

## Assessment Peer Review Rubric

	Exemplary	Good	In Progress
<b>Mission</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear and concise.</li> <li>Specific to the unit (identifies what separates the unit from other units).</li> <li>Addresses the larger impact of the program.</li> <li>Identifies key partners, collaborators &amp; community members.</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>No 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>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Observable and measurable.</li> <li>May be discipline-specific or specific to an accreditor standard (academic)</li> <li>Clearly linked to core mission and function of the unit.</li> <li>Uses action verbs.</li> <li>Align with college and university goals and with professional organizations, where applicable.</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>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>Incomplete - not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with the program (academic)</li> <li>Outcomes identified don't seem important/aligned with the program mission.</li> </ul>
<b>Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multiple measures for some or all outcomes.</li> <li>Direct and indirect measures used</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.</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>Do not seem to capture the "end of experience" effect of the curriculum/program.</li> </ul>

## Assessment Peer Review Rubric

<b>Targets</b>	<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 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>
<b>Results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>• Supporting documentation (rubrics, surveys, more complete reports*, etc.) are included in the document repository.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address whether targets were met.</li> <li>• May contain too much or too little 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> <li>• Does not provide data aligned with the measures.</li> </ul>
<b>Actions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed actions clearly follow from assessment results and directly state which finding(s) was used to develop the improvement.</li> <li>• Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical "next steps."</li> <li>• Contains completion dates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one proposed improvement in place.</li> <li>• Uses "Maintain Assessment Strategy" for all measures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No actions selected for each measure</li> </ul>