| **Plan Rubric** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Exemplary** | **Good** | **Consider Revision** | **Revision Requested** |
| **Outcomes** | **Outcomes Mapped** | Documentation of mapping **all** outcomes to appropriate university-wide mission/ outcomes, field-specific accreditation (where appropriate), and to specific courses. | Some evidence of mapping **most** outcomes to appropriate university-wide mission/outcomes, field-specific accreditation (where appropriate), and specific courses. | Some evidence of mapping **some** outcomes to appropriate university-wide mission/outcomes, field-specific accreditation outcomes, or specific courses. | No evidence of outcome mapping to university-wide mission/outcome, field-specific accreditation outcomes, or class outcomes. |
| **Clarity of Outcomes** | All outcomes are stated with clarity and specificity (precise verbs, clear description). | Most outcomes are stated with clarity and specificity (precise verbs, clear description). | Outcomes identified, but lacks clarity (imprecise verbs, vague descriptions). | No outcomes identified. |
| **Focus of Outcomes** | All outcomes are clearly and specifically stated and include at least: a. 2 student learning outcomes (what graduates know or can do) b. 1 program outcome (quality of program) c. 1 student achievement outcome (e.g., what they do after the program). | Outcomes include at least:  a. 1 student learning outcome (what graduates know or can do) b. 1 program outcome (quality of program e.g. advising) c. 1 student achievement outcome (e.g., what they do after the program). | At least one outcome is stated in terms of what graduates know, or are able to think or do, as a result of the program but missing outcomes related to educational programs and/or student achievement. | No outcomes are stated in terms of what graduates know, are able to think or do, as a result of the program. |
| **Measures** | **Assessment measures linked to Outcomes** | All measures reasonably assess all aspects of the outcome with documentation or details about how they do so. | All measures reasonably assess all aspects of the related outcome. | Most measures reasonably assess some, but not all, aspects of the related outcome. | No measures proposed. Measures not directly linked to, and therefore will not assess, the related outcome. |
| **Types of Assessment Measures** | All outcomes have a direct measure and the measures vary by outcome. | All outcomes have a direct measure but rely on a single observation (artifact, performance, test or survey). | Most outcomes have direct assessment measures. | Most outcomes do not have direct assessment measures and lack justification for such. |
| **Assessment measures likely to identify specific areas for improvement** | Plan provides a justification for how the measures and ways of summarizing data across students will likely provide data detailed enough to identify improvements | Measures and ways of summarizing data across students will likely provide data detailed enough to identify improvements | Measures or ways of summarizing data will likely identify only general areas for improvement | Measures unlikely to identify areas for improvement |
| **Criteria for Excellence** | Specific Criteria for Excellence with justifications for the criteria are proposed | Specific Criteria for Excellence are proposed for all assessment measures | Criteria for Excellence are proposed but vague for some measures | Criteria for Excellence are missing for some assessment measures |

We are working to include the following areas in future plans and reports. If you see evidence that units are currently addressing them, please feel free to rate.

| **Plan Rubric** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Exemplary** | **Good** | **Consider Revision** | **Revision Requested** |
| **Preparation, Resilience, & Inclusion** | **Modifications or Updates to the assessment plan** | Modifications reflective of assessment flaws and strengths from the previous biennial assessment plan have been made. | Criteria for excellence met during last cycle and no changes to the plan - but includes a justification for continuing same assessment. | At least one modification to the assessment plan has been partially implemented, but it is not clear how modifications will improve the assessment process. | Criteria for excellence met during last cycle, no changes to the assessment plan and does not provide justification for continuation of plan. |
| **Responsive to feedback** | Plan incorporates committee feedback. | Plan incorporates most committee feedback or provides justification for not doing so. | Plan does not incorporate committee suggested revisions and does not provide a justification. | Plan does not incorporate feedback on issues that needed improvement. |
| **Infrastructure** | Clear documentation and description of assessment. infrastructure with representative sampling and multiple raters. | Some evidence of appropriate assessment infrastructure; however, relies on one rater or sample is not representative. | It is unclear that assessment infrastructure is in place or methodological flaws are apparent (no multiple raters and undersampling, and unrepresentative samples). | No evidence that infrastructure has been developed to ensure data collection. Significant methodological flaws are apparent. |
| **Resilience** | Plan clearly and directly addresses ability to carry out plan through possible disruptions. | Some evidence the plan (as written or easily modified) could be carried out through possible disruptions. | It is unclear that plan could be carried out through possible disruptions. | n/a |
| **Equity-Minded** | Clear documentation and description of consideration for how assessment impacts multiple student populations. | Some evidence of consideration for how assessment impacts multiple student populations. | It is unclear that plan considers impact of assessment for multiple student populations. | n/a |

| **Report Rubric** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Exemplary** | **Good** | **Consider Revision** | **Revision Requested** |
| **Fidelity** | **Implementation Fidelity** | Reviewed (good/exemplary) plan implemented, or plan modified with justifications for modifications (perhaps based on feedback). | Reviewed (good/exemplary) plan generally implemented. | Plan not implement as reviewed without justifications for modifications. | Revisions requested by UAC for plan but not implemented. |
| **Results** | **Results Presented** | All assessment measures have results that are clearly presented with adequate detail to confidently assess the outcomes. | All assessment measures have results, but the clarity could be improved. | Most assessment measures have results, but the clarity of these should be *greatly* improved. | Most or all assessment measures are missing results. |
| **Alignment with Criteria** | Whether or not the reported results met the criteria for excellence is clear. | Whether or not the reported results met the criteria for excellence is apparent but could be improved. | Some of the results directly align with the outcomes and criteria. | Many of the results do not directly align with the outcomes and criteria. |
| **Interpretation & Reflection** | Broad faculty involvement in Interpretation of the results seems reasonable and includes discussion of what factors may have influenced the results. | Interpretation of the results seems reasonable. | Interpretation of the results attempted, but the interpretations are not aligned with methods and/or results. | No evidence of interpretation of the results. |
| **Communications** | **Faculty Involvement in Assessment Process** | Documented broad faculty involvement implementation of modifications. | Broad faculty involvement in implementation of modifications. | Some faculty involvement in the assessment process (e.g., report distributed only after modifications made). | No evidence of faculty involvement or distribution of assessment results. |
| **Communication with Stakeholders** | Documentation of communication of outcomes, results, and modifications to stakeholders (e.g., students, dean, alumni …). | Evidence of communication of some of the assessment results/modifications with stakeholders. | No evidence of communication. | n/a |
| **Improvement** | **Evidence of Improvement** | Documented evidence that improved student learning/services (better results) was directly because of program modifications. This requires the program to assess, make modifications, and assess again (perhaps over multiple assessment cycles) | Some evidence that improved student learning/services (better results) was likely because of program modifications. This requires the program to assess, make modifications, and assess again (perhaps over multiple assessment cycles) | Modifications implemented based on last assessment cycle, but no evidence that improvements occurred (i.e., continue making modifications) | n/a |
| **Plans to Improve** | **Modifications to student learning/services** | Multiple documented substantial modifications stemming from assessment have been implemented with justification as why the modification will likely lead to improved services or student learning. | At least one substantial modification stemming from assessment has been implemented; may be program, policy, or other program-related improvement that should lead to improved student learning, student achievement or educational program. | At least one modification has been partially implemented or it is not clear how identified modifications will likely lead to improved student learning, student achievement or educational program. | No substantial modifications stemming from assessment have been partially or completely implemented |