

The University of Mississippi Assessment Evaluation Rubric for Instructional Programs

excellent (3)

acceptable (2)

in need of improvement (1)

PLAN: Outcome Statement

<i>An appropriate Outcome measures student learning</i>	Outcome is stated in terms of what graduates know, or are able to think or do, as a result of the program	Outcome statement only indirectly suggests student learning, such as students getting jobs or getting into graduate programs.	Outcome is stated in terms of program characteristics, processes, or inputs
<i>An Outcome Statement should be focused</i>	Statement describes a single, focused learning Outcome	Statement describes two or more learning Outcomes that are related	Statement describes multiple, unrelated learning Outcomes
<i>Program must have some responsibility/control for Outcome</i>	Program has full or significant responsibility/control for Outcome	Program has modest responsibility/control for Outcome	Program has little or no responsibility/control for Outcome

PLAN: Means of Assessment

<i>Multiple Means of Assessment strengthen findings</i>	More than one Means of Assessment are proposed	One Means of Assessment is proposed	No Means of Assessment is proposed
<i>Means of Assessment must be valid to assess a program</i>	At least one Means of Assessment directly measures student learning, (e.g., the use of rubrics, faculty panels, external reviewers, employer/internship supervisors directly evaluating work, or standardized or departmentally-created tests)	Means of Assessment use <i>only</i> attitudinal surveys (e.g., of employers/internship supervisors, or alumni) or indirect measures (e.g., job placement or graduate school acceptance rates)	Means of Assessment use measures of student learning invalid for assessment purposes (e.g., course grades, pass/fail comps, or student attitudinal surveys)
<i>Means of Assessment must be linked to the Outcome</i>	Means of Assessment reasonably measure all aspects of the Outcome statement	Means of Assessment reasonably measure some, but not all, aspects of the Outcome statement	Means of Assessment not directly linked to, and therefore will not measure, the desired Outcome
<i>Means of Assessment likely to identify specific areas for improvement</i>	Means of assessment and method of summarizing data across students will likely provide data detailed enough to identify improvements (e.g., item or component analyses).	Means of assessment or method of summarizing data will likely identify only general areas for improvement (e.g., mean score on a final, percent of students passing a national test).	(not applicable)

PLAN: Criteria for Excellence

<i>Criteria for Excellence should be established</i>	Specific Criteria for Excellence are proposed	Criteria for Excellence are proposed but vague	Criteria for Excellence are missing
--	---	--	-------------------------------------

RESULTS: Data

<i>Sufficient data reported</i>	Sufficient data reported in adequate detail to confidently assess the Outcome.	Data reported, but more data and/or detail would increase confidence in the results.	Inadequate data were collected to assess the Outcome.
<i>Data should be linked to the Criteria for Excellence</i>	Whether or not the reported results meet the criteria for excellence is clear	Unclear whether data are linked to or meet criteria for excellence	Data not linked to criteria for excellence

RESULTS: Use of Results

<i>Assessment results spark specific improvements</i>	Specific program improvements that clearly stem from assessment results and seem likely to improve student performance are described; or, criteria for excellence were met	Vague statements are made of program improvements that seem to stem from assessment results	No program improvements related to assessment results were proposed, even though Criteria for Excellence were not met
<i>Improvements already have been implemented</i>	At least one unit improvement is already in place; or criteria for excellence were met	Program improvements have been identified and are scheduled for implementation	Needed program improvements have not been identified.

OVERALL: Entire Report

<i>Faculty involved in the assessment planning and implementation process</i>	Broad faculty involvement in the assessment planning and implementation process is evident	There is some faculty involvement in the assessment process and implementation	Faculty involvement in the assessment process and implementation appears to be lacking
<i>Report is clearly written</i>	Clearly written and concise	Generally well written, but parts are not clear	Poorly written, rambling, or opaque
<i>Responsive to committee feedback</i>	Plan/Report incorporates committee feedback	Plan/Report does not incorporate feedback on issues that were acceptable, but could be improved.	Plan/Report does not incorporate feedback on issues that were in need of improvement
<i>Assessment results used to make program improvements</i>	At least one substantial improvement stemming from assessment has been implemented; may be program, assessment process/tool, policy, or other program-related improvement that should lead to improved student learning	Improvement stemming from assessment has been partially implemented; may be program, assessment process/tool, policy, or other program-related improvement that should lead to improved student learning	No substantial improvement stemming from assessment has been partially or completely implemented
<i>Evidence that previous program modifications improved services</i>	Results indicate that the implemented improvements actually improved student learning (may require examination of results across assessment cycles)	Results do not show improved learning; however, additional improvements are proposed or additional time is required before results likely to show improvement.	(not applicable)