

**Evaluation Form for Assessment Lead  
Core Competencies Assessment Report**

Degree Program:  
 Department/School:  
 Program Chair/Director's Name:  
 Report Writer's Name (if different than chair/director):  
 Chair/Director or Report Writer's Email:

Previous year's ratings (1-4 - if available; n/a – if unavailable)		
Process:	Performance:	Progress:

**Rating Guide:**

Rate each area as follows: **1 = Needs improvement; 2 = Needs minor improvement; 3 = Meets Requirement; 4 = Exceeds Requirement**

I. Overall Process Section Ratings Criteria	N/A	1	2	3	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The core competency learning outcomes are clearly and appropriately written.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Curricular Map is attached and depicts a clear and sufficient crosswalk of core competencies and courses.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of learning is sufficient for assessment of each core competency.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All assessment tools are attached.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment tools are clearly tied to the core competencies and contain distinguished levels of evaluation.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of achievement seems appropriate for the core competencies.</li> </ul>					
<b>Overall Rating for Process Section</b>					
<b>Comments for Process Section:</b>					

II. Overall Performance Section Ratings Criteria	N/A	1	2	3	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Levels of achievement explanation captures either satisfactory achievement levels or unsatisfactory achievement levels <u>with</u> strong justifications/rationale.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student performance data is attached or on the report with appropriate analysis.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student performance data consistently supports levels of achievement explanation.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student performance data and analysis were satisfactorily shared with faculty and students.</li> </ul>					
<b>Overall Rating for Performance Section</b>					
<b>Comments for Performance Section:</b>					

III. Overall Progress Section Ratings Criteria	N/A	1	2	3	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The narrative clearly responds to past years' recommendations.</li> </ul>					

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3-year performance data is attached or on the report; and the data is reasonably comparable. Any gaps in the data trend is appropriately explained.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The narrative provides insights and learning points based on data analysis of student performance.</li> </ul>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The program articulates a good plan for program improvement (i.e., closing the loop).</li> </ul>					
<p><b>Overall Rating for Progress Section</b></p>					
<p><b>Comments for Progress Section:</b></p>					