

Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports (2014-2018)

Program Name \_\_\_\_\_

Year \_\_\_\_\_

Components	Levels of Performance		
	Exemplary	Acceptable	Emerging
Mission Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and concise.</li> <li>• Specific to the unit identifies what it does that separates it from other units).</li> <li>• Addresses the larger impact of the program.</li> <li>• Identifies stakeholders.</li> <li>• Aligned with the college and division mission and with respective professional organization, if applicable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of the program's purpose and who it serves.</li> <li>• Aligned with the college and division mission statements.</li> <li>• Scope and reach may be limited.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General statement of the intent of the program.</li> <li>• Identifies the functions performed but not the greater purpose.</li> <li>• Does not identify stakeholders.</li> <li>• Fails to demonstrate clear alignment with college or division mission.</li> <li>• Too general to distinguish the unit or too specific to encompass the entire mission.</li> </ul>
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encompass a discipline-specific body of knowledge for academic units (may also include general competencies); focus on the cumulative effect of the program.</li> <li>• Align with college and university goals and with professional organizations, where applicable.</li> <li>• Associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.) are identified, where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline.</li> <li>• Aligned with program, college, and university mission.</li> <li>• Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incomplete – not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program or unit.</li> <li>• Objectives identified don't seem important/aligned with the program mission.</li> <li>• Fails to note appropriate associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.).</li> </ul>
Learning Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observable and measurable.</li> <li>• Encompass a discipline-specific body of knowledge for academic units (may also include general competencies); focus on the cumulative effect of the program.</li> <li>• Reasonable number of outcomes identified - enough outcomes to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable to evaluate and assess.</li> <li>• Uses action verbs.</li> <li>• Describe the level of mastery expected, appropriate to degree type (BS/BA, MS, PhD) if applicable.</li> <li>• Align with college and university goals and with professional organizations, where applicable.</li> <li>• Accurately classified as "instructional" or "non-instructional".</li> <li>• Associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.) are identified, where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observable and measurable.</li> <li>• Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline.</li> <li>• Aligned with program, college, and university mission.</li> <li>• Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe a process, rather than an outcome (i.e. language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns).</li> <li>• Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome has been met.</li> <li>• Incomplete – not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program.</li> <li>• Outcomes identified don't seem important/aligned with the program mission.</li> <li>• Fails to note appropriate associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.).</li> </ul>

Components	Levels of Performance		
	Exemplary	Acceptable	Emerging
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multiple measures for some or all outcomes.</li> <li>Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct.</li> <li>Instruments reflect good research methodology.</li> <li>Feasible - existing practices used where possible; at least some measures apply to multiple outcomes.</li> <li>Purposeful - clear how results could be used for program improvement.</li> <li>Described with sufficient detail (documents attached in Document Repository, where appropriate).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 1 measure or measurement approach per outcome.</li> <li>Direct and indirect measures are utilized.</li> <li>Described with sufficient detail.</li> <li>Implementation may still need further planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all outcomes have associated measures.</li> <li>Few or no direct measures used.</li> <li>Methodology is questionable.</li> <li>Instruments are vaguely described; may not be developed yet.</li> <li>Course grades used as an assessment method.</li> <li>Do not seem to capture the "end of experience" effect of the curriculum/program.</li> </ul>
Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aligned with measures and outcomes.</li> <li>Represent a reasonable level of success.</li> <li>Specific and measurable.</li> <li>Meaningful - based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aligned with measures and outcomes.</li> <li>Target identified for each measure.</li> <li>Specific and measurable.</li> <li>Some targets may seem arbitrary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targets have not been identified for every measure, or are not aligned with the measure.</li> <li>Seem off-base (too low/high).</li> <li>Language is vague or subjective (e.g. "improve", "satisfactory") making it difficult to tell if met.</li> <li>Aligned with assessment process rather than results (e.g. survey return rate, number of papers reviewed).</li> </ul>
Assessment Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete, concise and well-organized.</li> <li>Appropriate data collection/analysis.</li> <li>Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target.</li> <li>Provide solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met.</li> <li>Compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate.</li> <li>Supporting documentation (rubrics, surveys, more complete reports*, etc.) are included in the document repository. <i>*Reports must be free of student identifiable information.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete and organized.</li> <li>Aligned with the language of the corresponding achievement target.</li> <li>Address whether targets were met.</li> <li>May contain too much detail or stray slightly from intended data set.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incomplete or too much information.</li> <li>Not clearly aligned with achievement targets.</li> <li>Questionable conclusion about whether targets were met, partially met, or not met.</li> <li>Questionable data collection/analysis; may "gloss over" data to arrive at conclusion.</li> </ul>
Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action plans clearly follow from assessment results and directly state which finding(s) was used to develop the plan.</li> <li>Actions are realistic.</li> <li>Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced.</li> <li>Defines logical "next steps."</li> <li>Contains completion dates.</li> <li>Identifies a responsible person/group.</li> <li>Number of actions are manageable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects with sufficient depth on what was learned during the assessment cycle.</li> <li>At least one action plan in place.</li> <li>Action plans follow from assessment results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not clearly related to assessment results.</li> <li>Seems to offer excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretation or "next steps" for program improvement.</li> <li>No action plans or too many to manage.</li> <li>Too general; lacking details (e.g. time frame, responsible party).</li> </ul>

Components	Levels of Performance		
	Exemplary	Acceptable	Emerging
Closing the Loop Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of a formal and effective feedback and improvement process.</li> <li>Most program faculty members are engaged in a regular assessment of data with student learning and stakeholder feedback routinely used to improve curriculum, instruction, and/or learning.</li> <li>Responses or actions are supported by multiple pieces of evidence or feedback on program goals or learning outcomes.</li> <li>Assessing student learning is fully integrated in the program's vision and operations.</li> <li>Evidence that follow-up information has been shared, discussed, and acted on by relevant groups, as appropriate.</li> <li>Program demonstrates and documents significant, continuous improvements in student learning over multiple cycles of assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of formal review process of assessment data for most goals or learning outcomes.</li> <li>Some program faculty members are engaged in a regular assessment of data with student learning and stakeholder feedback routinely used to improve curriculum, instruction, and/or learning.</li> <li>Responses or actions are supported by evidence or feedback on program goals or learning outcomes.</li> <li>Assessing student learning is an additional activity that has some value for the program.</li> <li>Program demonstrates and documents some improvements in student learning over time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited evidence of a periodic review or use of assessment data for some program goals or learning outcomes.</li> <li>Few program faculty members are engaged in a regular assessment of data with student learning and stakeholder feedback routinely used to improve curriculum, instruction, and/or learning.</li> <li>Actions are identified, but not implemented.</li> <li>Assessing student learning plays little to no role in the program's vision and operations.</li> <li>Program demonstrates and documents no/minimal improvements in student learning.</li> </ul>