

DRAFT RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING ASSESSMENT REPORTS v2

| Criteria | | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
|---|------------------|---|--|--|---|
| GOAL SETTING | | | | | |
| A. Description of student learning outcomes | | No outcomes stated. | Outcomes 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”) | Outcomes 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 outcomes 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”) |
| B. Alignment | Program reports: | Alignment with institutional goals is not indicated or explained. | Alignment with institutional goals is indicated but not explained. | General detail about how outcome(s) relate to institutional goals(s) is provided. | Outcome-to-institutional goal match(es) is specified with clarity and specificity. |
| | Mode reports: | Alignment with mode goals is not indicated or explained. | Alignment with mode goals is indicated but not explained. | General detail about how outcome(s) relate to mode goals(s) is provided. | Outcome-to-mode match(es) is specified with clarity and specificity. |
| B1. Expected level of achievement | | No a priori desired results for outcomes | 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.) |
| DATA COLLECTION | | | | | |
| C. Assessment methods | | No measures indicated for targeted goal(s). Seemingly no relationship between outcomes and measures. | Most targeted outcomes assessed primarily via indirect measures (e.g., surveys, self-assessments). At a superficial level, it appears the content assessed by the measures matches the outcomes, but no explanation is provided. | Most targeted outcomes assessed primarily via direct measures. General detail about how outcomes relate to measures is provided. For example, the faculty wrote items to match the outcomes, or the instrument was selected “because its general description appeared to match our outcomes.” | All targeted outcomes assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., performance assessments, tests, essays). Detail is provided regarding goal-to-measure match. Specific items on the test are linked to outcomes. |
| C1. Data collection process | | 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, | Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process, such as a description of the | The data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired |

| Criteria | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | but not enough to judge the veracity of the process (e.g., thirty-five seniors took the test). | 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. | 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) |
| ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION | | | | |
| D1. Analysis of results | No results presented. | Results are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the outcomes or the desired results for the outcomes. | Results are present, and they directly relate to the outcomes and the desired results for outcomes but presentation is sloppy or difficult to follow. Statistical analysis may or may not be present. | Results are present, and they directly relate to outcomes and the desired results for outcomes, are clearly presented, and were derived by appropriate statistical analyses. |
| D2. Interpretation of results | No interpretation attempted. | Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the outcomes or desired results of outcomes. Or, the interpretations are clearly not supported by the methodology and/or results. | Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcomes, desired results of outcomes, and methodology. | Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable given the outcomes, desired results of outcomes, and methodology. Plus, multiple faculty interpreted results (not just one person). And, interpretation includes how classes/ activities might have affected results. |
| CLOSING THE LOOP & PLANNING | | | | |
| E1. Described actions to be taken based on results (pedagogical, instructional, curricular, advising, for example) | No mention of any actions to be taken based on assessment results. | Examples of actions to be taken based on assessment results documented but the link between the actions and the assessment findings is not clear. | Examples of actions to be 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., nature of change(s) and implementation and |

| Criteria | Beginning | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | where in curriculum they will occur.) |
| E2. Action timetable | No timetable provided. | General or partial timetable provided, but it is not clearly aligned to the proposed action plan. | General timetable provided to reassess student work after actions or changes have been implemented to improve or maximize student learning. However, timetable lacks specificity. | Specific timetable provided to reassess student work after actions or changes have been implemented to improve or maximize student learning. |