**Rubric for Program Assessment Reports**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department/Program/Unit:** | | Click here to enter text. | |
|  | |  | |
| **Date:** | Click here to enter a date. | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Department/Program Mission, Vision, Values, or Goals:** | | | | | | | |
| Comments: Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **2. Brief Description of Department/Program Improvements and/or Changes** | | | | | | | |
|  | **Strengths, Challenges, Suggestions:** | | | | | | |
| The department presents a brief summary of purposeful changes resulting from previous assessment activities. | Click here to enter text. | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **3. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Beginning** | **Developing** | **Proficient** | |
| Aligned with Mission, Vision, Values, or Goals? | | | Outcomes are not aligned with mission, vision, values, or goals. | Outcomes are somewhat aligned with mission, vision, values, or goals. | Outcomes are consistently and clearly aligned with mission, vision, values, or goals. | |
| Learning Outcome Language & Measurable/Observable | | | Outcomes are not written in learning outcome language and are not measurable / observable. | Outcomes are mostly written in learning outcome language and are somewhat measurable / observable. | Outcomes are written in learning outcome language and are measurable / observable. | |
| Clarity | | | Outcomes do not clearly define intended student learning in these areas:  knowledge  skills/abilities  dispositions | Outcomes somewhat clearly define intended student learning in these areas:  knowledge  skills/abilities  dispositions | Outcomes clearly define intended student learning in these areas:  knowledge  skills/abilities  dispositions | |
| Utility | | | Scope and detail of outcomes do not clearly reflect what is at the core of the program. | Scope and detail of outcomes somewhat reflect what is at the core of the program. | Scope and detail of outcomes clearly reflect what is at the core of the program. | |
| Comments:Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **4. National/Professional Standards** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Beginning** | **Developing** | **Proficient** | |
| PLOs are aligned with Professional Standards?  Not applicable/unknown  Yes… then answer…. | | | Learning outcomes are not linked to national / professional standards. | Learning outcomes are partially linked to national / professional standards. | Learning outcomes are strongly linked to national / professional standards. | |
| Comments: Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **5. Curriculum Map:** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Strengths, Challenges, Suggestions:** | | | | |
| Curriculum Map represents a thoughtful ALIGNMENT between PLOs and Student Learning Experiences (courses, labs, internships, etc.) | | | Click here to enter text. | | | | |
| Curriculum Map is detailed enough to provide USEFUL information that leads to ideas for improvement | | | Click here to enter text. | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **6. Assessment Methods and Measures:** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Beginning** | **Developing** | **Proficient** | |
| PLOs measured | | | None / Few | Some | Most / All | |
| Usefulness | | | Methods and measures do not measure PLOs or are not useful. | Methods and measures align to only some PLOs and/or may be too general to guide improvements to the program. | Methods and measures are appropriate to the PLOs and specific enough to guide improvements to the program. | |
| Direct Measures of Student Learning  (portfolios, rubrics, embedded assignments, lab reports, etc.) | | | No or limited use of Direct Measures. | Direct Measures are identified, but appear to have limited application to program assessment. | Direct Measures are identified, and have application to program assessment. | |
| Indirect Measures  (surveys, interviews, etc.) | | | No or limited use of indirect measures, or they do not target a wide range of constituents (students, alumni, employers, supervisors). | Some use of indirect measures targeting constituent groups (students, alumni, employers, supervisors). | Extensive use of indirect measures targeting at least two constituent groups (students, alumni, employers, supervisors). | |
| Comments: | | | Click here to enter text. | | | |
| **Assessment Timeline:**  Measures all PLOs during 5-year cycle; appropriate (reasonable, efficient, meaningful); schedule is clear and specific; responsibilities clearly defined and shared. | | | **Strengths, Challenges, Suggestions:** | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **7. Assessment Results / Findings / Interpretation:** | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Beginning** | **Developing** | **Proficient** | |
| Results/Findings | | | Little to no evidence from assessment results/findings presented, or not linked to PLOs. | Some evidence presented, but not detailed/meaningful enough to inform improvements; linkage to PLOs is somewhat evident. | Extensive presentation of evidence in meaningful and useful ways; evidence is clearly linked to PLOs. | |
| Standards / Performance Criteria | | | Standards / performance criteria are not explained, or are not connected to interpretation. | Standards / performance criteria are discussed, but not clearly applied to interpret findings. | Standards / performance criteria are stated clearly and used to interpret findings. | |
| Interpretation / Conclusions | | | Little or no interpretation of findings; or no conclusions presented. | Partial interpretation of findings; some conclusions presented. | Thorough interpretation / meaningful conclusions presented. | |
| Comments: Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **8. Dissemination of Findings** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Strengths, Challenges, Suggestions:** | | | | |
| The program has a clear plan regarding dissemination of results; includes who will be involved, when and how and with whom information will be shared, etc. | | | Click here to enter text. | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **9. Implications: Process for Improvement** | | | | | | | |
| Use of results to improve instructional delivery or curriculum; realistic and reasonable plans | | Report includes little to no discussion of how assessment results will be used. | | Report includes some discussion for how the results will be used by the department, but these suggestions are not detailed or realistic. | | Report includes extensive discussion for the application of findings to make improvements; plans are realistic. | | |
| Consideration of resource use and allocation teaching, learning, and curricular issues. | | Report includes little to no discussion of resources. | | Report includes some discussion of resources. | | Report includes extensive discussion of resources. | | |
| Comments: Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **10. Reflections on the Department Assessment Process** | | | | | | | |
|  | | **Strengths, Challenges, Suggestions:** | | | | | |
| Comments on the successes and challenges faced during the assessment process; perceptions about what worked well, what could be improved; ideas for future. | | Click here to enter text. | | | | | |
| Suggestions for, and support needed from, the Assessment Subcommittee. | | Click here to enter text. | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| Additional Comments:Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |