

**Andrews University**  
**Rubric for Evaluating Program Assessment Plan**

**Program:**

**Cycle Year:**

**Date Reviewed:**

**Mission Statement & Goals** - *A mission is a clear, concise statement outlining the ultimate principles that guide the work of the program, how the program is unique, who the program serves, in what ways and with what results. (i.e. Why would a student want to take this program?) Goals, if used, connect the mission to the learning outcomes. They provide a focus for the program and give direction to mission implementation.*

<b>Proficient (3)</b>	<b>Acceptable (2)</b>	<b>Developing (1)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and concise</li> <li>• Specific to the program (identifies what it does that separates it from other units or programs.)</li> <li>• Addresses the larger impact of the program.</li> <li>• Identifies stakeholders.</li> <li>• Aligned with the university mission, and with respective professional organization, if applicable.</li> <li>• Goals provide clear direction for mission implementation, and link to outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of the program's purpose</li> <li>• Identifies who it serves (stakeholders)</li> <li>• Aligned with the university mission statement.</li> <li>• Scope and reach may be limited.</li> <li>• Goals relate to mission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General statement of the intent of the program</li> <li>• Identifies the functions performed but not the greater purpose</li> <li>• Does not identify stakeholders</li> <li>• Fails to demonstrate clear alignment with university mission.</li> <li>• Too general to distinguish the unit or too specific to encompass the entire mission.</li> <li>• Not clear how goals relate to mission or connect to outcomes</li> </ul>

**Notes on Mission:**

**Outcomes/Objectives**

*Learning outcomes are specific statements that articulate the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and abilities students should gain or improve through engagement in the academic program or learning experience. Objectives have a broader scope, and may include administrative measures, such as quality of key services, productivity and outputs.*

<b>Proficient (3)</b>	<b>Acceptable (2)</b>	<b>Developing (1)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observable and measurable.</li> <li>• Encompass a discipline-specific body of knowledge (academic units) with focus on cumulative effect of the program. May also include general competencies.</li> <li>• Include faith-related outcomes or alignment with AU faith goals</li> <li>• Number of outcomes:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Undergraduate: minimum of four student learning outcomes</li> <li>○ Graduate: minimum of three student learning outcomes</li> <li>○ (Administrative units: minimum of three objectives)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Use action verbs</li> <li>• Describe level of mastery expected, appropriate to degree level</li> <li>• Accurately classified as "student learning" or "not student learning."</li> <li>• Alignment/associations with program mission, university goals, general education, etc. are identified (as appropriate)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observable and measurable.</li> <li>• Focus on student learning</li> <li>• Encompass the mission of the program and/or the central principles of the discipline.</li> <li>• Aligned with mission statement</li> <li>• Aligned with university goals and associations</li> <li>• Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether the outcome has been met.</li> <li>• Describe a process, rather than a learning outcome (i.e. focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns).</li> <li>• Incomplete-not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, or services associated with program.</li> <li>• Outcomes identified don't seem aligned with the program mission.</li> <li>• Fail to note appropriate associations (to goals, general education, etc.)</li> </ul>

**Notes on Outcomes/Objectives:**

**Measures**

*The variety of measures used to evaluate each outcome; the means of gathering data. Direct measures assess actual learning or performance, while indirect measures imply that learning has occurred*

<b>Proficient (3)</b>	<b>Acceptable (2)</b>	<b>Developing (1)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of two appropriate, quantitative measures for each outcome, with at least one direct measure.</li> <li>• Instruments reflect good research methodology.</li> <li>• Feasible-existing practices used where possible; at least some measures apply to multiple outcomes.</li> <li>• Purposeful-clear how results could be used for program improvement.</li> <li>• Described with sufficient detail; specific assessment instruments are made available (e.g., via URL, as attachments, etc.)</li> <li>• Specific inclusion of formative assessment to promote learning and continuous quality improvement (e.g., establishes baseline data, sets stretch targets based on past performance, etc.).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one measure or measurement approach per outcome.</li> <li>• Direct and indirect measures are utilized</li> <li>• Instruments described with sufficient detail.</li> <li>• Implementation may still need further planning.</li> <li>• At least one measure used for formative assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all outcomes have associated measures.</li> <li>• Few or no direct measures.</li> <li>• Methodology is questionable.</li> <li>• Instruments are vaguely described; may not be developed yet.</li> <li>• Course grades used as an assessment method.</li> <li>• Do not seem to capture the "end of experience" effect of the curriculum/program.</li> <li>• No apparent inclusion of formative assessment.</li> </ul>

**Notes on Measures:****Achievement Targets**

*Results, target, benchmark, or value that will represent success at achieving a given outcome. May include acceptable and aspirational levels. (e.g. Minimum target: 80% of the class will achieve acceptable on all rubric criteria; aspirational target: 80% of the class will achieve proficient or better on two-thirds of the criteria.)*

<b>Proficient (3)</b>	<b>Acceptable (2)</b>	<b>Developing (1)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target identified for each measure.</li> <li>• Aligned with measures and outcomes.</li> <li>• Specific and measurable</li> <li>• Represent a reasonable level of success.</li> <li>• Meaningful-based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards</li> <li>• Includes acceptable levels and stretch (aspirational) targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target identified for each measure.</li> <li>• Targets aligned with measures and outcomes.</li> <li>• Specific and measurable</li> <li>• Some targets may seem arbitrary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targets have not been identified for every measure, or are not aligned with the measure.</li> <li>• Seem off-base (too low/high).</li> <li>• Language is vague or subjective (e.g. "improve," "satisfactory") making it difficult to tell if met.</li> <li>• Aligned with assessment process rather than results (e.g. survey return rate, number of papers reviewed).</li> </ul>

**Notes on Achievement Targets:**

## Rubric for Evaluating Program Assessment Reports

<b>Findings</b>		
<i>A concise analysis and summary of the results gathered from a given assessment measure.</i>		
___ <b>Proficient (3)</b>	___ <b>Acceptable (2)</b>	___ <b>Developing (1)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete, concise, well-organized, and relevant data are provided for all measures.</li> <li>• Appropriate data collection and analysis.</li> <li>• Aligned with the language of the corresponding achievement target.</li> <li>• Provides solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met.</li> <li>• Compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate.</li> <li>• Reflective statements are provided either for each outcome or aggregated for multiple outcomes.</li> <li>• Supporting documentation (rubrics, survey, more complete reports without identifiable student information) are included in the document repository.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete and organized.</li> <li>• Aligned with the language of the corresponding achievement target.</li> <li>• Addresses whether targets were met.</li> <li>• May contain too much detail, or stray slightly from intended data set.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incomplete information</li> <li>• Not clearly aligned with achievement target.</li> <li>• Questionable conclusions about whether targets were met, partially met, or not met.</li> <li>• Questionable data collection/analysis; may “gloss over” data to arrive at conclusion.</li> </ul>
<b>Notes on Findings:</b>		
<b>Action Plans</b> <i>Actions to be taken to improve the program or assessment process based on analysis of results</i>		
___ <b>Proficient (3)</b>	___ <b>Acceptable (2)</b>	___ <b>Developing (1)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report includes one or more implemented and/or planned changes linked to assessment data.</li> <li>• Exhibit an understanding of the implications of assessment findings.</li> <li>• Identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical “next steps”.</li> <li>• Possibly identifies an area of the assessment process that needs improvement.</li> <li>• Contains completion dates.</li> <li>• Identifies a responsible person/group.</li> <li>• Number of action plans are manageable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflects with sufficient depth on what was learned during the assessment cycle.</li> <li>• At least one action plan in place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not clearly related to assessment results.</li> <li>• Seem to offer excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretation or “next steps” for program improvement.</li> <li>• No action plans or too many to manage.</li> <li>• Too general; lacking details (e.g. time frame, responsible party).</li> </ul>
<b>Notes on Action Plans</b>		

**Feedback on Assessment Plan and Report:**

Thank you for your dedication to data-based decision making in your program. Based on a review by the Assessment Committee, the membership offers the following feedback and advice for the program's assessment to inform your practice next year.

Strengths of the plan:

Items needing clarification:

Items that need to be added or modified:

Feedback for action planning: