

Assessment Feedback Rubric: Degree Programs with Program Learning Outcomes

UA Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Version 3.0: 8/25/25

Beginning	Developing	Mature	Exemplary
Outcomes: These are the expected outcomes of core unit activities (e.g., teaching, training). For academic degree programs (ADPs) and similar units, feedback reviews will focus on program learning outcomes (PLOs) —the specific knowledge and skills that graduating students are expected to gain from the program.			
I. Number of PLOs (maximum rating is “Mature”)			
No PLOs included in plan.	1-2 PLOs present.	A reasonably robust yet manageable number of outcomes (e.g., 3-5).	n/a
II. Specificity of PLO Statements			
No PLOs included; or statements worded as activities rather than desired outcomes.	Some PLOs are specific (e.g., precise verbs; rich descriptions of content/skill area) and modular (i.e., no overlap with other program PLOs).	Most PLOs are specific (e.g., precise verbs; rich descriptions of content/skill area) and modular (i.e., no overlap with other program PLOs).	All PLOs are specific (e.g., precise verbs; rich descriptions of content/skill area) and modular (i.e., no overlap with other program PLOs).
III. Rigor of PLOs (higher-level verbs from Bloom’s Taxonomy reflect stronger rigor)			
No PLOs included.	PLO set seems insufficiently rigorous for the degree level (e.g., most verbs are lower-level, such as “remember” and “understand”).	PLO set seems sufficiently rigorous for the degree level (e.g., balance between lower-level and higher-level verbs).	PLO set seems very rigorous for the degree level (e.g., emphasis on higher-level verbs such as “apply”, “analyze”, and “create”).
Curriculum Map: For degree programs, a curriculum map shows key instructional points (required courses and experiences) that give all students in the program the opportunity to progressively achieve the program PLOs.			
IV. Mapping of Relationship between Curriculum and PLOs			
No curriculum map included with assessment plan.	Courses/learning experiences are listed in map, but links to/coverage of PLOs not indicated.	Map shows coverage of PLOs in required courses/ learning experiences using basic notation (e.g., “X” or check mark).	Map shows progressive path to PLO achievement (e.g., Introduced, Reinforced, Mastered) through core courses in major (i.e., required learning activities).
Methods: What assessment measures/metrics are employed to determine if program learning outcomes are achieved? How are data collected and reviewed/evaluated by faculty?			
V. Number of Direct Measures (direct measures involve student work samples/performances that can be observed)			
No measures; or all measures are indirect (e.g., self-report surveys).	Some PLOs have direct measures.	Every PLO has a direct measure.	Multiple direct measures for most PLOs.
VI. Alignment between Measures and PLOs			
No measures; or measures don’t seem specific/direct enough to align with individual PLOs (e.g., course grades).	At a superficial level, most measures seem to align with individual PLOs (e.g., “Outcome X is measured with a graded essay administered in course 302”).	General detail provided about alignment (e.g., questions/tasks were developed by faculty/staff to match PLOs).	Links between measures and PLOs explained and delineated (e.g., questions/prompts attached).
VII. Measure-Specific Expectations for Achievement of PLOs			
No reference to a <i>priori</i> expectations included.	Measure-specific expectations stated but lacking in specificity (e.g., “growth”) or rigor (i.e., arbitrary low bar); or “Collecting baseline data.”	Measure-specific expectations specified (e.g., “90% of graduating students should obtain score X”) without stated rationale.	Measure-specific expectations specified (e.g., “90% of graduating students should obtain score X”) with stated rationale (e.g., based on past data or faculty norming process).

Beginning	Developing	Mature	Exemplary
VIII. Data Collection/Review/Evaluation Details			
Little or no detail provided about data collection and evaluation procedures.	Limited description provided about data collection/evaluation procedures (e.g., “student essays are graded by faculty” [no detail about rating rubric/guidelines]).	Enough detail provided that a new assessment coordinator could understand the general process for collecting data and sharing it with colleagues for review/evaluation.	Data collection and review/evaluation procedures well described (e.g., who, what, where, when); annual timeline indicated, pertinent prompts/rating forms attached for sustainability of process.
IX. Trustworthiness of Data Collection/Evaluation Methods			
No evidence that methods are likely to yield trustworthy, actionable results.	Basic approach seems logical, but more detail needed or methodological flaws/gaps apparent (e.g., unrepresentative sampling; reliance on course grades or defense pass/fail rates).	Methods seem sound and likely to yield actionable data; 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 PLO-specific, actionable results that can be trusted (e.g., inter-rater agreement statistics; triangulation via multiple measures).
Results/Interpretation: This section includes summary results (relative to <i>a priori</i> expectations) and more detailed interpretation/analysis--what do the results mean to the unit? What do they say about the impact of the curriculum? How do they compare to prior results? Are there relative strengths, weaknesses, or avenues for improvement?			
X. Presentation of Summary Results			
Results absent or seemingly unrelated to PLOs and/or <i>a priori</i> expectations for achievement.	Some summary results are presented clearly and seem directly related to PLOs and <i>a priori</i> expectations for achievement.	Most summary results are presented clearly and seem directly related to PLOs and <i>a priori</i> expectations for achievement.	All summary results presented clearly and related directly to PLOs and expectations (i.e., “research Qs” about student learning directly answered).
XI. Interpretation/Analysis of Results			
No results reported in this cycle; or no attempt at interpretation/analysis beyond summary results.	Interpretations seem unsupported by results; or interpretations beyond summary results are minimal (e.g., “Expectations 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; qualitative themes).	Interpretations seem reasonable and “drill down” in multiple ways (e.g., relative strengths/weaknesses; subgroup comparisons; error analysis), with reference to improvement opportunities.
Use of Results: Based on the results and interpretations, what actions does the program intend to take to help students achieve or further achieve PLOs?			
XII. Action Plans to Improve Student Learning			
No action plans; or no apparent reference in action plan(s) to improving student skills, knowledge, etc.	Described plan(s) do not flow logically from results, seem unrealistic, or are vague/underdeveloped (e.g., “We plan to meet next fall to develop an action plan”).	Plan(s) seem logical and data-informed but may lack detail such as timelines (e.g., “We will increase coverage of skill Y in course Z”; “We are developing a capstone course”).	Plan(s) seem manageable, based directly on results/interpretations, and sufficiently detailed (incl. timeline) to measurably improve student learning once implemented.
XIII. Action Plans to Refine Assessment Process (Note--units rated Mature or better on dimensions VIII and IX will automatically receive a Mature rating here)			
No action plans.	Described plan(s) to enhance the assessment process lack a clear rationale or seem vague (e.g., “We will consider alternative measures”).	Plan(s) to enhance the process are based on critical review and seem logical; or evidence that the existing process is mature and working well.	Plan(s) seems manageable, logical, and sufficiently detailed to enhance/build the assessment process in a timely, collaborative way.
Closing the Loop: What impact, if any, has resulted from prior/ongoing actions intended to improve student learning?			
XIV. Evaluation of Prior Actions Seeking Learning Improvement			
No apparent evaluation of prior/ongoing actions; or no active “LI” action plans (see <i>element XII</i>).	Indication that one or more “LI” action plans are still in progress (no reassessment yet); or claims of improved PLO results that do not reference an associated prior/ongoing action plan.	Clear evaluation of the impact of implemented “LI” action plan(s) on PLO results (assessed, <i>intervened</i> , reassessed), even if results did not improve. May include action plan adjustments.	Documented improvement in student learning (i.e., longitudinal data shows that PLO results improved after implementation of a data-informed “LI” action plan). Learning improvement achieved!