## Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans

	Missing	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Exemplary (these practices in addition to those that are satisfactory)
Mission		Statement does not clearly describe the program's purpose	Clearly states broad aspects of the program's function Aligned with university mission	Includes purpose, primary functions, activities, and stakeholders Expands on university mission
Outcomes		Not aligned with program mission Not measurable Outcomes are expressed as statements that include multiple outcomes	Aligned with and specific to the program mission Clearly measurable Expressed in language that focuses on what students will be able to demonstrate	<u>Have evolved based on previous</u> assessments <u>Is responsive to new information and</u> changing environments
Target		Target lacks rationale	Target is clearly stated and has defensible rationale	Targets are responsive to previous assessments, new information and changing environments Targets will stretch the program and its students
Data Source		Data is not collected at a consistent point in the program Data collection is post-hoc rather than planned	Data is collected towards the end of the academic program Sampling is random (for larger programs) or all majors are included (<10 grads per year) Criteria for student work is <i>coordinated</i> among program faculty who contribute	Data is collected from a culminating experience shared by all students
Means of Assessment		Does not match outcomes Does not describe data collection process	Content to be assessed fits outcomes Data collection process is briefly described Direct measures (e.g., student work) are used	Designed to promote curricular improvement Rationale is clearly articulated Direct and indirect measures are used
Means of Scoring		Rubric or standards are referenced but not attached Scoring is done by instructor who assigned the work Scores are not broken down to allow for analysis (e.g., based on holistic grade)	Rubric provided that describes different levels of performance Scoring allows for analysis of aspects of student performance	Rubric clearly differentiates different levels of performance Reliability is ensured through more than one scorer

	Missing	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Exemplary (these practices in addition to those that are satisfactory)
Evidence Storage		Student work is not retained	Samples of student work are retained Documentation of assessment process submitted to Division Chair, Dean and Academic Effectiveness office Data is stored in a specific, identified location so it can be easily located by Division Chair upon request	Evidence that assessment is used to improve curriculum is made public in research on teaching & learning Assessment is referenced, when appropriate, in the curriculum change process
Findings		Holistic scoring does not allow for analysis of components of student performance	Components of student performance are identified and analyzed	Multiple data points are available Trends over time are discussed
Dissemination		Findings are submitted to university but not discussed among faculty	Findings are discussed at a faculty meeting	Findings are disseminated to all stakeholders (e.g., instructors)
Actions (use of results)		Actions not aligned with outcomes sought No improvements described for findings that fail to meet the target	Action plan is developed from findings and is aligned with outcomes sought Clearly describes intended changes and hypothesized improvements Program shows use of assessment results for improvement	Responsibilities for action are assigned in the report Target implementation date for action is stated Implement and planned changes are described and linked to assessment data (if no changes are reported, an explanation is provided)
Reporting		Annual report is incomplete or not up-to- date	Report is complete (all questions are answered) and up to date	Additional documentation describes methods, findings, and actions taken in complete detail Report shows continuity with previously submitted reports
Pacing		Pacing of study of outcomes is such that all outcomes will not be assessed in a three year period	Outcomes are assessed at a rate where all outcomes will be assessed in a three year period	All outcomes are assessed annually