

Program _____

Program Point of Contact _____

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Target (3pts)</i>	<i>Developing (2pts)</i>	<i>Beginning (1pt)</i>
<i>Outcomes Clarity and Measurability</i>	Outcomes are clear, represent multiple levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, are measurable, and reflect national standards where appropriate.	Some, but not all outcomes are exemplary and could use improvement.	Outcomes are presented but are too broad, describe a process, or not measurable, or all at lower level of Bloom's.
<i>Number and Type of Measures Utilized</i>	At least two direct measures of assessment are listed for each outcome. Indirect measures are included where appropriate. Measures for cross-curricular skills (undergraduate programs) are clearly addressed as well.	Two direct measures of assessment are listed for some but not all learning outcomes. Indirect measures may or may not be included. Measures for some cross-curricular skills are included.	Only a single direct measure of assessment is listed for each outcome and/or some outcomes are missing any assessment measure. Measures for cross-curricular skills (undergraduate programs) are not addressed.
<i>Formative and Summative Measures</i>	All outcomes are assessed using formative and summative measures.	Some outcomes have a method of formative assessment in addition to summative program assessments.	Only summative assessments are utilized.
<i>Criteria for Success</i>	Criteria for success or benchmarks for each outcome are meaningful, based on a reasonable level of success, and referenced to national standards where appropriate.	Criteria or benchmarks are set for some or all outcomes. Some criteria may be set arbitrarily or at a level to guarantee success. Success is target rather than true evaluation of student progress.	Criteria or benchmarks are not set or language is subjective (improve, reach satisfactory level, etc.)
<i>Explanation of Methodology</i>	Plan explicitly outlines how and when outcomes will be assessed, establishes responsible parties, and describes how results will be shared with relevant stakeholders.	Plan generally outlines how the outcomes are assessed but lacks specifics on courses targeted, faculty responsible, or methodology for discussion of assessment results within the program and with relevant stakeholders.	The plan provides a brief, indirect overview of how outcomes will be assessed.

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Target (3pts)</i>	<i>Developing (2pts)</i>	<i>Beginning (1pt)</i>
<i>Explanation and Interpretation of Results</i>	Results are clearly and completely stated and provide evidence of whether or not criteria for success were met or unmet. Reflection on results by all faculty is evident.	Results are provided but reflection on results is not discussed.	Results are provided but are incomplete, vague, or not related to the intended outcome.
<i>Utilization of Results for Improvement</i>	A clearly stated plan for program improvement is provided as a result of the reflection of results. Improvement suggestions are then tied to department goals, the strategic plan, and budgeting if appropriate and tracking of evidence of student learning is evident.	Program improvements are submitted but may not necessarily reflect data from assessment measures or incorporate changes into department level goals. Changes may be suggested based on information gathered outside of the outlined assessment process. Tracking of improvement based on results is limited.	There is no stated program improvement to outcomes, benchmarks, or curriculum as a result of assessment. Program may state that outcomes are being met so program improvements are not necessary at this time.
<i>Rubrics and Curriculum Maps Included</i>	Yes	Rubrics are included but no curriculum map has been uploaded	No

Rubric Score _____

*Rubric designed based on the following college assessment rubrics: West Texas A&M University, Washburn University, University of Pittsburg, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, and the articles:

Fulcher, K.H. and C.D. Orem. 2010. *Evolving from Quantity to Quality: A New Yardstick for Assessment*. Research and Practice in Assessment, Volume 5: Winter 2010.

Fulcher, K.H. M. Swain, and C.D. Orem. 2012. *Expectations for Assessment Reports: A Descriptive Analysis*. Assessment Update, Volume 24 Number 1.