HOW TO CREATE A STUDENT LEARNING DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Note to Readers: This mini-handbook on how to create a student learning development (SLD) plan is designed to help EWU faculty members evaluate the extent to which students can demonstrate the skills and knowledge that the faculty deem most important.

Rather than read this document from front to back, you are encouraged to use it as a reference: that is, when your program arrives at a given stage in the student learning development process, you can turn to the section that covers that stage of the process and read it for a step-by-step description of what to do.

This handbook also has worksheets in the appendices that you can use to break down the process into manageable steps.

Please note that this handbook is a living document that will be revised and updated as EWU's student learning development landscape changes.

Readers are invited to direct their questions about SLD to the Office of Assessment and Accreditation at assessment@ewu.edu. They are also encouraged to visit EWU's assessment and accreditation website at https://sites.ewu.edu/assessment-accreditation/.

CONTENTS

Culminating Learning Activities / Capstone Projects

To plan for program learning outcomes assessment, the department should decide which *culminating learning activities* (assignments/tests) they will have students undertake to demonstrate the degree to which they have achieved the program learning outcomes. So that instructors can assess students' work at one point in time, the activities need to result in a *learning artifact* or a *scheduled live performance.*

- **Types of Activities[1]**

  - Artifacts. Examples of learning artifacts that faculty may use to assess program learning outcomes include the following:
    - A capstone project manuscript (e.g., a research report, a business plan, a lab report)
    - A portfolio of written work
    - An exhibition of art work
    - A written comprehensive final exam developed by departmental faculty
    - A major field test (MFT) published by a testing company such as the ETS or College Outcomes (provided that the test generates sub-scores that match your program's PLOs)

  - Performances. Examples of scheduled live performances that faculty may use to assess program learning outcomes include the following:
    - A skills test (e.g., an audiology examination of a patient)
    - A teaching demonstration
    - A theatrical monologue
    - A dance performance
    - A musical performance
    - A speech
    - An oral exam

- **Criteria for Culminating Learning Activities**

  - Allow Faculty to Assess Students as Individuals. The culminating learning activities need to allow faculty to assess students *as __individuals__* on *each program learning outcome*. A paper written by a group, for instance, would not allow you to assess the degree to which each student has achieved each of the PLOs the assignment was designed to elicit. As such, it would not qualify as an acceptable culminating learning activity for the purpose of student learning outcomes assessment.

  - Program Requirement. In order to determine the degree to which all graduating students in your program have achieved each program learning outcome, the culminating learning activities should be a program requirement—that is, mandated of every graduating (or upper-level) student in the program. This can be done by assigning the activities in a senior-level required

---

[1] For examples of assignments created by faculty from across the country, you can check out the National Institute of Learning Outcomes Assessment's assignment library at https://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/ourwork/assignment-library/.

course like a capstone class. Different sections of the course should assign the same culminating activities so that the results can be meaningfully pooled across sections. Also, the same activities would ideally be used from year to year so that you can evaluate improvement in student outcomes over time as a result of program enhancement efforts.

- Literal Translation of PLO. The culminating learning activity needs to be a literal translation of the PLO, not something that approximates it. If your PLO states that students should be able to "Explain why two substances combine to form other substances," an assignment that has students design an experiment to show how two substances combine to form another substance would be a misalignment. The activity must require that students *explain why* two substances combine to form other substances just as the PLO dictates. You may ask students to do this in, say, an essay question on a test, paper, or oral presentation.

- Activities Enable Faculty to Assess All PLOs and GE Outcomes.

  - Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). Each PLO needs to be assessable via a culminating learning activity. However, you don't need one activity per PLO. Instead, you can use a single activity to assess multiple PLOs, provided that the activity requires students to demonstrate in a literal way each of the PLOs it is intended to elicit.

    A comprehensive exam for testing knowledge in the discipline and a capstone paper demonstrating research, writing, and cognitive skills can be a fruitful combination of culminating learning activities for a humanities, social science, or natural science program. A skills test and major field test (or practice licensing exam) may work well for a clinically-oriented program. And a juried performance, exhibition, or artist portfolio coupled with a research or reflection paper is a mix that is well suited to assessing arts programs. Of course, these combinations are provided as possibilities, not requirements.

  - GE Outcomes. In addition to creating culminating learning activities that prompt students to demonstrate your program's program learning outcomes, you should develop the activities to require students to exhibit four of EWU's five general education outcomes: written communication, information literacy, analytical thinking, and creative thinking. If math skills are a part of your discipline, your culminating learning activity would ideally include the fifth GE outcome, quantitative literacy. Operational definitions of what is meant by written communication, information literacy, analytical thinking, creative thinking, and quantitative literacy can be found in the GE rubrics at https://d3tb2mkdocc4em.cloudfront.net/generaleducation/wp-content/uploads/sites/54/2018/11/Five-GE-Learning-Outcomes_Spring2018.pdf. Although program faculty need to have the GE outcomes "baked into" the culminating activities, they don't need to assess them.

  - Assignment Transparency. The instructions faculty provide for each culminating student learning activity should explicitly require students to demonstrate each program learning outcome the activity will be used to elicit. Research shows that making explicit one's evaluation criteria markedly improves the quality of student work. This is even more so for first-generation students and students of color (Winkelmes et al., 2016).[2] The directions for an English BA capstone project paper might, for instance, state something like the following:

---

[2] Information about transparent assignment design, including a template and checklist, can be found at

In this 15-page paper, you are to identify key themes that connect five literary texts of your choosing. Your paper will be evaluated on the degree to which you (a) Closely analyze the literary texts using appropriate literary and critical vocabulary (PLO-2); (b) Synthesize theoretical knowledge to produce original written interpretations of the literary texts (PLO-3): (c) Appropriately employ pertinent secondary sources in writing (PLO-4); and (d) Demonstrate effective communication skills in academic writing (PLO-6).

In addition, your paper needs to demonstrate the following General Education Outcomes: information literacy, analytical thinking, and creative thinking. I will provide the rubrics that will be used to assess your grasp of these skills.[3]

In addition to having the assignment instructions make explicit to students that their artifact or performance needs to demonstrate the PLOs, the rubric the instructor will use to evaluate the artifact or performance must do so too (as described in "PLO Rubrics" below). The rubric should accompany the assignment directions so that students have both prior to beginning their work on the activity.

Upon designing your culminating program learning activities, complete the Culminating Program Learning Activities Worksheet in Appendix A. The worksheet should be submitted to your college assessment committee as part of your Student Learning Development Plan.

PLO Rubrics

For student work for which there is no single right answer, whether it be a paper, oral presentation, theatrical performance, artist's portfolio, or open-ended test question, you should create a rubric to assess the degree to which students' work meets the learning outcome(s) you designed the assignment to elicit.

Rubric Benefits

Rubrics provide a number of benefits over "free scoring" student work (i.e., making global judgements about which grade to assign). First, they require you to make explicit the criteria you will use to evaluate student work. Making your expectations transparent to students enhances the likelihood that students' work will exhibit the desired characteristics. Further, communicating the evaluation criteria establishes a contract between you and the student. The rubric constrains you to judge students' work on what you said you would and, as such, holds you accountable. Likewise, it holds students accountable by conveying the attributes that their work needs to demonstrate.

A second important benefit of rubrics is that they help you be more consistent across students and

---

https://sites.ewu.edu/SLD-accreditation/SLD/SLD-resources/step-3-how-to-create-methods-to-assess-slos/.

[3] Since written communication is one of the program's PLOs and this PLO is going to be assessed in this assignment, including the GE outcome written communication would just be redundant. Therefore, only the three other required GE outcomes are listed here.

across time in your judgements about student work. This is important because most student learning outcomes assessment, like most grading, requires professors to *exercise their professional judgement* to render an evaluation about the quality of student work along one or more dimensions. In other words, the assessment or grading of student work for which there is not one correct answer—which is most of what gets evaluated at the baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate levels—rests on faculty subjectivity. Subjectivity is not the same as arbitrariness or haphazardness, however. Rather, it reflects instructors' expert evaluations. While professional judgements are not arbitrary or haphazard, they tend not to be perfectly consistent. One's evaluations of the same thing may vary some from day to day. Although rubrics don't entirely eliminate inconsistency in one's assessment, they do help mitigate it by holding the evaluation criteria constant. In so doing, they enable people to render their subjective judgements more systematically across students and time.

A third benefit of rubrics is that they provide a way to convert qualitative judgements into quantitative data. This is useful not because quantitative data are more objective than qualitative—they're not—but because doing so allows faculty to track improvement in student learning over time, which qualitative information, however rich and interesting, does not enable one to do.

Finally, rubrics can be great time savers when used for grading. Rather than writing the same comments over and over, instructors can point to the rubric to show students where their work hits the mark and where it falls short.

Create Simple Rubrics

You are advised—though not required—to keep the rubric you develop simple to make the assessment process as straightforward as possible. To create a simple rubric, list in the left-hand column the PLOs that the particular assignment will be used to elicit. The top row should show the rating scale.

The rating scale may have between two ("Satisfactory" and "Unsatisfactory") and innumerable quality levels. The fewer the number of levels, the more consistent people are apt to be in their ratings. Imagine you were given a stack of papers whose writing quality you are to assess as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Chances are good that if given the same set of papers two years in a row, your pile of satisfactory papers and unsatisfactory papers would be nearly identical across years. Now, imagine you had been asked to sort the stack into five piles (e.g., "Outstanding," "Very Good," "Competent," "Underdeveloped," and "Poor or Absent"). Chances are good you wouldn't be able to replicate the piles as consistently from one year to the next.

While fewer quality levels leads to greater internal consistency ("reliability" to use social scientists' term), they require you make blunter judgements. The "Satisfactory" pile will contain papers that marginally meet your expectations to those that are outstanding. And the "Unsatisfactory" pile will span the range from those that are marginally below your expectations to those that are thoroughly disappointing. Having to sort students' work into only two categories is likely to feel unsatisfying because it won't adequately reflect your judgements about the variability in quality.

A four-level rubric scale is apt to hit the sweet spot. Four levels is sufficiently few that you can be reasonably consistent in your judgements while giving you enough options to distinguish among students' work. Furthermore, four levels generate more information than three or two. In addition to indicating the fraction of students who are or aren't meeting your expectations, they reveal what percentage of your students are excelling on any given program learning outcome in your view and what

percent are missing the mark entirely.

A simple rubric for an English department's capstone paper might look like the following:

Capstone Paper Rubric for English BA Majors		Excellent 4	Proficient 3	Non-proficient 2	Poor or Absent 1
ENGL-PLO-2	Closely analyzes literary texts using appropriate literary and critical vocabulary	☐	☐	☐	☐
ENGL-PLO-4	Synthesizes theoretical knowledge to produce original written interpretations of literary texts	☐	☐	☐	☐
ENGL-PLO-5	Appropriately employs pertinent secondary sources in writing	☐	☐	☐	☐
ENGL-PLO-7	Demonstrates effective communication skills in academic, professional, or creative writing	☐	☐	☐	☐

If you prefer a more complex, but more fine-grained, rubric, you could choose to use a whole rubric to assess one PLO. When creating a rubric for one PLO, the rubric criteria should correspond to the list of attributes that students' work needs to demonstrate in order to achieve the PLO. A rubric for the English BA program's PLO-7, "Demonstrates effective communication skills in academic, professional, or creative writing," might look like this:

English BA PLO-7 Rubric*					
The student:	Excellent 4	Proficient 3	Non-proficient 2	Poor or Absent 1	Score
Clarified the purpose of the document	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Conveyed meaning clearly throughout the document	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Organized the document logically	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Responded to the needs of the audience by making appropriate rhetorical choices about genre, format, voice, tone, and formality	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Produced polished text that conforms to academic conventions of grammar, mechanics, and punctuation	☐	☐	☐	☐	
				Sum	
			Student's PLO-7 Mean Score (Sum/5)		

Calculating Rubric Data for Assessment

A key way that grading and assessment are different is that grading computes the score for each student *across learning outcomes*, whereas assessment computes the score for learning outcomes *across students*. As shown in the table below.

English BA Students' Capstone Paper Grading and Assessment Worksheet							
		Rubric Results				Grade	
		PLO-2	PLO-4	PLO-5	PLO-7	Avg Grade per Student*	Avg Grade per Student**
Clayton Thomas		4	3	4	4	3.75	**94%**
Katie Britton		3	1	3	4	2.75	**69%**
Louise Hernandez		4	2	3	4	3.25	**81%**
Keesha Coleman		4	3	4	3	3.5	**88%**
Katie Chang		3	2	3	4	3	**75%**
Program Assessment Results	Avg. Score per PLO*	3.6	2.2	3.4	3.8		
	Avg. Score per PLO**	**90%**	**55%**	**85%**	**95%**		

*PLOs measured on a 4-point rubric scale (4 = Excellent; 1 = Poor or Absent)
** Average converted to a 100-point scale

Performance Targets

Setting performance targets for your PLO data before you conduct the assessment will help you make sense of your assessment results. For instance, the math faculty could more easily interpret the meaning of the finding that 78% of graduating seniors in the math BS program are able to describe the logical structure of proofs if prior to assessing the PLO they had established their expectations for the *minimum percentage* of students who *should* be able to achieve this PLO.

During the planning stage, the program faculty should set performance targets for each PLO. Because targets are somewhat arbitrary, I advise the faculty to divide the scores into three ranges—that is, (a) a range of scores that demonstrate that the program has successfully taught the PLO to the graduating cohort, (b) a range indicating it has failed to teach the PLO adequately to the graduating cohort, and (c) a range in the middle, which signals that the program's success on the PLO is gray or ambiguous.

For instance, the three ranges for a PLO measured on a four-point rubric (in which 4 = exemplary; 3 = proficient; 2 = non-proficient; and 1 = poor or absent) might be as follows: A cohort's mean score of 3.0 or greater is satisfactory; 2.9 to 2.1 is ambiguous; and 2.0 or lower is unsatisfactory.

A program might determine that on a nationally standardized test a sub-score with an average percentile ranking of 75% or higher is satisfactory; 50% to 74% is ambiguous; and below 50% is unsatisfactory. Similarly, faculty might determine that students' average score on the four questions on the department's comprehensive exam used to measure a given PLO would have the following ranges: 85% and above correct is satisfactory; between 79% and 84% is ambiguous; and below 79% is unsatisfactory.

When programs set their performance targets, they should bear in mind that their unit, faculty members, and students will not suffer any negative consequences for failing to meet their targets: the purpose of the Student Learning Development process is to inform and improve, not reward or punish. As such, faculty members are advised against establishing targets that students will easily surpass. Rather, they should set the bar in the medium-high range instead.

Use the PLO Target Worksheet in Appendix B to provide the three ranges for each PLO. The worksheet should be submitted to your college assessment committee as part of your Student Learning Development Plan.

The Assessment Process

Grading vs. Assessing

Assessment is designed to encode faculty subjectivity. It provides a systematic method for faculty to determine how *satisfied* they are with how well their students as a whole are achieving each of their program's program learning outcomes. Furthermore, it allows them to track the degree to which their level of satisfaction with students' work increases over time as they make pedagogical and curricular changes to improve student learning.

To make the process meaningful, faculty need to record their *genuine judgement* about student work when conducting assessment—not inflate the numbers to have better seeming results. Since assessment data measure faculty members' opinions, it wouldn't make sense for the university to base rewards or punishments on these data. Allocating or denying resources to a program based on how pleased faculty report themselves to be with their students' work would be silly. (And administrators have made clear that they won't use assessment data that way.)

Unlike grades, assessment data have no consequences. Grades affect whether a student can earn a degree in a particular major, get admitted into a graduate program, or possibly be hired for a job. By contrast, assessment data do not. No harm or good will come to a student, faculty, or program based on the program's assessment data. For this reason, it makes sense to apply assessment standards that are at least as, if not more, rigorous than those used to make grading judgements.

Grading and Assessment

Culminating program learning artifacts and performances should be graded as part of one or more required senior-level courses, typically a capstone in the major. It is important that the activities used for assessment contribute significantly to a course grade so that students are motivated to do their best work. That said, the program has a choice about the degree to which it wants to differentiate the grading and assessment of the culminating program learning activities.

- Undifferentiated Grading and Assessment. Given that it is reasonable that a student's grade on the assignment would directly reflect his or her performance the PLOs the assignment is designed to elicit, the program might decide to calculate students' grade for the assignment by using the PLO rubric. The benefit of not differentiating between grading and assessment is that it saves faculty

time and reflects the logical relationship between assessment and grading criteria. (See example of an Undifferentiated Grading and Assessment Rubric below).

- Simultaneous Grading and Assessment. A second option is for faculty to evaluate the culminating program learning activity using a rubric that contains rows for the PLOs and rows for the other elements on which they want to base students' grade. The PLO rows would count toward both the assessment and the grade, while the other elements would count exclusively toward the grade. (See example of a Simultaneous Grading and Assessment Rubric on the following page).

- Separate Grading and Assessment. Grading and assessment may be done as distinct activities. One could use a rubric in which the PLO rows are only used to generate assessment data, while the other rows are only used for grading. Or, one could decide to decide to grade the assignment using one's traditional grading practices (e.g., free-scoring students' work), but use the PLO rubric for assessment. In addition to according faculty greater flexibility to grade how they are most comfortable, a benefit of grading and assessing separately is that, as noted above, grades have consequences, while assessment data do not. To employ different standards of rigor, one might want, therefore, to grade differently from how one assesses. This option has two downsides, however. First, using this method might feel like you are doubling your work, especially if you free-score students' work and then assess it with a PLO rubric. Second, students won't be motivated to put forth their best effort demonstrating the PLOs if they know that their performance on the PLOs won't contribute to their grade. (See example of a Separate Grading and Assessment Rubric on the following page).

In making the decision about which of the three alternatives your faculty prefers, it may be useful to know that Canvas's Outcomes feature accommodates all of the options. You can set it up so that every row in a rubric counts toward the grade or only some rows. (All rows will automatically generate assessment data, but for program assessment purposes you would only be interested in the data generated by the rubric's PLO rows.)

The rubric illustrations below depict the three different options.

Undifferentiated Grading and Assessment Rubric

	Excellent 4	Proficient 3	Non-proficient 2	Poor or Absent 1	Score
Closely analyzes literary texts using appropriate literary and critical vocabulary (PLO-2)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Synthesizes theoretical knowledge to produce original written interpretations of literary texts (PLO-4)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Appropriately employs pertinent secondary sources in writing (PLO-5)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Demonstrates effective communication skills in academic, professional, or creative writing (PLO-7)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
				Grade	

PLOs = Grading Criteria

Simultaneous Grading and Assessment Rubric

	Excellent 4	Proficient 3	Non-proficient 2	Poor or Absent 1	Score
Closely analyzes literary texts using appropriate literary and critical vocabulary (PLO-2)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Synthesizes theoretical knowledge to produce original written interpretations of literary texts (PLO-4)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Appropriately employs pertinent secondary sources in writing (PLO-5)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Demonstrates effective communication skills in academic, professional, or creative writing (PLO-7)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Demonstrates subject matter expertise	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Has a unique scholarly voice	☐	☐	☐	☐	
				Grade	

PLOs = Grading Criteria
Additional Grading Crite

Separate Grading and Assessment Rubric

	Excellent 4	Proficient 3	Non-proficient 2	Poor or Absent 1	Score
Closely analyzes literary texts using appropriate literary and critical vocabulary (PLO-2)	☐	☐	☐	☐	N/A
Synthesizes theoretical knowledge to produce original written interpretations of literary texts (PLO-4)	☐	☐	☐	☐	N/A
Appropriately employs pertinent secondary sources in writing (PLO-5)	☐	☐	☐	☐	N/A
Demonstrates effective communication skills in academic, professional, or creative writing (PLO-7)	☐	☐	☐	☐	N/A
Demonstrates subject matter expertise	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Has a unique scholarly voice	☐	☐	☐	☐	
				Grade	

Grading Criteria

Individual vs. Group Assessment

Another decision programs need to make is whether the instructor of the course in which the culminating program learning activities are assigned (e.g., the capstone course instructor) generates the program's PLO data or whether a group conducts the assessment. The former is easier. Given that the instructor is already grading the artifact or performance, it can little (or no) additional effort for him or her to complete the assessment depending on which of the three grading vs. assessment options is used. Furthermore, unlike group assessment, the process entails no coordination. The great benefit of group assessment, however, is that the program can place greater faith in their assessment data when it reflects the faculty's collective appraisal of the quality of student work rather than that of one person. Another benefit is that it may be unfair to place the responsibility for program assessment in the hands of one person. Group assessment enables the program to share the duty.

When assessing PLOs demonstrated through a live performance, two or more faculty members might score a rubric while in the audience. In the case of learning artifacts, a subgroup of faculty might assess

students' work after the course ends (like in the summer). Another option programs may consider is engaging a panel of outside jurors (e.g., well respected artists from the region who attend a student photographic exhibition) to conduct the assessment.

To enhance the credibility of the results, programs that conduct group assessment have the option—and are encouraged to—participate in a norming process. The norming process, which is overseen by the Office of Assessment and Accreditation, is a short practice period during which faculty come to develop shared standards and, as such, learn to generate similar rubric ratings.

If the program has a large number of students in its graduating cohort and/or requires culminating student products that are lengthy (e.g., long manuscripts) or entail complex evaluation procedures (e.g., three experts rating a musical performance), they may choose to assess a random sample of student products, rather than all students' work. The Office of Assessment and Accreditation is available to generate the random sample.

The Student Learning Development Assessment Plan

Logistics

During the planning phase, the faculty need to think through all of the practical steps that will need to be executed in order for the data to be generated, collected, and warehoused in a usable form. Matters to consider include the following: the venue for collecting the data (e.g., in a course and, if so, in which one(s); in a performance or exhibition outside of class time); who the assessors will be (e.g., the instructor of the capstone course, the members of a student learning development steering committee, a jury composed of invited experts in the field); who will take responsibility for managing the data collection process; and where and how the data will be stored.

Student Learning Development Plan

The program's Student Learning Development plan should include the following information:
- The program name and degree
- The PLOs (enumerated)
- The curriculum map for each program, in which the major CLOs for each required course are listed and aligned to the PLOs (with "I's," "D's," and "A's" denoted)
- Culminating Program Learning Activities Worksheet (Appendix A)
- PLO Target Worksheet (Appendix B)
- Assignment directions for all culminating learning activities
- Rubric(s) for each culminating learning activity
- Test(s) that will be used to each one or more PLOs along with a learning key for tests with right and wrong answers and rubrics for any essay-type questions
- A completed Student Learning Development Plan Template (Appendix D)

Appendix A: SLD Plan Document 1: Culminating Program Learning Activities Worksheet

Program Name: _____ Program Degree: _____

Activity Name:									
Artifact or Performance? (circle one)	Artifact				Scheduled Live Performance				
PLO (circle all that apply)	PLO-1	PLO-2	PLO-3	PLO-4	PLO-5	PLO-6	PLO-7	PLO-8	PLO-9
GE Outcome (circle all that apply)	Written Communication		Information Literacy		Analytical Thinking		Creative Thinking		Quantitative Literacy
Can faculty assess students as individuals?	Yes				No				
Is the activity a literal translation of the PLO?	Yes			No			Partially		
Do the assignment directions make the PLOs on which students will be evaluated explicit?	Yes			No			Partially		
Is the rubric aligned with PLOs?	Yes			No			Partially		

Notes:

Activity Name:									
Artifact or Performance? (circle one)	Artifact				Scheduled Live Performance				
PLO (circle all that apply)	PLO-1	PLO-2	PLO-3	PLO-4	PLO-5	PLO-6	PLO-7	PLO-8	PLO-9
GE Outcome (circle all that apply)	Written Communication		Information Literacy		Analytical Thinking		Creative Thinking		Quantitative Literacy
Can faculty assess students as individuals?	Yes				No				
Is the activity a literal translation of the PLO?	Yes			No			Partially		
Do the assignment directions make the PLOs on which students will be evaluated explicit?	Yes			No			Partially		
Is the rubric aligned with PLOs?	Yes			No			Partially		

Notes:

Activity Name:									
Artifact or Performance? (circle one)	Artifact				Scheduled Live Performance				
PLO (circle all that apply)	PLO-1	PLO-2	PLO-3	PLO-4	PLO-5	PLO-6	PLO-7	PLO-8	PLO-9
GE Outcome (circle all that apply)	Written Communication		Information Literacy		Analytical Thinking		Creative Thinking		Quantitative Literacy
Can faculty assess students as individuals?	Yes				No				
Is the activity a literal translation of the PLO?	Yes			No			Partially		
Do the assignment directions make the PLOs on which students will be evaluated explicit?	Yes			No			Partially		
Is the rubric aligned with PLOs?	Yes			No			Partially		

Notes:

Appendix B: SLD Plan Document 2: PLO Target Worksheet

Program: _____   Degree: _____

PLOs	Culminating Student Products (List the three ranges for each PLO) *		
	+	**~**	**−**
Students who earn a [**degree**] in [**program name**]] at EWU should be able to do the following:	**Within target range**	**Ambiguous/ Gray**	**Below Target Range**
PLO-1	≥		≤
PLO-2	≥		≤
PLO-3	≥		≤
PLO-4	≥		≤
PLO-5	≥		≤
PLO-6	≥		≤
PLO-7	≥		≤
PLO-8	≥		≤
PLO-9	≥		≤

*When providing raw test or rubric scores, be sure to indicate the total number of points possible (e.g., 70 out of 83 possible points; 3.82/5 points)

Appendix C: Student Learning Development Assessment Plan Template: Example

	Students who successfully earn a BA in English at EWU should be able to do the following:	Course # & Name	Short Description of Culminating Learning Activity	A or P*
PLO-1	Identify important literary periods	ENGL 490: Senior Capstone	Comprehensive Exam	A
PLO-2	Identify major writers	ENGL 490: Senior Capstone	Comprehensive Exam	A
PLO-3	Closely analyze literary texts using appropriate literary and critical vocabulary	ENGL 490: Senior Capstone	Capstone Research Paper	A
PLO-4	Synthesize theoretical knowledge to produce original written interpretations of literary texts	ENGL 490: Senior Capstone	Capstone Research Paper	A
PLO-5	Appropriately employ pertinent secondary sources in writing	ENGL 490: Senior Capstone	Capstone Research Paper	A

	When will the assessment take place? (Quarter/Semester & Year)	Who will conduct the assessment?	Where will the learning artifacts be stored?	Where will the completed rubrics be stored?	Who will compile the results?
PLO-1	F, W & Spr Qtr: 2021, 22 & 23	capstone instructor	Canvas	shared program drive	capstone instructor
PLO-2	F, W & Spr Qtr: 2021, 22 & 23	capstone instructor	Canvas	shared program drive	capstone instructor
PLO-3	summer session 1: 2021, 2022, 2023	program assessment committee	shared program drive	shared program drive	program assessment committee
PLO-4	summer session 1: 2021, 2022, 2023	program assessment committee	shared program drive	shared program drive	program assessment committee
PLO-5	summer session 1: 2021, 2022, 2023	program assessment committee	shared program drive	shared program drive	program assessment committee

When will faculty meet to review results?	
Year	Quarter/Semester
2022	Fall
2023	Fall
2024	Fall

*A = Artifact P = Performance

Appendix D: SLD Plan Document 3: Student Learning Development Assessment Plan Template

	Students who successfully earn a [degree] in [program name] at EWU should be able to do the following:	Course # & Name	Short Description of Culminating Learning Activity	A or P*
Student Learning Development Assessment Plan Template				
PLO-1				
PLO-2				
PLO-3				
PLO-4				
PLO-5				
PLO-6				
PLO-7				
PLO-8				
PLO-9				

	When will the assessment take place? (Quarter/Semester & Year)	Who will conduct the assessment?	Where will the learning artifacts be stored?	Where will the completed rubrics be stored?	Who will compile the results?
PLO-1					
PLO-2					
PLO-3					
PLO-4					
PLO-5					
PLO-6					
PLO-7					
PLO-8					
PLO-9					

When will faculty meet to review results?	
Year	Quarter/Semester