Assessment Feedback Rubric: Programs/Units with Student Learning Outcomes

Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Beginning	Developing	Mature	Exemplary
Outcomes: These are the expected consequences/impact of core unit activities (e.g., teaching, training). For academic degree programs (ADPs) and similar units, feedback will focus on **student learning outcomes (SLOs)**--the specific knowledge, skills, and attitudes that graduating students are expected to have mastered.			
S1. Number of Outcomes (maximum rating is "Mature"; this is the number of program-level SLOs)			
No outcomes included in plan.	1-2 outcomes present; or an excessive number that may be difficult to manage.	A reasonably robust yet manageable number of outcomes (e.g., 3-5).	n/a
S2. Specificity of Outcome Statements			
No SLOs included; or statements worded as activities rather than desired impact/consequences.	Some SLOs are specific (e.g., precise verbs/details), modular (i.e., not overly broad or complex), and conducive to measurement.	Most SLOs are specific (e.g., precise verbs/details), modular (i.e., not overly broad or complex), and conducive to measurement.	All SLOs are specific (e.g., precise verbs/details), modular (i.e., not overly broad or complex), and conducive to measurement.
S3. Rigor of Outcomes			
No SLOs included.	Some SLOs seem sufficiently rigorous given the mission and nature of the unit (e.g., skills/knowledge should be appropriate to the degree level).	Most SLOs seem sufficiently rigorous given the mission and nature of the unit (e.g., skills/knowledge should be appropriate to the degree level).	All SLOs seem sufficiently rigorous given the mission and nature of the unit (e.g., skills/knowledge should be appropriate to the degree level).
Curriculum/Activity Mapping: For ADPs, a curriculum map shows how courses/experiences "cover" SLOs and allow all students to progress to mastery. For other units (where applicable), a map can show how specific activities/events contribute to student mastery of SLOs (e.g., Student Affairs programming).			
S4. Mapping of Relationship between Curriculum and Desired Outcomes (where applicable)			
No curriculum/activity map included with assessment plan.	Courses/learning experiences listed in map, but links to/coverage of SLOs not indicated.	Map shows coverage of SLOs in required courses/learning experiences using basic notation (e.g., "X" or check mark).	Map shows progressive path to mastery of SLOs (e.g., Introduced, Reinforced, Mastered) through core courses in major (i.e., required learning activities).
Methods: What assessment measures/indicators/metrics are employed to determine if outcomes are achieved? How/when are data collected and evaluated?			
S5. Number of Direct Measures (direct measures involve student work samples/performances that can be observed)			
No measures; or all measures indirect (e.g., self-report surveys are indirect).	Some SLOs have direct measures.	Every SLO has a direct measure.	Multiple direct measures for most SLOs.
S6. Alignment between Measures and Outcomes			
No measures; or measures don't seem specific/direct enough to match SLOs (e.g., course grades for ADPs).	At superficial level, most measures seem to match SLOs (e.g., "Outcome X is measured with an essay in course 302").	General detail provided about alignment (e.g., questions/tasks were developed by faculty/staff to match SLOs).	Links between measures and SLOs explained and delineated (e.g., questions/prompts attached).
S7. Expectations for Achievement			
No reference to a priori expectations included.	Expectations stated but lacking in specificity (e.g., "growth") or rigor (i.e., arbitrary low bar); or "Collecting baseline data."	Expectations specified (e.g., "5% increase in Metric Y"; or "80% of graduating students met expectations") without stated rationale/explanation.	Expectations specified and justified (e.g., "10% increase in exit exam scores after curriculum redesign with increased coverage of this SLO").

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA

Beginning	Developing	Mature	Exemplary
S8. Systematic, Ongoing Process for Collecting/Evaluating Data (Multi-Year Schedule)			
No indication of when data will be collected beyond current year.	Future data collection and evaluation timeline (3-to-5 year horizon) provided for some measures.	Future data collection and evaluation timeline (3-to-5 year horizon) provided for most measures.	Future data collection and evaluation timeline (3-to-5 year horizon) provided for all measures.
S9. Data Collection/Evaluation Details			
Little or no information provided about data collection and evaluation procedures.	Limited description provided about data collection/evaluation procedures (e.g., "student essays rated by faculty" [no detail about rating rubric or scheme]).	Enough detail provided that a new assessment coordinator could understand the process for data collection/evaluation.	Data collection and evaluation procedures fully described (e.g., who, what, where, when); pertinent prompts/rating forms attached.
S10. Trustworthiness of Data Collection/Evaluation Methods			
No evidence that methods are likely to yield trustworthy results (e.g., "Instructors submitted course grades").	Basic approach logical, but more detail needed or methodological flaws/gaps apparent (e.g., unrepresentative sampling; subjective rating process).	Methods seem sound; some efforts to foster trustworthiness are described (e.g., multi-rater design; use of rubric developed by multiple faculty).	Methods seem robust and likely to yield results that can be trusted (e.g., inter-rater agreement statistics; triangulation via multiple measures).
Results/Analysis: This section includes summary results (relative to expectations) and more detailed interpretation/analysis--what do the results mean to the unit? What do they say about the impact of programming? How do they compare to prior results? Are there relative strengths, weaknesses, or avenues for improvement?			
S11. Presentation of Summary Results			
Results absent or seemingly unrelated to desired SLOs and expectations for achievement.	Some results presented clearly and related directly to SLOs and expectations for achievement.	Most results presented clearly and related directly to SLOs and expectations for achievement.	All results presented clearly and related directly to SLOs and expectations for ach. (i.e., 'research questions' about student learning definitively answered).
S12. Interpretation/Analysis of Results			
No results reported in this cycle; or no attempt at interpretation/analysis.	Interpretations seem unsupported by data/methods; or interpretations are minimal and do not go beyond summary findings (e.g., "Expectations were met; no need for action").	Interpretations seem reasonable and "drill down" in at least one way (e.g., relative strengths/weaknesses; subgroup comparisons; error analysis).	Interpretations seem reasonable and "drill down" in multiple ways (e.g., relative strengths/weaknesses; subgroup comparisons; error analysis), with ref. to improvement opportunities.
Use of Results: Based on the results and analysis, what actions does your program/unit plan to take to achieve or further achieve outcomes?			
S13. Action Plan: Impact (on student learning, attitudes, etc.)			
No action plans; or no apparent reference in plan to improving student skills, knowledge, attitudes, etc.	Described plan does not flow logically from results, seems unrealistic, or is vague/under-developed (e.g., "We plan to develop a plan to improve").	Plan seems logical but may lack detail such as timelines (e.g., "We will increase coverage of Y in course Z"; "We will revise our training process").	Plan seems manageable, based directly on results, and sufficiently detailed (incl. timeline) to measurably improve student learning once implemented.
S14. Action Plan: Assessment Process (Note--units rated Mature or better on dimensions 9 and 10 will automatically receive a Mature rating here)			
No action plans.	Described plan to enhance assessment process does not have a clear rationale or is vague/underdeveloped (e.g., "We will review measure X").	Plan to enhance process is based on critical review and seems logical; or evidence that existing process is mature and needs no alteration.	Plan seems manageable, logical, and sufficiently detailed to enhance/build assessment process in a timely way.