Check Your Assessment Status: Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Area Name | Click or tap here to enter text. | Years(s) | Click or tap here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| **ASSESSMENT PLAN REVIEW** |
|  |
| **Mission Statement: (Note: Areas change over time, make sure the Mission Statement currently reflects your area)**A concise statement outlining the purpose of the area, who it serves, in what ways, and with what result. |
|  |  |  |
| • Clear and concise.• Specific to the unit (identifies what it does that separates it from other units).• Addresses the larger impact of theprogram.• Identifies stakeholders.• Aligned with the college and division mission and with respective professional organization, if applicable. | • Statement of the program's purpose and who it serves.• Aligned with the college and division mission statements.• Scope and reach may be limited. | • 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. |
| Notes: |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
|  |
| **Goal: A broadly worded statement that serves as the link between the area's mission and the specific program/unit outcomes/objectives. The Goal should clarify the over-arching intent of the program/area. It addresses what your are aspires to do in contributing to student****success and university enhancement.** |
|  |  |  |
| • Clearly derived from program/unit mission.• Describes in general terms what students/stakeholders are expected to achieve/learn or (i.e., communicate clearly and succinctly, understand small group dynamics, understand problem-solving techniques, attend graduate school) or gain (timely service, accurate information) | • Connects to the program/unit mission.• Reflects program expectations of students with regard to overall learning or the unit'soverall service activities. | • Restatement of mission.• Not derived from the program/unitmission.• Reflects specific outcomes/objectives. |
| Notes: |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
|  |
| **Outcomes/Objectives: (Note: An Outcome should be specifically related to a particular skill, ability or action, try to avoid using "AND". Most times using "and" indicates different skills/abilities/actions are being referenced, skills/abilities/actions should be independently assessed in the plan i.e., Objective 1.1, Objective 1.2)****Academic Areas:** Specific statements that articulate the knowledge, skills, and abilities students should gain/demonstrate/identify through engagement in the academic program or learning experience.**Academic Support or Administrative Areas:** Outcomes describe the desired quality or quantity of key services and these must be measurable. |
|  |  |  |
| • Observable and measurable.• Encompass a discipline-specific body ofknowledge for academic units (may alsoinclude general competencies); focus onthe cumulative effect of the program.• Reasonable number of outcomesidentified - enough outcomes toadequately encompass the mission whilestill being manageable to evaluate andassess.• 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 andwith professional organizations, whereapplicable.• Accurately classified as "student learning"or "not student learning".• Associations (to goals, standards,institutional priorities, etc.) are identified,where appropriate. | • Observable and measurable.• Encompass the mission of the programand/or the central principles of thediscipline.• Aligned with program, college, anduniversity mission.• Appropriate, but language may be vagueor need revision. | • Describe a process, rather than anoutcome (i.e. language focuses on whatthe program does, rather than what thestudent learns).• Unclear how an evaluator could determinewhether the outcome has been met.• Incomplete - not addressing the breadth ofknowledge, skills, or services associatedwith the program.• Outcomes identified don't seemimportant/aligned with the programmission.• Fails to note appropriate associations (togoals, standards, institutional priorities,etc.). |
| Notes: |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
|  |
| **Measures/Metrics:** The variety of methods used to evaluate each outcome; the method of measurement, actual tool or instrument used. |
|  |  |  |
| • Multiple measures for some or alloutcomes.• Direct and indirect measures used;emphasis on direct.• Instruments reflect good researchmethodology.• Feasible - existing practices used wherepossible; at least some measures applyto multiple outcomes.• Purposeful - clear how results could beused for program improvement.• Described with sufficient detail(documents attached in DocumentRepository, where appropriate). | • At least 1 measure or measurementapproach per outcome.• Direct and indirect measures are utilized.• Described with sufficient detail.• Implementation may still need furtherplanning. | • Not all outcomes have associatedmeasures.• Few or no direct measures used.• Methodology is questionable.• Instruments are vaguely described; maynot be developed yet.• Course grades used as an assessmentmethod.• Do not seem to capture the "end ofexperience" effect of the curriculum/program. |
| Notes: |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
|  |
| **Targets:** Result, target, benchmark, or value that will represent success at achieving a given outcome. |
|  |  |  |
| • Aligned with measures and outcomes.• Represent a reasonable level of success.• Specific and measurable.• Meaningful - based on benchmarks,previous results, existing standards. | • Aligned with measures and outcomes.• Target identified for each measure.• Specific and measurable.• Some targets may seem arbitrary. | • Targets have not been identified forevery measure, or are not aligned withthe measure.• Seem off-base (too low/high).• Language is vague or subjective (e.g."improve", "satisfactory") making itdifficult to tell if met.• Aligned with assessment *process* ratherthan results (e.g. survey return rate,number of papers reviewed). |
| Notes: |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
|  |
| **General considerations**• Is it likely that this assessment plan will yield information useful for making improvements in the student learning experience and/or the program?•What has been done as a result of the prior assessment plan results? What has changed or been improved?• Are internal and/or external stakeholders (may include students, customers, faculty, staff, administrators, advising boards, employers, etc.) involved in the assessment process?• Is the plan feasible with current resources and staff?• Is there a plan for collecting, tabulating, and analyzing assessment results? Who will be responsible for this work and when will it be done?• Have all elements of the assessment plan been marked as "final" in the software system? |
|  |
| **Assessment Plan Comments** |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
|  |
| **Findings:** A concise summary of the results gathered from a given assessment measure. If percents are reported, numerators and denominator are required. |
|  |  |  |
| • Complete, concise and well-organized.• Appropriate data collection/analysis.• Align with the language of thecorresponding achievement target.• Provide solid evidence that targets weremet, 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.*\*Reports must be free of student identifiable information.* | • Complete and organized.• Align with the language of thecorresponding achievement target.• Address whether targets were met.• May contain too much detail or strayslightly from intended data set.• Reads "In Progress, Findings will becompleted by MONTH YEAR" "Findings werenot available for this year due to adiscontinuance of the national instrumentused for assessment." | • Incomplete or too much information.• Not clearly aligned with achievementtargets.• Questionable conclusion about whethertargets were met, partially met, or notmet.• Questionable data collection/analysis;may "gloss over" data to arrive atconclusion.• Reads "Findings Complete""Target Met" "In Progress" "No Findings" |
| Notes: |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
|  |
| **Action Plans:** Actions to be taken to improve the program or assessment process based on analysis of results. Even if Targets were achieved, Action Plans are always required. Action Plans must be based on assessment plan Findings. |
|  |  |  |
| • Action plans clearly follow fromassessment results and directly statewhich finding(s) was used to developthe plan.• Identifies an area that needs to bemonitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical "next steps."• Contains completion dates.• Identifies a responsible person/group.• Number of action plans are manageable. | • Reflects with sufficient depth on whatwas learned during the assessment cycle.• At least one action plan in place.• Actions plans follow from assessmentresults. | • Not clearly related to assessment results.• Seems to offer excuses for results ratherthan thoughtful interpretation or "next steps" for program improvement.• No action plans or too many to manage.• Too general; lacking details(e.g. timeframe, responsible party).•Reads "No Action needed, Target Met" |
| Notes: |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Overall Assessment Comments:** |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |