

Assessment Rubric

Program: _____

CATEGORY	3 Exemplary	2 Acceptable	1 Developing	Pts.
Mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise. • Specific to the unit (identifies what it does that separates it from other units). • Addresses the larger impact of the program. • Identifies stakeholders. • Aligned with the college and division mission and with respective professional organization, if applicable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of the program's purpose and who it serves. • Aligned with the college and division mission statements. • Scope and reach may be limited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General statement of the intent of the program. • Identifies the functions performed but not the greater purpose. • Does not identify stakeholders. • Fails to demonstrate clear alignment with college or division mission. • Too general to distinguish the unit or too specific to encompass the entire mission. 	

<p>Outcomes/Objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observable and measurable. • Encompass a discipline-specific body of knowledge for academic units (may also include general competencies); focus on the cumulative effect of the program. • Reasonable number of outcomes identified - enough outcomes to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable to evaluate and assess. • Uses action verbs. • Describe the level of mastery expected, appropriate to degree type (BS/BA, MS, PhD) if applicable. • Align with college and university goals and with professional organizations, where applicable. • Accurately classified as "student learning" or "not student learning". • Associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.) are identified where appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observable and measurable. • Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline. • Aligned with program, college, and university mission. • Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe a process, rather than an outcome (i.e. language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns). • Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome has been met. • Incomplete - not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program. • Outcomes identified don't seem important/aligned with the program mission. • Fails to note appropriate associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.). 	
-----------------------------------	---	---	--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Measures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple measures for some or all outcomes. • Direct and indirect measures used; emphasis on direct. • Instruments reflect good research methodology. • Feasible - existing practices used where possible; at least some measures apply to multiple outcomes. • Purposeful - clear how results could be used for program improvement. • Described with sufficient detail (documents attached in Document Repository, where appropriate). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 measure or measurement approach per outcome. • Direct and indirect measures are utilized. • Described with sufficient detail. • Implementation may still need further planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all outcomes have associated measures. • Few or no direct measures used. • Methodology is questionable. • Instruments are vaguely described; may not be developed yet. • Course grades used as an assessment method. • Do not seem to capture the "end of experience" effect of the curriculum/program. 	
--	---	---	--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Targets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with measures and outcomes. • Represent a reasonable level of success. • Specific and measurable. • Meaningful - based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with measures and outcomes. • Target identified for each measure. • Specific and measurable. • Some targets may seem arbitrary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets have not been identified for every measure, or are not aligned with the measure. • Seem off-base (too low/high). • Language is vague or subjective (e.g. "improve", "satisfactory") making it difficult to tell if met. • Aligned with assessment process rather than results (e.g. survey return rate, number of papers reviewed). 	
<p style="text-align: center;">Findings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete, concise and well-organized. • Appropriate data collection/analysis. • Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target. • Provide solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met. • Compares new findings to past trends as appropriate. • Supporting documentation (rubrics, surveys, more complete reports*, etc.) are included in the document repository. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and organized. • Align with the language of the corresponding achievement target. • Address whether targets were met. • May contain too much detail or stray slightly from intended data set. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete or too much information. • Not clearly aligned with achievement targets. • Questionable conclusion about whether targets were met, partially met, or not met. • Questionable data collection/analysis; may "gloss over" data to arrive at conclusion. 	

<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Improvements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed improvements clearly follow from assessment results and directly state which finding(s) was used to develop the improvement. • Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical "next steps." • Contains completion dates. • Identifies a responsible person/group. • Number of proposed improvements are manageable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflects with sufficient depth on what was learned during the assessment cycle. • At least one proposed improvement in place. • Proposed improvement(s) follows from assessment results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clearly related to assessment results. • Seems to offer excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretation or "next steps" for program improvement. • No proposed improvements or too many to manage. • Too general; lacking details(e.g. time frame, responsible party). 	
---	--	--	---	--

Comments: