

## Rubric for Evaluating Outcomes Assessment Plan and Progress

The purpose of this rubric is to assist programs in their assessment planning, and to prepare them for the Academic Program Review process. This rubric is aligned with NWCCU (Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities) standards for institutional assessment reporting as well. This rubric will allow for consistency in assessment reporting, and it will simplify expectations for quality. Please note that many specialized accrediting bodies have their own expectations for meeting accrediting performance standards. It is more than likely that those standards may exceed the ones specified here.

Criterion	(1) Does not meet expectations	Meets expectations (2)	Exceeds expectations (3)
Assessment Plan	Does not meet one or more criteria specified in the met expectations column	Formal plan has identified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- learning outcomes;</li> <li>- appropriate assessments, including at least one direct measure of student learning;</li> <li>- a process to analyze the results of the outcomes assessed;</li> <li>- a plan to adjust or improve program from results of the learning outcomes assessed; and</li> <li>- faculty involvement in assessment planning.</li> </ul>	Exceeds by one or more criteria (specified in the met expectations column), for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- assessments include approx. 50% direct measures.</li> <li>- plan specifies assessment for continuous improvement of the program.</li> <li>- plan for multi-year data collection.</li> </ul>
Curricular Alignments	Does not meet one or more criteria specified in the met expectations column	Clear relationships between student learning outcomes at the program level with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- course-level outcomes;</li> <li>- campus-wide learning outcomes, if undergraduate program;</li> <li>- professional standards, if applicable.</li> </ul>	Evidence that program alignments are revisited annually to reflect changes or revisited at intervals required by specialized accreditors
Learning Outcomes	Does not meet one or more criteria specified in the met expectations column	Evidence that expected student learning outcomes identify the intended knowledge, understandings, or abilities that students will acquire through the academic program	Evidence that program communicates program-level learning outcomes to students

Assessment Activities	Does not meet one or more criteria specified in the met expectations column	Evidence that assessments activities - align to student learning outcomes ; - are appropriate measures to assess learning outcomes; and - engage faculty in assessment implementation process.	Evidence that assessments are reviewed annually or revisited at intervals required by specialized accreditors
Data Quality	Does not meet one or more criteria specified in the met expectations column	For at least A PORTION of program assessments there is evidence of - process to check for inter-rater reliability, if applicable; - process to check for quality (see detail below); and - process to ensure sampling quality (see detail below).	For ALL program assessments: - process to check for inter-rater reliability, if applicable; - process to check for quality (see detail below); and - process to ensure sampling quality (see detail below).
Assessment Findings	Does not meet one or more criteria specified in the met expectations column	Results for outcomes collected and discussed. For example: - reporting addresses findings from each learning outcome assessment activity. - assessment findings are used to: 1) improve student learning, classroom instruction, and assessments; and 2) review, evaluate, and modify the curriculum in the programs.	Evidence that data are collected over time allowing for pre-post measures of student learning  Findings used in strategic program planning

### Data Quality

Basically what you want to know if your assessment method is credible. Here are some ways to check:

Quantitative Assessment:

- 1) Content Validity: Is there a match between test (assessment) questions and the content or subject area assessed?
- 2) Face Validity: Does the assessment appear to measure a particular construct as viewed by an outside person?
- 3) Content-related Validity: Does an expert in the testing of that particular content area think it is credible?
- 4) Curricular Validity: Does the content of an assessment tool match the objectives of a specific curriculum (course or program) as it is formally described?
- 5) Construct Validity: Does the measure assess the underlying theoretical construct it is supposed to measure (i.e., the test is measuring what it is purported to measure).
- 6) Consequential Validity: Have you thought of the social consequences of using a particular test for a particular purpose?

Qualitative Assessment:

- 1) Have you accurately identified and described the students for whom data were collected?

- 2) Can the findings be transferred (applied to) to another similar context?
- 3) Is there dependability in your accounting of the changes inherent in any setting as well as changes to the assessment process as learning unfolded?
- 4) Can the findings be confirmed by another?

### **Sampling**

For program review, we ideally want a combination of assessment evidence to address program goals. This evidence includes assessment of all students in the program at times, and assessing only a subset of the students at other times. We often see this difference in the choice to use quantitative vs. qualitative assessment methods.

#### **Quantitative Methods**

A randomly selected sample from a larger sample or population, giving all the individuals in the sample an equal chance to be chosen. In a simple random sample, individuals are chosen at random and not more than once to prevent a bias that would negatively affect the validity of the results. We strive in sampling for representativeness of the sample to the population from which it was drawn.

#### **Qualitative Methods**

Having a large number of students is not essential using qualitative methods, as the goals may be to 1) explore topics in depth, 2) try a new method that explores a topic of interest, and 3) the assessment method used is labor intensive (e.g., portfolio reviews), as an example.