

## Assessment Progress Rubric

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
<b>1. Student-centered learning outcomes</b>			
<b>A. Clarity and Specificity</b>			
No outcomes stated/ no outcomes stated in student-centered terms.	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”); some outcomes stated in student-centered terms. Ex. Students will understand ethical decision-making.	Outcomes generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain, and specification of whom should be assessed (e.g., “students enrolled in the Computer Engineering Technology program”); most outcomes stated in student-centered terms. Ex. Associate of Arts students will connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making.	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., “graduating students in the Office Systems Technology program”); outcomes stated in student-centered terms (i.e., what a student should know, think, or do). Ex. Upon completion of the Associate of Arts Program, graduating students will connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making. Ethical issues – Students recognize ethical issues in the social context of problems. Perspectives – Students analyze alternative ethical perspectives and predict the consequences related to the situation. Values – Students assess their own ethical values and identify the origin of their values.
<b>2. Course/learning experiences that are mapped to outcomes</b>			
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.
<b>3. Systematic method for evaluating progress on outcomes</b>			
<b>A. Types of Measures</b>			
No measures indicated	Outcomes are not assessed via direct measures (only with indirect measures such as graduation/employment rates).	Most outcomes assessed with direct measures (student essay, quiz/test, project).	All outcomes assessed using at least one specific direct measure (e.g., student presentation or portfolio, final essay, safety skills demonstration).
<b>B. Relationship between measures and outcomes</b>			
Seemingly no relationship between outcomes and measures.	At a superficial level, it appears the content assessed by the measures matches the outcomes, but no explanation is provided.	General detail about how outcomes relate to measures is provided.	Detail is provided regarding outcome-to measure match. Specific items are linked to outcomes.
<b>C. Specification of criteria and desired targets for outcomes</b>			
No criteria and desired target for outcomes	Statement of criteria and desired target, but no specificity (e.g., Students will grow; students will perform better than last year)	Criteria and desired target specified. (e.g., Students will score above a faculty-determined standard of 70%).	Criteria and desired target specified AND justified. (e.g., Students will score at least 72% on mid-term exams during the 2020-2021 academic period after meeting the 70% threshold for 3 consecutive years).

## Assessment Findings and Improvement

1 – Beginning	2 – Developing	3 – Good	4 – Exemplary
<b>4. Findings of program assessment</b>			
<b>A. Presentation of findings</b>			
No findings presented	Findings are present, but it is unclear how they relate to the outcomes or the desired findings for the outcomes.	Findings are present, and they directly relate to the outcomes and the desired findings for outcomes but presentation is sloppy or difficult to follow. Statistical analysis may or may not be present.	Findings are present, and they directly relate to outcomes and the desired findings for outcomes, are clearly presented, and were derived by appropriate statistical analyses.
<b>B. Interpretation of Findings</b>			
No interpretation attempted	Interpretation attempted, but the interpretation does not refer back to the outcomes or desired findings of outcomes. Or, the interpretations are clearly not supported by the methodology and/or findings.	Interpretations of findings seem to be reasonable inferences given the outcomes, desired findings of outcomes, and methodology.	Interpretations of findings seem to be reasonable given the outcomes, desired findings of outcomes, and methodology. Interpretation includes how classes/ activities might have affected findings.
<b>5. Documents how findings are shared with faculty/stakeholders</b>			
No evidence of communication	Information provided to limited number of faculty or communication process unclear.	Information provided to all faculty, mode program meetings, e-mails) and details of communication clear.	Information provided to all faculty, mode and details of communication clear. In addition, information shared with others such as advisory committees, other stakeholders, or to conference attendees.
<b>6. Documents the use of findings for improvement</b>			
<b>A. Program modification and improvement regarding student learning and development</b>			
No mention of any modifications.	Examples of modifications documented but the link between them and the assessment findings is not clear.	Examples of modifications. (or plans to modify) documented and directly related to findings of assessment. However, the modifications lack specificity.	Examples of modifications (or plans to modify) documented and directly related to findings of assessment. These modifications are very specific (e.g., approximate dates of implementation and where in curriculum they will occur.)
<b>B. Improvement of assessment process</b>			
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; 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.