Some—but not all— information or Action Plan/Steps are included from the previous cycle: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	☐ Information included in 'Previous Action Plan' component, but is not Action Plan from previous cycle (copy and paste as written).	Action Plan from the previous year is not included.
CLOSING LOOP, or, ENGAGEMENT WITH PREVIOUS CYCLE'S ACTION PLAN/STEPS	☐ The action plan from the previous cycle is referenced in the new action plan (e.g., items that were not addressed or you were able to implement are being carried over into the new plan).	☐ All action plans/steps from the previous reporting cycle are addressed in detail based on how they were implemented.	☐ All action plans/steps from previous cycle note whether or not they were implemented (but include no detail): ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	☐ Some, but not all, components of the previous action plan are addressed based on how these facets were implemented: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4	☐ No response provided based on how previous year's action plan was implemented.