**RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORTS**

|  | **RUBRIC** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Categories | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| 1. Stated **student learning outcome** statements with active verbs. | Learning Outcomes | No objectives stated. | Objectives present, but with imprecise verbs (e.g., know, understand), vague description of content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and non-specificity of whom should be assessed (e.g., “students”) | Objectives generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and specification of whom should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.A. program”) | All objectives stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and specification of whom should be assessed (e.g., “graduating seniors in the Biology B.A. program”) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RUBRIC** | | | | |
| Categories | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| 2a. **Program-Level Assessment Method(s) and Timing**.  Described **direct and indirect methods** used to assess each outcome; identified the times when student work is collected. | Assessment Methods | No measures indicated | Most objectives assessed primarily via indirect (e.g., surveys) measures. | Most objectives assessed primarily via direct measures. | All objectives assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., tests, essays). |
| 2b. **Program-Level Assessment Method(s) and Timing**.  Stated **criteria and standards of judgment** by which student work is assessed (scoring rubrics or benchmarks on tests). | Assessment Methods | Seemingly no relationship between objectives and measures. | At a superficial level, it appears the content assessed by the measures matches the objectives, but no explanation is provided. | General detail about how objectives relate to measures is provided. For example, the faculty wrote items to match the objectives, or the instrument was selected “because its general description appeared to match our objectives.” | Detail is provided regarding objective-to-measure match. Specific items on the test are linked to objectives. The match is affirmed by faculty subject experts (e.g., through a backwards translation). |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RUBRIC** | | | | |
| Categories | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| 3a. Collected **evidence of student learning:** data collection | Data Collection | No information is provided about data collection process or data not collected. | Limited information is provided about data collection such as who and how many took the assessment, but not enough to judge the veracity of the process (e.g., thirty-five seniors took the test). | Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process, such as a description of the sample, testing protocol, testing conditions, and student motivation. Nevertheless, several methodological flaws are evident such as unrepresentative sampling, inappropriate testing conditions, one rater for ratings, or mismatch with specification of desired results. | The data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired results (e.g., representative sampling, adequate motivation, two or more trained raters for performance assessment, pre-post design to measure gain, cutoff defended for performance vs. a criterion) |
| 3b. Collected **evidence of student learning:** psychometrics. | Psycho-metric Properties | No info on psychometric (e.g., reliability and validity)  properties provided. | Reliability estimates (e.g., internal consistency, test-retest, inter-rater) provided for most scores, although reliability tends to be poor (<.60). Or, author states how efforts have been made to improve reliability (e.g., raters were trained on rubric). | Reliability estimates provided for most scores, most scores are marginal or better (>.60). | Reliability estimates provided, most scores are marginal or better (>.60). Plus, other evidence given such as relationship of scores to other variables and how such relationship strengthens or weakens argument for validity of test scores. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RUBRIC** | | | | |
| Categories | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| 4. Described practices that demonstrate that there is an **intentional and collaborative commitment across the program / department to address stated outcomes.** | Culture of Assessment | No evidence that there is an intentional and collaborative commitment across the department to address the stated outcomes. | A few faculty members in the department appear to have an intentional and collaborative commitment to address the stated outcomes. | Most faculty members in the department appear to have an intentional and collaborative commitment to address the stated outcomes. | All faculty members in the department appear to have an intentional and collaborative commitment to address the stated outcomes. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RUBRIC** | | | | |
| Categories | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| 5. Stated the **expected level of achievement/ performance Criteria** students should demonstrate in direct and indirect methods. | Performance Criteria | No a priori desired results for objectives | Statement of desired result (e.g., student growth, comparison to previous year’s data, comparison to faculty standards, performance vs. a criterion), but no specificity (e.g., students will grow; students will perform better than last year) | Desired result specified. (e.g., our students will gain ½ standard deviation from junior to senior year; our students will score above a faculty-determined standard). “Gathering baseline data” is acceptable for this rating. | Desired result specified and justified (e.g., Last year the typical student scored 20 points on measure x. The current cohort underwent more extensive coursework in the area, so we hope that the average student scores 22 points or better.) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RUBRIC** | | | | |
| Categories | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| 6. Stated students’ **actual level of achievement** on methods.  Identify students' actual level of achievement against the expected performance level.  7a. Provided **analysis** of students’ results. | Results & Interpreta-tion | No results presented. | Results are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the objectives or the desired results for the objectives. | Results are present, and they directly relate to the objectives and the desired results for objectives but presentation is sloppy or difficult to follow. Statistical analysis may or may not be present. | Results are present, and they directly relate to objectives and the desired results for objectives, are clearly presented, and were derived by appropriate statistical analyses. |
| 7b. Provided **interpretation** of students’ results. | Results & Interpreta-tion | No interpretation attempted. | Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the objectives or desired results of objectives. Or, the interpretations are clearly not supported by the methodology and/or results. | Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable inferences given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. | Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable given the objectives, desired results of objectives, and methodology. Plus, multiple faculty interpreted results (not just one person). And, interpretation includes how classes/ activities might have affected results. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RUBRIC** | | | | |
| Categories | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| 8. Described **actions taken** based on results (pedagogical, instructional, curricular, advising, for example). | Continuous Improvement | No mention of any actions taken based on assessment results. | Examples of actions taken based on assessment results documented but the link between the actions and the assessment findings is not clear. | Examples of actions taken based on assessment results (or plans for action) documented and directly related to findings of assessment. However, the actions lack specificity. | Examples of actions taken based on assessment results (or plans for action) documented and directly related to findings of assessment. These actions are very specific (e.g., approximate dates of implementation and where in curriculum they will occur.) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RUBRIC** | | | | |
| Categories | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| 9. Provided a specific **timetable to reassess** student work after actions or changes have been implemented to improve or maximize student learning. | Follow Up | No mention of any plan to reassess, | Vague statements of plans to reassess. | Statements of plans to reassess. However, the outcomes and schedule lacks specificity. | Specific statements of outcomes and schedule to reassess. |