Over-Alignment: "All Courses to All Outcomes or the Majority of Outcomes"

1. Loss of Meaningful Alignment

When every course is marked as addressing every Learning Outcome, alignment becomes **symbolic rather than functional**. It fails to reveal which courses are *intentionally designed* to support specific outcomes, making the alignment map essentially useless for curriculum analysis.

If everything is aligned to everything, nothing is truly aligned to anything.

2. Inhibits Curriculum Mapping Insights

Over-alignment makes it nearly impossible to:

- Identify **gaps** in outcome coverage.

- Determine the **scaffolding** of skills and knowledge across a program.

- Pinpoint **redundancies** in instruction.

- Assess the **coherence and sequencing** of learning experiences.

A strong curriculum map should reveal how PLOs are introduced, reinforced, and mastered across the curriculum—not that they appear everywhere.

3. Dilutes Assessment Focus

If all courses are expected to assess all PLOs:

- Faculty may use **generic or misaligned assignments** just to check a box.

- Assessment results become **superficial or inconsistent**.

- Programs may struggle to gather high-quality evidence that meaningfully tracks learning progression.

4. Overburdens Faculty and Reporting

Expecting every instructor to assess all outcomes:

- Increases workload unnecessarily.

- Leads to **resistance** and **low fidelity** in assessment.

- Contributes to **assessment fatigue** and loss of buy-in.

5. Misrepresents the Student Learning Experience

Students don't develop all PLOs equally in every course. Over-alignment fails to reflect the **authentic role of each course** in shaping distinct competencies. It can also hinder efforts to track learning development across a student's academic journey.