

**Rubric for Assessment Report Evaluation**  
**Assessment Steering Committee, Updated 7/27/2021**

<b>OVERALL LEVEL OF REPORT</b>	<b>4 – ADVANCED</b>	<b>3 – SATISFACTORY</b>	<b>2 – DEVELOPING</b>	<b>1 – UNSATISFACTORY</b>	<b>NO REPORT</b>
<b>Content</b> (Report contains required information)	<b>All data provided for the following for each outcome:</b>	<b>Missing 1 – 2 of the following:</b>	<b>Missing 3 or more of the following:</b>	<b>SLOs are present. No data provided for the following:</b>	<b>Program on hiatus or new program</b>
	Responsible Users/Assessment Team Members	Responsible Users/Assessment Team Members	Responsible Users/Assessment Team Members	Responsible Users/Assessment Team Members	No report
	Term Data Collected	Term Data Collected	Term Data Collected	Term Data Collected	
	Next Scheduled Assessment Analysis Term and Year	Next Scheduled Assessment Analysis Term and Year	Next Scheduled Assessment Analysis Term and Year	Next Scheduled Assessment Analysis Term and Year	
	Program level	Program level	Program level	Program level	
	Progress (e.g., Ready for Review)	Progress (e.g., Ready for Review)	Progress (e.g., Ready for Review)	Progress (e.g., Ready for Review)	
<b>Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</b>  Certificate Program = minimum of 2 SLOs  Degree Program = minimum of 3 SLOs (recommended 3-5)	All SLOs use specific language describing expected skill or competency	Most SLOs use specific language describing expected skill or competency (e.g. instead of using “know”, “understand” describe the expected skill or competency)	Some SLOs use specific language (e.g., instead of using “know”, “understand” describe the expected skill or competency)	No SLOs use specific language (e.g., instead of using “know”, “understand”, describe the expected skill or competency)	
	All SLOs describe specific observable student behaviors	Most SLOs describe specific observable student behaviors	Some SLOs describe specific observable student behaviors	No SLOs describe specific observable student behaviors	
	All SLOs are measurable (i.e., outcomes describe how students will meet standards)	Most SLOs are measurable	Some SLOs are measurable	No SLOs are measurable (may not use taxonomies for learning)	
	Adequate number of SLOs (Certificate = Minimum of 2 SLOs; Degree = Minimum of 3 SLOs; 3-5 SLOs recommended)	Adequate number of SLOs	Fewer than the minimum SLOs	Fewer than the minimum SLOs	

OVERALL LEVEL OF REPORT	4 – ADVANCED	3 – SATISFACTORY	2 – DEVELOPING	1 – UNSATISFACTORY	NO REPORT
<b>Direct/Indirect Assessment Methods and Data Collection</b>	All data collection (results) reported	Most data collection (results) reported	Some data collection (results) reported	No data collection (results) reported	No report
	Explanation linking all SLOs with assessments is clear	Explanation linking most SLOs with assessments is clear	Assessment methods appear to align with SLOs, but explanation is unclear or is not provided	No explanation given as to why nothing has been done	
	If using one assessment for multiple SLOs, an explanation of how the instrument assesses <u>each</u> is clear	If using one assessment to assess multiple SLOs, an explanation of how one instrument assesses each SLO may not be clear		If assessment methods are reported, no methods align with stated SLOs	
	All SLOs are measured using direct methods	All SLOs are measured using direct methods	Some SLOs are measured using only indirect methods		
	“Progress” selected reflects extended cycle, if applicable	“Progress” selected reflects extended cycle, if applicable	“Progress” selected does <u>not</u> reflect extended cycle, if applicable	“Progress” selected does <u>not</u> reflect extended cycle, if applicable	
<b>Assessment Results &amp; Analysis</b>	Results are present, and there is reference in the analysis for all assessed SLOs	Results are present, and there is reference in the analysis to most assessed SLOs	Presentation of data is weak (i.e., results are too broad or do not provide measures of student performance on assessed SLOs)	No analysis of results is provided	No report
	History of results is provided and is used in conjunction with the current year’s results to make inferences about student learning	Some history of results is mentioned, but not always connected to current results	No mention of history of results (i.e., results from previous assessment cycles), if applicable	No mention of history of results (i.e., results from previous assessment cycles), if applicable	
	Detailed explanation and discussion of results including whether or not outcome was achieved	Limited level of detail in explanation and discussion of whether or not outcome was achieved	No explanation/ discussion of results including whether or not outcome was achieved	No interpretation of results	
	If on extended cycle, written explanation is provided in “Action(s) Taken”	If on extended cycle, written explanation is provided in “Action(s) Taken”	If on extended cycle, no written explanation is provided in “Action(s) Taken”	If on extended cycle, no written explanation is provided in “Action(s) Taken”	

OVERALL LEVEL OF REPORT	4 – ADVANCED	3 – SATISFACTORY	2 – DEVELOPING	1 – UNSATISFACTORY	NO REPORT
Use of Results/Actions Taken	All actions are clearly derived from interpretation of results	Most actions are clearly derived from interpretation of results	Some actions are clearly derived from an interpretation of results	No actions are stated	No report
	All actions address specific, measurable deficiencies of student performance on specific SLOs and/or address areas for improvement of student learning	Most actions address specific, measurable deficiencies of student performance on specific SLOs and/or address areas for improvement of student learning	Some actions address specific, measurable deficiencies of student performance on specific SLOs and/or address areas for improvement of student learning	If reported, the actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>do not support results</li> <li>are not faculty-driven</li> <li>do not enhance student learning</li> </ul>	
	All actions are faculty-driven and clearly defined in terms of timeframe and who is responsible for implementation	Most actions are faculty-driven and clearly defined in terms of timeframe and who is responsible for implementation	Some actions are faculty-driven and clearly defined in terms of timeframe and who is responsible for implementation		
	Clear evidence that the program is <i>seeking</i> (and experiencing) improvement, where possible, based on historical trends already identified in “Analysis of Results” (i.e., “Closing the loop”)	Limited evidence that the program is <i>seeking</i> (and experiencing) improvement, where possible, based on historical trends already identified in “Analysis of Results” (i.e., “Closing the loop”)	No evidence that the program is <i>seeking</i> (and experiencing) improvement, where possible, based on historical trends already identified in “Analysis of Results” (i.e., “Closing the loop”)		

### Definitions for Overall Level of Report

- No report (0 points)**      A new program; an existing program undergoing curriculum change or on hiatus.
- Unsatisfactory (5 – 8 points)**      A program with outcomes, methods, and no assessment completed; incomplete assessment report.
- Developing (9 – 13 points)**      Started assessment, tweaking methods, need to provide more information about the assessment methods, weak discussion of results, hard to determine validity due to lack of explanation, perhaps no actions stated; room for improvement.
- Satisfactory (14 – 18 points)**      Sufficient report; has a few areas needing clarification and/or enhancement. On the way to becoming advanced. Data is collected, but not analyzed due to program being on extended cycle.
- Advanced (19 – 20 points)**      Clear measures, clear process, good interpretation and use of results, clearly closes the loop, provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of results; complete report.