

Academic Program Assessment Rubric

Program Name: _____

Contact person _____

Date _____

Criterion	Needs work – 1	Acceptable - 2	Exceptionable - 3	Score
Student Learning Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLOs are vague in terms of what student should know or be able to do • SLOs are not assessable as written (e.g., lead with “understands”, “knows”, or includes the term “knowledge”) • SLOs are too broad for assessment • SLOs are not linked to program mission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLOs are clearly stated • Most SLOs written in assessable language • SLOs support program mission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLOs are clear and explicit about expectations • All SLOs are written in assessable language (actions that can be observed or demonstrated) • SLOs are clearly linked to program mission and to University mission 	
Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments are not aligned to SLOs. • Descriptions of assessment tools are vague or missing • Only one type of assessment is designated, or the same assessment tool is use for multiple SLOs. • Assessments provide limited actionable data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment are mostly aligned to SLOs. • Assessments are clearly described. • Multiple types of assessments are used for one or more SLOs. • For most SLOs, assessments provide sufficient data on which to base decisions. • Some SLOs are assessed at multiple points in the program to provide both 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments are clearly and explicitly aligned to SLOs • Assessments are clearly and explicitly described • Multiple types of assessments are used for most SLOs. • For most SLOs, assessments result in robust data to provide a clear picture of student attainment of the SLO 	

		formative and summative data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes both formative (likely course level) and summative (likely capstone or exit exam) assessments. 	
Benchmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmarks are vague or not aligned to assessments Benchmarks are not mathematically feasible Benchmarks reflect low expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmarks are aligned to assessments. Benchmarks are clearly stated in terms of both “success” on the assessment and “success” of the student cohort. Benchmarks are mathematically reasonable. Benchmarks reflect reasonable expectations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmarks are clearly aligned to assessments Benchmarks are clearly stated in terms of both an individual’s “success” on the assessment and the “success” of the cohort completing the assessment Benchmarks are mathematically sound Benchmarks reflect high but reasonable expectations 	
Process (Who, How, When, Where)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designations of responsible faculty are missing or vague Descriptions of data collection processes are missing or vague Descriptions of data storage are missing or vague 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible faculty are designated by name or position for most SLOs Includes reasonable description and timeline for data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible faculty are designated by name and position for all SLOs Includes clearly delineated process and timeline for data collection 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes description of how and where data are stored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes descriptions of how and where data are stored and when and how data are accessed, analyzed, and discussed by program faculty 	
Data Results and Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data summary is missing or vague • No indications of whether benchmarks are met or not met 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data summary is clearly stated • Includes statements of whether benchmarks are met or not met • Includes numbers of students being assessed • Sampling, when appropriate, is suitably representative of the population • Mentions national or professional standards (as appropriate or available) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data summary is clearly stated in layman's terms • Includes statements of whether benchmark is met or not met for each assessment and includes discussion of whether program outcomes have been met • Data summary also includes longitudinal analysis • Includes number of students being assessed and clearly describes the student cohort's level of attainment on the assessment 	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes comparisons to national or professional standards 	
How data have been used to implement a change or inform a decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions based on data are missing or vague • Over reliance on “will continue to monitor” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions based on data are clearly described 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions based on data are clearly described and linked to data summaries • Includes discussion of longitudinal results • Future-oriented 	
General observations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report was submitted after due date • Report contains multiple grammatical/spelling errors • Overtly obvious “cut and paste” from previous reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report was submitted on time • Generally well-written and easy to follow • Very few grammatical/spelling errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report was submitted before due date • Well-written, easy to follow, conveys information succinctly • Free of jargon, grammatical/spelling errors • Includes evidence of faculty collaboration on assessment 	
Total score:				
Additional comments:				