

Academic Program Assessment Evaluation Rubric v1.0
Dabney S. Lancaster Community College

Highlighted Elements Not Expected in Reports Until 2014-2015 Assessment Cycle

I. Student Learning Outcomes

Beginning 1	Developing 2	Good 3	Exemplary 4	Score
A. Clarity and Specificity				
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., “Students graduating from the Nursing A.D.N. 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., “Students graduating from the Nursing A.D.N. program”).	
B. Orientation				
No outcomes stated in student-centered terms.	Some outcomes stated in student-centered terms.	Most outcomes stated in student-centered terms.	All outcomes stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do).	

II. Learning Experiences Mapped to SLOs

Beginning 1	Developing 2	Good 3	Exemplary 4	Score
No activities/courses listed.	Activities/courses listed but link to outcomes is absent.	Most outcomes have classes and/or activities linked to them.	All outcomes have classes and/or activities linked to them.	

Rubric adapted from:

Fulcher, K. H., Sundre, D. L., & Russell, J. A. (2009). *Assessment Progress Template Rubric*. The Center for Assessment and Research Studies, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA.

III. Systematic method for evaluating progress on SLOs

Beginning 1	Developing 2	Good 3	Exemplary 4	Score
A. Relationship between measures and outcomes				
Seemingly no relationship between outcomes and measures or no measures indicated for a majority of outcomes.	Measures are linked to stated outcomes, but no explanation of how the measures were created to explicitly assess the outcome is provided. The measures do not seem to be an appropriate format for the stated outcome. All outcomes may or may not be linked to specific measures. Not enough information is provided about the measure to determine the appropriateness of its relationship to the outcome.	General detail about how outcomes relate to measures is provided. For example, the test was developed for a given course in which the outcome is taught or the program uses a licensure exam to determine student achievement.	Detail is provided regarding outcome-to-measure match. When appropriate, the measure uses multiple items to assess a specific outcome. For performance assessments, rubrics or checklists were developed to assess specific outcomes and the specific criteria of the performance assessments are linked. For licensure exams, subsections of the test are mapped to competencies/outcomes.	
B. Types of Measures				
No measures indicated for a majority of outcomes.	Most outcomes assessed primarily via indirect (e.g., surveys, course grades) measures.	Most outcomes assessed primarily via direct measures	All outcomes assessed using at least one direct measure (e.g., tests, essays, performance tasks, writing rubrics, checklists).	
C. Multiple Measures Used				
No measures indicated for a majority of outcomes	All outcomes assessed using only one measure or indicator.	Some outcomes assessed using multiple measures or indicators. Primary measures constitute performance assessments, essays/research papers, or multiple test items. Secondary measures may or may not include indirect measures (e.g., surveys)	The majority of outcomes assessed using multiple measures or indicators. Primary measures constitute performance assessments, essays/research papers, or multiple test items. Secondary measures may or may not include indirect measures (e.g., surveys)	
D. Specification of Targets for Success				
No benchmarks/targets for success identified 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; faculty will be satisfied with the results)	Desired result specified. (e.g., our students will meet or exceed the national average score; 90% of students will demonstrate competency). "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.)	

Rubric adapted from:

Fulcher, K. H., Sundre, D. L., & Russell, J. A. (2009). *Assessment Progress Template Rubric*. The Center for Assessment and Research Studies, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA.

Beginning 1	Developing 2	Good 3	Exemplary 4	Score
E. Data collection & Research design integrity				
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, but not enough to judge the veracity of the process (e.g., thirty-five students took the test). Or, information is provided, but the process presents several major issues that jeopardize the validity of the findings (first-year students are assessed on program outcomes, use of course grades).	The data collection process is well documented with information such as a description of the sample, testing protocol, testing conditions, and student motivation. Nevertheless, some methodological issues that could potentially weaken the validity of the findings (Low student motivation, unstandardized testing conditions, poor or no reliability information).	The data collection process is clearly explained and is appropriate to the specification of desired results (e.g., representative sampling, adequate motivation, standardized testing conditions, students assessed at appropriate time in the program)	

IV. Presence of Results

A. Presentation of Results/Findings				
No results presented	Results are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the outcomes or the desired results for the outcomes. Or, only results presented are general statements about student performance (e.g., student performed well).	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. If applicable, results are disaggregated by distance learning method (Compressed Video, online, independent study)	Results are present, disaggregated by distance learning (if applicable), and they directly relate to outcomes and the desired results for outcomes, are clearly presented (e.g., tables or graphs), and any statistical analyses seem appropriate (t-tests, means or percentages provided).	
B. History of results				
No results presented	Only current year's results provided.	Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year's) provided for some assessments in addition to current year's.	Past iteration(s) of results (e.g., last year's) provided for majority of assessments in addition to current year's.	
C. 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	Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcomes, desired results of outcomes, and methodology. A statement is made regarding whether or not the results indicate that	Interpretations of results seem to be reasonable given the outcomes, desired results of outcomes, and methodology. And, interpretation includes how classes/ activities might have affected results.	

Rubric adapted from:

Fulcher, K. H., Sundre, D. L., & Russell, J. A. (2009). *Assessment Progress Template Rubric*. The Center for Assessment and Research Studies, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA.

	methodology and/or results.	students are meeting the outcome, but no reference is made to an action plan, or to the effects of an action plan on student learning. If results are disaggregated by distance learning, little to no comparison of these results is made.	Results were shared with any other faculty involved with the program, such as adjuncts or other full-time faculty. If results are disaggregated by distance learning method, results are compared and inferences are made about any differences between methods.	
--	-----------------------------	---	--	--

V. Evidence of Improvements Based on Assessment Results

Beginning 1	Developing 2	Good 3	Exemplary 4	Score
A. Improvement of programs regarding student learning and development				
No mention of any improvements to the program.	Examples of improvements or plans for improvement documented in an action plan but the link between them, the assessment findings, and specific outcomes is absent or unclear.	Examples of improvements (or plans to improve) are documented in an action plan and directly related to findings of assessment and outcomes. However, the improvements lack specificity.	Examples of improvements (or plans to improve) documented in an action plan and directly related to findings of assessment and outcomes. These improvements are very specific (e.g., approximate dates of implementation, specifics of the improvements, where in curriculum they will (have) occur(red), budget or resources requested (if needed)).	
B. Improvement of assessment process.**				
No mention of how this iteration of assessment is improved from past administrations.	Some critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws, but no evidence of improving upon past assessment or making plans to improve assessment in future iterations.	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws; Plus evidence of some moderate revision, or general plans for improvement of assessment process.	Critical evaluation of past and current assessment, including acknowledgement of flaws; both present improvements and intended improvements are provided; for both, specific details are given. Either present improvements or intended improvements must encompass a major revision.	

**If a program receives a score of exemplary in at least 8 elements, it will automatically receive a score of at least “Good” for element 6b.

Rubric adapted from:

Fulcher, K. H., Sundre, D. L., & Russell, J. A. (2009). *Assessment Progress Template Rubric*. The Center for Assessment and Research Studies, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA.