|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan Rubric** | | | | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Exemplary (3)** | **Acceptable (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Feedback** | | | |
| **Mission Statement** | • Program mission is clear, concise, and specific to the program.  • Program mission directly aligns with university’s mission | • Program mission is stated with some clarity and specificity; it may contain minimal extraneous information  • Program mission closely aligns with university’s mission. | • Program mission is vague but can still be understood; it may contain excessive extraneous information.  • Program mission partially aligns with university’s mission. |  | | | |
| **Functional Statement of Learning Outcomes** | • Reasonable number of outcomes identified - enough outcomes to adequately encompass the mission while still being manageable to evaluate and assess.  • The level of rigor is appropriate to degree type (BS/BA, MS, PhD).  • Associations (to goals, standards, institutional priorities, etc.) are identified, where appropriate. | • Observable and measurable.  • Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline.  • Aligned with program, college, and university mission.  • Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision. | • Describes a process or a goal, rather than an outcome (i.e., language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns).  • Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome has been met.  • Vague/too broad; resulting measurement will provide incomplete data required for action. | **LO1** | **LO2** | **LO3\*** | **LO4\*** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Measures & Evaluation Tools** | • One direct measure is described with sufficient detail; additional assessment methods are used (direct measures preferred)  •Evaluation tools are identified and provided. Emphasis on direct.  • Purposeful - clear how results could be used for program improvement. | • One direct measure is described with sufficient details  • Measure closely aligns with SLO  The Evaluation Tool identified includes an explanation of how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill, or ability.  • Copies of the Measures and Evaluation Tools are provided. | • Measure (if listed) doesn’t clearly align with stated SLO  • Only Indirect measures are used.  • Does not include a description of the evaluation tool used  • Course grades are used  • Copies of the Measures and Evaluation Tools are not provided. |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Methodology** | | • Data collection methods align with every Measure and Evaluation identified.  • Course(s), person(s) responsible, and data collection methods are described in sufficient detail, and reflect a sound sampling methodology.  • A purposeful and defined strategy for disseminating Findings and developing an Action plan within the program’s department is identified. | | • Data collection and methods align with the Measures identified.  • Course(s), person(s) responsible, and data collection methods are described in sufficient detail with sampling methodology described.  • A strategy for disseminating Findings and developing an Action Plan is identified, but implementation may need further planning. | | • Data collection and methods do not align with the Measures. It includes questionable methodology.  • Course(s), person(s) responsible, and/or data collection methods are described vaguely, no sampling methodology described.  • No strategy for disseminating Findings or developing an Action Plan is identified. | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| **Targets/ Benchmarks** | | • A proportion or percentage of students is identified and an explanation is given for that specific proportion.  • An expected Level of achievement is identified and an explanation is given for the level of choice. | | • A specific proportion or percentage of students is identified.  • An expected level of achievement is identified. | | • A specific proportion or percentage of students is not identified.  • An expected level of achievement is not identified. | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| **Report Rubric** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Exemplary (3)** | | **Acceptable (2)** | | **Developing (1)** | | **Feedback** | | | | | | | |
| **LO1** | | **LO2** | | **LO3\*** | | **LO4\*** | |
| **Findings** | • A complete, concise, and well-organized summary of the percentage of students and the Level of Proficiency achieved is provided.  • Evidence of student achievement is included (score reports, student artifacts) | | • A complete and organized summary of the percentage of students and the Level of Proficiency achieved is provided  • Evidence of student achievement is included (score reports, student artifacts) | | • The Findings are incomplete OR do not clearly align with the Target.  • Evidence of student achievement not included (score reports, student artifacts) | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| **Summary and Analysis** | • Analysis of the Findings by program faculty includes solid evidence that the Target was met or not met.  • Analysis of the Findings references supporting documentation. • Elaborates on specific findings used to make program improvements.  • Makes a clear connection between finding(s) and action plan(s).  • Provides thorough status update of previous and/or ongoing action plan(s) | | • Analysis of the Findings by program faculty address whether the Target was met or not met  • Identifies finding(s) used to make program improvements.  • Changes/improvements made to program relate to finding(s).  • Refers to previous and/or ongoing action plan(s). | | • The Analysis of the Findings is not included OR the Analysis of the Findings is unclear about whether the Target was met or not met.  • Failure to identify finding(s) used to make program improvements.  • Does not refer to previous and/or ongoing action plan(s). | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| **Action Plan** | • Action plans clearly follow from assessment results and directly state which finding(s) was used to develop the plan  • Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated or enhanced and defines logical next steps  • Plan is detailed and identifies completion dates & Person(s) responsible | | • Reflects with sufficient depth on what was learned during the assessment cycle.  • Actions plans follow from assessment results. | | • No changes are provided OR changes provided lack thoughtful interpretation or “next steps” for program improvement. | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| **TOTAL SCORE** | | | | | | | **LO 1** | | **LO 2** | | **LO 3** | | **LO 4** | |
|  | |  | |  | |  | |

**Improvements Needed:**