# University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee

# RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Highly Developed 4-points** | **Developed 3 -points** | **Emerging****2- points** | **Initial****1-point** |
| **Quality of Program Learning Outcomes** | Outcomes are stated in measurable terms and the curriculum map **clearly indicates** the **progression** of each outcome across the program. | Outcomes are stated in measurable terms and aligned across **most** of the curriculum. | Outcomes are not fully developed across the program, with **little evidence** of alignment across curriculum | Outcomes are not measurable or are **inappropriate** for the program. Does not appear to use best practices. |
| **Quality of Evidence** | Faculty collect quality reliable and valid evidence for each outcome. | Faculty collect reliable and valid evidence for each outcome. | Faculty collect evidence, but the reliability or the validity of the evidence collected is questionable. | The collection of evidence is neither valid nor reliable. |
| **Quality of Measuring Instruments** | Instruments or measurement tools (rubrics) identified and description of use is clearly articulated and developed enough to be meaningfully and consistently applied.Instruments are attached to the report. | Instruments or measurement tools identified and description of use are clearly articulated but may need further development to be more meaningfully and consistently applied. | Instruments or measurement tools identified, but incomplete, vague, or in early stages of development. | Instruments or measurement tools to access student learning are not identified. |
| **Methods of Assessment** | Both direct and indirect measures are used | Only direct measures are identified and used.  | Only indirect measures are collected. | Neither direct nor indirect measures of student learning are collected.  |

Rubric, continued

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Highly Developed****4- points** | **Developed****3 – points** | **Emerging****2 – points** | **Initial****1 –point** |
| **Use of Evidence** | There is an explicit, well-­‐reasoned connection between the assessment results and proposed changes. | There is an adequate connection between the assessment results and proposed changes. | The connection between the assessment results and proposed changes are either unclear or not well-reasoned. | The connection between the assessment results and proposed changes are indiscernible. |
| **Completeness** | The report is complete, clear and well-written. | Most required categories in the report are addressed and clear. | Some required categories in the report are vague, or poorly written. | Most required categories remain unaddressed, vague, poorly written. |
| **Evidence of Collaboration and Communication – “CLOSING THE LOOP"** | There is **explicit** and documented evidence of departmental discussions and faculty collaboration on assessment, closing the loop activities and report preparation. | There is **adequate** evidence of departmental discussions and faculty collaboration on assessment, closing the loop activities and report preparation. | Evidence **slightly** exists of either departmental discussions or faculty collaboration on most assessment activities. | There is **insufficient** evidence of departmental discussions or faculty collaboration on assessment activities. |

University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee

Report for Program Assessment

Name of Program Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Directions to UCAP Review Committee: In the table below, use the attached scoring rubric to comment on the quality of responses given by the program for each component, and any recommendations for the program to consider. Provide feedback that is evaluative and clear. This report will be sent to the program as part of the feedback loop.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component of Report** | **RUBRIC SCORE** | **Comments and Recommendations** |
| **Quality of Program Learning Outcomes** | 2 | One Learning Outcome is identified, but is not developed |
| **Quality of Evidence** | 1 | No evidence presented |
| **Quality of Measuring Instruments** | 2 | Identified but incomplete, and appear to be in the early stages |
| **Methods of Assessment** | 1 | Anecdotal evidence presented. |
| **Use of Evidence** | 1 | No evidence presented to support assessment |
| **Completeness** | 1 | Most categories are not developed for assessment |
| **Evidence of****Collaboration and****Communication – “CLOSING THE LOOP"** | 2 | Anecdotal evidence of collaboration and discussion. Senior Assessment was moved to EXSC 430 Research & Evidence Based Practice. |
|  |  |  |
| **OVERALL SCORE/** **Summary and Conclusions** | 10 |  |

Summary statement from UCAP regarding the quality of the report (including commendations and recommendations):

Learning outcomes for Exercise Science are identified and mapped to courses. However, there is no evidence in the report of a comprehensive assessment plan for the program’s learning outcomes. One learning outcome was assessed, but not enough information was included in the form of evidence.

Final recommendation of Program Review Committee (circle one): ACCEPT DO NOT Accept

Date: \_\_\_\_November, 16 2015\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Glossary of Terms:**

Assessment: the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development.

Benchmarking: an actual measurement of group performance against an established standard at defined points along the path toward the standard.

Evaluation: The use of assessment findings (evidence/data) to judge program effectiveness; used as a basis for making decisions about program changes or improvement.

Learning Outcomes: operational statements describing specific student behaviors that evidence the acquisition of desired knowledge, skills, abilities, capacities, attitudes or dispositions.

Program: a program is defined as a major or major/concentration.

Methods of assessment: tools and instruments used to measure student learning.

Direct methods of assessment: include standardized and locally developed tests, student portfolios, embedded assessments and course activities, and oral examinations (competence interviews).

Indirect methods of assessment: include surveys, interviews, focus groups, and reflective essays

Reliability: Reliable methods are consistent. Students would perform equally well if assessment process was repeated or presented in a unique way. Reliable assessment methods allow assessors to score at an acceptance rate of consistency.

Validity: Valid measures are meaningful. The results of the assessment process inform the assessor by providing data that is useful, and informs the success of student learning.