

## Evaluation of Annual Assessment Reports from Academic Departments and Programs

### Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Reports

Annual assessment reports vary in a number of characteristics. This rubric represents an effort to recognize departmental or program achievements.

#### **Exceptional:** Score = 8 - 10

General characteristics: Reports in this category contained excellent descriptions of assessment activities conducted throughout the curriculum, including service or General Education courses offered by the program. Multiple measures of evaluating student learning are used with an emphasis on direct measures of student learning.

Faculty involvement was evident and the assessment plan is included or had been provided within the last three years. Assessment results have been used to strengthen individual courses and (or) to improve the curriculum. The "Levels of Implementation" departmental self-evaluation was consistent with the content of the report. Reports at the top of this classification exceed minimum expectations and may be comparable to the best assessment reports available from regional and peer institutions.

#### **Above Average:** Score = 6 - 7

General characteristics: Reports in this grouping lack two or more of the strengths described for the previous category or they might have been ranked in the lower range of the previous category but were submitted late. There may have been evidence that the Chair/Head developed the report without involvement of the faculty or that the Chair/Head had minimal involvement in writing the report.

#### **Average to slightly below average:** Score = 4 - 5

General characteristics: Reports in this grouping have several areas for development and typically lack the majority of strengths identified for the top category of assessment reports. Assessment activities may focus on indirect measures of student learning, such as interviews with graduating seniors or surveys of alumni and employers.

#### **Strong corrective actions are needed:** Score = 1 - 3

General characteristics: Reports in this grouping may demonstrate a lack of understanding of assessment activities or a general lack of interest by the Chair/Head and (or) the faculty.

#### **No report received:** Score = 0

### **Explanation of ratings:**

The initial assessment plans were submitted in 1992 and a University Assessment Committee (UAC) was formed in that same year. Five departments volunteered to submit early assessment reports to provide members of the UAC with experience in reviewing assessment reports and to increase inter-rater reliability when assessment reports were required of all departments.

The basic approach of the UAC has not changed over time. Assessment guidelines have been updated and rewritten over time to promote clarity. The expectations for quality assessment reports have slowly evolved. Experience by departments and programs in the evaluation of student learning, opportunities to incorporate what was discovered through assessment of student learning, and opportunities to implement suggestions from the review process should have led, over time, to improved assessment practices and stronger assessment reports.

Higher ratings (evaluations) have been used to recognize those departments and programs that have strengthened their activities to evaluate student learning. The characteristics of exceptional assessment reports have been described earlier in this document.

Updated: July 6, 2006